This item is the archived preprint of:

"There's definitely gonna be some serious carnage in this house" or how to be genuinely impolite in Big Brother UK

Reference:

Sinkeviciute Valeria.- "There's definitely gonna be some serious carnage in this house" or how to be genuinely impolite in Big Brother UK

Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict - ISSN 2213-1272 - 3:2(2015), p. 317-348

Full text (Publishers DOI): <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1075/jlac.3.2.04sin>

Sinkeviciute, Valeria. 2015. "There's definitely gonna be some serious carnage in this house" or how to be genuinely impolite in *Big Brother* UK, *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict* 3(2): 317-348. [<http://www.jbe-platform.com/content/journals/10.1075/jlac.3.2.04sin>]

The article is under copyright and the publisher should be contacted for permission to re-use or reprint the material in any form.

"There's definitely gonna be some serious carnage in this house" or how to be genuinely impolite in *Big Brother* UK

Valeria Sinkeviciute
IPrA Research Center

Although it is quite easy to conceive of a number of conventionalised impoliteness formulae that, depending on context, do not lead to the hearer's evaluations of impoliteness, there are many situations when the speaker aims to be genuinely impolite and does not try to mitigate his/her verbal behaviour. This paper reports the findings of an analysis of twenty-nine genuinely impolite verbal behaviours that occurred in the *Big Brother* UK 2012 house. The main objective of this study is to examine the triggers for genuine impoliteness and determine which aspects of the hearer's face and rights s/he claims for him/herself are targeted in such interactions. The results reveal that impoliteness among the housemates is triggered by previous impolite (non-)verbal behaviour, implied negativity or personal dislike of the target. The speaker, in his/her turn, tends to associate the target with a negative aspect or behaviour, question his/her mental, emotional state or knowledge, deny the freedom of expression or participation and, finally, warn or threaten the target.

Keywords: genuine impoliteness, retaliation, implied negativity, personal dislike, *Big Brother*, UK

1. Introduction

Impoliteness, which not long ago was a peripheral phenomenon and received far less attention than polite verbal behaviour, has become one of the most researched topics in pragmatics in the 21st century. Despite the fact that a number of works in different disciplines mentioned aggravating language, rudeness, conflict as well as aggression (Tedeschi, Smith, and Brown 1974; Lachenicht 1980; Lakoff 1989; Kasper 1990; Beebe 1995 among others), this phenomenon was largely ignored and no explanation for the existence or occurrence of impolite behaviour was offered (Eelen 2001, 101) until Culpeper's (1996, 349) attempt "to build an impoliteness framework".

How we understand impoliteness today – a phenomenon with specific interactional goals that can and should be studied in its own right – is different from how it was originally seen. It gradually moved away from a more traditional model (Culpeper 1996) that mirrored strategies of Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory to models that integrate a more elaborated understanding of *face* (Culpeper (2005) incorporates Spencer-Oatey's (2002) concept of "rapport management"), present no positive/negative face distinction (Bousfield 2008a) or offer a prototype understanding of impoliteness and rudeness (Bousfield 2008b; 2010) to more discursive approaches where the main role is given to context and situated evaluations of verbal behaviour (Eelen 2001; Mills 2003; 2011; Locher and Watts 2005; 2008;

LPRG 2011). Impoliteness, whose trajectory started with discourses found in military training (to which it is particularly central), is “ubiquitous across and within virtually all modes of human communication” (Bousfield 2008a, 51) and has been a topic of interest in such areas as workplace relationships (Schnurr, Marra and Holmes 2008; Mullany 2008, 2011), political discourse (García-Pastor 2008; Kienpointner 2008; Taylor 2011), legal discourse (Archer 2008; Harris 2011), humour (Haugh and Bousfield 2012; Dynel 2013), media discourse (Culpeper 2005; Lorenzo-Dus 2009; Dynel 2012; Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, Bou-Franch and Lorenzo-Dus 2013), among others.

Impoliteness theories have been developing in different ways. Alongside the prevailing emphasis on context, negotiability and “the instant-stable meanings” (Mills 2013) in the discursive approach, a set of conventionalised impoliteness formulae in British English has also been introduced (Culpeper 2010, 2011). They include insults (e.g. ‘you are so stupid’), dismissals (e.g. ‘get lost’) and threats (e.g. ‘I’m gonna box your ears if you don’t [X]’) (for a more complete list, see Culpeper 2011, 135-136). The items on the list refer to expressions that have “a more stable relationship with (im)politeness contexts” (Culpeper 2011, 127). In other words, native speakers tend to place them on the impoliteness side of the continuum in a number of different contexts since the meanings of those expressions are associated with similar backgrounds and contextual assumptions typically evaluated as rather impolite.

Undoubtedly, the phenomenon of impoliteness is a form of social action, i.e. “language choice is ultimately socially motivated” (Gumperz 1992, 39). The perception of impoliteness is based on our socio-culturally shared interactive history and our “social knowledge is part of the input that determines what we perceive as linguistic reality” (Gumperz 1992, 50). Indeed, our understanding of impoliteness is “socially acquired” and such concepts are “to a high degree socially *shared* even if ultimately individually *produced* and *spun*” (Bousfield 2010, 119; emphasis in the original). Therefore, due to shared communicative practices and background assumptions, it is not surprising that Culpeper’s suggested conventionalised formulae tend to evoke evaluations of impoliteness. However, one should always bear in mind that they are not (socio-culturally) context-free and could still be interpreted as non-impolite in a particular situated discourse (see Section 2; see also section 6.5 on genuine and mock impoliteness in Culpeper 2011, 207-215).

This paper concentrates on genuinely impolite verbal behaviour that is expressed through conventionalised impoliteness formulae (though in some cases clear instances of sarcasm¹ can also be encountered) and linguistic behaviour seen as impolite in a chosen discourse – *Big Brother*. In Section 2 the notions of potentiality and genuineness (with special attention to context and non-verbal cues) are discussed and a shift from potentially impolite verbal acts to genuinely impolite verbal acts is illustrated. The data taken from *Big Brother* is introduced in Section 3 and the relationship of this reality television programme to impoliteness, as well as the connection between genuine impoliteness and entertainment, are discussed in Section 4. Section 5 is dedicated to the triggers for genuinely impolite verbal behaviour in the *Big Brother* house, paying close attention to the targeted aspects of the hearer’s face and rights. Finally, the relationship between impoliteness triggers and the subsequent threat to the hearer’s face/rights is explored.

2. Potentiality and genuineness (context and non-verbal cues)

Despite different but complementary views on context (for a review, see Goodwin and Duranti 1992; for the role of contextualisation in language, see Auer and di Luzio 1992), the notion is indispensable for a pragmatic perspective on meaning. Since context is broad and

multi-faceted (apart from linguistic context, physical, social and mental worlds can be distinguished), only the relevant elements towards which the discourse itself orients us should be taken into account (Verschuere 1999, 109; 2014). Indeed, not all contexts are salient in all interactional scenarios and contextualisation cues – “empirically detectable signs” (Gumperz 1992, 42) – limit “the range of possible understandings” (Gumperz, in Prevignano and di Luzio 2003, 10). Even though salient contexts should help us to grasp the current meaning of linguistic expressions more easily, it is interesting to observe how sometimes newly-formed contextual information prevails over the already established knowledge or behaviour patterns, consequently misleading the hearer in his/her interpretation. A case in point is deadpan humour, where no jocular non-verbal cues indicating that there is humorous intent are present, but that a (potentially impolite) message should be taken humorously. Goddard (2006, 86) suggests that in context (i.e. the Australian cultural context) it should be perfectly clear that deadpan jocular irony is “a light-hearted ironic comment, not to be taken seriously”.

However, it seems that not everyone, even in the same cultural context, can unequivocally position (or even recognise) deadpan humour in a non-serious frame or be sure that what has been said is actually a joke. Here, I would like to give two examples from different discourses: the first one is from the American crime television series *The Inside* and the second one is closer to home, i.e. from a course I attended.

Example 1. The Los Angeles Violent Crimes Unit is having a meeting and one of the agents is late because his wife is pregnant and he had to go to Lamaze (childbirth) classes. The supervisor, who does not seem to be a humorous character, says: “It’s the longest nine months since Martha Stewart went inside”. Agent Melody Sim is quite nonplussed and asks: “Did you just make a joke, sir?”; to which he answers: “No”. She looks puzzled.

Example 2. During a three-day course on methodology from time to time the lecturer used deadpan humour towards participants. At one point, when a girl came in several minutes late, the lecturer in a serious voice said that a note from the headmaster was required. Even though it produced laughter from other participants, the target was not sure whether she could sit down. On the last day of the course, there was no place in the room for the tea/coffee service, so some people brought cups with tea/coffee from the corridor and the lecturer, directing a message at a British participant, said: “Apparently they don’t allow liquids in the room, so you will have to take it outside.” The target hesitated and then asked whether it was meant seriously because he was not “good at deadpan humour”.

It seems that for the interactants in both examples the context(s) that they choose to foreground is/are not sufficient to correctly interpret whether what is said is meant as humour. In the first example, a doubt about the presence of humour is caused by a clash between the already available background knowledge (that includes the ‘unfunny’ personality of the supervisor) and the interlocutor’s understanding of what ‘a joke’ is. The second example also presents the uncertainty about the interpretation even though the previous instances of deadpan jocularity have already been observed. Most interestingly, it seems that in both examples the ‘here-and-now’ context (that directs the hearer to a specific interpretation of the content of the linguistic expressions) is more dominant than the background information and previous experience. This variety of interpretations (and not communicative failure per se), however, should help to combine more than just one level of analysis, this way pointing to the inseparability of context and linguistic structure and a constant negotiability of their interrelationships. As a result, it would be possible to see “context as a parameter of stability at a different level”, “whilst allowing for the variability of the meanings of linguistic forms” (Verschuere 1999, 9).

These considerations are of prime importance in the area of linguistic (im)politeness as well. I see (im)politeness as a product of social interaction between the speaker (here the

offender) and the hearer (the target). Thus, it is impossible to refer to the production part as the only one generating the evaluations of impoliteness without taking into consideration the contextualisation cues and the target's response.² In order to try to dissect genuinely impolite behaviour, a good point for departure is to look at the form and semantic content of a message. Even if it includes conventionalised impoliteness formulae (Culpeper 2010, 2011), it would be a precipitate decision to label the whole interaction as genuinely impolite. That is why at this first stage I am referring to the verbal action as *potentially impolite*. Undoubtedly, context (or contexts) and the presence of particular non-verbal cues (that similarly to communication and language themselves can be context-dependent and/or context-creating (Prevignano and di Luzio 2003, 9; Culpeper 2011, 196)) are crucial for the target to realise how s/he is *supposed* to take the message. This, however, does not mean that the target *will* interpret the message the way s/he is supposed to only because context and other cues apparently dictate so. For instance, as Culpeper (2011, 113) suggests, "the negative effects of impoliteness formulae and behaviours, especially when highly offensive and thus salient, are not easy to eliminate by means of the context" (for po-faced responses to teasing, see Drew 1987; for negative reactions to playful teasing, see Sinkeviciute 2013). But let's now consider the following example [1]³ where non-verbal cues play an important part in strengthening the already existing understanding of the context:

[1] Day 16

Becky is winding up Scott.

Becky:		{[smiling] ba:h ba:h}
Scott:	→	you bitch {[putting a pillow on Becky's face] stop it you know how it irritates me (...) fucker (fuck) (...) STOP IT}
Becky:		= {[smiling] Scott you don't (fuck) () someone} =
Scott:		= [smiles] {[smiling] = I do (...) you can breathe through your nose} (...) no that's it {[smiling] STOP IT (...) STOP IT} you're such a () a look on her face (that's what's annoying) (...) ok that's it I'm not even
	→	bothering I'm not bothering you're a fucking weirdo I hate you
Becky:	→	[smiles]

Firstly, it should be mentioned that Scott and Becky get along well and call each other friends, which is part of the social context in the *Big Brother* house (for the details on *Big Brother*, see Section 3). Everything that Scott verbally does in this extract is use conventionalised impoliteness formulae (e.g. 'you bitch', 'you're a fucking weirdo') when referring to Becky. Even though in a minimal context such verbal action would be highly offensive and termed as insults (cf. Culpeper's (2011, 135) list of insults), it is not how Becky takes it. The jocularity that the non-verbal cues point to – Scott is constantly smiling while using potentially impolite expressions – is likely to show Becky that Scott's (projected) intention is not to insult her. This 'banterish' behaviour, apparently, does not clash with her expectations taking into consideration their relationship (social context). This also leads to her decision to follow the cultural proscription against *taking oneself too seriously* and she is able to see the funny side of her being the target of this potentially impolite verbal behaviour

(Goddard 2009; Sinkeviciute 2014). As a result, no public offence⁴ is taken and the relationships between Scott and Becky remain the same.

Extract [1] illustrates the importance of non-verbal cues (alongside the presence of the social context) in showing the target that there is an extra or even primary (jocular) meaning added to the semantic content of utterances. Similarly, non-verbal cues (e.g. the tone of the voice, facial expression and other body language) can point in the opposite direction and the same message can be interpreted as genuinely impolite. What is interesting is that, in this scenario, the cultural (collective) injunction against taking oneself too seriously will most probably be ignored and preference will be given to the personal perceptions and the subsequent action, i.e. the obvious public offence being taken (see Section 5). Thus, genuine impoliteness can be seen as a result of “a communicative activity that aims at damaging the face of others [and deprive them of their rights], according to social codes supposedly shared by speakers” (Bernal 2008, 788) in a number of (cultural) contexts in general (i.e. the use of conventionalised impoliteness formulae) and in a given context in particular (here *Big Brother*).

3. Data and methods

The data for this analysis is taken from the gameshow *Big Brother* UK 2012, which was screened from June 5 to August 13. *Big Brother* is one of the world’s most successful television programmes, where strangers have to live in a house without any contact with the outside world. The housemates nominate each other every week and the viewers vote for one housemate to be evicted (by saving other housemates), ultimately choosing the housemate that wins the money prize. In the UK, this BAFTA (The British Academy of Film and Television Arts) winning series “continues to be a hit across TV, online and social media as well as generating front page headlines” (Endemol UK).

It is fair to say that in seventy days of this series of the show, which on several occasions was claimed by the host Brian Dowling to be “the bitchiest and the [most] backstabbing house we have had for a while”, more than half of the time the housemates felt that they were mocked and verbally abused behind their backs.⁵ Since this paper analyses the televised situations where the target is physically present and reacts to impolite behaviour, the number of the analysed interactions is smaller compared to the overall instances of aggressive behaviour in the house. Still, twenty-nine genuinely impolite verbal behaviours that led to an extended argument/conflict were selected. In all but one of those situations, the speaker interacts face-to-face with the target. In the remaining fragment, the instigator (Conor) verbally insults and threatens another housemate (Deana) – who can possibly hear that he is making some negative comments – in front of other housemates after her failure to complete a weekly task. As a result, he is called to the diary room, where his remarks and threats are labelled as “unacceptable language and behaviour”. Incidentally, Conor’s verbally abusive behaviour throughout the series caused over two thousand complaints from viewers. Deana, who referred to Conor’s behaviour towards her as bullying, even sought libel damages from Conor, but the judge ruled “the taunts aimed at [Deana] were not defamatory” (Lockley 2014).

The fragments selected for the analysis were chosen on the basis of the form and content of the message, as well as contextual and non-verbal cues, such as prosody, facial expression and body language. The genuinely⁶ impolite verbal behaviours consist of one or more conventionalised impoliteness formulae, disapproved comments in the *Big Brother* house (e.g. conversations about evicting someone or being fake) and/or demonstrate implied negativity towards the target (e.g. putdowns based on sarcasm). Since impoliteness is

normally triggered by some previous (non-)verbal behaviours, the main impoliteness triggers in the *Big Brother* house were identified. Furthermore, all the targeted aspects of the hearer's face and rights were classified into four groups. It should be mentioned that the notions of the hearer's face and rights draw on Spencer-Oatey's (2002) distinction between *face* and *sociality rights*, but are only used as umbrella terms for the offender's verbal behaviour that is further categorised (see Sections 4 and 5). Spencer-Oatey (2002, 540) associates face with "personal/social value, and [it] is concerned with people's sense of worth, credibility, dignity, honour, reputation, competence and so on", while sociality rights "are concerned with personal/social entitlements, and reflect people's concerns over fairness, consideration, social inclusion/exclusion and so on". Undoubtedly, face is interrelated with identity and "assessments of im/politeness can be connected to the notion of identity, as well as the notion of face" (Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, Bou-Franch and Lorenzo-Dus 2013, 100).⁷ Finally, in order to find out whether the same or different aspects of the hearer's face and rights were targeted as a response to different impoliteness triggers, the relationship between the former and the latter was illustrated.

4. *Big Brother*: An impoliteness-oriented context?

There is a number of discourses to which impoliteness is likely to be pertinent (e.g. military and civilian police training, parking disputes and exploitative TV shows) (for analyses, see Culpeper 1996, 2005, 2011; Culpeper, Bousfield and Wichmann 2003; Bousfield 2008a, 2008b; Lorenzo-Dus 2009; Culpeper and Holmes 2013; Lorenzo-Dus, Bou-Franch and Garcés-Conejos Blitvich 2013). Due to the nature of these discourses and activity types therein, impoliteness can be referred to as "the normal and expectable communicative behaviour" (Kienpointner 2008, 244) or "rule-governed rudeness" (Lakoff 1989, 123) and, therefore, as sanctioned. Mills (2002) argues that in such cases, i.e. within a particular community of practice, impolite verbal behaviour should not be analytically "classified as impolite" (Mills 2002, 79), even if perceived as such by the target, because it is "'appropriate' to the context" (Mills 2002, 86) and is seen as a local norm. This type of behaviour indeed can result in the target not taking offence *publicly* (and it seems that this is exactly what Mills bases her argument on), but, as Culpeper (2005, 65, emphasis in the original) accurately points out, there is "the difference between *sanctioning* such [impolite] behaviour and *neutralizing* it". Even when aggressive behaviour is seen as appropriate and normal in a particular community of practice, people "do still take offence" (Culpeper 2011, 217) (even though this might only be on a *personal* level and not publicly expressed) (see also Bousfield 2010, 105; Garcés-Conejos Blitvich and Lorenzo-Dus 2013, 17-18).

Without a doubt, reality television puts "a greater emphasis on interpersonal conflict, sexuality and emotion, and the staging of aggression" (Bignell 2005, 173) and some forms of it (e.g. exploitative reality shows) "openly stage maximally offensive face-threat" (Lorenzo-Dus 2009, 166) and their "local norms [...] allow, indeed rely on, precisely such behaviour" (Lorenzo-Dus 2009, 176) (for more on reality television and aggression, see the chapters in Part III in Lorenzo-Dus and Garcés-Conejos Blitvich 2013). Being not only the epitome of reality television but also at least partially reflecting daily life communication, *Big Brother* demonstrates potential for verbal conflicts, arguments and other impolite behaviours. However, not all verbal arguments should be immediately associated with genuinely impolite behaviours (as described in Section 2). Furthermore, the *Big Brother* format – a global phenomenon – is subject to some regional adaptations, and not all cultural contexts condone overt verbal aggression and massive conflict. As Peter Abbott (Executive Producer of the Australian *Big Brother* version) explained, he wanted to cast people as if for a dinner party:

“You might invite somebody to be provocative, but you would have to assume that the party was still going to be a pleasant experience for everybody... It was a failure in the American *Big Brother* that they cast too much for conflict and there was no sense of group” (quoted in Roscoe 2001, 428). Here the distinction between something provocative and conflictive is made clear. Indeed, during the whole series of *Big Brother* Australia 2012 there was only one televised face-to-face encounter that could be labelled as genuinely impolite, where one of the participants (Angie) was really angry and quite aggressive in her verbal expression. This, however, does not mean that there were no discussions or arguments in the house, but they were of a more jocular nature and without the non-verbal cues (body language, prosody) that mark verbal behaviour as genuinely impolite (for the analyses of potentially impolite verbal behaviour being perceived as non-impolite, see Haugh and Bousfield (2012) and Sinkeviciute 2014, among others).

Finally, the very participants of *Big Brother* do not seem to be impoliteness-oriented in their vision of the relationships in the house. After a conflict with another housemate in *Big Brother* UK 2012, Arron confessed:

Arron: I am just trying to engage in happy
 conversations you can try and avoid other
 conversations but it's hard to try and
 avoid other conversations without being
 rude and that's what I don't wanna be

All this suggests that ‘being rude’ is not the main goal per se in interactions in the house but it is rather employed for a number of different reasons that are shown in Section 5.

4.1 Genuine impoliteness and entertainment

Big Brother, “the godfather of reality shows” (Endemol UK), has been relocated from a mere reality gameshow “to an entertainment space” (Hill 2007, 128, cf. Hill 2002). Nor is entertainment foreign to the phenomenon of impoliteness. As Lorenzo-Dus (2009, 164) points out, “[a]cross reality television formats [...] unmitigated face-aggravation [...] acts as a regular (‘unmarked’) vehicle for entertainment.” This is what Culpeper (2011) refers to as entertaining impoliteness, i.e. when the offender deliberately uses impolite language and behaviour so that the others, who “can understand the probable impoliteness effects for the target” (Culpeper 2011, 234), could be amused. There are different reasons for the observers to be entertained by an overtly impolite behaviour, e.g. emotional and voyeuristic pleasure (Culpeper 2011, 234-235) or mirthful pleasure on the audience’s part (Dynel 2013).

When the viewers are present, the interactive situation becomes more complex. As Scannell (1991) holds, broadcast talk – a general term for (studio) talk on radio and television – has a *double articulation*, i.e. the participants in discussion or interviews interact with each other, but the talk itself “is designed to be heard by absent audiences” (Scannell 1991, 1). Many forms of broadcast talk are examples of institutional interaction and, as Tolson (1991, 179) claims, “they should be seen as institutionalized variants of ‘conversation’ as such”. It is not surprising then that they often “involve a particular set of power relationships between the two participants” (Hutchby 1996, 3), e.g. the host and the caller (Hutchby 1991; 1996) or the capitalist and entrepreneurs who need to prove in a competition show that they deserve the former’s investment (Lorenzo-Dus 2009). When there is power imbalance, conflict is likely to occur. And when there is a broadcast conflict, the audience in the studio or the viewers at home might find it entertaining (e.g. television courtroom shows (Lorenzo-Dus 2008) or political debates (Dynel 2011b)).

Impoliteness in film discourse, that, similarly to broadcast talk, “operates on two communicative levels: i.e. that of characters and that of the viewer” (Dynel 2011a, 1642), is a rich source of disaffiliative humour. Dynel (2012; 2013) points out that in this discourse impoliteness primarily “serves *viewers*’ entertainment and humour experience” (Dynel 2013, 106; emphasis added; see also Garcés-Conejos Blitvich and Lorenzo-Dus 2013, 15). As a result, the targets’ perceptions are rarely available to the viewer, since an image of the target being offended might “decrease recipients’ enjoyment” (Dynel 2013, 109). Indeed, watching reality television programmes some viewers express sympathy towards the participants who are unfairly treated or humiliated (Hill 2007, 208), especially when they [viewers] believe that the targets “really felt insulted” (Blas Arroyo 2013, 233) (cf. viewers’ complaints caused by Conor’s inappropriate behaviour).

Big Brother, which is a type of media discourse standing somewhere in between the real and fiction, is a clear illustration of a double articulation and interactions on two communicative levels. Yet, those levels are somewhat distinct from what many types of broadcast talk (e.g. debates, radio or news interviews) and film interactions offer us. First of all, even if the show structurally has much to share with soap operas, it is ‘scripted’ in a different way. What we observe are “unpredictable interactions in confined situations” (Tolson 2013), where the housemates “themselves write the script” (Roscoe 2001, 480-481). Thus, the exact meanings are not pre-defined as in political interviews (Scannell 1991, 2) or constructed for the recipients by the production crew through actors (cf. Dynel 2011a, 1642) but by the housemates themselves.

Furthermore, unlike in the film or drama discourse, where conflicts between the characters primarily generate viewers’ interest and entertainment (Culpeper 1998; Dynel 2012), genuine impoliteness in the house can amuse not only the audience, but also the fellow housemates. The latter, however, do not seem to find impolite behaviours as entertaining as the viewers. For instance, after one housemate’s (Luke S) insulting comments towards another housemate, Luke A confesses in the diary room:

Luke A: in a verbal way it was more sort of he was
 calling him really offensive names it was
 really horrible to be around

Undoubtedly, entertainment is an indispensable part of the format. However, not all genuinely impolite behaviours are caused because the speaker thinks that they might entertain the audience (for the triggers for genuine impoliteness in the house, see Section 5). After a female housemate (Shievonne) had been arguing with another housemate (Deana), the latter claimed:

Deana: she’s trying to start an argument with me
 on purpose so that everyone will see it and
 I’ll be up for nomination tomorrow

Indeed, it is understandable that in the *Big Brother* house, where each housemate tries to become the winner of the series, everyone (at least subconsciously) is primarily guided by the desire to (strategically) nominate someone else in order for that person to be eventually evicted - see Beebe (1995) on instrumental rudeness and Kienpointner’s (1997, 271-274) discussion on strategic rudeness. But at a higher level, the housemates are aware that their popularity among the viewers could be generated by the extent to which they are amusing.⁸ Finally, it should be mentioned that even though the ‘show’-oriented discourse and analyses of the *Big Brother* format have been the main focus of research, one should not forget about a

potential ‘reality’ in the show – “the real reality” of which the housemates themselves “can be sincerely convinced” (Goffman 1959, 17) – and allow for a possibility that the target at least for a moment after being seriously insulted feels *real* emotions, which can also be easily observed via his/her immediate body language and/or verbal reaction⁹ (cf. Culpeper 2005; Lorenzo-Dus 2009; Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, Bou-Franch and Lorenzo-Dus 2013; Garcés-Conejos Blitvich and Lorenzo-Dus 2013, 17-19).

5. Three triggers for impoliteness in *Big Brother* UK

In different discourses impoliteness can be occasioned for various reasons, but in all of them there should be some circumstances, an ‘offending event’ that provokes such behaviour (Bousfield 2008a). In the *Big Brother* UK 2012, three main triggers for genuine impoliteness have been observed: it occurs as (1) retaliation for previous impolite (non-)verbal behaviour, (2) a response to implied negativity or (3) as a result of personal dislike of the target or something related to him/her. The first two do seem to follow a similar pattern (see also Fig. 1.) and can appear to be more valid than the third one. However, it was observed that the behaviour in the house (as well as in everyday life) can be a product of merely disliking someone or not sharing a particular view with a fellow housemate. For example, Arron after being very nasty towards Deana, explains his behaviour to her:

Arron: me and you we don’t get along (.) you
 shouldn’t you shouldn’t be shocked by
 anything

Definitely, impoliteness can be triggered by different (non-)verbal behaviours; thus, Figure 1 illustrates the distribution of primary and secondary triggers. While primary triggers are seen as the ones provoking most of genuinely impolite behaviour in a particular situation, secondary triggers manifest themselves not always during the interaction but can also be observed in the previous encounters and in metalanguage. For example, in extract [4] discussed later in the paper, it is obvious that the speaker starts offending the target due to an implied negative attitude towards him, but the main impoliteness outburst comes when the target insults him directly. Interestingly enough, personal dislike as a secondary trigger is almost as frequent as when it is the primary one, thus substantially complementing impoliteness generated by either previous impolite verbal behaviour or implied negativity.

Figure 1. The distribution of primary and secondary triggers for genuine impoliteness

Irrespective of the trigger, the target in the previous turn¹⁰ takes the role of the speaker or, more accurately, the offender. S/he has to make a choice between responding and not responding, and if the former has been opted for, a further decision is waiting: whether to accept the face-threat or deny the opponent's position, which in turn leads to two options, namely, finding a compromise or countering the impolite act by either defending oneself or offending the other person (Bousfield 2008a). Dobs and Garcés-Conejos Blitvich (2013) employ Bousfield's response options, while further refining the model in order to account for impoliteness in polylogal or multi-party interaction (for more on polylogue, see Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2004; Dynel 2010), taking into consideration face-attack witnesses' (the third party's) responses. Similarly to the targets, the third party – the unaddressed ratified hearers – could choose to respond or not to respond. In responding, however, more options are given: to corroborate opposition (supporting the offender), to deny it by proposing a compromise or either defensively or offensively countering the face-attack, or, finally, to simply react (e.g. being genuinely surprised or deliberately intensifying the argument) (Dobs and Garcés-Conejos Blitvich 2013, 116-126). Interestingly, discussing offensive and defensive strategies, Dobs and Garcés-Conejos Blitvich (2013) report that face-threat witnesses in the classroom setting are more likely to choose to defend the targets than offend them. The same tendency was earlier noticed by Bousfield (2008a) who comments that reacting to impoliteness with impoliteness, i.e. attacking the other person back, is not the most common scenario in his data (military and police training among others) due to power or social differences, etc (see, however, Culpeper and Holmes 2013; Blas Arroyo 2013).

In the *Big Brother* house, on the other hand, where power relationships are reduced to a minimum and “egalitarian types of relationships” among the housemates are promoted (Garcés-Conejos Blitvich and Lorenzo-Dus 2013, 15), a great majority of all impoliteness events are met with the same or even more intensified impoliteness. Thus, the offender targets a number of aspects related to the hearer's face and rights that, undoubtedly, can and do function as triggers for a further impolite verbal behaviour if the target decides to take another turn. In this paper, the hearer's face and rights are targeted by employing either conventionalised impoliteness formulae (especially, insults, dismissals, silencers and threats) or comments that carry pejorative connotations in the *Big Brother* house or their combination. All the targeted aspects were divided into four categories, namely, (1) associating the target with negative characteristics and/or behaviour; (2) denying the freedom of expression or participation and/or consumption rights;¹¹ (3) questioning the target's mental, emotional state, knowledge or maturity, and (4) warning or threatening, where (1) and (3) represent the hearer's face (and/or identity) values, whereas (2) and (4) relate to rights s/he claims for him/herself. This classification presents broad categories (the first being probably the most inclusive) that comprise more concrete verbal behaviours (see subsections in this section). For example, the offender explicitly associates the target with negative features when belittling him/her, or points to a negative behaviour, such as a wrong decision being made previously and having negative consequences for the offender at the moment.

Figure 2. The targeted aspects of the hearer's face and rights in relation to the impoliteness triggers

As shown in Figure 2, not all of the four categories are targeted to the same degree. If a housemate is responding to an impolite verbal behaviour, s/he tends to associate the target with something negative much more than if genuine impoliteness is provoked by implied negativity, in which case denying the freedom of expression, mainly speech, is a dominant category. Curiously enough, personal dislike of the target or his/her specific behaviour resulted in no questioning of mental, emotional state, knowledge or maturity. The reason for this could be the fact that in almost all the situations, the offender was irritated by a particular opinion or idea expressed by the target, while seeing him/herself as a friend in general. Taking this into consideration and the fact that all other categories refer to more temporal (verbal) activities, the offender decides not to pose threat to such personal qualities as emotions or knowledge.

In the following Subsections 5.1-5.3, genuinely impolite verbal behaviours with a variety of targeted aspects of the hearer's face and rights s/he claims for him/herself generated as either (1) retaliation for previous impolite (non-)verbal behaviours, (2) a response to implied negativity or (3) as a result of personal dislike of the target or something related to him/her are illustrated with the examples from the *Big Brother* UK 2012 house.

5.1. Impoliteness as retaliation for impolite (non-) verbal behaviours

"Rudeness begets rudeness" (Lakoff 1989, 124) and it has been suggested that impoliteness as a reaction to impoliteness (e.g. a previous personal attack) is adequate and legitimate (Kienpointner 1997; Culpeper 2011), especially when it is "provoked by extraordinarily bad behavior, so that equally bad behavior is the only self-esteem-preserving response" (Lakoff 1989, 123). Not all 'bad behaviours', however, lead to an equally impolite response, which causes different self-protective reactions (as well as their absence) on the target's part (cf. extracts [2], [3] and [4]). Also, this does not mean that retaliation is a universal common practice, but it can be a frequent reaction at least in British and North American cultures (Culpeper 2011, 205).

[2] Day 17

The housemates are not allowed to mention nominations in their conversations. Caroline and Conor talked about nominations, where Caroline

said that Becky was not going to win the show because 'she's annoying'. Since it was a breach of the rules, the whole conversation was repeated to all the housemates, who are present during the fragment.

Caroline: I'm sorry Becky and [laughs] everyone else
Benedict: → == no you're not you bitch about people all the time
Caroline: I do::
Benedict: → you do you've been incredibly nasty and bastard you've been here about several people
Caroline: I was only (irritated with) Becky
Benedict: → you laughed when Victoria found that she was going {[abruptly and looking directly at Caroline] you laughed (...) when she was going (...) you LAUGHED (the foulest form) you've been nasty all the time}
Caroline: no I was very irrit-
Benedict: → == how ungrateful to your parents as well who brought you up
Caroline: no I was (very) irritated by Becky yesterday (.) I mean Becky I am really sorry
Benedict: so () character at all Caroline
Caroline: {[not looking at anyone] no I haven't been bitching about anyone else}
Benedict: → BULLSHIT
Caroline: {[in a slightly smiley voice] I haven't been ()-}
Benedict: == bullshit

Caroline, who during the series was labelled as 'the most sarcastic or the bitchiest person' in the house, tries to apologise, but judging from her several attempts at laughing, unlike her fellow housemates, she finds the whole situation humorous (as almost all other offensive situations generated by her or other housemates). This fragment is particularly interesting since Benedict retaliates against Caroline's impolite behaviour that was not directed at him, but at some other housemates (Becky and Victoria, in particular). Caroline's comment about Becky being 'annoying' initially triggers Benedict's remarks about Caroline being 'incredibly nasty and bastard', thus reducing her face value. But the main wave of his anger is caused by Caroline laughing when Victoria (Benedict's friend in the house) was evicted. His voice is abrupt and he shouts on several occasions, almost all the time maintaining the eye contact with Caroline who seems to try to hide herself. Even though Caroline is massively belittled and associated with negative and highly criticised behaviour in the house (i.e. bitching about other housemates), Benedict in his impolite behaviour also decides to threaten Caroline's identity and mentions her parents, which in his opinion should make the target ashamed of her verbal actions. Caroline tries to defend herself claiming that she was nasty towards Becky as a response to her 'being irritating', but does not use impolite behaviour towards Benedict, as if legitimising his impoliteness. It should also be mentioned that most of the housemates do not find Benedict's retaliation as 'out of place', maybe because they are aware of how

'bitchy' Caroline can be. However, Benedict's genuinely impolite behaviour does provoke Ashleigh's retaliation:

[3] Day 17 (continuation)

Ashleigh: you always want to get the last word you
 need to shut up once in a while
Benedict: that's nice (.) that's very rude
Ashleigh: = not at all =
Benedict: = I wasn't = being rude at all I was just
 setting out my point
Ashleigh: → SHUT UP Benedict keep your opinions to
 yourself for once in a while
Benedict: (...) {[very seriously] voilà}

Unlike Benedict, Ashleigh does not primarily damage his face (she does not associate him with negative characteristics), but rather denies his association rights, i.e. his freedom of expression, suggesting that he should 'shut up'. Benedict's reaction is peculiar, since first he opts for the obviously sarcastic 'that's nice', but then immediately labels Ashleigh's comments as 'very rude' and tries to defend and explain himself, claiming that he 'wasn't being rude at all' (i.e. trying to neutralise his genuinely impolite behaviour in metatalk). Ashleigh, in her turn, denies his active participation rights suggesting that he should 'keep [his] opinions to [himself]', to which after a pause he responds with 'voilà'. Being said with a falling tone, it does not suggest surprise but rather a conclusion he makes for himself that expressing his opinion in the house is not welcomed.

In these two fragments, the relationship between genuinely impolite behaviours and the subsequent retaliation can be said to be at the same level. This could also explain why the third party (Benedict and Ashleigh), that in general does not show a tendency to defend other housemates, and not the targets (Becky and Caroline) felt the need to retaliate against impolite behaviour towards someone else. However, when this relationship is not proportional, the retaliation seems to be inappropriate and the conflict escalates. Consider the following interaction:

[4] Day 8

During the first weekly task the housemates are not allowed to laugh. Scott accidentally giggles, which generates Chris's criticism. Becky tries to defend Scott, saying that 'it's ok', thus suggesting that Chris takes the task too seriously. Chris tries to explain himself saying that Becky's interpretation of what he was referring to is wrong. Some other housemates are present but do not get involved.

Chris: you taking every word literally it's just a
 saying you take {[more slowly] every word
 literally}
Becky: → you are very aggressive Chris
Chris: → [looks very serious and negatively
 surprised]
Becky: [attempts at smiling]
Chris: → seriously where are you from? you're from a
 land where everyone goes around like (.)
 saying {[changing the voice] he::y ho::

it's the real world wake up smell
 coffee just grow up seriously that's what
 I'm saying to you grow up becau-
 Becky: I've smelt the coffee
 Chris: → not really if you think you take everything
 literally and you tell I'm aggressive
 because I said I walked out and having a
 bath cause-
 Becky: (enjoy your) bath ()
 Chris: because I don't wanna stand here and argue
 I'd rather storm off but if you want it
 {[faster and leaning forward] I'll argue I
 don't care I'd rather storm off and
 → not argue with someone than make them fell
 this big if you wanna argue I'll make you
 look this big
 Becky: = oh you would never make me look (...) you
 would never =
 Chris: → = make you feel this big trust me I would
 don't try it don't try it trust me =
 Becky: == make me look that big Chris
 Chris: I know Scott nominated me cause he's a
 sheep but at the end of the day I (did not)
 feel I () put up with Scott but {[pointing
 at Becky] with you} I'm not gonna (put up)
 so I'm not gonna go around with you on my
 tiptoes (.) {[with an expression of disgust
 on his face moving backwards] there's a
 (problem) between me and you} think it's
 gonna get any better you're gonna vote for
 me every single time?
 Becky: oh I = know =
 Chris: = STANDARD = STANDARD
 Becky: oh I know what
 Chris: → and every time I'm gonna (vote) I'm gonna
 vote for {[pointing at Becky] for you} if I
 may
 Becky: = that's absolutely fine =
 Chris: → = that's standard = you know you've picked
 yourself the wrong person
 part of the conversation omitted
 Becky: bloody = bullying Chris =
 Chris: → = {[leaving the bedroom] fucking
 mug} =

Unlike fragment [2], Chris's genuinely impolite verbal behaviour is initially generated by Becky implying he should relax. The main aggression arises, however, after Becky explicitly calls Chris 'aggressive' (not just being aggressive at the moment, but she attributes aggression as his personal feature – his face value), which carries a negative connotation and deeply insults Chris. This is seen in his face expression: it changes into negative surprise.

Apart from questioning Becky's mental state and maturity ('where are you from', 'grow up'), Chris directly threatens her ('I'll make you look this big', 'you've picked yourself the wrong person'). Becky does not choose to counter impoliteness with impoliteness, even though she tries to respond on several occasions to Chris's threats. This might be generated by the fact that Chris's verbal behaviour goes far beyond what could have been expected as a response to Becky characterising him as 'aggressive' and the target decides to observe rather than participate. Only at the very end when Chris leaves the bedroom do we hear Becky labelling such an aggressive behaviour as 'bullying'. It should be emphasised that Chris's behaviour is additionally occasioned by his and Becky's discussion several days earlier, when she, trying to guess Chris's job, said that he was a scrap metal collector. He interpreted it as attack on his identity (he is actually a bailiff) and later claimed that it offended him, thus his 'problem' with Becky is also personal dislike (see Subsection 5.3). Finally, what is peculiar in this argument is that Chris's outrage is also provoked by nominations that being a normal process in the show should be seen as sanctioned in the *Big Brother* context. However, similarly to Culpeper's (2011) observations about sanctioned behaviour not neutralising the offence, the fact that people voted for Chris makes him feel deeply insulted and genuinely impolite towards them.

5.2. Impoliteness as a response to implied negativity

Impoliteness as a response to implied negativity differs from retaliation for a genuinely impolite verbal behaviour, since (i) in this case the previous turn does not include conventionalised impoliteness formulae and (ii) even if a negative message is quite clear, the speaker of the previous turn has a potential way-out and can always claim its untruthfulness and try to cancel it, which has not been observed after genuinely impolite verbal behaviour (cf. Benedict's insults towards Caroline in [2] that can hardly be later claimed to be untruthful). This type of impoliteness is related to what Culpeper (2011, 156-180) terms implicational impoliteness, which arises due to particular linguistic triggers: form (e.g. snide remarks or mimicry), content (e.g. sarcasm or some types of irony and conversational humour) and context (e.g. when expected behaviour is absent). Even if the negotiability of meanings is always present, the offence taken at implied negativity can be as serious as the one taken at a direct insult and, as a result, cause a conflict. Consider the following fairly long example:

[5] Day 14

Benedict decides to confront Arron after he was told that Arron thought he was boring. Everything happens at the table where Lydia and Deana (Benedict's friends) are having breakfast. While explaining himself Arron says 'horrible two-faced bastards who ever said that' and at the end of the conversation with Benedict he remarks:

Arron: → I hope you enjoyed that erm Deana and Lydia
 Lydia: that had nothing to do with me {[pointing
 at Arron] you're just assuming
 Arron: no you two were the spectators I'm not
 assuming

part of the conversation omitted

Arron: → I wasn't blaming it on you I wasn't blaming
 it on you
 Lydia: → == {[louder] after what I've said about you

don't you dare turn on me Arron}
 Arron: I wasn't blaming it on you
 Lydia: → = {[faster] don't make little comments
 don't say () calling everyone ()} =
 Arron: → = I said I hope you enjoyed it cause you
 stayed there =
 Lydia: = {[louder, abruptly and frowning] what do
 we do () to walk away} =
 Deana: = () because of you =
 Lydia: I'm eating my breakfast this is a table in
 the in the living room
 Arron: → enjoy your breakfast then
 Deana: yeah we will = () =
 Lydia: = ok Arron I've totally
 changed = my opinion of you now thanks very
 much I gave you a chance and I tried to say
 → that to other people but if that's the way
 you wanna treat the people that try and
 give you a chance
 part of the conversation omitted
 Arron: → I said whoever said that to Benedict I
 wasn't that wasn't directed at anyone (.)
 ok I'm done
 part of the conversation omitted
 Lydia: → don't call people's names Arron
 it's so offensive (.) listen I've just said
 to you I've got nothing to do with it
 part of the conversation omitted
 Lydia: == you've just brought me in to it I'm
 sitting and eating my breakfast I didn't
 say a word I didn't say a word and
 {[pointing at Arron] you} say
 {[mimicking Arron] hope you enjoyed that
 Deana and Lydia
 → = {[systematically pointing at Arron] don't
 you dare say my name don't
 you dare say my name Arron} =
 Arron: = you're making yourself you're
 making yourself a victim = you're making
 yourself a victim
 Lydia: → no (.) how would I ever be a victim of you
 Arron a victim of you are you joking
 Arron: = so what you're trying to say- =
 Lydia: = I've been around the world = many more
 times I've seen more than you've seen don't
 → ever say I'd be a victim of {[pointing at
 Arron] you} = you're 23 years old =
 Arron: = {[laughing] oh my god = look
 at that
 Lydia: → a victim of you = are you joking =

Arron: {[smiling] = and that's = your
 response and that's your response}
 Lydia: that's absolutely my response
 Arron: perfect
 Lydia: → guess again little boy
 Arron: all right little boy

The extract starts when Lydia hears that Arron refers to those who told Benedict about his comment as 'horrible two-faced bastards', which most probably has been deliberately mentioned in front of her. Nevertheless, it does not seem to threaten her face and trigger her response. However, hearing Arron's remark 'I hope you enjoyed that [the conversation between Arron and Benedict]', which is explicitly directed at her, Lydia (who is not the person who told Benedict what Arron said) seems to have no doubt that Arron implies that they (Deana and Lydia) are those 'bastards'. Since it is a false accusation, Lydia decides to offend Arron in her turn. It is interesting to observe how Arron tries to cancel this implied negativity, repeating that 'I wasn't blaming it on you' and 'I said I hope you enjoyed it cause you stayed there'. Lydia does not seem to believe that and, when Arron uses a sarcastic 'enjoy your breakfast then', explodes, which can also be seen in her facial expression that changes to an even more serious one and her raised voice. While Arron still tries (in vain) to 'escape' the negativity ('I said whoever said that to Benedict I wasn't that wasn't directed at anyone'), Lydia deprives him of rights to equal communication and reduces his face value: she warns him about possible consequences of his behaviour ('if that's the way you wanna treat the people', 'don't you dare say my name'), belittles him ('how would I ever be a victim of you Arron a victim of you are you joking', 'guess again little boy') and tries to deny his freedom of expression claiming that what he says is 'offensive' ('don't call people's names', 'don't ever say'). Arron, who is one of the jokers in the house always looking for 'banterish' people, deliberately (and apparently not genuinely) attempts to laugh (or rather laugh Lydia's comment off) on several occasions and does not take Lydia's impolite behaviour seriously (as much as everything else in the house).

5.3. Impoliteness as a result of disliking (part of) somebody

The last trigger for genuine impoliteness is personal dislike of the target or something related to him/her. As already mentioned, this category invoked less impoliteness than the other two, but was frequently used as a supplementary trigger for impolite behaviour. In the *Big Brother* house (as well as outside) some people just do not get along, but if in the real world one has more opportunities to avoid such people, the housemates have to manage to live with them side by side, which often causes some disagreement and conflict. However, the majority of arguments in this subsection are based on someone not appreciating the target's current behaviour, but still finding the person nice and likeable. Consider fragment [6] from the very beginning of the show:

[6] Day 3

While playing a game, Arron has to respond whom of the housemates he would snog, marry and evict. For the latter he says Victoria, who is upset afterwards. They discuss it in the bedroom. Some other housemates are also in the bedroom.

Arron: we play a little game and it's () spin
 the ball and it lands on you know snog

marry evict and I just come up with you
 know you because everybody
 → else is enjoying it you're not
 part of the conversation omitted
 Victoria: → I actually came in here to have a laugh
 Conor: I'm () here to have a laugh that's the
 whole point of being on a show
 Victoria: I would rather say that I want somebody out
 → cause I don't really like them that much
 rather than someone that's come to me
 confided in me so I'm really upset right
 now
 Arron: I've made an effort to come and speak to
 → you because you've locked down you've been
 unhappy
 part of the conversation omitted
 Arron: so just chill out now
 Victoria: {[loudly] I can't wait to be at home and
 watch (.) the carnage () really gone}
 Conor: () there's gonna be carnage (.) everyone's
 getting along with everybody
 Victoria: == there's definitely gonna be some serious
 carnage in this house
 Conor: you think so
 Victoria: yeah
 Conor: I don't think so
 Arron: → I don't I think it's gonna be a fucking
 right (love) as soon as we get rid of
 people like yourself that wanna put a
 downer on the experience
 Victoria: I'm not putting a downer on the experience
 Arron: → () I've (done with) people like you I I
 said at the beginning of this year I won't
 be dealing with negative vibes and
 {[pointing at Victoria] you're} a
 negative vibe girl
 Victoria: ok cool
 Arron: good night guys
 Conor: → [leaves] {[in the kitchen to Deana and
 Lydia] if she doesn't go on Friday that
 will fuck me off I'll be fucking snapping}
 part of the conversation omitted
 Victoria: [cries in the bedroom]

Extract [6] presents metatalk on the previous impolite event (Arron says he would evict Victoria, which in the *Big Brother* context is seen as an insult (related to the target's face values and identity) and exclusion (related to target's rights), since there is no more participation in the show after eviction). Victoria, instead of being impolite towards Arron, tries to understand why he said that if, as she thinks, they are friends.¹² Arron, however, associates Victoria with negative behaviour, i.e. not enjoying, being unhappy and putting 'a

downer on the experience'. Since having a laugh is culturally valued (i.e. the cultural proscription against taking oneself too seriously), Victoria being 'a negative vibe' seems to be not welcome in the house. Arron explicitly wants to exclude her (deny her participation rights), saying everything is going to be fine 'as soon as we get rid of people like yourself'. Knowing that the target is already 'upset', every attempt to belittle her makes the situation and offence even more serious. At the end, while Victoria is crying in her bed, Conor thinks that not being 'happy' in the house is a valid reason to be 'snapping' at her.

Although the situation in extract [6] is between two strangers, since it takes place on day 3, personal dislike can be also encountered at the end of the show when friendship relations have already been formed.

[7] Day 53

Sara hears how Deana is saying to Caroline that she is happy to have met her. Knowing that Deana's opinion of Caroline has always been very negative, Sara asks Deana why she said that. Adam and Luke A are present.

Sara: → no I was just shocked cause yesterday you
said she was a fucking dickhead
Deana: she is a dickhead
Sara: = and today you're () happy to meet you
{[puzzled] I was like uh} =
Deana: = you're misinterpreting it Sara = you are
misinterpreting what I'm saying right she
is a dickhead I've said it in the diary
room I don't like what she does
Sara: = I don't think she's a dickhead I don't
think she's a dickhead I just think =
Deana: = but at the end of the day but at the end
of the day = ok you're not listening to
what what I'm saying
Sara: {[playing with a toy crown] what is it I'm
not even bothered by this}
conversation
Deana: no but you asked me so you said your point
→ I don't like what she does so you made
yourself look good by saying you don't like
what she does
Sara: {[frowning] what are you talking about
= making myself look good (...) what are you
talking about} =
Deana: = but you're not- but you're not- =
listening to my answer by what I mean
part of the conversation omitted
Sara: → = I'm asking you a question {[making a stop
gesture] ()} just don't bother speak with
me =
Deana: = () you just said you just said =
Sara: → {[faster] just don't bother speak with me}
Deana: oh fine don't speak to me then
Sara: = I (wanna) speak to you =

Deana: = I you ask me a question listen to the
answer =

Sara: → clearly what I thought about you first is
completely wrong () that to me (.) whatever
[silence]

Adam: {[laughing] oh my goodness what the fuck
just happened right now}

In this fragment we see how Sara, being Deana's friend, does not approve of her positive comments towards Caroline, taking into consideration that the day before Deana said that 'she was a fucking dickhead'. This suggests that Sara associates Deana with one of the most negatively evaluated behaviours in the house – pretence.¹³ This seems quite paradoxical, though, since the housemates repeatedly say that 'it's not the real life', but at the same time they condemn 'fakeness' in the house, where "authenticity, sincerity and staying true to oneself [are emphasised] as key values" (Hamo 2013, 67). Deana defends herself and insinuates that Sara, claiming that she does not like Caroline's behaviour, makes herself 'look good'. This implied negativity about being 'not real' in front of the cameras extremely threatens Sara's face and provokes her further impoliteness when she denies Deana's participation rights ('just don't bother speak with me') and explicitly says that she has changed her opinion about Deana, because she seems to have been pretending all the time. This is directly related to Deana's identity as Sara's friend in the house, which has been questioned. Adam, who has been listening to the whole argument and knows that Deana and Sara are friends, laughs trying to point to the absurdity of the situation.

In this section, three main impoliteness triggers in the *Big Brother* house were identified. Not only are people genuinely impolite in order to retaliate against previous impolite (non-)verbal behaviours, but also to respond to implied negativity and show personal dislike. Furthermore, all the instances of impolite behaviour were classified into four groups indicating which aspects of the hearer's face and rights were targeted, namely associating the hearer with some negative qualities or behaviour, questioning his/her mental, emotion state, knowledge or maturity, denying the freedom of expression or participation rights and, finally, warning or threatening. Undoubtedly, this is not an exhaustive list of either possible impoliteness triggers or targeted aspects of the hearer's face and rights, but it reflects the use of genuine impoliteness in the *Big Brother* UK 2012 house.

6. Conclusions

Nowadays impoliteness is if not the most frequent concept used to describe verbal activities among speakers, then at least one of the most prevailing areas of research. In this paper, I concentrated on genuine impoliteness in the context of *Big Brother* that was caused by a combination of conventionalised impoliteness formulae (Culpeper 2010, 2011), disapproved verbal behaviour in the *Big Brother* house and implied negativity.

In order to arrive at genuine impoliteness such notions as potentiality and genuineness in relation to context and non-verbal cues were explored (Section 2). Acknowledging the inseparability of linguistic structure and context, it was observed that in particular contextual situations some meanings become salient or an extra meaning might be acquired. In the case of some conventionalised impoliteness formulae, their meanings seem to be more stable, since the interpretation of those formulae, derived from socially based background assumptions, suggests a negative evaluation in many different contexts (cf. Culpeper 2011). Unquestionably, they should not be attached to the phenomenon of conversational

impoliteness by default. Hence, it is useful to refer to potentially impolite verbal behaviours that due to contextual cues could be evaluated as non-impolite.

Before moving to the analysis of genuine impoliteness in the *Big Brother* UK 2012 house, the relationship between this gameshow and impoliteness as well as between entertainment and impoliteness was described (Section 4). Even though verbal conflicts and aggression are not foreign to reality shows, *Big Brother* cannot be labelled as a typical impoliteness discourse. Illustrating a double articulation (Scannell 1991) and operating on two communicative levels (Dynel 2011a; 2011b; 2012; 2013), the interactive situation of the show and partly impoliteness therein functions as a source of the viewers' entertainment. This, however, does not mean that the housemates use impolite behaviour exclusively in order to amuse the audience. On the characters' (housemates) level, impoliteness is provoked by previous impolite (non-)verbal behaviour, implied negativity or personal dislike and manifests itself in a variety of ways, i.e. different aspects of the target's face and rights are threatened (cf. Spencer-Oatey's (2002) work on rapport management). For instance, if previous impolite behaviour triggers impoliteness, the target is likely to be associated with negative characteristics (related to face values/identity), be excluded from the conversation (related to rights) or his/her maturity is questioned (related to face values) (Subsection 5.1), while the freedom of expression or participation rights tends to be primarily denied if the offender responds to implied negativity (Subsection 5.2). Finally, when personal dislike generates genuinely impolite behaviour, the target might be belittled (related to face values/identity), warned (related to rights), but his/her mental state or knowledge (related to face values) are not questioned (Subsection 5.3).

Although impoliteness has always been present in our communicative behaviour (and *Big Brother* is not an exception), it certainly manifests itself in different ways in different discourses. In addition, attitudes towards it are constantly changing. What we, analysts, can do is analyse those attitudes in their own 'interactional environment' in order to be able to explain the phenomenon of impoliteness across time and discourses.

Acknowledgements

This research is supported by a grant from the University of Antwerp (IWS BOF UA 2012). I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Jef Verschueren for helpful comments and suggestions that significantly contributed to the discussion of 'meaning in context' in this paper. Also, I am thankful to two anonymous reviewers for their useful suggestions.

Endnotes

¹ For reasons of clarity, it should be mentioned that in this paper the notion of sarcasm merely refers to the use of a polite linguistic form that in a particular context is obviously insincere and can be used, for example, as a putdown (*mock politeness*; cf. Culpeper 2005, 42).

² Cf. Bousfield's (2010) prototype understanding of impoliteness and rudeness, where he also takes into consideration the speaker and the hearer and identifies twelve possible scenarios. However, he does it from a slightly different perspective, concentrating on the speaker's intent and awareness of possible face-damaging effects as well as the hearer's construction of the speaker's intent and his/her face being actually damaged. Given the focus of this paper, this analysis identifies itself with one of the proposed scenarios and would be labelled as impoliteness that 'is successfully communicated' (Bousfield 2010, 122).

³ The videos can be accessed at <https://vimeo.com/album/2887847>; password: carnage.

⁴ For the difference between public (frontstage) and personal (backstage) offence being taken at potentially impolite verbal action, see Sinkeviciute (2014, under review).

⁵ Note, however, that talking in an impolite way behind one's back does not seem to cause as many hurt feelings as its face-to-face counterpart.

Lydia: I might have been () in the diary room and nominated someone but for god's sake at least it was behind their back and not in their face like I've just had to deal with and I'll tell you what people can say two-faced or talking behind people's backs is hell a lot better than treating people how I've just been treated face-to-face and I assure you of that

⁶ A reviewer of this paper correctly suggested that the label 'genuine' might be problematic in the context of reality television, where performance is predominant. Indeed, (performed) impoliteness might be expected in such contexts, but theoretical and empirical analyses of impoliteness in reality television discourses show that "it is interpreted as 'real' by both participants and the audience" (Garcés-Conejos Blitvich and Lorenzo-Dus 2013, 17-18; also see references therein) (see also footnote 9).

⁷ Here, the notion of face is seen as inclusive of the notion of identity (cf. Spencer-Oatey (2002) where *social identity face* is one aspect of *face*).

⁸ Ironically, Arron's (*Big Brother* UK 2012) practical jokes were not perceived as funny by most of the housemates or, apparently, the audience (he lost out in a four-way eviction).

⁹ On the other hand, it is possible to assume that the entire population *acts* 24/7. Indeed, as Park (1950, 249-250) holds, "everyone is always and everywhere, more or less consciously, playing a role... It is in these roles that we know each other; it is in these roles that we know ourselves. [...] In a sense, and in so far as this mask represents the conception we have formed of ourselves – the role we are striving to live up to – this mask is our truer self [...]"

¹⁰ There might be no previous impolite turn in the case when impoliteness is based only on personal dislike.

¹¹ For instance, Adam refused to share cigarettes with Ashleigh because of her inconsiderate behaviour towards himself and other housemates.

¹² The next day Arron reflects on Victoria thinking they are friends:

Arron: I've known you for 2 days girl chill out

¹³ Similarly, in the Spanish television programme *Mujeres y hombres y viceversa*, "[o]ne of the most harshly condemned aspects is lack of honesty" (Blas Arroyo 2013, 226).

References:

- Archer, Dawn Elizabeth. 2008. "Verbal Aggression and Impoliteness: Related or Synonymous?" In *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*, ed. by Derek Bousfield and Miriam A. Locher, 181-207. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Auer, Peter, and Aldo di Luzio, eds. 1992. *The Contextualization of Language*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Beebe, Leslie M. 1995. "Polite Fictions: Instrumental Rudeness as Pragmatic Competence." In *Linguistics and the Education of Language Teachers: Ethnolinguistic, Psycholinguistic, and Sociolinguistic Aspects*, Georgetown University Roundtable on Language and Linguistics, ed. by James E. Alatis, Carolyn A. Straehle, Brent Gallenberger and Maggie Ronkin, 154-168. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Bernal, María. 2008. "Do Insults Always Insult? *Genuine Impoliteness* versus *Non-Genuine Impoliteness* in Colloquial Spanish." *Pragmatics* 18 (4): 775-802.
- Bignell, Jonathan. 2005. *Big Brother: Reality TV in the Twenty-first Century*. Hampshire/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Blas Arroyo, José Luis. 2013. "'No eres inteligente ni para tener amigos... Pues anda que tú' ['You are not even clever enough to have any friends... Look who's talking!']: A Quantitative Analysis of the Production and Reception of Impoliteness in Present-day Spanish Reality Television." In *Real Talk: Reality Television and Discourse Analysis in Action*, ed. by Nuria Lorenzo-Dus and Pilar Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, 218-244. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bousfield, Derek. 2008a. *Impoliteness in Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Bousfield, Derek. 2008b. "Impoliteness in the Struggle for Power." In *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*, ed. by Derek Bousfield and Miriam A. Locher, 127-153. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bousfield, Derek. 2010. "Researching Impoliteness and Rudeness: Issues and Definitions." In *Interpersonal Pragmatics*, ed. by Miriam A. Locher and Sage L. Graham, 101-134. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, Jonathan. 1996. "Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness." *Journal of Pragmatics* 25 (3): 349-367.
- Culpeper, Jonathan. 1998. "(Im)politeness in Dramatic Dialogue." In *Exploring the Language of Drama: From Text to Context*, ed. by Jonathan Culpeper, Mick Short and Peter Verdonk, 83-95. London: Routledge.
- Culpeper, Jonathan. 2005. "Impoliteness and Entertainment in the Television Quiz Show: *The Weakest Link*." *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture* 1 (1): 35-72.
- Culpeper, Jonathan. 2010. "Conventionalised Impoliteness Formulae." *Journal of Pragmatics* 42 (12): 3232-3245.
- Culpeper, Jonathan. 2011. *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, Jonathan, Derek Bousfield, and Anne Wichmann. 2003. "Impoliteness Revisited: With Special Reference to Dynamic and Prosodic Aspects." *Journal of Pragmatics* 35 (10-11): 1545-1579.
- Culpeper, Jonathan, and Olivier Holmes. 2013. "(Im)politeness and Exploitative TV in Britain and north America: *The X-Factor* and *American Idol*." In *Real Talk: Reality Television and Discourse Analysis in Action*, ed. by Nuria Lorenzo-Dus and Pilar Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, 169-198. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dobs, Abby Mueller, and Pilar Garcés-Conejos Blitvich. 2013. "Impoliteness in Polylogal Interaction: Accounting for Face-threat Witnesses' Responses." *Journal of Pragmatics* 53: 112-130.
- Drew, Paul. 1987. "Po-faced Receipts of Teases." *Linguistics* 25 (1): 219-253.
- Dynel, Marta. 2010. "Not Hearing Things – Hearer/Listener Categories in Polylogues." *mediAzioni* 9, http://www.mediazioni.sitlec.unibo.it/images/stories/PDF_folder/document-pdf/2010/dynel_2010.pdf
- Dynel, Marta. 2011a. "'You talking to me?' The Viewer as a Ratified Listener to Film Discourse." *Journal of Pragmatics* 43 (6): 1628-1644.
- Dynel, Marta. 2011b. "Entertaining and Enraging: The Functions of Verbal Violence in Broadcast Political Debates." In *Studies in Political Humour*, ed. by Villy Tsakona and Diana Elena Popa, 109-134. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dynel, Marta. 2012. "Setting Our House in Order: The Workings of Impoliteness in Multi-party Film Discourse." *Journal of Politeness Research* 8 (2): 161-194.
- Dynel, Marta. 2013. "Impoliteness as Disaffiliative Humour in Film Talk." In *Developments in Linguistic Humour Theory*, ed. by Marta Dynel, 105-144. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Eelen, Gino. 2001. *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Endemol UK. *Big Brother*. Accessed May 24, 2014. <http://www.endemoluk.com/programme/big-brother>.

- Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, Pilar, Patricia Bou-Franch, and Nuria Lorenzo-Dus. 2013. "Identity and Impoliteness: The Expert in the Talent Show *Idol*." *Journal of Politeness Research* 9 (1): 97-121.
- Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, Pilar, and Nuria Lorenzo-Dus. 2013. "Reality Television: A Discourse-analytical Perspective." In *Real Talk: Reality Television and Discourse Analysis in Action*, ed. by Nuria Lorenzo-Dus and Pilar Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, 9-23. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- García-Pastor, María Dolores. 2008. "Political Campaign Debates as Zero-sum Games: Impoliteness and Power in Candidates' Exchanges." In *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*, ed. by Derek Bousfield and Miriam A. Locher, 101-123. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Goddard, Cliff. 2006. "'Lift your game Martina!': Deadpan Jocular Irony and the Ethnopragmatics of Australian English." In *Ethnopragmatics: Understanding Discourse in Cultural Context*, ed. by Cliff Goddard, 65-97. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Goddard, Cliff. 2009. "Not Taking Yourself too Seriously in Australian English: Semantic Explications, Cultural Scripts, Corpus Evidence." *Intercultural Pragmatics* 6 (1): 29-53.
- Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.
- Goodwin, Charles, and Alessandro Duranti. 1992. "Rethinking Context: An Introduction." In *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, ed. by Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin, 1-42. Cambridge: CUP.
- Gumperz, John J. 1992. "Contextualization Revisited." In *The Contextualization of Language*, ed. by Peter Auer and Aldo di Luzio, 39-53. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hamo, Michal. 2013. "The (Inter)play of Nationality, Religiosity and Gender: Textual Mechanisms for the Rich Representation of Israeli Identity on a Reality Race Gamedoc." In *Real Talk: Reality Television and Discourse Analysis in Action*, ed. by Nuria Lorenzo-Dus and Pilar Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, 66-87. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Harris, Sandra. 2011. "The Limits of Politeness Re-visited: Courtroom Discourse as a Case in Point." In *Discursive Approaches to Politeness*, ed. by LPRG, 85-108. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haugh, Michael, and Derek Bousfield. 2012. "Mock Impoliteness in Interactions amongst Australian and British Speakers of English." *Journal of Pragmatics* 44: 1099-1114.
- Hill, Annette. 2002. "Big Brother: The Real Audience." *Television & New Media* 3 (3): 323-340.
- Hill, Annette. 2007. *Restyling Factual TV: Audiences and News, Documentary and Reality Genres*. New York: Routledge.
- Hutchby, Ian. 1991. "The Organization of Talk on Talk Radio." In *Broadcast Talk*, ed. by Paddy Scannell, 119-137. London/Newbury Part/New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Hutchby, Ian. 1996. *Confrontation Talk: Arguments, Asymmetries, and Power on Talk Radio*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kasper, Gabriele. 1990. "Linguistic Politeness: Current Research Issues." *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 193-218.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Catherine. 2004. "Introducing Polylogue." *Journal of Pragmatics* 36: 1-24.
- Kienpointner, Manfred. 1997. "Varieties of Rudeness: Types and Functions of Impolite Utterances." *Functions of Language* 4 (2): 251-287.

- Kienpointner, Manfred. 2008. "Impoliteness and Emotional Arguments." *Journal of Politeness Research* 4: 243-265.
- Lachenicht, Lance G. 1980. "Aggravating Language: A Study of Abusive and Insulting Language." *Paper in Linguistics: International Journal of Human Communication* 13 (4): 607-688.
- Lakoff, Robin Tolmach. 1989. "The Limits of Politeness: Therapeutic and Courtroom Discourse." *Multilingua* 8 (2/3): 101-129.
- Locher, Miriam A., and Richard J. Watts. 2005. "Politeness Theory and Relational Work." *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture* 1 (1): 9-33.
- Locher, Miriam A., and Richard J. Watts. 2008. "Relational Work and Impoliteness: Negotiating Norms of Linguistic Behaviour." In *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*, ed. by Derek Bousfield and Miriam A. Locher, 77-99. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lockley, Mike. 2014. "Big Brother Star Deana Uppal Loses Libel Case Against Fellow Contestant Conor McIntyre." *Birmingham Mail*, April 9.
<http://www.birminghammail.co.uk/whats-on/whats-on-news/big-brother-star-deana-uppal-6941227>.
- Lorenzo-Dus, Nuria. 2008. "Real Disorder in the Court: An Investigation of Conflict Talk in US Television Courtroom Shows." *Media, Culture & Society* 30 (1): 81-107.
- Lorenzo-Dus, Nuria. 2009. "'You're barking mad, I'm out': Impoliteness and Broadcast Talk." *Journal of Politeness Research* 5: 159-187.
- Lorenzo-Dus, Nuria, and Pilar Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, eds. 2013. *Real Talk: Reality Television and Discourse Analysis in Action*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lorenzo-Dus, Nuria, Patricia Bou-Franch and Pilar Garcés-Conejos Blitvich. 2013. "Impoliteness in US/UK Talent Shows: A Diachronic Study of Evolution of a Genre." In *Real Talk: Reality Television and Discourse Analysis in Action*, ed. by Nuria Lorenzo-Dus and Pilar Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, 199-217. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- LPRG (Linguistic Politeness Research Group), eds. 2011. *Discursive Approaches to Politeness*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Mills, Sara. 2002. "Rethinking Politeness, Impoliteness and Gender Identity." In *Gender Identity and Discourse Analysis*, ed. by Lia Litosseliti and Jane Sunderland, 69-89. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Mills, Sara. 2003. *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mills, Sara. 2011. "Discursive Approaches to Politeness and Impoliteness." In *Discursive Approaches to Politeness*, ed. by Linguistic Politeness Research Group, 19-56. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyten Mouton.
- Mills, Sara. "Discursive Approaches to Politeness". Opening lecture at *The 1st Postgraduate Conference on Linguistic Politeness*, University of Huddersfield, 8 March 2013.
- Mullany, Louise. 2008. "'Stop hassling me!' Impoliteness, Power and Gender Identity in the Professional Workplace." In *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*, ed. by Derek Bousfield and Miriam A. Locher, 231-251. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mullany, Louise. 2011. "Im/politeness, Rapport Management and Workplace Culture: Truckers Performing Masculinities on Canadian Ice-roads." In *Politeness Across Cultures*, ed. by Francesca Bargiela-Chiappini and Dániel Z. Kádár, 61-84. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Park, Robert Ezra. 1950. *Race and Culture*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.
- Prevignano, Carlo L., and Aldo di Luzio. 2003. "A Discussion with John J. Gumperz." In *Language and Interaction: Discussions with John J. Gumperz*, ed. by Susan L.

- Eerdmans, Carlo L. Prevignano, and Aldo di Luzio, 7-29. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Roscoe, Jane. 2001. "Big Brother Australia: Performing the 'Real' Twenty-four-seven." *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 4 (4): 472-488.
- Scannell, Paddy. 1991. "Introduction: The Relevance of Talk." In *Broadcast Talk*, ed. by Paddy Scannell, 1-13. London/Newbury Part/New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Sinkeviciute, Valeria. 2013. "Decoding Encoded (Im)politeness: 'Cause on my teasing you can depend'." In *Developments in Linguistic Humour Theory*, ed. by Marta Dynel, 263-288. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sinkeviciute, Valeria. 2014. "'When a joke's a joke and when it's too much': *Mateship* as a Key to Interpreting Jocular FTAs in Australian English." *Journal of Pragmatics* 60: 121-139.
- Sinkeviciute, Valeria. forthcoming. "'Everything he says to me it's like he stabs me in the face': Frontstage and Backstage Reactions to Teasing". In *Multiple Perspectives on Language Play*, ed. by Nancy D. Bell, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Schnurr, Stephanie, Meredith Marra, and Janet Holmes. 2008. "Impoliteness as a Means of Contesting Power Relations in the Workplace". In *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*, ed. by Derek Bousfield and Miriam A. Locher, 211-229. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen. 2002. "Managing Rapport in Talk: Using Rapport Sensitive Incidents to Explore the Motivational Concerns Underlying the Management of Relations." *Journal of Pragmatics* 34 (5): 529-545.
- Taylor, Charlotte. 2011. "Negative Politeness Forms and Impoliteness Functions in Institutional Discourse: A Corpus-assisted Approach." In *Situated Politeness*, ed. by Bethan L. Davies, Michael Haugh, and Andrew John Merrison, 209-231. London/New York: Continuum.
- Tedeschi, James T., Bob B. Smith, and Robert C. Brown. 1974. "A Reinterpretation of Research on Aggression." *Psychological Bulletin* 81 (9): 540-562.
- Tolson, Andrew. 1991. "Televised Chat and the Synthetic Personality." In *Broadcast Talk*, ed. by Paddy Scannell, 178-200. London/Newbury Part/New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Tolson, Andrew. 2013. "Moments of Truth: Telling it like it is on *The Jeremy Kyle Show*." In *Real Talk: Reality Television and Discourse Analysis in Action*, ed. by Nuria Lorenzo-Dus and Pilar Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, 266-287. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Verschueren, Jef. 1999. *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Arnold, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Verschueren, Jef. "Plotting Meaning Landscapes." Lecture at *the IPrA Forum*, University of Antwerp, 21 March 2014.

Transcription conventions

=	overlapping speech
==	latching
(.) (..) (...)	pauses of different length
::	lengthened segments
?	rising or question intonation
-	word or utterance cut-off
CAPS	markedly louder
[]	non-lexical phenomena, both vocal and non-vocal

{[] text}	non-lexical phenomena, both vocal and non-vocal, that overlay the lexical stretch
()	unintelligible speech
(text)	a good guess at an unclear word
* text *	additional information
→	special attention should be paid to these utterances

Corresponding author

Valeria Sinkeviciute

IPrA Research Center, University of Antwerp, Stadscampus, S.R. 216, Rodestraat 14, 2000 Antwerp, Belgium

E-mail: valerija.sinkeviciute@yahoo.com