

## **Egyptian Journal of Linguistics and Translation "EJLT"**

**An International peer-reviewed journal published bi-annually**

**Volume 6, Issue 1, June- 2021: pp: 1-29**

<https://ejlt.journals.ekb.eg/>

### **Original article**

**A Pragmatic Study of Verbal and Nonverbal Impoliteness in Adam**

**Series and Hiyya FawDa Movie**

Hanaa Al Sayed <sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Languages & Translation Center, Faculty of Arts, Sohag University;

[alsunhanaa@yahoo.com](mailto:alsunhanaa@yahoo.com)

\*Correspondence: [alsunhanaa@yahoo.com](mailto:alsunhanaa@yahoo.com) , (+2) 01225377986

### **Abstract**

The present paper 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 impoliteness 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. Additionally, all types of responses to impolite utterances were adopted in the series and the movie.

***Keywords:*** Impoliteness, Nonverbal impoliteness, Power, Intention.

## **1. Introduction**

### **1.1. Context of the Study**



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 neglect the word choices and 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.

## **I.2. Objectives**

The present paper 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 examines 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 Adam series and Hiyya FawDa (*It is Chaos*) movie?
2. How are impoliteness strategies realized in the movie and the series?
3. How do the addressees respond to the speaker's impolite utterances?
4. How do the speaker and the hearer create nonverbal impoliteness?
5. How is power related to impoliteness?
6. What is the connection between intention and impoliteness?

### **1.4. Hypotheses**

The present paper postulates that the addresser employs different strategies of verbal and non-verbal impoliteness. Moreover, there is a strong connection between impoliteness and power which permits the high-ranked persons to use impoliteness strategies deliberately. In

addition, the addressee may keep silent or counter face attack offensively or defensively. Nonverbal communication plays a fundamental role in creating impoliteness in both the series and the movie. It either creates nonverbal impoliteness or strengthens the effect of verbal impoliteness. Additionally, impoliteness is successfully conveyed if the speaker (or someone in the producer role) intends face-damage and the hearer (or someone in the receiver role) perceives the speaker's (producer's) intention to damage face.

### **1.5. Significance**

Significance of this study stems from the fact that very few researches have addressed 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 count on this paper 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.

Although impoliteness has gained a great deal of attention in the recent years, it has not been extensively investigated as its opposite phenomenon, politeness. Furthermore, impoliteness has been rarely explored in TV series and movies. In addition, these shows are viewed worldwide, so they deserve investigation. Series and movies that shed light on the low classes' issues are the ones that involve several impolite utterances, as well.

### **1.6. Scope**

People observe impolite acts not only in reality, but also in movies and series, such as Adam series and Hiyya FawDa (*It is Chaos*) which were released in Egypt in the last decade. The researcher selects both performances because the characters frequently employ impolite utterances, either to offend the recipient or to counter the authoritative speaker. Moreover, power and high positions tremendously stimulate the speaker to utter impolite words. Both of them reflect the gap between the citizens who deliberately use impoliteness strategies. In addition, the



speakers break the norms of communication in the regular social interaction and in work-place interaction.

## **2. Review of the Literature**

### **2.1. Impoliteness Theory**

Culpeper (1996) utilizes 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 (1967); 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) claims 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 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 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 Framework**

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

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

Impoliteness is a behavior that causes offense and involves a conflict between the participants. 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. Elen (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 offence. 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
2. Positive impoliteness
3. Negative impoliteness
4. Sarcasm or mock politeness
5. Withhold politeness

### **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.



### **3. 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. Oculesics: 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 and analytical one because it describes and 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.

#### **4.3. Models/Tools**

Following the models surveyed in the section "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

### 5.1. Adam Series

#### Example 1: Episode Ten



Figure 1: Surprise and angry facial expression

سيف: سهام سهام، اصحى.

سهام: أيه، في حد يصحى حد كده!

سيف: أيه ده؟

سهام: عقب سجارة

سيف: [من دخل أوضة نومي وشرب السجارة؟]

#### 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 National Security Department, Seif extensively uses verbal impoliteness, particularly bold on record impoliteness as well as positive impoliteness. According to Culpeper (1996), bold on record impoliteness is especially common among people who have a close relationship. When Seif says "سهام سهام اصحى" (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 "من دخل أوضة نومي وشرب السجارة؟" (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. 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 does not keep silent and responds "أيه، في حد يصحى" (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 did not hear what the speaker said, did not comprehend the content of the FTA, or he/she has been caught by surprise and does not come up with anything to reply. She defends her own face through using the exclamation "أيه" (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 and often blow, as well. The loud tone of his voice when he says, "من دخل أوضة نومي وشرب السجارة؟" (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: Episode Twelve



Figure 2: Seif's anger and threat

سيف:(سيف يأكل)..... أزيك يامرزوق، تاكل حمام؟

مرزوق: شكراً

Marzouk:( silent)

سيف: أنت خاطب البت أخت آدم عبدالحى؟

مرزوق: أيوه

سيف: حلوة؟

مرزوق: (لا يتحدث)

سيف: بتحبها؟

مرزوق: اللى تشوفه سعادتك.

سيف: طالما اللى أشوفه، أنا أخذ على خاطرى منك، الواد آدم عمل عمله منيلة بستين نيله. أنت ابن مصر، راجل من رجالتها.

مرزوق: أنا عوز أقول حاجة، آدم.....

سيف: [آدم إرهابى وابن ستين كلب]، أيه يامرزوق، عوز تقول حاجة؟

مرزوق: آدم إرهابى وابن ستين كلب

سيف: آدم هنجيبه هنجيبه بس لما يجيبه النظام مش هيرحمك لأنه هيعرف إنك متستر على

إرهابى. جبت لى آدم هتكون فى مكتبى، ماجبتليش آدم برضه هتكون معى بس مش فى مكتبى.

هتكون فى الأوضة اللى جوه وربنا يكفيك شرها. مش بحب أحرق المفاجآت. هسيبك تعرفها

وحده وحده.

## 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.

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 do not 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 do not 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 do not want to disturb the surprise because I want you to know it gradually.**

### **Analysis**

Impoliteness is more likely to occur in situations where there is an imbalance of power, such as police and courtroom discourses. 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 "أنت خاطب البت أخت آدم عبدالحى؟" (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 impose Marzouk to assist him and report Adam's place.

In addition, he utilizes taboo words, such as "آدم إرهابى وابن ستين" (Adam is a terrorist and son of a bitch). Some people believe that their high position entitles them to talk to the others impolitely, particularly the suspects and sergeants. 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 "أيه" (Hey! Marzouk, would you like to say anything?), Marzouk, definitely, cannot contradict Seif's opinion on Adam because he knows the consequences of his different opinion. Indeed, he will be detained and tortured. Seif also terrifies him again to motivate him to help arrest Adam "أدم هنجيبه هنجيبه بس لما يجيبه النظام مش هيرحمك لأنه هيعرف إنك متستر على إرهابي". (Definitely, we will arrest Adam. However, we won't bestow you our mercy if you do not report his place. Otherwise, you will be accused of hiding a terrorist). Certainly, Marzouk has the willingness to help Seif to avoid his evil and harm. Seif also attempts to horrify Marzouk, indicating the punishment he will get in case of concealing a

"ماجبتليش آدم برضه هتكون معي بس مش في مكتبي. هتكون في الأوضة اللي جوه terrorist (In case you do not 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 do not want to disturb the surprise because I want you to know it gradually).

Moreover, Seif belittles Adam using the diminutives "الواد آدم" (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 "حلوة" (pretty?). Talking about Marzouk's promising future as long as he supports him "جبت لي آدم هتكون في مكتبي" (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 offence and agrees with him when he says "آدم إرهابي وابن ستين كلب" (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 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 ignorance to Marzouk in order to belittle as well as humiliate him. His ignorance 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 "آدم إرهایی وابن ستين كلب" (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

حاتم: قلت هي اصتباحة فل. يلا ياد يلا يا ولاد الشوارع. وقفوهم صفين، كل واحد يحط بطاقتة على الأرض والساعة وكل اللي معاه. أوعو تكونوا فاكيرين البلد سايبية [البلد فيها حكومة من حديد والحكومة دي أنا مش بقلكم فاكيرينها سايبية].

محتجز: أنا من حقي أتكلم في المحمول بتاعي.

حاتم: وأنا من حقي أضربك.

الساعي: والله يا باشا دول ولاد كلب ما يستهلوش تعكر دمك بسببهم، الشاي.

حاتم: جبتها في وقتها حطها على ظهر الواد ده، وطى يلا.

الساعي: يا باشا المسامح كريم.

حاتم: طب هاتها، وطى يلا، أبوك بيشتغل ايه يلا؟

محتجز: أبوي مات من سنة، الله يرحمه.

حاتم: يعني يتيم أومال عامل بلطجي وبتاع سياسة ليه مش تبص لمستقبلك أحسن بدل المرمطة في المظاهرات.

محتجز: إحنا لازم نخرج من هنا وأهلنا لازم يعرفوا إننا محبوسين.

حاتم: ياد أهاليكم هما اللي جابوكم هنا علشان معرفوش يربوكم. تعال هاتهم كلهم، شكلي كده بدل ما أوديكم النيابة هوديكم الاستقبال علشان تعرفوا أن الله حق شايف دول لسه راجعين من حفلة الاستقبال عاوز تبقى زيهم.

### 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 do not 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?**

### **Analysis**

As a sergeant at the police station, Hatem offends the detainees and extensively uses verbal impoliteness, particularly bald on record impoliteness. Because of power differential, he clearly and directly attacks the recipient's face. For example, he says "ولاد شوارع" (homeless boys), "وطي يلا", (Little boy! Lean), and "معرفوش يربوكم" (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 "ولاد شوارع" (homeless boys) and calls the other names when he accuses the detainee of mugging and participating in demonstrations "بلطجي وبتاع سياسة" (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, "ياد أهاليكم هم اللي " ياد أهاليكم هم اللي " (Little boy, your families brought you here because they could not raise you well).

Moreover, he hinders and imposes the hearer using negative impoliteness strategies. Hatem frequently belittles the detainee when uttering the word "ياد" (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 "أوعوا تكونوا فاكرين البلد سايبية، البلد فيها حكومة، وحكومة من حديد، والحكومة دي " أنا. (Do not think that the country has no regime. It has a powerful government that I represent) and " شايف دول لسه راجعين من حفلة الاستقبال، عاوز " (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 "أنا" and "أنت" (I and you). Moreover, he condescends, scorns, and ridicules the hearer when he emphasizes his relative power, "يعني يتيم" (you are orphan, aren't you?), he scorns the detainee and makes him feel bad because he does not 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, "حطها على ظهر الواد ده" (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 "ولاد كلب" (sons of a bitch).

Concerning the hearer's responses to the speaker's impoliteness, he meets the impolite offence of the speaker with an impolite defense as a counter to provide offensive-defensive pairing, for example, "إحنا لازم إنا نخرج من هنا وأهالينا لازم يعرفوا إنا محبوسين" (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, "البلد فيها حكومة وحكومة من حديد والحكومة دي أنا" (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 domination. 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, and vertical lines appear between the brows. 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**

### **6.1. Adam**

#### **6.1.1. The Addresser's Verbal Impoliteness**

**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	Ignore, snub the other	1	28	1.4 %	41.5 %
	Excluding the other from an activity	0		0 %	
	Being disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic	0		0 %	
	Using inappropriate identity markers	2		2.9 %	
	Using obscure or secretive language	0		0 %	
	Seeking disagreement	2		2.9 %	
	Making the other feel uncomfortable	6		8.9 %	
	Using taboo words	17		25.3 %	
	Calling the other names	0		0 %	
3. Negative Impoliteness	Frightening	8		11.9 %	
	Condescending, scorning or	7		10.4 %	



	ridiculing		28		41.5%
	Invading the other's space	6		8.9 %	
	Explicitly associating the other with a negative aspect	5		7.4 %	
	Putting the other's indebtedness on record	2		2.9 %	
4. Sarcasm or Mock Politeness	Employing Insincere Politeness	1		1.4 %	
5. Withhold Politeness	Being Silent	0		0 %	
	Failing to Thank	0			
Total/Percentage	67			99.2%	

Table (1) indicates that impoliteness strategies occur (67) times in Adam series in the analyzed extracts. Four types of impoliteness strategies occur in the speakers' utterances. They are bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and sarcasm or mock politeness. Meanwhile, the absent type is withhold politeness.

Occurrence of positive and negative impoliteness is equivalent because each type occurs (28) times with a percentage of (41.5%). Accordingly, they are ranked the highest. Bald on record impoliteness,



which appears ten times, with a percentage of (14.9%), is ranked second. However, sarcasm or mock politeness, which occurs only once with a percentage of (1.4%), is ranked the lowest.

Each type of impoliteness strategies has its specific realizations. For instance, bald on record impoliteness is realized in the form of using a direct, clear, and unambiguous statement. However, positive impoliteness is expressed in the form of ignoring and snubbing the other, using taboo words, seeking disagreement, making the other feel uncomfortable, and using inappropriate identity markers. On the other hand, negative impoliteness comprises five realizations, including frightening; condescending, scorning or ridiculing; invading the other's space; explicitly associating the other with a negative aspect; and putting the other's indebtedness on record. Sarcasm or mock politeness is realized in the form of employing insincere politeness.

Concerning the realizations of impoliteness types, using taboo words, which appears (17) times with a percentage of (25.3%), occupies the first position. However, ignoring, snubbing the other and employing insincere politeness are ranked the lowest because they occur only once,



with a percentage of (1.4%). The second rank is dedicated to using a direct, clear, and unambiguous statement that occurs ten times, with a percentage of (14.9%).

Frightening, as a realization of negative impoliteness, is frequently used to threaten and impose on the hearer. It is used (8) times, with a percentage of (11.9%). Condescending, scorning or ridiculing, whose frequency is (7) times with a percentage of (10.4%), comes in the fourth position, while invading the other's space and making the other feel uncomfortable which occur (6) times with a percentage of (8.9%) are ranked the fifth. Explicitly associating the other with a negative aspect, by using the pronouns "I" and "you", is classified the sixth, with a percentage of (7.4%). Putting the other's indebtedness on record and using inappropriate identity markers are ranked the same because they are only adopted twice, with a percentage of (2.9%). On the other hand, no utterance comprises using obscure or secretive language; being disinterested, unconcerned, and unsympathetic or excluding the other from an activity.

### **6.1.2. The Addressee's Responses to Impolite Utterances**

**Table (2): Responses to Impolite Utterances**

Response	Number	Percentage
No Response (Being Silent)	1	4.1%
Defensive Countering	8	33.3%
Offensive Countering	13	54.1%
Accepting Face Attack	2	8.3%
Total/ Percentage	24	99.8%

Table (2) indicates that all types of responses to impolite utterances are used in the series, but each type has a different frequency of occurrence in the analyzed extracts. There are four types of responses, i.e. no response, accepting the face attack, offensive countering and defensive countering. The most dominant type is offensive countering which appears (13) times with a percentage of (54.1%). The second highest frequency is defensive countering which occurs (8) times with a percentage of (33.3%). Accepting face attack, which is used twice with a percentage of (8.3%), is ranked third. The least frequent type is no response (being silent) which appears once with a percentage of (4.1 %).

Offensive countering is the most dominant response used by the hearer because he/she deliberately meets a face attack with another to retaliate against the speaker's impoliteness. In addition, defensive countering comes in the second position because most recipients are less powerful than the speaker, so they tend to defend their faces through giving an explanation of the situation rather than attacking the speaker's face. Moreover, remaining silent is the least frequent strategy because no hearer is caught by surprise or missed the content of the speaker's utterance. Thus, all recipients either defend their face or use offensive-offensive pairing.

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	0%	53.8%
	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%	
		21		

	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%	30.7%
	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%

### 6.1.3. Nonverbal Impoliteness

Nonverbal communication plays a fundamental role in creating impoliteness in the series. It either creates nonverbal impoliteness or strengthens the effect of verbal impoliteness. Loud tone, annoyed and aggressive mood, as well as facial expressions are the most common aspects used to create nonverbal impoliteness. In addition, the group of

oculesics occurs when the interlocutors wink or avoid direct eye contact with each other. Furthermore, the category of haptics rarely occurs when one participant touches the other. Interlocutors also deploy index and open palm, as features of kinesics, to enhance their threat and domination. Moreover, the category of proxemics, represented by physical closeness, appears four times.

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

### **6.2.1. The Addresser's Verbal Impoliteness**

#### **Table (3): Frequency of Types and Realizations of Impoliteness Strategies in Hiyya FawDa (It is Chaos) Movie**

Table (3) indicates that impoliteness strategies occur (39) times in Hiyya FawDa (It is Chaos) movie in the analyzed examples. The speakers utilize three types of impoliteness strategies: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, and negative impoliteness. Meanwhile, they do not deploy withhold politeness and sarcasm or mock politeness.

Positive impoliteness, which occurs (21) times with a percentage of (53.8%), is ranked first. Then, negative impoliteness, which occurs (12) times with a percentage of (30.7%), is ranked second. Bald on



record, which is used (6) times with a percentage of (15.4%), comes in the third position.

Concerning the realizations of impoliteness types, using taboo words, which appears (9) times with a percentage of (23%) occupies the first position. However, the realizations of using obscure or secretive language and being disinterested, unconcerned, and unsympathetic are ranked the lowest because they occur only once, with a percentage of (2.5%). The second rank is dedicated to using derogatory nominations which occurs (7) times, with a percentage of (18%). Condescending, scorning or ridiculing, which come in the third position, are adopted four times with a percentage of (10%). Invading the other's space and explicitly associating the other with a negative aspect, as realizations of negative impoliteness, are ranked fourth because they appear (3) times with a percentage of (7.6%). Frightening, which occurs twice with a percentage of (5%), is ranked fifth.

### **6.2.2. The Addressee's Responses to Impolite Utterances**

**Table (4): Responses to Impolite Utterances**

Response	Number	Percentage
----------	--------	------------



No Response (Being Silent)	0	0%
Defensive Countering	4	40%
Offensive Countering	5	50%
Accepting Face Attack	1	10%
Total/ Percentage	10	100%

Table (4) indicates that three types of responses to impolite utterances are used in the movie, but each type has a different frequency of occurrence. The most dominant type, which appears (5) times with a percentage of (50%), is offensive countering. The second highest frequency is defensive countering which occurs (4) times with a percentage of (40%). Accepting face attack, which is used once with a percentage of (10%), is the least dominant type. No recipient is silent because he/she properly hears and comprehends the speaker's impolite utterance. Accordingly, all hearers prefer to use offensive-offensive pairing or offensive-defensive pairing.

### **6.2.3. Nonverbal Impoliteness**

Nonverbal communication is indispensable in creating impoliteness in the movie. In other words, it either induces nonverbal



impoliteness or enhances the influence of verbal impoliteness. The groups 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, are the most prominent characteristics used to create nonverbal impoliteness. Furthermore, the category of haptics seldom occurs; it appears only twice in the above-mentioned examples. Interlocutors also deploy index and open palm, as features of kinesics, to enhance their threat and domination. Moreover, the category of proxemics, represented by physical closeness, appears three times in the movie.

## **7. Discussion and Conclusion**

### **7.1. Adam**

The present study revealed that only four types of impoliteness strategies occurred in the speaker's 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 impolitenesses 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.

What is notable about the first strategy is that although Culpeper (1996) claims that bald on record impoliteness is common particularly in extremely close relationships, the distant relationship did not prevent the speakers, particularly Seif and Adam, from using this strategy. They prioritized it with relatively unknown people either because they did not give concern to the others' opinion or because they were highly annoyed and tended to go bald on record.

Each type of impoliteness strategies had its definite realization. For instance, bald on record impoliteness was realized in the form of using a direct, clear, and unambiguous statement. However, positive impoliteness was expressed in the form of ignoring and snubbing the other, using taboo words, seeking disagreement, making the other feel uncomfortable, and using inappropriate identity markers. On the other



hand, negative impoliteness had five realizations, including frightening; condescending, scorning or ridiculing; invading the other's space; explicitly associating the other with a negative aspect; putting the other's indebtedness on record. Meanwhile, sarcasm or mock politeness was only realized in the form of employing insincere politeness. Swearing or using profane and abusive language, which appeared (17) times with a percentage of (25.3%), occupied the first position. However, snubbing the other and employing insincere politeness were ranked the lowest because they occurred only once, with a percentage of (1.4%).

Moreover, negative impoliteness was realized in the form of violating the social norms that necessitate the wife's respect and appreciation. For instance, Hisham (Seif's assistant) belittled and offended his wife who gave no concern to their daughter. Tolba also violated the social norms of the Egyptian ethics as well as virtues when he talked with Marie about his photos while taking a shower. It is totally outrageous to take photos in the bathroom to be kept on a hard disk.

Withhold politeness was the most complicated strategy to be analyzed because it involved the detection of an implicit thing; i.e. it is a matter of an opinion to a great extent. Some instances of withhold



politeness involved the absence of manners that are expected from anyone in a normal interaction (e.g. greeting or saying goodbye), However other instances involved utterances that are expected from a husband, a wife, a friend, or an officer. Furthermore, the other interactants did not keep silent because they tended to express their offence and dissatisfaction apparently to Seif. It would have an ambiguous meaning if they remained silent. In addition, failing to thank did not appear in the series because when Seif talked to the other recipients, he did not perform the utterances that required thanking.

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 attack with another face attack to stop the speaker's impoliteness and to provide an offensive-offensive pairing. The last rank was no response (being silent) which was used once with a percentage of (4.1%). It was the least frequent strategy because no hearer was caught by



surprise, missed the content of the speaker's utterance and the opportunity to respond, or refused to participate in the conversation. Accordingly, all recipients provided either offensive-defensive pairing or offensive-offensive pairing. Although the speakers were more powerful than the recipients, they retaliated with another impolite utterance.

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.

There is a strong connection between impoliteness and power which permits the high-ranked people to use impoliteness freely. The



present paper 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 offence. Seif, for instance, attacked and insulted the other participants, such as his wife, his friends, his assistants and Adam, because of the significant power differential. Amir also did not fear Seif's threat and agitation because of holding the American citizenship that reinforces his situation. Accordingly, his power, as an American citizen, entitled him to resist Seif's impoliteness as well as offence. It also motivated him to counter Seif's impolite utterance using offensive-offensive pairing.

Bousfield (2008) claims that impoliteness is successfully conveyed if the speaker (or someone in the producer role) intends face-damage and the hearer (or someone in a receiver role) perceives the speaker's (producer's) intention to damage face. This claim is applied to the present paper because all speakers, particularly Seif and Adam, intended to damage the hearer's face. In addition, the hearers, specifically Amir, Manal and Seham, were fully aware that the speakers intentionally damaged their positive and negative faces.



Culpeper (2005) states that impoliteness occurs when: (1) the speaker communicates face-attack intentionally or (2) the hearer perceives and/or constructs behavior as intentionally face-attacking, or a combination of (1) and (2). The recipients countered the speakers' impolite utterances with offensive-offensive pairing because an utterance produced by a speaker who truly intends it to be impolite is much more offensive to a hearer than an utterance that was not intended to be impolite (Culpeper, 2010). Intentionality is also scalar in nature in that if a hearer understands an act to be intentional, it magnifies the level of offense received by the hearer or addressee. Accordingly, the speakers' inappropriate and negatively marked behaviors, expressed in either verbal or nonverbal impoliteness, are intentionally caused.

## **7.2. Hiyya FawDa (It is Chaos) Movie**

The participants did not use the five types of impoliteness strategies. They focused on the strategies that resulted in more face damage and offence, namely bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, and negative impoliteness. However, they did not employ withhold politeness and sarcasm or mock politeness.





Hatem's acts indicated tremendous impolite utterances because he had no connections with the detainees or his neighbors. He showed impoliteness and rudeness towards people, whether they were strangers or acquaintances. Sheriff, the prosecutor, also aggravated the situation with the police officer when he damaged his face verbally and nonverbally based on the distance between them.

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%). Positive impoliteness attacks the addressee's positive face, but negative impoliteness attacks the addressee's negative face, i.e. the person's will or need to be unimpeded, not distracted by others, and to be free from all types of imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The interlocutors deployed negative impoliteness (12) times with a percentage of (30.7%) and it was ranked second. Moreover, they used bald on record impoliteness on a regular basis although Culpeper (1996) claims that this kind of impoliteness is especially common among people who have a close relationship. Consequently, its effect was much stronger.

The participants, particularly Hatem and Toha, prioritized taboo words, such as "روح أمك" (bastard), "شرف أمك" (your mother's virginity), "أشترشحك" (terribly scold you) and "وأجرسك" (disclose you). Accordingly, the situation was aggravated because both of them intended to hurt the hearer's face and the hearer properly understood it. However, they rarely used obscure and secretive language or showed lack of interest and sympathy towards the hearers because they created the others' face-damage and offence on purpose. Although they used some of the realizations of positive impoliteness, they adopted all the realizations of negative impoliteness to raise the addressees' underestimation and offence.

In addition, all interactants extensively utilized derogatory nominations, such as "بلطجي وبتاع سياسة" (mugger and demonstrator), "عايب" (deficient), "ابن الهيلة" (son of an idiot woman), "ناقص" (immature), "أهبل" (idiot), "واطي" (villain) and "ابن العايبة" (son of a deficient woman) to show disrespect and detestation. Furthermore, employing insincere politeness, being silent and failing to thank were not involved because the talk required all interlocutors' participation and reaction. Failing to thank



did not appear in the movie because when Hatem, Sherif and Toha talked, they did not perform the polite utterances that require thanking.

Bousfield (2007) states that any response to an offending situation can cause frustration or anger. As a result, a new impolite utterance is created because the defensive strategies may damage the interactant's face in the process of saving one's face. The conversation also may turn into a physical fight between the participants who seek retaliation. Similarly, the detainee neither kept silent nor accepted face attack when Hatem adopted a great deal of impolite utterances with him. However, he countered the face attack defensively because he was not powerful enough to retaliate offensively. The whole participants rejected their face hurt, so they tremendously used offensive countering which appeared (5) times with a percentage of (50%). Moreover, the less powerful ones, such as Samy (the police officer) and the detainee, utilized the defensive countering which came in the second position because Samy did not have the power and courage to use offensive-offensive pairing with the prosecutor and the detainee couldn't counter a sergeant offensively.

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 because the above-mentioned categories were the most widely used to create nonverbal impoliteness or to reinforce verbal impoliteness. Andersen (1999) claims that a polite utterance converts to an impolite utterance through changing the tone of voice. By changing one's tone of voice from a positive to sarcastic and ridiculing, the effect of an utterance will change completely.



Like Hatem, Sherif (the prosecutor) frequently deployed the two types of impoliteness, especially with the individuals who breached laws and regulations, such as some police officers and sergeants, because he was fully conscious that they would not retaliate against his impolite utterances owing to his senior position. In contrast, the less powerful participants are restricted by the social structure from meeting impoliteness with impoliteness– they are more likely to suffer face loss without the ability to counter it. All detainees did not retaliate against Hatem's corporal punishment as well as impolite utterances because he was more powerful.

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 offence and face loss. They also counted on their nonverbal features to assert the fact they 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.

Toha also kept delivering impolite utterances before damaging Hatem's positive and negative faces. Accordingly, he did not have the opportunity to retaliate against her offence at first although he had known that she had the intentional face loss. In addition, her constant speech asserted that she tended to convey offensive utterances. Culpeper (2005) proposes that impoliteness has two layers: the offensive information expressed by the utterance and the concept that the information is expressed intentionally. Recognizing intentions is highly problematic because they have to be inferred in communication. Moreover, a face-attack may be intentionally communicated but fails to find its mark in any way. Conversely, the hearer may perceive or construct intentional face attack on the part of the speaker, when lacking the damage intention.

## **References**

- 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).
- 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. Strahle, 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. (2008). *Impoliteness in Interaction*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- 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, 349-367.
- Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The Weakest Link. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1, 35-72.
- Culpeper, J., Bousfield, D., & Wichmann, A. (2003). Impoliteness revisited: With special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 1545–1579.
- Elen, G. (1999). Politeness and ideology: A critical review. *Pragmatics*, 9 (1), (pp.163-173).
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual*. Chicago: Anchor Books.
- 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 thesis). Faculty of Arts, Fayoum University.
- Holmes, J. & Schnurr, S. (2005). Politeness, humour and gender in the workplace: Negotiating norms and identifying contestation. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1, 121–149.
- Hutchby, I. (2008). Participants, orientations to interruptions, rudeness and other impolite acts in talk-in-interaction. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 4, 221–41.
- Kasper, G. (1990). Linguistic politeness: Current research issues. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, (pp. 193-218). Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90080-W](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90080-W).
- 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).
- Lakoff, R. (1989). The limits of politeness. *Multilingua*, 8, (pp.101–129).
- Laitinen, M. (2011). *Breaking the rules of communication: Verbal and nonverbal impoliteness in the American hospital drama House M.D.* (Master thesis.) University of Jyväskylä, Finland.
- 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* 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), 221-238.

- Omar, Z., & Wahid, S. (2010). Pragmatic analysis of impoliteness in some of Harold Pinter's plays. *Iraq Academic Scientific Journal*, 8, 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.

### الملخص العربى

دراسة تداولية للبذاعة اللفظية وغير اللفظية فى مسلسل آدم وفيلم هى فوضى

هناء السيد

مركز اللغات والترجمة-كلية الآداب-جامعة سوهاج

تهدف هذه الدراسة لإظهار أن نظرية كلبير (1996) عن البذاءة، وتصنيف أندرسن (1999) للتواصل غير اللفظي واستراتيجيات بوسفيلد (2008) للرد على البذاءة أدوات فعالة في دراسة البذاءة اللفظية وغير اللفظية في مسلسل آدم وفيلم هي فوضى. كما تتناول العلاقة بين السلطة والبدذاءة، كما توضح الارتباط بين نية المتحدث وما يتقوه به من الفاظ بذيئة، وتتناول ردود المستمعين على الألفاظ البذيئة الموجهة لهم. أظهرت النتائج استخدام أربعة أنواع فقط من إستراتيجيات البذاءة في المسلسل، البذاءة الصريحة، والبذاءة الإيجابية، والبذاءة السلبية، والتهكم والسخرية. وصُنفت البذاءة الإيجابية والبذاءة السلبية في المرتبة الأعلى وتكرر كل منهما (28) مرة، بنسبة (41.5%). فيما يتعلق بالفيلم، حيث استخدم المتحاورون البذاءة الصريحة والبذاءة الإيجابية والبذاءة السلبية. وصُنفت البذاءة الإيجابية في المرتبة الأولى، حيث تكررت (21) مرة بنسبة (53.8%). بالإضافة إلى ذلك، كانت هناك علاقة قوية بين البذاءة والسلطة التي تمكن الأشخاص ذوي المناصب العليا من استخدام البذاءة بكثرة. وكان هناك نية مسبقة لدى المتحدثين لإهانة المستمع وإراقة وجهه، كما لعب التواصل غير اللفظي دورًا أساسيًا في إثارة البذاءة في كل من المسلسل والفيلم. واستخدم المتحدثون أربع استراتيجيات للرد على الألفاظ البذيئة وفقاً لبوسفيلد (2008)، هي التصدي المهين والتصدي الدفاعي وعدم الرد وقبول إراقة ماء الوجه.

**كلمات افتتاحية:** البذاءة، البذاءة غير اللفظية، السلطة، النية.

