

Impoliteness

When is language considered 'impolite'? Is impolite language only used for anti-social purposes? Can impolite language be creative? What is the difference between 'impoliteness' and 'rudeness'? Grounded in naturally occurring language data and drawing on findings from linguistic pragmatics and social psychology, Jonathan Culpeper provides a fascinating account of how impolite behaviour works. He examines not only its forms and functions but also people's understandings of it in both public and private contexts. He reveals, for example, the emotional consequences of impoliteness, how it shapes and is shaped by contexts, and how it is sometimes institutionalised. This book offers penetrating insights into a hitherto neglected and poorly understood phenomenon. It will be welcomed by students and researchers in linguistics and social psychology in particular.

JONATHAN CULPEPER is based in the Department of Linguistics and English Language at Lancaster University.



Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics

EDITORS

Paul Drew, Marjorie Harness Goodwin, John J. Gumperz, Deborah Schiffrin

- 1 Discourse Strategies John J. Gumperz
- 2 Language and Social Identity edited by John J. Gumperz
- 3 The Social Construction of Literacy Jenny Cook-Gumperz
- 4 *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage* Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson
- 5 Discourse Markers Deborah Schiffrin
- 6 Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse Deborah Tannen
- 7 Conducting Interaction: Patterns of Behaviour in Focused Encounters Adam Kendon
- 8 Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings edited by Paul Drew and John Heritage
- 9 Grammar in Interaction: Adverbial Clauses in American English Conversations Cecilia E. Ford
- 10 Crosstalk and Culture in Sino-American Communication Linda W. L. Young (with foreword by John J. Gumperz)
- 11 AIDS Counselling: Institutional Interaction and Clinical Practice Anssi Perakyla
- 12 Prosody in Conversation: Interactional Studies edited by Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen and Margret Selting
- 13 Interaction and Grammar edited by Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff and Sandra A. Thompson
- 14 Credibility in Court: Communicative Practices in the Camorra Trials Marco Jacquemet
- 15 Interaction and the Development of Mind A. J. Wootton
- 16 The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air Steven Clayman and John Heritage
- 17 Gender and Politeness Sara Mills
- 18 Laughter in Interaction Philip Glenn
- 19 Matters of Opinion: Talking about Public Issues Greg Myers
- 20 Communication in Medical Care: Interaction between Primary Care Physicians and Patients edited by John Heritage and Douglas Maynard
- 21 In Other Words: Variation in Reference and Narrative Deborah Schiffrin
- 22 Language in Late Modernity: Interaction in an Urban School Ben Rampton
- 23 Discourse and Identity edited by Anna De Fina, Deborah Schiffrin and Michael Bamberg
- 24 Reporting Talk: Reported Speech in Interaction edited by Elizabeth Holt and Rebecca Clift
- 25 The Social Construction of Literacy, 2nd Edition edited by Jenny Cook-Gumperz
- 26 Talking Voices, 2nd Edition Deborah Tannen
- 27 Conversation Analysis: Comparative Perspectives edited by Jack Sidnell
- 28 Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence Jonathan Culpeper



Impoliteness

Using Language to Cause Offence

Jonathan Culpeper

Lancaster University





> CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521689779

© Jonathan Culpeper 2011

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2011

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data Culpeper, Jonathan, 1966—

Impoliteness: using language to cause offence / Jonathan Culpeper.

p. cm. – (Studies in interactional sociolinguistics; 28) Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-521-86967-6

Politeness (Linguistics)
English language – Honorific.

3. Power (Social sciences) 4. Interpersonal relations. I. Title.

P299.H66C85 2011

306.44 - dc22 2010041665

ISBN 978-0-521-86967-6 Hardback ISBN 978-0-521-68977-9 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



> I dedicate this book to my father, who embodies everything this book is not about.



Contents

| | List Prej | of figures and tables face | <i>page</i> ix xii |
|---|--|---|-----------------------|
| | Intr | oducing impoliteness | 1 |
| 1 | Unc | lerstanding impoliteness I: Face and social norms | 19 |
| | 1.1 | Introduction: Impoliteness definitions | 19 |
| | 1.2 | The notion of impoliteness | 22 |
| | 1.3 | Face and offence | 24 |
| | 1.4 | Social norms and offence | 31 |
| | 1.5 | Cross-cultural variation and offence type | 43 |
| | 1.6 | Conclusion | 47 |
| 2 | Understanding impoliteness II: Intentionality and emotions | | 48 |
| | 2.1 | Introduction | 48 |
| | 2.2 | Intentionality and offence | 48 |
| | 2.3 | Emotion and offence | 56 |
| | 2.4 | Understanding impoliteness: An integrated socio-cognitive model | 65 |
| | 2.5 | Conclusion | 69 |
| 3 | Impoliteness metadiscourse | | 71 |
| | 3.1 | Introduction | 71 |
| | 3.2 | Metalanguage/metadiscourse and impoliteness | 73 |
| | 3.3 | The corpus-methodology and impoliteness | |
| | | metalanguage/metadiscourse | 75 |
| | 3.4 | The frequencies of impoliteness metalinguistic labels: | |
| | | Academia and general usage compared | 76 |
| | 3.5 | Impoliteness metalinguistic labels and their semantic domains | 80 |
| | 3.6 | Metalinguistic labels and their domains of usage: | |
| | | Corpus and report data findings | 82 |
| | 3.7 | Mapping impoliteness metalinguistic labels in conceptual space | 97 |
| | 3.8 | Impoliteness metapragmatic comments and the case | 400 |
| | 2.0 | of 'over-politeness' | 100 |
| | 3.9 | Impoliteness metapragmatic rules | 103 |
| | 3.10 | Conclusion | 111 |

vii



| viii | | Contents | |
|------|---|---|-----|
| | 4 | Conventionalised formulaic impoliteness and its | |
| | | intensification | 113 |
| | | 4.1 Introduction | 113 |
| | | 4.2 Face-attack strategies and context | 114 |
| | | 4.3 Is (im)politeness inherent in language? | 117 |
| | | 4.4 From conventionalised politeness to conventionalised impoliteness | 126 |
| | | 4.5 Exacerbating the offensiveness of impoliteness formulae | 139 |
| | | 4.6 Conclusion | 152 |
| | 5 | Non-conventionalised impoliteness: Implicational | |
| | | impoliteness | 155 |
| | | 5.1 Introduction | 155 |
| | | 5.2 Implicational impoliteness: Form-driven | 156 |
| | | 5.3 Implicational impoliteness: Convention-driven | 165 |
| | | 5.4 Implicational impoliteness: Context-driven | 180 |
| | | 5.5 Directness, context and gravity of offence | 183 |
| | | 5.6 Conclusion | 193 |
| | 6 | Impoliteness events: Co-texts and contexts | 195 |
| | | 6.1 Introduction | 195 |
| | | 6.2 The backdrop for impoliteness | 197 |
| | | 6.3 Contextual priming: Face components, sensitivity and exposure | 201 |
| | | 6.4 Co-textual priming: (Im)politeness thresholds and reciprocity | 203 |
| | | 6.5 Recontextualising impoliteness: Genuine vs mock impoliteness | 207 |
| | | 6.6 Contextual neutralisation of impoliteness | 215 |
| | | 6.7 Conclusion | 218 |
| | 7 | Impoliteness events: Functions | 220 |
| | | 7.1 Introduction | 220 |
| | | 7.2 Affective impoliteness | 221 |
| | | 7.3 Coercive impoliteness | 225 |
| | | 7.4 Entertaining impoliteness | 233 |
| | | 7.5 Creativity and patterns of impoliteness | 239 |
| | | 7.6 Institutional impoliteness | 245 |
| | | 7.7 Conclusion | 252 |
| | 8 | Conclusions | 254 |
| | | Notes | 259 |
| | | References | 263 |

Index

288



Figures and tables

Figures

| 1.1 | Cross-cultural variation in the types of offence in impoliteness events | page 44 |
|------|---|---------|
| 12 | Cross-cultural variation in the primary types of offence in | puse |
| 1.2 | impoliteness events | 45 |
| 2.1 | Components and processes in the understanding of | |
| | impoliteness | 68 |
| 3.1 | The twenty subject domains of the OEC (raw frequencies in | |
| | millions of words) | 76 |
| 3.2 | A mapping of impoliteness metalinguistic labels in | |
| | conceptual space | 98 |
| 4.1 | Instrumental analysis of 'you leave with nothing' | 146 |
| | Instrumental analysis of 'eer' on the left and 'eeh' on | |
| | the right | 162 |
| 5.2 | An instrumental analysis of 'the Australian army trained me' | 164 |
| 5.3 | An instrumental analysis of 'is that why you go up in all your | |
| | sentences' and 'yes' | 165 |
| 5.4 | Instrumental analysis of 'you are the weakest link goodbye' | 170 |
| 5.5 | An instrumental analysis of 'you don't' | 172 |
| 5.6 | An instrumental analysis of 'well what an interesting person | |
| | you turned out to be' | 173 |
| 5.7 | Interactions between directness and gravity of offence in the | |
| | expression of impoliteness | 186 |
| 5.8 | Degree of impoliteness: High to low vs Low to high power | |
| | conditions | 189 |
| 5.9 | Degree of impoliteness and degree of directness (in both | |
| | power conditions combined) | 190 |
| 5.10 | Degree of impoliteness and degree of directness in high to | |
| | low power condition | 191 |

ix



| X | List of figures and tables | |
|------|--|-----|
| 5.11 | Degree of impoliteness and degree of directness in low to high power condition | 191 |
| 6.1 | The potential for face loss | 203 |
| | Advertisement: 'Eat beef, you bastards' | 210 |
| 0.2 | Advertisement. DAT BEET, TOO BASTARDS | 210 |
| | Tables | |
| 1 | The social profile of the report data | 10 |
| | The correlation of intentionality and gravity of offence | 53 |
| | Emotions associated with offences involving Quality face | 63 |
| | Emotions associated with offences involving Equity rights | 64 |
| | Emotions associated with offences involving Association | |
| | rights | 65 |
| 3.1 | Frequency and distribution of hits for IMPOLITENESS- | |
| | related nominal expressions in the Social Sciences Citation | |
| | Index and the Arts and Humanities Citation Index | 77 |
| 3.2 | Frequency and distribution of hits for IMPOLITENESS- | |
| | related adjectival expressions in the Social Sciences Citation | |
| | Index and the Arts and Humanities Citation Index | 78 |
| 3.3 | Frequency of IMPOLITENESS-related expressions in the | |
| | OEC | 79 |
| 3.4 | Synonyms for rude, impolite, aggressive, abusive and | |
| | offensive given in seven different thesauri | 81 |
| 3.5 | Rude and impolite: Words sharing the same corpus-based | |
| | thesaurus category (top thirty in order of statistical | |
| | significance) | 83 |
| | Rude and impolite: Lexico-grammatical patterns in common | 85 |
| | Lexico-grammatical patterns peculiar to impolite | 85 |
| | Lexico-grammatical patterns peculiar to <i>rude</i> | 86 |
| 3.9 | The distribution of <i>rude</i> and <i>impolite</i> over text-type (up to the | |
| | most frequent ten) | 88 |
| 3.10 | The distribution of verbally aggressive and verbally abusive | |
| | over text-type (up to the most frequent ten) | 89 |
| 3.11 | The collocates of <i>impolite</i> and <i>rude</i> (the top-ten rank ordered | |
| | according to MI score) | 90 |
| 3.12 | The collocates of verbally aggressive and verbally abusive | |
| | (the top-ten rank ordered according to MI score) | 91 |
| 3.13 | Metalinguistic labels provided for 100 reported impoliteness | _ |
| | events | 94 |
| | Words and offensiveness in Britain in the year 2000 | 143 |
| 5.1 | Pragmatic explicitness: Syntactic and prosodic directness | 187 |



| | List of figures and tables | xi |
|-----|---|-----|
| 7.1 | The frequencies of variants of the formula 'You bastard' in | |
| | the OEC | 239 |
| 7.2 | Examples of 'standard' and 'exploitative' chat and quiz shows | 249 |
| 7.3 | The nature of 'chat' in three quiz shows | 250 |
| 8.1 | Conventionalised impoliteness strategies and formulae | |
| | discussed in this book | 256 |



Preface

Any research needs to justify its existence, because all research requires effort, time and money. Impoliteness is, in its modern incarnation, a new field of study, and any new field is prone to insecurity. More than this, impoliteness is up against prejudice. Embarrassed silence is a typical reaction when I declare what my research is, followed by a rapid change of topic. This is not quite the reaction one gets having declared one's research to be Shakespeare or the syntax of world languages. Impoliteness is assumed to be an unfortunate behavioural aberration, and, as far as language is concerned, it is the nasty scum on the margins. To be fair, this is not so often the reaction of people with more social interests. Impoliteness is, in fact, of great social importance. It is salient in the consciousness of the general public. In the guise of 'verbal abuse', 'threats', 'bullying' and so on, it is referred to and prohibited by public signs, charters, laws and documents relating to public places (especially in England); it is addressed by government (cf. Tony Blair's Respect Agenda); it is often reported in the media, particularly when it occurs in contexts where it seems 'abnormal' (e.g. verbal abuse directed at the elderly); and beamed into our living rooms usually as entertainment, as in the case of exploitative TV chat, quiz and talent shows (e.g. Britain's Got Talent). In fact, it is much more salient than politeness – in the UK, we almost never see signs urging positive verbal behaviour, such as 'Please use "please" to the staff' (though signs urging positive behaviours in general, such as 'Thank you for driving carefully', do sometimes appear). In private life, of course, we may well hear politeness rules being articulated and enforced, particularly in contexts such as parent-child discourse. And here we will also come across behaviours that break those politeness rules being condemned as impolite. Impoliteness has an intimate, though not straightforward, connection with politeness. Impoliteness is also of great interpersonal significance. Impoliteness is involved in aggression, abuse, bullying and harassment. Minimally, it results in emotional pain but can even end in suicide.

So, why do we need a linguist for this topic? Research suggests that the saying 'sticks and stones may break my bones, but words can never hurt me' is not always true. The sociologist and criminologist Michele Burman and

xii



Preface xiii

her colleagues (e.g. Burman et al. 2002) found, for example, that teenage girls viewed non-physical or verbal behaviours as potentially more hurtful and damaging than physical violence. Greenwell and Dengerink (1973: 70), working in a very different psychological tradition of research on aggression, had arrived at a very similar conclusion: 'while attack is an important instigator of aggressive behaviour, it appears that the physical discomfort experienced by a person may be subordinate to the symbolic elements that are incorporated in that attack'. Symbolic violence is an important feature of much impolite language. One can get a sense of this by considering how words describing specific kinds of impoliteness have developed. For example, the word insult is derived from Latin insulto, which in the period of Classical Latin had two senses: (1) to leap or jump upon, and (2) to taunt, ridicule or insult. The original meaning of physical violence - jumping on one's victim - had developed a metaphorical symbolic violent meaning, and this is the one that survives today. However, neither sociologists nor psychologists investigate in any detail what those verbally impolite behaviours consist of or how they work. Enter the linguist! Indeed, there is much for the linguist to do. Verbal impoliteness is not simple (e.g. a mere reflex of anger). As I will demonstrate in this book, it can be elaborately creative. Moreover, the study of language and impoliteness is of value to the discipline of linguistics, despite the fact that it is rarely mentioned. Theories of linguistic interaction and communication developed in fields such as pragmatics, interactional sociolinguistics and communication studies are biased towards, and developed from, socially cooperative interactions. Consequently, they cannot adequately account for anti-social, impolite interactions. Yet, as I have noted, impoliteness is an important aspect of social life, and indeed plays a central role in many discourses (from military recruit training to exploitative TV shows), discourses which are rarely described in detail.

The writing of this book was made possible by a three-year Research Fellowship awarded to me by the UK's Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) (RES-063–27-0015). Without this, it probably never would have happened. Along the way, I have accumulated a significant overdraft of favours. I would like to extend particular thanks to Leyla Marti (Boğaziçi University, Turkey), Meilian Mei (Zhejiang University of Technology, China), Minna Nevala (University of Helsinki) and Gila Schauer (Lancaster University) for letting me draw on some of their diary-report data for some sections of Chapter 2. Similarly, I have benefitted from the generosity of John Dixon (Lancaster University), for not only allowing me to report our pilot study in Section 5.5 but for undertaking it with me in the first place. I thank the many people who helped procure impoliteness diary-reports, including: Pu Bei (Zhejiang University of Technology); Martin Pütz (Universität Koblenz-Landau); Beatrix Busse (Universität Bern); Roland Kehrein (Philipps Universität Marburg); Tanja Giessler (Philipps Universität Marburg); Hans-Jörg Schmid



xiv Preface

(Ludwig-Maximilians Universität München); Anke Lüdeling (Humboldt Universität zu Berlin); John Dixon, Andrew Wilson, Eivind Torgersen, Sebastian Hoffman, Kevin Watson, Veronika Koller, Pelham Gore (Lancaster University); Sara Mills (Sheffield Hallam University); Andrew Merrison (York St John University); and Amy Wang (Manchester Metropolitan University). I am very grateful to: Brian Walker, who saved me from the tedium of transcribing all the British data, and ran some data searches for me; Jane Demmen, who helped procure some of the literature I needed; and Claire Hardaker, who, with remarkable efficiency, helped lick the bibliography of this book into shape. Special gratitude is reserved for John Heywood who read the entire manuscript, saving me from many a howler and infelicity, and prepared the index. More generally, I am indebted to the very many people who have helped shape my thinking over the years, including the members of the Linguistic Politeness Research Group (LPRG). Finally, I owe apologies more than thanks to Elena, Emily and Natalie who have born the brunt of a stressed-out family member.

The figures and a small amount of text in Sections 4.5.3 and 5.3 are drawn from Culpeper (2005; an article which is available here: www.reference-global.com/toc/jplr/1/1) and printed here by kind permission of De Gruyter; some text in Sections 1.3.2, 1.4.3 and 1.5 is based on Culpeper *et al.* (forth-coming); the tables and some of the text in Sections 3.4 and 3.6 are drawn from Culpeper (2009); some text in Sections 4.3 and 4.4 is drawn from Culpeper (forthcoming a). Every effort has been made to secure necessary permissions to reproduce copyright material in this book, though in some cases it has proved impossible to trace or contact copyright holders. If any omissions are brought to our notice, we will be happy to include appropriate acknowledgements in reprinting and any subsequent edition.