Pragmatics of Impoliteness in Construction Sites: A Case study of Mwanza, Tanzania

Farida J. Washokera and Lea Mpobela

ABSTRACT

This article examined Pragmatics of Impoliteness in the construction sites: A case study of Mwanza region. The study based on Jonathan Culpeper's impoliteness model (1996) and revised by Culpeper in 2005. Moreover, impoliteness strategies, reasons for using impoliteness, as well as responses for impoliteness in construction sites have been researched. The study is of the view that impoliteness strategies are applied in the construction sites so as to achieve certain goals. This is a qualitative study with the data gathered through observation, interview and focus group discussion. The data have been collected from the seven construction sites. The study concluded that all the five impoliteness strategies (Bald on record, positive, negative, mock or sarcasm impoliteness and withhold politeness) listed by Culpeper were used by the construction workers and there were reasons for using impoliteness strategies some of them were; to raise working morale, to entertain the workers and to provide simple and clear information and instruction.

Keywords: construction sites, construction site workers, impoliteness, impoliteness strategies.

F. J. Washokera
Department of Languages and Linguistics, St Augustine University of Tanzania, Mwanza-Tanzania
(e-mail: fwashokera@gmail.com)
L. Mpobela*
Department of Languages and Linguistics, St Augustine University of Tanzania, Mwanza-Tanzania
(e-mail: rafikilea@yahoo.co.tz)

*Corresponding Author

I. INTRODUCTION

Language is a very important means of communication and the use of it is restricted by social norms in a particular context. The communicators apply different strategies to make sure their message is delivered as intended. Some of the strategies are politeness in which a speaker is required to be as polite as possible in the communication context. Different politeness strategies have been suggested by Brown and Levinson (1987). There are other times in which communicators use language strategies to attack face. Culpeper (1996) claims that impoliteness is the opposite of politeness since it has the opposite effect, which is social disruption. Contrary to that, Verschuem (1999) says politeness should not be treated as center of social interaction; nevertheless, impoliteness may be functional as politeness in interaction. This means that impoliteness maybe used in some context and results into clear understanding and fulfills the communication needs. Impoliteness has been defined by Culpeper (1996) as the use of strategies designed to attack face and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony. This definition has been refined by Culpeper (2005, p. 38) into: Impoliteness comes about when: (1) the speaker communicates face-attack intentionally, or (2) the hearer perceives and/or constructs behaviour as intentionally face-attacking, or a combination of (1) and (2).

Lucky (2015) claims that, impoliteness can be highly damaging to personal lives. In addition to that Lucky says impoliteness is highly salient in public life, especially in the digital era nowadays. It is often reported in the media, notably when it occurs in context where it seems strikingly deviant (for example, verbal abuse directed to the president by congressman, verbal abuse that causes suicide, etc.). However, since language use is contextual, there are some contexts in which impoliteness is experienced without resulting into any breakdown and people communicate smoothly.

There are literatures suggest that impoliteness normally occur in situations in which collocutors have conflict of interest (Bousfield, 2007(a); Culpeper, 2005; Keinpointer, 2008; Kryk-Kastovsky, 2006). In addition to that, impoliteness tends to have a connection to power, specifically social power. Studies have shown that those with more power (legitimate and/or expert power) tend to use impoliteness (Culpeper, 1996; Kantara, 2010). This implies that there are always reasons for employing impoliteness strategies in conversations.

There are two ways to respond to impoliteness including: to respond or to not respond, that is, to be silent. A response to impoliteness situation may be to accept the impoliteness and submit to the other and the situation may end; or to counter either in defensive or offensive manner. Countering defensively means defending one's own face through direct contradiction, abrogation, insincere agreement and ignoring the attack. Countering offensively is intended to match or worsen the situation. Here the super

strategies of impoliteness (bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm, or mock impoliteness, withhold politeness) are applied (Bousfield, 2008; Bousfield *et al*., 2003).

It has been observed in previous studies which investigated about impoliteness that it is a negative behaviour and it has negative effect to communicators that is to attack and damage face. This paper aims at identifying the impoliteness strategies and impoliteness types employed by communicators in the construction sites and why the interlocutors in the construction sites are continue using impoliteness strategies. Every impoliteness strategy employed has a response and so they will be revealed as well.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

As seen in the introduction, impoliteness is reflected in different contexts including construction sites where most of the workers are youths. This may be because of the nature of their work which needs the use of lots of energy, their status and the life style. Most of the time, youths communicate using slangs and codes to connect to each other. These seem to meet communication needs for the youths. Doing so, they find themselves using impoliteness strategies which according to the literatures lead to communication breakdown most of the time. This raises some questions the researcher will wish to answer including: why do workers in construction sites use impolite language? Do they understand each other? Does this kind of communication affect their performance or improve their performance? So, the researcher is expecting to find the answers in construction sites.

The problem therefore is, despite being impolite; they still use the strategies to communicate. This raised the researcher's interest in this topic. The researcher was curious to find what is happening in the construction sites. Therefore, this study analyses the pragmatics of impoliteness applied in the construction sites. The focus is on assessing the impoliteness acts applied in the communication among interlocutors in the construction sites.

III. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Culpeper (1996; 2005) proposed five impoliteness super strategies. These are bald-on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock (off-record) impoliteness and withhold politeness. Moreover, Afzaal *et al*. (2020) explains two more impoliteness strategies with a little modification. These are positive impoliteness output strategies which occur when one disassociates from the other. For example, deny association or common ground with the other, avoid sitting together, seek disagreement, select a sensitive topic, and negative impoliteness output strategies that is; condescend, scorn or ridicule, emphasize your relative power, be contemptuous, explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect Speaker-personalize, use the pronouns 'I' and 'You'. On the same view Bousfield (2008) develops the second order models proposed by Culpeper (1996, 2005) by subsuming the five super strategies (bald on record impoliteness; positive impoliteness; negative impoliteness; off record impoliteness; withhold politeness) within two which are; on-record impoliteness and off-record impoliteness.

IV. IMPOLITENESS STRATEGIES

Impoliteness model that is proposed by Culpeper in 1996 and 2005 was used in this study. Culpeper calls them super strategies of impoliteness which are bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock (off-record) impoliteness and withhold politeness. Through these strategies, impoliteness can be created and received.

A. Bald on Record Impoliteness

This strategy is used when there is much face at risk and when the speaker intends to damage the hearer's face and thus the impolite utterance will be performed directly and clearly. Culpeper uses Face-Attack-Act (FAA) in opposition to Face Threatening Act (FTA). This is identified when there is a deliberate intention on the part of the speaker in damaging the hearer's face. For example, in giving orders like "shut up", "come here" and "sit down".

B. Positive Impoliteness

This is a strategy that is used to damage the hearer's face wants (desire to be accepted). Here Culpeper added sub-strategies to positive politeness such as; ignoring or snubbing the other, denying common grounds with the hearer, selecting a sensitive or undesirable topic to talk about, using inappropriate identity markers, being disinterested and unsympathetic with the hearer, looking for disagreements, using obscure language and inserting secretive words within the discourse and using taboo words.

C. Negative Impoliteness

It is designed to attack hearers negative face want (his desire to be free from imposition). It has sub strategies such as scorn, frighten, ridicule and invade the hearer's space literary or metaphorically.

D. Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness

Speaker performs FTA using politeness strategies which are clearly insincere because, sarcasm has opposite meant.

E. Withhold Politeness

This occurs when the speaker does not perform politeness where it is expected as in keeping silent when the speaker is supposed to thank or answer the hearer.

V. REASONS FOR USING IMPOLITENESS ACTS

Bousfield (2007a) argues that impoliteness does not exist in a vacuum and that the interactants must have felt sufficiently provoked at some point prior to delivering the utterance containing impoliteness. Bousfield reports that common triggers of impoliteness are offensive situations such as behaviours that could not meet the expectation of other interlocutors. Another reason is, a combination of behaviours and unexpected physical appearance which are unexpected by an institution become offensive situations which then provoke face attacks.

Other factors are social power, intimacy and conflict of interest. When collocutors have unique social power, those with more such power tend to do impoliteness. For example, non-commissioned officers set up face attacks regularly towards an army recruit who has less power (Culpeper, 1996). Culpeper also adds that in situations where collocutors have close relationships, impoliteness tends to occur because they lack a mechanism to achieve their dominance. Impoliteness will also occur when collocutors have a conflict of interest.

VI. RESPONSES TO IMPOLITENESS

Lucky (2015) says that there are three choices open to a recipient of FTA or impoliteness acts which are accepting the face attack, countering the face attack and choosing not to respond. Gunawan (2017) also reveals that the recipients can respond differently towards the impoliteness act basing on the situation. These responses can be described as follows:

A. Accepting the Face Attack

Bousfield (2008) says that for the participants who choose to accept the face attack, it can be assumed that they account some kind of responsibilities for the impoliteness act to happen. It is also possible that they may agree with the impolite assessment contained within the worsened FTA. Therefore, the impoliteness act that occurs might be met with an apology (Bousfield *et al*., 2003).

A. Countering the Face Attack

The option to counter the face attack resulted in a set of strategies which can be considered in terms of whether they are offensive or defensive. The offensive countering refers to the response of face attack with the face attack (Culpeper, 1996).

The defensive countering refers to the response of face attack by defending one's own face or the face of the third part (Bousfield, 2008). Defensive countering can be done through strategies as direct contradiction, abrogation, dismissal, ignoring the face attack, offering an explanation, opting out on record, treating the situation as a different type (Bousfield, 2007).

B. Choose Not to Respond

Bousfield (2008) argues that choosing not to respond might be caused by several reasons or that there are intended participant aims within a conventional exchange including defending someone's own face. Other reasons are participant's failure to hear the content of the speaker's utterances, participant's acceptance to the FTA or the participant's lack of understanding about the content of the utterance. It is also possible that the participant does not know how to respond to impoliteness.

People in the construction sites communicate mostly by using impoliteness strategies. Thus, the researcher of this study identified the responses which construction sites workers opted to employ.

VII. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study employed qualitative research approach because it allowed the researcher to observe and

listen to the explanations of the respondents. The approach allowed data collection process in the natural environment. Furthermore, descriptive research design was applied so as to explain in details the reasons for workers to use impoliteness strategies in the construction sites. This design is appropriate for describing the characteristics of the sample.

The research was conducted in Mwanza region specifically in Misungwi and Sengerema districts. These districts are populated by different people from nearby places who interact for economic and social purposes. The interaction is also motivated by the presence of construction projects in progress. This has influence on the use of language as these people are multicultural.

This study involved 16 respondents, including one construction inspector and one human resource officer (both from the government construction site), twelve general labours and two food sellers.

In this study, data was collected through observations, interviews and focus group discussions. Participant was of observation was used where researcher took a position of a construction site supervisor. The researcher observed the impoliteness acts in the conversations so as to identify impoliteness strategies, types and their responses. The interviews were done to ten respondents while focus group discussion was done to six respondents. Interviews and focus group discussion were conducted after gathering the data from observations with the focus on discussing the reasons for employing impoliteness strategies in conversations in the construction sites.

VIII. STUDY FINDINGS

The study collected impoliteness strategies, impoliteness types, reasons for impoliteness and the responses to impolite acts. The identities of participants are protected by using pseudonyms. Utterances that show impoliteness acts in conversations are italicised.

IX. IMPOLITENESS STRATEGIES IN THE CONSTRUCTION SITES

The first objective of this study was to find out the impoliteness strategies used in construction sites. This part presents, and analyses the impoliteness strategies applied by people in the construction sites. The impoliteness strategies identified during participant's observation are: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or scorn impoliteness and withhold politeness.

A. Bald on Record Impoliteness

Impoliteness work in bald on record is applied in a very clear way. This strategy occurs when the speaker has an intention to attack the hearer's face, and when there is an adequate amount of face at risk (Culpeper, 2003). Interlocutors in the construction sites used bald on record impoliteness strategy where by direct orders were provided when the hearer needed to direct or give instructions. In example 8, the speaker asked the addressee to help him measure the surface by taking one side of a tape. After measuring, the speaker was not satisfied so he asked the addressee to repeat measuring. The way the speaker shouted the word, *Tena!* 'again/repeat' with a non-verbal signal directing the addressee to stoop down and commanding the addressee to do it damaged his face because he was not willing to repeat and emphasised that the first measurements were correct. The conversation in construction site A was as in example 1.

1) John: *Tena! Tena!* [Repeat! Repeat!]
   Eliud: Ni sawa [It is okay]
   John: *Sisawa, sisawa! Tena!* [Not okay, not okay! Repeat!]

John performed bald on record impoliteness as he forced Eliud to redo the measuring of the surface by saying *tena,* [repeat], *sisawa* [not okay], *tena* [repeat] with the high pitch and using a stoop down signal to insist him to do as he was directed. This impolite situation was also facilitated by a language barrier because the interlocutors were natives of different languages, whereby John only knew few Swahili words hence it was difficult for him to explain why he wanted Eliud to redo the measuring. Maybe, if Eliud could know the reason for a redo, he could do it willingly. This impoliteness act was performed in a clear way and attacked the hearer's face by forcing him to do what he was not willing to.

Bald on record impoliteness was also employed in another construction site where the addressee was pushing a machine towards the speakers who were shouting as exemplified in the utterance in 2 in construction site B.

2) Ali: *Sukumaa!* [Push]
   Masanja: (continue pushing)

Majaliwa:	*leta huku!* [Bring here]
Ali:	*leta hapa!* [Bring here] (in a diferent direction)
Masanja:	*Nimsikilize nani sasa*? [Whom should I listen to now?]

In this example, Ali and Majaliwa employed bald on record impoliteness because they were commanding Masanja to bring the machine to each of them while they were in different directions. They commanded by shouting at him a situation that made him confused to whom to take the machine first. The commanding utterance and shouting voice damaged the addressee's face of being which made him fail to figure out where or to whom to bring the machine first.

Bald on record impoliteness were expressed by using high pitch and loud voice which contributes much for the utterance to be considered impolite and harm the addressee's face. The instructions were heard like shouting. This view is supported by Culpeper (2011) when studying the relationship between prosody and impoliteness. He found that the sound effects such as pitch, tone of voice, and loudness may affect the interpretation and perception of the utterance as being impolite or polite. He further said that an utterance can be considered impolite not only because of what the speaker says, but also because of how he or she says it.

B. Positive Impoliteness

Positive impoliteness strategy is normally used to cause harm to the addressee's positive face (Culpeper, 2005). Communicator may decide to attack the hearer's need or will to be accepted by others. Positive impoliteness strategy has sub strategies like ignoring the other, excluding the other from an activity, being disinterested, unconcerned, and unsympathetic, using inappropriate identity markers, using obscure or secretive language, seeking disagreement, using taboo words, and calling other names. This was observed in the constructions sites (as presented in 3) which reflects the conversation between one member of a group who was going out of the moth pipe where they were tightening the moths to make that pipe stronger and his fellow worker.

3) Tom: *Sasa unaenda wapi wewe, wewe tumbili?*
   [Where are you going now, you monkey?]
   Josh: *Yanakuhusu ninapoenda? Twende wote basi*
   [Does it concern you where I am going? Let's go together then]
   Tom: We*we tumbili acha usenge, acha upumbavu wenu huo, zama ndani uje ujaze.*
   [You monkey, stop being gay, stop that foolishness, go in and fill.]

In 3), Tom performed positive impoliteness strategy as he used inappropriate identity markers by calling Josh, *tumbili* [monkey] and using inappropriate words *usenge* [being gay] and *upumbavu* [foolishness] in the utterance. This damaged the hearer's face need; a need to be considered and asked why he's doing what he was doing or where he was going and the right to be addressed by their names.

Moreover, Josh performed positive impoliteness by using ignoring the other strategy. Instead of answering him by saying where he was going, or even explaining why he was going out of their moth pipe he ignored by asking *yanakuusu ninapoenda*? [Does where I am going concern you?] Josh decided not to recognise and value Tom's presence and the questions asked even though he knew the essence of the question that they have to do their work and finish it on time.

The above discussion proves that some impoliteness strategies in the construction sites are employed intentionally as commented by Culpeper (2005) that impoliteness comes about when the speakers deliberately communicate face, and or hearers observe the behaviour as intentionally face attacking. Impoliteness strategies can be employed intentionally to emphasise the point the speaker intends to deliver without intending to hurt or damage the addressee's feelings and face. The use of multiple impoliteness sub-strategies also aims at emphasising the message.

Also, the fact that both sides use impolite utterances that is, Tom and Josh suggest that in the construction sites, this is a normal way of communicating which does not affect their work. The researcher observed that despite the name calling and inappropriate responses the interlocutors were happy and the work continued. That suggests that impoliteness does not result to communication breakdown in all circumstances. In some circumstances it is the best way of keeping the communication going as observed in the construction sites in Mwanza region.

In another utterance some labourers were offloading bags of cement from the lorry while others were continuing with the building activities. One of the labourers was considered clumsy as he acted like dropping a bag of cement on the other hence this utterance in 4 occurred.

4) Sam: *Angalia basi usije ukatuua.* [Watch out not to kill us]
   Jack: *Wewe umri wako umeshaenda hata ukifa huku ni sawa, we utakujaje kufanya kazi na*

	vijana?
	[You are too old. So, even if you die here it is fine, how comes you work with youths?]
Sam:	*Acha basi upimbi na wewe, acha basi upimbi.*
	[Stop acting like hyrax]. (twice)
Jack:	*Sasa unaogopa nini na wewe?* [Now, what are you afraid of?]
Sam:	We si una baba yako na mama yako. [You have a father and a mother, right?]
Jack:	Kwani nimekukatalia. [Did I refuse it?]
Sam:	Mimi nina watoto sasa wananitegemea. [I have children who depend on me]
Peter:	*Wewe unawatoto na wewe*? [Do you have children as well?]
Jack:	*Sasa na wewe unataka kuwa mama yangu*? Maana baba ni mmoja, mama wanaweza kuwa wengi, *kuwa mama sasa!*
	[Do you want to be my mother? Because there is one father but mothers can be many, be my mother then]
Peter:	*Kama na wewe unawatoto dunia imeenda mwisho hii*, dunia imeishaa
	[If you too have children, this world is ending, the world has reached the end].

In example 4 Jack performed positive impoliteness strategy by excluding the other from the activity by saying *wewe umri wako umeshaenda hata ukifa huku ni sawa, we utakujaje kufanya kazi na vijana* [You are too old. So, even if you die here, it is fine, how comes you work with youths?]. He was trying to exclude Sam from the group by telling him that he is older than them. This damaged the hearer's face want of being considered strong and healthy and so fit into the group.

On the other hand, Peter performed positive impoliteness strategy by seeking disagreement by saying *we una watoto na wewe? Kama na wewe una watoto dunia imeenda mwishoni hii, dunia imeishaa* [Do you have children as well? If you too have children, this world is ending, the world has reached the end]. Here Peter was refusing the fact that it is possible for Sam to have babies even if they condemned him to be older than others in their group. This damaged Sam's face need to be recognised as a man who has children.

Also, Sam applied positive impoliteness strategy by insulting others using inappropriate identity markers as in *Acha basi upimbi wewe, acha basi upimbi* [Stop acting like hyrax]. He said so to his fellow who was pretending to drop the cement bag on him. He was trying to mean 'stop doing that, it is not good, you may hurt others.

This conversation is also a proof that impoliteness strategies are employed in the construction sites intentionally even though in a joking manner like *Kama na wewe una watoto dunia imeenda mwishoni hii* [If you too have children, this world is ending, the world has reached the end]. It also proves that impoliteness strategies are employed by communicators in the construction sites as their daily normal way of communication when they make jokes. Impoliteness strategies naturally have verbal creativity which makes the impolite conversation in a form of a joke interesting. This is justified by Culpeper's (2011) assertion that much impoliteness has elements of creativity, not least of all because of its frequently competitive nature: if one is attacked, one responds in kind or with a superior attack. And to achieve a superior attack requires creative skills. Therefore, application of impoliteness strategies in the construction sites is a normal behaviour.

C. Negative Impoliteness Strategy

This impoliteness strategy is used in order to harm the hearer's negative face (Culpeper, 2005, p. 41). Negative impoliteness strategy aims to attack the addressee's need to be independent. This also has sub strategies which are; frightening the other, condescending, scorning or ridiculing, being contemptuous, not treating the other seriously, belittling the other, invading the other's space, explicitly associating the other with a negative aspect, and putting the other's indebtedness on record.

There was a conversation between two people in one of the visited construction sites that reflected this strategy. These people were working while telling stories. Most of the stories were about how they win girls and women. Along these conversations, the two diverged and scorned each other which made others including the researcher to burst into laughter. The conversation is presented in 5.

5) Oloo:	*We mmasai mfupi unaongea kishamba utaingizwa mjini hapa*
	[You short Maasai with your rustic accent you'll be raided here]
Charles:	*We wenzio wanafuga pesa we unafuga ndevu*
	[Your fellows are keeping money, you are keeping beards]
Oloo:	*Sasa wewe ndevu huna na pesa huna, afu ni mmasai. Yaani huna chochote cha kumvutia mwanamke.*
	[Now you neither have beards nor money, and then you are a Maasai. You don't have anything that motivates a woman]

Others: *haaahaaaahaa*

In example 5, Oloo applied negative impoliteness strategy through belittling and scorning the other. He ridiculed the addressee's physical appearance, tribe and accent by using the words *mmasai* [Maasai] *mfupi* [short] *kishamba* [rustic]. He emphasised that the addressee is short and he speaks rustically. He added that he has neither beards nor money, and that Charles is a Maasai. Taking into account the conversation, to Oloo, being a Maasai was taken as being primitive and disadvantaged. This damaged the hearer's face of being independent and being who he is and how he talks. This statement shows segregation and humiliation which damages the addressees face by ridiculing his tribe and physical appearance.

Charles also applied negative impoliteness to Oloo by not treating him seriously through the sentence *we wenzio wanafuga pesa we unafuga ndevu* [your fellows are keeping money, you are keeping beards]. That he does not have enough money instead he has enough beards. That is, he is not capable of saving money but beards. This conversation shows that Charles considered Oloo lazy and irresponsible that he cannot do anything rather than the obvious like keeping the beards. This also damaged the receiver's need to be how he wishes to be physically because if he did not like beards, he could have shaved them.

The discussion above reveals that in the construction sites, impoliteness strategies can be revealed using the facts of who a person is like; physical appearance, tribe and religion. Impoliteness utterances can have elements of truth because the communicators know each other well to use their identities in a conversation. Even though they are the facts, the interlocutors use the information not in a serious manner so as to joke in a friendly way and entertain the overhearing audience which to structurally seem impolite especially to the people who are not used to such.

Again, negative impoliteness strategy was used in the conversation where one person indirectly invited his fellow to go to help them with what they were doing as expressed in this conversation in 6 from construction site B.

6) Haris: *Oyaa twende ukatusaidie kufunga huku*. [Let you help us to fasten here]
   Bruno: *Sina utaahira wa hivo mimi.* [I don't have such a mental illness]
   Haris: Naomba basi futi. [Please give me a tape then]
   Bruno: *Fundi gani hana futi.* [A technician without a tape?]

In this example, Bruno employed a negative impoliteness strategy by not taking others seriously. Haris asked Bruno to give them a hand on locking the steels. Instead of helping them he replied *sina utaahira wa hivo mimi* [I don't have such a mental illness] that means those who are insane are the one who can help. This damage the hearer's need to have freedom of action that what they are doing can be done by insane people. Bruno also used negative impoliteness strategy through belittling the other by saying *fundi gani hana futi* [A technician without a tape?] implying that Haris was supposed to have a tape measure as long as he is a technician. So, because he does not have a tape measure, he was disvalued which is not proper because they shared most of the instruments. Asking for help or borrowing things are very normal actions in a day-to-day life but here it was considered impolite because of the situation that everyone is working on a certain section and so they were supposed to be independent.

This is proved by Locher's (2006) affirmation that what is perceived to be impolite will thus ultimately rely on interactants assessments of social norms of appropriateness that have been previously acquired in the speech events in question.

D.   Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness Strategy

Here a speaker performs the FTA using politeness strategies which are insincere. Sarcasm means the use of one or more sub-strategies which are superficially suitable and accepted but deeply they have opposite meaning (Bousfield, 2008, p. 95). This impoliteness strategy is mostly used in conversation when the communicators are familiar with each other. In the construction sites interlocutors use sarcasm impoliteness as well.

In one of the sites a mason went to his friend to ask for drinking water, his friend drunk the water first then gave him. Others around started to scorn them as shown in 7).

7) Joshua: *Tunasikia siku hizi mnasagana.*
                   [We hear that nowadays you are lesbians]
   Machela: *eeh eeh eeh eeeh Mtatuambia tu* [You'll tell us]
   Others: (laughing)

Joshua performed sarcasm impoliteness strategy by telling the addressees that they are lesbians while they are males. Machela also emphasised on the sarcasm that they have to explain to them about it.

However, the addressees were quiet and only smiling while others who heard the sarcasm were laughing. This damaged the addressees' face of right to have friends whom they can share things like drinking water because when they shared water others insulted them by referring to them as lesbians.

The researcher found that impoliteness strategies in the construction sites are sometimes done for the purpose of entertaining. Speakers do not intend to damage the face of the addressee hence use female gender words or phrases to make it more entertaining.

Sarcasm impoliteness strategy is normally used to mean the opposite of what is said. During a conversation in construction site E, a mason stumbled on a water pipe, and he almost fell down a situation which raised a sarcastic conversation as in 8.

8) Alan: *Oyaa vipi?* [How is it?]
   Baguma: *Shwari* [Fine]
   Alan: *Huoni babuu* [Can't you see friend (lit. Grandfather)]
   Baguma: *Nawazaa* [I'm thinking]

The conversation started by Alan asking Baguma *Oyaa vipi*? [How is it?] to mean, what happened? Why stumbling? instead of feeling sympathy for Baguma who almost fell. Then, Baguma performed a mock impoliteness strategy by replying *shwari* [fine] instead of explaining what happened to him. This implies that because Alan pretended not to recognise that Baguma was almost hurt, he decided to pretend not to understand Alan's question as well. Alan used sarcasm impoliteness strategy again by asking the hearer whether he was blind while he knew that he was not. Baguma decided to give a reason *nawazaa* [I'm thinking] which indirectly mean 'I am not blind' but it happened because 'I am thinking'.

This leads into the assertion that in the construction sites, workers are busy and move here and there in a hurry. So, in the situations where they have to explain some things, they choose to use simple and clear sentences as they have no time for clarification. Hence impoliteness strategies are employed so as to save time and continue working.

Generally, the construction sites there are people who are friends and relatives who take this advantage of using their information and use it in a form of a joke so as to entertain the overhearing. Again, these interactions strengthen the communicators' relationships.

These examples of sarcasm impoliteness strategy agree with Chaika's (1994) views that speech acts are the ways people use language to manage the social interaction. He adds that the words that people use do not all the time represent their literal meaning but they mean different things and ideas in that context. Hence the words *mnasagana, huoni, mwehu and mavi* have been used and understood by these communicators in their context.

E. Withhold Politeness

This impoliteness strategy occurs when the speaker does not perform politeness where it is expected as in keeping silent when the speaker is supposed to thank the hearer (Thielemann and Kosta, 2013, p. 239). Withhold impoliteness was performed in the visited construction sites where the communicators started conversations without greetings. In any social interaction, a greeting is a starting point of conversation. Beginning a conversation without a greeting is a sign of impoliteness as presented in the following conversation in construction site A.

9) Agrey: *Oyaa huna kazi?* [Don't you have a work?]
   Brale: *Kazi zinaishaga mwanangu* [we are never idle my friend]
   Agrey: *Aah kwaiyo umekuja kutusalimia tu*
             [So, you have come just to greet us]
   Brale: *Nataka mnipishe nifanye usafi hapa…*
             [I want you to leave so I can clean here]

In 9, Brale went at Agrey's station where without greetings, Agrey started impolitely by implicitly asking him if he did not have a work to do. From the observation, Agrey wanted to know if Brale was free so that he could ask him for help. But the best way to start a conversation is through greetings before expressing your ideas as the hearer will be ready to give attention to the speaker. Brale was also expected to start greeting Agrey before claiming that he wanted them to move so that he could clean that place. Hence because the conversation missed greetings both sides decided not to take the other seriously and so both failed to fulfil their needs of being considered and treated properly.

This suggests that greetings are important for a conversation to be taken seriously. However, in the construction sites greeting each other is not prioritized. It was observed that several times greetings were ignored by the interlocutors in the construction sites. However, this did not affect their working as they had other ways of starting their conversation with jokes as seen in 9.

Withhold politeness can also be expressed when the interlocutor is expected to thank the other but choose to ignore the politeness act done by them as seen in the construction site G in 10).

10) Zabron: *Wewe embu naomba iyo* [You please give me that]
    Solomon: (pick a tool from the ground and give it to him)
    Zabron: *(silent)*

In this example withhold politeness was expressed by Zabron whereby he received a requested tool without thanking Solomon who gave it to him. Solomon had options, he could refuse but he opted to do him a favour but Zabron did not recognise and appreciate what Solomon had done. This damaged the hearer's need of being appreciated regarding his help.

Withhold impoliteness strategy was seen in all the construction sites leading into the conclusion that many of the workers in the construction sites do not take thanks giving and greetings seriously when in the sites. This is because they are busy all the time and it seems like greetings and thanks giving take their time. However, greetings are important before starting any conversation as it makes the hearer attentive and ready to listen. Appreciations are important too so as to make the communicators feel valuable. These seem not the case in the construction sites as they employ withhold impoliteness and the communications continue properly.

X.   REASONS FOR IMPOLITENESS ACTS IN STRUCTION SITES

The third objective of this study was to find out the reasons which compelled people in the construction sites to apply impoliteness strategies in their conversations. The findings revealed that there are different reasons according to the information gathered through observation, interview and focus group discussion. Most of the reasons were found to be positive.

A. To Boost the Workers Morale

One of the reasons given was "for morale". Impoliteness strategies in the construction sites were employed among communicators so as to raise the morale of the workers. This is because some impoliteness strategies make others laugh and somehow forget how tough their work is and keep working for a long time. In support of this, one of the informants argued:

> *Tunatumia sana maneno makali na matusi ili kuinua morali ya mafundi na kuwafanya wainjoi wanachokifanya. Unajua tunafanya kazi ngumu tunachoka sana, sasa tukitumia kubembelezana kazi haitaenda na watu watachoka.*

We use harsh words and insults mostly so as to raise the morale of technicians so that they can enjoy what they are doing. You know we are doing a hard work; we get very tired. So, if we use polite acts, the work won't be completed and they will get exhausted.

This was clearly seen during observation where by those people who were working in groups were more active compared to those who were working in isolation due to their working stations like truck drivers and security officers who were seen idle and sleeping. People in groups were activated by the rise of different stories and songs most of which were impolite but raised their morale. Songs like Sandakalawe by Harmonize, *leo nataka kukuto-to-kutoa out* [today I want to-to take you out]*, mimi nina hamu ya kuto-to-kutoka na wewe* [I have a desire to-go out with you] and mwagia ndani by Abbah ft Maua Sama *ooh mwagia ndani* [pour it in], *baba mwagia ndani* [dear pour it in], *chakula cha Watoto mwagia ndani* [babies food, pour it in] and *Nyegezi* by Rayvanny *nyege nyege* [sexual desire], were over heard. Some were even swinging but continuing to work happily and actively. This is contrary to Nicola Thompson in Mair *et al*., (2014) that the use of banter offensive language in the construction sites leads to the exclusion of talented people from the industry.

B. Simple and Clear Communication

The findings revealed that people in the construction sites used impoliteness strategies to make their communication process simple and clear and make the message to deliver quickly to the addressee. The nature of their work does not allow the communicators to spend time in explaining the information hence use short and direct words like; *Sukuma* [push]*, mwaga* [pour]*, funga* [close]*, tena* [again]*, hapa* [here]*, huku* [there]*, fasta* [faster]. This was clearly described by one of the informants during FGC in construction site A.

> *Kazi zetu zinatakiwa ziende haraka haraka kwa sababu tumetawanyika vikundi vikundi sasa kundi moja likijichelewesha litafanya makundi mengine wasimamishe kazi. Ndo*

> *maana hatuna maelekezo mengi unatumia maneno mafupi ili ueleweke na unaongea kwa*
> *msisitizo mfano; Kimbia! Haraka! Sogeza!*

'Our activities are supposed to be fast because we are divided in groups. If one group delays, it will make others stop. That is why we don't have lots of instructions. We use short words so that you can be understood and you speak with emphasis for example; run! Fast! Move that!'

For this reason, bald on record impoliteness was dominantly employed in providing simple and clear information and instructions. The researcher observed that even though short phrases were used to provide information and instructions, people understood each other well without asking for clarifications or explanations. This justified Verschueren's (1999) assertion that impoliteness may be functional as politeness in interaction. Each construction site worker seemed aware of the instructions. It is their usual way of communicating.

C. Familiarity

This is a relaxed friendliness and closeness of communicators. The findings revealed that due to the duration of the projects, these people worked together for quit a long time hence most of them are familiar to each other. This made them use impoliteness strategies such as using inappropriate identity markers, taboo words towards each other and names calling like *fala* [fool], *tumbili* [monkey], *mtoto wa nje ya ndoa* [bastard], *mkundu* [anal]', *pimbi* [hyrax] etc. This was justified by of the respondents as he said "Tumezoeana sana maana kila siku tunaonana na hivo mnajikuta tu mnaitana majina ambayo mkiwa nje ya kazi hamuwezi kuyatumia." [We got used to each other a lot because we see each other every day so you find yourselves using names which you cannot use outside the site].

Moreover, during observation, the researcher revealed that those who were close and working together in groups use impoliteness to make jokes than those who are unfamiliar. It was also observed that those people who uttered impolite stories and jokes have more friends and are known to most of the people. This is supported by Culpeper (1996) who claims that in the situations in which collocutors have close relationships, impoliteness tends to occur because they lack a mechanism to achieve their dominance.

D. Entertainment

Furthermore, interlocutors in the construction sites used impoliteness strategies so as to be entertained and entertain others around them. Most of the time the entertainments are in form of jokes. This made them enjoy their work and feel happy while working because they were able to laugh, as one of the participants said:

> *Maneno yetu mengi yamejaa utani, mtu mwingine anaweza kudhani ni ukweli kumbe*
> *tunataniana tu ili tuinjoi tunachokifanya, wanaweza wakawa wawili wanataniana ila kundi*
> *zima mnacheka na saa zingine mnachangia kidogo kidogo ili kunogesha.*

[Most of our words are full of jokes, the other person might think they have truth but we only joke to each other so as we can enjoy what we are doing. It can be a joke between two but the whole group is laughing and sometimes you add a little bit to make it funny].

Through observation it was revealed that apart from the impolite jokes, these people were entertained by songs as well. One might start a song and others catch up and sing together. In a certain situation one member started to sing, *nyege nyege*… and the others caught up and sang together with him as follows *eeh nyege nyege* [sexual desire], kwetu Mwanza nyegezi [our place mwanza nyegezi] e*hh nyege nyege* [sexual desire].

The essence that they sing only that part and repeat it several times made others laugh and both hearers and singers were entertained. This agrees with Culpeper's (2011a) argument that impoliteness, which is designed for entertainment purposes, functions to amuse others, particularly those who are not targets of the impoliteness.

E. Peer Group

Workers in the construction sites share most of their characteristics such as age, status, and behaviours like smoking and drinking alcohol. This makes them to use impoliteness strategies as they weigh each other the same. These peer groups also form friendships which make them closer hence, they find themselves using more impolite utterances like taboo words and name calling. One of the informants said: "Walioko hapa wengi ni vijana na ni kama 'age mates'. Sasa kwao matusi na maneno ya ajabu ajabu sio kitu cha kushangaza." [Most of people here are youths and they are like age mates. So, to them, insults and strange words are not astounding].

Another informant, when he was asked (during interview) of the informants who seem of old age than others and their inclusion in the impolite conversations said:

> *Watu wazima wapo lakini kutokana na mazingira unakuta wanajichanganya na vijana na 'kubehave kama young' wanatumia matusi kama maneno ya kawaida ili kuongeza ari ya kazi na kutafuta kukubalika katika kundi.*

[There are older people as well but because of the context you find them mixed up with the young ones and behave like one. They use insults as normal words so as to raise the desire to work and include themselves among others].

The study revealed that, people in the construction sites share most of their behaviours which makes it easy for them to work together and consider impoliteness strategies as a trigger for their work morale. In one of the conversations, a technician was welding and one who was passing by decided to tease him as shown in this conversation.

11) Amos: *Wewe msenge! Unalipua mabomu*? [You gay, are you exploding bombs?]
    Habibu: *Niambie mkuu.* [Tell me chief]
    Amos: *Niambie inginia.* [Tell me engineer]
    Habibu: *Niambie fundi.* [Tell me technician]

These interlocutors were youths. The conversation showed that these people were friends and they share backgrounds and that was a kind of greetings or a way of telling his friend that 'I see you'. This was understood that way because of the peers. According to this conversation, the interpretation of the impoliteness can also be done on the cultural norms and context in which the interaction took place.

F. Gender

Most of the workers in the construction sites are males due to the nature of the activities which demand the physic application**.** According to discourse analysis, male gender uses more impolite language than female. Lakoff, (1973 p. 43) claims that women are more polite than men. This was verified by one of the consulted food sellers who declared:

> *Hawa wateja wetu wanaongea na sisi kama wanavoongea wao kwenye kazi zao. Wamezoea lugha hiyo. Kwa sababu ni wanaume wanaona ni kawaida. Imebidi tuzoee na kuona ni kawaida. Labda wakiajiriwa wanawake wengi wanaweza kuongea lugha nzuri.*

[Our customers speak to us as they speak to their fellows at work. They get used to their language because they are men. We have to get used to it. Maybe if they employ more female workers, they can speak proper language]

This statement implies that people in the construction sites use impoliteness strategies because most of them are male hence few females who are present are forced by the situation to cope with them. In other words, they are overpowered. To complement this, during FDG one male informant said:

> *"Sisi wanaume huwa hatuna mambo ya kubembeleza bembeleza."* [We men normally don't have flattering issues]. The same was supported by the other man who added.
> *Wanaume tukiongea mazungumzo yakawaida unaweza kudhani tunatukanana au tunagombana kumbe ndo tunaongea. Sisi wenyewe tunaona kawaida tu.*

[When men are in normal conversations you might think we are insulting each other, or we are in conflict but that is how we talk. We take it as a normal situation].

This conversation implies that the impoliteness conversations in the construction sites are accentuated by gender where many of the workers are men.

This study revealed that the conversations in the construction sites are full of impoliteness strategies. They are used to give instructions, to praise, to scorn, to joke and the like. Impoliteness strategies are used not for the purpose of damaging the other but as a way of communication among male members. This supports the idea that men regard the world as a battlefield of "a hierarchical social order in which he was either one-up or one-down" and to them conversations are negotiations in which people try to achieve and maintain the upper hand (Tannen, 1990. p. 24)

There was a conversation between a mason and a machine operator. The machine operator was given a task of taking off the tools from the container using his machine and they conversed as in 12:

12) Zungu: We *msenge* umemaliza mara hii [You gay! Are you done!]
    Elisha: Imeisha iyoo [It is finished]
    Zungu: Aah *kubabake* we *mjinga* uko fasta [F*** you fool! you are very fast]

In this example, when the mason came back, all the tools were off the container and so he was trying to tell the machine operator that he is very good at his work. The use of these impolite words here as compliments are normally used by most of males in their day to day conversations hence, they capture their implied meaning from the context.

G. Offensive Situation

According to the observation, the researcher found offensive situation as one of the reasons for impoliteness utterances in the construction sites. This occurred when the speaker identified the undesirable situation done by others and decided to react impolitely towards the situation.

In this instance, a mason saw a technician who was late and decided to attack him impolitely.

13) Maulid: *Unatoka wapi?* [Where are you from?]
    Kaka: Hamna [Nothing]
    Maulid: *Umechelewa, toka ukalale!* [You are late! Go to sleep!]
    Kaka: Sio hivo [It's not like that]
    Maulid: *Kalale!* [Go to sleep]

Here the offensive situation is him being late because he was aware of the rules and knew the time to go out and the right time to go in. The mason employed impoliteness strategies to give warning and commands to the addressee so as to stop the behaviour.

This shows that sometimes the addressees commit offensive acts that force the addresser to be impolite to them. In such situations the impoliteness is no longer a joke but a serious command which must be followed by the addressee.

H. Imbalanced Social Power

Through observation method the researcher observed imbalanced social power among the communicators as another reason of using impoliteness strategies in the construction sites. There were situations where impoliteness strategies were employed because the speaker was more powerful socially than the hearer. This is supported by Culpeper's (1996) assertion that imbalanced social power can induce impoliteness. In the following conversation, the impoliteness was applied by the speaker because of his power.

14) Amos: *Long time no see*
    Ben*:*   Long time no see halafu *mnaharibu kazi, kwa nini waya huu umepinda?*
             [Long-time no see then you are destroying the work, why this wire has bent?]
    Amos: (looking at the wire)
    Ben: *Jifanye unielewi ntakupiga mabuti. Muunyooshe. Mnakula bata tu badala ya   kufanya kazi   eeh!*
             [Pretend not to understand. I will kick you. Unbent it. You are relaxing instead of working!]
    Ben: *Kwa sababu sijaja siku mbili hizi mmejiachia eeh?*
             [is it because I didn't come these two days you are relaxing?]

The speaker used his power to threaten the addressee as it was clearly observed in his sentence *kwa sababu sijaja siku mbili hizi mmejiachia eeh* [Is it because I didn't come these two days you are relaxing?]. This means that they work properly under his supervision. Also having a lot of sentences shows that he was expressing his power because he could simply tell him that the wire was not straight and so he should make it straight.

Bousfield (2008) emphasises that there are always antecedent events which trigger the onset of impoliteness. These are anger, a show of power, dispute, a threat to the face, great sorrow, disappointment, panic, jealousy, feeling of helplessness, desire to provoke, the wish to entertain and the like. This study finds that in the construction sites there are also positive reasons for employing impoliteness strategies. These are to raise working morale, simple and clear communication and entertainment.

XI. RESPONSES FOR IMPOLITENESS UTTERANCES IN CONSTRUCTION SITES

Another objective of this study was to find out the responses given by the addressees to speaker's impoliteness utterances. When a recipient of an utterance perceives a strategic impoliteness act, s/he has two choices open to her/him: to either respond or to not respond (stay silent) (Culpeper & Bousfield, 2003). Those who choose to respond to the impoliteness act have another set of choices: they can either

accept the face attack encounter it.

A. Accepting the Face Attack

Participants who choose to accept the face attack sense some kind of responsibility for the impoliteness act to happen (Bousfield, 2008 p. 193). In this study, the findings revealed that some participants respond to impoliteness acts through accepting the face attack because they partly cause them.

In a certain conversation, the addressee was the source of the impolite reply from his friend because his utterance implied that his friends were waiting for a break time so badly that they couldn't waste any time.

15) Abas: *Yaani makamanda muda wa kula hata hamgadigadi.*
              [You commanders are not wasting the time for eating]
    Kibwe: *We k*** kalale.* [You, (Female sexual organ) go to sleep]
    Abas: *Poa, twende wote.* [Okay, let's go together]

The word *poa* 'okay' shows the acceptance of the positive impoliteness strategy through the use of a taboo word *k**** [female sexual organ]. The receiver accepted it because he started the conversation with a joke that his fellows normally do not waste time during lunch break. The receiver thought he could start a conversation with a different joke or a normal sentence.

Other impoliteness strategies were accepted because of the close relationship the communicators had. Some interlocutors in the visited construction sites seemed to be closer socially than others especially those working in the same section. This fact is reflected in the conversation in 16):

16) Amos: Wewe *msenge unalipua mabomu.* [You gay, you are exploding the bombs]
    Habibu: *Niambie mkuu.* [Tell me chief]

Here Amos used positive impoliteness by calling Habibu *Msenge* [gay] and he accepted the name because of their relationship. Habibu indirectly accepted the name by a smile and allowing Amos to continue the conversation. Moreover, this also means that the word *msenge* [gay] here was used differently from its literal meaning. This is reflected by Chaika (1994) who said that speech acts mean the ways people use language to manage the social interaction. Amos and Habibu had a positive meaning of this word or they know how to use it positively within their context.

Moreover, this study revealed that most of bald on record impoliteness strategies such as *Sukuma* [push], *acha* [stop], *mwaga* [pour], *haraka* [fast], *and leta* [bring] were responded through accepting them. The researcher observed that the instructions and directions provided were responded through actions. The addressees acted upon the given instructions reflecting what is argued in the speech act theory that utterances act. These actions meant that those impoliteness instructions were accepted by the receivers.

In addition to that, withhold impoliteness strategy was also responded to by accepting it. The researcher observed that people in the construction sites were not complaining when others pass them without greetings or giving thanks for a polite action or utterance. This implies that they accepted this withhold impoliteness.

B. Countering the Face Attack

The receiver who chooses to use the countering of the face attack has two options which are: using offensive or defensive strategies. Offensive strategy countering the face attack is when the response of face attack is a face attack. Some interlocutors in the construction sites applied the offensive strategy as a response to an impolite act. This happened to interlocutors who are close or have the same social status.

In the following conversation, the interlocutors were friends; that is why they seemed to know the information they used to make jokes to each other.

17) Mody: *Yaani hawa wanakula mavi ya mbuzi wanajua dawa*
              [They eat goat dung knowing it's a medicine]
    Michael: *Huyu jamaa kaoa mwehu kaanza kufanana nae*
              [This man married a lunatic and he began to be alike]
    Mody: *Mnakula mavi eti mnaita kichuri.*
              [You eat goat's dung you call it 'kichuri']
    Michael: *Yaani wewe ni wakudharau kichuri wewe, we si umekuja na gari ya mkaa baba yako*
              anahesabu magunia ya mkaa anakuhesabiamo

[How comes you dispise '*kichuri*', you came here by a charcoal lorry, your father was counting the coal bags including you

In this example, Mody employed sarcasm impoliteness strategy and Michael responded to the face attack by face attack and used sarcasm impoliteness strategy as well so as to offend him. The speakers were talking while smiling and this implied that what they were talking about was not serious even though the utterance meant to attack the face of the addressees. In the construction sites, speakers can use offensive countering through jokes for the purpose of entertaining the group and not to offending the addressee.

In another conversation, a speaker employed positive impoliteness strategy through taboo word. The speaker used a taboo word to refer to the addressee and the hearer decided to counter attack.

18) Amanzi: *Embu vuta iyo nondo mkundu wewe* [Pull that moth you anal]
     Big: Wanani sasa [Whose one?]
     Amanzi: *Washangazi yako* [Your aunt's]
     Big: *Nilijua wa mkeo* [I thought your wife's]
     Amanzi: *Labda wa mkeo yule mwehu* [May be that of your insane wife]

In this example, the receiver of the impoliteness act through the use of taboo word *mkundu* [anal] first accepted the attack and then reacted by countering it. The offensive countering attack employed by both communicators in the disagreement of *wanani sasa* [whose one?]: by saying *nilijua wa mkeo* [I thought your wife's], *labda wa mkeo yule mwehu!* [May be that of your insane wife] show that they were responding to each other by countering the attack. Interlocutors employ impoliteness strategies to offend each other by insulting their relatives indirectly.

Countering face attack seems to be among the responses found in the construction sites. The speakers tend to defend themselves by attacking each other's face or rejecting the face attacks. Countering face attacks is done in the construction sites to prolong the conversation which in a way make the site workers forget their being tired and continue working.

C. Choosing Not to Respond (Non-Verbal Response)

There were participants in construction sites who decided not to respond to the impoliteness utterance. The hearer decides not to respond so as to avoid stimulating more impoliteness acts or for the sake of saving time and keep working.

In the following example the foreman was reminding the mason to mix the material when making the concrete.

19) Abas: *Anzia chini we fala, chiniii! Umeshasahau eti?*
               [Start from the bottom you fool, from the bottom! Have you forgotten already?]
     Bunda: *(starting from the bottom)*

The receiver responded by doing the right thing (starting from the bottom) but ignoring the positive impoliteness strategy applied to him which is calling him by taboo word *fala* [fool]and asking him a challenging and unpalatable question *umeshasahau eti* [have you forgotten already]. In the construction sites, people mostly respond to words through actions so as to save time. These speech acts responses are due to the interactant's interpretations which are influenced by the norms of interactions in the construction sites and interpersonal relationships of the speakers thus they are able to respond and ignore the impoliteness strategies.

Choosing not to respond might be caused by participant's failure to hear the content of the speaker's utterance, participant's acceptance to the FTA, or participant's lack of understanding about the content of the utterance (Bousfield, 2008). It might also be that the addressee does not know how well to respond to such an impoliteness act. For whatever reason, choosing not to respond is a good way of defending one's own face. In the construction sites the researcher observed that the interlocutors chose not to respond so as to avoid wastage of time by talking through arguing or trying to prove a point.

XII. Conclusions

This study found that five strategies of impoliteness are employed in the construction sites including bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm impoliteness and withhold politeness. The impoliteness acts were used as triggers for raising working morale, creating friendly relationships among participants and emphasising the spirit of team work.

In addition to that, affective, coercive and entertaining types of impoliteness were employed in the construction sites. Affective impoliteness was expressed whenever the speaker faced an offensive situation that results into a negative emotional state. Coercive impoliteness was mostly used by the leaders to the workers when wish to instruct, inform with emphasis so as to get things done properly. Apart from that entertaining impoliteness was employed mostly by workers in the construction sites by

making jokes so as to create friendship among themselves and to their work. Jokes and sarcasm made them lough and refresh their minds. Calling each other inappropriate names and the use of taboo words while working created a sense of togetherness and belongingness hence facilitated the spirit of team work and hard work as well.

Moreover, the study revealed that there is also a non-verbal impoliteness employed in the construction site such as prosody and gestures. The researcher agrees with Culpeper (2011) that it is not what you say, it's how you said it. This means that the tone used and how words were uttered contributed to the utterance to be considered impolite. During observation, the researcher came across some examples of non-verbal impoliteness such as threw contract papers, looking at the other in a despise way, screaming and shouts. These happened among communicators with imbalanced social power.

Furthermore, the study revealed that the addressees with less power decided not to respond to the impolite acts so as to avoid conflicting with their bosses. This also happened to the addressees who were friends with the speaker. They decided not to respond so as to maintain the friendly relationship and save their own face. The strategy of choosing not to respond to impoliteness strategy was a way of saving time because instead of arguing they opt to ignore and keep work.

XIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

The researcher recommends that the users of language should change their views on impoliteness strategies. This research revealed that impoliteness strategies were used to facilitate communication process among people in the construction sites and communicators understood each other well and their work was progressing well.

The interlocutors in the construction sites who use impoliteness acts as a way of communicating should avoid applying them to others who are not familiar to like site visitors such as leaders. Moreover, this kind of communication should not be taken outside the construction sites like home.

However, people in construction sites should be advised to reduce the use of taboo words and making jokes about people outside the sites and make sure that the impoliteness utterances belong to the speakers only or speakers and hearers around them. For example, avoid joking or use taboo words on their wives, mothers, fathers, children, and so on.

REFERENCES

Afzaal, M., Baoqin, W., Noor, U. & Younas, M. (2020). *Impoliteness strategies and rapport-challenge pragmatic orientation in competing utterance*. Revista Argentina.

Austine, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words.* Oxford University Press.

Bousfield, D. & Locher, M. (2008). *Impoliteness in language: studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice*. Mouton De Gruyter.

Bousfield, D. (2007). Beginnings, middles and ends: A Biopsy of the Dynamics of Impolite exchanges. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39 (12), 2185–2216. Doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2006.11.005.

Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in interaction.* John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Bousfield, D., Culpeper, J. & Wichman, A. (2003). Impoliteness Revisited: with Special Reference to dynamic and Prosodic Aspects. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35 (10), 1545–1579. Doi: 10.1016/s0378-2166(02)00118-2.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.

Chaika, E. (1994). *Language: the social mirror.* Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approach.* Sage.

Critchmar, J. (2005*). President George Bush Junior's Visit to the European Union. 21ˢᵗ February 2005*. ITV news.

Culpeper, J. (1995). *Towards an anatomy of impoliteness*. Lancaster University.

Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25 (3), 349-367. Doi: 10.1016/0378-2166(95)00013-3.

Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: the weakest Link. *Journal of Politeness Research Language Behaviour Culture, 1 (1), 35-72*. Doi:10. 1515/jplr.2005.1.1.35.

Culpeper, J. (2009). *Impoliteness: using and understanding the language of offence*. Lancaster University

Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: using language to cause offence.* Cambridge University Press.

Culpeper, J. (2017) *Impoliteness.* Lancaster University.

Gabriel, Y. (1998). An introduction to the social psychology of insults in organizations. *SAGE Journals,* 51 (11), 1329-1354

Grice, P. H. (1975). *Logic and conversation.* Academic Press.

Gunawan, S. (2017). *Sherlock Holmes' Impoliteness Strategies and other Characters' Responses in Sherlock TV Series Season 1Episode 1*. Sanata Dharma University.

Kienpointer, M. (2008). *Impoliteness and Emotional Arguments*. Journal of Politeness Research, 4(2), 243–265. https://doi.org/10.1515/JPLR.2008.012.

Kryk-Kastovsky, B. (2006). *Impoliteness in early modern English courtroom discourse.* Journal of Historical Pragmatics, 7(2), 213-243. Doi: 10. 1075/hjp.7.2.04kry.

Lakoff, R. T. (2006). *Civility and its discontents: or getting in your face.* John Benjamins.

Lakoff, R.T. (1973). *Language and woman's place.* University of California.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics.* Longman.

Locher, A. M., & Watts, J. R. (2008). *Relational work and impoliteness: negotiating norms of linguistic behaviours.* Mouton de Gruyter.

Locher, A. M. (2006). *Polite behaviours within relational work: the discursive approach to politeness*: *multilingual.* Multilingual: Journal of Cross Cultural and interlanguage Communication, 25 (3), 249–267. Doi: 10.1515/MULTI.2006.015.

Lucky, B. J. (2015). *A pragmatic analysis of impoliteness strategies in British TV-Series Sherlock.* Yogyakarta State University.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand women and men in conversation.* Morrow & Co Inc.

Thielemann, N. & Kosta, P. (2013). *Approaches to Slavic interaction.* Cambridge University Press.