

**Verbal and Nonverbal Impoliteness in some Egyptian  
Movies and Series during the Period (from 2005 to 2015)  
An Analytical Pragmatic Study**

---

**Hanaa Abdellah Al Sayed <sup>(\*)</sup>**

---

**Abstract**

The present study aims to show how Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness theory, Andersen's (1999) categorization of nonverbal communication and Bousfield's (2008) strategies of responding to impoliteness are effective tools in investigating verbal and nonverbal impoliteness in Adam series and Hiyya FawDa ( It is Chaos) movie. It also examines the relation between power and impoliteness. In addition, it indicates the association between intention and impoliteness. The results showed that the interlocutors employed four types of impoliteness strategies in the series. Positive and negative impoliteness were ranked the highest in the series. Their occurrence was equivalent because each type occurred (28) times, with a percentage of (41.5%). With regard to the movie, the intractants used bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, and negative impoliteness. Positive impoliteness came in the first position; it occurred (21) times with a percentage of (53.8%). In addition, there was a strong connection between impoliteness and power which stimulated the high-ranked persons to use impoliteness enormously. Moreover, all speakers intended to damage the hearer's face. Furthermore, nonverbal communication played a fundamental role in creating impoliteness in both the series and the movie.

---

(\*) This paper is part of an M.A. thesis entitled : **Verbal and Nonverbal Impoliteness in some Egyptian Movies and Series during the Period (from 2005 to 2015) An Analytical Pragmatic Study**, Supervised by Prof. Bahaa el Deen M. Mazeed – Faculty of Al- Alsun, Sohag University & Dr. Hanan A. Ebaid – Faculty of Arts, Sohag University.

Additionally, all types of responses to impolite utterances were used in the series and the movie.

*Keywords:* Impoliteness, nonverbal impoliteness, power, intention.

### **1. Introduction**

This section provides an introduction to pragmatics and impoliteness. In addition, it addresses the objectives, significance, and questions of the study.

#### **1.1. What is impoliteness?**

Interlocutors have different styles when they communicate with one another. Some individuals wisely choose their words and employ polite language to make the process of communication run smoothly. Others employ impolite language to express their feelings to the recipients.

The employment of polite or impolite language is based on people's purposes in conducting communication. They use polite language to keep or to save the other's face. However, they use impolite language to attack or threaten the other's face. In linguistics, people can study polite and impolite language using pragmatics approaches.

Yule (1996) states that pragmatics is a branch of linguistics which deals with how the meaning is communicated by speakers (or writers) and how it is interpreted by listeners (or readers). It also handles the correlations between the linguistic forms and their users. Moreover, it is concerned with how language is used in real life because the way people use language when communicating is very important.

#### **1.2. Objectives**

The present study aims to reveal how Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness theory, Andersen's (1999) categorization of nonverbal communication and Bousfield's (2008) strategies of responding to impoliteness are effective tools in examining

verbal and nonverbal impoliteness in Adam series and Hiyya FawDa (*It is Chaos*) movie. It also explores the relation between power and impoliteness. In addition, it indicates the association between intention and impoliteness.

### **1.3. Questions**

1. What types of impoliteness strategies do the addressers employ in the series and the movie?
2. How are impoliteness strategies realized in the series and the movie?
3. How do the addressees respond to the speaker's impolite utterances?
4. How do the speaker and the hearer create nonverbal impoliteness?
5. What is the relation between power and impoliteness?
6. What is the relation between intention and impoliteness?

### **1.4. Significance**

The significance of this study stems from the fact that very few researches have been conducted on verbal and nonverbal impoliteness in Egyptian movies and series. It benefits the researchers and the students of linguistics through developing their knowledge of the strategies of verbal and nonverbal impoliteness. Thus, they can use this study as a reference of impoliteness in their future study. It improves the researcher's ability to conduct a qualitative and quantitative research. In addition, it apparently indicates the relation between nonverbal features, especially facial gestures as well as tone, and impoliteness. Consequently, several learners will properly comprehend impoliteness strategies and how they are created. Furthermore, it is a good source of linguistic studies because it addresses verbal and nonverbal impoliteness which has not been extensively investigated. It also provides a platform for further research on impoliteness as it expands the existing literature.

### 2. Review of the Literature

The literature review of this paper comprises three sections. The first section addresses the previous researches that have been conducted on Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness theory. The second section is devoted to the previous pieces of literature that shed light on the association between impoliteness and power. The third part concentrates on the past researches that explore impoliteness in means of entertainment.

#### 2.1. Impoliteness Theory

Culpeper (1996) utilized Brown and Levinson's model as a departure for his seminal article on impoliteness. Terming impoliteness "the parasite of politeness" (p. 355), Culpeper conceives of impoliteness as the use of intentionally face threatening acts. Culpeper lays out five super strategies that speakers deploy to create impolite utterances.

Despite Culpeper's (2005) expanded definition of impoliteness as a function of relational work, the difficulty remains just how to categorize specific utterances as polite versus impolite. Holmes and Schnurr (2005) noted that "we can never be totally confident about the ascription of politeness or impoliteness to particular utterances, even for members of our own communities of practice" (p. 122). Hutchby (2008) attempted to rectify this shortcoming in his study of impoliteness in talk-in-interaction. He employed a conversational analytic approach to define impoliteness and to limit himself to only those occasions where the participants publicly orient to an utterance as polite/impolite. He examined interruptions and explicit reports of rudeness in naturally occurring speech-in-interaction and argued that analysts should shift their attention from defining particular linguistic devices that a participant may or may not utilize, and instead examine the ways in which participants themselves orient to the actions or utterances of others as impolite.

Locher and Watt's (2008) conception of relational work uses the notion of face, not as reformulated by Brown and

Levinson (1987), but as originally put forth by Goffman; it is intended to cover not just politeness/impoliteness, but “the entire continuum from polite and appropriate to impolite and inappropriate behavior” (p. 51). Their point of departure is the notion that impoliteness (and politeness) is dependent on the judgments that the participants make during an ongoing interaction in a particular setting. Moreover, these judgments are based on and constructed through the individual’s history of social practice; i.e. their history of interactions with the interlocutors within their community. Interactants orient to particular norms of behavior that a given social interaction evokes. An impolite utterance has two fundamental characteristics: a breach of the expectations of a given interaction and a negative assessment by the participants according to the norms of a given interaction.

Omar and Wahid (2010) explored the role of impoliteness strategy in interactional communication and its function in Harold Pinter's plays: *the Dumb Waiter*, *the Caretaker*, and *the Homecoming*. The results indicated that bald on record and positive impoliteness strategies were the most frequently used strategies. In addition, Pinter employed impoliteness to reveal the life of a modern man who lived in a constant struggle between himself and others to join the high status and gain respect.

## **2.2. Impoliteness and Power**

Austin (1990) claimed that the main variables involved in the decision to save or not to save face are power and intimacy. Thus, impoliteness may occur between intimates and in situations where there is an imbalance of power. “People cannot always be expected to defend their face if threatened since the consequences of this could be more damaging than the face attack in areas such as job security, employment prospects and physical safety” (p. 279).

Kuntsi (2012) investigated politeness and impoliteness strategies used by lawyers in the "Dover Trial". Results showed that lawyers used both polite and impolite linguistic strategies when they communicated with their colleagues, the judge and witnesses. Furthermore, polite utterances occurred more than impolite utterances because of the formal setting of the courtroom.

Mohammed and Abbas (2016) explored 'impoliteness phenomenon' in *George Bernard Shaw's Pygmalion (1913)*. Furthermore, they highlighted the variation of impoliteness strategies used by the characters. Results showed that the choice of impoliteness strategies differed from one character to another in terms of the social level they belonged to. For example, Higgins, who belonged to a higher social level than Eliza, used bald on record and positive impoliteness strategies rather than other impoliteness strategies to exercise his social power over her and to create a kind of predominant aura around him at her presence.

Mirhosseini, Mardanshahi, and Dowlatabadi (2017) analyzed the discourse between two characters (male and female) in the movie of "Mother" by Ali Hatami. Eight extracts of the movie were chosen to investigate impoliteness strategies employed by the male and the female characters. The results indicated that males used more impoliteness strategies than females in their interactions in the movie. The total number rated (58) and the most frequent strategy was positive impoliteness. Moreover, the significant impacts of intonation and self-insulting were ignored in Culpeper's model. Furthermore, impoliteness was interwoven with the power of the male speaker.

### **2.3. Impoliteness in Means of Entertainment**

In his study of impoliteness in the series: *The Clampers, Car Wars, Soldiers To Be, Redcaps, Raw Blues and Boiling Point*, Bousefield (2008) indicated that the interactant who

uttered impoliteness must have been previously provoked by aggressive utterance (intentional or non-intentional) which damaged his/her negative or positive face.

Laitinen (2011) examined verbal and nonverbal impoliteness in the American hospital drama "House M.D". Results showed that all the impoliteness strategies listed by Culpeper (1996) were used. Positive impoliteness and negative impoliteness, in particular, were the most frequent strategies. However, not all Andersen's (1999) categories of nonverbal communication were employed; proxemics and haptics were not involved in the utterances of both the speaker and the addressee. The interactants frequently deployed the loud tone of voice and facial expressions to create nonverbal impoliteness.

Hamed (2014) investigated the use of politeness and impoliteness strategies by the British and Egyptian participants in sports talk shows. The study conducted a contrastive analysis between spoken Egyptian Arabic and spoken British English. The study followed the pragmatic framework of Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness and that of Culpeper's (1996) model of impoliteness, focusing on the pragmatic functions and linguistic realizations of politeness and impoliteness strategies employed by the participants.

The results revealed significant similarities and differences between the two groups. Both groups tended to use more positive politeness strategies than negative ones. The two groups similarly used a few impoliteness strategies. Moreover, Egyptian participants used more positive politeness strategies than British participants, while British participants used more negative politeness strategies. In addition, differences between the two groups were identified in relation to using certain linguistic techniques as realizations of politeness and impoliteness strategies.

Wicaksono (2015) investigated impoliteness strategies used in action movies: *Die Hard 3* (1995) and *the Expendables* (2010). The impoliteness strategies used by the characters were analyzed using Culpeper's theory (1996). Furthermore, Kasper's theory (1997) and Halliday's theory (1985) were employed to find out the pragmalinguistic form and the social aspect of contextual meaning in the utilized strategies. The results indicated that the social aspect which influenced the speaker's utilization of impolite utterance were daily activities, job routines, and the purpose of utterances. The purpose of the sentence pronounced was the most important factor. Moreover, the interactants deployed three strategies of impoliteness in (49) examples: bald-on record, positive impoliteness, and negative impoliteness. Bald on record impoliteness was used (14) times, positive impoliteness was employed (56) times, and negative impoliteness was utilized (24) times.

### **3. Theoretical Background**

This part addresses two sections. The first section handles rudeness and impoliteness more precisely according to Culpeper (1996) and Kienpointner (1997). It introduces the framework of impoliteness employed in the study (Culpeper, 1996) and responses to impolite utterances (Bousfield, 2008). Furthermore, it handles the relation between impoliteness and intention as well as how far power is related to impoliteness (Bousfield & Locher, 2008; Culpeper, 2011a). The second section is devoted to the relation between impoliteness and nonverbal communication (Andersen, 1999).

#### **3.1. Verbal Impoliteness**

##### **3.1.1. Definition of Impoliteness**

Impoliteness is a behavior that causes offense and involves a conflict between the participants. It is also very



context governed, which means that a certain kind of behavior might not be always impolite (Farid, 2014)).

Lachenicht (1980) views aggravation as a rational attempt to hurt or damage the addressee. ‘Hurt’ is achieved by (a) conveying that the addressee is not liked and does not belong (positive aggravation) and by (b) interfering with the addressee's freedom of action (negative aggravation). He considers four aggravation superstrategies, presented below, to cause face threat:

- i. Off record: Ambiguous insults, insinuations, hints, and irony. This strategy is of much the same kind as the politeness strategy and is designed to enable the insulter to meet an aggrieved challenge from the injured person with an assertion of innocence.
- ii. Bald on record: Directly produced FTAs and impositions (shut that door, do your work, shut up, etc.) of the same kind as in the politeness strategy.
- iii. Positive aggravation: An aggravation strategy that is designed to show the addressee that he/she is not approved of, is not esteemed, does not belong, and will not receive cooperation.
- iv. Negative aggravation: An aggravation strategy that is designed to impose on the addressee, to interfere with his/her freedom of action, and to attack his/her social position and the basis of his/her social action. (p.619)

Culpeper, Bousfield, and Wichmann (2003) claim that conflictive, verbally aggressive, and impolite communication frequently takes place. Eelen (1999) argues that politeness is conceptually biased and that impoliteness is marginal.

Mills (2003) contends that there has been less research done in the area of linguistic impoliteness than in politeness. This might be because conversation, in most studies, is seen as something that follows the harmony and proper principles of communication between the speakers.

### 3. 1.2. Rudeness

Like impoliteness, rudeness results in face loss and offense. Beebe (1995) proposes that rudeness is an FTA which violates a socially sanctioned norm of interaction for the social context in which it occurs. It is only rudeness if it receives insufficient redressive action that mitigates its force or if it does not occur in a context, such as intimacy or emergency, which would negate the need for redressive action. Consequently, it causes antagonism, discomfort or conflict and results in some disruption of social harmony.

### 3.1.3. Culpeper's (1996) Model of Impoliteness

Culpeper's (1996) model of impoliteness involves the following strategies:

1. *Bald on record impoliteness*: The FTA is performed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way in circumstances where face is not irrelevant or minimised. It is important to distinguish this strategy from Brown and Levinson's Bald on record. For Brown and Levinson (1987), Bald on record is a *politeness* strategy in fairly specific circumstances. For example, when face concerns are suspended in an emergency, when the threat to the hearer's face is very small (e.g. "come in" or "do sit down"), or when the speaker is much more powerful than the hearer (e.g. "stop complaining" said by a parent to a child). In all these cases, little face is at stake, and, more importantly, it is not the intention of the speaker to attack the face of the hearer.

2. *Positive impoliteness*: The use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants, such as:

- Ignore, snub the other: Fail to admit the other's presence
- Exclude the other from an activity
- Disassociate from the other: Deny association or common grounds with the other; avoid sitting together.
- Be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic

- Use inappropriate identity markers: Use title and surname with acquaintances, or nickname with strangers.
- Use obscure or secretive language: Confuse the other with a jargon, or use a code known to some participants.
- Seek disagreement: Select a sensitive topic.
- Make the other feel uncomfortable: Do not avoid silence, joke, or use small talk.
- Use taboo words: Swear, or use offensive or abusive language.
- Call the other names: Use derogatory names (Culpeper, 1996, p. 357)

3. *Negative impoliteness*: The use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's negative face wants, such as:

- Frighten: Instill a belief that harm will occur.
- Condescend, scorn or ridicule: Emphasize your relative power. Be contemptuous. Do not treat the other seriously. Belittle the other (e.g. use diminutives).
- Invade the other's space: Literally (position yourself closer to the other than the relationship pertains) or metaphorically (ask about privacy).
- Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect: Personalize, use the pronouns "I and you".
- Put the other's indebtedness on record: Speak directly how the other is indebted to you (Culpeper, 1996, p. 358)

4. *Sarcasm or mock politeness*: Sarcasm is a face-threatening act which is performed through the employment of politeness strategy insincerely. Someone can use sarcasm to express his/her opposite feeling, i.e. the unreal meaning of what he/she says. It can be concluded that the realization of sarcasm or mock politeness is employing insincere politeness (Culpeper, 1996).

5. *Withhold politeness*: Culpeper (1996) claims that it occurs when someone remains silent or fails to thank another person. The realizations of withhold politeness are being silent and failing to thank.

### 3.1.4. Impoliteness and Intention

Austin (1990) argues that impoliteness is characterized by acts that he identifies as ‘face attack acts’, i.e. “communicative acts which are injurious to the hearer’s positive or negative face, and are introduced in a situation which could have been avoided, but where their inclusion is perceived by the hearer to be intentional” (p. 279). Face attack acts differ from face-threatening acts in the perception of intentionality. While face attacks necessarily involve the intention to cause harm, this is not the case of FTAs. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), FTAs are “those acts that by their nature run contrary to the face wants of the addressee and/or the speaker” (p. 65), but nothing is said about the intention of the speaker.

Hence, it is clear that the intention to hurt the addressee is a necessary component of impoliteness. As Culpeper et al. (2003) point out, “it should be noted that a key difference between politeness and impoliteness is intention; whether it is the speaker’s intention to support face (politeness) or to attack it (impoliteness)” (pp. 1549-1550). Certainly, identifying the speaker’s intention is problematic.

### 3.1.5. Impoliteness and Power

Culpeper (1996) claims that impoliteness is associated with power. It may occur when the speaker is more powerful than the addressee. If the speaker is in a higher position, he/she can use impoliteness more freely because he/she might have the means to reduce the ability of the less powerful participant to retaliate with impoliteness. Therefore, one could argue that

impoliteness is likely to occur in situations where the speaker has more power.

Bousfield (2008) argues that when a person is truly impolite, he/ she is either “creating/activating/re-activating some aspect of [his/her] relative power” or “challenging someone over their power” or even both (p. 150). However, when a person uses power, it does not mean that he/she is always being impolite in doing so.

### **3.2. Responses to Impolite Utterances**

#### **3.2.1. Discourse Beginnings**

Impoliteness does not exist in a vacuum. The contexts, in which impoliteness appears and is utilized strategically, must have been previously invoked. That is, the interactant who utters impoliteness must have felt formerly provoked. Culpeper et al. (2003) state that the episodes in which impolite confrontation occur center around some sort of initial dispute; i.e. they consist of general disagreements in interaction which are displayed by the occurrence of some sort of opposition to an antecedent event.

#### **3.2.2. Discourse Middles**

Thomas (1986, p. ii) states that "naturally occurring interaction far from being cooperative in the everyday (i.e. social-goal sharing) sense of the word is confrontational or gladiatorial". Impoliteness is one way of being confrontational or gladiatorial, but it is only one side of the battle: it takes two to have a fight. Bousfield (2008) claims that the addressee of the impoliteness strategies can accept the face attack, counter it, or give no response. The further response to counter the face attack can be offensive or defensive.

### 3.2.3. Discourse Ends

Researchers of impoliteness have given little concern to how the discourse is resolved. Grimshaw (1990) provides five options for the conclusion of conflictive arguments: i. submission to opponent, ii. dominant third party intervention, iii. compromise, iv. stand-off, and v. withdrawal.

### 3.3. Nonverbal Impoliteness

#### 3. 3.1. Differentiating Verbal and Nonverbal Communication

According to Andersen (1999), nonverbal communication is analogic, nonlinguistic and governed by the right brain hemisphere. By *analogic*, he refers to the messages that have a "direct, nonarbitrary, intrinsic relationship to the thing they represent" (p. 3); messages look or sound exactly like what they represent. For example, a hug instantly conveys a meaning, depending on the context. If two friends meet, a hug has a function of a greeting. If, however, a friend is sad, a hug has a comforting function.

#### III. 3.2. Categorizing Nonverbal Communication

Andersen's (1999) classification of nonverbal communication is as follows:

1. Physical appearance: gender, clothing style, race, age, ethnicity, stature, body type, and mood
2. Kinesics: Body movements, including
  - a. Facial expressions
  - b. Gestures
  - c. Interactional synchrony (how two individuals move together as they communicate).
3. Oculistics: Face and eyes, divided into
  - a. Eye contact (when both look into each other's eyes)
  - b. Pupil dilation
  - c. Eye movement
4. Proxemics: Interpersonal space and distance, divided into

- a. Territoriality
  - b. Crowding and density (how many people exist in a certain space)
  - c. Personal space
5. Haptics: Touching, including
- a. Types of touch (professional, social, friendly, loving...etc.)
  - b. Touch avoidance
  - c. Touch and relationships
  - d. Touch taboos (what kind of touch to avoid)
6. Vocalics: Pitch, rhythm, tempo, resonance, control, and accent

### **3.3.3. Facial Expressions**

Facial expressions play a substantial role in creating impolite utterances. Face itself has a number of functions in interpersonal communication. It mirrors our attitudes, gives nonverbal feedback to the ones we listen to, and most importantly tells the others how we feel (Knapp & Hall, 2002). Facial expressions are either spontaneous or intentional and they usually have an impact on others. Emotions are sometimes difficult to interpret, but it is easy to recognize six basic emotions: happiness, anger, disgust, sadness, surprise and fear. They are widely recognized not only in the United States but also globally.

## **4. Methodology**

### **4.1. Type of Research**

This research is a qualitative analytical one because it analyzes the types, realizations and responses to impoliteness in *Hiyya FawDa (It is Chaos)* movie and *Adam* series. It also adopts the quantitative approach to show the number as well as the percentage of the types, realizations, and responses.

### 4.2. Data Collection

The data to be analyzed are collected through note-taking of some characters' utterances in both the movie and the series.

The techniques of collecting data are as follows:

1. The researcher watches the movie and the series.
3. She takes notes of the character's utterances which are in accordance with the objectives of the study.
4. She carefully watches the interactants' nonverbal gestures to define the features suggesting impolite acts.

### 4.3. Models/Tools

Following the models surveyed in the chapter "Theoretical Background", the study starts with the model of Culpeper (1996) to investigate strategies of verbal impoliteness. Furthermore, Andersen's (1999) categorization of nonverbal communication is employed to examine the relation between impoliteness and nonverbal gestures. Moreover, Bousfield's (2008) model of responding to impoliteness is deployed to explore the recipient's reaction to the speaker's impoliteness.

## 5. Analysis

This part comprises two sections. The first addresses verbal and nonverbal impoliteness in "*Adam*" series as well as the recipients' responses to impoliteness realizations. The second handles verbal and nonverbal impoliteness in *Hiyya FawDa (It is Chaos)* movie as well as the addressee's responses to impoliteness realizations. All instances of verbal impoliteness are marked in bold font and loud or emphasized tone is marked in square brackets.



### Example 1: Extract from Episode Ten



Figure 1: Surprise and angry facial expression

Seif: *sihaam, sihaam, ?iShi.*

Seham: *?eeh, fii haddi ySahhi haddi kida.*

Seif: *?eeh da?*

Seham: *fu?bi sgaara*

Seif: [**miin dakhil ?ooDit noomi wi-sharab issigaara?**]

#### Translation

Seif: **Seham, Seham! Get up.**

Seham: **Oh! How do you wake me up this way?**

Seif: What is this?

Seham: Cigarette remnant

Seif: [**Who entered my bedroom and smoked a cigarette?**]

#### Analysis

As a lieutenant colonel in the State Security Department, Seif extensively uses verbal impoliteness, particularly bald on record impoliteness as well as positive impoliteness. According to Culpeper (1996), bald on record impoliteness is especially common among people who have a close relationship. When Seif says */sihaam, sihaam, ?iShi/* 'Seham, Seham! Get up', he uses a sub-strategy of positive impoliteness; make the other feel uncomfortable because he violently and aggressively wakes her up as a result of his suspicion and lack of confidence. Furthermore, when asking her */miin dakhil ?ooDit noomi wi-sharab issigaara?/* 'Who entered my bedroom and smoked a cigarette?', he damages her positive face wants. To be more precise, he bothers and terrifies her due to his doubts.

## Verbal and Nonverbal Impoliteness in some Egyptian Movies

---

His question indicates that he adopts a sub-strategy of negative impoliteness; he frightens the other person, because he intends to panic her to detect the truth.

The addressee doesn't keep silent and responds */ʔeeh, fii ḥaddi ySaḥḥi ḥaddi kida/* 'Oh! How do you wake me up this way?' to demonstrate that she hears and understands him well. According to Bousefield (2008), being silent might mean that the hearer didn't hear what the speaker said, didn't comprehend the content of the FTA, or he/she has been caught by surprise and doesn't come up with anything to reply. She defends her own face through using the exclamation "ʔeeh" (Oh!) to express her surprise and disappointment. She defensively counters his attack to stop his insult and accusation.

According to Andersen's categorization of nonverbal impoliteness, Seif's aggressive and annoyed mood represents the first category, physical appearance. His facial gesture, represented by surprise, belongs to the group of kinesics. He feels surprised because he discovered that she smokes. Thus, his brows are raised, the skin below the brow is stretched, horizontal wrinkles go across the forehead, the eyelids are open, and the white of the eye shows above the iris, as well. The loud tone of his voice when he says, */miin dakhal ʔooDit noomi wi-sharab issigaara?/* 'Who entered my bedroom and smoked a cigarette?' belongs to the group of vocalics. Ultimately, Seif's nonverbal impoliteness reinforces his verbal impoliteness.

### Example 2: Extract from Episode Twelve



Figure 2: Seif's anger and threat

Seif: .....(Seif is eating)... ?izzyak ya marzuu?, taakul hamam?

Marzouk: shukran.

Seif: **?innta khaatib ilbitt ukht ?aadam sabdilhayy?**

Marzouk: ?aywa

Seif: hilwa?

Marzouk:( silent)

Seif:bithibaha?

Marzouk: ?illi tshuufu sa?attak

Seif: Talama ?illi ?shuufu ?ana ?aakhid ?ala katri minnak. **?ilwaad ?aadam** ?amal ?amla minayyila bisitiin niila. ?intta ibn maSr, raagil men riggalitha.

Marzouk: ?ana ?awiz ?a?uul haagah, ?aadam ...

Seif: **?aadam ?irhaabi wi-bn sittiin kalb, ?eeh ya marzuu? ?aawiz ti?uul haaga?"**

Marzouk: [**?aadam ?irhaabi wi-bn sittiin kalb**]

Seif: **?aadam hanguibuh hanguibuh bas lamma yagibuh ?iniiZam mish hayrhamak li-?innu hayfiraf ?innk mutasattir ?la ?irhaabi. gibitli ?aadam hatkun fi maktabi. ma gibtliish ?aadam bardiuh hatkiun ma?i, bas mush fi maktabi. hatkiun fe al ?iiDa ilii guwwa wi rabbina yikfiik sharraha. mush bahub ahra? al mufag?aat. hasiibak ti?rafha wahda wahda.**

#### **Translation**

Seif: .....(Seif is eating) How are you, Marzouk? Would you like to eat pigeons?

Marzouk: Thanks

Seif: **Are you engaged to the girl who is Adam Abd Alhay's sister?**

Marzouk: Yes

Seif: Pretty?

Marzouk: (silent)

Seif: Do you love her?

Marzouk: As you like, your Majesty.

## Verbal and Nonverbal Impoliteness in some Egyptian Movies

---

---

Seif: As it is based on what I like, I am cross with you. **The little boy Adam** conducted a terrible act. You are the son of Egypt and one of its men.

Marzouk: I would like to say something, Adam...

Seif: [Adam is a **terrorist and son of a bitch**]. Hey! Marzouk, **would you like to say anything?**

Marzouk: **Adam is a terrorist and son of a bitch.**

Seif: **Definitely, we will arrest Adam. However, we won't bestow you our mercy if you don't report his place. Otherwise, you will be accused of hiding a terrorist.** If you report his place, you will work in my office. **In case you don't do this, you will also be with me. However, you will not be in my office because you will be in the hidden room. May Allah protect you from it. I don't want to disturb the surprise because I want you to know it gradually.**

The conversation between Seif and Marzouk indicates that the powerful participant is fully entitled to be impolite because he/she can reduce the ability of the less powerful participant to retaliate with impoliteness (e.g. through the denial of speaking rights). Seif employs a wide range of impoliteness strategies. For instance, he employs positive impoliteness strategies. At the beginning of the conversation, Seif is eating and completely ignores the presence of Marzouk in his office so as to damage his positive face wants. He also seeks disagreement with Marzouk when asking him about his fiancée and her appearance. He asks him" /?innta khaatib ilbitt ukht ?aadam ʃabdilhayy/? (Are you engaged to the girl who is Adam Abd Alhay's sister?). According to the Egyptian customs and traditions, several men avoid speaking about their fiancées as well as wives because it creates more embarrassment and annoyance. Seif knows this, but he insists on tackling this aspect in order to force Marzouk to assist him and report Adam's place.

In addition, he utilizes taboo words, such as /?aadam ?irhaabi wi-bn sittiin kalb/ (Adam is a terrorist and son of

bitch). Some people, especially officers, believe that their high position entitles them to talk to others impolitely. Seif talks to Marzouk impolitely because he is aware that the lieutenant colonel is superior to a sergeant. Therefore, Marzouk can't retaliate against his insult. In the police context, one might think that these words are mildly taboo. However, it should be noted that the situation is relatively formal (Marzouk is in the lieutenant colonel's office), and that the use of taboo words to swear and insult Adam is unilateral. Seif makes Marzouk uncomfortable when he keeps talking and using abusive or profane language.

Furthermore, Seif frequently adopts negative impoliteness strategies. For instance, he tends to frighten and threaten Marzouk / *?eeh ya marzoo? Saawiz ti?uul haaga?*" (Hey! Marzouk, would you like to say anything?), Marzouk, definitely, can't contradict Seif's opinion on Adam because he knows the consequences of his different opinion. Indeed, he will be detained and get tortured. Seif also terrifies him again to motivate him to help arrest Adam / *?aadam hangiibuh hangiibuh bas lamma yagibuh ?iniiZam mish hayrhamak li-?innu hayfiraf ?innk mutasattir fla ?irhaabi/* (Definitely, we will arrest Adam. However, we won't bestow you our mercy if you don't report his place. Otherwise, you will be accused of hiding a terrorist). Certainly, Marzouk has the willingness to help Seif, avoiding his evil and harm. He also attempts to horrify Marzouk, indicating the punishment he will get in case of concealing a terrorist / *ma gibtliish ?aadam bardiuh hatkiun mafi, bas mush fi maktabi. hatkiun fe al ?iiDa ilii guwwa wi rabbina yikfiik sharraha. mush baḥub aḥra? al mufag?aat. hasiibak tiḥrafha waḥda waḥda/* (In case you don't do this, you will also be with me. However, you will not be in my office because you will be in the hidden room. May Allah protect you from it. I don't want to disturb the surprise because I want you to know it gradually).

## Verbal and Nonverbal Impoliteness in some Egyptian Movies

---

Moreover, Seif belittles Adam using the diminutives /ʔilwaad ʔaadam/ (the little boy Adam). Adam is not a little boy, but he is a young man. Seif tends to condescend and scorn Adam because of the significant power differential. Additionally, he invades the other's space when he asks about Marzouk's fiancée /ħilwa/ʔ" (pretty?). Talking about Marzouk's promising future as long as he supports him / *gibitli ʔaadam hatkun fi maktabi* / (If you report his place, you will work in my office.), Seif puts the other's indebtedness on record.

Marzouk, as a sergeant, does not have the power to counter face attack with another face attack, so he accepts Seif's offense and agrees with him when he says /ʔaadam ʔirhaabi wi-bn sittiin kalb / (Adam is a terrorist and son of a bitch). He also gets shocked and surprised when Seif asks about his fiancée's beauty, so he does not respond and keeps silent.

In terms of nonverbal impoliteness, Seif seems irritated and his facial gestures show that he is highly annoyed with Marzouk. Raising of eyebrows, wide opened eyes and tight lips suggest a negative emotion which can be interpreted as annoyance due to the context. In this case, nonverbal impoliteness is created through facial expression that belongs to the group of kinesics. In order to strengthen the effect of his threat, he uses his index. Accordingly, he indicates his nonverbal impoliteness through the group of kinesics.

Moreover, the influence of verbal impoliteness is reinforced by Seif's ignoring Marzouk in order to belittle as well as humiliate him. Ignoring him is also classified as nonverbal impoliteness. His physical closeness to Marzouk represents the group of proxemics which illustrates that nonverbal impoliteness is created when the speaker comes physically too close to a stranger. It is also created through touching which is related to the group of haptics. For instance, Seif deliberately touches Marzouk and puts his hand on his mouth as an indication of his power as well as subordination.

His loud tone when uttering the sentence" Adam erhaby wa-bn seteen kalb" (Adam is a terrorist and son of bitch) belongs to the group of vocalics.

## 5.2. Hiyya FawDa (It's Chaos) Movie

### Example 1



Figure 8: Annoyed and angry face

*Hatem: qolt hiyya istebaha fol. yallah yad yalla ya wilaad ishshawaariŕ. waqafuuhom Safeen. kol wahed yoŕoT bitaqtoh ŕla alarD we alsafa wi kol il maŕah. ewŕu tkunu fakriin ilbalad sayyba [ilbalad fiha ŕkoma we ŕkoma men hadeed we elŕekoma de ana. mesh baqolokom fakrenha sayyba.]*

*Detainee: ana men ŕaqi atklem fi ilmaŕmuul bitafi.*

*Hatem: we ana men ŕaqi aDrabak.*

*Office boy: walahi ya pasha dool wilaad kalb ma yestahlosh teŕakar damak besababhom, eshai.*

*Hatem: jebtaha fe waqtaha, ŕuTTaha ŕala Dahr ilwaad dah, waTTi yalah.*

*Office boy: ya pasha ilmisameŕ kariim.*

*Hatem: Tab hatha waTTi yalah. abuuk beyashtaghal eh yalah.*

*Detainee: aboi mat men sanah Allah yarŕamoh.*

*Hatem: yaŕni yatiim omal ŕamel balTagi we betaŕ seysa leh mesh teboŕ lemostaqbalak aŕssan badal elmarmata fe almoZaharat.*

*Detainee: iŕna lazem nokhrog men hina weŕhalena lazem yaŕrafo innana maŕbusiin.*

*Hatem: yad ahalikom homma ely jabukom hina ŕlashan maŕirfuush yirabbuukum. tŕala, hatohom kolohom, shakli*

*kidd badal mawadikom elniyabah hawadikom al eSetqbal  
flashan tšrafo in Allah haq. shayiif duul lessah rajšiin men  
haflet il isetqbal šawez tebqa zayehem.*

### Translation

Hatem: I supposed it would be a dull morning. Boys, **homeless boys**, hurry up. Stand in two rows. Everyone has to put down everything he has, including his watch and identification card. **[Do not think that the country has no regime. It has a powerful government that I represent.]**

Detainee: I have the right to use my cell phone.

Hatem: And **I** have the right to beat you.

Office boy: I swear by Allah that **they are sons of a bitch**, so you should not get annoyed. Here is your tea.

Hatem: You have brought it on time. **Put it on the little boy's back. Little boy! lean.**

Office boy: Pasha, all is forgiven.

Hatem: Get it. **Little boy! Lean.** What is your father's job?

Detainee: My father died a year ago. God rest his soul.

Hatem: **You are an orphan**, aren't you? Why do **you** act as a **mugger and a demonstrator**? Why don't you care about your future instead of participating in useless demonstrations?

Detainee: **You must release us and let our families know that we are detained.**

Hatem: **Little boy, your families brought you here because they could not raise you well.** Come on! Get them all, I think you will be sent to a torture room instead of prosecution to believe that I can do anything. **These detainees have just been tortured. Would you like to face the same destiny?**

As a sergeant at the police station, Hatem offends the detainees and uses verbal impoliteness extensively, particularly bald on record impoliteness. Because of power differential, he clearly and directly attacks the recipient's face. For example, he says /wilaad ishshawaariš/ (homeless boys), /waTTi yalah/ (Little boy! Lean), and /maširfuush yirabbuukum" (they could not raise you). Although bald on record impoliteness is so



common among close individuals, Hatem employs it with the detainees because he thinks that his power entitles him to act in such an offensive manner.

He also attacks their positive face wants, employing positive impoliteness strategies. For example, he makes the hearers feel uncomfortable when talking with no pauses in order not to give the other participant the opportunity to retaliate or protest. In addition, he employs taboo words, such as "wilaad ishshawaariif" (homeless boys) and calls the other names when he accuses the detainee of mugging and participating in demonstrations "balTaji we betaif seysa" (a mugger and a demonstrator). In addition, he is disinterested, unconcerned and unsympathetic with the detainee who wants to inform his family about his place, */yad ahalekom homma ely jabukom hena flashan mafirfuush yirabbuukum/* (Little boy, your families brought you here because they could not raise you well).

Moreover, Hatem hinders and imposes on the hearer using negative impoliteness strategies. He frequently belittles the detainee when uttering the word "yaad" (little boy). He is fully aware that Egyptian young men never like this word because it indicates the speaker's underestimation. He also terrifies all the detainees when he beats them, saying */ewfu tkunu fakriin ilbalad sayyba [ilbalad fiha hkoma we hkoma men hadeed we elhekoma de ana. mesh baqolokom fakrenha sayyba/* (Do not think that the country has no regime. It has a powerful government that I represent) and */shayeeif duul lessah rajsiin men haflet il isetqbal sawez tebqa zayehem /* (These detainees have just been tortured. Would you like to face the same destiny?). In fact, he would like to horrify them so as not to demonstrate or revolt again. He also invades the other's space when he positions himself closer to the detainee than the relationship permits. In addition, he explicitly associates the other with a negative aspect using the pronouns

## Verbal and Nonverbal Impoliteness in some Egyptian Movies

---

/ʔana/ and /ʔinta/ (I and you). Moreover, he condescends, scorns, and ridicules the hearer when he emphasizes his relative power, "yaʕni yatiim" (you are orphan, aren't you?), he scorns the detainee and makes him feel bad because he doesn't sympathize with him, but he makes fun of him when he says that his father is dead. He also violates the social norms when asking the office boy to put the glass of tea on the detainee's back, /ħuTTaha ʕala Dahr ilwaad dah/ (Put it on the little boy's back). He relentlessly deals with him although the detainee is a human that must be respected and appreciated. The office boy also employs strategies of positive impoliteness. For instance, he uses taboo words, such as /wilaad kalb/ (sons of a bitch).

Concerning the hearer's responses to the speaker's impoliteness, he meets the impolite offense of the speaker with an impolite defense as a counter to provide offensive-defensive pairing, for example, /iħna lazem nokhrog men hina weʔhalena lazem yaʕrafo innana maħbusiin/ (You must release us and let our families know that we are detained). His response indicates that he understands the content of the speaker's utterance properly, so he dismisses the attack asserting his rights as a human.

According to Andersen's (1999) categorization of nonverbal impoliteness, Hatem's aggressive and annoyed mood represents the first category, physical appearance. The louder tone of his voice when he says, /ewʕu tkunu fakriin ilbalad sayyba ilbalad fiha ħkoma we ħkoma men ħadeed we elħekoma de ana. mesh baqolokom fakrenha sayyba/ (Do not think that the country has no regime. It has a powerful government that I represent.) belongs to the group of vocalics. Definitely, his nonverbal impoliteness reinforces his verbal impoliteness.

Moreover, Hatem's physical closeness to the detainees and beating them represent the group of proxemics which illustrates that nonverbal impoliteness is created when the speaker comes physically too close to a stranger. It is also created through touching which is related to the group of

haptics. For instance, Hatem deliberately touches the detainee and asks him to lean as an indication of his power as well as subordination. Furthermore, his facial gestures, represented in anger emotions, which belong to the group of kinesics, enhance his verbal impoliteness. To show his anger, the brows are lowered and drawn together, vertical lines appear between the brows, the lower lid is tensed, the upper lid is tensed and may be lowered. His nonverbal impoliteness reaches its peak when he slaps the detainee who wants to use his cell phone. Moreover, he uses his hand as a gesture representing the group of kinesics to reinforce the effect of his threat as well as oppression.

## **6. Results and Conclusion**

This part involves two sections. The first addresses the findings and discussion of the types and realizations of verbal and nonverbal impoliteness in "Adam" series. It also handles the recipients' responses to impolite utterances. The second is devoted to the findings and discussion of the types and realizations of verbal and nonverbal impoliteness in Hiyya FawDa (It is Chaos) movie. Moreover, it sheds light on the recipients' responses to impolite utterances in the movie.

## Verbal and Nonverbal Impoliteness in some Egyptian Movies

### 6.1. Adam Series

**Table (1): Frequency of Types and Realizations of Impoliteness Strategies in Adam Series**

Type	Realization	Total	Percentage	
1. Bald on Record Impoliteness	Using Direct, Clear, and Unambiguous Statement	10	14.9 %	
2. Positive Impoliteness	Ignoring, snubbing the other	1	28	41.5 %
	Excluding the other from an activity	0		
	Being disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic	0		
	Using inappropriate identity markers	2		
	Using obscure or secretive language	0		
	Seeking disagreement	2		
	Making the other feel uncomfortable	6		
	Using taboo words	17		
	Calling the other names	0		
3. Negative Impoliteness	Frightening	^	28	41.5 %
	Condescending, scorning or ridiculing.	∇		
	Invading the other's space	∩		
	Explicitly associating the other with a negative aspect	◦		
	Putting the other's indebtedness on record	∪		
4. Sarcasm or Mock Politeness	Employing Insincere Politeness	∖	1.4 %	
5. Withhold Politeness	Being Silent	0	0 %	
	Failing to Thank	•		
Total/Percentage	67		100 %	

The present study revealed that only four types of impoliteness strategies occurred in the speakers' utterances. They were bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness,

negative impoliteness, and sarcasm or mock politeness. However, withhold politeness was not used. Positive and negative impoliteness were ranked the highest in the series. The reason for the high frequency of these strategies could be the fact that positive impoliteness and negative impoliteness are the only two strategies with a long list of sub-strategies. Their occurrence was equivalent because each type occurred (28) times, with a percentage of (41.5%). Bald on record impoliteness, which appeared ten times with a percentage of (14.9%), was ranked second. However, sarcasm or mock politeness, which occurred only once with a percentage of (1.4%), was ranked the lowest.

Nonverbal communication played a fundamental role in creating impoliteness in the series. It either created nonverbal impoliteness or strengthened the effect of verbal impoliteness. Avoiding eye-contact or shouting, for example, could be a means of conveying impoliteness (Culpeper, 1996). All of Andersen's (1999) categories of nonverbal communication were present. Loud tone as well as annoyed and aggressive mood representing the group of physical appearance, and facial expressions revealing the category of kinesics were the most dominant aspects the interlocutors employed to create nonverbal impoliteness. However, they rarely used the groups of haptics, proxemics and oculiscs. Interactants also deployed index and open palm, as features of kinesics, to enhance their threat and domination.

All types of responses to impolite utterances were used in the series, but each type had a different frequency of occurrence. Some hearers remained silent; others accepted the face attack or countered it offensively or defensively. The most dominant type was offensive countering which appeared (13) times with a percentage of (54.1%) because the recipients, including Seham, Manal, Adam, Tolba and Amir, met the face

## Verbal and Nonverbal Impoliteness in some Egyptian Movies

attack with another face attack to stop the speaker's impoliteness and to provide an offensive-offensive pairing.

There is a strong connection between impoliteness and power which permits the high-ranked people to use impoliteness freely. The present study indicated that the more powerful speakers tended to be impolite and rude with the less powerful addressees who could not retaliate against their impoliteness and offense.

### 6.2. Hiyya FawDa (It is Chaos)

**Table (2): Frequency of Types and Realizations of Impoliteness Strategies in Hiyya FawDa ( It is Chaos) Movie.**

Type	Realization	Total	Percentage	
1. Bald on Record Impoliteness	Using direct, clear, and unambiguous statement	6	15.4%	
2. Positive Impoliteness	Ignoring, snubbing the other	0	21	0%
	Excluding the other from an activity	0		0%
	Being disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic	1		2.5%
	Using inappropriate identity markers	0		0%
	Using obscure or secretive language	1		2.5%
	Seeking disagreement	0		0%
	Making the other feel uncomfortable	3		7.6%
	Using taboo words	9		23%
	Calling the other names	7		18%
3. Negative Impoliteness	Frightening	2	12	5%
	Condescending, scorning or ridiculing.	4		10%
	Invading the other's space	3		7.6%
	Explicitly associating the other with a negative aspect	3		7.6%
	Putting the other's indebtedness on record	0		0%
4. Sarcasm or Mock Politeness	Employing insincere politeness	0	0%	
5. Withhold Politeness	Being silent	0	0%	
	Failing to thank	0		
Total/Percentage	39		100%	

The participants did not use the five types of impoliteness strategies. They focused on the strategies that

resulted in more face damage and offense, namely bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, and negative impoliteness. However, they did not employ withhold politeness and sarcasm or mock politeness.

Positive impoliteness came in the first position. The speakers tended to damage the addressee's positive face wants which means the person's want or need to be a part of a certain action or to be appreciated. It occurred (21) times with a percentage of (53.8%). The interlocutors deployed negative impoliteness (12) times with a percentage of (30.7%) and it was ranked second.

No recipient remained silent because he/she properly heard and comprehended the speaker's impolite utterances. Accordingly, all hearers preferred to use offensive-offensive pairing or offensive-defensive pairing. In addition, in all cases of face-damage, the hearer somehow perceived that his/her face had been attacked.

Nonverbal communication played a fundamental role in creating impoliteness in the movie. Some participants adopted nonverbal communication, represented by loud tone, facial gestures, and mood, as an indication of an FTA. Others used it to enhance the influence of verbal impoliteness. They adopted the five categories of nonverbal impoliteness, but they did not use them equivalently. Substantially, they deployed the category of vocalics represented by loud tone, the category of physical appearance indicated by annoyed and aggressive mood, as well as the group of kinesics represented by facial expressions. However, they rarely used the categories of proxemics and haptics.

Intentionality indicates whether the event was caused or occurred by accident. This ultimately influences the perception of a wrongful act. The more intentional the act appears to the speaker, the greater the justification for an angry response is. In fact, the speakers as well as the recipients performed impolite

utterances deliberately because they succeeded in creating offense and face loss. They also counted on their nonverbal features to assure the fact that their impoliteness, either verbal or nonverbal, was not spontaneous. Hatem, for instance, excessively adopted impolite utterances with the detainees and his neighbors. He did not use them by accident, but he deliberately prepared them to attack and offend the addressees. Moreover, his annoyed and aggressive mood, before talking to the detainees, assured the connection between impoliteness and intention.

### References

- Abozeid, A. M., & Samy, M. (2011). *Adam* ( Series). Egypt: MBA.
- Andersen, P. A. (1999). *Nonverbal communication: Forms and functions*. London, Toronto: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Austin, J. (1990). Politeness revisited-The dark side. In A. Bell , & J. Holmes (eds.), *New Zealand ways of speaking English* (pp. 277-293). Clevedon and Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Beebe, L. M. (1995). Polite fictions: Instrumental rudeness as pragmatic competence. In J. E. Alatis, C. A. Straehle, B. G., & M. Ronkin (Eds.), *Linguistics and the Education of Language Teachers: Ethnolinguistic, Psycholinguistics and Sociolinguistic Aspects. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics* (pp. 154-68). Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
- Bousfield, D. & Locher, M. ( Eds.) (2008). *Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with power and practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatic*, 25, pp.349-367.
- Culpeper, J., Bousfield, D., & Wichmann, A. (2003). Impoliteness revisited: With special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, pp.1545–1579.
- Eelen, G. (1999). Politeness and ideology: A critical review. *Pragmatics*, 9 (1), pp.163-173.
- Grimshaw, A. D. (1990). *Conflict talk: Sociolinguistic investigations of arguments in conversations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hamed, A. M. E. (2014) *A contrastive study of politeness and impoliteness strategies in British and Arab sports media discourse* (Master's thesis). Faculty of Arts, Fayoum University.
- Hartono, M. (2014). *Impoliteness used in command in characters in One Piece comic strip* (BA. project). Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta, Indonesia.
- Knapp, M. L., & Hall, J. A. ( 2002). *Nonverbal communication in human interaction* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). South Melbourne: Thomson Learning.
- Kuntsi, P. (2012). *Politeness and impoliteness strategies used by lawyers in the 'Dover Trial': A case study* (Master thesis). Philosophical Faculty, University of Eastern Finland.
- Lachenicht, L. G. ( 1980). Aggravating language: A study of abusive and insulting language. *International Journal of Human Communication*, 13, pp.607–688.
- Laitinen, M. (2011). *Breaking the rules of communication: Verbal and nonverbal impoliteness in the American hospital drama House M.D.* (Master's thesis.) University of Jyväskylä, Finland.
- Lakoff, R. (1989). The limits of politeness. *Multilingua*, 8, pp.101–129.

## Verbal and Nonverbal Impoliteness in some Egyptian Movies

---

---

- Locher, M. & Watts, R. (2008). Relational work and impoliteness: Negotiating norms of linguistic behavior. In D. Bousfield & M.A. Locher (Eds.), *Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice* (pp.77-101). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mirhosseini, M., Mardanshahi, M., & Dowlatabadi, H. (2017). Impoliteness strategies based on Culpeper's model: An analysis of gender differences between two characters in the movie "Mother". *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 4 (3), pp.221-238.
- Mohammad, H. N., & Abbas, N. F. (2016). Impoliteness in literary discourse: A pragmatic study. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 5 (2), pp. 76-82.
- Omar, Z., & Wahid, S. (2010). Pragmatic analysis of impoliteness in some of Harold Pinter's plays. *Iraq Academic Scientific Journal*, 8, (pp. 189-210).
- Penman, R. (1990). Facework and politeness: Multiple goals in courtroom discourse. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 9 (1), pp.15-38.
- Shaheen, Y., Youssef, K., Khoury, G., & Brehat, J. (2007). *Heyya FawDa* ( Movie). Egypt: Misr International Films.
- Thomas, J. (1986). *The Dynamics of discourse: A pragmatic analysis of confrontational interaction* (Doctorate dissertation). Lancaster University.
- Wicaksono, E. B. (2015). *Impoliteness used in action movies* (Master's thesis). School of Teacher Training and Education, Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press