

How to Cite:

Alawawda, M., & Hassan, A. (2021). Impoliteness in only drunks and children tell the truth by drew Hayden Taylor. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(1), 195-202.
<https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5n1.1307>

Impoliteness in Only Drunks and Children Tell the Truth by Drew Hayden Taylor

Mariam Alawawda

School of Foreign Languages, Faculty of Education, Cyprus International University, North Cyprus, Mersin 10 Turkey

Ahdi Hassan

Plcorporata, Islamabad, Pakistan

Abstract--The present study attempts to examine (im) politeness in Only Drunks and Children Tell the Truth, a drama play written by Drew Hayden Taylor. Politeness and impoliteness have received a great amount of attention from many scholars in recent years. The study applied a classification developed by Culpeper in his latest book entitled *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. The classification mainly focuses on conventionalized and implicational impoliteness in literary texts. Drew Heyden through his characters' conversational dialogues presents numerous (im) polite expressions to both entertain and make actors and audiences think critically. This study applied the previously mentioned classification to examine impoliteness in characters' expressions. The findings revealed that impoliteness is a common phenomenon in the language used especially by women characters in the play. The main reason behind this is the emotional pain the characters experienced in their life. Impoliteness was used by both females and males, but it was found that women used more impoliteness strategies than men.

Keywords--communicative language, conventionalized devices, English language, implicational devices, impoliteness, interactional sociolinguistics, language usage, linguistic politeness, linguistics circle, politeness.

Introduction

Words used by people in conversations tend to be perceived as one of the most powerful forces shaping today's world. Nowadays, the aspect of im (politeness) is being investigated by many researchers around the world. Katz (2015), points out that all speech can be considered to have illocutionary effects. This idea

highlights that language expressions do not exist in inanity. Therefore, the study of speech acts has broadened to include more or less every kind of utterance, as well as the interpersonal functions of whole texts. Politeness and impoliteness discharge certain effects in the speeches delivered by people. In light of this, this study will analyze the effects of emotional pain on human speech in *Only Drunks and Children Tell the Truth* by Drew Hayden Taylor.

Politeness and impoliteness

The theory of politeness and impoliteness was first introduced by Brown and Levinson. Their theory is based on Goff's man-s face notion and Grice-s maxims. This theory declares that any behavior that strives to protect the face of the addressee is polite; therefore, impoliteness is any behavior that offends the face of the addressee (Culpeper et al., 2003; Haugh & Bousfield, 2012; Rudanko, 2006; Maledo & Edhere, 2021). According to Culpeper (2011), impoliteness involves a variety of feelings. As mentioned by him, when communicative language or behaviors that are negatively appraised in a particular context as a result of violating expectations, desires, or obligations (often concerning the management of identity), leads to a feeling of offense. As a result, specific negative emotional reactions, notably, hurt and anger. He adds that the background of impoliteness studies is connected to linguistics, especially pragmatics, extending along with communication studies, and also interactional sociolinguistics. This is where much work on politeness has been produced and so it is natural that its apparent antithesis should be here. However, impoliteness studies draw much of their strength from the fact that this area is a multidisciplinary field. Looking at some ancient studies like Goffman (2005), verbal acts of aggression alongside physical acts have been considered by social psychologists an aggressive behavior (Culpeper, 2011; Kecskes, 2015; Lorenzo-Dus et al., 2011). Sociology is one of the areas where impoliteness can be approached. Culpeper (2011), special attention was given to the social effects of verbal abuse in group contexts by sociology area researchers. The family marital breakdown, or out-group contexts such as school bullying, workplace harassment, as well as a focus on specific social groups and identity aspects like gender, race. Adolescents, in which case it may be referred to as hate crime, were some of the areas that received that attention (Hassan et al., 2020; Mills, 2014).

Impoliteness and emotion

People's speech can be a reflection of their emotions. Therefore, some impoliteness can appear as a result of emotional pain. In his research Kienpointner (2008), pointed out that impolite behavior often involves some kind of emotional argument. To connect between emotional pain and (im) politeness a deeper understanding of emotion is needed. Emotional pain involves both psychological experiences and feelings. Kienpointer (2008), defined emotion as psychological processes which are experienced as strong feelings. According to some background history of emotional pain, this pain can be classified as positive (pleasant) or negative (unpleasant) feelings. To have a better understanding of the relationship between (im) politenesses certain points must be considered. Brown and Levinson are some of the researchers that searched the importance of emotions as a factor of influencing im (polite) behavior. As they suggested, the

theory of (im) politeness is a MP. Related to them "MP is a rational agent whose rationality consists in the availability to our MP of a precisely definable mode of reasoning from ends to the means that will achieve those ends" (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Haugh, 2015; Mills, 2009). Power distance and rank of imposition are some factors that affect im (polite). Other factors as pointed out by Watts (2003), the cooperative or competitive climate of the ongoing interaction can be influenced by the emotional relationship between the interlocutors (Kienpointer, 2008). Arndt & Janney (1985), Spencer-Oatey (2011), argued that successful interaction rests on the production and interpretation of emotive cues and that interpersonal equilibrium is difficult to maintain without this.

Plays as data

In the study of drama, politeness strategies are the most important and useful aspects to be analyzed. According to Brown & Gilman (1989), Aydinoglu (2013), plays can contribute with the best information on colloquial speech. Culpeper (2011), claims that the literary-critical issues are used to shed light on frameworks of linguistic politeness. It is noticed that there are outstanding studies in which plays are taken as data for impoliteness research by scanning literature in this field. Aydinoglu (2013), added that among those plays Shakespeare's four major tragedies can be related to politeness theory.

Research questions

- Does emotional pain lead to impoliteness?
- Is there any gender difference in the use of impoliteness?

Data: Only Drunks and Children Tell the Truth by Drew Hayden Taylor
Drew Hayden Taylor was an only child, raised solely by his Ojibwe mother Frikie Taylor on the Ojibwe Curve Lake First Nations reserve in Peterborough, Ontario, Canada. Taylor attended and received his degree in Radio and Television Broadcasting from Seneca College in Toronto. After graduating, he worked as a correspondent on Native affairs for the Canadian Broadcasting Company. In 1988-1989 he became a playwright in residence at the Native Earth Performing Arts in Toronto. Some of his plays are Toronto at Dreamer's Rock, The Buzz' Gem Blues, Someday, The Bootlegger Blues and other humorous plays (Zheng et al., 2021; Chen, 2001; Culpeper, 1996; 2010; Suroso et al., 2021).

Measurement instruments

To identify and classify the acts of impoliteness in Only Drunks and Children Tell the Truth by Drew Hayden Taylor play, the researcher used Culpeper's classification of impoliteness according to his book titled Impoliteness: Using Language to cause Offence and Bousfield framework to study impoliteness at discourse level are taken as the measurement instruments. Impoliteness was divided by Culpeper into two main groups (Bargiela, 2003; Terkourafi, 2015). Impoliteness was divided into main groups. In the first group, it can be seen the impolite acts that are inherent in the English language. The impolite acts are classified by Culpeper as:

- Insults
- Pointed criticisms/complaints
- Unpalatable questions and/or presuppositions
- Condescension
- Message Enforcers
- Dismissals
- Silencers
- Threats
- Negative Expressive

The second group of impoliteness consists of:

- Form-driven: the surface form or semantic context of behavior is marked. (insinuation, casting aspersions, snide remarks)
- Convention-driven : (sarcasm, teasing)
 - Internal: the context projected by part of behavior mismatches that projected by another part; or
 - External: the context projected by part of behavior mismatches the context of use.
- Context-driven :
 - Unmarked behavior. An unmarked (concerning the surface form or semantic context) and unconventional behavior mismatch the context.

Analysis of the Play *Only Drunks and Children Tell the Truth* by Drew Hayden Taylor

- Tonto: "There's some damn good art up here". (Negative expressive/ teasing)
- Tonto "What the hell is that"? (Negative expressive / unpalatable question)
- Barb "what now?" (Unpalatable question)
- Barb "why didn't she return our calls?" (Complaints/ anger)
- Barb "shit!" (Negative expressive/ anger/ insult)
- Janice "Go back. Go back?" (Disapproval/ unpalatable question)
- Barb "what do you mean you can't?" (Disapproval/ unpalatable question/withdrawal)
- Janice " sorry, but I'll determine what's proper for me to do" (disapproval/anger/sorrow)
- Barb "I don't believe you ". (Disapproval/ anger/ threat)
- Barb "what? I don't want to stay here". (Unpalatable question/ dismissal/ disapproval)
- Janice "what a bizarre name. Tonto". (Offensive respond/ insult/sarcasm)
- Barbe "well..." (No response)
- Janice "Maybe". (Threat/ withdrawal/ disapproval/ no response)
- Janice "What is this? Some kind of joke?" (Unpalatable question/ teasing)
- Janice "Was that song for my benefit?" (Sarcasm/ teasing)
- Tonto "I don't do benefits". (A threat to face/provocation)
- Janice "Not everybody runs on your timetable". (Disapproval/ withdrawal)
- Janice "You can do that by getting me drunk? Isn't that a little cliché?" (Disapproval/ sarcasm)

- Janice "I bet if he really applied himself ". (Disagreement/ direct contradiction)
- Janice "Barb the philosopher ". (Threats/ sarcasm)
- Janice "I don't like that attitude. Quit making me out to be a villain. I'm not". (Disapproval/ message enforces)
- Barb "Are you going to open the present or not?" (Angry/ message enforces)
- Janice "In a minute". (Withdrawal/ no respondent)
- Janice "I still don't believe you". (Disapproval/ threat/ withdrawal)
- Barb "Afraid of the truth?" (Withdrawal/ sarcasm/ teasing)
- Tonto "What the hell was all that?" (Negative expressive/ anger/ insult)
- Barb "You betcha". (Negative expressive/ insult/ disapproval/provocation)
- Janice "Barb this is unbelievable". (Disapproval)
- Barb "That's bullshit and you know it". Negative expressive/ insult/ anger
- Janice "You want to play lawyer? You want to play fucking lawyer?" (Insult/ negative expressive/ provocation)
- Janice "That's not fair". (Disapproval/ no response/ withdrawal/)
- Janice "I'm part of this whole fucking picture, too". (Insult/ negative expressive/ anger)
- Tonto "What the hell is this?" (Insult/negative expressive/ anger)
- Tonto "Damn it, Rodney, this is serious". (Negative expressive/ insult/ anger)
- Rodney "I know, I know, but the system fucked them up royally". (Negative expressive/ complaint/ insult/ offensive response)
- Rodney "Something equally screwy had to fuck them back down". (Negative expressive/ insult)
- Janice "In great emotional pain. Now it's physical pain. I don't know which one is better. (Pause) Yes I do. The physical pain will go away. The emotional pain will take longer. If at all". (Sorrow/ message enforce/ unmarked behavior/ silence).
- Janice "I'm sorry I left the way I did. It must have been a horrible Christmas for you. But you must understand I didn't walk out on you. I walked out on myself. To everybody I was Grace, but to me I'm Janice. I don't know if I can ever be the Grace you wanted, or the Grace Barb wants. I don't know anything anymore. I'm hangover". (Anger/ disapproval/ sorrow)
- Janice "I guess the reason I'm here is to seek forgiveness for the bad thoughts I had about you ". (Sorrow/ anger/ complaint)
- Janice "I feel so ashamed. You were so kind to me, so nice". (Sorrow/ anger/ message enforce)
- Janice "Everything I had wanted to believe was gone because of you. That made me even angrier. I hate myself now. I'm tired of being angry. I'm tired of mistrusting you. I'm tired of everything. I just don't want to fight it anymore. I'm sorry. You deserve better..." (sorrow/ anger/ message enforce)

Findings

Table 1
Types of impoliteness strategies used by men and women

Type of Strategy	Female	%	Male	%
Insults	7	58.3	5	41.7
Pointed criticism/ complaints	2	40	3	60
Unpalatable questions	50	5	50	5
Messages enforces	0	0	5	100
Dismissals	0	0	3	100
Silencers	0	0	4	100
Threats	0	0	3	100
Negative expressive	7	50	7	50
Disapproval	10	71.5	4	28.5
Sarcasm	4	66.7	2	33.3
Sorrow	6	75	2	25
Teasing	5	71.5	2	28.5
Anger	7	63.5	4	36.5

In this analysis, it is found out that women use more impolite strategies in their utterances (Ryabova, 2015; Sifianou, 2012; Tripathy, 2018). Considering the types of impoliteness strategies most frequently used by women are insults (58.3), dismissals (100), threats (100), and disapproval (71.5) respectively. Regarding impolite strategies most frequently used by men is pointed criticism (60).

Table 2
Causes of impoliteness

Cause	Female	%	Male	%
Sorrow	4	66.7	2	33.3
Anger	7	63.7	4	36.3
A threat to the face	3	100	0	0
Disapproval	10	71.5	4	28.5
Disappointment	8	66.7	4	33.3

The analysis shows that the main reasons for impoliteness are sorrow, anger, threat to the face, disapproval, and disappointment. It can be seen a significant difference in the cause of impoliteness where women suffer more than men.

Conclusion

In this comic play, we can see two sisters trying to find a way to each other after they were separated due to adoption. Here the pain of the adopted girl; Grace, by a white family can be seen from the expressions used by her in the play. After analyzing the findings, it was found that impoliteness is a common phenomenon in the language used by women in the play. In addition to that, it was found that both children adopted and separated from their families, were the most delivering and using impoliteness pragmatics. As mentioned previously, the language used by people can be a reflection of their emotional pain. This emotional suffering is

clear in Grace's language (Fukada & Asato, 2004; Mandala, 2018; Limberg, 2009; Culpeper et al., 2003). Furthermore, this emotional pain was confessed by the character (Grace) in a visit to her mother's grave. The consequence of the adoption affected her character both psychologically and culturally. After adoption Grace received another name; Janice. Moreover, both of the adopted children; Grace and Tonto, in the play seemed to have a wave of anger and pain that affected their speech. Impoliteness was used by both females and males, but it was found that women are using more impoliteness strategies than men.

References

- Arndt, H., & Janney, R. W. (1985). Improving emotive communication: verbal, prosodic and kinesic conflictavoidance techniques. *Per linguam*, 1(1).
- Aydinoğlu, N. (2013). Politeness and Impoliteness Strategies: An Analysis of Gender Differences in GERALD L. HORTON'S PLAYS. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 83, 473-482.
- Bargiela-Chiappini, F. (2003). Face and politeness: new (insights) for old (concepts). *Journal of pragmatics*, 35(10-11), 1453-1469. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00173-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00173-X)
- Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.
- Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1989). Politeness theory and Shakespeare's four major tragedies. *Language in society*, 18(2), 159-212.
- Chen, R. (2001). Self-politeness: A proposal. *Journal of pragmatics*, 33(1), 87-106. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00124-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00124-1)
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of pragmatics*, 25(3), 349-367. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00014-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3)
- Culpeper, J. (2010). Conventionalised impoliteness formulae. *Journal of pragmatics*, 42(12), 3232-3245. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.05.007>
- Culpeper, J. (2011). 13. Politeness and impoliteness. In *Pragmatics of society* (pp. 393-438). De Gruyter Mouton.
- Culpeper, J., Bousfield, D., & Wichmann, A. (2003). Impoliteness revisited: With special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. *Journal of pragmatics*, 35(10-11), 1545-1579. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00118-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00118-2)
- Fukada, A., & Asato, N. (2004). Universal politeness theory: application to the use of Japanese honorifics. *Journal of pragmatics*, 36(11), 1991-2002. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2003.11.006>
- Goffman, E. (2005). *Interaction ritual: Essays in face to face behavior*. AldineTransaction.
- Hassan, A., Mitchell, R., & Buriro, H. A. (2020). Changes in uses of salutations in British English. *International research journal of management, IT and social sciences*, 7(1), 197-204.
- Haugh, M. (2015). Impoliteness and taking offence in initial interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 86, 36-42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.05.018>
- Haugh, M., & Bousfield, D. (2012). Mock impoliteness, jocular mockery and jocular abuse in Australian and British English. *Journal of pragmatics*, 44(9), 1099-1114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.02.003>

- Katz, M. H. (2015). Politeness theory and the classification of speech acts. *Working Papers of the Linguistics Circle*, 25(2), 45-55.
- Kecskes, I. (2015). Intercultural impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 86, 43-47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.05.023>
- Kienpointner, M. (2008). Impoliteness and emotional arguments.
- Limberg, H. (2009). Impoliteness and threat responses. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(7), 1376-1394. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.02.003>
- Lorenzo-Dus, N., Blitvich, P. G. C., & Bou-Franch, P. (2011). On-line polylogues and impoliteness: The case of postings sent in response to the Obama Reggaeton YouTube video. *Journal of pragmatics*, 43(10), 2578-2593. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.03.005>
- Maledo, R. O., & Edhere, J. U. (2021). Experiential metafunction: representing environmental degradation. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(1), 129-145. <https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5n1.1081>
- Mandala, H. (2018). Divergent Principles of Politeness in Verbal and Non-Verbal Directive Speech Act. *International research journal of engineering, IT & scientific research*, 4(2), 41-51.
- Mills, G. J. (2014). Dialogue in joint activity: Complementarity, convergence and conventionalization. *New ideas in psychology*, 32, 158-173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2013.03.006>
- Mills, S. (2009). Impoliteness in a cultural context. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 41(5), 1047-1060. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.10.014>
- Rudanko, J. (2006). Aggravated impoliteness and two types of speaker intention in an episode in Shakespeare's *Timon of Athens*. *Journal of pragmatics*, 38(6), 829-841. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2005.11.006>
- Ryabova, M. (2015). Politeness Strategy in Everyday Communication. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 206, 90-95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.033>
- Sifianou, M. (2012). Disagreements, face and politeness. *Journal of pragmatics*, 44(12), 1554-1564. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.03.009>
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2011). Conceptualising 'the relational' in pragmatics: Insights from metapragmatic emotion and (im) politeness comments. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(14), 3565-3578.
- Suroso, A., Hendriarto, P., Kartika MR, G. N., Pattiasina, P. J., & Aslan, A. (2021). Challenges and opportunities towards Islamic cultured generation: socio-cultural analysis. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(1), 180-194. <https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5n1.1203>
- Terkourafi, M. (2015). Conventionalization: A new agenda for im/politeness research. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 86, 11-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.06.004>
- Tripathy, M. (2018). Building quality teamwork to achieve excellence in business organizations. *International research journal of management, IT and social sciences*, 5(3), 1-7.
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.
- Zheng, X., Zhang, F., Wang, K., Zhang, W., Li, Y., Sun, Y., ... & Xu, L. (2021). Smart biosensors and intelligent devices for salivary biomarker detection. *TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry*, 116281. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2021.116281>