Requests in Film Dialogue and Dubbing Translation

Requests in Film Dialogue and Dubbing Translation:

A Comparative Study of English and Italian

By

Vittorio Napoli

Cambridge Scholars
Publishing

Requests in Film Dialogue and Dubbing Translation:
A Comparative Study of English and Italian

By Vittorio Napoli

This book first published 2021

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2021 by Vittorio Napoli

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-6405-3
ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-6405-3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AmE:	American English
AVT:	Audiovisual Translation
BrE:	British English
CA:	Conversation Analysis
CCSARP:	Cross-Cultural Speech Act Research Project
D:	Social distance
DCT:	Discourse completion test
FTA:	Face-threatening act
H:	Hearer
ILP:	Interlanguage Pragmatics
P:	Relative power
PCFD:	Pavia Corpus of Film Dialogue
Pos face:	Positive face threat
S:	Speaker
SL:	Source language
ST:	Source text
TL:	Target language
TT:	Target text

LIST OF TABLES

List of Figures

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is never easy to thank every single person who, in one way or the other, has contributed to the accomplishment of an enterprise, however big or small it may be. I have many people, on my side, to express my gratitude to. Many people who have been there for me in my academic and private life during these three years of PhD study and without whom every page of this book would not have been possible. But I will start where it all began, in a French brasserie in Tours.

We were all language assistants temporarily working in France as native speakers in high school foreign language classes and came from all over the world. That night was one of the many nights we hung out together to enjoy our French stay, because our service at school did not start before late in the morning. We were all sitting at the table of this brasserie, a bit tipsy and sipping on our drinks when Drew, the English assistant, a stereotypically British guy oozing self-restraint and discretion, made a joke about the Spaniards being direct and abrupt, referring to the two Spanish twin sisters of the group: Elena and Marina. At one point of the conversation, Drew started telling the story of when, a few days before, he had heard Marina saying to Elena, in Spanish: "¡ Elena, la puerta !", abruptly ordering her to close the door. I remember your hilarious face, Drew, while you were aping them. We all burst out laughing because you, so typically British, could not possibly understand how someone could ask a favour in that way and you wondered, out loud: "What do you want me to do with the door? Close it? Half close it? Open it?...Well, it's better to say *Could you close the door, please*? So much clearer and more polite!", you mocked them teasingly in a mixture of puzzlement and laughter.

I was laughing myself right then but on my way home, when I was alone, I could not stop thinking about that excellent example of intercultural communication pragmatic incident and it immediately dawned on me how important it might be to analyse similar cross-cultural differences in a translational perspective. What if that utterance had been uttered by a Spanish film character and had been translated literally for an English audience? Would the viewer from another lingua-culture have reacted like Drew? And how would all this impact on the character's characterization?

I could not go to sleep over the thought that maybe no-one had ever investigated how polite and impolite requests, such as "la puerta!", which was felt to be normal by two Spanish speakers but had sparked hilarity in an English speaker, were handled in translation for dubbing. Little by little, the next days, I pieced together my research proposal, secured a PhD position at the University of Pavia and finally lived out my dream: doing research.

That very small, tiny idea that night turned out to become a research project and the emotions that I feel now that this path has come to a completion are too overwhelming to be put into words: it was all so fast and wonderfully unexpected. But if there are words I want to spend, these go to the people I wish to thank for making this PhD experience possible, profitable and enjoyable.

My first thanks go to Drew, Elena and Marina: thank you for being that inspirational for me, the authors of this book are in fact you. A special thanks goes to prof. Pavesi, my supervisor: thank you Maria, you have been more than a supervisor to me, you have been an invaluable source of academic inspiration. Your intellectual rigor and strictness have put me to test but ultimately laid the basis for any small and big improvement in my academic writing and in my academic ideas which I only owe to you. A special thanks goes to prof. Mellinger (University of North Carolina) and to prof. Hanson (Butler University): thank you Chris and Tom for your precious statistical advice and for helping a PhD student that you barely knew. Your consultancy was invaluable to me. A wholehearted thanks goes to prof. Culpeper (Lancaster University) and to prof. Kecskes (University at Albany) for being two excellent supervisors and sources of inspiration for my knowledge in pragmatics and (im)politeness, during my research stays in the UK and in the US. Many thanks to all the academics I met during the conferences I had the chance to attend: every bit of conversation with each one of you has helped me shape up and hone my ideas and made me more aware of the weaknesses and strengths of my research. Thank you: you have contributed to making every page of this book become what it is now. A big thanks goes to my family and friends who always supported me and believed in me in the easiest and in the hardest of times.

INTRODUCTION

This book provides a thorough account of the speech act of requesting and its pragmatic features, both in English and Italian film conversation and in translation for dubbing from English into Italian. Its aim is thus two-fold. Firstly, the focus on English and Italian requests provides an insight into the similarities and differences in terms of pragmatic and (im)polite behaviour, as well as the linguistic patterns of requests in English and Italian film speech. Secondly, the focus on dubbing translation contributes to a yet largely unexplored area, namely, the way in which pragmatic phenomena and pragmatic language features, such as (im)politeness, travel across languages in the translation process. The fact that the analysis is based on audiovisual translation also makes it possible to examine the impact that the non-verbal codes that make up the complex semiotic whole of which film dialogue is but one component (along with suprasegmental features of characters' speech, as well as aural and visual information) have on the pragmatics of translated requests.

The research contributes to two areas where academic work is still scant and, therefore, it purports to fill these gaps. The first area, which is part of the field of cross-cultural pragmatics, concerns the understanding of the pragmatics and the (im)politeness of requests produced by English and Italian speakers from a cross-cultural viewpoint. No study has, to date, investigated requests or any other pragmatic act in English and Italian spontaneous speech from a comparative perspective, so possible cross-cultural pragmatic differences or similarities are still unknown. Apart from English and Italian, and speaking more broadly, studies on how speech acts, as well as the (im)polite import inherent in them, are realized by speakers from differing lingua-cultures have almost exclusively relied on data obtained through elicited speech (Márquez-Reiter 2000, Alcón-Soler 2008, Flores-Salgado 2011, Economidou-Kogetsidis and Woodfield 2012). However, there has been ample academic debate on the fact that speech acts produced under elicitation methods cannot be compared to speech acts as they are issued in real-life exchanges (Johnston et al. 1998, Golato 2003, Clark and Beebe 2006, Flöck 2016). There are a number of reasons for this, including the influence of the researcher's presence on the speaker's linguistic output and the fact that exchanges (and possible incidents thereof) occurring in a fictional scenario made up by the researcher do not have consequences on the speakers' rapport, as happens in real life.

The originality of this study consists in examining film dialogue in order to offer an insight into how requests are linguistically realized, as well as how (im)politeness is conveyed through them. Although film dialogue differs in many respects from spontaneous conversation, it is presumably more similar to it than conversation elicited through discourse completion tests or role plays. In view of this, contingent similarities or divergences in the pragmatic features of requests, as used by English and Italian film speakers, allow the formulation of hypotheses regarding the pragmatic requestive behaviour of real-life English and Italian speakers, to be tested by future investigations on spontaneous conversation. The findings and the hypotheses resulting from the present research cannot in any way be extended to spontaneous speech, but are undoubtedly thought-provoking in this sense.

The second area to which this research offers its contribution is Translation Studies, with special focus on Audiovisual Translation Studies, and involves aspects related to pragmatics from a translational perspective. The relationship between pragmatics and Translation Studies still constitutes new ground in academic circles, and issues such as how pragmatic features of language, in particular (im)politeness, travel across linguistic systems and how they are handled by translators[1] still need extensive enquiry. This study sets out to fill this gap by examining translation trends, as well as translators' strategies as observed in Italian dubbed dialogues translated from English, and by proposing possible explanations for the patterns that emerge. For instance, one of the most salient patterns observed when analysing translations is pragmatic hybridization, a phenomenon whereby translated requests exhibit features both belonging to the source language system and to the target language system.

As for the methodology adopted, the research is corpus-based and the data is made up of request realization strategies and pragmatic modification

[1] In dubbing translation, it is hardly possible to attribute linguistic strategies observed by the researcher to one figure, that of the translator, since the utterances ultimately produced by dubbing actors as heard in the target-language version are the result of the collaborative work of many figures: the translator, the adaptor (when the two are not the same person), the dubbing actor, the dubbing assistant and the dubbing director. However, when reference is made to how requests are translated, the focus and the interest of the research is the translation process proper, so that involving translation-adaption. After this stage, the text undergoes only minor manipulations by the other figures involved in the dubbing process (Martínez 2004, 6), so it is sensible to speculate that any substantial linguistic departures from the source text are made during the translation stage.

strategies collected from three film language varieties: (1) original English, (2) dubbed Italian and (3) original Italian. The research takes an onomasiological approach, in that the criterion for the collection and annotation of requests is not their linguistic realization but the pragmatic function of their components. This means that classic query-based data collection methods adopted in corpus-based studies of a semasiological nature, which follow a form-to-function rather than a function-to-form criterion, were not suitable for the study. For this reason, data was collected "manually" to create three sub-corpora (one for each language variety) by watching the films selected for data collection and annotating requests each time these were issued by on-screen characters. The requests were annotated and categorized following taxonomies adopted in previous studies and subsequently analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitative data is used both in the cross-linguistic account of request features in English and in Italian dialogues and in the translational account of requests in dubbed Italian. Qualitative data, on the other hand, is mainly referred to in the description of the role that non-verbal information in film translation, including audiovisual constraints proper to dubbing, have on the translation of requests from a pragmatic viewpoint.

Qualitative analyses focus on single request pairs made up of the original English utterance and its translated utterance in dubbed dialogue and consist in case studies that discuss translation strategies and translators' choices against the background of the non-verbal semiotic whole in which the request is embedded. Quantitative analyses, which also make use of statistical methods, are useful in bringing to light the major trends concerning the linguistic realization of requests with a focus on their pragmatic and (im)polite import in the two film languages, as well as the major translation patterns that emerge from the double comparison between original English and dubbed Italian, on the one hand, and dubbed Italian and original Italian, on the other hand.

Both in the cross-linguistic part of the book, which compares English and Italian, and in the translation part, which involves dubbed dialogues analysed against original English and original Italian dialogues, requests are investigated from a pragmalinguistic viewpoint and from the viewpoint of the communicative context. In the former approach, the focus is on the realization strategies and on the pragmatic modifiers through which requests are issued in the three language varieties, independently of the communicative on-screen contexts in which characters interact. In the latter approach, on the contrary, three pragmatic variables which contribute to shaping the communicative context where the request is uttered and which were selected for the present research were included in the analysis: (1) the degree of intimacy or distance between interactants, (2) the presence or absence of power imbalance between them and (3) the presence or absence of implied criticism carried by some requests. The three variables were chosen because, based on previous studies, they were hypothesized to influence pragmatic behaviour and the (im)polite import of the speech act. In the communicative context approach, requests were thus investigated against the influence that these parameters might have had on their different linguistic realizations and so on their pragmatic and (im)polite load.

The book is structured as follows: Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 provide the reader with the theoretical background useful to interpret the findings of the research and to position them in the context of research carried out to date. Chapter 1 provides the theoretical framework for the speech act of requesting and, more broadly, for (im)politeness research. Chapter 2 reviews the main studies carried out on film dialogue, Translation Studies and Audiovisual Translation from a pragmatic perspective, with special focus on dubbing, which is relevant to this investigation. Chapter 3 is dedicated to the methodological approach adopted and explains how data collection was performed. In Chapter 3, the taxonomy containing the pragmatic categories that make up requests, used to first annotate and then codify the data, is presented, together with the criteria followed for data annotation. Chapter 4 focuses on the analysis of requests in English and Italian film speech and thus represents the part of the book which deals with issues of film dialogue in the two languages from a cross-cultural pragmatic perspective. Chapter 5 introduces the data relative to the translational part of the research and deals with translation patterns and translators' strategies in terms of pragmatic features and (im)politeness of requests. Chapter 6 critically discusses the data laid out in Chapters 4 and 5 by grouping them into macro topics and by generating speculation based on previous scholarly work on similar issues where possible. To conclude, Chapter 7 summarizes the main findings as well as the hypotheses put forward throughout the book and points out areas and issues which particularly deserve further enquiry, to foster debate in light of the contributions offered by the study.

CHAPTER 1

(IM)POLITENESS RESEARCH AND THE SPEECH ACT OF REQUESTING

Politeness research

The first time reference was made to linguistic politeness in academic circles was in Lakoff's widely-cited work "The Logic of Politeness, or, Minding your p's and q's" (1973). Referring to speakers' pragmatic competence, Lakoff posited the existence of two abilities: "Be clear", which is reminiscent of Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975), and "Be polite". Lakoff's contention was that, in view of the importance of maintaining good rapport in interpersonal communication, being polite takes precedence over being pragmatically clear (1973, 297) and proposed a politeness principle consisting of three rules (1973, 298): "Don't impose" (rule 1), "Give options" (rule 2) and "Make A feel good, be friendly" (rule 3).

Later on, drawing on Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975), Brown and Levinson's work "Politeness: some Universals in Language Usage" (1978/1987) represented the very first pioneering contribution to politeness research, leading it to become an independent field of enquiry. The work proposed a theoretical framework comprising linguistic strategies for performing politeness, with a focus on speech acts. However, to fully understand the tenets of Brown and Levinson's theory and before expanding on it, reference to Goffman's previous work "Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior" (1967) is needed.

Goffman is credited with having coined the notion of "face", which has dominated politeness research in the past and continues to be greatly influential in conceptualizing and explaining how people produce and perceive (im)polite language. Goffman defined face as: "The positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact. Face is an image of self, delineated in terms of approved social attributes" (1967, 5). Goffman thinks of face as the positive image that each of us wants others to recognize and relates to how we want to be perceived in the course of verbal exchanges. In the scholar's view, to avoid or redress the sometimes inevitable damage to the hearer's face, interactants have to engage in "face-work" (1967, 12), which designates linguistic strategies for avoiding conflict and restoring harmony by redressing the potential face damage incurred during potentially conflictual exchanges.

Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) elaborated on Goffman's notion of face and coined two different labels for it, namely, *positive face* and *negative face*. Positive face refers to people's desire to be liked and approved of by others, while negative face is the desire to act autonomously and be free from others' impositions. Positive face is defined as: "the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others [...] in particular, it includes the desire to be ratified, understood, approved of, liked or admired" (1987, 62) and negative face is "the want of every competent adult member that his actions be unimpeded by others" (1987, 62). Brown and Levinson drew on Speech Act Theory (Austin 1962, Searle 1969) and argued that some speech acts intrinsically threaten either negative or positive face, thus demeaning the interlocutor's desire to be appreciated and his/her desire to be autonomous from others' imposition respectively. For instance, requests and advice threaten the hearer's negative face, since they impinge upon his/her freedom of action, while criticism and reprimands threaten his/her positive face wants, because they undermine his/her desire for approbation. Brown and Levinson label these speech acts "face-threatening acts" (hereinafter FTAs). To avoid social conflict, which an FTA is likely to generate, the speaker can choose from a set of linguistic strategies for mitigating face threat and restoring interpersonal comity. The strategy chosen to redress face depends, in the scholars' opinion, on two sociopragmatic variables which regulate the rapport between speaker and hearer, namely, the degree of social distance and relative power, as well as the degree of imposition brought about by the object/action involved in the FTA.

Speakers have a set of linguistic "super-strategies" (Brown and Levinson 1987, 69) to choose from when mitigating an FTA: firstly, they can decide whether to perform it or not. If they decide to perform it, they can opt for the "off-record" strategy, which consists in only giving hints on which hearers can rely to infer the speaker's real illocutionary intent, or for the "on-record" strategy, through which the illocutionary intent is communicated explicitly. Going on-record can in turn entail the presence of face redress strategies or their absence, in which case no attempt at politeness is made and the strategy is called "bald on-record". If, on the contrary, speakers opt for face redress and so decide to mitigate the imposition inherent in the FTA, they can either mitigate face threat by appealing to the interlocutor's positive face wants (Brown and Levinson, 1987, 103), or by appealing to the interlocutor's negative face wants (Brown and Levinson, 1987, 70). In the first scenario, face redress is reached by appealing to the hearer's want to feel liked and cared about and encompasses strategies such as using terms of endearment within the request (e.g. "*My dear*, pass the salt") or paying a compliment (e.g. "*Your hair is amazing*! Can you tell me who your hairdresser is?"). Finally, bald on-record strategies do not involve any form of mitigation (e.g. "Help me with the cleaning"). In the second scenario, on the other hand, linguistic strategies are adopted which soften or minimize the impositive load carried by the request and include, for instance, strategies whereby the speaker asks for the hearer's ability or willingness to perform an action, rather than using imperative forms (e.g. "*Can you* pass the salt?" instead of "*Pass* the salt") or pragmatic modifiers that downplay the effort involved in the action (e.g. "If you drive me to the supermarket and wait for me, *I will only be inside for a couple of minutes*").

Brown and Levinson contend that the level of pragmatic directness or indirectness of an FTA (which they equate with less and more politeness respectively) and the choice of the four aforementioned linguistic strategies for performing an FTA vary according to the speaker's calculation of: social distance between interactants, relative power (whether there is a power imbalance between requester and requestee) and ranking of imposition of the action involved in the FTA. They propose the following formula for the calculation of the politeness degree required for a given FTA, which in turn determines the linguistic strategy to choose: $Wx = D (S; H) + P (H; S) + Rx$. Wx stands for "weightiness of the FTA" and ultimately determines which of the four super-strategies the speaker will select, depending on the level of politeness required, D is the degree of social distance between speaker (S) and hearer (H), P is the degree of power imbalance between speaker and hearer (if there is any) and Rx is the ranking of imposition of the action involved in the FTA. The ranking of imposition refers to how "costly" the object of the FTA is. In the case of criticism, complaining to someone about his/her driving is less costly than complaining about his/her dishonesty as a friend. Similarly, in requests, asking to borrow a pen does not carry the same degree of imposition as asking to borrow one hundred dollars.

Later on, still drawing on Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975) and on Speech Act Theory (Austin 1962, Searle 1969), in "Principles of Pragmatics" (1983), Leech introduces his theory of politeness consisting of "maxims", which he labels *Politeness Principle*. Leech's summary of the underlying the model and the communication of politeness is: "Minimize (other things being equal) the expression of impolite beliefs [...] Maximize (other things being equal) the expression of polite beliefs" (1983, 81). Leech's Politeness

Principle consists of six maxims: *maxim of tact, maxim of generosity, maxim of approbation, maxim of modesty, maxim of agreement* and *maxim of sympathy* (Leech 1983, 132):

(I) TACT MAXIM: minimize cost to O, [and maximize benefit to O]
(II) GENEROSITY MAXIM: minimize benefit to S, [and maximize cost to S]
(III) APPROBATION MAXIM: minimize dispraise of O, [and maximize praise of O]
(IV) MODESTY MAXIM: minimize praise to S, [and maximize dispraise to S]
(V) AGREEMENT MAXIM: minimize disagreement between S and O [and maximize agreement between S and O]
(VI) SYMPATHY MAXIM: minimize antipathy between S and O [and maximize sympathy between S and O].

By introducing these maxims, Leech maintains that while Grice's Cooperative Principle accounts for *how* people convey indirect meaning through implicatures, his own model of politeness explains *why* indirect meaning (and implicatures thereof) is preferred over directness and clarity, for reasons of politeness.

Subsequently, Fraser and Nolen (1981) contributed to paving the way for a discourse-based approach to politeness. Previously, politeness had only been investigated at the utterance level and had only focused on the speaker's output, thus fully ignoring the role of the hearer in the construal of (im)politeness. They introduced the notion of Conversational Contract (CC) which posits that, when starting a conversation, speakers bring with them a set of rights and a set of obligations that both speaker and hearer hold and that shape the interaction. These rights and obligations are mutually held and manifest and may well change in the course of interaction: an interactant can become more powerful and hence gain more rights than obligations, or vice-versa. The novelty of such an approach to politeness is that the hearer comes to be included in the picture, together with the speaker. Evaluations of (im)politeness grow out of, and depend upon, whether or not these rights and obligations are respected: in the case of requests, for instance, the requester will select a certain linguistic strategy which corresponds to the level of politeness required, depending on how legitimate his/her request is (how entitled he/she is to ask something of the hearer) and how the hearer is expected or obliged to comply with it (Fraser 1990, 233).

Also worth mentioning is Terkourafi's (2005) contribution to politeness research, who is credited with having introduced a frame-based approach to politeness, previously taken by Aijmer (1996). According to Terkourafi, "it is the regular co-occurrence of particular types of context and particular linguistic expressions […] that create the perception of politeness" (2005, 248). She took the notion of linguistic frames (Goffman 1974, Fillmore 1976, Tannen 1993, Escandell-Vidal 1996) and applied it to politeness. According to the frame-based approach, the use of a particular degree of politeness in interactions is often harnessed to certain regular communicative situations (aka frames), so the speaker selects certain politeness formulae over others because they are conventionally and routinely associated with that type of exchange, which has occurred many times in the past and which is stored in the speaker's memory. Terkourafi argues that frames can then create expectations, in both speakers and hearers, concerning the level of politeness required in a given type of communicative situation.

In "Rapport management: a framework for analysis" (2000), Spencer-Oatey introduces the notion of *rapport management* as an alternative to Goffman's and Brown and Levinson's *facework*. She distinguishes between *face* (corresponding to Brown and Levinson's positive face) and *sociality rights* (corresponding to Brown and Levinson's negative face). Face is further subdivided into *quality face, relational face* and *social identity face*. Quality face is the need to feel appreciated as an individual and for one's own competences and qualities (which more closely overlaps with Brown and Levinson's positive face), relational face is the want for one's abilities and qualities to be recognized by the social group to which one belongs, and social identity face is the desire for other people to acknowledge and uphold one's social identities and roles. Sociality rights, on the other hand, refer to the collective dimension of the individual and his/her entitlements as to what to expect of others. They include two (seemingly contradictory) needs: *equity rights* and *association rights*. The first represents the need to be unimpeded by others and to be autonomous (which corresponds to Brown and Levinson's negative face), while the second represents the desire to feel involved in the collective life of a community or group.

Until 2000, studies investigating politeness-related phenomena had always used the single speech act as their unit of analysis and had only placed their focus on the speaker. The year 2000 was a watershed, since it marked the advent of the so-called "discursive turn" or "post-modern turn" (Eelen 2001, Mills 2003, Watts 2003, Locher 2006, Locher and Watts 2005). This new line of thinking regarding politeness advocated for the need to abandon theories and methodological approaches that were utterance-based and speaker-based and so failed to conceptualize (im)politeness at the discourse level. This new approach focused instead on the development and on the negotiation of (im)politeness (meaning that impoliteness began to receive due attention) at the discourse level. From a methodological viewpoint, the unit of analysis ceased to be the single utterance, isolated from its communicative context, and came to include the multiple turns that make up conversation, through which both speakers and hearers evaluate (im)politeness, and how they change and are continuously re-shaped during interaction. More prominence was given to the figure of the hearer and his/her evaluations of (im)politeness, as well as to the speaker's utterances and his/her (im)polite intent. Scholars advocated for larger units of analysis, namely, entire speech events and chunks of discourse, rather than single utterances (Haugh 2007, 14) and brought to the fore the interactants' conversational struggle over evaluations of what constitutes polite or impolite behaviour. Scholars of the discursive turn also argued that politeness should not be an abstract and merely theoretical concept designed by the analyst but should move according to real speakers' evaluations and metapragmatic comments, which should be used as a starting point for building a theoretical framework (Eelen 2001, 253; Watts 2003, 143). From a methodological point of view, the discursive turn advocated for the use of corpora, which made it possible to collect and investigate data from real-life interactions. This provided analysts with a base for their research hypotheses and to develop theories from genuine pieces of conversation and not from their own intuitions.

Among the most well-known representatives of the discursive turn are Locher and Watts (2008) who conceive of politeness as a social behaviour which does not occur in a vacuum but is tied to the context and negotiated by interactants, making it subject to change. They maintain that speakers' norms and expectations concerning (im)polite behaviour in a given communicative event can derive from past experiences in which the speaker has found him/herself in a similar setting, place and time. In this respect, Locher and Watts echo Terkourafi's frame-based approach to politeness and maintain that "frames are cognitive conceptualizations of forms of appropriate and inappropriate behaviour that individuals have constructed through their own histories of social practice" (Locher and Watts 2008, 78). The scholars coined the term *relational work*, as an alternative to Brown and Levinson's *facework*, which harks back to Halliday's (1973) interpersonal level of communication (Locher and Watts 2005, 11) and which highlights the fact that politeness is not tied to a single individual's face but is rather a dynamic and fluid notion co-constructed by both speaker and hearer during interaction.

Another contribution to the discursive turn was given by Watts (1992) who introduced the concept of *politic behaviour*. He argues that politeness and impoliteness are not dichotomous concepts, because there exists a continuum going from what is (evaluated as) impolite to what is (evaluated as) polite. In the middle of this continuum there is politic behaviour, which designates the "normal", unmarked behaviour (neither polite, nor impolite) that speakers expect of their interlocutors in a particular interaction, based on previous similar communicative contexts and on the norms that the regularity of such contexts has set with time. For instance, responding to a greeting with a greeting or thanking someone for a gift received is part of politic behaviour and is neither polite nor impolite. According to Watts, politic behaviour is not conspicuous, so it passes unnoticed and it is not remembered, whereas behaviour which is marked towards excessive impoliteness or politeness (over-polite behaviour), is noticed, remembered and evaluated negatively since it deviates from the norm.

To conclude with this brief review of the main politeness scholars and their theories, worth mentioning is Haugh (2013, 1) who forcefully argues that (im)politeness research should focus on *evaluations* of (im)polite speech rather than simply basing itself on single utterances and considering them inherently (im)polite. These evaluations cannot but emerge during interaction and are co-constructed by participants, so Haugh argues for a discourse-based methodological approach. One reason why (im)politeness should be studied in its context is that, quite frequently, the speaker intends to be polite or impolite, but the hearer does not perceive him/her as such, or vice versa (Haugh 2013, 2). According to the scholar, analysts should conceptualize evaluations and productions of (im)polite speech as a real "social practice" in and of itself (Haugh 2013, Kadar and Haugh 2013) and not as phenomena which are only constituents of conversation. Referring to the discursive feature of (im)politeness, Haugh argues that evaluations of (im)politeness by participants in a conversation influence their next linguistic moves, which in turn determine future evaluations of (im)politeness that will in turn influence the formulation of new utterances, and so on. This chain of (im)politeness evaluations generated by and in turn generating other instances of (im)politeness was labelled *reflexive (im)politeness* (Haugh 2013, 9). Haugh goes on to argue that speakers ground their evaluations of linguistic behaviour as polite or impolite, appropriate or inappropriate, on the so-called *moral order* which Garfinkel (1964, 35-36) had previously described as the "taken for granted", "seen but not noticed", "expected, background features of everyday scenes". The moral order, which dictates the appropriate social norms of a particular interaction in a particular communicative context, to which speakers appeal and which hearers expect, is also co-construed and jointly constructed by participants: it is not stable or fixed a priori, but changes as the conversation proceeds (Haugh 2015). The next section introduces the more recent line of research on impoliteness.

Impoliteness research

> "Impoliteness comes about when: (1) the speaker communicates face-attack intentionally, or (2) the hearer perceives and/or constructs behaviour as intentionally face-attacking, or a combination of (1) and (2)"
> (Culpeper 2005, 38).

From the above definition given by Culpeper (2005), it can be understood that impoliteness can also constitute intentional and deliberate attacking behaviour and cannot be simply reduced to the absence of politeness, as had been conceptualized previously in early accounts of politeness research (Brown and Levinson 1987). Another definition is attempted by Bousfield (2008, 72) who argues that: "impoliteness constitutes the communication of intentionally gratuitous and conflictive verbal face-threatening acts which are purposefully delivered".

Scholarly work on impoliteness, initiated by Culpeper (1996), is more recent and arguably scanter than the work carried out on politeness (Eelen 2001). The fact that enquiries have mainly addressed politeness and arguably neglected impoliteness is not surprising, since politeness is more common in everyday interactions, geared as they are towards preventing social conflict and fostering social comity (Terkourafi 2008, Culpeper 2010, Chung Kwong Ho 2011) as opposed to impolite behaviour which, on the contrary, seeks to create disharmony (Culpeper et al. 2003). As Culpeper rightly put it (2010), polite behaviour is normal and unmarked, while intentionally impolite behaviour is noticed, commented upon and salient, since it challenges the norms of smooth interaction (Leech 2014, 219). Studies of impoliteness began to emerge (Culpeper 1996, Tracy and Tracy 1998, Culpeper et al. 2003, Mills 2003, Bousfield 2008, Bousfield and Locher 2008) to account for its undeniable presence in human rapport.

Eelen (2001), for example, made the claim that in numerous frameworks proposed for the study of politeness (Fraser and Nolen 1981, Leech 1983, Arndt and Janney 1985, Blum-Kulka et al. 1989), impoliteness is seen as failed or absent politeness (e.g. failure to adequately redress an FTA) or, if we imagine a continuum where politeness and impoliteness mark the two ends, as the polar opposite of politeness. For this reason, for many years, impoliteness lacked proper theorization and scholars continued to use frameworks employed in politeness research, such as the one designed by Brown and Levinson (Blum-Kulka 2005). If, on the one hand, one cannot deny that impolite behaviour may well arise when politeness is expected and the norms underlying it are breached (Culpeper 2011, 28), and consequently impoliteness is not totally independent of politeness, on the other hand, impoliteness is sometimes intentional and used to attack face