



Implications of Impoliteness Strategies on Interpersonal Relations: An Analysis of *The Dirty Picture*

Dr. Jitendra Kumar Yadav

Associate Professor of English, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Shri Ramswaroop Memorial University, Barabanki, Uttar Pradesh, India

Email: jitendragita@rediffmail.com

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2348-2589>

Received: 20 May 2022; Received in revised form: 07 Jun 2022; Accepted: 15 Jun 2022; Available online: 18 Jun 2022

©2022 The Author(s). Published by Infogain Publication. This is an open access article under the CC BY license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Abstract— *Impoliteness is an action or a linguistic expression contrary to politeness. It is a general impression that all the societies have devised certain norms of politeness to keep the conflict in conversation at bay and thereby keep the interactants in a good humour. Nevertheless, interactants sometimes either fail to observe politeness in interaction or intend to violate the said norms of politeness which results in impoliteness. The present paper makes an attempt to understand impoliteness from a linguist's perspective and draw a line between politeness and impoliteness. It uses impoliteness framework proposed by Culpeper (1996) to understand the implications of impoliteness on interpersonal relation through the analysis of select exchanges taken from the film, The Dirty Picture. The analysis reveals that the interactants are sensitive to impoliteness and the frequent use of impoliteness strategies (accidental or deliberate) in interpersonal discourse causes conflict in relations. It is often used as a tool or strategy to exercise power, dominance, superiority or threat over the hearer, subject to the speaker's intention, position, gender, goal and context, which play a vital role in the choice of impoliteness strategies, perception of meaning in day-to-day exchanges and in causing disharmony in relation between the parties at the negotiations of useful business.*

Keywords— *Impoliteness strategies, politeness, interaction, interpersonal relation, conflict, discourse, The Dirty Picture.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Politeness is an essential attribute of speech that reveals the nuances of our culture. It is a general social behaviour expressed through verbal (language/speech) and non-verbal expressions (body language). Every culture is blessed with certain discourse practices which every user of that culture is supposed to adhere to in order to maintain harmony in interpersonal relationship. Such practices are usually known as politeness principle, cooperative principle, conversational maxims, politeness strategies, etc. And any failure to observe them could have an adverse effect on the interlocutors' relationships subject to context and intention. Such behaviour is often marked as impolite or rude. However, it is very difficult to universally define

which behaviour or expression (verbal or non-verbal) may always be recognized as (im)polite as there are various factors like context, culture, language, gender, race, community, class, relationship, etc. that affect it. Locher and Bousfield (2008), and Culpeper (2011) too are of the opinion that there is no consensus over what is to be recognized as (im)polite behaviour/expression across different cultural settings. Generally, any act (physical or linguistic) that hurts someone's feelings is referred to as impoliteness. In day-to-day socio-political discourse, people employ (im)politeness to meet their prospective goals.

Locher and Bousfield (2008) believe that impoliteness is a face aggravating behaviour in a given

context whereas Culpeper (2008) views it as a behaviour either intended to damage the 'face' of the hearer or interpreted as impolite by the hearer. Like Brown and Levinson's (1987) definition of politeness, these definitions of impoliteness too are inspired by Goffman's (1967) concept of 'face' which refers to an individual's public self-image. According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 62), there are two types of face, 'positive face' and 'negative face'. Positive face is an individual's want that his actions should be appreciated and approved of while negative face is an individual's want for freedom of action or of freedom from imposition. Thus, an action otherwise to the hearer's positive or negative face wants is often called 'face threatening act' (FTA) which causes impoliteness.

Lakoff (1989) and Beebe (1995) mark 'impoliteness' as 'rudeness' or 'rude behaviour' that does not observe conversational norms in the context wherein they are expected to occur (quoted in Culpeper, 2011: 19); whereas, Terkourafi (2008) is of the opinion that 'in impoliteness, actively inferring the speaker's intention leads to the conclusion that the speaker had *no* face-threatening intention, while in rudeness proper it leads to the conclusion that the speaker *did* have a face-threatening intention' (62).

Holmes *et al.* (2008) (quoted in Culpeper, 2011: 20) are of the view that any linguistic behaviour which the hearer interprets to be threatening to his/her face or which infringes the norms of accepted social behaviour pervading in a given society can be called impoliteness. They look at impoliteness from the hearer's viewpoint whereas Bousfield (2008a) and Culpeper *et al.* (2003) interpret impoliteness from the speaker's perspective. They term impoliteness as opposite to politeness—the acts designed to attack one's face to cause social disharmony or conflict. Bousfield (2008a: 72) believes that impoliteness acts are 'intentionally gratuitous and conflictive verbal face-threatening-acts (FTAs) which are purposefully delivered: (i) unmitigated, in contexts where mitigation is required, and/or, (ii) with deliberate aggression, that is, with the face threat exacerbated, 'boosted', or maximised in some way to heighten the face damage inflicted'. Culpeper (2005) suggests two possibilities in which impoliteness could occur—when the speaker attacks the hearer's face intentionally and/or when the hearer interprets the given act as intended face-attack. In this regard, Culpeper (2011) points out that impoliteness lies in the eye of the hearer—how he perceives a given act or associates it with the context. Analogous to Culpeper (2005), Bousfield (2008b) perceives linguistic impoliteness as an effort to use power over the target and thereby to ensure that the target gets offended.

Impoliteness Models

To examine how impoliteness is exercised in conversation to cause offence, Lachenicht (1980), Austin (1990) and Culpeper (1996) have suggested significant models. Lachenicht's (1980) model sees impoliteness in terms of aggravating language which is often used to hurt the hearer. According to him, the speaker may hurt the hearer in two ways: by suggesting that the hearer is not welcomed and/or is not associated with the speaker and by infringing the hearer's freedom of action (Lachenicht (1980) cited in Bousfield 2008a). Inspired by Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness model, he proposes four aggravation super-strategies—off-record, bald-on-record, positive aggravation, and negative aggravation—to examine impoliteness in interaction. However, his aggravation model failed to impress the scholars as his positive aggravation is different from Brown and Levinson's (1987) concept of positive and negative face (Bousfield, 2008a: 87), his off-record and bald-on-record are old strategies having greater affinity with Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness model, and more importantly his model lacks 'real life' examples (Culpeper *et al.* 2003: 1553).

Austin's framework (1990) talks of how an act is taken as offensive by the hearer rather than how it is communicated by the speaker. She gives examples how 'incidental' or 'accidental' face threats are acts of impoliteness (cited in Culpeper *et al.* 2003: 1534). Culpeper *et al.* (2003) have criticized her framework for lacking tested examples.

Like Lachenicht (1980), Culpeper (1996) also bases his impoliteness model on Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness model. He postulates five super-strategies of impoliteness—bald-on-record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness and withhold politeness; nevertheless, there are marked differences between the two. Culpeper's impoliteness strategies are designed to threaten rather than enhance the hearer's face. Moreover, Culpeper's (1996) model has an advantage of being tested on real life data—the army-recruit-training discourse and drama discourse. A brief account of his model (see Culpeper 1996: 357-58; Culpeper *et al.* 2003: 1555) is as follows:

Bald-on-record Impoliteness

The speaker performs the FTA in 'a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way where face is not irrelevant or minimised' (Culpeper 1996: 356). It is 'deployed where there is much face at stake and where there is an intention on the part of the speaker to attack the face of the hearer' (Culpeper *et al.* 2003: 1554).

Positive Impoliteness

It involves the strategies which are designed to attack the hearer's positive face wants. The linguistic output strategies for positive impoliteness are: 'ignore, snub the other', 'exclude the other from an activity', 'dissociate from the other', 'be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic', 'use inappropriate identity markers', 'use obscure or secretive language', 'seek disagreement', 'make the other feel uncomfortable', 'use taboo words', 'call the other names', etc.

Negative Impoliteness

The speaker employs these strategies to attack the hearer's negative face wants. The linguistic output strategies of this super-strategy are as follows: 'frighten', 'condescend, scorn or ridicule', 'invade the other's space', 'explicitly associate the other with negative aspect', 'put the other's indebtedness on record', etc.

Sarcasm or Mock Politeness

Sarcasm is the use of language by people to say just the opposite of what they mean. Such language is marked by the use of politeness only at the surface level. Sarcasm is a mock politeness strategy employed for social disharmony and is clearly the opposite of banter which is a mock impoliteness strategy for social harmony.

Withhold Politeness

It is an act of remaining silent wherein politeness is expected to take place.

Culpeper (1996) considers sarcasm or mock politeness as one of the impoliteness super-strategies whereas Lachenicht (1980) considers sarcasm as a positive aggravation sub-strategy and mock politeness or 'inappropriate positive politeness' is a negative aggravation sub-strategy (Bousfield 2008a: 87). However, Bousfield (2008a: 95) has categorized 'sarcasm or mock politeness' and 'withhold politeness' under 'off-record impoliteness'.

Later, Culpeper *et al.* (2003: 1546) have criticised Culpeper's (1996) model for being centric to 'single impoliteness strategies' derived from 'grammatical or lexical items', and supplemented the same including prosody (paralinguistic features) in the interpretation of impoliteness. However, Culpeper's (1996) model is still useful in the analysis of impoliteness.

II. METHODOLOGY

The present study is qualitative research. It involves film dialogues considering film dialogues mirror the real life conversation. For this purpose, total three excerpts of exchanges have been taken from the Hindi film, *The Dirty Picture*. The select exchanges are

exemplary to explain and understand the use of impoliteness in interaction. In order to understand how impoliteness is employed as powerful tool to achieve desired goals in interaction or influence interpersonal relations, Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness framework as a model supplemented with Culpeper *et al.*'s (2003) model is used.

The Dirty Picture: Summary

The film, *The Dirty Picture* (2011), is written by Rajat Arora and directed by Milan Luthria, and co-produced by Shobha Kapoor and Ekta Kapoor. Its plot is inspired by the life of a South Indian actress Silk Smitha. The film received many accolades such as the Best Actress trophy for Vidya Balan (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Dirty_Picture).

The story of the film is woven around a village girl, Reshma, who secretly runs away from her home a day before her marriage and arrives at Jupiter Studio to make career in acting; but gets rejected by Sudhir, the casting director. He, however, gives her some money to buy food for herself. She, however, buys a movie ticket instead of food. During the show, a middle aged man, sitting beside her, offers her some money to have sex with him. This incident shocks her from within; nevertheless, it reminds her of her worthiness. Next day, she goes to Sudhir and luckily, she gets a role in an item song. On the day of release, Reshma goes to watch the film but she gets disappointed finding her dance scene missing. Since, the film fails to attract movie goers, the producer, Selva Ganesh, decides to replay it after adding deleted dance scene which turns out to be a major box-office hit.

Impressed by Reshma's electric dance, Selva Ganesh launches her with new identity as 'Silk' against the superstar Suryakanth in his upcoming film. Suryakanth and Silk turn to be a lucky match for Selva Ganesh to produce many a blockbuster film one after another. With the passage of time, Silk develops an intimate relationship with Suryakanth that lives short and then she turns to his younger brother, Ramakanth. After a long gap, Silk encounters Suryakanth in an award ceremony wherein he passes personal comments on her. Infuriated by his comments, she lambastes not only him but also the audience for their hypocrisy. Naila, a film critic, applauds her bold step and asks her to keep doing that, on which, Silk defiantly remarks that she is not a film that changes after an interval.

Day-by-day, Silk and Ramakanth's relationship blossoms; when Naila learns of it, she casts aspersions on Silk for dating both the brothers. In revenge, Silk not only spoils her private party but also kisses Ramakanth publicly to hurt Suryakanth's ego. After this incident, Suryakanth

distances himself from her as a result she loses offers from big filmmakers. Her mercurial and arrogant behaviour distances her from everyone. Later on, Ramakanth too breaks the relationship with her when she misbehaves Shakeela, an aspiring actress.

Gradually, Silk becomes addicted to alcohol and cigarettes and gains weight consequently she loses film offers. She makes her own film with Selva Ganesh by copying her rival Abraham's idea of triple role. The film flops and she loses all her hard earned money. Debt ridden Silk approaches a less known film maker, Mutthu, who tries to cast her in a porn film after intoxicating her. Luckily, she is saved from ignominy by the police. Loneliness and debt make her life miserable as a result she slips in depression and commits suicide.

Analysis and Interpretation of Impoliteness Strategies

In order to understand how impoliteness is used as a tool of achieving desired goals or influencing interpersonal relations of the participants, select excerpts of the exchanges have been taken from the film, *The Dirty Picture*. Since the exchanges took place in Hindi language, transliteration of each turn has been given along with the translation in the parenthesis for the sake of analysis.

The following exchange has been taken from the scene which opens in Jupiter Studio where Reshma, a village girl obsessed with urban lifestyle, arrives for the audition. She is the last contestant in the queue and when her turn comes, the casting director, Sudhir, refuses to entertain her. She requests him to give her a chance. Below is an excerpt of the conversation between Sudhir and Reshma:

Reshma: Sir-sir! Mujhe actor banana hai, sir. [Sir-sir! I want to be an actor, sir.]

Sudhir: (laughs) Mujhe bhi director banana tha. [And I wanted to be a director.]

Reshma: Main doosari ladakiyon ki tarah dance nahin karana chaahati. Main actor banoongi sir. [Sir, I don't want to dance like other girls. I'll be an actor, sir.]

Sudhir: Main bhi kuchh hat kar filmen banaana chaahata tha. [And I wanted to make offbeat films.]

Reshma tells that she wants to become an actor; however Sudhir not only laughs at her but also makes a sarcastic remark, mocking his failure to become a director to imply that acting is not a joke rather a wild goose chase for her. Here, Sudhir employs off-record impoliteness to communicate either his inability or his outright rejection to cooperate with her. Reshma tries to convince him saying that she is different from the crowd. She tries to intensify his interest with the expression '*main actor banoongi sir*'.

But, instead of showing any interest, Sudhir refuses her request by telling his own story of failure to produce offbeat films (*main bhi kuchh hat kar filmen banaana chaahata tha*) to imply that it's a very challenging and competitive field. His implied rejection is a face threatening act to her positive face wants. Thus, the given expression is an example of off-record impoliteness.

Reshma: Sir! Main actor banane ke liye kuchh bhi kar sakati hoon. [Sir, I'll do anything to become an actor.]

Sudhir: Main director banane ke liye kuchh nahin kar paaya. [And to become a director I could not do anything.]

Reshma: Jo in photos men nahin hai vo dikhaaon kyaa? [Would you like to see what's not in these pictures?]

Sudhir: Main apni film ki kahaani sunaon kyaa? [Shall I tell you the story of my film?]

Reshma makes her utmost effort to win Sudhir's favour by stating her readiness to face any challenge to become an actor (*Sir! main actor banane ke liye kuchh bhi kar sakati hoon*). But, Sudhir doesn't move rather reiterates his failures (*main director banane ke liye kuchh nahin kar paaya*). His self-criticism implies that she shouldn't expect any cooperation from him. Thus, the implied non-cooperation is an example of off-record impoliteness. Reshma doesn't lose her patience rather she seeks Sudhir's permission to show her talent (*Jo in photos men nahin hai vo dikhaaon kyaa?*). Instead of giving a direct answer, Sudhir asks her whether she would like to listen to the story of his film in the same tone and sentence structure (*main apni film ki kahaani sunaon kyaa?*); maybe, he doesn't want to hurt her directly. His utterance can be seen as an implicit challenge to her ability. Thus, it is an off-record impoliteness to Reshma's positive face.

Reshma: Sir aap meri baat sun hi nahin rahe. Aap apni film se baahar niklo naa sir. [Sir, you aren't even listening to me. Sir, step out of your film.]

Sudhir: Too bhi apne sapanon se baahar aajaa. Teri jaisi pachchees baithi hain baahar. Kal pachaas ho jaayengi. Kuchh nahin hone vaala teraa. Naa to kisi angle se mahaboobaa dikhti hai, naa bivi. Bahut fiki dikhti hai too. [And you too step out of your dreams. There are 25 like you waiting outside... and tomorrow there will be 50 more. You're good for nothing. Neither do you have the seductive charm of a lover nor the grace of a wife. You are very dull.]

Reshma: Do din se chini khaa rahi hoon sir. Namakin kahaan se lagoongi. [I've been living on sugar for two days... so how can I look spicy?]

Sudhir: Ek minute, ye rakh le (offers some money). Jaake kuchh khaa lenaa aur fir sochanaa kyaa karanaa hai life ke saath. Actor bananaa sab ke bas ki baat nahin hai. Chal. [Hold on... take this and have something to eat. And think about what you want to do with your life. Not everyone can become an actor. Now leave.]

Helpless Reshma complains of ignoring her (*Sir aap meri baat sun hi nahin rahen*). She requests Sudhir to come out of hangover from his film (*Aap apni film se baahar niklo naa sir*) to imply indirect request for support. Her demand is an imposition to his freedom of action. Reshma's lower social rank doesn't give her licence to criticise or impose on Sudhir. Her imposition puts an adverse effect on him. Consequently, Sudhir attacks her positive face by making disparaging comments on her ambition (*Too...aajaa*), social standing (*Teri jaisi...vaala teraa*) and appearance (*Naa to...fiki dikhati hai too*). He uses second person pronoun 'too' (thou) to belittle her social rank. Sudhir seems too judgemental of her potential. His critical remark employs positive impoliteness—Ignore, snub the other (*teri jaisi 25 baithi...50 ho jaayengi*); Be disinterested, uninterested, unsympathetic (*kuchh nahi...dikhati hai too*); and negative impoliteness—Invade the other's space (*too bhi...baahar aajaa*); Condescend, scorn or ridicule (*naa to kisi...naa bivi*).

Having got humiliated Reshma acknowledges her reality by stating that she is surviving solely on sugar these days so how she could manage her seductive look (*namakin*) and thereby she employs on-record off-record appeal to communicate her helplessness and win his favour. Her off-record appeal succeeds when Sudhir offers a little money to buy food as a gesture of help.

Though Reshma gets rejected, she never lets her hope go. She makes another visit to the studio wherein she gets a minor role in an item number. Her titillating moves impress the producer, Selva Ganesh (or Selva), who launches her against the superstar Suryakanth (or Surya) in his upcoming film with her new identity 'Silk'. Silk (earlier Reshma) tries her best to tune with Suryakanth for the dance shoot; but, it goes in vain. Suryakanth gets irritated and refuses to shoot with Silk. He sits down in a chair and lights up a cigarette. The interaction takes place when Suryakanth calls her.

Surya: Ai ladaki! idhar aa. Kyaa naam hai teraa? [Hey girl! Come here. What's your name?]

Silk: Reshma... Silk.

Surya: Naam do-do rakhe huye hain, kaam ek bhi nahin aataa. Ye plastic kaa cover dekh rahi ho? Ye ho yaa naa ho isase cigarette par koi fark nahin padataa. Thik isi tarah tum is film men ho

yaa na ho isase kisi ko koi fark nahin padataa. [Two names to go by and you can't do even one silly step. You see this plastic cover? Whether it's there or not it makes no difference to the cigarette. Similarly whether you are in this film or not it makes no difference to anyone.]

Silk: Vaise sir ab agar baarish aa jaaye aur ye cover naa ho to is cigarette men aag bhi naa lagegi. [Suppose that if it rains and there's no cover... the cigarette won't even light up.]

Surya: Pack up. Heroine kaa kahanaa hai baarish hone vaali hai bhayi. [Pack up! Heroine says that it's going to rain.]

Suryakanth uses inappropriate address marker 'Ai ladaki!' and the second person pronoun 'teraa' (of inferior rank) to distance her from him and demean her social rank. It is a face threatening act to her positive face. For a moment, Silk is confused, then turns and finds it is Suryakanth who is beckoning her. She is so nervous that she tells her real name unconsciously; nevertheless, she immediately corrects her slip by uttering 'Silk'. Listening to her reply, Suryakanth seems to be critical of her behaviour. He makes disparaging comments on her name as well as on her performance (*Naam do-do...nahin aataa*) employing positive impoliteness strategy to pull down her image. He doesn't stop here rather he humiliates Silk by comparing her with the plastic cover over the cigarette to tell her worth in the film. Thus, Suryakanth threatens her positive face employing positive impoliteness strategy: Ignore, snub the other (*...tum is film men ho yaa naa ho...*); and Exclude the other from activity (*isase kisi ko koi fark nahin padataa*).

Silk gets stunned listening to his disparaging comments; however, she, restraining her anger, defends herself giving her own argument (*...agar baarish aa jaaye aur ye cover naa ho to is cigarette men aag bhi nahin lagegi*) to save her positive face wants. Her logical argument is a challenge to Suryakanth's comment as it contradicts his belief, which causes threat to his positive face. Thus, she employs positive impoliteness (Seek disagreement). At this, Surya gets infuriated and announces pack up stating that is going to rain, perhaps to give a befitting reply to her blunt argument and show his anger. People at the receiving end get shocked at Suryakanth's decision. This utterance causes FTA not only to Silk but also to Selva Ganesh. None of them might have expected such a bad situation. Thus, Suryakanth's statement seems to involve off-record impoliteness.

On the request of Selva Ganesh and the crew members, Silk apologises to Suryakant and requests him to give her a chance. They prove to be a lucky match to make hit at box office. Silk's excitement goes leaps and bounds.

She wants to do more films with Suryakanth. One day, while they were talking on this issue in the studio, Selva Ganesh and Abraham make an entry. The latter comes to discuss his upcoming film with Suryakanth. Seeing both together, Suryakanth cuts a joke. Selva Ganesh enjoys his sense of humour, then turns to Abraham and introduces Silk to him.

Silk: Hello.

Abraham: Surya sir mujhe aap se apani agali film ke baare men discuss karanaa hai. Aur ye film sirf aap par hogi. Isako chalaane ke liye koi chaaloo yaa ghatiyaa stunt ki zaroorat nahin padegi aapako. [Surya sir, I want to talk to you about my next film. And this film will showcase you. You won't need a cheap and disgusting act to promote this film.]

Surya: Abraham! Tum bahut achchhi film banaate ho, sab jaanate hai... [Abraham! everybody knows that you make good films.]

Abraham: Thank you sir! Ye sab idli, rasam aur rum kaa kamaal hai. [... I owe it all to *idli, rasam* and rum.]

Silk greets Abraham saying 'hello' which is a friendly gesture. The expression aims to enhance his positive face wants. However, Abraham, who doesn't like Silk, ignores her warm greeting. He turns to Suryakanth and tells that his next film will be based on him only (*Surya sir...par hogi*) and it will not require any cheap and vulgar stunt to promote it (*Isako chalaane...padegi aapako*). Addressing Suryakanth by his name and offering him a film, Abraham tries to win Suryakanth's favour. But the expression goes contrary to Silk's positive face wants when Abraham refuses to answer her greetings and offers his film exclusively to Suryakanth (*aur ye film sirf aap ke oopar hogi*), and negative face wants when he indirectly associates Silk with '*chaaloo yaa ghatiyaa stunt*' looking at her to imply that she is infamous for it. Thus, he uses positive impoliteness (Ignore, snub the other; Exclude the other from an activity) and negative impoliteness (Explicitly associate the other with negative aspect).

Abraham's indirect comment on Silk makes Suryakanth rather uncomfortable. After a little silence, Suryakanth, scratching his moustache and looking at Silk, makes a faint cough to signal her move from there. Silk's half-opened mouth and wide-opened eyes clearly indicate that she is shocked. Feeling offended and finding no way to counter Abraham's off-record remark, she moves from there.

Suryakanth appreciates Abraham for making good films; and in response, the latter too thanks Suryakanth for appreciating his effort and cracks jokes by giving credit to '*rasam and rum*' to make others feel light

and interested. Seeing Selva Ganesh laughing at his joke, Suryakant too joins him showing a grim smile. Thus, they reciprocate familiarity and common ground to enhance one another's positive face wants.

Surya: Lekin tumhaari filmen commercially successful nahin hongi. Hoon, kisi film festival ki to garmi badhaa sakati hain, lekin theatre men to kuttaa bhi nahin munh maarataa. Am I right? [But your films aren't commercially successful. They captivate the audience at film festivals but they fail to bring in even a dog at local theatres. Is that right?]

Selva: Right sir.

Surya: Spice it up. Abraham! Spice it up. Sex daalo. Silk kaa ek gaanaa daalo, do gaanaa daalo, whatever you like. Dekho! Successful film vahi hoti hai jisame masaalaa sahi ho. Right Selva? [... Add some sex. Have Silk dance to a number or two, whatever you like. Let me tell you successful films are those that have the right spice...]

Selva: Genius sir. You are a genius.

Surya: It's a curse Selva. It's a curse.

Suryakanth has some reservations in his mind. No sooner does he stop smirking, than he criticises Abraham's films for failing to meet commercial viability (*lekin tumhaari...nahin hongi*). Though he admits that his films can attract people at film festivals, they cannot even drive a mongrel to theatre. The given expression which predicts the negative impact of the sort of films Abraham wants to make, can be seen as a direct threat to his negative face as it goes contrary to his beliefs. Putting both positive and negative impacts of his films, Surya cites the reasons as to why the idea should be dropped. Using over-generalised remark (*hoon kisi...munh maarataa*), Suryakanth shows his reluctance to cause potential FTA to Abraham's negative face; therefore, he raises a yes-no question to seek an agreement. Thus, he employs positive impoliteness by predicting commercial failure of his films and underestimating the viewers' response.

Suryakanth's comment makes Abraham dazed. However, Selva Ganesh, endorses Suryakanth's viewpoint (*Right sir.*) and thereby he enhances his positive face. Further, Suryakanth suggests making films spicy by adding 'sex' and Silk's numbers, seeking Selva Ganesh's approval (*Spice it up...right Selva?*). Impressed by his suggestion, Selva Ganesh laughingly endorses it (*Genius sir! You are a genius.*); thereby he enhances Suryakanth's positive face want. Then, Suryakanth says that it is a curse. The expression seems to involve implicature intending the hearer to elicit the meaning as it is not clear what is curse.

Abraham: Sir! I am a director, not a pimp. Main film banaane nikalaa hoon, sex bechane nahin. Aur aap log is ghatiyaa aurat ke saath kaam kar sakate ho, main nahin. [... I want to make a film, not sell sex. Perhaps you can work with that cheap girl but I can't! Right.]

Surya: Right. To Selva, tumhin direct kar lo. [Fine, then Selva you direct it.]

Selva: OK sir. Then bye.

Abraham gets annoyed noticing Suryakanth and Selva Ganesh thwarting his plan. He reminds Suryakanth that he is a director not a pimp who sells sex. Reminding his position, he clears that he is aware of his gains and has self-esteem in this regard. The act of reminding his own position threatens the addressee's negative face as the speaker puts some pressure on him to recognise his position. The expression '*main film...bechane nahin*' is counter remark on Suryakanth's belief that films hit when they have right amount of spice (sex). He adds that they can work with that cheap girl but he cannot. Associating Suryakanth and Selva Ganesh with Silk whom he regards as a cheap girl (*ghatiyaa ladaki*), Abraham implies that they are no better than her. This undoubtedly causes FTA to both the hearers' positive face wants. In this way, the speaker dissociates himself from others (*Aur aap log...main nahin.*) employing positive impoliteness.

Abraham's firm decision not to entertain Silk leaves Suryakanth shell shocked. As a result, he asks Selva to direct the film (*Right, to Selva tumhi direct kar lo.*). No sooner does Suryakanth finish his statement than Selva accepts his proposal (*OK sir.*) and turning to Abraham says him bye (*Then bye.*). Abraham might not have imagined that his proposal would be refused so easily. Selva Ganesh's act of bidding bye with a sarcastic smile adds more to his problem which causes positive impoliteness (Ignore, snub the other).

Silk: Tumhen mujhase problem kyaa hai? [Why do you have a problem with me?]

Abraham: Problem tere maan-baap se hai. Unhen tujhe paidaa hi nahin karanaa chaahiye thaa. [I have a problem with your parents. They shouldn't have given birth to you.]

Silk: Mujhe mere maan-baap ne janm nahin diyaa. Silk ko janm diyaa hai un logon ne jo mujhe chaahate hain. [My parents didn't give birth to me. Silk was brought into this world by the people who admire me.]

No sooner does red-faced Abraham leave the room than Silk interrupts him asking why he is allergic to her (*Tumhe mujhase problem kyaa hai?*). Her enquiry-cum-complaint is a reaction to his negative attitude

towards her. The complaint is an FTA to Abraham's freedom of action (negative face wants) as it forces him to respond, and thereby it doubles the amount of FTA to Abraham's face which has already got a big shot in the arm from Suryakanth and Selva Ganesh. Consequently, Abraham attacks her accusing her parents responsible for this problem (*problem tere...chaahiye thaa.*). One's parents are the most respectable individuals in one's life and such a disparaging remark invites high risk of FTA to one's face. The accusation levelled against her parents certainly drags her social image down, and thereby causes an FTA to her negative face. Thus, Abraham uses bald-on-record impoliteness as it is direct, unambiguous and concise, and is intended to attack the addressee's face wants.

Surprisingly, Silk remains cool; there is sign of anger on her face. She boldly tells that it is not her parents rather her admirers who brought her into this world (*mujhe mere...chaahate hain.*). Thus, she tries to neutralise the effect of FTA caused by Abraham, thereby, she lets his comment hang in the air. Mention her admirers the reason behind her success, she tries to raise her value in his eyes. Her explanation could be seen as a strategy to tease Abraham as it proves him wrong.

Abraham: Tere chaahane waale naa, saamane ke chaar udhar baidhate hain. Peechhe ki chaalis rows meri hai. Main saabit kar doonga ki filmen tere jaise logon ki wajah se nahin chalti. [Your admirers occupy the first four rows in a cinema hall. The 40 rows at the back are mine. I will prove that films don't need gimmicks like you to sell.]

Silk: Filmen sirf teen cheejon ki wajah se chalti hain ... entertainment, entertainment, entertainment. Aur main entertainment hoon. [Films need three things to sell... entertainment, entertainment, entertainment! And I am entertainment.]

Abraham, using bald-on-record impoliteness, again attacks her mentioning that she has got only four admirers in the front row of the hall while the remaining 40 rows are of his admirers (*tere chaahane...meri hain*). Stressing that his admirers outnumber her admirers, he wants to underrate her popularity though he knows that the reality is different. The use of pronoun '*tere*' suggests that he has little respect for her social image as in Hindi speaking community it is usually interpreted as impolite. Abraham challenges that he would prove that films hit not because of people like her (*main saabit...nahin chalti.*). The given utterance attacks Silk's beliefs and underestimates her recognition as an actor. Thus, Abraham employs negative impoliteness strategy (Condescend, scorn or ridicule). Despite Abraham's continuous effort to

damage Silk's face, she remains calm as there is no sign of resentment or surprise on her face. Instead, she smilingly tells that films hit because of entertainment and she is an entertainment (*filmen sirf...hoon.*). The non-verbal expressions reveal that she takes a short pause followed by a wink before uttering the expression 'aur main entertainment hoon' to communicate that films are all about entertainment and luckily she can offer what the audience expect. The winking indicates she involves implicature and whatever she has stated cannot be taken blindly. Thus, the given turn can be viewed as an example of off-record impoliteness intended to ridicule the hearer and thereby trying to damage his face wants indirectly.

III. CONCLUSION

The exchanges held between Sudhir, a casting director, and Silk, an ambitious village girl, in the first scene of *The Dirty Picture* are the examples of the use of impoliteness strategies in interpersonal discourse. Sudhir employs off-record impoliteness most often, followed by positive and negative impoliteness. He involves off-record impoliteness as an implicature to refuse Silk's request and avoid direct threat to her face. However, Silk fails to construe his off-record impoliteness, except his direct comments, due to the intellectual and cultural gap between her and Sudhir. Sudhir's utterances appear to be domineering as compared to Silk's innocent requests and responses. His use of impoliteness strategies is more of circumstantial than intentional. At the surface level, Sudhir seems to humiliate Silk on her appearance that raises feminist issues. However, observing critically under the surface and considering Sudhir's qualification, position and responsibilities, one could very well understand the limit of the patience he could have. This helps us understand the reason behind the use of impoliteness strategies inconsistent with the level of the co-interactants.

In the second scene, Suryakanth employs positive impoliteness to snub Silk's acting and to exclude her from the film. He uses impoliteness strategies not only to criticise her performance but also to exercise power on her in order to attract her submission to his calibre, experience and position. Being a superstar Suryakanth is privileged to exercise his power over Silk who is novice in acting but ambitious to make an entry. His perception about Silk is that she is dwarf against his personality. Silk not only fails to perceive the implied meaning of his remarks rather counters him with her innocent but logical arguments which prove to be a challenge to his sense of superiority which doesn't allow him to indulge in arguments with the girl like Silk. Her counter response hurts his ego; consequently, Suryakanth declares the cancellation of

shooting. Such an incident becomes a brilliant example of breach of harmony, trust, friendship and cooperation in interpersonal relations.

In the last scene, Abraham, while talking to Suryakanth of his new film, uses a number of impoliteness strategies to attack Silk that doesn't go well with Suryakanth who is attracted towards her. Suryakanth criticises Abraham's films for losing the interest of the viewers. He recommends to include Silk's item numbers in the film to attract the audience but Abraham refuses his idea at once alleging that they (Suryakanth and Selva Ganesh) can sell sex to make their films hit but he cannot. The exchange of impoliteness between them results in break-up of their ties. Likewise, Abraham spoils his relationship with Silk too by making disparaging comments on her parents, social standing and talent.

The factor behind the conflict in communication between Sudhir and Silk (Scene-I), Suryakanth and Silk (Scene-II) and Suryakanth and Abraham, and Abraham and Silk (Scene-III) is superiority complex or inferiority complex which is the general feature visible in the day-to-day discourse. Sudhir's choice of impoliteness strategies are provoked by his high stature as a film director before Silk who has no position; that is why she appears to be of no use for him. It becomes evident in the second scene when Suryakanth compares her worth with the cigarette cover. But the response given by Silk to Suryakanth, through the example of rain, punctures the balloon of not only his ego but also of the persons at high position because it reminds the inevitable significance of the people of the low stature, which sends the audience home with the lesson of co-existence, cooperation, and social harmony among the people of different classes.

Thus, on the basis of analysis it can be said that people use (im)politeness strategies as a powerful tool to defend ones face, offend other's face, exercise power over the target, influence interpersonal relationship, etc. The discourse in *The Dirty Picture* is a prototypical model of real life discourse. Such conflicts in interpersonal relations can be resolved by having empathy with other.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bousfield, D. *Impoliteness in Interaction* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2008a. Print.
- [2] Bousfield, D. 'Impoliteness in the struggle for power'. In Bousfield, D. and Locher, M.A. (eds.) *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice* Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 2008b. 127-153. Print.

- [3] Brown, P. and Levinson, S.C. *Politeness: Some universals in Language Usage* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1987 [1978]. Print.
- [4] Culpeper, J. 'Towards an anatomy of impoliteness' *Journal of Pragmatics* 25. 1996. 349-367. Online. <[https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00014-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3)> retrieved on 10 January 2020.
- [5] Culpeper, J., Bousfield, D. and Wichmann, A. 'Impoliteness revisited: with special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects' *Journal of Pragmatics* 35. 2003. 1545-1579. Online. <[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00118-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00118-2)> retrieved on 23 January 2020.
- [6] Culpeper, J. Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The Weakest Link. *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture* 1. 2005. 35-72. Online. <<https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.35>> retrieved on 19 February 2021.
- [7] Culpeper, J. 'Reflections on impoliteness, relational work and power'. In Bousfield, D. and Locher, M.A. (eds.). *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 2008. 17-44. Print.
- [8] Culpeper, J. *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2011. Print.
- [9] Locher, M.A. and Bousfield, D. 'Introduction: Impoliteness and power in language'. In Bousfield, D. and Locher, M.A. (eds.). *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 2008. 1-13. Print.
- [10] Terkourafi, M. 'Towards a unified theory of politeness, impoliteness, and rudeness'. In Bousfield, D. and Locher, M.A. (eds.). *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 2008. 45-74. Print.
- [11] *The Dirty Picture* <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Dirty_Picture> retrieved on 14 June 2022.
- [12] *The Dirty Picture* (2011). Milan Luthria (Director). Shobha Kapoor and Ekta Kapoor (Producer).