

# Integrating Elements of Body Language to the Analysis of Impoliteness in Drama

Neda Daliri<sup>1</sup>, Mahmoud Reza Ghorban Sabbagh<sup>2</sup>, Sara Khazae<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Graduate student, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad

<sup>2</sup>Assistant professor, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad

<sup>3</sup>Assistant professor, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad

---

## ABSTRACT

*Spencer-Oatey's (2002, 2008) model of rapport management is used for the analysis of (non)linguistic impoliteness in one scene of the play Doubt: A Parable (2004) and its adaptation Doubt (2008). The behavior of the two main characters, Sr. Aloysius and Fr. Flynn, in this scene of the play is first analyzed according to Spencer-Oatey's linguistic model. Then, their kinesic behavior is also examined by referring to the same model. The results show that the analysis of performance as the non-linguistic aspect of behavior is both possible and necessary for a more comprehensive understanding of impoliteness in drama.*

**Keywords: drama, performance, impoliteness, kinesic, non-linguistic**

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Adopting theories of politeness has been a popular approach in analyzing the discourse of drama in the field of stylistics (Macrae, 2014, p. 258). Since the genre of drama is mainly dominated by speech and dialogue, plays have mostly been analyzed from a linguistic perspective, that is, the performance of plays have not received much critical attention (Macrae, 2014, p. 254). Short (2002) claims that the linguistic analyses of drama, based solely on the play text, are sufficient since experienced readers can understand the performance of plays from reading the text alone, and also argues that analyzing the theater performance of plays is nevertheless problematic because critics cannot “hold constant the object under critical discussion” (p. 8).

However, it is important to note that drama is in the category of performed literature. As such, the multimodal nature of drama needs to be included in its stylistic analysis in order to achieve a more comprehensive understanding

of its workings. In this regard, McIntyre (2008) remarks that “the filmed version [of plays] constitutes a permanent record of a particular production of the play in question, which, theoretically, all critics have access to” (p. 311). Therefore, he argues that it is both possible and necessary to integrate the multimodal aspect of drama to its more common linguistic analyses (McIntyre, 2008). This paper then sets out to analyze Shanley’s play *Doubt: A Parable* (2004) and its later movie adaptation *Doubt* (2008), written and directed by Shanley himself, from both linguistic and kinesic perspectives with regard to Spencer-Oatey’s (2002, 2008) model of rapport management.

The title of Shanley’s work *Doubt: A Parable* (2004) refers to Sister (Sr.) Aloysius’ doubt about Father (Fr.) Flynn’s possible abusive relationship with students, especially Donald Muller, in the school. The story takes place in the winter of 1964 in St. Nicolas parochial school in New York. Sr. Aloysius is the strict and conservative principal of the school, and Fr. Flynn is the more open-minded pastor of the church and PE teacher. Sr. Aloysius’s doubt eventually becomes certainty as she is informed that Fr. Flynn has had a secret meeting with Donald Muller. Therefore, she decides to confront Fr. Flynn, and make him confess to the (possible) abuse of Donald. However, Fr. Flynn denies all accusations, and attempts to defend himself. Sr. Aloysius’ struggle to prove Fr. Flynn’s sin and his desperate attempts to defend himself finally end with Fr. Flynn leaving the school. However, in the last scene of the play, Sr. Aloysius ironically confesses that she has doubts about her own certainty of Fr. Flynn’s sinful behavior. This play is adapted quite faithfully into the movie *Doubt* (2008).

In the case of these two works, scholarly research has noticeably focused on the conflict between the two main characters: Sister Aloysius and Father Flynn. Since these two characters present opposing viewpoints on a controversial topic, priests’ relationship with children, studying their conflicts seems to be a favored approach in analyzing this work (Stefanovici, 2012; Halford, 2012). It is noteworthy to mention that these works refer to the Catholic Church’s scandal regarding numerous cases of abuse of minors by priests publicized through consistent articles by *The Boston Globe* newspaper in 2002 (Plante, 2002; Rezendes, 2004). Considering the impact of medium, other researchers have chosen to compare the play with its movie adaptation (Scarafile, 2017; Fritsch and Maggia, 2013). However, these researches have not yet paid systematic and scholarly attention to the stylistic aspect of the work neither in the play nor in the movie.

In order to keep the scope of the study focused, the first encounter between Sr. Aloysius and Fr. Flynn in the story will be looked into. This scene will be examined according to Spencer-Oatey’s model of rapport management.

First, the dialogues in this scene will be analyzed in order to explain the impolite language used by Sr. Aloysius and Fr. Flynn. Second, the body language of these two characters, while performing their lines in the movie, will be analyzed by referring to Spencer-Oatey's model. It needs to be mentioned that the theorization and practice of elements of body language according to Spencer-Oatey's model is the innovative part of this study, which has been done by the author.

In the following section, the theoretical framework of this study will be explained in more detail.

## **2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

The selected scene between Sr. Aloysius and Fr. Flynn is suitable for the study of impoliteness because it shows a sort of "conflict of viewpoint" between these two characters (Culpeper, 2011, p. 5). According to Culpeper (2011), this scene can be viewed as an example of "interpersonal conflict," in which the focus is "on relations between individuals" (p. 5). In such interpersonal conflict scenes, and especially in drama, characters often deviate from everyday norms. This means that their behavior becomes more impolite, depending on the intensity of the situation at hand.

### **2.1 Linguistic Impoliteness**

This paper refers to the work of Spencer-Oatey (2002, 2008) as its main theoretical framework for the analysis of the two characters' impolite behavior. Spencer-Oatey's (2002, 2008) model draws on Brown and Levinson's (1987) classic politeness model; however, focuses more on the interpersonal aspects of face. Both Brown and Levinson (1987) and Spencer-Oatey (2008) refer to Goffman (1967) for their definition of 'face'. As such, face is defined as "the positive social *value* a person effectively claims for himself [*sic*] by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" (Spencer-Oatey, 2008, p. 13). In other words, face involves concepts such as self-esteem, self-concept, image of oneself, etc. In fact, face is an inseparable part of communication. The mutual attempts of interlocutors to keep each other's face is a natural attitude in everyday interactions, which is referred to as being polite. However, this tendency is changed in situations of conflict, which then results in impolite behavior.

Spencer-Oatey (2008) proposes that the management of rapport is one of the two functions of language (p. 12). She suggests that rapport management has three bases, which, if neglected, results in impoliteness. The first base

is named 'face sensitivities,' and is related to aspects of interaction which concern face. She further subdivides face sensitivities into quality, social identity, and relational face. She defines them thus:

*Quality* face: "We have a fundamental desire for people to evaluate us positively in terms of our personal qualities, e.g. our confidence, abilities, appearance etc." (Spencer-Oatey, 2002, p. 540)

*Social identity* face: "We have a fundamental desire for people to acknowledge and uphold our social identities or roles, e. g. as group leader, valued customer, close friend" (Spencer-Oatey, 2002, p. 540)

*Relational* face: "refers to the relationship between participants (e.g. distance-closeness, equality-inequality, perception of role rights and obligations), and the ways in which this relationship is managed or negotiated" (Spencer-Oatey, 2007, p. 647)

The second base of rapport management is named 'sociality rights and obligations,' and relates to people's "behavioral expectations in relation to their perceived sociality rights and obligations" (Spencer-Oatey, 2008, p. 15). This category is subdivided into two levels: equity rights and association rights (Spencer-Oatey, 2008, p. 16). Spencer-Oatey (2008) explains them thus:

*Equity* rights: "We have a fundamental belief that we are entitled to personal consideration from others, so that we are treated fairly: that we are not unduly imposed upon, that we are not unfairly ordered about and that we are not taken advantage of or exploited" (p. 16)

*Association* rights: "We have a fundamental belief that we are entitled to social involvement with others, in keeping with the type of relationship that we have with them ... association rights relate partly to *interactional involvement - detachment* (the extent to which we associate with people, or dissociate ourselves from them) ... They also relate to *affective involvement- detachment* (the extent to which we share concerns, feelings and interests)" (p. 16)

Finally, the third base of rapport management is 'interactional goals,' which is related to the specific purpose of communication that people have in mind. Accordingly, she argues that failure to observe any of these three bases will threaten rapport in communication, and will cause impoliteness or offence.

## 2.2 Kinesic Impoliteness

Brown and Prieto (2017) emphasize the important role of non-verbal communication in the delivery of politeness (p. 357). They believe that in order to be perceived as polite, both the content of speech and the manner of speaking need to be polite (Brown and Prieto, 2017). It can be argued that this claim is also true of impolite behavior. Hence, this paper will also examine the impolite body language of the two characters under analysis besides examining their impolite language. Regarding the elements of body language, this paper uses Culpeper's (2011) four non-verbal cues including "gaze, facial expressions, body movement/gestures (e.g. with the head, shoulders, hands) and the spatial positioning of the self" (p. 151). Considering these elements, this study will explain the body language of Sr. Aloysius and Fr. Flynn according to Spencer-Oatey's (2002, 2008) model of rapport management.

It can be argued that *gaze* is a kind of *kinesic imposition* on the person who is the object of gaze. Therefore, it can be seen as equity rights-threatening (Spencer-Oatey, 2008, p. 16). In a similar manner, short spatial distance can be seen as violating the interlocutor's equity rights as it makes the person feel uncomfortable. Still, the elements of facial expression and body movement cannot be specifically theorized as such because the range of their possible examples is too wide. Therefore, more detailed explanations of these two elements, according to Spencer-Oatey's (2002, 2008) model, will be provided later in the discussion section.

## 3. DISCUSSION

Sr. Aloysius asks Sr. James, another nun and teacher in the school, to carefully observe Fr. Flynn's actions. After receiving Sr. James' report about Donald Muller's odd behavior after returning from a talk with Fr. Flynn, Sr. Aloysius becomes rather certain that Fr. Flynn is abusing the child in some manner. Therefore, she decides to call Fr. Flynn to her office on an unrelated matter, and then ask him about his secret talk with Donald. Act five of the play *Doubt: A Parable* (2004) consists mainly of this encounter between Sr. Aloysius and Fr. Flynn in the presence of Sr. James (Shanley, 2005, pp. 27-35). This act along with its adaptation in the movie (mins. 39-54) are the subject of analysis in this subsection.

The act begins with Sr. Aloysius answering Mr. McGinn's phone call, who is asked to remove a tree limb from the yard. Right then, Fr. Flynn knocks at Sr. Aloysius' door, and greets her. He is about to enter the office when Sr. Aloysius reminds him that they are "just short Sr. James" (Shanley, 2005, p. 28), and must wait for her to arrive as a third party. As will also be discussed in the next subsection, Sr. Aloysius' warning to Fr. Flynn cannot be considered impolite because she is only asking him to follow Church rules. Anyhow, Fr. Flynn steps back, and they

wait and chat a little until Sr. James arrives hurriedly. Then, they all enter the principal's office, apparently, to discuss the Christmas pageant.

The conversation begins with an example of non-linguistic impolite behavior by Fr. Flynn. Much to the chagrin of Sr. Aloysius, Fr. Flynn goes to her desk, and sits in the principal's chair. This non-linguistic behavior can be considered impolite toward Sr. Aloysius in two ways because it threatens both of her sociality rights. Here is how the incident is explained in the stage directions of the act (Turns are numbered for easier reference, and the underlined parts contain impoliteness):

- (1) SISTER ALOYSIUS. Well, after the incident with ... Never mind. Well, come in, please. Sit down. *(They come in and sit down. Father Flynn takes Sr. Aloysius' chair. He's sitting at her desk. She reacts but says nothing.)* I actually have a hot pot of tea. *(Closes the door but for an inch.)* And close this but not quite, for form's sake. Would you have a cup of tea, Father?
- (2) FLYNN. I would love a cup of tea.

(Shanley, 2005, p. 29)

First, it can be argued that the reason Fr. Flynn goes to Sr. Aloysius' chair is because he is conscious of his superior status in the Catholic hierarchy. In other words, the principal's chair represents power, and Fr. Flynn chooses to sit on this chair because he knows he has more power than Sr. Aloysius. However, this kind of behavior is not appropriate, and seems to be an undue imposition on Sr. Aloysius. After all, she is the 'principal' of the school, and the office belongs to her. Therefore, Fr. Flynn's behavior can be seen as threatening Sr. Aloysius' equity rights as it is a matter of autonomy-control (Spencer-Oatey, 2008, p. 16).

Second, Fr. Flynn's behavior shows a certain lack of respect for Sr. Aloysius, who is the title-owner of the office, the desk, and the chair. Hence, it can also be seen to threaten her association rights as it is also a matter of respect (Spencer-Oatey, 2005, p. 100). As a result, Fr. Flynn's kinesic behavior, in the opening parts of their conversation in this encounter, threatens Sr. Aloysius' sociality rights, and creates impoliteness. Also, Sr. Aloysius' silent reaction to this behavior shows that she has taken offence.

Moreover, this kinesic behavior is adapted faithfully in its movie adaptation titled *Doubt* (2008), which is also written and directed by Shanley. Fr. Flynn's other linguistic/non-linguistic behaviors do not reveal any specific

intention for having decided to sit in the principal's chair. Therefore, the above ambiguity about the explanation of his impolite behavior remains unclear in both works.

They begin to discuss the up-coming Christmas pageant, and Sr. Aloysius rejects Sr. James' and Fr. Flynn's idea about including the secular song 'Frosty the Snowman' in the pageant because she believes that the song "spouses a pagan belief in magic" (Shanley, 2005, p. 30). Then, Fr. Flynn sarcastically attacks her strict mindset in the following manner:

- (1) FLYNN. So. Not "Frosty the Snowman." (*Father Flynn writes something in a small notebook.*)
- (2) SISTER ALOYSIUS. I don't think so. "It's Beginning to Look a Lot Like Christmas" would be fine, I suppose. The parents would like it. May I ask what you wrote down? With that ballpoint pen.
- (3) FLYNN. Oh. Nothing. An idea for a sermon.
- (4) SISTER ALOYIUS. You had one just now?
- (5) FLYNN. I get them all the time.
- (6) SISTER ALOYSIUS. How fortunate.
- (7) FLYNN. I forget them, so I write them down.
- (8) SITER ALOYSIUS. What is the idea?
- (9) FLYNN. Intolerance.

(Shanley, 2005, p. 30)

Here, Fr. Flynn attacks Sr. Aloysius' quality face by implying that she is an intolerant person. He writes down his idea right after Sr. Aloysius disagrees with him about the appropriateness of the song 'Frosty the Snowman'. This shows that the idea has connections with Sr. Aloysius' opinion; therefore, one would conclude that he means to imply that Sr. Aloysius' behavior is intolerant. As such, he attacks Sr. Aloysius' quality face by sarcastically and indirectly accusing her of being intolerant and close-minded. By evaluating Sr. Aloysius' attitude toward the song negatively (Spencer-Oatey, 2002, p. 540), he shows an offensive behavior.

The stage directions in this act of the play provide a lot of information about the movement of the three characters and their relative positioning; however, they fail to inform the readers of how these characters specifically perform each of their lines in terms of their choice of kinesic elements. These types of information are necessary for a non-linguistic analysis of impoliteness. As a result, it is not possible to analyze the non-linguistic aspects of the performance of these lines academically based on the play alone. Similarly, readers or researchers do not know about

the performance of turn 9 in the above exchange. However, the movie adaptation of this play will be a reliable source of reference in order to analyze the exchange from a multimodal perspective (McIntyre, 2008, p. 311).

In the movie, the three characters are sitting around the desk. Throughout this exchange, Fr. Flynn utters his turns looking down at his notebook as he is writing something on it, and Sr. Aloysius closely examines him. However, when Sr. Aloysius asks Fr. Flynn about the idea in turn 8, he finishes writing, and looks up at Sr. Aloysius. Below is the performance of turn 9 in the movie:



**Figure 1.** *Fr. Flynn's performance of turn 9 in the above exchange*

The important thing here is how Fr. Flynn changes the direction of his look as he utters turn 9 because this intentional gaze at Sr. Aloysius confirms that he is in fact talking about her. In other words, Fr. Flynn's decision to look at Sr. Aloysius, while saying that the idea is intolerance, eliminates any ambiguity about the target of his remark. Therefore, it helps transfer, and add to, the offensive effect of this sarcastic and indirect sentence.

Furthermore, they continue to talk about the Christmas pageant, and Fr. Flynn expresses his liberal ideas about the need to "take on a more familiar face" (Shanley, 2005, p. 30). However, Sr. Aloysius disagrees with him strongly. Meanwhile, she finds an opportunity to talk about Donald Muller, and begins to ask Fr. Flynn questions about his meeting with the boy. Consequently, their conversation becomes more intense, and they both show more impolite behaviors. In the following exchange, Fr. Flynn expresses his surprise in how the topic of conversation took a change:

- (1) FLYNN. Hmmm. Did you want to discuss the pageant, is that why I'm here, or is this what you wanted to discuss?
- (2) SISTER ALOYSIUS. This.
- (3) FLYNN. Well. I feel a little uncomfortable.
- (4) SISTER ALOYSIUS. Why?
- (5) FLYNN. Why do you think? Something about your tone.
- (6) SISTER ALOYSIUS. I would prefer a discussion of fact rather than tone.
- (7) FLYNN. Well. If I had judged my conversation with Donald Muller to be of concern to you, Sister, I would have sat you down and talked to you about it. But I did not judge it to be of concern to you.
- (8) SISTER ALOYSIUS. Perhaps you are mistaken in your understanding of what concerns me. The boy is in my school, and his well-being is my responsibility.

(Shanley, 2005, p. 32)

The two characters display linguistic impoliteness in turns 7 and 8. First, Fr. Flynn attacks Sr. Aloysius' association rights by means of ignoring the principle of interactional involvement (Spencer-Oatey, 2008, p. 16). In other words, he attacks her association rights by implying that she was not important enough to be informed about the meeting. This implication is impolite because Sr. Aloysius is the principal of the school, and has the right to be involved in anything that concerns the students. It should also be considered that this turn (7) is in fact a more indirect/polite version of the sentence 'It is none of your business,' hence the impolite effect is reduced in this way (Spencer-Oatey, 2008, p. 23).

It can also be argued that Fr. Flynn threatens Sr. Aloysius' equity rights as well. Considering the manner of his assertion in turn 7, it can be reasoned that he believes himself to be superior to Sr. Aloysius, and capable of managing students' affairs on his own. Here, he obviously believes that he does not need to answer to Sr. Aloysius about his activities in the school; therefore, he threatens her equity rights by showing signs of autonomy (Spencer-Oatey, 2008, p. 16). This feeling of superiority in him may be due to the fact that he occupies a more powerful role within the church hierarchy.

In response, Sr. Aloysius threatens Fr. Flynn's equity rights as well by highlighting her rights as the principal, and pressuring Fr. Flynn to tell her about the details of his meeting with Donald in turn 8. In fact, she is using the principle of control (Spencer-Oatey, 2008, p. 16), and is attempting to remind Fr. Flynn that she is not just an inferior nun, but also occupying the role/position of principal. Hence, she manages to respond to Fr. Flynn's impolite assertion by attacking him back.

Now, let us examine this exchange in the movie in order to analyze the kinesic aspects of their impolite behavior. Fr. Flynn has left the principal's chair to flip the blinds, and is standing up in front of the principal's chair next to Sr. James. Meanwhile, Sr. Aloysius, who had also left her chair to answer the phone, goes to the principal's chair, and sits down. As for turns 7 and 8 analyzed above, Shanley has decided to remove them from the screenplay; therefore, it is not possible to examine the performance of these two turns. Although, Sr. Aloysius' kinesic behavior of turn 2 is marked. The following figure shows her performance of this line:



**Figure 2.** *Sr. Aloysius' performance of turn 2 in the above exchange*

As can be seen, Sr. Aloysius stares at Fr. Flynn while saying the word 'this,' which threatens Fr. Flynn's equity rights because it is a kinesic form of imposition on others, and makes the interlocutor feel uncomfortable. Therefore, it can be classified as an impolite behavior. This may also show her confidence and secure position regarding the issue they are about to discuss. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that Fr. Flynn somehow tries to avoid making eye contact with Sr. Aloysius, which can show his confusion at the sudden accusation of the Sisters.

During this conversation, and also in their next encounter, Sr. Aloysius acts somehow like a detective who repeatedly questions the accused person, Fr. Flynn in this case, in order to make him confess to his crime. This authoritative behavior of hers can be seen in the following exchange:

- (1) SISTER ALOYSIUS. What happened in the rectory?
- (2) FLYNN. Happened? Nothing happened. I had a talk with a boy.
- (3) SISTSER ALOYSIUS. What about?

- (4) FLYNN. It was a private matter.
- (5) SISTER ALOYSIUS. He's twelve years old. What could be private?
- (6) FLYNN. I'll say it again, Sister. I object to your tone.

(Shanley, 2005, p. 32)

In this exchange, Sr. Aloysius attacks Fr. Flynn in three ways. First, she attacks Fr. Flynn's equity rights by repeatedly asking him questions about his meeting with Donald in the rectory, which puts Fr. Flynn in a disadvantaged position. In other words, she uses the strategy of autonomy-control through holding the more powerful position of the inquisitor. By doing so, she is displaying an offensive behavior toward Fr. Flynn, who then becomes baffled, and sees no other choice but to strongly deny any implication of wrongdoing in his meeting with Donald.

Furthermore, by asking these questions, Sr. Aloysius indirectly implies that something suspicious has happened between Fr. Flynn and Donald in their meeting in the rectory. As such, she is also attacking Fr. Flynn's quality face by assuming the possibility that he is a child abuser. Even though the negative implication of these sentences is not assertive, they nevertheless threaten Fr. Flynn's quality face because they fail to "evaluate [him] positively" (Spencer-Oatey, 2002, p. 540). As can be seen in turn 2, Fr. Flynn is also conscious of these negative implications, for example in the action verb 'happen', and that is why he repeats the word in an interrogative form besides clearly stating afterwards that "nothing happened".

Finally, she displays offensive behavior toward Fr. Flynn in a third way in turn 5. In this turn, Sr. Aloysius sarcastically undermines Fr. Flynn's excuse for not revealing the truth about his meeting with Donald. Therefore, she manages to threaten his quality face by challenging his reasoning skills (Spencer-Oatey, 2002, p. 540). In her opinion, Fr. Flynn's excuse is, in a way, ridiculous because nothing about a twelve-year-old boy can be private.

In terms of the performances of this exchange, no information is available except for Fr. Flynn's objection to Sr. Aloysius' tone in turn 6. Therefore, we need to turn to the movie in order to examine the non-linguistic aspect of the above exchange. In the movie, Sr. Aloysius is sitting behind her desk, while Sr. James and Fr. Flynn are in front of her on the other side of the desk. Sr. James is sitting on a chair, and Fr. Flynn is standing next to her.

From turn 1 to turn 4, the kinesic performance of the characters is interestingly marked. The following picture shows the rather peculiar camera angle, which portrays the three characters while turns 1 to 4 are being played:



**Figure 3.** *Sr. Aloysius and Fr. Flynn's performance of turns 1-4 in the above exchange*

As is shown, Sr. Aloysius is staring at Fr. Flynn while Fr. Flynn is trying to avoid looking back at her. Staring at someone is a kinesic form of imposition, which causes impoliteness. Therefore, Sr. Aloysius is demonstrating kinesic impoliteness in this exchange, which adds to the offensive effect of her lines.

Also, Fr. Flynn's attempts to avoid looking back at Sr. Aloysius may prove his uncomfortable and disadvantaged position as the subject of Sr. Aloysius' interrogations. The following picture shows his kinesic performance of turn 6:



**Figure 4.** *Fr. Flynn's performance of turn 6 in the above exchange*

Here, Fr. Flynn's look can be contrasted to Sr. Aloysius' look in figure 4. 3. Unlike Sr. Aloysius' equity rights-threatening and imposing gaze, Fr. Flynn's look seems to be a defensive act. As can be seen, his face is tilted to one side while the direction of his look is to the other side. This shows that he does not wish to make eye contact with Sr. Aloysius; however, he has no other choice but to continue the conversation. Therefore, his look cannot be interpreted as an impolite kinesic behavior.

Similar to the previous exchange, Sr. Aloysius continues to offend Fr. Flynn by indirectly accusing him through her questions. However, Fr. Flynn eventually overcomes the shock, and begins to attack Sr. Aloysius back. This mutually rude exchange can be perceived in the following extract from the play:

- (1) SISTER ALOYSIUS. You know what I'm talking about. Don't you? You're controlling the expression on your face right now. Aren't you?
- (2) FLYNN. My face? You said you wanted to talk about the pageant, Sister. That's why I'm here. Am I to understand that you brought me into your office to confront me in some way? It's outrageous. I'm not answerable to you. What exactly are you accusing me of?
- (3) SISTER ALOYSIUS. I am not accusing you of anything, Father Flynn. I am asking you to tell me what happened in the rectory. (*Father Flynn stands.*)
- (4) FLYNN. I don't wish to continue this conversation at all further. And if you are dissatisfied with that, I suggest you speak to Monsignor Benedict. I can only imagine that your unfortunate behavior this morning is the result of overwork. Perhaps you need a leave of absence. I may suggest it. Have a good morning. (*To Sister James.*) Sister?
- (5) SISTER JAMES. Good morning, Father. (*Sister Aloysius's next words stop him.*)
- (6) SISTER ALOYSIUS. There was alcohol on his breath. (*He turns.*) When he returned from his meeting with you. (*He comes back and sits down. He rubs his eyes.*)

(Shanley, 2005, pp. 32-33)

As usual, Sr. Aloysius threatens Fr. Flynn's quality face by indirectly implying that something has happened between him and Donald in the rectory. In turn 1 of this exchange, she once again suggests that Fr. Flynn is hiding the truth about his meeting with Donald, which, in itself, is an implication that something worth hiding and wrong must have happened. She is in fact suggesting that Fr. Flynn is attempting to cover the truth by "controlling the expression on his face" (Shanley, 2005, p. 32). In this way, she succeeds in attacking his quality face (Spencer-Oatey, 2002, p. 540).

However, Fr. Flynn, who had been mainly a receiver of offence, begins to attack Sr. Aloysius as well. In turn 2, he threatens Sr. Aloysius' social identity face by asserting that her position as principal is not powerful enough to give her the right to question him. In other words, he looks down at Sr. Aloysius' social role as the principal, and stresses that her position is below his. It is interesting to note that his way of expressing this message, by saying "I'm not answerable to you," shows that he specifically means to attack Sr. Aloysius' lower position as a nun. This claim is not necessarily true because Sr. Aloysius is held responsible for the well-being of students as she has once pointed out herself.

Moreover, in turn 4, Fr. Flynn threatens Sr. Aloysius' quality face as well by means of employing sarcasm. Here, he manages to imply that Sr. Aloysius' behavior is unreasonable and unacceptable. He sarcastically attacks Sr. Aloysius by accusing her of behaving irrationally as a result of overwork. This sarcastic assertion threatens Sr. Aloysius' quality face by negatively evaluating her behavior (Spencer-Oatey, 2002, p. 540).

This scene is adapted somewhat differently in the movie especially in terms of the characters' kinesic movements. While characters are playing turns 1 to 4, Sr. Aloysius is in her chair, but Fr. Flynn is standing on the other side of her desk. Unlike the stage directions in the play, Fr. Flynn finishes his dialogue in turn 4, and then walks towards the door, which is at the other end of the room. Then, Sr. Aloysius displays non-linguistic offense by standing up and walking towards Fr. Flynn. Her kinesic behavior is marked here because she walks towards the door, and stands right in front of Fr. Flynn. This happens while she is uttering her dialogue in turn 6. The following picture shows her performance of this turn:



**Figure 5.** *Sr. Aloysius' performance of turn 6 in the above exchange*

Short spatial distance is one form of non-linguistic impoliteness (Culpeper, 2011, p. 152) because it can be viewed as kinesic imposition on others. Therefore, it threatens Fr. Flynn's equity rights. Needless to mention that she keeps staring at Fr. Flynn, and threatens his equity rights in this way as well. However, this offensive behavior is mutual as Fr. Flynn also stares at her during this exchange.

#### **4. CONCLUSION**

This study adopted Spencer-Oatey's (2002, 2008) model of rapport management as its theoretical framework for the analysis of linguistic and kinesic impoliteness in the behaviors of Sr. Aloysius and Fr. Flynn in one scene of the play *Doubt: A Parable* (2004) and its movie adaptation *Doubt* (2008). Though Spencer-Oatey's model is quite detailed in its explanations of linguistic impoliteness, it does not include the non-linguistic aspect of behavior. Therefore, the theorization of kinesic elements according to her model, by referring to Culpeper's (2011) four non-verbal cues, was done by the researcher.

The integration of kinesic elements of performance to the linguistic analysis of the scene in this study showed that these non-linguistic factors are a complementary source for discourse analysis in the field of impoliteness. As explained in the discussion section, these kinesic elements can either be a source of impoliteness independently or complement the linguistic impoliteness exhibited by characters. Therefore, this study recommends the integration of the analysis of performance to the analysis of play text in examinations of drama or other types of performed literature. This conclusion is in line with McIntyre's (2008) argument about the need and possibility of such multimodal examinations.

#### **REFERENCES**

- [1] Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- [2] Brown, L., & Prieto, P. (2017). (Im)politeness: Prosody and gesture. In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh & D. Z. Kadar (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im)politeness* (pp. 357-380). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [3] Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- [4] Fritsch, V. H., & Maggia, S. S. (2013). Imagery interchange in John Patrick Shanley's *Doubt: A Parable*. *FronteiraZ*, (10), 153-169.
- [5] Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays in face-to-face behaviour*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- [6] Halford, M. (2012). "Progressive education and a welcoming church": Vatican II, feminism, and Sister Aloysius's uncertainty in John Patrick Shanley's *Doubt*. *The Albatros*, 2(1), 33-42.
- [7] Macrae, A. (2014). Stylistics, drama and performance. In M. Burke (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of stylistics* (pp. 253-267). New York, NY: Routledge.
- [8] McIntyre, D. (2008). Integrating multimodal analysis and the stylistics of drama: A multimodal perspective on Ian McKellen's *Richard III*. *Language and Literature*, 17(4), 309-334.
- [9] Plante, T. G. (2004). Introduction. In T. G. Plante (Ed.), *Sin against the innocents: Sexual abuse by priests and the role of the Catholic Church* (pp. xvii-xxvii). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- [10] Rezendes, M. (2004). Scandal: The *Boston Globe* and sexual abuse in the Catholic Church. In T. G. Plante (Ed.), *Sin against the innocents: Sexual abuse by priests and the role of the Catholic Church* (pp. 1-12). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- [11] Rudin, S. (Producer), & Shanley, J. P. (Director). (2008). *Doubt* [Motion picture]. United States: Miramax.
- [12] Scarafile, G. (2011). The pathic/haptic relationship in philosophy of cinema: The case of *Doubt* (John Patrick Shanley, 2008). *Revista Iberoamericana de Argumentacion*, 2, 1-14.
- [13] Shanley, J. P. (2005). *Doubt: A Parable*. Dramatists Play Service Inc.
- [14] Short, M. (2002). From dramatic text to dramatic performance. In J. Culpeper, M. Short & P. Verdonk (Eds.), *Exploring the language of drama: From text to context* (pp. 6-18). New York, NY: Routledge.
- [15] Spencer-Oatey, H. (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.
- [16] Spencer-Oatey, H. (2005). (Im)Politeness, face and perceptions of rapport: Unpackaging their bases and interrelationships. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1, 95-119.
- [17] Spencer-Oatey, H. (2007). Theories of identity and the analysis of face. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 639-656.
- [18] Spencer-Oatey, H. (2008). Face, (im)politeness and rapport. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally speaking: Culture, communication and politeness theory* (pp. 11-47). New York, NY: Continuum.

- [19] Stefanovici, S. (2012). Catholic intolerance in the movie 'Doubt'. *Studia Universitatis Petru Major*, (13), 213-218.