



A practical study of the tactics and purposes of mockery in Steve Harvey's television programs

Hussain Hameed Mayuuf ¹, Arshed Sadoun Atei ^{2*}

¹ Prof of Linguistics, University of Babylon, Iraq

² PhD Candidate of Linguistics, University of Babylon, Iraq

* Corresponding Author: **Arshed Sadoun Atei**

Article Info

ISSN (online): 2582-7138

Volume: 05

Issue: 03

May-June 2024

Received: 11-04-2024

Accepted: 14-05-2024

Page No: 777-780

Abstract

Mockery has always been connected to humor, mocking both politeness and impoliteness. According to some (Drew 1987; Norrick 1993; Boxer and Cortes-Conde 1997; Partington 2006; Martin 2007; as cited in Dynel, 2009), mockery can be addressed as a type of humor that is represented by teasing. However, according to some others, it should be treated as a separate pragmatic act (Haugh and Bousfield, 2012). Actually, Leech (1983) was the one who first used the phrase "mock impoliteness" to characterize actions that appear rude at first glance but actually reveal a deeper level of communication between the persons involved. Mockery is also known as mock impoliteness, according to Maíz-Arévalo (2015), and it encompasses a variety of behaviors like teasing, banter, jocular insults, etc. The use of humor to denigrate or minimize a target, whether or not they are present, is known as muckraking Kazakova, (2015). It shares conceptual similarities with teasing, which likewise entails fun and provocation. Dynel (2008).

Keywords: Mockery, impoliteness, pragmatics, speech acts, tactic

1. Introduction

Mock impoliteness, according to Haugh and Bousfield (2012) ^[10], is a unique pragmatic phenomenon whose interpretation is predicated on ongoing evaluation throughout a discourse. A mock's impoliteness is assessed using two primary components: spoken words and nonverbal cues like gaze, gestures, facial expressions, and spatial placement. Nonetheless, this kind of assessment can be determined by the individuals involved in the discussion, where it is deemed impolite by one or more participants and non-impolite by a minimum of two. Similarly, mock impoliteness was defined by Culpeper (1996 & 2011) ^[4, 6], Boxer and Cortes-Conde (1997) ^[2], and Bernal (2008) ^[11] as lighthearted comments or banter that is made in a way that is obviously intended to be impolite and occurs out of intimacy and solidarity. Wider pitch modulation and intensity peaks are more common in genuine impoliteness as opposed to mimic impoliteness, according to McKinnon and Prieto's (2014) research.

1.1 Literature Review

Mock impoliteness has been defined by Culpeper (1996 & 2011) ^[4, 6], Boxer and Cortes-Conde (1997) ^[2], and Bernal (2008) ^[11] as lighthearted comments or banter that is made in a way that is obviously intended to be impolite and occurs out of intimacy and solidarity. Wider pitch modulation and intensity peaks are more common in genuine impoliteness as opposed to mimic impoliteness, according to McKinnon and Prieto's (2014) ^[12] research.

Culpeper, Bousfield, and Wichmann (2003) ^[7] offered a model of impoliteness that includes the following five elements:

- Bald on record impoliteness: This form of impoliteness takes place when a speaker presents impoliteness intentionally and clearly.
- Positive impoliteness: This form of impoliteness occurs when the speaker uses strategies to harm the recipient's positive face wants, such as excluding, discomfiting and seeking disagreement with the other speaker/s.
- Negative impoliteness: This form of impoliteness takes place when the speaker uses strategies to damage the addressee's

- d. Negative face wants, such as frightening, deterring, ridiculing the other speaker/s physically or linguistically, or intruding into one's space.
- e. Sarcasm or mock politeness: This form of impoliteness occurs when the speaker employs hypocritical politeness strategies.
- f. Withholding politeness: This form of impoliteness occurs when the speaker stays silent despite the need of using politeness.
- g. Culpeper *et al.* made a distinction between sincere and non-sincere impoliteness using this approach. Genuine impoliteness encompasses blatantly rude behavior that is documented, positive impolite behavior, and negative impolite behavior. These behaviors are characterized by the use of strategies to cause face damage, which can lead to social conflict and disagreement. Examples of these strategies include the use of dismissal expressions like "fuck off," "piss off," insulting expressions like "you fucking dirty," silencing expressions like "shut [the fuck] up," threatening expressions like "I'm going to beat the shit out of you," and negative expressions like "curses and ill-wishes Culpeper (2011) [6].
- h. Mock impoliteness was later described by Culpeper (2011) [6] as circumstances in which actual impoliteness does not occur. Culpeper (2010) [5] argues that determining mock impoliteness requires an awareness of the participants and the setting in which there is a correlation between the use of actually impolite expression and the close friendship between friends. Since (im)politeness is embedded in these elements, it is important to take into account both the pragmatic and semantic factors of (im)politeness expressions or utterances in order to evaluate them as being genuinely impolite or not.
- i. Though there are many definitions, they all focus on humorously provocative communication that isn't intended to offend. Mockery and mock impoliteness are significant interpersonal phenomena that are receiving more and more attention from researchers. Mocking and mock impoliteness, which frequently involve playfully forceful yet lighthearted verbal targeting of others, serve a variety of sophisticated social roles, such as navigating power relations and fortifying bonds. Although more research has been done on their applications and effects, there are still important conceptual and theoretical issues.
- j. Mock rudeness and blathering are significant occurrences in social encounters that serve a variety of purposes, including building rapport and managing power relationships. According wide definition, mockery includes any nonverbal or vocal denigration of a target, whether they are present or not, in a lighthearted manner. Haugh and Bousfield (2012) [10] concentrate especially on lighthearted jeers directed at individuals in attendance. Mock impoliteness is the term used to describe actions that appear rude but actually imply a relationship was the first to introduce this word.

1.3 Methodology

1.3.1 Introduction

This socio-pragmatic study aims to pinpoint the kinds of humor that are employed in selected TV shows by Steve Harvey to convey mocking. Additionally, it makes an effort to offer a practical interpretation of the (im) politeness

techniques employed to convey ridicule in the examined data. In addition, it looks at the rhetorical strategies that are employed in the selected data to convey both humor and ridicule. It also investigates the kinds of maxims that are broken in Steve Harvey's TV shows that have to do with humor and mockery as well as the various implicatures. In order to achieve these goals, the data under consideration will be examined from two angles: a pragmatic perspective and a sociolinguistic perspective, as will be discussed in chapters two and three.

The purpose of this chapter is to give a quick overview of the methods and processes used to gather and analyze the data. Its primary focus is on outlining the processes involved in gathering, classifying, identifying, and analyzing data. This chapter is divided into a number of sections and subsections, including research ethics, the method for gathering data, the history of Steve Harvey and the two TV shows that were used in the study, and a summary.

1.3.2 Procedure

In this section, the method used to gather the data is described, the speech acts that involve humor and mockery are identified, and the data is analyzed. The following subsections are included in it.

13.3 Data Collection and Analysis

This study uses quotes from two of Steve Harvey's television shows, Ask Steve and Family Feud, as its source of data. In the subsection that follows, several TV series are briefly addressed. The humor and mocking remarks are taken from just two episodes of each TV program that are examined closely. The information in the appendix contains specifics on these occurrences. Based on the pragmatic and sociolinguistic information that we can decipher; these data and TV programs were chosen. Comedy and satire abound in this TV series and the statements chosen for data analysis.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fe9qx4k363Y&list=PLCydfUmPdILkuO6cAKowibwET0kSybmew&index=1&ab_channel=SteveTVShow

I'm not going to help you	
0:00	hi Steve I I hope you can help me my
0:03	husband and I we've been married for
0:05	over 20 years
0:07	and I I know there's no doubt he's in
0:12	love with me there's no doubt the
0:14	problem is every time I get home from
0:15	work he's overly affectionate he wants
0:19	to kiss me hug me he sits down next to
0:22	me all the time I I just need a I need
0:25	to calm him down but I don't I don't
0:28	want him to stop but I need him to calm

0:29
down you know he's standing there hoping
0:37
you can help him calm down he loves you
0:44
they know that you have a problem that
0:46
most women wish they have you got a guy
0:55
you actually have a man who absolutely
0:58
adores you just 30 minutes have you ever
1:05
asked him before yes and okay okay and
1:09

0:00: hi Steve

0:01: **Hi**

0:02: I hope you can help me my husband and I we've been married for over 20 years

0:06: **that's your husband?**

0:07: this is my husband.

0:07: **ok**

I am certain that he is smitten with me. Without a doubt, the issue is that he is really kind and always wants to sit next to me or give me a kiss when I arrive home from work. All I want is for him to quit, but I also need him to calm down.

0:32: **you know he's standing there?** HAHAAHAHH...

He is right there!

0:37: hoping you can help him calm down... HAHAAHAHA.

0:43: **he loves you! Do you know that you have a problem that most women wish they have?** HAAHAHAHHAhHAHHHhAh...

0:55: **you got a guy, you actually have a man who absolutely adores you**

1:01: just 30 minutes HAHAAHAH

1:04: **have you ever asked him before?**

1:06: yes

1:09: **and okay okay and what'd he say?**

1:10: I don't think ...

1:11: **the guy that is now standing next to you. Hahhahahah I believe her not! hahhahah**

1:13: I don't know what his problem is.

1:17: **you don't know what his problem is? he thank you fine that's the damn problem he married a woman he's in love with.** Hahahhahhhhh applause, Hello.

1:31: **he didn't just start this that's how he got you.**

1:35: well can you just calm down a little bit?

1:37: **I'm not going to help you. NO, nope hahhahhhah applause**

1:48: **do what you are doing very well. I like it very well, yeah.. Hahahahahah.**

1:50: **yeah, see you. See what you don't want to mess around and do is have him have to give all that affection to somebody else....** Applause and HAHhhahhahahh

For the sake of this study's data analysis, three passages from each episode were chosen. These are listed in the following order:

First excerpt: Steve Harvey: You are loved! Are you aware that you have an issue that the majority of women wish they had? AhaahAahhaHHHHhAh... You truly have a boyfriend

who is utterly devoted to you (0:43-0:55).

1.3.3.1 Speech Acts according to Searle

The speech acts that indicate the speaker's beliefs are included in the utterances mentioned above. Harvey portrays the woman and her husband's relationship and reality as he perceives it by engaging in these types of speech behaviors.

Context: This conversation happened during an Ask Steve episode where a wife confided in Steve Harvey about a marital issue. Harvey said these things because he thought they were true after hearing her narrative. He gave the woman the reassurance that her spouse loves her and that this is a problem that more ladies should be facing. Furthermore, he reassured her that her partner is treating her badly because he loves her.

1.3.3.2 Grice's Maxims

In a conversation, speakers ought to adhere to Grice Maxims' explanation of the cooperative principle in the preceding chapter. The four maxims that make up this principle are quality, quantity, relation, and manner. The following information is obtained from the aforementioned utterances:

Harvey transgresses the two maxims of manner and quantity. He breaks the rule of quantity by beginning by repeating the same sentence, "he loves you," more times than is necessary to make his contribution more informative than is necessary. Harvey also responds to the woman in a lengthy manner, speaking to her repeatedly after she asks him to assist her with her husband's problem. He transgresses the rule of manners by failing to be succinct.

1.3.3.3 Leech's Principles of Politeness

Omer and Al-Azzawi claim that when people break the rules of etiquette during a conversation, jokes are said. According, we can pragmatically analyze incongruity issues in spoken conversations or texts. Analysis of these characteristics of spoken incongruity can be obtained from the Politeness Principle, whereas the Cooperative Principle can be used to analyze textual incongruity asserts that politeness, which is defined as minimizing face threats and enhancing face wants, is a crucial component of social interaction. The positive social value that an individual asserts for themselves during a particular interaction is referred to as face. Act, charity, approval, modesty, agreement, and sympathy were the six maxims he listed. Based on Leech's Principles of Politeness, it is evident from the aforementioned statements in Excerpt 1 that Harvey transgresses the principle of sympathy, which calls for demonstrating care, understanding, and support for the woman who is complaining about her spouse. These statements, along with the episode's title, indicate that Harvey does not provide the woman any support or sympathy at all during her trying or trying circumstances. This rule was broken, which created a humorous impact and made the audience and the couple—the wife and her husband—laugh uncontrollably.

1.3.3.4 Davies' Sociolinguistic Approach to Humour

Argues that a key element of the performance of a complicated social identity is humor. As a result, it is crucial to the ongoing development of social interactions as a facet of individual and collective styles on many levels. Using this sociolinguistic technique, the Excerpt 1 is analyzed in this subsection. Harvey's playback of the woman's help request shows that she is whining about something nice that most

modern ladies seem to miss. Through his remarks, he draws the attention of the audience's social and cultural aspects by emphasizing to them the oddity of the lady's request. It is strange from a social, cultural, personal, ethnic, and ethnic standpoint to be critical of something positive, such as a devoted and caring spouse. Harvey's remarks made the audience chuckle as a result.

1.3.3.5 Weber's Power Dimensions

Asserts that the multidimensional Power Dimension Model analyzes social dimensions of communication. The social stratification can be ascertained through three primary dimensions: the class dimension (i.e., economic standing), the power dimension, and the prestige dimension. According to this model, Harvey's statements above make it clear that their power dimension is one of power. This dimension focuses on demonstrating a person's ability and strength to exert and uphold another person's will, as Harvey demonstrates in the statements above. By employing philosophical advice, he also utilized his influence to persuade the woman that what she was talking about wasn't a problem but rather something positive.

2. Conclusion

As a result, Steve makes an attempt to make fun of the audience members who are attempting to find the most effective answer to their difficulties. The act of acting in a manner that is contrary to the principles of quality, quantity, relevance, and manner directly results in ridicule and physical laughter. It has been established beyond a reasonable doubt that the speech act is representative.

There is a correlation between the power of the host and the visitors' willingness to listen to and accept his own orders, even if those instructions are not always feasible. There is a clear indication that breaking the politeness maxims is primarily responsible for the development of humor.

3. References

1. Bernal M. Do insults always insult? Genuine impoliteness versus non-genuine impoliteness in colloquial Spanish. *Pragmatics*. 2008;18(4):775-802.
2. Boxer D, Cortés-Conde F. From bonding to biting: Conversational joking and identity display. *Journal of Pragmatic*. 1997;27(3):275-294. Doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(96)00031-00038.
3. Trimarco P. The Cambridge International Dictionary of English. *Dictionaries: Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America*. 1998;19(1):254-257.
4. Culpeper J. Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatic*. 1996;25(3):349-367.
5. Culpeper J. Conventionalised impoliteness formulae. *Journal of Pragmatic*. 2010; 42(12):3232-3245.
6. Culpeper J. *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge; c2011.
7. Culpeper J, Bousfield D, Wichmann A. Impoliteness revisited: with special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. *Journal of Pragmatic*. 2003; 35(10-11):1545-79.
8. Dynel M. Introduction to special issue on humour: A modest attempt at presenting contemporary linguistic approaches to humour studies. *Lodz Pap Pragmat*. 2008;4(1):1-12.
9. Dynel M. Beyond a joke: Types of conversational humour. *Lang Linguist Compass*. 2009;3:1284-1299.

10. Haugh M, Bousfield D. Mock impoliteness, jocular mockery and jocular abuse in Australian and British English. *Journal of Pragmatic*. 2012;44(9):1099-1114.
11. Martin RA. *The psychology of humour: An integrative approach*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier Academic Press; c2007.
12. McKinnon S, Prieto P. The role of prosody and gesture in the perception of mock impoliteness. *Journal of Politeness Research*. 2014;10(2):185-219.
13. Norrick NR. *Conversational joking: Humour in everyday talk*. Indiana University Press; c1993.