

Impoliteness Strategies in Comic TV Shows: A Case Study of Brooklyn
Nine-NineAssist.Lec. Sura Amer Abbas
Tikrit University/ College of Arts

الاستراتيجيات الفظة في المسلسلات الكوميدية: دراسة حالة لمسلسل

Brooklyn Nine-Nine

م.م. سري عامر عباس

جامعة تكريت/ كلية الآداب

Abstract

This study examines the use of impoliteness strategies in political debates featured in the sitcom Brooklyn Nine-Nine, focusing on the interactions between key characters. The study investigates how impoliteness strategies within comedic narratives significantly influence audience perception, engagement, and interpretation of humor. The analysis is grounded in Culpeper's (1996) framework, which provides an approach to impoliteness.

Data were collected from ten episodes of the series, selected due to their high frequency of impoliteness strategies. The findings indicate extensive use of bald-on-record impoliteness, sarcasm, and ridicule, which enhance audience engagement and character interactions. Additionally, impoliteness strategies serve as social commentary devices, illustrating how humor can be employed to satirize social issues while entertaining viewers. The interplay between comedy and critique not only deepens character development but also encourages audiences to reflect on societal norms that shape everyday interactions.

Moreover, the study explores how impoliteness techniques drive both the show's comedic appeal and the audience's understanding of character relationships. These strategies highlight the role of impoliteness in achieving humor and conveying a message to the audience while maintaining face.

Keywords: Impoliteness strategies, comedy, humor, face.

المخلص

تبحث هذه الدراسة استخدام استراتيجيات الوقاحة في المناظرات السياسية التي تناولها المسلسل الكوميدي Brooklyn Nine-Nine ، مع التركيز على التفاعلات بين الشخصيات الرئيسية . وتبحث الدراسة في كيفية تأثير استراتيجيات الوقاحة في السرديات الكوميدية بشكل

كبير على إدراك الجمهور للفكاهة وتفاعله معها وتفسيره لها . ويستند التحليل إلى إطار عمل كولبير (١٩٩٦)، الذي يقدم نهجاً لمفهوم الوقاحة .

جُمعت البيانات من عشر حلقات من المسلسل، اختيرت نظراً لكثرة استخدام استراتيجيات الوقاحة فيها . وتشير النتائج إلى استخدام مكثف للوقاحة الصريحة والسخرية والاستهزاء، مما يعزز تفاعل الجمهور وتفاعل الشخصيات . بالإضافة إلى ذلك، تُستخدم استراتيجيات الوقاحة كأدوات للتعليق الاجتماعي، موضحةً كيف يمكن توظيف الفكاهة للسخرية من القضايا الاجتماعية مع ترفيه المشاهدين . لا يقتصر التفاعل بين الكوميديا والنقد على تعميق تطور الشخصية فحسب، بل يشجع الجمهور أيضاً على التفكير في المعايير المجتمعية التي تُشكل التفاعلات اليومية . علاوة على ذلك، تستكشف الدراسة كيف تُعزز أساليب الوقاحة جاذبية العرض الكوميدي وفهم الجمهور لعلاقات الشخصيات . تبرز هذه الاستراتيجيات دور الوقاحة في تحقيق الفكاهة وإيصال رسالة للجمهور مع الحفاظ على كرامته.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الاستراتيجيات اللفظية، الكوميديا، الفكاهة، الوجه

INTRODUCTION

Speech acts and impoliteness serve as critical lenses to analyze communication dynamics, particularly in interactions laden with tension, critique, or humor. Speech acts, as developed in Austin's (1962) and Searle's (1969) frameworks, focus on the intentions behind utterances, whether they are to inform, request, express emotion, or enact a change in the social reality. Understanding how these intentions manifest in various contexts allows us to dissect the layers of meaning that underlie communication, revealing not only the explicit messages but also the implicit power dynamics and social norms at play.

Impoliteness, rooted in Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory and expanded by Culpeper (1996), deliberately subverts expectations of politeness to elicit emotional reactions or critique power structures. Impoliteness strategies include bald-on-record impoliteness, mock politeness, and withholding expected courtesies, often targeting the "face" a person's social value or identity within a relationship. While impoliteness in real-life communication risks conflict, its strategic use in media and satire, like comedic television shows, transforms it into a tool for engagement and social commentary. This transformation allows audiences to reflect on societal norms and question the status quo,

fostering a deeper understanding of interpersonal dynamics and cultural critiques.

The interplay of speech acts and impoliteness reveals how language can both adhere to and disrupt social norms, shaping interactions to amuse, critique, or provoke. By examining their role in communication, we gain insight into the underlying mechanics of language and its impact on relationships, societal structures, and discourse. This exploration not only highlights the complexities of human interaction but also underscores the power of language as a means of both connection and division within various contexts.

The current study aims to analyze the use of impoliteness strategies in the political debates featured in the sitcom Brooklyn Nine-Nine, with a particular focus on the interactions between key characters. The study examines the strategic use of impoliteness in comedy shows and whether it significantly influences audience perception, interaction, and interpretation of humor. These strategies are integral tools for shaping character dynamics, driving narratives, and delivering social critiques. Impoliteness strategies serve as essential mechanisms for creating humor and fostering audience connection.

Additionally, Culpeper's framework of impoliteness strategies will be employed to examine the linguistic and contextual elements that define these strategies. This framework includes bald-on-record impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and withholding politeness. These categories will provide a comprehensive basis for analyzing how impoliteness strategies function within the show's comedic framework.

2.1. IMPOLITENESS

Television as a medium often serves as a reflection and critique of societal norms, with its narratives driven by the dynamics of human communication. One dimension of these narratives lies in their use of speech acts and impoliteness strategies. Speech acts, as conceptualized by Austin (1962) and later refined by Searle (1969), encompass the intentions and functions of utterances within interactions. These include assertive acts that present information, directive acts that aim to provoke actions, commissive acts that commit the speaker to future actions,

expressive acts that reveal psychological states, and declarative acts that bring about changes in the social world. Speech acts are foundational to communication as they dictate how meaning is conveyed, understood, and acted upon in varying contexts. Understanding the role of impoliteness strategies further enriches our comprehension of these interactions, as they highlight how speakers navigate social norms and power dynamics while expressing dissent or resistance.

Impoliteness strategies, on the other hand, deliberately deviate from conventional politeness norms to challenge social expectations and elicit emotional responses. Building on Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, Culpeper (1996) identified strategies of impoliteness, such as bald-on-record impoliteness (direct affronts), positive impoliteness (disrupting social bonds), negative impoliteness (threatening autonomy), sarcasm (mock politeness), and withholding politeness (neglecting expected social courtesies). These strategies frequently aim to attack the "face" of the interlocutor, either their positive face (the desire for approval) or their negative face (the desire for autonomy). While often perceived as disruptive in real-world interactions, these strategies become a rich source of engagement, confrontation, and humor when used in television. This unique application of impoliteness not only highlights the complexities of communication but also serves to entertain audiences by subverting traditional expectations, creating moments that resonate with viewers on a deeper emotional level.

In the context of the popular sitcom Brooklyn Nine-Nine, impoliteness strategies intersect with speech acts to shape character dynamics and narrative progression. For instance, the assertive acts by characters like Captain Holt frequently reflect his stern demeanor, but impoliteness strategies such as sarcasm from Gina or Jake's playful bald-on-record remarks complicate interactions, adding depth to relationships. Such combinations of speech acts and impoliteness strategies create layered communication, often subverting conventional expectations while driving relational and narrative complexities. This interplay not only enhances comedic effect but also provides insight into the characters' personalities, revealing their vulnerabilities and motivations as they navigate workplace challenges.

As Culpeper (2011) emphasizes, impoliteness in scripted media shifts from mere conflict to a tool of engagement, where the intent is not to offend genuinely but to entertain and provoke thought. This shift alters the reception of speech acts in scripted discourse, where an assertive or directive act paired with sarcastic impoliteness, for example, serves to both relay information and disrupt conversational norms for comedic or narrative effect. This dynamic is further contextualized through relevance theory (Sperber and Wilson, 1995), which suggests that audiences actively engage with layered, intentional violations of norms, deriving meaning and humor from the incongruity and cognitive effort involved. Understanding this interplay between impoliteness and audience engagement reveals how scripted media can challenge traditional communication boundaries, inviting viewers to reflect critically on social norms while simultaneously enjoying the humor embedded in these interactions.

Consequently, Brooklyn Nine-Nine emerges as an exemplar for analyzing the multifaceted use of speech acts and impoliteness strategies. Its characters employ a calculated mix of assertive insults, expressive sarcasm, and directive provocations to challenge authority, negotiate identity, and maintain workplace camaraderie. Through this lens, the show not only critiques hierarchical norms but also fosters a nuanced appreciation of language as a tool for both conflict and connection. Drawing from theories of speech acts and impoliteness, this study delves into the interplay of these linguistic strategies, offering insights into their role in shaping media discourse and audience reception. This exploration reveals how humor serves as a vehicle for addressing serious social issues, allowing viewers to engage with complex themes while enjoying the comedic elements of the show.

Emotions also play a critical role in discussions of impoliteness. Culpeper (2011: 23) incorporates the notion of "emotional consequences" into his definition of impoliteness, emphasizing their generally negative valence. He examines various subordinate emotions related to basic ones such as fear, sadness, and anger, highlighting the emotional reactions provoked by impoliteness (Culpeper, 2011: 62-65). Langlotz and Locher (2017: 303) further elaborate that emotions are inherently both personal and The

interplay of humor and social commentary ultimately invites audiences to reflect on their own experiences with authority and identity, creating a space for dialogue that transcends mere entertainment. representing cognitive processes as well as interactions that emerge in relational contexts. While an in-depth exploration of emotions and cognitive sciences is beyond the scope of this study, it acknowledges the significant interplay between emotions and impoliteness as part of its focus. This relationship underscores the complexity of human communication, where emotional responses can shape perceptions and reactions to social norms, ultimately influencing how individuals navigate interpersonal dynamics.

2.2. CONVENTIONALIZED AND NON- CONVENTIONALIZED IMPOLITENESS

The concept of conventionalized and non-conventionalized impoliteness has been extensively debated, particularly concerning the inherent qualities of impoliteness in language. Culpeper (2011) adopts a dualist perspective, viewing semantic and pragmatic impoliteness as interdependent opposites along a continuum (Culpeper, 2011: 117-125). According to him, the extent to which a linguistic expression encodes impoliteness is determined through acquired schematic knowledge, developed over time via a process of conventionalization. This process not only reflects societal attitudes but also highlights the fluidity of language as it adapts to cultural shifts and individual experiences.

Building upon Terkourafi's (2002) work on formulaic politeness, Culpeper (2011) distinguishes between two primary forms of impoliteness: conventionalized and non-conventionalized (implicational) impoliteness. Conventionalized impoliteness is analyzed by examining recurring contexts where certain expressions consistently convey impoliteness, as well as exploring metadiscourses surrounding impolite behavior (Culpeper, 2011: 133). Using Terkourafi's frame-based approach, Culpeper identifies nine categories of formulaic impoliteness in English: insults, pointed criticisms or complaints, unpalatable questions, condescensions, message enforcers, dismissals, silencers, threats, and negative expressives (Culpeper, 2011: 135-136). These

categories not only provide a framework for understanding how impoliteness operates within communication but also reveal the underlying social dynamics that shape interpersonal interactions and perceptions of politeness in various contexts.

In contrast, non-conventionalized or implicational impoliteness is classified into three subcategories, each defining how impoliteness is inferred: form-driven, convention-driven, and context-driven impoliteness (Culpeper, 2011: 155). Form-driven implicational impoliteness encompasses behaviors that implicitly convey negative messages via formal or semantic aspects, often resulting in consequences for specific individuals. This includes phenomena such as insinuation, innuendo, casting aspersions, snide remarks, mimicry, and echoed behaviors (Culpeper, 2011: 156-165). These behaviors not only challenge the recipient's social standing but also complicate the dynamics of communication, as they often leave room for interpretation and ambiguity. These complexities highlight the importance of context in interpreting impolite behaviors, as cultural norms and personal experiences can significantly influence how such messages are received and understood. Such ambiguity can lead to misunderstandings and conflicts, as individuals may struggle to discern the intent behind these subtle forms of impoliteness, thereby affecting their responses and overall interpersonal relationships.

Convention-driven implicational impoliteness involves mixed messages that simultaneously point to both polite and impolite interpretations. These can stem from internal multimodal mismatches (e.g., contradictions between verbal and non-verbal cues) or external contextual mismatches (e.g., communication that defies situational expectations) (Culpeper, 2011: 165-180). Understanding these nuances is crucial for effective communication as it enables individuals to navigate the intricate landscape of social interactions and respond appropriately to ambiguous signals.

Lastly, context-driven implicational impoliteness arises when there is no explicit marker or mismatch with conventional politeness formulas. Instead, the interpretation of impoliteness relies on strong contextual expectations. This category includes instances where behavior is either unmarked or expected behavior is completely absent (Culpeper, 2011: 180-183). Recognizing

these subtle forms of impoliteness can greatly enhance one's ability to engage in nuanced conversations, fostering a deeper understanding of interpersonal dynamics and promoting more effective conflict resolution strategies.

2.3. THE CONCEPT OF FACE

The concept of "face" is integral to understanding communication, especially within the frameworks of politeness and impoliteness. Rooted in Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, "face" represents a person's public self-image or social value that they want to maintain in interactions. It is divided into two primary types: positive face, the desire to be liked, appreciated, and included, and negative face, the desire for autonomy and freedom from imposition. Understanding these dimensions of "face" is crucial as they influence how individuals navigate social interactions and the strategies they employ to either uphold or challenge each other's self-image during conversations.

Impoliteness, as defined by Culpeper (1996, 2011), actively challenges or threatens an individual's face, either intentionally or unintentionally. For instance, positive impoliteness strategies undermine someone's need for inclusion and respect through actions like insults or dismissive remarks. Conversely, negative impoliteness strategies attack an individual's desire for autonomy, such as issuing threats or expressing disdain. These dynamics highlight the delicate balance individuals must maintain in communication, as the use of impoliteness can lead to conflict and a breakdown in relationships if not navigated carefully.

Arundale (2006) expands the notion of face, presenting it as a dynamic, "dyadic phenomenon" co-constructed during interactions. Face is not static but evolves based on communicative exchanges, emphasizing its relational aspect. Spencer-Oatey (2008) further elaborates on this by categorizing face into three dimensions: quality face (related to self-esteem and personal worth), social identity face (linked to group membership and public roles), and relational face (the perceived rights and expectations in interpersonal relationships). Impoliteness disrupts these dimensions, often damaging social harmony and rapport. Understanding the intricate interplay of these face dimensions is crucial for effective communication, as it highlights the need for

sensitivity and awareness in our interactions to maintain social cohesion.

Emotions are closely tied to face and impoliteness. As Culpeper (2011) notes, face-threatening acts often provoke negative emotional responses, such as anger, shame, or embarrassment. Langlotz and Locher (2017) describe emotions as both personal and social, emerging through interaction. Impoliteness exploits this emotional dimension by attacking face to evoke strong reactions, intensifying the communicative impact. Recognizing the emotional stakes involved in interpersonal exchanges can lead to more empathetic communication strategies, allowing individuals to navigate conflicts with greater care and understanding.

Impoliteness strategies, therefore, function as a mechanism to assert power, dominance, or critique in various contexts. By threatening or attacking face, they disrupt expected norms, reconfigure social relationships, and convey underlying intentions, making the study of face essential for understanding the dynamics of impoliteness. Understanding these dynamics not only enhances our grasp of social interactions but also informs the development of effective conflict resolution techniques that prioritize respect and mutual recognition.

2.4. IMPOLITENESS STRATEGIES

Culpeper (1996: 356–358) introduces a framework of impoliteness that includes the following:

1. Bald-on-record impoliteness: An FTA (face-threatening act) is delivered in a direct, clear, unambiguous, and concise manner in situations where face is at stake. Crucially, the speaker intends to attack the hearer's face.
2. Positive impoliteness: The deployment of strategies aimed at undermining the addressee's positive face desires (the need to be liked or approved of).
3. Negative impoliteness: Strategies designed to damage the addressee's negative face desires (the need for autonomy and freedom from imposition).

4. Sarcasm or mock politeness: FTAs are performed using transparently insincere and ostensibly polite strategies, maintaining only a surface appearance of politeness. Culpeper relates this to Leech's (1983) view of irony: "If you offend, at least do so in a way that doesn't overtly conflict with the Politeness Principle but allows the hearer to infer the offence via implicature." Culpeper equates sarcasm with irony, suggesting that it involves a conscious effort by the speaker to restrain overt impoliteness to meet their communicative intentions. Eisterhold, Attardo, and Boxer (2006: 1240) argue similarly that irony and sarcasm, used interchangeably in their analysis, cannot be theoretically distinguished. Following Attardo (2000), their concept treats irony as a trope that blends "simultaneous inappropriateness" (about impoliteness) with relevance (linked to communicative intent).

5. Withholding politeness: Refusal to perform politeness work where it would ordinarily be expected.

Culpeper (1996: 357–358) also proposes several positive and negative impoliteness strategies, offering specific output examples:

Positive Impoliteness Output Strategies

- Ignoring or snubbing the other by not acknowledging their presence.
- Excluding the other from activities.
- Denying association or shared ground with the other.
- Displaying disinterest, lack of concern, or lack of sympathy.
- Using inappropriate identity markers, such as titles or nicknames that do not align with the relationship.
- Employing obscure or exclusive language to alienate the target (e.g., using jargon or coded language).
- Seeking disagreement by raising sensitive or contentious topics.
- Intentionally making the other feel uncomfortable through silence, joking, or avoiding small talk.
- Using taboo language, such as swearing or employing abusive or profane terms.

- Calling someone derogatory names.

Negative Impoliteness Output Strategies:

- Instilling fear or the belief that harmful actions will occur.
- Contension, ridicule, or scorn to assert relative power and belittle the other.
- Invading the other's personal or metaphorical space by overstepping relational boundaries.
- Associating the other with negative traits explicitly, often using pronouns like "I" and "you."
- Making the other's indebtedness publicly known.

Culpeper, Bousfield, and Wichman (2003: 1549–1550) examine the role of indirectness, often linked with Brown and Levinson's bald-on-record strategy, and its complex association with politeness. While indirectness may enhance politeness in some contexts, Culpeper et al. highlight that indirectness can intensify impoliteness in others, particularly cross-culturally.

As noted, whether sarcasm or irony constitutes impoliteness, depends heavily on context and the hearer's reaction. A further strategy identified in their study is "challenge", often executed through rhetorical questions as a form of negative impoliteness. Lastly, Culpeper et al. argue that impoliteness does not typically emerge from isolated strategies but rather from a combination of multiple strategies that collectively produce its effect. They further observe that highly direct utterances, akin to bald-on-record acts, are often the most challenging to interpret as polite, impolite, or neutral.

3.1.METHODOLOGY

This research adopts a qualitative approach, focusing on discourse analysis to examine the language and interactions in Brooklyn Nine-Nine. The study selected ten episodes across multiple seasons, chosen for their notable use of impoliteness strategies. Transcripts of the episodes were analyzed to identify instances of impoliteness, following Culpeper's (1996) framework of impoliteness strategies, which includes bald-on-record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm or mock politeness, and withholding politeness. The analysis aimed to uncover how these strategies contribute to character dynamics and humor within the series, providing

insights into contemporary communication practices in a comedic context.

The analysis also considered the contextual factors that influence the interpretation of impoliteness, such as character relationships, situational context, and audience expectations. Data were coded and categorized using thematic analysis to identify patterns in the use of impoliteness strategies. This comprehensive approach allowed for a deeper understanding of how humor is constructed through impolite interactions, revealing not only the comedic intent behind these exchanges but also their potential to reflect and challenge societal norms regarding politeness and interpersonal communication.

3.2.DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis focused on identifying and categorizing instances of impoliteness in the selected episodes. For examples:

“You’re as robotic as ever.”

In Brooklyn Nine-Nine, Jake Peralta’s remark to Captain Holt, "You're as robotic as ever," is a clear example of bald-on-record impoliteness, where an impolite statement is delivered plainly, without any softening or politeness markers. The blunt critique of Holt’s formal and stoic demeanor is evident. However, given the close and familiar relationship between Jake and Holt, this statement carries no real threat to Holt's face. Instead, it is perceived as playful banter, falling into the category of banter-based impoliteness where expected rudeness among familiar individuals strengthens camaraderie rather than creates conflict. Holt’s emotionally reserved personality further amplifies the humor, as Jake’s exaggerated comment contrasts with Holt’s demeanor and contributes to the comedic tone of the show.

The context of their relationship shapes how this impoliteness is interpreted. While the comment is inherently face-threatening, the established dynamic between the two neutralizes any potential harm. Holt’s self-awareness regarding his personality makes him unlikely to take offense, and viewers recognize that Jake’s humor is a defining trait of his character. Additionally, the remark opens the door for a humorous response from Holt, who often employs dry, witty comebacks. This interaction exemplifies a recurring theme in Brooklyn Nine-Nine: the use of teasing and impoliteness to reinforce relationships rather than inflict harm. The strength of

this particular remark lies in its blend of directness and humor, positioning it as both a critique and a sign of affection, thereby enriching the comedic rapport between the characters.

“I see you’ve resorted to lifting the vending machine for lunch again.”

This statement exemplifies bald-on-record impoliteness, where Captain Holt directly and unambiguously mocks Terry's dietary habits. The phrase "lifting the vending machine for lunch" suggests an exaggerated critique of Terry's focus on consuming high-protein foods, using hyperbole to underline his point. The comment is delivered without mitigation, highlighting the directness characteristic of bald-on-record impoliteness.

From a speech act theory perspective, this utterance functions as an expressive act, wherein Holt conveys his attitude toward Terry's eating habits amusement or mild disapproval. The expressive act humorously ridicules Terry's behavior, creating a moment of camaraderie through sarcasm.

The humor relies heavily on context and tone. Holt's deadpan delivery neutralizes the potential hostility of the remark, framing it as playful teasing rather than genuine offense. This interplay between impoliteness and humor reflects their close relationship and underscores the workplace culture of affectionate ribbing in Brooklyn Nine-Nine. Additionally, the exaggeration in the statement introduces incongruity, enhancing the comedic effect by presenting an absurd image that is both unexpected and entertaining.

This example demonstrates how impoliteness in comedic contexts can foster humor and strengthen character dynamics, provided the relational context frames it as a benign joke rather than an actual affront.

“Wow, you’re really killing it, Casanova.”

In this utterance, Gina Linetti employs sarcasm and mock politeness, an impoliteness strategy, to deliver a playful critique of Boyle's romantic missteps. The phrase "Wow, you’re really killing it, Casanova" is laden with irony, as the exaggerated compliment contrasts with the reality of Boyle's failure. Gina's tone, intentionally over-the-top, highlights her insincerity, marking the statement as an example of mock politeness.

From a speech act theory perspective, Gina's utterance functions as an expressive act. It conveys her attitude of amusement and playful criticism toward Boyle's romantic endeavors. While ostensibly positive, the underlying meaning is a negative evaluation of Boyle's success in his romantic pursuits.

The effectiveness of the humor lies in Gina's delivery. Her exaggerated tone transforms what might otherwise be a cutting remark into a lighthearted jab, ensuring that the impoliteness does not damage their camaraderie. This interplay exemplifies banter-based impoliteness, where expected rudeness among close associates strengthens bonds rather than causing harm.

"Thank you, Amy, for showing us what anxiety looks like in its purest form."

In this utterance, Gina Linetti employs sarcasm and mock politeness, a form of impoliteness strategy, to humorously critique Amy Santiago's meticulous personality. The phrase "Thank you, Amy, for showing us what anxiety looks like in its purest form" is a sarcastic statement framed as gratitude. Gina's exaggerated tone of mock admiration underlines the humor and criticism embedded in the comment. This remark illustrates mock politeness, as it pretends to praise Amy, yet conveys an underlying critique of her over-organized nature.

From the perspective of the speech act theory, Gina's comment functions as an expressive act, as it conveys her feelings of amusement and mild criticism toward Amy's behavior. The humor is further enhanced by Gina's characteristic deadpan delivery and Amy's earnest, rule-abiding personality, which make the contrast between the characters more pronounced.

"You must be allergic to responsibility, Jake."

The statement is a clear example of positive impoliteness, where Terry Jeffords employs a yet critical remark to highlight Jake Peralta's tendency to avoid responsibility. The comment diminishes Jake's competence by pointing out a perceived flaw in his behavior, but it is delivered in a teasing and non-malicious tone. This approach helps maintain the camaraderie between the characters, as the intention is clearly humorous rather than genuinely insulting.

From a speech act theory perspective, Terry's utterance functions as an expressive act, conveying his amusement and light-hearted

criticism of Jake's behavior. By framing the critique in a teasing manner, Terry uses humor to address Jake's irresponsibility without causing harm to their relationship.

Pragmatically, this utterance aligns with banter-based impoliteness, a form of positive impoliteness where humor and teasing are used among familiar individuals to strengthen bonds rather than disrupt them. This is contextualized within the show's dynamic, where such interactions often highlight the characters' quirks while reinforcing their friendships. Terry's delivery and relationship with Jake ensure that the remark is interpreted as playful rather than offensive.

The humor relies on contextual cues and the audience's understanding of Jake's character as someone who often avoids serious responsibilities. Terry's tone and body language likely emphasize that the remark is not meant to be taken literally, helping the audience interpret the scene as a comedic exchange rather than a serious reprimand.

"You wouldn't appreciate fine cuisine even if it jumped onto your plate and begged you to eat it."

In the utterance, Boyle employs positive impoliteness, a strategy aimed at challenging Rosa's positive face the desire to be liked and appreciated. The statement diminishes Rosa's perceived taste for sophisticated food, implying her inability to appreciate fine cuisine, which qualifies as an affront to her social or personal competence.

From the perspective of speech act theory, Boyle's comment functions as an assertive act, where he states his opinion or belief about Rosa's culinary preferences. It indirectly positions Boyle as the authority on what constitutes "fine cuisine," emphasizing his passion for food while simultaneously highlighting a disparity in their tastes.

Pragmatically, Boyle's delivery and their close relationship frame the insult as part of their ongoing banter, mitigating the level of genuine harm. The humor lies in the exaggerated imagery of cuisine "jumping onto a plate and begging," which adds a playful tone to the critique. This mitigates the sting of the insult and keeps the exchange within the bounds of friendly teasing.

The comment exploits context-driven impoliteness, relying on the interpersonal dynamic between Boyle and Rosa for its reception.

Rosa, known for her tough demeanor, is unlikely to be deeply offended, and the audience perceives the remark as an expression of Boyle's enthusiasm for food rather than a serious attack on Rosa's character.

“You’re too needy, and that’s annoying.”

Rosa Diaz’s statement exemplifies negative impoliteness, a strategy designed to damage the addressee’s negative face and their desire for autonomy and freedom from imposition. The bluntness and dismissive tone of the remark emphasize Rosa's direct and curt communication style, underscoring her straightforward personality.

From a speech act theory perspective, Rosa’s utterance functions as an expressive act, as she explicitly conveys her irritation towards Boyle's behavior. This lack of mitigation or politeness markers reflects her typical no-nonsense approach. The straightforward phrasing leaves no room for alternative interpretations, making it a direct, face-threatening act.

The humor in this exchange arises from the contrast between Rosa’s curt demeanor and Boyle’s overly affectionate and needy personality. The clash of their behavioral styles highlights their dynamic and adds to the comedic value. Pragmatically, the effectiveness of the remark relies on Rosa’s established character traits and the audience’s understanding of the relationship dynamic between the two.

“You’re only winning because you’re boring and follow every rule.”

The statement is an example of negative impoliteness, a strategy aimed at attacking the addressee's negative face and their desire for autonomy and freedom from criticism. Jake Peralta’s remark belittles Amy Santiago’s achievements during a competitive challenge by attributing her success to dullness and rigid adherence to rules, rather than skill or effort.

From a speech act theory perspective, Jake’s utterance functions as an assertive act, where he states his judgment or belief about Amy’s approach to competition. This act conveys disdain and dismissiveness, undermining her accomplishment. The remark also serves as an indirect directive act, subtly provoking Amy to defend herself or change her behavior.

The humor in Jake's statement arises from the interplay between their well-established personalities and the rivalry dynamic. Amy, known for her meticulous and rule-abiding nature, becomes the target of Jake's teasing, which reflects his playful yet competitive character. This dynamic makes the impoliteness more playful than harmful, ensuring that it fits within the comedic framework of Brooklyn Nine-Nine.

Pragmatically, the comment exploits context-driven implicational impoliteness, as its interpretation relies on the rivalry and familiarity between the two characters. While the statement is inherently face-threatening, the context of their relationship mitigates its severity, allowing it to be perceived as humorous rather than genuinely offensive.

“Good morning, Rosa!”

The interaction exemplifies withholding politeness, an impoliteness strategy where expected politeness or social norms are deliberately ignored or withheld. Rosa's refusal to respond to Jake's cheerful "Good morning" is a clear example of this strategy. By choosing silence over the expected courteous reply, Rosa subverts the norms of conversational etiquette, which amplifies her character's tough and no-nonsense persona.

From the perspective of the speech act theory, Jake's "Good morning" is a phatic act, intended to establish or maintain a social connection. Rosa's silence disrupts this communicative intention, creating tension that is comedically undercut by Jake's awkward reaction. The absence of a response transforms the exchange from a routine social ritual to a humorous moment that reflects the characters' contrasting personalities.

The humor in the scene arises from context and contrast. Rosa's unresponsiveness, though impolite, aligns with her character's established traits. The awkwardness that follows as Jake processes the silence allows the audience to enjoy the clash between his cheerful demeanor and her taciturn nature. This interaction also critiques social norms by framing Rosa's rejection of small talk as both amusing and refreshingly unorthodox.

“It is indeed your birthday, Sergeant Jeffords.”

The statement is a clear example of withholding politeness, where expected social warmth is deliberately or unintentionally omitted in a situation that typically calls for acknowledgment or

celebration. Captain Holt's factual, emotionless remark, delivered during a team celebration, contrasts sharply with the warmth and enthusiasm expected in such settings. This absence of emotional expression magnifies the humor, especially given Holt's characteristic delivery.

From a speech act theory perspective, Holt's remark functions as an assertive act, where he simply states a fact without performing the additional expressive act of acknowledging Terry's feelings or the occasion. The lack of expressive intent acknowledging the significance of a birthday leads to an inherently face-threatening act for Terry, whose positive face (the need for appreciation and inclusion) is unintentionally undermined.

The humor stems from the mismatch between the context (a celebratory gathering) and the delivery of the statement, which feels detached and overly formal. This creates a comedic tension that plays into Holt's personality as stoic and overly literal. Meanwhile, Terry's visible reaction amplifies the awkwardness and the comedic effect as the audience empathizes with his unfulfilled expectations.

Pragmatically, this exchange exploits context-driven withholding politeness, where the omission of expected pleasantries is interpreted humorously because the audience understands Holt's consistent nature and the dynamic between the characters.

3.3.FINDING AND DISSECTION

Brooklyn Nine-Nine utilizes several forms of verbal impoliteness to enhance humor, describe interpersonal interactions, and create a plot. The use of impoliteness when speaking "on the record" is particularly evident in unfiltered direct speeches, and it happens to be hilarious. For example, Captain Holt gets direct and unapologetic comments from Jake, who speaks to his contrary playful self. Gina excessively employs shorthand sarcasm, where people are said to be polite, but their speech is ridiculing or criticizing effectively while covering the absurdity. Positive impoliteness, most often manifesting as mock sarcasm and affectionately nasty jabs, is the norm in the precinct.. The constant mockery of Boyle's awkwardness not only serves to solidify the character's traits but also shows how team members are united. Negative impoliteness has its place in highlighting the conflict or comic absurdity of a scenario and is used very sparingly. Masked

Rosa's stupidity and refusal to make small talk illustrates the level of violence her persona embodies, and it simultaneously is awkwardly funny. This blend of humor and tension creates a unique dynamic within the team, where each character's flaws are both exposed and embraced, ultimately fostering a sense of camaraderie amidst their quirky interactions.

The examination of these strategies shows how they analyze the humor and character interactions within the series. The sarcasm and bald-on-record rudeness are constantly employed because of the focus given to conflict as well as distortion and hyperbolic behavior, which completely invalidate audience anticipation and bring attention to the absurdity of different situations. The use and non-use of politeness in communication have a dominant place in the process of character deepening. For instance, Holt's rigid, emotionless compliance as a response to Jake's behavior illustrates his control over the situation while showing the contrast in their characters, and Gina's sarcastic comments complimenting her confident attitude support the idea that she is the most eccentric member of the precinct. Apart from the interactions of characters, the remarks also address important issues such as the social hierarchy in the organization, the changing of demographics, and femininity and masculinity. His life as a gay Black man in authority is subject to much well-intended humor, especially from the unwillingness to mask and rather use rudeness to delve into deeply rooted prejudice. This dynamic not only highlights the complexities of identity and power within the precinct but also serves as a lens through which broader societal issues can be examined, revealing how humor can both challenge and reinforce existing stereotypes.

The audience's interpretation counts a lot when it comes to the effectiveness of the strategies. In the case of Brooklyn Nine-Nine, the modest rudeness is encompassed by pre-existing character relationships and the general humor level of the program, which permits it to be taken lightly and entertainingly instead of being rude. Most contexts that may be socially unacceptable in everyday interactions are made funny and easy to associate with because of the context created by the show's narrative. These constructed dynamics do not only serve to amuse the audience, they also challenge them to think about social issues by using comedy as

the main framework. This clever blend of humor and social commentary encourages viewers to reflect on their own experiences and attitudes, ultimately fostering a deeper understanding of the complexities within interpersonal relationships.

3.4. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis conducted in this study, it has been found that impoliteness strategies play a role in shaping the humor framework of Brooklyn Nine-Nine. These strategies influence how humor is generated, how characters develop, and how social critiques are conveyed. The show strategically establishes boundaries through its use of linguistic and behavioral impoliteness, allowing characters to engage in confrontational exchanges that not only serve comedic purposes but also challenge audience perceptions of social norms and power dynamics.

The findings reveal that the incorporation of sarcasm, impoliteness, and direct insults functions as a deliberate tool to create humor by emphasizing contrasts in character behavior and workplace relationships. This interplay not only entertains but also prompts viewers to engage with underlying themes of friendship, loyalty, and the complexities of professional interactions.

Furthermore, the study highlights that Brooklyn Nine-Nine encourages audiences to critique cultural hierarchies, stereotypes, and boundaries of social interaction through humor. This representation of characters and their exchanges reflects broader societal complexities, inviting viewers to consider their own biases and experiences in similar settings. By embedding impoliteness strategies within its comedic structure, the show balances entertainment with critique, making serious societal issues more accessible and engaging.

REFERENCES

- Arundale, Robert B. (2006). Face as relational and interactional: A communication framework for research on face, facework, and politeness. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 2(2), 193-216.
- Attardo, Salvatore (1994). Backmatter. In *Linguistic Theories of Humor* (pp. 335-426). Berlin, New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Austin, John Langshaw. (1975). *How to do things with words* (2nd ed.). Harvard University Press.

- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.
- Clark, Herbert H. (1996). Using language (1st edition). Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, Jonathan. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. Journal of pragmatics, 25(3), 349-367.
- (2011). Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence (Vol. 28). Cambridge University Press.
- Dynel, Marta. (2011). The pragmatics of humour across discourse domains. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins,
- Saldaña, Johnny. (2013). The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers. Sage Publications. (2nd edition).
- Searle, John R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge university press.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen. (Ed.). (2008). Culturally speaking second edition: Culture, communication and politeness theory. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Sperber, Dan, and Deirdre Wilson (1986). Relevance: Communication and cognition (Vol. 142). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Recanati, François. (2004). Literal meaning. Cambridge University Press.
- Macagno, Fabrizio. (2022). Ignoring Qualifications as a Pragmatic Fallacy: Enrichments and Their Use for Manipulating Commitments. Languages, 7(1), 13.