

A wall that speaks: A critical discourse analysis of the Graffiti Writings of Generation Z

Aporbo, Russel

Department of Teacher Education, University of Mindanao-Tagum College, Tagum City, Philippines

Abstract

This critical discourse analysis aimed to elucidate the different ideologies of the graffiti- writings of the generation Z students of New Bataan National High School, Davao de Oro, Philippines. From the analyzed linguistic corpora, the results revealed that the graffiti writings of high school students convey impermissible, very sensitive, grubby and bigoted expression of thoughts and feelings as graffitist. Eight major functions of the graffiti-writings were identified: expressing personal feelings, expressing resentment, expressing general insult, expressing sexual ideas, expressing self-glorification, quoting cartoon expression, and even a form of cheating. There were five themes extracted from the gathered linguistic corpora, these are: sexual derogation, self-glorification, profanity and cursing. The result of this study is deemed significant for those practitioners of linguistics, education and language pedagogy.

Keywords: *Graffiti writings, critical discourse analysis, linguistic functions, New Bataan National High School*

1. Introduction

The primordial and potent tool of human survival is having the ability to communicate. Language, as it is, capacitates man to perpetuate and to triumph in his circumnavigation as part of the ethno linguistic ecology. Language is a powerful tool for determining how people view and then interact in the world (Orwell 1949). Ostensibly, it has become the tool of expression of ones' needs, making connections, persuasion and manipulation of others, and even the key of expressing and shaping individual's identity (Halliday 1975).

As a tool of expression, graffiti writings are one of the identified channels which one can voice out and express oneself. Students, as they are situated in the academe, sometimes found it difficult to express themselves regarding their social issues experienced in the classroom settings such as feeling of hostilities being stereotyped and differentiated in classroom diversity, resentments to their peers, desires as adolescents and many more. Thus, resolved to make use of graffiti writings as an avenue of expression. Graffiti writing is defined as an unauthorized writing or drawing on a public surface. Graffiti abounds in the world around us. Predominantly, it offers a good insight into the general aspects of the society for it expresses social, political, religious, emotional and linguistic messages (Abdullah 2008). With the bounty of such material to draw on, it has become a logical focus for many scholars from variety of disciplines (Agnes 2004), including those in the field of critical linguistics.

According to Yieke (2010), graffiti has been utilized for a long time as ways of expression by human beings all over the world in various institutions. She stressed that most of the time, the most sensitive graffiti are found in walls of public toilets and along narrow corridors, and even at universities.

In the University of Chicago, the use of graffiti as a source of data has spread beyond studies of human sexuality and urban youth to include linguistic studies of discourse patterns and grammar, explorations of cultural production in disputed areas, and modelling gender differences. Analysis suggests that insults and remarks about advice, classes, love, the surroundings, school, and oneself should be considered common in graffiti found in university libraries, in addition to sex. Trends in

writing style and approach to the various topics in each corpus were also identified (Dombrowski 2011).

In the Philippines, various researches across universities have established that graffiti writing is a universal social practice. The graffiti-writings of the students convey thoughts and feelings which are forbidden, very sensitive, filthy and bigoted. Most of them talked about sex, hatred, love, discrimination. students as graffiti writers heavily relied on borrowing English words. The graffiti-writings' authors used terse statements to convey their opinions and ideas in a more understandable or clearer way as well as to avoid sanctions or punishments if caught. Students' graffiti writings are condensed with personal feelings which they cannot express openly. These graffiti-writings are very personal and insulting towards others whom they meant to read such. Most of the students are very discriminating in nature and some also express confidential too sensitive issues concerning students' identity and teacher's roles in the academe.

In New Bataan National High School, graffiti writings can be found in classroom walls, comfort rooms, parks and benches of the school. At some sort, these graffiti writings can also be the cause of trouble among students in the classroom since some writings are very discriminating in nature and some also express confidential and too sensitive issues concerning students' identity and teacher's roles in the academe.

With these empirical facts, the research wants to delve deeper the graffiti writings of millennial writers in the locality in order to illuminate the ideologies behind those words inscribed on the walls.

1.1. Literature review

This study is primarily gleaned to the framework on language functions of Al-Rousan Abdullah (2008). In his research, "A Socio-linguistic Study of Graffiti-Writings" in Unrwa School, Jordan, he identified fourteen (14) language functions which he used in classifying students' graffiti-writings. These are: quoting religious expressions, expressing patriotism, expressing personal feelings, expressing sport loyalty, quoting lyrics, expressing expressions of wisdom, expressing proverbs, expressing human rights, quoting cartoon expressions, expressing humor, expressing political content, expressing memoirs, expressing resentment, and expressing general insults.

Abdullah's framework is related to this present study since it also explores the different language functions found in the graffiti-writings of the millennial students. His framework will be used to describe the unrelenting issues explicitly stated and obliquely suggested from the linguistic corpora.

The concept of "graffiti" is derived originally from the Italian word "graffito" which is mainly employed to refer to "any form of writing or images on the walls or surfaces of public buildings, parks, toilets, buses or trains, usually bearing some political or sexual contents, a lover's pledge, proposition, or obscene words" (Chiluwa, 2008 as cited by El-Nashar, 2016).

Blume (1987) as cited by Farnia, (2014) defined graffiti as any graphic or written inscriptions for which no official establishment is made, which are largely undesirable, and which are written on the most several publicly reachable surfaces, typically by anonymous people. Graffiti have been considered as a map of a genuine representation of reality as well as an evolutionary means that has made people reflect on their cultural identity using artistic and social modes of expressions (Sheivandi et al., 2015).

Abel and Buckley (1977) as cited by Al-Khawaldeh. al(2017) view it as: A form of communication that is both personal and free of the everyday social strains that normally prevent people from giving uninhibited reign to their thoughts. As such, these sometimes crude inscriptions offer some intriguing insights into the people who author them and into the society in which these people belong. Basthomi (2007) as cited Al-Khawaldeh. al (2017) argued that graffiti are related to any sort of symbols, scratches, drawings, signs, paintings found on walls or anywhere irrespective to what inspires the writing. Considering their various forms, they have been studied from different angles: social (Adams & Winter, 1997 as cited by Blommaert, 2016), cultural, religious (Morva, 2016), language learning (Mwangi, 2012), motivational and emotional (Peiris, and Jayantha, 2015), gendered (House, 2007, Matthews, et al., 2012, Haslem, 2012), linguistics (Grider, 1975, Abu-Jaber, et al., 2012 as cited by Farnia, 2014) quantitative, preventative, and aesthetic.

Culture according to Hofstede (2005) as cited in the study of Al-Khawaldeh. al (2017) is the discernible practices of the society and that the significance of graffiti also stems from the fact that they have been considered as a profound source that encompasses insightful psychological, societal, and cultural information worthy of thoughtful attention (Farnia, 2014; El-Nashar & Nayef, 2016).

Attitudes towards graffiti are ambivalent. Graffiti have been seen as an undesirable annoyance, a sign of rebellion against societal authorities, and an utter manifestation of destruction that must be mended (Nwoye, 1993 as cited by Al-Khawaldeh et. al 2017)). On the other hand, they are regarded as an unconventional medium or an alternative form of personal communication that is free of ordinary social limitations that avert people from freely flow their thoughts (Abel & Buckley, 1997 as cited by El-Nashar, 2016) and a source of information about significant social issues and problems (Yieke, 2003). Hence, Gross et al. (1997) as cited by Al-Khawaldeh et. al (2017) argued that graffiti are human products and forms of communication which can be inferred, examined, and understood. Despite their manifestations, graffiti are viewed as a linguistic phenomenon that encompasses both form and content and uses discourse to signify something other than itself (Mwangi 2012 as cited by Al-Khawaldeh et. al 2017). Considering their various contents, researchers have come up with different classifications. For example, Dombrowski (2011) as cited by Sheivandi et al., (2015) has classified graffiti found in four universities' libraries in the United States into the following themes: advice, classes, despair, and drugs, where those graffiti concerning the

theme of insults and remarks about the previously-mentioned themes were the most distinctive themes of graffiti besides sex. Şad and Kutlu (2009) classified graffiti into socially acceptable themes, such as belongingness, homesickness, romance, and humour or the form of someone's name and signs (doodling) and anonymous inscriptions themes, such as sex and politics or religion, which are found to be the production of men rather than women. Graffiti have also been classified as either latrinalia, humorous, public, tags, folk epigraphy, or historical (Gadsby, 1995). In particular, latrinalia, which is termed by Dundes (1966), refers to restrooms' graffiti. As claimed by Haslam (2013) public toilets are "ideal hothouses and are the earliest form of human expression that preceded language in primitive times. This partly explains why societies are still involved in the practice of graffiti.

1.2. Research questions

This study will seek information through the following research questions:

- 1.) What are the language functions in the graffiti-writings of gen-Z students?
- 2.) What are the linguistic themes generated from the graffiti-writings of gen-Z students?

2. Method

2.1 Design

This is a qualitative study employing critical discourse analysis to describe and analyze the language functions and unrelenting issues found in the graffiti writing among generation -Z students of New Bataan National High School.

The process of inquiry flows from philosophical assumptions, to interpretive lens and on to the procedures involved in studying social or human problems. Further, linguistic corpora will be collected from natural settings which were subjected to both inductive and deductive analysis in order to establish patterns or themes (Creswell 2013).

The present study which explores the graffiti writings is an example of how language is used in a specific context of human interaction. The collected data of this study were analyzed based on the Critical Discourse Analysis of van Dijk (1998). It intends to elucidate the intricacies of the graffiti writings found within the research locale which occurred in different settings either in benches, toilet walls, chairs and classroom walls and the like.

Critical Discourse analysis sought to understand how such language is used in human communication to produce a meaning the speaker intends and the listener understands given their knowledge of the social and situational context of the speech-act. CDA further recognizes that the intended meaning is not always the one that is received by the listener, or reader and is interested in the way of multiple interpretations.

Essentially, the focus of CDA on the human element of communication is an attempt to identify "how a language is used to create cohesive and coherent communication." This focuses on the context in which words and phrases are used, because the manner and method of communication could change based on the environment in and purpose for which it is uttered.

All comprehensible graffiti writings found on different surfaces available at the school such as walls, doors, desks, chairs, and other surfaces were investigated. In this study, drawings were excluded.

2.2 Sample / Participants

Graffiti- writings were the linguistic corpora of this study. These were collected using a digital camera, mobile and free hand note book, pen and pencil to jot down graffiti while visiting the different areas of the school. All comprehensible graffiti writings found in the variety of school surfaces: bathrooms, surrounding walls and school building asset such as walls, doors, tables, chairs and desk will be noted. These graffiti writings were gathered from January to February 2019 and were photographed to ensure the authenticity of the study.

2.3 Instrument(s)

An approach developed by van Dijk was employed and adapted into the analysis of the gathered linguistic corpora. It intends to elucidate the intricacies of the graffiti writings found within the research locale which occurred in different settings either in benches, toilet walls, chairs and classroom walls and the like.

Critical discourse analysis sought to understand how such language is used in human communication to produce a meaning the speaker intends and the listener understand given their knowledge of the social and situational context of the speech-act. DA further recognizes that the intended meaning is not always the one that is received by the listener, or reader and is interested in the way of multiple interpretations.

Essentially, the focus of CDA on the human element of communication is an attempt to identify “how a language is used to create cohesive and coherent communication.” This focuses on the context in which words and phrases are used, because the manner and method of communication could change based on the environment in and purpose for which it is uttered.

All comprehensible graffiti writings found on different surfaces available at the school such as walls, doors, desks, chairs, and other surfaces were investigated.

2.4 Data collection procedures

The following procedures were undertaken in conducting this study:

Asking permission is the prior to the actual data gathering; I sought the permission of the Dep.Ed division supervisor of Davao de Oro and school principal of New Bataan National School to record and documents all the graffiti writings within the research locale.

Next is the collection of the corpora of the study. The data were collected utilizing a digital camera, mobile and free hand note book, pen and pencil to jot down graffiti while visiting the different areas of the school. All comprehensible graffiti writings found in the variety of school surfaces: bathrooms, surrounding walls and school building asset (walls, doors, tables, chairs and desk) will be noted. Graffiti writings will be photographed to ensure the authenticity of the study.

Then, analysis of the linguistic corpora which followed after the data collection utilizing Critical Discourse Analysis as the method. As stated by Van Dijk, ideology may in principle show up anywhere in discourse yet, ideological content is most directly expressed in discourse meaning.

In assessing ideology found in student graffiti-writings, the first step of analysis focuses on the semantic macrostructures of the text, that is, with the study of global meanings, topics or themes, Such topics represent the gist or most important information of a discourse, and tell what a discourse is all about, globally speaking.

The next step in analyzing ideologies focused on language functions analysis. Analyzing discourse involves looking at both language form and language function (Demo, 2001). According to Keraf (1996) as cited by Barbosa (2013), language, in principle, has some features that are used based on human needs; as a tool to express oneself, and to do social control. The purpose for which speech

or writing is being used is called language function. Language functions, therefore, refer to the purposes in which one uses language to communicate.

Then, assessing ideological content of student graffiti-writings requires not only examining meaning and form but also social dimension-action and interaction. Discourses when uttered in a specific situation may accomplish the speech act of an assertion, of a question, accusation, promise or threat.

Lastly is the peer-review debriefing in which the outcomes of the analysis will be tabulated to draw conclusions and recommendations for future researchers on the same topic. The results were validated and reviewed by experts in the field of Applied Linguistics. This is to uncover taken for granted biases, perspectives and assumptions on the researcher’s part.

2.5 Data analysis

Thematic analysis of data was employed in which the data during the conduct of study were grouped according to the emerging themes. These identified themes were interpreted and analyzed based on the objective of the study. “Horizontalization” of data were also applied in which listing of each of the relevant quotes on the students-graffiti writings is done. Equal value was also given to them so to make textual descriptions. After that, relevant topics were grouped into units of meaning to identify the linguistic functions and common themes among students graffiti-writings

3 Results

In order to determine the language functions of the gathered linguistic corpora, Al-Rousan Abdullah’ s linguistic frame is used. The documented linguistic corpora were recorded and classified according to its functions. Themes were also generated from the different graffiti-writings of the students.

The first research question centered on the different linguistic functions in the graffiti-writings. As shown in table 1, the corpora gathered upon which the 200 graffiti-writings of students are based, show the five functions; expressing personal feelings, expressing resentment, expressing general insult, expressing sexual ideas, expressing self-glorification.

Table 1 Analysis on the Language Functions in the Students’ Graffiti Writings

| Language Functions | Graffiti Writings |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Expressing Personal feelings | It really hurts when you were just left hanging |
| | Wow! Are your dead?! |
| | You really love me |
| | Happy Break Up |
| | Stop loving someone doesn’t know your worth |
| | You and I forever |
| | Beautiful, I already move on with you |
| | LOVE, you are my love.. |
| | I love you! To the moon and back |
| | The one I will love is the luckiest! |
| | No forever for those bitter! |
| | I’m so sorry, Please forgive me love |
| | Being busted is so hurt! |
| | Don’t believe that concept of love, you were just a victim of it! |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| | Who are you to be my boyfriend? |
| | I won't believe that idea that there is you and me. |
| | Ma'am, please have time for our class! |
| | All those study sessions are just shit! |
| | I think I failed in math! |
| | Regrads to Irene, I really love you! |
| | How beautiful are you! You are so arrogant! |
| Expressing Sexual Ideas | Your vagina sucks! |
| | Your dick is shit! |
| | Your dick is cute 😊😊 |
| | A ringworm on your penis! |
| | FUCK YOU! |
| | FUCKERS!! |
| | Uncircumcised! |
| | Shut up! You are prostitute! |
| Expressing Resentment | Wanna Kiss me?, come and get me! |
| | Shut up! You are all family of idiot! |
| | You Demon! |
| | Fuck that Exam! |
| | You are good at hanging people right? How beautiful are you? |
| Expressing General Insult | You behave! Because you are idiot! |
| | You all believe that you are smart! Yet, you also cheat! |
| | Wow! You're good! You only rely on my answer!! |
| | And you, do you think your pretty?! |
| Expressing Self-Gratification | Yes, I'm pretty! Unlike you, pretending to be KPop, you look disgusting! |
| | You are not pretty so do not act like you are! |
| | I am the prettiest! |
| | Do i look hot? I feel so hot! |
| | I am the smartest one! |
| | No one can ever defy my beauty! |

Expressing Personal Feelings

This language functions ranked 1st among the identified language functions from the corpora gathered. Feelings refer to complex and usually subjective response. These may also refer as emotional or moral sensitivity, especially in relation to personal principles or dignity. For Abdullah(2008) personal feelings include sentiment emotion, passion and sensation . They refer to joyful or painful consciousness experienced when someone is stirred to affection, tenderness, hatred, etc.

Expression of Sexual Ideas

Sexual ideas are expressed in the graffiti-writings of the students. These are ideas of students pertaining bigoted expression or language of sex among young individuals. Below are identified linguistic corpora that manifest sexual ideas.

Expression of Resentment

Resentment, as defined, is a feeling of indignant displeasure or persistent ill will at something regarded as wrong, insult, or injury. The result entails that the students find graffiti writing as an outlet to express their complaints, displeasure and anger towards other people or issues afflicting them or the whole school campus.

Expressing General Insult

The result also shows that expressing general insult is evident among the language functions from the students' graffiti-writings. Insult is commonly defined as offensive words that aim to hurt other people. In the study, it has been observed that graffiti have been used basically to censure and defame other students, groups and organization, teachers and even schools or institution.

Expressing Self-Glorification

Self-glorification, according to Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2012), is a feeling or expressions of one's superiority. In addition to Free Dictionary (2012) defined it as giving or making something appears more glorious or excellent than is actually the case.

Themes Generated from Students' Graffiti-Writings

There were eight themes extracted from the gathered linguistic corpora, these are: triumphs in love and relationships, failure and break up, moving on and letting go, sexual derogation, self-glorification, profanity and cursing, and form of cheating as shown in table 2.

Table 2 Themes Generated from Graffiti Writings of Gen-Z Students

| Graffiti Writings | Themes |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>You really love me, right?</i> • <i>Till death do us part, Love</i> • <i>There is forever you and me.</i> • <i>LOVE you to the moon and back</i> • <i>I Love you!</i> • <i>Love?are you serious with me</i> • <i>I'm truly yours till the end of time</i> • <i>Hey, call me baby</i> • <i>May I be your love till eternity?</i> • <i>Hey sexy lady, be with me. Call me ☺</i> | <p>Expression of Affection</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Happy Break Up!</i> • <i>Way FOREVER TANAN, MAGBULAG</i> • <i>Don't blame me for our break up!</i> • <i>Maybe its wrong to please love me too</i> • <i>I have loved you but you chose to break my heart.</i> | <p>Failure in Relationship</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Your dick is shit!</i> • <i>Uncircumcised penis!</i> • <i>Rinworm on your penis!!</i> • <i>Sex is a no no! By management</i> | <p>Derogatory sexual expressions</p> |

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Fackers !</i> • <i>Slutssss!!</i> • <i>Disgusting semen!</i> • <i>I feel something weird bout your boobs</i> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The most beautiful is only ME</i> • <i>I am beautiful no matter what they say!</i> • <i>I know my worth because my beauty is eternal</i> • <i>I am the prettiest!! I know right!!</i> • <i>SMART-that's me!</i> • <i>The only and one and only!</i> | Expression of Self adoration |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>You are Idiot!!</i> • <i>Evil Artist</i> • <i>Fuck YOU!</i> • <i>Fuck U!</i> • <i>Let's fuck together!!</i> | Expression of Profanity |

4 Discussion

Language Functions of the Millennials' Graffiti-Writings

Expressing Personal Feelings

This language function ranked first among the identified language functions from the corpora gathered. Feelings refer to complex and usually subjective response. These may also refer as emotional or moral sensitivity, especially in relation to personal principles or dignity. For Abdullah(2008) personal feelings include sentiment emotion, passion and sensation They refer to joyful or painful consciousness experienced when someone is stirred to affection, tenderness, hatred, etc.

Based on the results, student's graffiti writings are undeniably condensed with personal feelings. The students as graffitists are fearless to express even the most sensitive and reprehensible feelings and opinion they have, which they cannot dare to express openly. This affirms Reisner's (1974 as cited by Barbosa 2013) statement in the introduction of his encyclopedia of Graffiti that graffiti allows one may fear an open expression.

Most gathered graffiti writings that express the personal feelings talked of love and hatred towards other persons and subject with the construction is usually a person, a subject, or a thing. This is in congruence to the findings of Clingman (2004) and Bates (2004) cited by Barbosa (2013) . Their studies revealed that hatred, love, and anger are some common themes on students' graffiti. It also support the statement of Abel and Buckely (1977) that graffiti is a form of communication that is both personal and free everyday social restraints that normally prevent people from giving uninhibited reign to their thought.

Further, the result implies that the student find school surfaces as venue to express their sentiments and opinion. This supports the notion of Abdullah (200) that students consider school surfaces a refuge to express their feelings. Most of them have even included or mentioned in their graffiti writings the names of those to whom they are addressing their feelings. This could ascribe to the fact that graffiti's authorship is private and writers are anonymous (Rawlison and Farrel, 2010).

Wales and Brewer (1976) as cited by Blommaert (2016) point out that graffiti is of interest as an area of study mainly because it represents a form of spontaneous self-expression which does not suffer the inhibition of accountability and also for the fact that graffiti is a reflection of areas of conflict or popular preoccupation. This view of graffiti is important to the present research in that it characterizes graffiti as an authentic platform where authentic discourse is constructed. The lack of contrition on the graffiti platform or wall has contributed immensely in the study of graffiti as an

authentic reflection of culture. Heider (2012), in the Egyptian post-revolution situation, characterizes graffiti as a true reflection of ‘the beat of the street.’ Also implicit is that fact that the content of graffiti is both culture- and place-specific. For example, this explains why South African graffiti is fundamentally different from Zimbabwean graffiti; hence graffiti reflects the social milieu and geopolitical and cultural environment in which it is construed and constructed.

Derogatory sexual expressions

Sexual ideas are expressed in the graffiti-writings of the students. These are ideas of students pertaining bigoted expression or language of sex among young individuals. Sexual ideas are expressed in the graffiti-writings of the students. However, only few expressions contain the language function. This is in contrast to the finding of Clingman (2004) and Bates (2004). Bate’s study (2004) revealed that sex is the second most popular topic of graffiti. Clingman (2004) in his study found out that sex is among the top 5 most common themes of graffiti found in bathrooms.

The results revealed that sex graffiti in the study are solicitations and general statements about students’ stand on sex. In accordance to Solomon and Yager (1975) as cited by Blommaert (2016), graffiti is a medium that ‘can serve as a release of repressed impulses.’ They cite situations whereby, compared to more public areas, toilet graffiti is more hostile to out-groups.

Expression of Resentment

Resentment, as defined, is a feeling of indignant displeasure or persistent ill will at something regarded as wrong, insult, or injury. The result entails that the students find graffiti writing as an outlet to express their complaints, displeasure and anger towards other people or issues afflicting them or the whole school campus.

According Barbosa (2013), graffiti-writing may be used to express denial and disapproval over issues resulting from political, socio-economic status, or emotionally disturbing experience. The findings are also parallel to that of Clingman’s (2004) in his study of graffiti bathrooms, which revealed that one of the most common themes of graffiti in bathrooms dealt with anger and hatred.

Expressing General Insult

The result also shows that expressing general insult is evident among the language functions from the students’ graffiti-writings. Insult is commonly defined as offensive words that aim to hurt other people. In the study, it has been observed that graffiti have been used basically to censure and defame other students, groups and organization, teachers and even schools or institution.

As exemplified in the examples, the students are very vocal in their graffiti in expressing malicious and reprehensible opinions about their peers, teachers, etc. this supports Reisner’s (1974) definition of graffiti as “the voice of common man ... topics too sensitive, too bigoted, too outrageous”.

It is also evident in the study that the graffiti-writings that are intended to insult others, initiate discussion or debate that lead to interactive insults, but others could not. These students who have been insulted feel they must reply with insult messages on the other students- a matter of which sometimes leads to interactive insults (Dombrowski, 2013).

Expressing Self-Gratification

Self-glorification, according to Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2012), is a feeling or expressions of one’s superiority. In addition to Free Dictionary (2012) defined it as giving or making something appears more glorious or excellent than is actually the case.

Blume (1987) as cited by Farnia, (2014) defined graffiti as any graphic or written inscriptions for which no official establishment is made, which are largely undesirable, and which are written on the most several publicly reachable surfaces, typically by anonymous people. Graffiti have been considered as a map of a genuine representation of reality as well as an evolutionary means that has

made people reflect on their cultural identity using artistic and social modes of expressions (Sheivandi et al., 2015).

Themes Generated from the Students' Graffiti-Writings

This discourse analysis illuminates the complexities of language in social inequity among high school students of New Bataan National High School. Abdullah's theory is being used as linguistic frame in describing and analyzing the discursive suppression through graffiti writings based on language functions in examining the ideologies and unrelenting issues explicitly stated or obliquely suggested in the linguistic corpora collected. The results revealed that the graffiti writings of high school students convey impermissible, very sensitive, grubby and bigoted expression of thoughts and feelings as participants of ethno linguistic community. These include feeling of hostilities being stereotyped and differentiated, resentments to their peers, aspirations and even sexual desires and ethnic discrimination as they are situated in the community of diversity.

Sexual Derogation

The first identified theme is the existence of sexually bigoted expressions. These are expressions of perception or treatment of someone or something as being worthless. Graffiti expressing taboo words and expressions have been found to be frequent occurrence. Al-Sadi and Hamdan (2005) defined taboo as words or expressions that talk about topics people generally avoid, as they are considered shocking, offensive, or embarrassing. Graffiti taboos are impolite words or expressions intended to offend or hurt others. Students used such graffiti to disdain each other with offensive insults about themselves, families, counterparts, and strangers. They are mainly apparent on washrooms' walls, particularly male's. This could be referred to the fact that students can freely and anonymously express their opinions without being witnessed by others. Students seek anonymity so as to avoid being stigmatized by producing such unacceptable expressions.

Mangeya (2014) noted that school based graffiti of students often discuss the issue of sexuality which imperatively suggest a social construct parallel sexuality discourses enabling adolescent to construct and renegotiate the notion of masculinity and sexual identities on their own.

The graffiti-writings of the students in this present study also suggested the same thing that male students obliquely or openly expressed their stand towards sex.

Expression of Self Adoration

This is the second identified theme from the gathered linguistic corpora. Self-glorification, according to Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2012), is a feeling or expressions of one's superiority. In addition to Free Dictionary (2012) defined it as giving or making something appears more glorious or excellent than is actually the case.

Expression of Profanity

This is the third identified theme from the students' graffiti-writings. This theme is manifested with the blasphemous or obscene language or the expression of misfortune, evil and doom to another person or people inscribed on the wall, benches and chairs of the school.

Profanity has become increasingly common in students' everyday language -- no doubt reflecting the frequency with which they hear foul language in the media, as well as in the casual conversations of adults. Students use profanity for a variety of reasons. Some swear to gain the attention of their teacher or classmates. Some swear to impress their peers. Some swear to express strong emotions, such as anger, distress, or frustration. And some swear to attack someone who has hurt them.

This is in consonance to the study conducted Fisher (2014) regarding sex differences in the topics of bathroom graffiti. According to this study, it is notable that graffiti functioned as a dialogue between those writing insulting words. In other words, certain graffiti are merely a matter of exchanging insults (e.g. the one who wrote this, I will curse her and I wish the same bad thing even

more happen to her). This could be due to students' anger when they find their names associated with an abusive expression. In other words, their words, they feel unable but to reply the insulting messages directed to him/her. Some graffiti constitute a request for friendship, whereas some others constitute revenge from an ex-friend.

5 Conclusions

The graffiti-writings of the students convey thoughts and feelings which are forbidden, very sensitive, filthy and bigoted. Most of them talked about sex, hatred, love and resentment. These are terse statements to convey their opinions and ideas in a more understandable and vivid ways as well as to avoid sanctions or punishment if caught by the authorities in school. These graffiti writings are condensed with personal feelings which they cannot express openly and freely towards the concern persons. Some of the graffiti writings are very personal, sexually provocative or sexually insulting and discriminating in nature which also tackles sensitive issues.

In cognizant to my observation out from the gathered corpora of my study, English language teachers should find means to discuss the effects or consequences of the sensitive and bigoted issues such as sex, discrimination, bullying and hatred in the language classroom. Moreover, it is my utmost consideration that teachers not only language teachers, should provide activities which can promote well-being, understanding, solidarity and camaraderie among learners despite their differences. It would also be a guide for language teachers to identify the weaknesses of the students necessary for improving their communicative competence.

Moreover, issues reflected in the graffiti-writings of the students could be an avenue for the school officials and stakeholders to improve their school services especially on issues about conflicts, violence and sex. It must also be emphasized by teachers in their classroom discussions that discrimination, bullying and expression of personal feelings and resentment are all harmful for one's perception of self-image as a learner.

References

- Abdullah, O. (2008). *Sociolinguistic Study of Student Graffiti- Writings in UNRWA Schools, Jordan*. Published MA Thesis. Philadelphia: Philadelphia University
- Abel, E., Buckley, B. (1977). *The Handwriting on the Wall*. Westport: Greenwood Press
- Abu-Jaber, H., Yagi, S. M., & Al-Ghalith, A. (2012). Spelling issues in EFL graffiti: Analysis and implications. *European Scientific Journal*, 8(21), 56-75.
- Adams, K. & Winter, A. (1997). Gang graffiti as a discourse genre. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 1(3), 337-360.
- Agnes, K. Dave, B. & Waihiga, E. (2014). Graffiti: Communication strategies for secondary school students in Kenya. *International Journal of Innovative Research & Development*, 3(1), 184-189.
- Al-Khawaldeh, N. (2014). Politeness in the linguistic expression of gratitude in Jordan and
- Barbosa, E. (2013). Critical Discourse Analysis on Students Graffiti- Writings. University of Southeastern Philippines. Master Thesis
- Bates, J. and Martin, M. (1980). The Thematic Content of Graffiti as a Non- reactive Indicator of Male and Female Attitudes. *The Journal of Sex Research*
- Basthomi, Y. (2007). An initial intimation of a yet banal discourse: Truck graffiti. *k@ta*, 9(1), 34-48.

- Blommaert, J. (2012). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2016). Meeting of styles and the online infrastructures of graffiti. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 7(2), 99-115.
- Blake, C.F. (1981). Graffiti and Racial Insults: The Archaeology of ethnic Relations in Hawaii. *Modern Material Culture: The Archaeology of Us*. Eds. R.A. Gould and M.B. New York Press.
- Blume, R. (1985). Graffiti. In T.A. van Dijk. *Discourse and Literature*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chiluwa, I. (2008). Religious vehicle stickers in Nigeria: A discourse of identity, faith and social vision. *Discourse & Communication*, 2(4), 371-387.
- Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dombrowski, Q. (2011). Walls that talk: Thematic variation in University library graffiti. *Journal of the Chicago Colloquium on Digital Humanities and Computer Science*, 1(3), 1-13.
- Dundes, A., (1966). Here I sit: A study of American Latrinalia. *Kroeber Anthropological Society Paper*, 34, 91-105.
- El-Nashar, M. & Nayef, H. (2016). Discourse on the go: Thematic analysis of vehicle graffiti on the roads of Egypt. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(5), 227-239.
- Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. United Kingdom: Longman
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Critical language Awareness*. New York: Longman
- Fairclough, N. (2001). The Dialectics of discourse. *Textus*, 14 231-242
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Farnia, M. (2014). A thematic analysis of graffiti on the university classroom walls: A case of Iran. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 3(3), 48-57.
- Farnia, M. & Tohidian, I. (2013). A thematic analysis of truck graffiti in Iranian context. Paper presented at the first national conference on research in teaching English, translation and linguistics (RTELT), 2-3 March, Islamic Azad university of Khorasgan, Iran.
- Fowler, R., (1996). *Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gadsby, J. M. (1995). Looking at the writing on the wall: A critical review and taxonomy of graffiti texts (Unpublished master's thesis). Boston, USA.
- Grider, S. A. (1975). Con Safos: Mexican-Americans, names and graffiti. *The Journal of American Folklore*, 88(348), 132-142.
- Haslam, N. (2012). *Psychology in the bathroom*. Palgrave: Macmillan.

- Hofstede, G. (2005) Culture and organizations: Software of the mind 2nd edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Mirzaalikhani, S. (2011). Iranian graffiti during political transformation: A semiotic analysis of graffiti before and after revolution (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU), Cyprus.
- Morva, O. (2016). The humorous language of street dissent: A discourse analysis on the graffiti of the Gezi Park protests. *European Journal of Humour Research*, 4(2) 19–34.
- Mwangi, F. G. (2012). Graffiti Writing and Its Likely Influence on English Language Learning in Selected Secondary Schools in the Larger Laikipia East District, Laikipia County. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Kenyatta University, Kenya.
- Nwoye, O. G. (1993). Social issues on walls: Graffiti in university lavatories. *Discourse & Society*, 4, 419-442.
- Patton, D. (2000). *Philosophy of mind: Classical and contemporary readings*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Peiris, D. & Jayantha, K. (2015). A Case Study on Emotion Types of Graffiti Writers in Jogging Paths, Sri Lanka. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 20(7), 63-67.
- Sheivandi, L., Taghinezhad, A., Alishavandi, A., & Ranjbar, S. (2015). Exploring linguistic aspects in Iranians' graffiti. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 2(5), 62-73.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1998). *Ideology. A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2001). *Critical Discourse Analysis in D. Shiffrin, D. Tannen and H. Hamilton (eds), The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Yieke, F. (2003). Graffiti: vandalism or expression academic freedom and intellectualism at universities in Kenya. Paper presented at the conference on Canonical Works and Continuing Innovation in African Arts and Humanities at the University of Ghana in Legon, Accra, September 17-19.
- Zakareviciute, I. (2014). Reading revolution on the walls: Cairo graffiti as an emerging public sphere. *Hemispheres*, 29(4), 5-22.

AUTHOR BIODATA

Prof. Russel J. Aporbo is presently connected in the Teacher Education Department at University of Mindanao Tagum College, Tagum City, Davao del Norte, Philippines. He is currently pursuing his PhD in Applied Linguistics at University of Mindanao. He received his master's degree in Applied Linguistics at University of Southeastern Philippines in 2016 and BSED-English from UM Tagum College. His current interests include sociolinguistics and language teaching.