

## The Pragmatics of AIN'T within Academic and Social Context

Jumanto Jumanto<sup>1\*</sup>, Rahmanti Asmarani<sup>2</sup>, Sarif Syamsu Rizal<sup>3</sup>,  
Haryati Sulistyorini<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,2,3,4</sup> Universitas Dian Nuswantoro, Jl. Imam Bonjol 2015 Semarang 50131, Indonesia

\*) Corresponding Author  
Email: [ilhamj@dsn.dinus.ac.id](mailto:ilhamj@dsn.dinus.ac.id)  
DOI: 10.18326/rgt.v15i1.126-146

### Submission Track:

Received: 14-02-2022

Final Revision: 06-04-2022

Available Online: 30-04-2022

Copyright © 2022 Authors



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

### Abstract

This paper aims at exploring as well as describing the form, the meaning, and the function of the contraction *AIN'T*, with the corpus data retrieved from English-affiliated URLs or Websites (*web-data*). This interpretive qualitative research employed interpretive techniques and a coding analysis. One finding showed that *AIN'T* belongs to non-standard or informal English, which represents or is derived from the forms AM NOT, IS NOT, ARE NOT, HAS NOT, HAVE NOT, DO NOT, DOES NOT, DID NOT, and the others. Another finding described that *AIN'T* implies different aspects, i.e. informality, topic area, low social class, emphasis, and content. The other finding also showed that *AIN'T* is part of *close language*, or is used for close people for friendship or camaraderie and that *AIN'T* belongs to informal utterances, which is then verified by other experts' states and theories within a synthesis as the world platform of discussion. Based on the findings, *AIN'T* should be taught academically in classrooms or other teaching and learning encounters as an informal language with its various derived constructions, and students or learners should be made aware of its use within an interpersonal or social context, as it may lead to a rude situation, and a probable disharmony between the speaker and the hearer then happens.

**Keywords:** pragmatics; politeness; camaraderie; informal English; *AIN'T*.

"I ain't gay but 20 dollars is 20 dollars" (Donald Trump: *People Magazine*, 1998).

## INTRODUCTION

In 1998, the utterance *I ain't gay but 20 dollars is 20 dollars* was popular and was probably intriguing to researchers. It was not the mere utterance itself, which is interesting, but what was contained in it and who made it interested the public more. A young businessman, with great success and great wealth, Donald Trump, then not yet enrolled to be President, and no one had expected so, made the utterance published and shared in general public by *People Magazine*, with various probable reactions: psychological, political, academic, economic, social, and even some other contexts.

Linguistically pragmatically, the utterance contains three aspects of interest: AIN'T, GAY, and 20 DOLLARS. The first is the utterance AIN'T. Previous knowledge from the linguistic context tells us that the utterance AIN'T is probably short from AM NOT. The question is: Why did Trump speak it into AIN'T? Did he imply something? Did he mean something else? Did he feel at ease saying it? Why? And other questions rise. The second interest is the utterance GAY. And the linguistic context also tells us that it is an adjective, but also a noun, a homosexual. Why did Trump choose the utterance, instead of another one? He could have said convenient, or pleased, or happy, as an alternative. Why did he prefer the word GAY? Did he imply something? Did he mean something else? Did he also mean a homosexual? And there are probably some other questions addressed to this context. The third is the utterance 20 DOLLARS. Why did Trump talk about money in public? Was that not of an embarrassment? Why did he freely talk about it? Did he feel at ease saying it in public? Did he actually say something about making money by having sex? These are questions, among others, concerning the third utterance. There are also probably others.

This paper is not trying to answer all the initial questions above but will highlight one of the three points contained in the main utterance, i.e. AIN'T, GAY, and 20 DOLLARS. The three points are, we suspect, what is called, in language use, as informality. The word AIN'T is contracted, the word GAY is informal or is taboo, and the words 20 DOLLARS are about money or are probably a homosexual transaction, thus about wealth or payment for sexual service, which is usually a talk among or between close people, within a closed context. Trump made this talk open to the public, why? Language use is a

matter of probabilities (Leech, 1983; Jumanto, 2014a; 2014b; 2017). This probability in language use is the main interest in this research, especially of the main concern on the utterance or the word *AIN'T*.

As the study of the interaction of meanings, or the study of speaker's meaning, or analysis on language within its context, pragmatics will see the utterance *AIN'T* from its locution, illocution, and perlocution, the three main aspects of which should come and be considered as simultaneous, not one after another of the three aspects. Thus, we should consider here the form (locution), the meaning (illocution), and the probable effects (perlocution) the utterance brings in language use. This research explores what linguistic constructions contribute to the form, what probable various meanings reveal from the form, and what probable effects the form gives in relation to a particular hearer. The form is elaborated from the aspect of informality in language use, the meanings are dug up from accounts and examples in language use, and the effects—thus, functions—are confronted to two types of the hearer, i.e. close people and superiors, elaborated from the theory of power and solidarity in the side of the hearer within speaker-hearer interpersonal interactions (Brown and Gilman, 1968). The research data are taken from English-language-affiliated URLs or websites as sources of accounts and examples on the utterance *AIN'T* and its elaborations. There are 12 URLs or websites employed as sources of data (*web-data*) in this explorative qualitative research.

The use of *AIN'T* in everyday context is, as pragmatics suggests, indeed, valid. As a pragmeme, i.e. a human act, the utterance is potentially there among speakers of the English language and is ready to launch in conversations, with a particular purpose of confirming something or instilling closeness or probable solidarity. However, speakers of the English language may fall into close speakers and not close people, the misuse of *AIN'T* of which may lead to impoliteness or threatening the face of particular hearers. Due to this potential risk towards face-threats upon the use of *AIN'T* in verbal interactions, this research on the use of *AIN'T* is indispensably important within an academic and social context. In the former context, school students of the English language should be made aware of the informal phenomenon on the use as well as usage of *AIN'T*, while within the latter, learners of the

English language should know how to maintain politeness in verbal interactions concerning the use of *AINT* towards close people or not close people.

The term informality, upon exploration of other disciplines, has employed an economic context. Hart (1972) coined this term in his article on informal income in his 1972 ILO report, and it then started to effect in the phrase *informal sector* (Bangasser, 2000), which then refers to heterogeneity and inconsistencies, along with its collocations, among others: informal, non-structured, non-observed, unorganized, irregular, unofficial, and unmeasured (Sindzingre, 2006). The term *informality* then is an unclear combination between maximum policy importance and political salience, whose literature is broad and its creation showed multifaceted nature (Kanbur, 2009). The term is generally used in the development context and is conceptualized and measured under growing inconsistencies (Heintz, 2012). No single approach is best applied to the term and the term is often full of inconsistency among different studies (Kanbur, 2009; Heintz, 2012).

Issues on informality in language use are also of interest to researchers or linguists. Jumanto (2014a; 2014b) asserts that there is a difference between formal and informal utterances. Informal utterances use incomplete, shorter forms, are not in good order, and sometimes cut-down, reversed-up, and changed in favor of the speaker. Informal utterances involve contractions, slangs, reverse-ups, changes, taboos, swearings, f-words, and uses any topics, personal and private. Informal utterances are part of the close language with any topics: safe, common, personal, and private. As formality and politeness are regarded as equivalent (Sifianou, 2013), informal utterances are used not for politeness, but for friendship or camaraderie, i.e. between friends or close people in a closed context.

Following Jumanto's (2014a) previous researches, and in line with economic accounts by Bangasser (2000), Sindzingre (2006), Kanbur (2009), Heintz (2012), and linguistic accounts on closeness politeness in the theories of the *positive face* (Goffman, 1959), *positive* politeness strategies (Brown and Levinson, 1987), *solidarity* politeness (Renkema, 1993), and *friendship* or *camaraderie* (Jumanto, 2006; 2014a; 2014b), the language of informality, and, hence, informal English, which involves the notorious, casual, heterogeneous,

inconsistent, irregular, unorganized, incomplete, shorter, cut-down, reversed-up, and speaker-dependent aspects, shows the direct nature, and has the literal nature. The direct nature shows honesty, frankness, and freedom in expressing true feelings and opinions, while the literal nature refers to the original and basic meaning of words and phrases of every day or daily conversations.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This qualitative research is a literature review, with different activities, ways of thinking, knowledge advancement as a foundation, and theory-development facilitation. A literature review also opens new areas of research (Baker, 2000; Webster & Watson, 2002). This research also employs a synthesis and a summary from other works to contribute to new ideas, and the findings can be a base for future research (Bolderston, 2008). Within this literature review, interpretive techniques are also employed. Based on this methodological context, premises are set up to be implemented in the interpreting process, so a conclusion can be induced or justified by an argument claim (Audi, 1999). The premises built and proposed then function to limit areas of data verification, knowledge advancement, and theory development on the form, meaning, and function of *AIN'T* elaborated in this research.

The steps of thinking in this research are presenting, identifying, and categorizing the corpus data, which also employed a coding technique with three steps: *open*, *axial*, and *selective* coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Holloway, 1997; Bohm, 2004; Saladana, 2012), respectively for identifying data, categorizing them, and selecting the main phenomena of the data behaviors. The research data were obtained from English-language-affiliated URLs or websites (web-data) as sources of accounts and examples for discussion as well as verification. For ease of reference, the web data are numbered (i.e. Web-Data 1; Web-Data 2; Web-Data 3; etc.). Here, the corpus data referred to, discussed, and justified are open for other researchers to verify and elaborate.

From the accounts of the research methodology, the pragmatics of *AIN'T* in this study is accounted for based on the three premises (P's) proposed below.

- (1) The form of *AIN'T* belongs to informal English with various derived constructions (P1);
- (2) The meaning of *AIN'T* implies different aspects of meaning (P2);
- (3) The function of *AIN'T* is bound to interpersonal context (P3).

These three premises are proposed for inducing synthesized discussions, verifying the findings, and bringing the points into an end in the conclusions.

## **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS**

### **The Premise 1 (P1)**

This P1 states that the form of *AIN'T* belongs to informal English with various derived constructions. Informal English involves the notorious, casual, heterogeneous, inconsistent, irregular, unorganized, incomplete, shorter, cut-down, reversed-up, and speaker-dependent aspects. Web-data 1 shows that *AIN'T* is a century-old contraction, deriving from the word AM NOT, IS NOT, ARE NOT, HAS NOT, or HAVE NOT. Users have derided the word for years and considered it acceptable in spoken English, but not in formal writing. Examples given in web-data 1 are (1) It *ain't* much fun; (2) A lot of people say if it *ain't* broke, don't fix it; (3) This *ain't* your grandmother's Lladró.

Web-data 2 explains that *AIN'T* is a contraction, along with the other words GOTTA, GONNA, and WANNA, and is often used in English songs. The contraction *AIN'T* refers to the constructions of auxiliaries before adjectives in English, IS NOT, AM NOT, and ARE NOT. However, it may also refer to the auxiliaries HAVE NOT and HAS NOT. The construction belongs to non-standard English, which is different from standard English. Examples given in web-data 2 are (1) *Time just ain't enough to heal everything*; (2) *I ain't kidding*; (3) *I ain't seen you before in this place*; (4) *Trust me, she ain't going to tell you the truth*.

Web-data 3 explains that in common spoken English, the word *AIN'T* is derived from AM NOT, IS NOT, ARE NOT, HAS NOT, and HAVE NOT. The

contraction is also used for DO NOT, DOES NOT, and DID NOT in some dialects. The development of the contraction for the various constructions of TO BE NOT, TO HAVE NOT, and TO DO NOT has occurred independently at different times. The establishment of AIN'T for various constructions of TO BE NOT had not happened until the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century, while that of TO HAVE NOT had not occurred until the early 19<sup>th</sup> century.

Web-data 4 accounts for various opinions from English users in public, among others, about AIN'T being a slang contraction and that it belongs to informal language. *AIN'T* also stands for other words. As a slang contraction, *AIN'T* is for IS NOT, ARE NOT, AM NOT, DO NOT, and DOES NOT. The contraction is of informal language, e.g. *Ain't* nobody got time for that; *She ain't* listening to you; *Why ain't* anybody texting me today. The contraction is also a single word equivalent to AM NOT, ARE NOT, IS NOT.

Web-data 5 accounts that *AIN'T* is a contraction and is of informal English. The contraction is for AM NOT, ARE NOT, IS NOT, HAS NOT, and HAVE NOT. Examples given in web-data 5 are (1) If it *ain't* broke, don't fix it; (2) They *ain't* got nothing to say; (3) *He ain't won a fight in years; and (4) Hey sis, I ain't forgotten about ya.*

Web-data 6 shows that *AIN'T* is a contraction for AM NOT, ARE NOT, IS NOT, HAVE NOT, and HAS NOT. This Web-data asserts that the contraction is not nonstandard, but is more common in use by the less educated in their everyday speech. *AIN'T* is rampant in American English. Within web-data 6, examples given in form of excerpts from famous people are (1) The wackiness of movies ain't funny anymore (Richard Schickel); (2) There ain't going to be any blackmail (R. M. Nixon); (3) The creative process ain't easy (Mike Royko); (4) It ain't for money? Say it ain't so, Jimmy! (Cleveland Amory); (4) If it ain't broke, don't fix it (Andy Rooney). Other examples given by this Web-data are *Ain't she sweet; It ain't necessarily; It's a free country, ain't it? Those people ain't got a clue; Her husband left and she ain't never been the same.*

Web-data 7 shows that *AIN'T* is nonstandard for AM NOT, ARE NOT, IS NOT, HAVE NOT, HAS NOT, DO NOT, DOES NOT, and DID NOT. This Web-data also includes an account that in 1706, the contraction was originally for AM NOT. The contraction began to serve its general use for ARE NOT, IS NOT, et

cetera, in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century. It also accounts that the form *AIN'T* in 1770-1980 was a variant of *AMN'T*, i.e. the contraction of *AM NOT*, with some adjustment.

Web-data 8 accounts that *AIN'T* is sometimes used instead of *AM NOT*, *AREN'T*, *ISN'T*, *HAVEN'T*, and *HASN'T*, but that use of *AIN'T* is considered incorrect for some people. *AIN'T* is used as dialect or in spoken English, e.g. Well, it's obvious, *ain't* it; I *ain't* got kids, but I have to pay towards the schools. This Web-data also shows that in British English, *AIN'T* is not standard and is a contraction of *AM NOT*, *IS NOT*, *ARE NOT*, *HAVE NOT*, or *HAS NOT*, e.g. I ain't seen it. In American English, *AIN'T* is informal for *AM NOT*, *IS NOT*, *ARE NOT*, *HAS NOT*, or *HAVE NOT* in a dialectal or nonstandard usage. This Web-data also accounts for the origin of *AIN'T*. The contraction has enjoyed its early assimilation, with a lengthened and raised vowel, of *AMN'T*, i.e. the contraction of *AM NOT*, and has contributed to later confusion with *A'NT* (*ARE NOT*), *I'NT* (*IS NOT*), and *HA'NT* (*HAS NOT*; *HAVE NOT*). This contraction is also serving its role in idioms, e.g. If it *ain't* broke, don't fix it.

Web-data 9 accounts that *AIN'T* is nonstandard and is at the first place, a contraction of *AM NOT*. In the second place, the contraction is also for *ARE NOT*, *IS NOT*, *HAS NOT*, and *HAVE NOT*. *AIN'T* has enjoyed a long history of controversy, as its first appearance in 1778 has evolved and replaced the century-earlier *AN'T*, which was the contraction for *ARE NOT* and *AM NOT*. This long history of form adjustment is probably due to adjusted convenience in pronouncing the contraction.

Web-data 10 accounts that *AIN'T* is a troublesome or slang contraction, and asserts that the contraction is in the dictionary, but questions whether or not it is a word and whether or not it is OK to use it. This Web-data also accounts that *AIN'T* is considered improper and slang, but it has actually arisen as an alternative or solution to two other contractions, i.e. *AMN'T* and *AREN'T*, i.e. I'm doing all right, *ain't* I, which is not clunky compared to: I'm doing all right, *amn't* I?, or which is not plain wrong grammatically compared to: I'm doing all right, *aren't* I? The Web-data also accounts, however, that the contraction *AIN'T* is not exclusively used in the first person singular, but also in the others, the conjugations of which are: I *ain't*; You *ain't*; He, she, or it *ain't*; We *ain't*; You *ain't*; They *ain't*, despite their usual unacceptability.

Web-data 11 defines AIN'T as the contraction for IS NOT, AM NOT, ARE NOT, DO NOT, HAVE NOT, WILL NOT, DOES NOT, et cetera. The contraction is also used especially in the South and Midwest of the United States, to indicate the double negative. Examples in web-data 11 are (1) *Ain't* nothing like that I *ain't* seen before; (2) He *ain't* got no money; (3) I *ain't* seen him since last year; and (4) She *ain't* going to school today.

Web-data 12 accounts for UK and US forms of AIN'T. The form AIN'T is not standard and is short from of AM NOT, IS NOT, ARE NOT, HAS NOT, or HAVE NOT. Examples given in web-data 12 are (1) He *ain't* going; (2) I *ain't* got none left; (3) You can't spend what you *ain't* got; and (4) I *ain't* got no money right now. This web data also accounts for AIN'T as part of an idiom, i.e. If it *ain't* broke, don't fix it.

From all the accounts contained in the Web-data above, as suggested by Premise 1 of this research, the form of AIN'T belongs to informal English with the casual, incomplete, shorter, and cut-down aspects. The form of AIN'T as part of informal English has been verified as unacceptable, especially in formal writing (Web-data 1, 10); as non-standard or informal English (Web-data 2, 5, 7, 9, 12); as the common spoken English in particular dialects (Web-data 3); as slang or troublesome construction of informal language with its questionable correct or proper use (Web-data 4, 8, 10); not as nonstandard, but only used by the less educated in their everyday speech (Web-data 6); as a particular dialect of the South and Midwest of the United States (Web-data 8, 11); as typically used in the double negative (Web-data 11); and as part of idioms (Web-data 8, 12).

Also suggested by Premise 1 of this research, the form of AIN'T has been derived from various constructions. The contraction has been derived from AM NOT, IS NOT, ARE NOT (Web-data 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12); from HAS NOT and HAVE NOT (Web-data 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12); from DO NOT and DOES NOT (Web-data 3, 4, 7, 11); from DID NOT (Web-data 3, 7, 11); from ARE NOT and IS NOT only (Web-data 9); from TO BE NOT, TO HAVE NOT, and TO DO NOT (Web-data 3); from the contractions AMN'T, AREN'T, and ISN'T (Web-data 11); and from WILL NOT and the others (Web-data 12). Thus, we have observed that the contraction AIN'T has derived from various constructions, i.e. AM NOT, IS NOT, ARE NOT, HAS NOT, HAVE NOT, DO NOT,

DOES NOT, and DID NOT, or the contraction has been derived from any words from TO BE NOT, TO HAVE NOT, and TO DO NOT. The contraction has also derived from and has been a solution to the contractions AMN'T, AREN'T, and ISN'T. The form of *AIN'T* has also been derived from WILL NOT and the others. This last finding on WILL NOT and the others, however, still requires further research.

### **The Premise 2 (P2)**

This P2 states that the meaning of *AIN'T* implies different aspects of meaning. Web-data 1 shows that *AIN'T* is mainly used as a tongue-in-cheek expression (a joke), as part of a common expression, or in an effort to sound folksy, i.e. not serious or friendly. Web-data 2 accounts that *AIN'T* is used in English songs, and we can see the meaning from the lyrics which contain the contraction. The Web-data 3 accounts that English speakers commonly use *AIN'T* in informal and oral contexts, within particular dialects and regions. People use *AIN'T* to mark a nonstandard and low socio-economic status of their educational level and effect rhetorically. *AIN'T* is slang or informal English, which is used in texting and talking (Web-data 4). Web-data 5 asserts that *AIN'T* is informal and its use of it was widespread in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. It is normally used in many dialects and informal contexts in both North America and Britain but should not be used in formal contexts.

Web-data 6 accounts that as non-standard English, *AIN'T* is more common in the habitual speech of the less educated, and is used in both speech and writing to catch attention and to gain emphasis, in journalistic prose as part of informal style, in fiction for purposes of characterization, in familiar correspondence as to the mark of warm personal friendship, and in popular songs for conveying metrical reasons and informal tone. Web-data 7 explains that *AIN'T* is more common in uneducated speech, but also in the informal speech of the educated. *AIN'T* occurs in humorous and set phrases and is also used for emphasis, for deliberate effects in phrases to represent speech. These Web-data 6 and 7 have similar references, as they both relate *AIN'T* to the utterance that belongs to the speech by those with a low education background.

Web-data 8 accounts that *AIN'T* is of dialectical or nonstandard usage, and occurs in idioms. Web-data 9 accounts that *AIN'T* is part of vulgarism, i.e.

a term used by the lower classes, is often regarded as a sign of ignorance and is part of folksy expressions. Web-data 10 asserts that *AIN'T* is troublesome, improper, and slang; however, *AIN'T* has been a solution to the clunky contraction AMN'T or the grammatically wrong contraction AREN'T. *AIN'T* is acceptable in dialogue, for a colloquial tone, for comedic effect, or as part of a joke or well-known saying in general conversation. Web-data 11 accounts that *AIN'T* is typically used in the double negative, while Web-data 12 accounts that *AIN'T* is not standard in English, and is part of idioms.

From all the accounts contained in the Web-data above, as suggested by Premise 2 of this research, the meaning of *AIN'T* implies different aspects of meaning. The research finding shows that the different aspects of meaning implied in the contraction *AIN'T* are: informality (Web-data 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12); topic area (Web-data 2, 3, 6, 10); low social class (Web-data 3, 7, 9); emphasis (Web-data 6, 11); and content (Web-data 8, 12). The informality aspect of the meaning of the contraction *AIN'T* is verified by its tongue-in-cheek expression, or a joke, as part of common expression, or in an effort to sound folksy or not serious or friendly, and commonly used by speakers in oral and nonstandard, informal settings. This aspect is also confirmed that *AIN'T* is slang or informal language, used in texting and talking. *AIN'T* is also used in many dialects and informal contexts and should not be used in formal contexts. That *AIN'T* is more common in the habitual speech of the less educated, of dialectical or nonstandard usage, and part of folksy expressions also confirms this aspect of informality. The informality aspect of *AIN'T* is also shown in that *AIN'T* is troublesome, improper, and slang, but is chosen as a solution to clunky and grammatical constructions. *AIN'T* is also typically used in the double negative, which is not standard in English.

The topic area is the second aspect of the meaning of *AIN'T*. Here, *AIN'T* is used in English songs, with the meaning of *AIN'T* in the lyrics for a rhetorical effect. *AIN'T* is used as an informal style in journalistic prose, for purposes of characterization in fiction, as the mark of warm friendship in familiar correspondence, and for metrical reasons and informal tone in popular songs. *AIN'T* is acceptable in dialogue, for a colloquial tone, for comedic effect, or as part of a joke or well-known saying in general conversation. The low social class is the third aspect of the meaning of *AIN'T*. This aspect is contained in

that use of *AIN'T* is considered as a marker of low-socio-economic status of educational level, is more common in uneducated speech, and is part of vulgarity, i.e. a term used by the lower classes. Emphasis is the next aspect of the meaning of *AIN'T*. This aspect is employed in both writing and speech to provide an emphasis and to catch attention. This aspect also occurs in the typical use of *AIN'T* in the double negative. The last aspect of the meaning of *AIN'T* is the content. In this sense, *AIN'T* can be used as part of idioms or idiomatic expressions.

### **The Premise 3 (P3)**

This P3 states that the function of *AIN'T* is bound to interpersonal context. This context has been elaborated from two tendencies of politeness, distancing and closeness, which is in line with theories of Goffman's *negative* and *positive* face (1959), Brown and Levinson's *negative* and *positive* politeness strategies (1987), Renkema's *respect* and *solidarity* politeness (1993), and Jumanto's *politeness* and *friendship* or *camaraderie* (2006), and types of the hearer in the theory of power and solidarity by Brown and Gilman (1968). Jumanto (2014a; 2014b) elaborates all the theories above into the so-called distant language and close language. Distant language is spoken to superiors for politeness, while close language is used to close people for friendship or camaraderie. To a broader extent, as accounted for above, superiors may also refer to the public in general, or potential strangers, or other hearers' informal situations, while close people may also refer to those a speaker has known for a quite long time, and thus, has shared common knowledge and interests within a closed context of friendship, solidarity, or camaraderie. Distant language elaborates formal, indirect, non-literal utterances, with safe and common topics. On the other hand, close language employs any topics: safe or common, personal, and even private. The form of close language is of informal, direct, and literal utterances. Informal utterances usually involve contractions, slangs, reverse-ups, changes, taboos, swearings, and f-words (2014a; 2014b).

The utterance *AIN'T*, as the author has suggested and is now confirmed, is part of close language, or is used for closeness politeness to close people for friendship or camaraderie. *AIN'T* also belongs to informal utterances, as it is incomplete, or shorter, or cut-down (or contracted) from the form AM NOT,

IS NOT, ARE NOT, HAS NOT, HAVE NOT, DO NOT, DOES NOT, and DID NOT. This utterance is used for close people for friendship or camaraderie, which is closeness politeness. The case in which Donald Trump uttered *AIN'T* in public with the joke on homosexuality, as illustrated in the introduction of this research paper, implies things as follows: (1) As a superior due to his great wealth and success, Donald Trump is using a close language to the public for closeness politeness, or creates friendship or camaraderie to the public; (2) As a superior, Donald Trump is freely talking about homosexuality (*gay*), and a homosexual transaction taboo (i.e. *20 dollars is 20 dollars*) as a joke to the public, which is subordinate to him or that he probably regards as subordinate, all of which instills friendship or camaraderie, thus a close language; (3) The contraction *AIN'T* is part of an informal utterance, which is part of the close language for closeness politeness, or friendship or camaraderie. The use of *AIN'T* as part of Donald Trump's utterance before public can so far be seen as his positive-face (Goffman, 1955) exposure or his positive face-management strategy (Brown and Levinson, 1987) for a joke with people, in general, to reduce his social distance with them, thus showing closeness to public. All this is in line with the perspectives of politeness theories from Brown and Levinson (1978; 1987) along with their advocates, which focuses on face-saving strategies and on reduction or avoidance of face-threats in verbal interactions. This is based on the stance that all utterances are potentially face-threats.

However, many others believe that no utterances are intrinsically face-threats (Fraser, 1990; Turner, 1996; Fukushima, 2000; Arundale, 2006; O'Driscoll, 2007) and that face-threats are a deliberate use of language to offend people (Culpeper, 1996, 2005, 2011; Kienpointner, 1997; Bousfield 2008; Bousfield and Culpeper, 2008; Bousfield and Locher, 2008). Here, the light of impoliteness theory is shed and research on impoliteness or face-threats is conducted (Pérez de Ayala, 2001; Harris, 2001; O'Driscoll, 2007). The use of *AIN'T* in Donald Trump's utterance is probably an intentional offense to those who oppose him or who are not in favor of his wealth and success. In other words, Donald Trump uses the *AIN'T* utterance to deliberately offend a particular group of people (i.e. haters) in an indirect manner.

The use of *AIN'T* can also be seen from the other perspective of verbal interactions or the interaction strategies, which is neither politeness nor impoliteness. The use of *AIN'T* in verbal interactions may depend on who the interactants are and what the interaction is for within a particular context (O'Driscoll, 2007; Stewart, 2008; Arundale, 2010; Spencer-Oatey, 2009; Chang & Haugh (2011). Use of *AIN'T* within interpersonal or social interaction may be termed differently as *banter* (Leech, 1983; Kienpointner, 2008), or *jocular mockery* (Haugh, 2010a), or *mock impoliteness* (Culpeper, 1996; 2011; Bousfield, 2008), or a *harmonious face-threatening act* (Su and Huang, 2002; Chang & Haugh, 2011). Thus, the use of *AIN'T* within different interactions to different people should be evaluated differently, as there are complex relationships between face-threats and impoliteness (Watts, 2003; Haugh and Bargiela-Chiappini, 2010; Chang & Haugh, 2011). Use of *AIN'T* within interactions may vary and should be evaluated as not face-threatening, but as *face-supportive* or *face-affiliative* (Su and Hwang, 2002; Bousfield, 2008; Haugh, 2010a), as the interactants (the speaker and the hearer) have a mutual understanding (Tracy, 2008), or the use of *AIN'T* within different interactions may be regarded as *sociopragmatically allowable* (Chang & Haugh, 2011). The use of *AIN'T* within Donald Trump's utterance may be termed as what Chang & Haugh (2011) call *strategic embarrassment* which has referred to the previously proposed term *politic* by Watts (1989; 2003). The use of *AIN'T* within this particular context by Donald Trump is, therefore, regarded as appropriate and strategic and has no bad impact on the long-term relationship.

The use, as well as the usage of *AIN'T*, is important to be included in the academic curriculum of English language teaching and learning, so students are made aware of its various original forms and they will also learn about its use in conversations or verbal interactions. Within interpersonal and social context, students and learners in general upon their knowledge of *AIN'T* will be able to use the utterance appropriately, i.e. to confirm or instill solidarity within a close context with close people, and to avoid using it within a formal situation with not close people or superiors for the sake of politeness. Using of *AIN'T* to not close people or superiors or in a formal situation may lead to impoliteness, i.e. a rude situation, which is threatening their face or damaging

the formal situation into a probable disharmony (Jumanto, 2014a; 2014b), as the utterance "I ain't know my schedule, Sir!" from an employee to their new employer, for example. The interpersonal or social use of *AIN'T* within theories of politeness, impoliteness, and strategic interactions may also be introduced to students and learners for their better understanding of its pragmatic use in verbal interactions. This way, students or learners are aware of whom they are talking to and why they are using or avoiding *AIN'T* in the conversations or verbal interactions with different speakers within different contexts.

## CONCLUSIONS

Based on the three proposed premises, the web-data verification and the accounts given, some points to bring this paper to an end are as the following.

The form of *AIN'T* belongs to non-standard or informal English with the casual, incomplete, shorter and cut-down aspects, which is unacceptable in formal writing. Originally as a form to represent or a solution to AMN'T, AREN'T, and ISN'T, the utterance *AIN'T* has evolved and represented various constructions, i.e. AM NOT, IS NOT, ARE NOT, HAS NOT, HAVE NOT, DO NOT, DOES NOT, DID NOT, TO BE NOT, TO HAVE NOT, TO DO NOT, WILL NOT and the others. This last finding on WILL NOT and the others, however, still requires further research.

The meaning of *AIN'T* implies different aspects of meaning, i.e. informality, topic area, low social class, emphasis, and content. The utterance *AIN'T* has aspects of meaning as a joke, as part of common expression, or as an effort to sound folksy or not serious or friendly in an oral, nonstandard, informal context. *AIN'T* is also used in the topic areas of English songs for particular meanings in the lyrics, of rhetorical effect, of informal style in journalistic prose, of characterization purposes in fiction, of warm friendship in correspondence, and of metrical reasons and informal tone in popular songs. The utterance *AIN'T* is also considered as a marker of low socioeconomic status and educational level, is commonly used in uneducated speech, and is part of vulgarism, i.e. a term used by the lower classes. *AIN'T* has also the aspect of emphasis, i.e. for gaining emphasis and catching attention in both writing and speech. This also occurs in the double negative.

Content is the last aspect of the meaning of *AIN'T*, as it is used as part of idioms or idiomatic expressions. Finally, the utterance *AIN'T* functions as part of close language or is used for closeness politeness to close people for friendship or camaraderie.

The utterance *AIN'T* should be taught academically in classrooms as an informal language with its various derived constructions, and students should be made aware that *AIN'T* is part of the informal language or close language. Close language involves informal, direct, and literal utterances. English learners, in general, should also be careful in using *AIN'T* in conversations or verbal interactions not to threaten the face of not close people or superiors or others in a formal situation. Otherwise, a rude situation may happen, and disharmony entails. In this context, the use of *AIN'T* should be avoided, or they had better not use it. However, the pragmatic use of *AIN'T* within interpersonal or social verbal interactions regarding politeness, impoliteness, and strategic interactions should also be introduced to students and learners for their better understanding of the discourse of *AIN'T* within a particular text or utterance.

## REFERENCES

- Arundale, Robert. (2010). Constituting face in conversation: face, facework and interactional achievement. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42, 2078-2105
- Audi, Robert, ed. (1999). *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, M. J. (2000). Writing a Literature Review. *The Marketing Review*, 1(2), 219-247. <https://doi.org/10.1362/1469347002529189>.
- Bangasser, P. E. (2000). *The ILO and the Informal Sector: An Institutional History*. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- Bohm, A. (2004). "Theoretical coding: text analysis in grounded theory", in U. Flick, E. Kardorff & I. Steinke (Eds.), *A Companion to Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 270-275.

- Bolderston, A. (2008). Writing an Effective Literature Review. *Journal of Medical Imaging and Radiation Sciences*, 39, 86-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmir.2008.04.009>.
- Bousfield, Derek. (2008). *Impoliteness in Interaction*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam. Bousfield, Derek, Culpeper, Jonathan. 2008. Special Issue on "Impoliteness:
- Bousfield, Derek, Culpeper, Jonathan. (2008). Special Issue on "Impoliteness: Eclecticism and diaspora". *Journal of Politeness Research* 4, 161-337.
- Bousfield, Derek, Locher, Miriam (Eds.). (2008). *Impoliteness in Language*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, Penelope, Levinson, Stephen. (1978). Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena. In: Goody, Esther (Ed.), *Questions and Politeness*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 56-311.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1968). The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of Language* (pp. 252–275). The Hague: Mouton & Co. N.V. Publishers.
- Chang, Wei-Lin Melody & Haugh, Michael. (2011). Strategic embarrassment and face threatening in business interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics* 43 (12), 2948-2963.
- Fraser, Bruce. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14, 219-236.
- Fukushima, Saeko. (2000). *Requests and Culture: Politeness in British English and Japanese*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor Books.

- Harris, Sandra. (2001). Being politically impolite: extending politeness theory to adversarial political discourse. *Discourse and Society* 12, 451-472.
- Haugh, Michael. (2010a). Jocular mockery, (dis)affiliation, and face. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42, 2106-2119.
- Haugh, Michael & Bargiela-Chiappini, Francesca. (2010). Face in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42, 2073-2077.
- Heintz, James. (2012). 'Informality, Inclusiveness, and Economic Growth: An Overview of Key Issues', SIG WORKING PAPER 2012/2. Amherst, USA: Political Economy Research Institute, University of Massachusetts, July 2012.
- Holloway, I. (1997). *Basic concepts for qualitative research*. Oxford: Blackwell Science Ltd.
- Jumanto, J. (2006). *Phatic communication among English native speakers, an Unpublished PhD Dissertation Thesis*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Universitas Indonesia.
- Jumanto, J. (2014a). *Politeness and Camaraderie: How Types of Form Matter in Indonesian Context*. Proceeding: The Second International Conference on Education and Language (2nd ICEL). Bandar Lampung University (UBL), Indonesia.
- Jumanto, J. (2014b). Towards a Character Language: A Probability in Language Use, *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics (OJML)*, 2014(4): 333-349. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2014.42027>. 2018 Thomson-Reuters Indexing, <https://www.scirp.org/imagesForEmail/abstract/ISI/ojml.png>.
- Jumanto, J., Rizal, S.S., & Nugroho, R.A. (2017). Acting the Intangible: Hints of Politeness in Non-Verbal Form, *English Language Teaching*, 10 (11), 2017, 111-118.
- Kanbur, Ravi. (2009). 'Conceptualising Informality: Regulation and Enforcement', at [www.people.cornell.edu/pages/sk145](http://www.people.cornell.edu/pages/sk145), February, 2009.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman.
- O'Driscoll, Jim. (2007). what's in an FTA? Reflections on a chance meeting with Claudine. *Journal of Politeness Research* 3, 243-268.

- People Magazine. (1998). Donald Trump: "I ain't gay but 20 dollars is 20 dollars", in People Magazine, Jess Cagle (ed.). New York: Time Inc.
- Pérez de Ayala, Soledad. (2001). FTAs and Erskine May: Conflicting needs? - Politeness in question time. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33, 143-169.
- Renkema, J. (1993). *Discourse Studies: An Introductory Textbook*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Saladana, J. (2012). "The coding manual for qualitative researchers", Sage, ISBN 1446247376. London: SAGE Publications.
- Sifianou, Maria. (2013). The Impact of Globalisation on Politeness and Impoliteness, *Journal of Pragmatics* 55 (2013) 86-102.
- Sindzingre, Alice. (2006). 'The Relevance of the Concepts of Formality and Informality: A Theoretical Appraisal' in *Linking the Formal and Informal Economy: Concepts and Policies*, Basudeb Guha-Khasnobies, Ravi Kanbur, and Elinor Ostrom eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, UNU-WIDER Studies in Development Economics and EGDI.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen. (2009). Face, identity and interactional goals. In: Bargiela- Chiappini, Francesca, Haugh, Michael (Eds.), *Face, Communication and Social Interaction*. London: Equinox, pp. 137-154.
- Stewart, Miranda. (2008). Protecting speaker's face in impolite exchanges: the negotiation of face-wants in workplace interaction. *Journal of Politeness Research* 4, 31-54.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques*. California: Sage Publications.
- Su, Lily I-wen & Huang, Shu-ping. (2002). Harmonious face threatening acts and politeness: a special consideration. *National Taiwan Working Papers in Linguistics* 5, 175-202.
- Tracy, Karen. (2008). "Reasonable hostility": situation-appropriate face-attack. *Journal of Politeness Research* 4, 169-191.
- Turner, Ken. (1996). The principal principles of pragmatic inference: politeness. *Language Teaching* 29, 1-13.

Watts, Richard. (1989). Relevance and relational work: linguistic politeness as politic behaviour. *Multilingua* 8, 131-166.

Watts, Richard. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Webster, J. & Watson, R.T. (2002). "Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: writing a literature review", *MIS Quarterly*, 26(2), xiii-xxiii.

**The English-language-affiliated URLs or websites (web-data):**

**Web-Data 1**

**AIN'T**

<https://grammarist.com/usage/aint/>

**Web-Data 2**

Penggunaan Ain't, Gotta, Gonna, dan Wanna dalam Bahasa Inggris

<https://www.ef.co.id/englishfirst/englishstudy/penggunaan-aint-gotta-gonna-dan-wanna.aspx>

**Web-Data 3**

**Ain't**

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ain%27t>

**Web-Data 4**

**Top Definition of Ain't**

<https://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=ain%27t>

**Web-Data 5**

**Definition of Ain't in English**

<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ain't>

**Web-Data 6**

**Ain't**

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ain't>

**Web-Data 7**

**Ain't**

<https://www.dictionary.com/browse/ain-t>

**Web-Data 8**

**Definition of Ain't**

<https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/aint>

**Web-Data 9**

**Ain't**

<https://www.thefreedictionary.com/ain%27t>

**Web-Data 10**

**Is Ain't a Word?**

<https://www.quickanddirtytips.com/education/grammar/is-aint-a-word>