

## A Socio-Pragmatic Study of Impolite Expressions in The American Action Movie "The Kill Team (2019)"

Muhammad Hussein Ali\*,<sup>1</sup>, Muslih Shwayash Ahmed<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of English, College of Education for Humanities, University of Anbar, Ramadi, Iraq

<sup>2</sup> Department of English, AlMaarif University College, Ramadi, Iraq

\* [moh20h1011@gmail.com](mailto:moh20h1011@gmail.com)

**KEYWORDS:** Impoliteness, Socio-Pragmatics, Action Movie, Power, Solidarity.



<https://doi.org/10.51345/v33i4.608.g321>

### ABSTRACT:

This study investigated impoliteness theory from a sociopragmatic perspective in the American action movie "The Kill Team (2019)". The study aimed at; investigating the most frequent use of impoliteness strategies in American action movies, finding out how characters' use of impoliteness is affected by social power and solidarity and investigating the functions of impoliteness strategies used by the characters in these movies. To achieve these objectives the researcher implemented a qualitative content analysis in analyzing every impolite situation extracted from the data of the movie, which includes impolite utterances employed by the characters of the chosen movie. Additionally, Culpeper's (1996, 2011) models were adopted in identifying the types of impoliteness strategies and their functions, whereas Brown and Gilman's (1960) theoretical framework of power and solidarity was used to investigate the extent to which power and solidarity influence characters' use of impoliteness strategies. However, there have been a lot of studies conducted on impoliteness but most of these studies focused on how impoliteness strategies are employed pragmatically, without taking into account the social context in which this phenomenon occurs. Thus, the current study is conducted in the discipline of linguistics in order to give an additional contribution to the phenomenon of impoliteness, and fill a gap that according to the researcher's knowledge impoliteness strategies have not yet been explored from a sociopragmatic perspective in American action movies, in sense it takes into account the extent to which the use of impoliteness is affected by social power and solidarity. The findings of this study are clarified as follows. First, four of the impoliteness strategies proposed by Culpeper (1996) were used by the characters of the movie. They were bald on record impoliteness strategy, positive impoliteness strategy, negative impoliteness strategy and sarcasm or mock politeness strategy. Positive impoliteness was the most frequently used strategy among the other, followed by negative impoliteness, which took the second position and then bald on record impoliteness and sarcasm or mock politeness. Meanwhile, withhold politeness was not used by any character in the movie. Regarding the two social variables 'power and solidarity', the results of the analysis revealed that powerful characters tend to use impoliteness strategies over the less powerful characters, as (10) strategies which formed a percentage of (76.9%) of the strategies were used by powerful characters. And that (3) strategies, i.e. (23.1%) percent of the total strategies, were used by characters who were equal in power in relation to the addressees. Finally, concerning the characters who were less powerful to the addressees, the analysis did not mention any use of impoliteness by them at all. In terms of solidarity, the analysis showed that only (5) occurrences which formed (38.5%) of the impoliteness strategies were performed by solidary interlocutors and that (8) occurrences which comprised (61.5%) percent of the impoliteness strategies were used by non-solidary interlocutors. Regarding the function of impoliteness, all the functions were used by the characters. The 'affective function' was the most

frequently used function among the others, which was used (6) times i.e. (46.1%) of the total functions. Followed by the 'coercive function' which was used (5) times i.e. (38.5%) percent. Finally, the 'entertainment function' took the last place with (2) occurrences only which comprised (15.4%) percent of the total data.

## REFERENCES:

- Ariani, I. (2018). An Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies used in Presidential Election Debate between Hilary Clinton and Donald Trump in 2016 (Doctoral dissertation, University Pasir Pengarain).
- Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in Interaction*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1960). *The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity*.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage publications.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(3), 349-367.
- Culpeper, J. (2005). *Impoliteness and Entertainment in the Television Quiz Show: The Weakest Link*.
- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence (Vol.28)*. Cambridge University Press.
- 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.
- Hussein, A. (2017). *A Pragmatic Analysis of Impolite Expressions in Selected American Movies*. College of Education for Humanities Department of English. University of Diyala.
- Laitinen, M. (2011). *Breaking the Rules of Communication: Verbal and Nonverbal Impoliteness in The American Hospital Drama House MD*.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Press.
- Leech, G. (2005). Politeness: is there an East-West divide. *Journal of foreign languages*, 6(3), 1-30.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Napoli, V. (2021). *Requests in Film Dialogue and Dubbing Translation: A Comparative Study of English and Italian*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Singh, R., & Ramdeo, S. (2020). *Leading Organizational Development and Change: Principles and Contextual Perspectives*. Springer Nature. *Style in Language*, 252-281.
- Tracy, K., & Tracy, S. J. (1998). Rudeness at 911: Reconceptualizing Face and Face Attack. *Human Communication Research*, 25(2), 225-251.
- Wagner, A., & Cheng, L. (Eds.). (2011). *Exploring Courtroom Discourse: The Language of Power and Control*. Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
- Walaszewska, E., Kisielska-Krysiuk, M., & Korzeniowska, A. (Eds.). (2008). *Relevant Worlds: Current Perspectives on Language, Translation and Relevance Theory*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Wang, H.-C., & Fussell, S. R. (2010). Groups in Groups: Conversational Similarity in Online Multicultural Multiparty Brainstorming. In *CSCW 2010*. ACM.
- Watts, R. J., Ide, S., & Ehlich, K. (1992). *Politeness in Language*. Mouton de Gruyter.

## 1. Introduction:

We all live in a world that is full of conflict. The more people on the planet, the more diverse the world's views and opinions are. However, people use language to communicate their ideas, thoughts, feelings and emotions. They use language in different ways to reveal their behaviours and fulfill their daily needs, so language is the main component in daily interaction. However, language communication is governed by societal norms, which people should adhere to in order to achieve a good social interaction and breaking these conventions causes misunderstanding and, in some cases, leads to a physical conflict. Wang et al. (2010) states that there are different communicative strategies which have to be followed by speakers to achieve a good relationship between the speaker and addressee. Therefore, speakers need to follow these strategies and preserve a strong relationship with the other members of the community. In order to maintain or achieve a good relationship, people must be aware of their words and behaviour, i.e. they need to treat their addressees with respect,

take into account their faces and be polite to them whenever they speak. On the other hand, impoliteness is a social behaviour which is considered abnormal that occurs frequently in everyday interactions and leads to social conflict and disharmony between interlocutors. Thus, Leech (1983) defines politeness as a type of communicative behavior that may be found in a wide range of human languages and cultures; it has even been described as a universal phenomenon of human society. Moreover, Watts et al. (1992) point out that politeness is a dynamic phenomenon that is always open to adaptation and change in any group, at any age, and at any point in time. For this reason, Walaszewska et al. (2008) refer that despite a large body of theoretical and empirical research on politeness, there is still no complete consensus on what politeness is and how it should be conceptualized. Thus, Brown and Livenson (1987) associate the phenomenon of politeness with various concepts such as indirectness, deference, tact, etiquette, appropriateness, formality and so on. On the other hand, the absence of politeness is referred to by Culpeper (1996) as impoliteness, he declares that impoliteness may be simply viewed as the absence of politeness where it should be expected, explaining this idea by saying that the failure in expressing thank to someone for a gift may be viewed as impoliteness. Tracy and Tracy (1998) look at impoliteness from a different perspective, they regard impoliteness as communicative activities considered by members of a particular social community (and often intended by speakers) to be purposely offensive behavior. However, Culpeper et al. (2003) briefly define impoliteness as "the use of communicative strategies designed to attack face, and thereby cause social conflicts and disharmony" (p. 1545). Later on, Culpeper (2005) modifies his previous definition, taking into account the role of the hearer in perceiving impoliteness and/or the speaker's intention to attack face, stating that impoliteness occurs when: (1) the speaker intentionally communicates a face attack and/or (2) the hearer understands and/or constructs behavior as purposely face-attack, or as a combination of both one and two. Therefore, Napoli (2021) refers that impoliteness is a deliberate and intentional offensive behavior and cannot be just reduced to the lack of politeness.

As a sociopragmatic phenomenon, impoliteness is tightly correlated with a number of elements, such as, power and solidarity, which are crucial elements in understanding impoliteness. Language is regarded as a powerful tool for exercising power, as well as a critical component in the construction of social reality. It has an essential role to play in "social manipulation and seduction", (Wagner & Cheng, 2011, p. 1). According to Brown and Gilman (1960), power as a social variable is a non-reciprocal relationship between at least two persons, in sense that the two persons cannot claim this variable in the same area of behaviour. It can be said that a power holder has the authority over his/her opposite to the extent that he/she is able to influence or control the behaviour of the other. In other words, it denotes that one of the individuals involved in an interaction is superior to the other due to factors such as status, age, occupation, wealth, and so on. Moreover, Leech (2005) claims that power is a vertical distance that significantly affects how interlocutors interact with one another in a variety of social interactions.

On the other hand, solidarity is one of the important social dimensions that governs the use of language, where communication is highly affected by the relationship between the indulged participants, whether they are intimate or not, close friends or strangers and so on. This new set of relationships as Brown and Gilman (1960) describe are symmetrical i.e. have

the same parents, practice the same profession or attend the same school. In communication, solidarity is defined as the similarity, closeness, and social equality of the parties involved. It controls the reciprocal and symmetrical relationships among participants having similar status, social ranks, age and position (Brown & Gilman, 1960). This suggests that both participants can communicate informally by using for example the same level of impoliteness with one another. Thus, solidarity has an important role to play in communication.

However, there have been a lot of studies conducted on impoliteness. Most of these studies focused on how impoliteness strategies are employed pragmatically, without taking into account the social context in which this phenomenon occurs. Laitinen (2011) presented a study entitled "Breaking the Rules of Communication: Verbal and Nonverbal impoliteness in the American Hospital Drama House M.D". The study aimed at investigating how impoliteness strategies were employed in the American Series Dr. House. The researcher adopted Culpeper's (1996) model in addition to using Peter A. Andersen's nonverbal communication categories (1999) in investigating the impolite strategies used by the main character Dr. Gregory House. Laitnen also utilized Bousfield's (2007) theory especially his chart to investigate the responses of Dr. Gregory House's patients towards these impolite behaviors. The results of the study showed that Dr. Gregory House used all the five impolite strategies proposed by Culpeper (1996), especially those that are oriented towards hears' positive and negative faces. Hussein in (2017) is also conducted a study entitled "A Pragmatic Study of Impolite Expressions in Selected American Movies". The study aimed at analyzing the impoliteness strategies from a pragmatic perspective. It also aimed to explain how the impoliteness strategies were realized, and describe how the targeted characters react to the impoliteness strategies directed towards them. The data were collected from American comedy and an action movie. The researcher used Culpeper's (1996) in analysing the data of these movies. She concluded that the positive impoliteness was the most common sort of impoliteness strategies in the characters' utterances, whereas withhold politeness was the least common type in the analyzed data. Additionally, each type of impoliteness strategies had a particular realization. Bald on record strategy was manifested by using the direct, unambiguous and clear statements. Positive strategy realized in forms of disassociating from others, calling the other names and using taboo words. Negative strategy took the forms of condescension, derision, or ridicule, as well as overtly linking the other with a negative trait. Furthermore, mock or sarcasm strategy was mainly manifested by the use of insincere politeness. Additionally, Ariani (2018), is presented a study entitled "An Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies Used in Presidential Election Debate Between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump in 2016". The study was about investigating the types of impoliteness strategies in the presidential election debate between Clinton and Trump. The reason for conducting this research as the researcher referred, was to investigate impoliteness in speech of higher class people and the officials. The researcher adopted Culpeper's (1996) model to analyse the impolite strategies used by Hillary Clinton and president Trump in their presidential campaign in (2016). The researcher used the qualitative methods to analyze the collected data. The findings of this study revealed that Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump used only four impolite strategies which were: A- Bald on the Record Impoliteness, B- Positive Impoliteness, C- Negative Impoliteness, and D-Sarcasm or Mock Politeness, whereas withhold politeness was never used by them.

However, these studies investigated impoliteness strategies from a pragmatic perspective only without taking into account the social context in which these strategies occurred, in sense that they examined impoliteness strategies in abstraction from the social context in which they occurred. Whereas, the current study takes into account the extent to which the use of impoliteness is affected by social power and solidarity. In addition, there are other important differences in terms of the selected data, objectives and/or adopted methodology, as the data for the Laitinen's (2011) study were from drama, while the data for the current study are taken from American action movies. Furthermore, Laitinen (2011) adopted Bousfield's (2007) theory in investigating the responses of Dr. House's patients towards the impoliteness strategies, and excluded the functions of these strategies. In contrast, the current study excludes the responses of the characters against the impoliteness strategies, and is restricted to examine the functions of these strategies, because most of the strategies are not oriented directly to the hearers, but to a third party that does not exist within the interaction. On the other hand, Hussein (2017) concentrated on pragmatic framework only in analyzing her data. Culpeper (1996) says that the main home of impoliteness phenomenon is sociopragmatics. Thus, investigating impoliteness phenomenon in abstraction from the social context in which it occurs, is tantamount to omitting motivation factors to this phenomenon, hence, the current study as mentioned earlier examines the impoliteness strategies with regard to two important social factors, power and solidarity. Moreover, the current study also differs from Hussein (2017) in its dependence on Culpeper's (2011) model in investigating the functions of the impoliteness strategies used by the characters. Ariani's (2018), study is different from the current one, since it was intended to examine impoliteness strategies in speech of high class people, i.e. in political speech. It was also conducted to explore the types of impoliteness strategies without dealing with the functions of these strategies. Another important difference, is that it dealt with impoliteness from a pragmatic perspective only without any regard to the social factors that might affect using impoliteness.

Based on the aforementioned elaboration, it can be concluded that all the researchers of mentioned studies did not investigate impoliteness in relation to the social factors (power and solidarity) in the American action movies. Consequently, as the present study is concerned, impoliteness is worth to be investigated in relation to power and solidarity in American action movies. Thus, it is conducted in the discipline of linguistics in order to give an additional contribution to the phenomenon of impoliteness, and fill a gap that according to the researcher's knowledge impoliteness strategies have not yet been explored from a sociopragmatic perspective in American action movies. This genre of movies is particularly chosen because there are a lot of interactions and conflict among the characters and because movies in general can portray various phenomena such as thoughts, feelings, ideas, culture, history, or relations among people in a more realistic way or more accurately in ways that are closer to reality. The study aims at identifying the most frequent type of impoliteness strategies in American Action movies, examining the extent to which impoliteness strategies are affected by social power and solidarity and investigating the functions of impoliteness strategies used by the characters in American action movies.

The study is limited to studying impolite expressions and will exclude any polite ones, it will also be restricted to the action movies and any other types of movies such as pure Comedy,

Drama, Fantasy, Horror, Mystery, Romance... etc. will be excluded. Finally, this study will only be confined on investigating the impoliteness strategies and their functions without examining the expected responses from the recipients.

## 2. Material and Method:

### 2.1. Data Analysis Procedures

The current study is characterized as qualitative study since it focuses on how a particular phenomenon of language is used in a specific context and under certain circumstances. As it is stated by Creswell (2014), qualitative research is a method of investigating and comprehending the meaning that groups or individuals attribute to a social or human issue. Thus, to fulfil the objectives of the study and the related questions the researcher conducted a form of qualitative method known as content analysis. According to Merriam (2009), content analysis is a method for explaining the content of communications in a systematic way. Additionally, Singh and Ramdeo (2020) describe content analysis as a tool of identifying the existence of specific words, topics, or concepts in a set of qualitative data. Merriam (2009) also adds that the most common use of modern content analysis has been to communications media (television, film, newspapers, periodicals) and has a strong quantitative emphasis. Its major concerns are to measure the frequency and variety of communications and to confirm hypotheses.

Based on the aforementioned elaboration, and for providing an accurate analysis, the researcher provided an appropriate description of the context that is essential in interpreting the data. According to Leech (1983), the results of the pragmatic study are more like sentence tokens than real words of a sentence. Thus, Contexts are absolutely necessary in order to interpret sentence tokens because they come with their own set of presumptions. After that, the researcher applied Culpeper's (1996) model in identifying the types of impoliteness strategies and their realizations, and then the researcher applied the theoretical framework of power and solidarity proposed by Brown and Gilman (1960) to explore the influence of these independent social variables on the language of the characters in terms of impoliteness. Brown and Gilman's (1960) theoretical framework of power and solidarity (discussed earlier in section (2.2.1) and (2.2.2) seems to be the most appropriate for the current study. This is due to the fact that, Brown and Gilman's (1960) framework of power and solidarity is universal and that power and solidarity are vital and essential principles in governing any act of interaction in society. However, Power relations are classified into (+power when the speaker is more powerful than the addressee, power when the speaker has low power than the addressee and =power when the speaker and address are equal). Whereas solidarity relations are classified into (+solidarity when the speaker and the addressee are solidary and -solidarity when the speaker and addressee are non-solidary). Then, the functions of impoliteness strategies are classified into three functions (affective, coercive and entertainment).

### 2.2. Data Description

The data of this research are in forms of words and sentences produced by characters of "The Kill Team (2019)" movie. The movie is chosen because it is based on real events that took place in Afghanistan during the American occupation as well as because, this movie is rich environment in impoliteness strategies. The movie has a duration of about one hour and twenty-seven minutes. According to IMDB, the film is an Action, Drama, war and



Bibliography. The movie is written and directed by Dan Krauss and produced by Marty Bowen, Wyck Godfrey, Adrian Guerra and Isaac Klausner. It released in 2019 in the United States. The events, which depict as taking place in Afghanistan, revolves around a young recruit (Briggman) who discovers that some of his colleagues in the platoon, under the command of sergeant Deeks, carry out systematic murders against innocent Afghan civilian, Briggman becomes conflicted with his moral and takes it upon himself to report the crimes to the Criminal Investigation Division. When Briggman realizes that sergeant Deeks is aware of what is happening and has ears on every soldier in the platoon, he starts to fear his reaction so he submits to Deeks' will and kills an old Afghan man. Finally, after Briggman becomes a member of the killing team, another soldier named Marquez tells the CIA of all the killings that the team carried out, so Deeks, Briggman and three other soldiers are summoned by the CIA and they are eventually convicted of murders. Briggman is sentenced to 3 years after he testified in the military court against his sergeant Deeks, who is sentenced to life imprisonment.

### 2.3. Model of the Study

The model adopted in this study is based on Culpeper's (1996) model of impoliteness strategies which is stated in Culpeper's (1996) article "Towards an anatomy of impoliteness". Additionally, Culpeper's (2011) model also adopted in investigating the functions of the impoliteness performed by the characters in the selected American action movies.

#### 2.3.1 Culpeper (1996)

Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness framework is among the first attempts to identify and explain the formerly ignored phenomenon of verbal rudeness. He (1996) presents a model that has the advantage of having been tested, to some extent, with real-world data from several different discourses. It examines the conflictive and rude language used in army training discourse in the United States (Bousfield, 2008). Hence, Culpeper (1996) adopts a face model that is more culturally and contextually responsive which comprises of five superstrategies that are discussed below.

##### 2.3.1.1 Bald on Record Impoliteness

According to Culpeper (1996) in situations where the face is not irrelevant or minimized, the FTA is conducted in a concise, direct, clear, and unambiguous manner.

##### 2.3.1.2 Positive Impoliteness

Culpeper (1996: 356) defines positive impoliteness as "the use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants" (the desire to be accepted, liked or appreciated by others).

##### 2.3.1.3 Negative Impoliteness

According to Culpeper (1996: 356) negative impoliteness implies "the use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's negative face wants".

##### 2.3.1.4 Sarcasm or Mock Politeness

Culpeper (1996) states that mock politeness, also known as banter, is politeness that stays on the surface since it is understood that it is not meant to offend. Culpeper (1996) refers that The FTA is carried out with using insincere politeness strategies, and hence stay surface realizations.

##### 2.3.1.5 Withhold Politeness

Culpeper (1996: 357) describes withhold politeness as "the absence of politeness work where it would be expected". He illustrates that failing to thank somebody for a gift may be seen as

deliberate impoliteness. In other words, remaining mute or doing nothing where politeness is required is regarded as a form of deliberate impoliteness.

### 2.3.2 Function of Impoliteness

Culpeper (2011) introduces three main functions for impoliteness namely: affective impoliteness, coercive impoliteness and entertaining impoliteness.

#### 2.3.2.1 Affective Impoliteness

According to Culpeper (2011), it could simply involve the uncontrolled expressions of emotion in situations where such expressions are not expected or they are prohibited.

#### 2.3.2.2 Coercive Impoliteness

It is a type of impoliteness that intends to establish a realignment of values between the speaker (producer) and the hearer (target), so that the speaker benefits or has their current benefits preserved or reinforced.

#### 2.3.2.3 Entertaining Impoliteness

Culpeper (2011) states that this type refers to exploiting impoliteness by the speaker to get entertainment. Entertaining impoliteness, like the other types of impoliteness involves a victim or a potential victim.

## 3- Results and Discussions:

### 3.1. Sociopragmatic Analysis of *The Kill Team* (2019)

The data presented below are in forms of conversations produced by the characters of "The Kill Team (2019)" movie.

#### A- Bald on Record Impoliteness

##### Extract (1)

Briggman: "*Arms up. Come on, arms up*"

An Afghan man: retaliates angrily in an unfamiliar language.

Briggman implies Bald on Record Impoliteness when he screamingly orders an angry Afghan man to put his arms up to be checked in one of the Afghan villages where Taliban armed group is active and launches attacks on US forces from time to time. The Afghan man refuses to obey Briggman's orders so he pushes Briggman and knocks him to the ground. Consequently, Briggman utilizes Bald on Record impoliteness to issue an aggressive attack against the Afghan man. The utterance "Arms up. Come on, arms up" is a clear, direct and unambiguous attack against the Afghan man.

Since Briggman is a soldier in the US occupation authority, so he has more power than the Afghan man and hence he exercises his power over the Afghan man by using Bald on Record Impoliteness. Moreover, Briggman tries to practice his power to reduce the ability of the Afghan man and prohibit him from retaliating and speaking rights. As for solidarity, Briggman and the Afghan man are not solidary at all. They are enemies from different countries, thus solidarity has not any role in triggering the aforementioned impoliteness.

In terms of the function of the bald on record impoliteness in the above extract, Briggman employs this strategy with coercive function. Through this strategy, Briggman aims to get the angry man into his submission, so he performs coercive actions against the Afghan man to force him to a compliance. These coercive actions lead to damage the social identity of the Afghan man by restraining his freedom of action.

##### Extract (2)



Sergeant Wallace: *"I said, that's enough! You look like the f\*\*\*ing Terminator in these things.* You'll scare the daylight out of these people. And you. *Look there.* See them kids?"

Rayburn: Mmm.

Sergeant Wallace: *"Raise your right hand. Move it repeatedly in a side-to-side motion"*

In this extract sergeant Wallace orders Coombrs, Rayburn and Wepler to stop laughing at Briggman after the Afghan man pushed him and knocked him to the ground. Hence, Wallace uses Bald on Record strategy to attack Coombrs' face directly by saying "You look like the f\*\*\*ing Terminator". Then the sergeant orders Rayburn to raise his right hand and move it from side to side. All these are examples of bald on record impoliteness employed by sergeant Wallace against the soldiers in his platoon.

Since Wallace is the sergeant and Coombrs, Rayburn and Wepler are soldiers under his command, it is natural that Wallace is more powerful than the soldiers, so that he practices imperative form as well as he tries to minimize Coombrs' face by saying "You look like the f\*\*\*ing Terminator" and that implies Bald on Record Strategy. The context also reveals that is an intimate relationship between sergeant Wallace and the soldiers in his platoon, thus the factor of solidarity also contributes in triggering this impoliteness strategy.

Sergeant Wallace is obliged to put the troops of his platoon into his submission so he utilizes the bald on record strategy with a coercive function as an instrument in gaining followership. He uses this strategy against the soldiers to force them to compliance, and carrying out his orders. In other words sergeant Wallace intended by this strategy to appear superior, and to get his soldiers to carry out his orders and shape what he tells them.

### **B- Positive Impoliteness**

#### **Extract (1)**

Rayburn: "I feel like a *goddamn* prom queen"

Wallace: *"F\*\*k* you what do you say, Rayburn?"

Rayburn: "Nothing Staff Sergeant"

Wallace: "That's what I thought"

The above conversation is between sergeant Wallace and Rayburn, the two characters employ positive impoliteness by utilizing taboo words. Firstly, Rayburn describes himself as goddamn prom queen, mocking the moves that sergeant Wallace forced him to do, describing himself as looking like a goddamn prom queen, but, fearing punishment, he immediately retracts his words. After Wallace has irritated by Rayburn words he also utilizes a taboo word saying "F\*\*k you what do you say, Rayburn?".

Here Wallace is the sergeant who has the right to order, command, prohibit and punish, whereas Rayburn is a soldier under his control, so Wallace regards Rayborn as his inferior to the degree that he pursues to control his behavior and denies his right of speaking. Consequently, the superiority of power that Wallace has, prompts him to issue such strategy of impoliteness. Regarding solidarity, Wallace and Rayburn work together and have the same goal, so solidarity also has a role to play in triggering this strategy of impoliteness. Such relationships are referred by Brown and Gilman (1960) the relationships in which power superiors are solidary.

The taboo words in the above context have two functions, for those which are employed by Rayburn have an entertainment function, Rayburn utilizes this strategy to amuse the soldiers by mocking the moves that sergeant Wallace forced him to do. Whereas for those which are

employed by sergeant Wallace have a coercive function. Sergeant Wallace uses this strategy against Rayburn to force him to a compliance, and carrying out his orders.

### Excerpt (2)

Coombs: "Did you hear this *bullshit* about us having to do some security detail tomorrow? Sit down with the local elder leaders or some *sh\*f*? Another KLE?"

Rayburn: "I swear to God, the LT drinks more tea than Queen *F\*\*\*ing* Elizabeth"

Marquez: "If Sergeant Wallace could see us now, he'd be laughin' his *ass* off, huh?"

After sergeant Wallace has been killed, sergeant Deeks takes command of the platoon. He informs the soldiers that they would search the villages to locate whoever is responsible for the murders of twenty-four American soldiers. The conversation revolved around the aggregation of the security situation after the increase in Taliban attacks on the American soldiers, and the authorities' intention to set up a meeting with the local leaders in order to help the American forces in eliminating Taliban insurgents. However, these new plans prompt Coombs, Rayburn and Marquez to utilize the taboo words as an output strategy of positive impoliteness. The characters use positive strategy to express their irritation against their lieutenant.

The four soldiers involved are all of the same rank and serve in the same military platoon, thus their power is equal, and the employed impoliteness in the above extract is clearly not due to a power imbalance but it is clearly due to the high solidarity between the soldiers.

In terms of the function of impoliteness in the above extract, it is clearly that this impoliteness is an example of affective impoliteness, since it is uncontrolled expressions of anger employed by Coombs, Rayburn and Marquez due to their dissatisfaction with the procedures taken by the authorities.

### Extract (3)

Coombs: "Sergeant. Brief for tomorrow's mission. It's the usual *bullshit*."

Deeks: Oh, yeah?"

Coombs: "We stand around sweating our *balls* off, LT drinks tea with some old dudes."

Deeks: Exactly.

Coombs: Yeah.

Sergeant Deeks: Coombs, is it?

Coombs: Yes, sergeant.

Deeks: "*You're dismissed. You're dismissed. Go back to your hooch*"

The above conversation takes place between the new sergeant Deeks and Coombs. They both use positive impoliteness. Coombs utilizes taboo words because he has been seduced by Deeks' words and thought that Deeks is so friendly and acts as if they were intimate friends, so he uses the taboo words twice. He uses the word 'bullshit', which is an overt taboo word and the word 'ball' which is Vulgar Slang related to the organ in the male human body in meaning testicle or testis. But, what has happened is that Deeks responds by dismissing Coombs from the position of a team leader and excluding him from the mission of giving the orders to the recruits. Thus Deeks utilizes the output strategy of positive impoliteness: "exclude the other from the activity", to damage Coombs positive face wants in being approved and appreciated.

Sergeant Deeks introduces himself to the soldiers as an intimate friend not as a sergeant, illustrating that he is here to lead plain and simple. However, Deeks conducts as if he had

equal power to the other soldiers and he intends to establish intimate relationships. Consequently, Coombs utilizes taboo words as an instance of doing collegiality between the soldiers and the Sergeant. However, Deeks suddenly reveals his power by using positive impoliteness to dismiss Coombs from the mission of giving orders to the other soldiers.

The positive impoliteness in the above context has two functions, the taboo words that are employed by Coombs has an entertainment function, Coombs utilizes this output strategy to amuse the soldiers by presenting himself as an object of entertainment. Whereas for "snub the other, exclude the other from the activity" output strategy that is presented by sergeant Deeks has a coercive function. Sergeant Deeks uses this output strategy against Coombs due to the conflict in the values, Deeks is a firm man, whereas Coombs is a comic one. Thus sergeant Deeks performs a coercive impoliteness that leads to restrict Coombs action.

#### Extract (4)

Briggman: "Sergeant? EOD is clearing the highway north of the blast site. Afghan police are tracking leads on the bomber's last-knowns"

Deeks: "Afghan police couldn't track *dogsh\*t* if it were stuck to their boots'

The above conversation is employed by Briggman and sergeant Deeks, the former is a team leader who strives to prove his aptitude. He informs his sergeant of all the operations carried out by the Afghan police within the sector under their command. Whereas, the latter (sergeant Deeks) expresses his discontent or even his dissatisfaction with the actions taken by the Afghan police by utilizing one of the output strategies of positive impoliteness namely, taboo words. However, he uses the taboo word "dogsh\*t" as a booster of the impolite attack to detract from the performance of the Afghan police. Moreover, the whole utterance "Afghan police couldn't track dogsh\*t if it were stuck to their boots" implies another output strategy of negative impoliteness, namely "scorn or ridicule", that will be discussed later under the heading Negative Impoliteness.

Regarding the social context in which the above conversation takes place, Deeks is more powerful than Briggman, he utilizes taboo words to express his disgust and scorn from the performance of the Afghan police. On the other hand, Briggman remains silent, he reacts neither negatively nor positively towards Deeks' statement, he seems less powerful than Deeks to express his opinion. Concerning solidarity, the above context reveals no solidarity at all, Briggman thinks of Deeks as an outsider, so he does not even dare to react towards Deeks' statement.

The function of the taboo words in the above conversation is affective. Deeks uses the taboo word as an instrument to express his extreme discontent and reveal his heightened anger against the useless procedures taken by the Afghan police, with the assumption that they are liable to be blamed for their catastrophic failure in eliminating Taliban fighters.

#### Extract (5)

Deeks: "Help you with something else?"

Briggman: "Yeah, it's... Sergeant Bruer. Is there any word?"

Deeks: *He's dead.*

Briggman: cries

Deeks: *"If you're going to get emotional, don't do it here"*

Deeks: *"Did you hear what I just said?"*

In the above conversation the recruit Briggman enquires about sergeant Bruer who has lately wounded and sergeant Deeks appears unconcerned, he acts badly towards Briggman. However, sergeant Deeks utilizes two output strategies of positive impoliteness to reveal his bad behavior towards Briggman, the first one is that Deeks shows himself unconcerned, uninterested and unsympathetic about Bruer's death, the utterance "If you're going to get emotional, don't do it here" is clearly captured within the output strategy of being disinterested, unconcerned and unsympathetic. On contrary Briggman who is accused of being excessively merciful even to the Afghan detainees, cries and sheds his tears over Bruer's death. The second output strategy employed by sergeant Deeks is snubbing, he aggressively says to Briggman after seeing him crying, "Did you hear what I just said?", here Deeks intends to snub Briggman, by showing his clear unwillingness to attend to Briggman's emotion and sympathy. Thus, Deeks uses the two output strategies to not attend to Briggman's apparent need to be appreciated and approved, and hence, an apparent attack against Briggman's positive face.

From a social perspective the two characters are asymmetrical in their characteristics, Deeks is more powerful than Briggman, the relationship is more likely to be interpreted as a sergeant to a soldier. Therefore, Deeks deliberately ignores Briggman's emotional state, and his utterances clearly amount to an aggravated, and hence impolite, attack on Briggman's face. Concerning solidarity, the context reveals that the two characters are not solidary at all, hence solidarity does not contribute in issuing this impoliteness strategy. However, such cases are referred to by Brown and Gilman (1960) as relationships in which power superiors are not solidary (officer to soldier), thus impoliteness is likely to be employed by a powerful participant who regards a less powerful participant as an outsider.

Regarding the function of the impoliteness in the above conversation, Deeks utilizes positive impoliteness with the coercive function, Deeks seeks to make a realignment of values between himself and Briggman. Deeks abhors Briggman for being overly sympathetic, he believes that the time is to take revenge, to be strong, to move fast not to shed tears, thus he seeks to prop his values to get his current benefits reinforced.

#### **Extract (6)**

Deeks: Briggman?

Briggman: Bloody.

Deeks: "**F\*\*king caveman**. Here you go"

What has happened in this conversation is that Deeks was grilling up steaks of meat to serve the soldiers and when it was Briggman's turn to take his steak he said that he wants it bloody, prompting Deeks to issue positive impoliteness by explicitly associating Briggman with a negative aspect, describing him as a caveman because cavemen were used to eating a bloody pieces of raw meat. Thus, Deeks employs one output strategy of positive impoliteness namely "explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect" to associate Briggman with the particular belief of eating raw meat that the cavemen portrayed to the world. Additionally, associating Briggman with a caveman by Deeks is clearly an attempt to communicate that he does not approve of Briggman's order may be because it is harmful to his health.

Regarding the social context of this extract, although Deeks is the sergeant who has the power over the soldiers of his platoon but apparently he does not want to practice his power over the soldiers, he desires to break the norms of power by regarding them as his equal, he neither wishes to order, nor to prevent the soldiers on contrary he serves them, so we can

safely say that power does not contribute in triggering the above impoliteness. In terms of solidarity the context reveals that there is a high solidarity among Deeks and the other soldiers, and Deeks thinks of the soldiers as intimates. Thus, it is clearly that solidarity is the main motive in triggering the above impoliteness.

In terms of the function, here Deeks utilizes associating the others with negative aspects as an output strategy of positive impoliteness with the entertainment function to amuse the soldiers by making Briggman the object of his entertainment.

### C- Negative Impoliteness

#### Extract (1)

Sergeant Deeks: "I'm gonna make you a deal. You give me your loyalty and I guarantee that each and every one you will have a chance to be a warrior, *to be a part of history instead of reading about it in some book*"

This extract is said by sergeant Deeks, addressing the soldiers after he has dismissed Coombs for his mockery of the situation, and here Deeks says to the soldiers that if they want to survive and return home with their entire bodies and not to be cut into pieces, they must give him their loyalty to guarantee their lives and make them real warriors instead of reading about them in the history books. Hence the utterance "to be a part of history instead of reading about it in some book" is clearly an example of "condescend, scorn, or ridicule emphasize your relative power and be contemptuous" output strategy of negative impoliteness, employed to attack Briggman's freedom in reading his favorite books because he once saw him reading a historical book, here Deeks shows contempt to Briggman, and hence impolite attack against Briggman's negative face.

From social perspective, sergeant Deeks practices his power over the soldiers to the degree that he has the right to order, command, dismiss, scorn, criticize them, or control their behavior, in sense that he has the freedom to be impolite and reduce the ability of the less powerful soldiers to retaliate with impoliteness. Thus, the above impolite strategy is clearly stimulated by Deeks' superiority of power over Briggman. In terms of solidarity sergeant Deeks was not solidary at all since no one of the soldiers has the right to freely react, all of them including Coombs and Briggman feel that they are outsiders and not intimates.

Sergeant Deeks has the obligation of putting the troops of his platoon into his submission so he utilizes the negative strategy with coercive function as an instrument to gain followership and to align the values of the troops in accordance with his values. Hence, he uses this strategy to get Briggman to compliance, and shape what he tells him.

#### Extract (2)

Briggman: "Sergeant? EOD is clearing the highway north of the blast site. Afghan police are tracking leads on the bomber's last-knowns"

Deeks: "*Afghan police couldn't track dogshit if it were stuck to their boots.*"

The above conversation is employed by Briggman and sergeant Deeks, the former is a team leader who strives to prove his aptitude. He informs his sergeant of all the operations carried out by the Afghan police within the sector under their command. Whereas, the latter (sergeant Deeks) discontents and dissatisfies with the actions taken by the Afghan police, so he utilizes "Condescend, scorn or ridicule – emphasize your relative power and be contemptuous" as an output strategy of negative impoliteness. This utterance is mainly pointed to Afghan police, due to their useless procedures taken against Taliban fighters.

Moreover, Deeks employs the taboo word dogsh\*t to exacerbate and boost the negative impoliteness.

Regarding the social context in which the above conversation takes place, Deeks is more powerful than Briggman, he utilizes negative impoliteness to express his disgust and scorn to the bad performance of the Afghan police. On the other hand, Briggman remains silent, he reacts neither negatively nor positively towards Deeks' statement, he seems less powerful than Deeks to express his opinion. Concerning solidarity, the above context reveals no solidarity at all, Briggman thinks of Deeks as an outsider, so he does not even dare to react towards Deeks' statement.

Deeks utilizes the above output strategy of negative impoliteness with affective function to express his extreme discontent and reveal his heightened emotions of anger against the Afghan police, with the assumption that they are liable to be blamed for their catastrophic failure in eliminating those who plant the improvised explosive devices.

### Extract (3)

Coombs: "The thing is just all mush, face is all f\*\*ked up, nose is broken, like... You should f\*\*king see him, bro"

Coopy: "**White man beating on helpless brown man**"

Weppler: "I think that is the first time in history that's ever happened"

In this excerpt, Coombs talks about the Afghan detainee who has been brutally beaten by the white recruit Rayburn, since Rayburn is a white man and the Afghan detainee is a brown one. Coopy exploits this incident to scorn and ridicule the black recruit Weppler, thus the utterance "White man beating on helpless brown man" is captured within one of the output strategies of negative impoliteness, namely "condescending, scorning or ridiculing". However, condescension in this extract is a form of impoliteness that is not only directed to Weppler but to all those of black skin, wherein Coopy displays an attitude of patronizing superiority and contempt that the white men have over the blacks. Thus, this utterance amounts to be an attack to Weppler's negative face.

The social context of this conversation is represented by (Coombs, Coopy and Weppler). They are supposed to be equal in power, since they are recruits that serve in the same platoon and have the same military rank. However, Coopy's utterance "White man beating on helpless brown man" shows as if Coopy broke the norms of power by resorting to the racial inequality and regarding Weppler as his inferior. On the other hand, the high solidarity among the soldiers in the above conversation plays a main role in prompting Coopy to issue such utterance. However, the above impolite expression is more likely to be understood by Weppler as a banter since they like each other.

The function of the impoliteness strategy in the above context is an entertainment. Coopy exploits the condescension output strategy of negative impoliteness to entertain and amuse the soldiers. He taps into the racial inequality to make Weppler his target for entertainment.

### Extract (4)

Deeks: "Now, unfortunately, **I'm going to have to threaten you**. Yeah. Sorry. I really don't want to do this. But it's necessary. For both our sakes. **Every time you get the urge to open your mouth, I want you to think of these little Muj fingers**"

Briggman: silent

The events of this conversation happen in Briggman's room, the entire conversation is employed by Deeks, who lately discovers that Briggman has informed his father about the



murders that sergeant Deeks and the other soldiers commit. So that, Deeks tries to threaten Briggman by giving him a small box containing fingers of the Afghan man that they have lately killed him. However, Deeks utilizes one of the output strategy of negative impoliteness, namely "Frighten – instil a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur" to frighten Briggman and dissuade or more accurately prevent him from telling his father about the murders. The utterances "I'm going to have to threaten you" and "Every time you get the urge to open your mouth, I want you to think of these little Muj fingers" are apparent threat employed to attack Briggman's negative face and hence imbedding his freedom of action.

From social perspective sergeant Deeks is more powerful than the recruit Briggman. Consequently, Deeks' superiority of power over Briggman allows him to practice impoliteness freely without even fearing Briggman's retaliation. Thus along the conversation Briggman does not even dare to say a word. However, Deeks does conversational management to get the floor and to shape what he wants to say to Briggman. Regarding solidarity, the two interlocutors are not solidary at all, Deeks regards Briggman as an outsider by proclaiming social boundaries that prohibiting Briggman from being within his group. These social boundaries are represented by his military rank which he exploits to be impolite against Briggman.

The function of the negative impoliteness strategy in the aforementioned extract is affective. Deeks utilizes this strategy to express his unveiled heightened emotions of rage against Briggman's behaviors, with the assumption that Briggman is liable to be blamed due to divulging information concerning the murders that Deeks and his soldiers do, and this may put the entire platoon at risk of investigation by the criminal Investigation Department.

#### ***D- Sarcasm or Mock Politeness***

##### **Extract (1)**

Sergeant Deeks: "Ever been hunting, Briggman?"

Briggman: "Yeah, my dad used to take me, he was in the Marines"

Deeks: - Oh, yeah?

Briggman: - Yeah.

Deeks: "*Any combat tours?*"

Briggman: "No, he worked a desk"

Deeks: "*Cool. So when your desk-job dad spotted a buck, did he roll up in his four-by-four?*"

Briggman: "No, that would scare away the animals."

Deeks: Mmm.

What has happened in this conversation, is that Deeks always appears to be a strong man, he describes himself as a man of mission who came to lead and not to waste time, he always took pride in himself and says "I've got three combat tours under my belt, I move fast, I don't f\*\*k around". However, Deeks utilizes sarcasm or mock politeness to socially harm or damage the social identity of Briggman and trying to lower his status, especially when he asks "any combat tours?", in sense that Deeks uses implicature to implicate rude things regarding Briggman and his father even though Briggman does not realize and pursues answering Deeks' questions regarding his father. Additionally, when Deeks ask Briggman about his father saying "Any combat tours?" Briggman answers that his father works as a desk, this answer prompting Deeks to respond with sarcasm or mock politeness, the word

cool is clearly insincere, it is obviously sarcastic in nature, so it remains surface realization, it implicates Deeks' distaste for Berkman's father's job. Thus, what has stated by Deeks represents apparent threat to Briggman's face.

From a social perspective, the above conversation reveals that Deeks seems to be more powerful than Briggman, he thinks that his contribution and qualities are asymmetrical to those of Briggman's. His intention is to mock Briggman's father, implying factors such as power and status that Briggman and his father are lack. Hence, the sarcasm politeness that Deeks employs, is clearly stimulated by Deeks' superiority of power that Briggman lacks. In terms of solidarity Deeks and Briggman are not solidary at all so, solidarity has not any role in triggering the above impoliteness.

In the above conversation Deeks exploits mock or sarcasm politeness with an affective function. Here Deeks tries to express his veiled heightened emotions of repressed disgust towards Briggman. He assumes that Briggman deserves this blame for his excessive sympathy, that may put the lives of all the platoon at risk.

### 3.2. Discussion of Findings

In light of the sociopragmatic analysis of "The Kill Team (2019)" movie, the results arrived at are shown in a table to be discussed. Table (4.1) displays the frequencies and percentages of occurrences of strategies, social factors (power and solidarity) and the functions.

**Table (4.1) Frequencies and Percentages of Strategies, Social Factors and the Functions**

Type of Strategy	Freq	Perce	Social factor	Factors	freq	Total freq	Perce
Bald on Record Impoliteness	2	15.4%		+power	10	13	76.9%
Positive Impoliteness	6	46.1%		=power	3		23.1%
Negative Impoliteness	4	30.8%		-power	0	13	0%
Sarcasm Politeness	1	7.7%		+ Solidarity	5		38.5%
Withhold Politeness	0	0%		- Solidarity	8		61.5%
TOTAL	13	100%	Function	Affective	6	13	46.1%
				Entertainment	2		15.4%
				Coercive	5		38.5%

According to table (4.1), the results of the analysis of "The Kill Team (2019)" movie, revealed that all of the strategies suggested by Culpeper were used except for the last one "withhold politeness" which was never used by any character. However, the results are explained as follows:

Regarding the impoliteness strategies used by the characters of 'The Kill Team (2019)' movie, the analysis showed that positive impoliteness was the most frequent use, where it was used (6) times which formed (46.1%) percent of the total data, followed by negative impoliteness which was used (4) times with a percentage of (30.8%), then bald on record impoliteness which ranked third with (2) occurrences which formed (15.4%) percent of the

total data, and finally sarcasm or mock politeness with (1) occurrence which formed (7.7%) percent only. Finally, withhold politeness was not used in the data.

The high use of positive impoliteness in this movie is due to many factors the first one is power. Throughout the movie Deeks exploited his authority over Briggman either to bring Briggman to his submission and mostly with affective function or to realign Briggman's characteristics to be more similar to his characteristics by forcing Briggman abandoning his excessive sympathy to join him in the killing team. The second factor is due to the widespread use of taboo words in the military environments, especially among the solitary soldiers.

In response to the two social factors (power and solidarity), the results of the analysis revealed that powerful characters tend to use impoliteness strategies over the less powerful characters, as (10) strategies which formed a percentage of (76.9%) of the strategies were used by powerful characters. And that (3) strategies, i.e. (23.1%) percent of the total strategies, were used by characters who were equal in power in relation to the addressees. As for the characters who were less powerful to the addressees, the analysis did not mention any use of impoliteness by them at all. However, this higher percentage of strategies which conducted by powerful characters was mainly employed by sergeant Deeks as a power holder against the soldiers in the platoon, especially the reluctant Briggman, to bring them into submission in carrying out the murders. Regarding the solidarity factor, the results of the analysis showed that only (5) occurrences which formed (38.5%) of the impoliteness strategies were performed by solitary interlocutors and that (8) occurrences which comprised (61.5%) percent of the impoliteness strategies were used by non-solitary interlocutors. This high proportion of lack of solidarity in contexts in which impoliteness strategies were used, was due to the arrogance and dominance of Deeks over the soldiers and considering them as outsiders.

In terms of the functions of impoliteness strategies used by the characters, all the functions of impoliteness were found in "The Kill Team (2019)" movie. The 'affective function' was the most dominant function which was employed (6) times which formed (46.1%) percent of the total functions. Followed by the 'coercive function' which was used (5) times i.e. (38.5%) percent. Finally, the 'entertainment function' took the last place with (2) occurrences only which comprised (15.4%) percent of the total data. However, the characters tended to use the 'affective function' more than any other types of functions because of their growing feelings either against what was happening on the ground in Afghanistan or against the actions of some soldiers, especially Briggman. The coercive function was mainly exploited by sergeant Deeks to align Briggman's values in according to his own by forcing Briggman to abandon his excessive sympathy and include him in the killing team that he manages. The reason for the low level of use of the entertainment function was due to the fact that the factor of solidarity between the characters, especially Deeks and Briggman, was low and that sergeant Deeks tended to assert social boundaries among the soldiers and pretend that he has asymmetrical characteristics to those of the other soldiers.

#### 4. Conclusions:

The analysis of the data in the previous section leads to the following conclusions:

1. Impoliteness as a sociopragmatic phenomenon is an essential component in interaction. It is used strategically by the characters of the movie for different purposes.

2. Movies environment represents a good examples of colloquial speech, which in turn is a rich environment for impoliteness, especially taboo words. However, this complex phenomenon can be employed through a different number of strategies, the use of these strategies differs from one context to another.
3. Most of the impoliteness strategies suggested by Culpeper (1996) are found in the data of 'The Kill Team (2019)' movie.
4. The only strategy that is not used by the characters, is "Withhold politeness". The absence of this strategy is typically due to the fact that this strategy is related to the deficiency in or absence of a polite act (typically utterances) where it would be necessary. For example, a failure to express thank for a favor, may be viewed as a deliberate impoliteness. However, since the title of the current study is restricted to the impolite utterances, so it is normal for this strategy to be absent.
5. Positive impoliteness is the more frequent strategy among the data of the two movies. Utilizing taboo words is the dominant output strategy of positive impoliteness, the reason for the wide use of this output strategy is that this strategy is used to boost the impolite attack by combining it with the other strategies.
6. The predominant function of impoliteness strategies is affective impoliteness. It is used along the two movies to reveal the heightened emotions of, anger, disgust, abhor, discontent .....etc.

## دراسة تداولية اجتماعية للتعبير غير المؤدبة في فلم الأكشن الأمريكي "فريق القتل 2019"

محمد حسين علي<sup>1\*</sup>، أ.د. مصلح شويش أحمد<sup>2</sup><sup>1</sup> قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية، جامعة الأنبار، الرمادي، العراق<sup>2</sup> قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية المعارف الجامعة، الرمادي، العراق

\* moh20h1011@gmail.com

الكلمات المفتاحية | غير مؤدب، تداولي اجتماعي، فيلم أكشن، القوة، الدعم.

<https://doi.org/10.51345/v33i4.608.g321>

## ملخص البحث:

تستقصي هذه الدراسة نظرية عدم التأذب من منظور تداولي اجتماعي في فيلم الأكشن الأمريكي "فريق القتل (2019)". أجريت هذه الرسالة لاعتقاد الباحث بأن استراتيجيات عدم التأذب لم يتم دراستها من منظور تداولي اجتماعي في أفلام الأكشن الأمريكية. تهدف الدراسة إلى: استكشاف استراتيجيات عدم التأذب الأكثر شيوعاً في أفلام الأكشن الأمريكية، ومعرفة مدى تأثير عاملي القوة والتضامن على استخدام الشخصيات لظاهرة عدم التأذب، وتحديد وظائف استراتيجيات عدم التأذب التي تستخدمها الشخصيات في الفلم المذكور. لتحقيق هذه الأهداف، اختار الباحث نموذجي كولبير لعام (١٩٩٦ و ٢٠١١) في تحديد أنواع استراتيجيات عدم التأذب ووظائفها، في حين تم استخدام إطار القوة والتضامن النظري لبراون وجيلمان (١٩٦٠) للتحقيق في مدى تأثير القوة والتضامن على استخدام الشخصيات لاستراتيجيات عدم التأذب. أجرى الباحث تحليل محتوى نوعي في تحليل كل موقف غير مهذب مأخوذ من بيانات الفلم المذكور. نتائج هذه الدراسة يمكن توضيحها على النحو التالي. أولاً، استخدمت الشخصيات أربعة من استراتيجيات عدم التأذب المقترحة من قبل كولبير (١٩٩٦). هذه الاستراتيجيات هي (استراتيجية عدم التأذب المجردة (المباشرة)، استراتيجية عدم التأذب الإيجابي، استراتيجية عدم التأذب السلبي واستراتيجية الادب الغير صادق او التهكمي. كانت استراتيجية عدم التأذب الإيجابي هي الاستراتيجية الأكثر استخداماً من قبل الشخصيات في الفلم المختار، تليها اللامبالاة السلبية والتي احتلت المرتبة الثانية، ومن ثم استراتيجية عدم التأذب المجردة واستراتيجية التهكم او التأذب الغير صادق على التوالي. في حين ان استراتيجية حجب التأذب لم يتم استخدامها من قبل أي شخصية في الفلم. فيما يتعلق بالتعبيرين الاجتماعيين "القوة والتضامن"، كشفت نتائج التحليل أن استخدام استراتيجيات عدم التأذب يزداد بين المتحاورين المتساوين في القوة، إذ ان (10) استراتيجية أي ما نسبته 66.7% من إجمالي عدد الاستراتيجيات، استخدمت من قبل متحاورين متساوين بالقوة بالنسبة للمخاطب. وأن (4) استراتيجيات أي ما نسبته (26.7) من إجمالي الاستراتيجيات استخدمت من قبل شخصيات أكثر قوة من المخاطب. فيما يتعلق بعامل التضامن، كشفت النتائج بان (5) استراتيجية أي ما نسبته (38.5%) من إجمالي الاستراتيجيات استخدمت من قبل متحاورين متضامين. وان (8) استراتيجيات أي ما نسبته (61.5%) من إجمالي الاستراتيجيات استخدمت في سياقات لا يوجد فيها تضامن بين المتحاورين. أخيراً، فيما يتعلق بوظائف

استراتيجيات عدم التأدب، تشير النتائج الى استخدام جميع الوظائف في فلم الأكشن الأمريكي المختار. كانت "الوظيفة العاطفية" هي الوظيفة الأكثر استخداماً من بين الوظائف الأخرى حيث استخدمت (6) مرات اي ما نسبة (46.1%) من إجمالي الوظائف. تليها "الوظيفة القسرية" التي استخدمت (5) مرات أي ما نسبته (38.5%) من الإجمالي. أخيراً، احتلت "الوظيفة الترفيفية" المرتبة الأخيرة حيث استخدمت مرتان فقط والتي شكلت (15.4%) من العدد الكلي للاستراتيجيات غير المهذبة المستخدمة في البيانات التي تم تحليلها. أخيراً، تنتهي الدراسة بعدد من التوصيات والمقترحات لمزيد من الأبحاث.