

Sociopragmatics in Cartoons: Politeness and Power Violations in the Arabic Version of *Gumball*

Seham Osama

English Language Department

Faculty of Languages and Translation

Sadat Academy for Management Sciences

seham.osama@sadatacademy.edu.eg

Abstract

Sociopragmatic competence is essential for functioning effectively in a language. It is manifested in several aspects, such as politeness and power relationships (Harlow, 1990). According to Brown and Levinson (1987), being polite is an effort on the part of the speaker to preserve his or her personal or the other person's face by attempting to minimize the effect of face-threatening acts (FTAs). Power relations also play a pivotal role in augmenting or mitigating FTAs in a particular context. The present study examines some marked elements of politeness and power relationships that the Arabic version of the popular American cartoon *The Amazing World of Gumball* carries. The qualitative analysis is applied to scenes that sample interactions within the family and school contexts. It examines if the used FTAs are marked in these contexts or not. These violations are introduced in a comic, attractive mode and are passed to children as favourable sociopragmatic practices. The analysis of the four selected scenes highlights several violations of politeness and power relations, such as ill-represented father-child marked interactions in the family context.

Keywords: Sociopragmatics – Politeness theory -Power relations –FTAs

Introduction

Watching cartoons is one of the most rewarding forms of entertainment for children across the globe, and several studies have addressed their advantages and disadvantages. Some claim that watching cartoons provides a colourful joyful pastime in several genres ranging from reviving classic fairy tales to modern futuristic science fiction (Sultana, 2014). Cartoons also provide children with authentic language input if they are watched in a foreign language, thus enhancing their second language acquisition at an early age. Other views maintain that cartoons carry subliminal messages and manipulations of gendered, ethnic discriminatory, and verbal and physical abusive content (Sudha, 2001; Gökçearsan 2010; Bader, 2018). Several other researchers studied children's social development incompetency and inclinations toward violence that developed because of cartoons (Yousuf et al. 2015; Rai et al. 2016). Nevertheless, studies about the effect of cartoons, based on the social learning theory, explained that watching TV, in general, may produce patterns of behaviour in children through repetition and imitation (McLeod, 2011). Furthermore, research based on cultivation theory claims internalized concepts and structured hypotheses about the world and relationships form through what children watch on TV repeatedly (Settle, 2018). Media plays a sensitive role by promoting ideological objectives that may be connected to a community (Mayr, 2008). In a way, the language used by numerous media platforms can influence how individuals perceive and act in their social interactions and relationships (Mayr, 2008). If the individuals in question are still children building their social, linguistic and communicative competence, then the effect of these media-altered norms is beyond imagination.

Cartoons usually present context elements out of proportion in relation to time, space, and participants which can be reduced, augmented, or mutated to suit their imaginary world. However, the underlying messages sent by the linguistic practices in cartoons should not lead to a distorted use of language in real-life because the highly perceptive minds of children may internalize these practices as normal conduct. Another lurking danger is that cartoons have a high frequency, amusing layouts and abundance of production. This entails a continual repetition of whatever sociopragmatic practices introduced to children through them.

Foreign cartoons are sometimes dubbed into standard Arabic while others use certain regional Arabic dialects or a mix of both. These cartoons usually carry

cultural issues that can be inappropriate for Arab culture; therefore, they are mostly censored to an extent. The present study focuses on one of the most popular cartoons broadcast on Cartoon network Arabia in standard Arabic with occasional code switching to colloquial Egyptian Arabic. Although this Arabic version of the cartoon is censored to a great extent with sexual, obscene, and some violent content omitted, this censorship could not delete some basic themes and linguistic practices that violate common family and school context codes from the series. In other words, *The Amazing World of Gumball* in its most censored version carries violations of politeness and power relations introduced in a comic, attractive mode and are passed to children as favorable conduct.

Research Questions

The analysis uses sample extracts from the dubbed cartoon *The Amazing World of Gumball* and attempts to find answers to the following questions:

1. What are the face-threatening acts (FTAs) used in the sample scenes?
2. Do these FATs violate norms of family and school-accepted politeness strategies and model inappropriate sociopragmatic competence for children?
3. What types of power relations norms are violated in each context?
4. Are these FTAs marked or unmarked in the given context?

Theoretical Framework and Definition of Terms

Sociopragmatic competence is one of the pillars needed for functioning effectively in a language. It has deeper roots in social structure behaviour, power relations in speech acts, everyday conversations, and courtesy in language use in a certain context (Harlow,1990). Hymes (1972) explained that “[A] normal child acquires knowledge of sentences, not only as grammatical but also as appropriate. He or she acquires competence as to when to speak, when not, and as to what to talk about with whom, when, where, and in what manner” (p. 277). Bruner (1981) maintained that language acquisition is not limited to the sound system, vocabulary, and Grammar, but it also extends to knowing how to do things with these elements and when to use them appropriately. Therefore, when children acquire language, they not only acquire the rules of language but also learn how to apply them. Utterances in a language are considered to be speech acts, and every speech act has an illocutionary force related to its meaning and direction (Searle & Vanderveken,1985). Searle & Vanderveken (1985) maintain that these speech acts

will fall into one of the following categories: assertive, commissive, directives, declaratives, and expressives. Some verbs require public performance and or a type of social power to fulfil them, while others are performed in soliloquy (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985). Therefore, understanding the rules of how to use a language appropriately and successfully, depending on the context, is crucial in language acquisition.

Politeness Theory

Politeness is a broad topic investigated across disciplines such as sociology, linguistics etc. from different perspectives. Definitions of politeness usually assume that building or maintaining relationships is one ultimate goal. For Lakoff (1975) politeness is a maxim added to Grice's maxims, and manners are "created by society to avoid friction in interpersonal interaction" (Lakoff, 1975, p. 64). Being courteous means avoiding offence to prevent friction by observing three maxims: don't impose, give options, and make your receiver feel good (Lakoff, 1973, p. 99). Lakoff (1973) also explained that by increasing involvement and lowering the likelihood of conflict and confrontation that arise from every human contact, politeness has to be sought as a system of interpersonal interactions. Therefore, any speaker should be clear, concise, and truthful and speaks politely. Lakoff's model states that being courteous is more crucial than being clear in any context. House (1998:54) defines politeness as "a societal phenomenon...appearing to exhibit regard for others."

Social interactions through talk involve the constant management of one's own and other people's faces. The sociologist Erving Goffman coined the term "face" in (1967) to describe people's public self-image or face. Face is a requirement of social interactions involving discourse. Any speaker's loss of face is disruptive and may need to be repaired by rephrasing a comment or issuing a formal apology. Facework is a part of the interpersonal function of language use that involves strategic speaking to improve or maintain the status of one's or others' faces. Mills (2003) explains politeness through face work as a "statement of the speakers' intention to decrease face dangers entailed by certain face hazardous acts toward another." (Mills, 2003, p. 6)

The theory of politeness has been the topic of various studies since Brown and Levinson's 1978 publication. According to Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 1), politeness aims to prevent conflict by containing and neutralizing the potential for hostility and facilitating conversation between potentially hostile parties. They also

maintain that politeness is an expression of the speaker's desire to minimize the threat of certain face-threatening acts (FTAs) directed at the listener (Brown and Levinson ,1987). As a result, being polite may be an attempt by the speaker to save his or her face or the face of the person to whom he or she is speaking. They also explained that positive and negative face exist universally in human society (Brown and Levinson ,1987). A face-threatening act (FTA) intrinsically damages the addressee's or speaker's face by acting in opposition to the other's wants and desires. Face-threatening activities can be verbal (using words/language), paralinguistic (conveyed by speech qualities such as tone, intonation, and so on), or nonverbal (without using words/language) (facial expression, etc.).

FTAs are sometimes unavoidable in social situations due to the terms of communication (Loacher & Watts, 2005). Brown and Levinson (1987) define a positive face as a desire to be liked, admired, affirmed, and favorably related to others, explaining that neglecting someone would jeopardize his positive face. They also defined a negative face as the wish not to be imposed upon, observing that imposing on someone could impinge on a negative face. The positive face denotes one's self-esteem, whilst the negative face denotes one's ability to act. The two components of the face are the most basic desires in any social interaction; participants must work together to preserve each other's face. Participants can accomplish this by employing positive and negative politeness, which cater to people's positive and negative facial demands, respectively (Watts, 2019). Some FTAs are damaging for both the hearer and the speaker at the same time. For example, if a mother says that having bad children is God's punishment for her, then the words carry both hatred for the children and a lack of self-love for herself, which makes the damage work both ways.

A negative face is threatened when someone does not avoid or intends to interfere with their interlocutor's freedom of action. It can harm the speaker or the listener and force one of the interlocutors to succumb to the other's wishes. Freedom of choice and action is limited when the negative face is threatened. When the speaker is unconcerned with their interlocutor's feelings or needs or does not want what the other wants, a positive face is threatened, and positive face-threatening actions can harm both the speaker and the listener. When people are forced to be separated from others, their well-being is regarded as less significant, and their positive image is threatened. When face-threatening acts are unavoidable or intended, politeness methods should be utilized to craft communications to keep the

listener's positive face. Brown and Levinson also proposed four politeness strategies that people can use to vary the level of formality and politeness in an utterance. The four strategies include: First, being Bald on-record where no redressive action is taken. Second, being on-record with redressive action where the speaker will attempt to mitigate the effect of the FTA through positive or negative politeness strategies. Third, off-record indirect strategy. And finally, not doing the FTA at all. Nevertheless, ordinary discourse might disclose many occasions in which politeness rules are disregarded, such as conversations amongst close friends or while joking, teasing, and so forth. Breaking these norms for no reason will provoke offence, resulting in problems.

Since Brown and Levinson state that "mutual awareness" of face needs in language use for establishing and maintaining social relationships, the distortion of such norms in the linguistic repertoire of children may result in their inability to have effective interpersonal exchanges in the future. Their theory is used in the present study for the analysis.

Markedness

According to Watts (2019), speakers can choose unmarked behaviour to save face. Unmarked behaviour is that which has been ritualized in a social context and would generally go unnoticed since it is appropriate such as greetings, parental orders, teacher's instructions, student's queries etc. On the other hand, marked behaviour entails violating the normal expectations of what is appropriate in a certain social context (Locher & Watts, 2005). These may be categorized as positively marked use of language that may violate the norms but still maintains the politeness and appropriateness and keeps the hearer's and /or the speaker's face (Watts, 1992). However, negatively marked ones are those which go against the social interaction norms that may cause damage to any of the interlocutors. Hence, marked linguistic behaviour would entail face-threatening acts for the Addressee or the speaker (Watts, 1992). For example, a child mocking a parent or a teacher, a child criticizing an adult, a spouse verbally abusing another, or a teacher speaking negatively about school or the teaching profession to the students can all be considered negatively marked acts.

Power Relations

An important factor that plays a role in augmenting or mitigating face-threatening acts is power. According to Brown and Levinson, power relationship is

'an asymmetrical social dimension' through which one person can impose her/his plans and evaluation at the expense of the other (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p.77). Power relations in a given situation may come from various factors, including money, knowledge, social status, role, age, or sex. In some cases, there are culturally created sources of power; for example, males may exhibit power more than females and a firstborn child more than other siblings (Thomas, 1995, pp. 125-7). Fraser and Nolen (1981) added that some professions, like those of a doctor, a lawyer, or a professor, come with inherent power; therefore, every time they perform tasks related to that position, that power is used (Fraser & Nolen, 1981, p.95).

There are also various types of power, including reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, and expert power. Reward power is used in professional contexts that may be connected to a promotion or pay raise. One has the right to punish others if coercive power exists, and it has a negative connotation. Legitimate power is the authority one has to make specific demands because of their position, age, or status; meanwhile, referent power is more attached to leadership and guidance (Fraser & Nolen, 1981, p.95). Nevertheless, expert power is based on a high level of knowledge and expertise. Koike (1989) mentioned "linguistic power or control" to describe the kind of authority one can exercise through language in a conversation without necessarily reflecting their rank or standing in the real world (Koike, 1989, p.188). Parents and teachers within their context are entitled to use many, if not all, types of power. Sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1992) states that the social conditions that enable distinct speech acts are crucial. The most potent speech act requires specific institutional conditions and is unavailable to every speaker. For example, school teachers should have authority and be able to issue commands to their students. However, they may not be able to use this power outside school.

On the other hand, Parents' power is not bound to a certain time or location and is not expected to be defied. Therefore, if a child is to give orders, lie, ridicule, or describe his/her parents in inappropriate language, this would violate both power and politeness in a family context. Face-threatening acts are more damaging if they go against the power's direction. For example, an order is given from a lower-power person to a higher-power person since they violate both politeness rules and power norms within the context (Bourdieu, 1992). When children learn how to use language in a certain context, they also learn impeded relationships of power, levels of respect, and chain of command, together with other human interaction models (Fowler, 1979). Power concepts in society can be established and changed through

language (Fowler, 1979). The discursive construction of power by institutions and people can change societal norms and reality (Mayr, 2008). And finally, they also need to be trained in that the ranking of imposition directly correlates with the danger of facial loss (Mazid, 2008).

Hofstede's Cultural Dimensions Theory, used to understand the differences in culture across countries, includes six key dimensions one of which is power distance (Hofstede,2011). The degree to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a nation assume and accept that power is allocated unequally is known as power distance, which is basically culturally defined (Hofstede,2011). Hofstede (2011) claims that some countries, and regions who share language or cultural heritage are higher on the power scale than others. For example, Egypt comes high on the parental authority power scale compared to the United States; therefore, in Egyptian family children are expected to be more obedient and argue less than in an American family. However, recent criticism of the theory claimed that although the several elements of the theory withstand cross examination in different cultures, the globalized nature of today's world and the availability of world media are in fact continuously changing practices within societies (McSweeney, 2002). In other words, when analyzing power relations, cultural differences need to be observed.

Context

Context is the main identifier of politeness since it contains the rules for what can be considered polite and what is not (Mazid, 2008). Mayor and Allington (2012) define context as the "physical location and social circumstances in which a particular example of language use occurs" (Mayor & Allington, 2012, p.6). Context components include the physical environment, the interplay between the speakers, their previous shared experiences, their current objectives, the social settings in which the contract takes place, the institutional setting and ideals, and expectations from a broader cultural perspective. Therefore, what is considered polite in one culture may not be perceived the same way in another. Anthropologists have confirmed that we require significant cultural and linguistic information to use and comprehend language in different contexts (Mayor & Allington, 2012). There will be various ways of speaking within any single community: distinct language uses connected with specific institutions, relationships, and social events. Interlocutors use the speakers' attitudes and expectations regarding language use in that particular

cultural context to grasp the function and meaning of any spoken conversation (Mayor & Allington, 2012). Thus, acquiring such elements in childhood is essential for efficient linguistic performance within a culture or a community. Four types of contexts play a role in shaping any language response: physical, epistemological, linguistic, and social context (Irvine et al., 1992).

Physical context refers to the immediate setting where the dialogue occurs. In contrast, the epistemic context refers to the interlocutors' past knowledge about one another, the topic under discussion, etc. Thirdly, linguistic context is the domination and submissiveness related to certain language structures and use. Finally, social context refers to the norms that govern interlocutors' verbal and nonverbal interactions and the community's expectations (Irvine et al., 1992). Therefore, when interacting parties are trying to figure out the illocution (intended meaning) from the locution, context becomes the most important factor to consider the surface meaning (Irvine et al., 1992).

Components of context include the physical environment, the interplay between the speakers, their previous shared experiences, as well as their current objectives, the social settings in which the encounter takes place, the institutional setting and finally, ideals and expectations from a broader cultural perspective (Mayor & Allington, 2012). The two contexts of family and school were chosen for the present study because they represent informal vs institutional settings. In them, children learn the difference between using language under the care and protection of family against that of a formal environment without parental guidance.

Family Context

The family context is not limited to a single physical setting in which the family dialogues occur, and the epistemic part of it evolves from the past shared knowledge by the spouses and their children and topics vary in an almost infinite number. The social norms that govern a family's verbal and nonverbal interactions are supposed to be based on respect among family members and mutual respect between spouses in Arab culture. Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik (2015) maintained that children should show respect and love to their parents, and each family member should fulfill certain responsibilities assigned by the particular culture and context. For example, parents are expected to financially support, nurture, discipline, educate, and set role models for their children (Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2015). A father in Arab culture is usually the source of power, support, and reassurance in a

family, and children usually seek protection in his existence. On the other hand, a mother is the source of emotional and social nourishment, and a grandparent is a source of wisdom.

Family discourse has an almost infinite impact on children's perception of language and life since family is the primary learning stage for speaking, thinking, feeling, and acting in socially and culturally meaningful ways (Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik, 2015). Caregivers use language to draw attention to, model, instruct, direct, reprimand, argue, narrate, plan, and generally influence young children into activities and dispositions important to their community members. According to Ochs & Kremer-Sadlik (2015), children worldwide are bombarded with familial communication during their first five years. Even older, school-aged children spend much time talking to other family members and rely on these connections for emotional and practical support. A family discussion takes place in various settings, from private to public. Depending on local societal standards, these locations offer a variety of activities that organize how family members communicate with one another.

Families are not just sociobiological units; they are living, dynamic organisms that require collaboration. Even the simplest activities such as having a meal in a family is a linguistically enriching experience for children (Ochs & Shohet, 2006). Therefore, a child's early sociopragmatic competence is defined by whatever s/he perceives in and about the family context.

School Context

School context is the first encounter for a child with sociopragmatic needs away from family in an institutional setting. Components of the linguistic context of school include a geographically limited physical environment with clear boundaries, namely the school premises. The interplay between the speakers does not mainly depend on their previous shared experiences since children in school come from different backgrounds and build their shared experiences in school during their years of Education. However, their common objectives play a much greater role in defining their language. In addition, the social settings, including the norms governing the interlocutors' verbal and nonverbal interactions in school, are expected to be formal and cooperative to a great extent. Finally, the school community context places teachers in an authoritative yet caring framework that would enable them to provide knowledge and guidance to the children (Temple & Wright, 2015).

In a study of language usage in schools, Shuy and Griffin (1981) noted that language interaction in schools on any given day is woven into an institutional context. For example, in school, a child meets different levels of power relationships and interactions where politeness and face work have a larger impact in a regulated society. Therefore, the language used in and about school seriously affects a child's behavioral patterns and socialization (Temple & Wright, 2015).

On the other hand, Tawfik (2005) maintained that teachers should show supportive, interactive strategies towards their students by showing their reward power (providing correct knowledge, giving advice, etc.). She also added that teachers need to help learners fulfill their relational goals by using kind language, discussing and correcting mistakes anonymously, and saving Lerner's negative face by showing coercive power. On the other hand, Teachers need to be aware that they may lose their positive face by belittling their expert power through self-criticism, admitting mistakes, questioning their credibility, and showing a lack of knowledge (Tawfik,2005).

Scope of the Study

The present study uses the Brown and Levinson's 1978 theory to analyze violations of politeness and power relations in the Arabic version of *Gumball*. The chosen extracts sample situations within family and school contexts. The data of the study is not exhaustive but rather representative. The chosen four scenes for the present analysis are selected as samples of the content in question. For example, they include content that may pass as a polite request, advice, etc. if uttered in a different context, but within the context factors it becomes unacceptable to be used. The actual wording of the Arabic version included in the study was transcribed and translated into English by the researcher, and the original American version is also provided for cross-referencing when needed. It is only highlighted in the analysis when a high discrepancy between the Arabic and American versions wording or type of speech act exists. Therefore, contrasting the original and the dubbed versions is not done extensively. A few examples are provided to highlight the degree of inappropriateness in the Arabic and the American versions. In the present study the analysis is not extended to include other features of the cartoon such as multimodal analysis.

Research Methodology

The Amazing World of Gumball

The cartoon that is chosen for the present study is *The Amazing world of Gumball* which is broadcast on free networks such as Cartoon Network; therefore, most Arab children have access to it. It is an award-winning show popular in 126 countries (*Home Gumball*, 2018). In this cartoon, the family of Gumball comically introduces the deepest problems that lurk under glamorous modern family life in a way that maps failure in interaction rather than success. The series takes place in the fictional city of Elmore in the state of California, USA, where the Waterson family lives. Gumball is the oldest kid in the Waterson family. It consists of his father, Richard Waterson, an unemployed couch potato food addict, and his mother, Nicole, a hard-working woman with a firm mind who acts as the family's provider. The family also includes Anais, his genius younger sister, and the adopted fish/brother Darwen. The character of Gumball is described on Cartoon Network's official website as "a very imaginative person. Despite his mediocre academic performance, he can be surprisingly brilliant when it comes to formulating all sorts of mischievous schemes." (*Home Gumball*, 2018). The first episode was aired on May 3rd, 2011. The episodes were originally produced in English with several dubbed versions. The chosen extracts in the analysis below were selected from the Arabic version.

Procedures

Selected scenes were transcribed and translated from the Arabic dubbed episodes of *The Amazing World of Gumball*, and the transcription of the original American version is also provided. Examples of certain speech acts in the Arabic version are sometimes translated by the researcher for clarification and comparison where high discrepancy between the original English version and the Arabic translation are found to have an implication in the analysis. The turns are numbered and tabulated (see appendices). Since context rules govern the interplay of interlocutors in any given situation, including face needs and power relations, the analysis in the following section will focus on several face-threatening acts directed towards positive or negative face observing and /or disturbing face needs and power relations within the context of family and school. Therefore, each extract will be analyzed according to the following procedures:

<p>Type of FTA Brown and Levinson (1978)</p>	<p>FTAs to negative face:</p> <p>1- Damage to the hearer (orders, requests, suggestions, advice, threats, or warnings, compliments, expressions of envy, or expressions of strong negative emotion toward the hearer)</p> <p>2- Damage to the speaker (expressing thanks, acceptance of thanks or apology, excuse, acceptance of offers, pretending to be unaware of something, promising to do something unfavorable)</p>
	<p>FTAs to positive face:</p> <p>1- Damage to the hearer (disapproval, criticism, contempt or ridicule, complaints, accusations, insults, contradictions or disagreements, challenges, disrespect, mention of topics which are inappropriate in general or in the context, belittling)</p> <p>2-Damage to the speaker (apologies, acceptance of compliment, inability to control one’s physical self, inability to control one’s emotional self, self-humiliation, confessions.)</p>
<p>Markedness of the FTA within the context</p>	<p>Unmarked: acceptable ritualized action in a social context and would generally go unnoticed</p>
	<p>Marked:</p> <p>1- Positively marked: a speech act that maintains the politic and appropriateness and keeps the hearer and /or the speaker's face</p> <p>2- Negatively Marked: a speech act that goes against the social interaction norms that may cause damage to any of the interlocutors</p>
<p>Power used in the FTA</p>	<p>A speaker may have or lose one or more of the following powers:</p> <p>1- Reward power</p> <p>2- Coercive power</p> <p>3- Legitimate power</p> <p>4- Referent power</p> <p>5- Expert power</p>

Table (1) procedures

Data Analysis

Example Scenes about Family Relations

The following extracts are selected to include family encounters inside and outside the household showing the FTAs and power rules used by the interlocutors in the family context (see appendices). For every scene, the context is given, followed by a discussion of the analysis provided in the appendices. The discussion attempts to answer the research questions by listing examples of FTAs in the

dialogues and describing their violation of norms of family and school-accepted politeness strategies and model inappropriate sociopragmatic competence for children, markedness and power relations.

Scene 1. The following extract is taken from an episode named "The Refund". In this episode, Gumball and his brother were scammed into buying a video game they could not use. The father, Richard, took the initiative to help the boys get a refund, so he changed his outfit, grew facial hair, and adopted the look of a thug. He escorted the kids to the shop and asked the shop assistant for a refund. After a long argument, Richard took the money from the register's drawer when the assistant refused to take back the game and return the money. The shop alarm goes off because of the theft, and the shop owner comes to the scene. He starts hitting Richard who begs for mercy. The chosen extract covers the encounter between the father, the two boys, and the shop owner (see appendix A)

In the scene Richard represents the anti-father figure. He is irresponsible and makes the wrong choice. He blamed his kids for doing the crime that he committed alone when he was caught. His first turn, "Please have mercy on me!" is an unmarked directive of begging for mercy and asking for forgiveness because the shop owner was beating him. He also showed a lack of self-control which is an FTA that threatens his positive face and loss of legitimate power. Thus, setting a bad example for his kids and other kids about handling emotional distress. All the FTAs in the rest of the conversation are marked. Richard then used two assertive speech acts to disclaim his mistake and blame his sons for the crime that he planned and committed in turn 2, causing damage to the positive face of the kids and misusing his legitimate parental power. It is worth mentioning here that most of Richard's powers as a father are usually brought to minimum throughout. He lacks, knowledge, expert, coercive, powers. His lack of linguistic power is one of the main sources of the comedy in the cartoon because most of his speech acts are miss directed or out of context. Besides, he shows no expert power except in food because he is a food addict, and in the scene analyzed above he uses his legitimate power to avoid responsibility for his actions.

Although submissiveness of children to parental authority is not as high in American culture as it is in Arab culture, it is expected that children have a minimal amount of respect to their parents. Gumball and the rest of the children in the family show no respect for their father while they look up to their mother. Gumball in turn 3 expresses anger and distrust toward the father by criticizing him openly and

damaging his positive face using expert power in guiding the father to what the right thing should have been. Such responses are common in the Gumball cartoon, and the children abuse and humiliate their father almost in every episode. The sequence of the marked FTAs continues with the reply of Richard, the father, in turn 4. He answers his son's remark in the Arabic version by saying,

"Would anybody trust his father?"

"وهل يثق أحد في أبيه؟!"

Which is a rhetorical question and a negatively marked directive. It is threatening the face of the listener and the speaker as well because it generalizes the mistrust between a father and his children. While in the English version the answer is "You know I can't be trusted", can be considered a marked FTA of self-humiliation and confession of incompetency directed to the positive face of the speaker and undermines the parental authority of only Richard. Therefore, it can be concluded that the Arabic version sends a more damaging message to all kids about all parents. Perhaps the translator of the dubbed Arabic version wants to refer to Richard's issues with his father. The latter deserted the family when Richard was an infant and made Richard fall victim to the helicopter parenting of a single psychopath mother. Children usually find safety in the presence of their parents and gain face and strength from that feeling. Therefore, the face damage of the original American version is not limited to Richard who is undermining his credibility but also to Gumball's face and power. On the other hand, the face damage of the Arabic version is to all children, including Gumball, about all fathers and the damage undermines the concept of fatherhood. This repetitive theme in several episodes plants the seed of doubt and despair about family validity in the minds of little children.

Scene 2. In a family, grandparents usually have special status which is associated with the love and care they give their grandchildren. However, the *grandma* figure that appears in Gumball's household in a few episodes is hideous, controlling, overprotective. Sometimes she is a threat to the family. In the episode "Grandma JoJo is here to stay- the authority", she comes to visit her injured son Richard and accuses Nicole (her daughter in law and mother of Gumball) of being careless and of jeopardizing the life of her husband and her children. Grandma JOJO convinces the entire family that it is best to do nothing in life except eating and sitting on the couch to be safe. For example, she shows the children how helping their mother in the house chores could get them killed etc. By the end of the episode, the

children turn into copies of Richard, sitting all day on the couch and watching TV while eating junk food. Nicol defies these practices and frees her children from their detainment before they lose all their mental and social skills. The chosen extract shows how the grandmother uses FTAs in a subtle observation of politic to destroy Nicole's self-confidence, so she can take over the house. Grandmothers in Arab culture may practice such domination over the family. However, the scene models how to manipulate others' feelings and damage their face without being impolite.

The conversation might seem like an ordinary exchange between an experienced grandmother taking charge to help her daughter in law and save the family from a chaotic hazardous life. However, the high level of implied meanings in the language of the grandmother is apparent in the episodes; therefore, it is easily deduced how manipulative she is. All the FTAs in the conversation analyzed in appendix B are marked in this family context except turn 6. The grandmother relies on her legitimate power and experience as two cannons to bombard Nicole. Moreover, she uses coercive powers to correct Nicole's mistakes and guide her and the rest of the family to the right path. Nicole, in turn 6, reacts to this continuous bombardment and tries to claim her worthiness as the caretaker of the family with her legitimate power. With the continuous use of FTAs and damaging both Nicole's positive and negative faces, Granny JOJO successfully undermines her daughter in law's self-confidence and claims control over the household to protect them from a reckless upbringing that can jeopardize their physical safety from her point of view.

Starting from turn 1, Granny pretends to advise Nicole by using a negatively marked FTA in a speech act of advice with an implied accusation of neglect. She gradually refutes all Nicole's attempts to reclaim her self-confidence in turns 2,4, and 6. Turn 1 also exemplifies how to use politeness in a manipulative way because Grandma JOJO did not direct the FTA at Nicole but used the pronoun "you" and stated a generalized fact, as a soft beginning of a sequence of face-damaging words. All of granny's FTAs are damaging to the hearer, while Nicole's FTAs are directed at herself except those in turn 6 where she tries to repudiate Granny's assertions. The conversation is an example of how family members can verbally abuse one another by using seemingly polite language.

Examples Scenes about School.

Schools for little children should offer a safe, comfortable environment that ensures mental, physical and emotional growth integration. Teachers should be sources of knowledge and act as role models for the school kids. However,

everything about Gumball's Elmore Junior High School is the opposite of these concepts. Two extracts are chosen here to exemplify the kind of language exchanged in the school context. They are taken from two episodes about school context and demonstrate how the interlocutors employ FTA and power.

Scene 3. This episode “Beginner’s Advice” starts with the two brothers, Gumball and Darwen, walking down a hall in their school, and they hear someone crying. They decide to know who is moaning, and when they enter the office, they find one of their teachers Mr. Small in deep sorrow telling them that he is sad for teaching an unfulfilling profession. They try to sooth his sadness and offer to help find a proof that teaching is a fulfilling profession. Therefore, the two boys start asking their teachers about what is fulfilling about doing their profession. All teachers including The Coach, Miss Simeon, and principal Brown are asked one common question “What's your favorite thing about teaching?”. The teachers’ answers are unexpected but were expressive of their characters.

Questions are directives giving the speaker the power to define the range of illocutionary force that the answer as a speech act will have, especially in the case of Wh-questions that require a complete truthful proposition in the answer (Searle & Vanderveken, 1985). However, the teachers' answers in turns 4,6,8 do not relate to the required speech acts and give a range of answers outside the realm of the expected ones in many aspects (see appendix C). First, the teachers’ answers may seem unexpected, but they are expressive of their characters. In turn 4, the Coach, who is cruel and cares not about the children, is waiting for retirement. In turn 6, Miss Simeon, the scary baboon that hates children, declares that she enjoys hearing the footsteps of children leaving. In turn 8 principal brown who is a hesitant materialistic hairy creature speaks about free coffee. Second, the implied meanings in their answers that should have referred to something rewarding in their profession are not related to the core of their job; therefore, they did not provide truthful propositions to the wh-question asked.

Moreover, the unexpected reasons that the teachers gave could be interpreted as loss of knowledge power. Besides, their avoidance to answer the questions in turns 4,6,8 could be a form of using an off-record strategy which would not be entirely aiming at saving the face of the hearer or the speaker in this context because their answer in turn 10 is unavoidably bold on the record FTA. Furthermore, their off-point answers may also have been used to avoid responsibility for their FTA.

Third, the power loss that is associated with the teachers' replies is evident in the loss coercive and reward powers that are turned into hatred for the children they are teaching. Their replies show lack of legitimate knowledge and reward powers which culminates in turn (10) with a consensus among them that the source of their sadness is children. Fourth, the quest of Gumball and Darwen is with a good cause; however, the scene is loaded with FTAs that damage the addressee's face and their personal face as teachers. The entire episode draws a gloomy picture of school life and puts forward an image of reluctant teachers who hate their job and children and lack knowledge and empathy.

Scene 4. The episode named "the Coach" includes a key scene in which Gumball and Darwen try to bribe the school nurse to get a sick note, so they can skip the sports class and avoid the new school trainer. Bribing is unethical in any context, not to mention in a school context between a student and the school staff member. However, the language exchanged between Gumball and the school nurse builds a linguistic model for using hypocrisy and avoiding face loss for both speaker and addressee while negotiating an unethical deed. Throughout the scene, the Nurse seems reluctant to hear the boys, but, by the end of the scene, she gives them the note and takes something from them. Then, she discovers that they scammed her by giving her a "thank you" note instead of a dollar (in the Arabic version).

The initial marked response in turn 1 of the nurse of rebutting the unspoken argument of the boys implies that she has experienced the same conversation before (see appendix D). Therefore, she is threatening their positive face under the assumption that she knows their intentions. Gumball uses politeness through a positively marked speech act (in turn 2) and uses assertive praise to show respect and express admiration of the nurse. Furthermore, in the Arabic version that we are targeting here, Gumball uses the word "طبيبة" a "Doctor" to talk about the nurse in a formal compliment, which is an exaggeration or flattery that is not found in the American version. This sets a model for children that illegitimate actions can be legitimized through the effective use of speech acts like praising and sweet talking. Nevertheless, the following turns include marked FTAs with implied double meaning that adds a comic feel to the scene because of the amount of money that Gumball is offering as a bribe and the possibility that the nurse is either playing along with the boys or accepting the bribe and is actually negotiating the amount of money. In both cases, writing a sick note for the boys is a violation as well.

The negotiations that go on from turn 3 to turn 6 set a model for bargaining. In turn 7, the nurse uses a question that offers a solution, but it is not only an FTA to the positive face of the boys but it carries an insult as well in the Arabic expression

“هل ستحل عني“

“Will you let me be and get out of my face”

which is not found in the English version. Gumball in turn 9 scams the nurse and gives her a thanks letter in the Arabic version and an IOU in the English original instead of the promised bribe. The nurse shouts with an expressive complain that is an FTA to the boys in as she was disappointed when she gets nothing. With negotiating the bribe and finally accepting it, the nurse loses her legitimate power to Gumball's reward power. In sum, the scene is a good example of how a child can win over an adult who has authority provided that a child is cunning, deceitful, and knows how to keep the politic of the conversation.

Conclusion

The present study attempted a qualitative analysis of several sociopragmatic interactions within the two contexts of school and family, many of which carry politeness and power relations violations. The distorted image of these two contexts that this cartoon introduces to Arab children may lead to the acquisition of sociopragmatic practices that children could internalize as ordinary uses of language. The analysis spotted several instances of inappropriate use of language within the examined scenes using politeness theory, power relations, and markedness. Examples range from using negatively marked language, such as accusing, threatening, and belittling adults, parents and teachers, to using positively marked language to legitimize an illegal action. Furthermore, in the analyzed cartoon, it was noticed that these speech acts are portrayed in an enjoyable, funny way portraying a family as a chaotic entity and school as an oppressive mundane one. Therefore, the analysis focused on describing the nature of the FTAs used and how their markedness impacted the addressees negatively. A child watching these continuous violations of face needs, politeness strategies, and disruption of power relations may interpret them as normal linguistic behaviour and internalize them in his/her sociopragmatic reservoir and hence use them. Therefore, dubbed cartoons with distorted sociopragmatic content need closer censorship. Finally, the present study focused on a few aspects of the politeness, power, and markedness of the content of the examined Cartoon. However, several other elements in this cartoon and similar

Arabic versions of internationally produced cartoons need to be investigated. These may include :a quantitative analysis of the frequency of FTAs and power relations violations , an analysis of multimodal aspects and cultural variations , and an investigation of transliteration of foreign lexical items in Arabic versions of cartoons .

References

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press
- Badr, M. (2018). The Role of Children’s TV Channels in the Demolition of Moral Values: Cartoon Network Arabia Channel as a Model Analytical Study. *Arab Journal of Sciences & Research Publishing*, 4(3),102–83. <https://doi.org/10.26389/AJSRP.M250618>.
- Bourdieu, P. (1992) *Language and Symbolic Power* (trans. G. Raymond and M. Adamson; ed. J. B. Thompson), Polity Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bruner, J. S. (1981). *The social context of language acquisition*. *Language & Communication*, 1(2-3), 155–178. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309\(81\)90010-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0271-5309(81)90010-0)
- Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and Control* 1st ed. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429436215>
- Fraser, B.& Nolen, W. (1981). The Association of Deference with Linguistic Form. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 27, 93–109.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction rituals: Essays on face-to-face interaction*. Doubleday.
- Gökçearsan , A. (2010). The Effect Of Cartoon Movies On Children's Gender Development. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*.2 (2),5202-5207
- Harlow, L. (1990). Do They Mean What They Say? Sociopragmatic Competence and Second Language Learners. *The Modern Language Journal*,74, 328–351.
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), 2307-0919.
- Home, Gumball. (2018, December 5th). The Amazing World of Gumball. YouTube. Retrieved September 25th, 2022, from <https://www.cartoonnetworkhq.com/show/gumball/character/darwin>

- House, J. (1989). Politeness in English and German: The Function of “Please” and “Bitte”. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper, (eds). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 96–119.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On Communicative Competence. In J. B. Pride, & A. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Irvine, J., Schieffelin, B., Series, C. M., Goodwin, M. H., Kuipers, J., Kulick, D., ... & Ochs, E. (1992). *Rethinking Context: Language as An Interactive Phenomenon* No. 11. Cambridge University Press.
- Kasper, G. (1990). Linguistic politeness: Current research issues. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 193–218.
- Koike, D. (1998). Requests and the role of deixis in politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 13 (2), 187-202
- Kramarae, C., Muriel S., & William M. O'Barr (1985.). *Language and Power*. Sage Publications.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). Language And Woman’s Place. *Language In society*, pp. 2, 45–80.
- Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and Women’s Place*. Harper & Row.
- Locher, M. & Watts, R. (2005). Politeness Theory and Relational Work. *Journal Of Politeness Research*. 1(1), 9-33. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.9>
- Mazid, B. M. (2008). The Politeness Principle from Grice to Netiquette. *Annals of Arts and Social Sciences (AASS)*, 29, (281). Academic Publication Council. Kuwait University.
- Mayr, A. (ed.) (2008) *Language and Power: An Introduction to Institutional Discourse*. London; New York: Continuum, 6 , 204.
- Mayor, B. & Allington, D. (2012). Talking in English. In B. Mayor, and D. Allington (eds.). *Communicating in English: Talk, Text, Technology*. Routledge.
- McLeod, S. (2011). Bandoura: Social Learning Theory. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/bandura.html>
- McSweeney, B. (2002). The essentials of scholarship: A reply to Geert Hofstede. *Human Relations*, 55(11), 1363-1372.
- Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and Politeness*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ochs, E. & Shohet M. (2006). The cultural structuring of mealtime socialization. In R. Larson, A. Wiley, & K. Branscomb, (eds). *New Directions in Child and Adolescent Development 11: Family Mealtime as a Context of Development and Socialization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 35–50.

- Ochs, E. & T Kremer-Sadlik, T. (2015). Discursive Underpinnings of Family Coordination. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds). *The handbook of discourse analysis. 2nd Edition*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Rai, S., Waskel, B., Sakalle, Salil., Dixit, S., & Mahore, R. (2016). Effects of cartoon programs on behavioural, habitual and communicative changes in children. *International Journal of Community Medicine and Public Health*. 10.18203/2394-6040.ijcmph20161456.
- Searle, J. R., & Vanderveken, D. (1985). *Foundations of illocutionary logic*. Cambridge University Press.
- Settle, Q. (2018). Introducing Communication Theory: Analysis and Application. *Journal of Applied Communications*. 102 (3). doi:10.4148/1051-0834.1223.
- Shuy, W. & Griffin, P. (1981). What do they do any day: studying functional language. In W. Patrick Dickson, (ed.) *Children's Oral Communication Skills*. Academic, 271–86.
- Song, S. (2012). *Politeness and Culture In Second Language Acquisition*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sudha, Dr. A. G. (2001). Factors Influencing the Change in the Behavior of Children on Viewing Cartoon Programs – A Study. *Namex International Journal of Management Research*, 1.
- Sultana, S. (2014). Role of Cartoon: A Brief Discussion on How Cartoons Impact Children. *ENH Community Journal*, 1.
- Tawfik, H. (2005). Facework in Egyptian EFL Classroom Interactions. *Journal of Faculty of Education (Literary section)*. XI, (11), 3-42
- Temple, C & Wright, A&J. (2015). Discourse in Educational Settings. In D. Schiffrin, Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis. 2nd Edition*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Longman.
- Watts, R. (1989). Relevance and Relational Work: Linguistic Politeness as Politic Behavior. *Multilingua* 8, 131–166.
- Watts, R. (2019). Linguistic politeness and politic verbal behaviour: Reconsidering claims for universality. In R. Watts, S. Ide & K. Ehlich (Eds.) *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice*. 43–70. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110886542-005>

Yousuf, Z., Shehzad, M., & Hassan. A. (2015). Effects of Cartoon Network on the Behavior of School Going Children (A Case Study of Gujrat City). *International Research Journal of Interdisciplinary & Multidisciplinary Studies (IRJIMS)*, 1, 173-179.

علم التداولية الإجتماعية وعلاقته بالكرتون: إنتهاكات نظرية التآدب وعلاقات القوة في

كرتون جامبول

د. سهام أسامة عبد العزيز

مدرس بكلية اللغات والترجمة

أكاديمية السادات للعلوم الإدارية

seham.osama@sadatacademy.edu.eg

المستخلص:

تعد قدره على استخدام الأساليب اللغوية السليمة التي يتناولها علم التداولية الاجتماعية من أهم مقومات كفاءة الأداء اللغوي حيث تظهر القدرة على استخدامها في نواحي عديدة منها التآدب في السلوك واحترام فروق السلطة الاجتماعية التي تظهر في إختلاف علاقات القوة بإختلاف السياق . وقد أشار براون وليفانسون 1990 إلى أن التآدب في الحوار هو جهد يبذله المتحدث للحفاظ على ماء وجهه وماء وجه الآخر لتقليل فرصه إراقة ماء الوجه لأحدهما أو كليهما . وعليه فإن هذه الدراسة هي تحليل لبعض عناصر التآدب واستخدامات علاقات القوة في سياقها السليم في مسلسل الكرتون الأمريكي الشهير غامبول في نسخته العربية. وقد إختيرت أربع مشاهد من حلقات المسلسل تمثل خروقات واضحة لإستخدامات اللغوية من حيث التآدب وعلاقات القوة في سياق الأسرة والمدرسة ومثال ذلك أو محاولة رشوة أحد العاملين بالمدرسة وقد اتخذت الدراسة منهاجا وصفيا في تحليل تلك المشاهد.

الكلمات المفتاحية: علم التداولية الاجتماعية - نظرية التآدب - علاقات القوة في المحادثات

Appendices

Appendix A

Turn no	Original Arabic and American Script	Translation of the Arabic version	Power	Type of face threatened	Damage direction	Markedness
1.	Richard لالا ارحمني Please don't hurt me!	Please have mercy on me!	Lost legitimate power	Positive face	To the speaker	Unmarked directive because Richard's behavior was illegal and he is asking for forgiveness from the shop owner. Inability to control one's emotional and physical actions also is an FTA for the speaker's positive face.
2.	Richard لست أنا السبب هما السبب It's not even my fault; it's their fault (Richard points at the boys)	It's not me ,it's them	Legitimate parental power misused	Positive face	To the Addressee (Gumball and Darwen) No damage is directed to the shop owner	Marked use of two assertives because he is trying to clear himself by incriminating his children.
3.	Gumball لم نتوقع منك سرقة " الخزينة عندما قلت "انك ستعيدها" "We didn't expect when you said you'll get a refund that you will steal from the register."	We did not expect you to steal the money from the register, when you said you'll bring it back.	Expert power used by the child toward a parent	Positive face	To the Addressee	Marked use of assertives since expressions of anger and accusations directed at parents are not normal, acceptable behaviour in a family context.
4.	Richard وهل يثق أحد في " أبيه"	Would anybody trust his father?	Expert power	Positive face	To the speaker	It is a marked directive since it questions the validity of fathers' worthiness in general.

"You know I can't be trusted."					As a parent is not expected to humiliate himself in the presence of his children
--------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Analysis of "The refund"

Appendix B

Turn no	Original Arabic and American Script	Translation of the Arabic version	Power	Type of face threatened	Damage direction	Markedness
1.	Grandma JoJo الأم الجيدة تمنع الحوادث قبل أن تقع A good mother prevents the incident before it happens	A good mother prevents accidents before they happen	Knowledge and Legitimate power	positive	Addressee	Negatively marked assertive because it is neither wise nor honest advice. Granny JoJo is imposing on her stepdaughter and making her feel bad. She is using a general form in the speech act pretending to be informing about the duties of a mother to sound less aggressive but she is implicitly accusing Nicole of negligence.
2.	Nicole لطالما اعتقدت جيدة أنني أم I always thought I was a good mother	I always thought I was a good mother	Both Knowledge and Legitimate power are undermined and lost	positive	Speaker	Negatively marked use of an assertive because she doubts herself. She was affected by her mother-in-law's remarks and lost face. Her feeble counterargument is an attempt to keep face.
3.	Grandma JoJo ولكنك لست كذلك But you're not. Are you?	But you're not	Knowledge and Legitimate power	positive	Addressee	Negatively marked use of assertives because Granny JoJo is humiliating Nicole and is dragging her into the assumption that she has

						been and will always be a bad mother and that she needs help from the experienced Granny JoJo. Granny again is imposing and not giving Nicole an option.
4.	Nicole ربما كان ذلك بسبب الضغوط Maybe it's because of stress	Maybe it's because of stress	Loss of legitimate power	Negative	Speaker	Positively marked use of assertives because Nicole is trying to find excuses for her failure is an indication that she is succumbing to the power of granny JoJo.
5.	Grandma JoJo لا تقلقي Don't worry about it	Don't worry	Knowledge and Legitimate power	Positive	Addressee	Positively marked use of a request because the addressee is being manipulated, on the surface, it sounds like providing emotional support but in reality, granny JoJo is destroying what is left of Nicole's self-confidence by forcing her opinion, imposing and not giving options.
6.	Nicole ولكنهم أولادي و يحتاجونني But they're my family they need me	But they're my children and they need me	Trying to reclaim rightful parental power	Positive	Addressee	Unmarked use of a declarative since Nicole is gaining back some of her self-worthiness, and is trying to repudiate the validity of Granny's assumptions
7.	Grandma JoJo بل يحتاجونني أنا They need me more	No, they need me	Knowledge	Positive	Addressee	Negatively marked use of an assertive because Granny is taking over the household by winning the argument, belittling

					the mother's role and asserting hers.
--	--	--	--	--	---------------------------------------

Analysis of "Grandma JoJo is here to stay- the authority"

Appendix (C)

Turn no	Text	Translation of the Arabic version	Power	Type of face threatened	Damage direction	Markedness
1.	Mr. Small لقد ادركت لتوي أنه لاشيئ مرضي في عملي كمعلم I just realized nothing is fulfilling about being a teacher.	I just realized nothing is satisfying about being a teacher.	Legitimate & Knowledge	Positive	Addressee	Negatively Marked because the teacher's assertion is based on his feeling of discontent about his job but this job involve children. Therefore, it is an FTA to the children's face.
2.	Gumball لا لا أنت مخطئ ! لا بد أن هناك الكثير من الأشياء التي تساعدك هنا Oh, come on. I'm sure there's lots to like.	No, no! you're wrong. There are plenty of things that can make you happy here	Pretending to have expert /or knowledge power	Positive	Addressee	Negatively marked since the children are arguing against the point of view presented by their teacher.
3.	Darwen دارون: يا مدرب قل لي ما أكثر ما تحبه في التدريس في Hey, coach!	Coach! What is the thing you like most about teaching?	Pretending to have expert /or knowledge power	Positive	Addressee	Positively marked because questions are directive speech acts that threaten the addressee's face, but they are asked in this context for a good cause which is helping

	What's your favorite thing about teaching?					Mr. Small find a fulfilling purpose for all teachers.
4.	coach المدرّب: أحب مشاهدته الوقت يمضي حتى التقاعد Watching the minutes tick by until the day I can retire	I like watching the time pass till retirement	Legitimate & Knowledge	Positive	Addressee	A negatively marked act that causes damage to the addressee since the coach assures the children that for the rest of his teaching career, he will be trying to pass the time till his retirement, indicating boredom and lack of interest in his job
5.	Gumball غامبول: انسه سميون؟ Uh, Miss Simeon?	Miss Simeon?	Pretending to have expert /or knowledge power	Positive	Addressee	Positively marked question considering the good intentions of the boys. The pattern is repeated with all teachers.
6.	Miss Simeon أحب سماع صوت تلك الأقدام الصغيرة تغادر الصف For me, it's the excited pitter-patter of little feet. Leaving my classroom!	I like hearing the sound of little feet leaving class.	Legitimate & Knowledge	Positive	Addressee	Negatively marked act since it carries hostility from the teacher Miss Simeon towards all her students, including the Addressees (Gumball & Darwen)
7.	Darwen دارون: ناظر براون؟ Principal brown?	Principal brown?	Pretending to have expert /or knowledge power	Positive	Addressee	Positively marked question considering the good intentions of the boys. The pattern is repeated with all teachers.

	Principal Brown قهوة ببلاش Free coffee! [panting and pulling out his hair]	Free coffee!	Legitimate & Knowledge	Positive	Addressee	A negatively marked speech act that damages both the addressee and the speaker's face since it implies that principal Brown only cares about having free coffee while it sends a message to the children that they, as students in the school, are not of any importance to him.
9.	Gumball غامبول: ما الذي جعلكم تكرهون عملكم هكذا؟ What could possibly have made you all feel like that?	What made you all hate your work this way?	Pretending to have expert /or knowledge power	Positive	Addressee	A negatively marked question is used as a direct accusation with the implied meaning that all the teachers hate their job.
10.	All teachers الجميع: الأطفال children!	children!	Legitimate & Knowledge	Negative	Addressee	A negatively marked assertion since it bluntly states that children are the source of their teacher's misery. This is damaging to the face of the children and undermining the relationship of teachers and students.

Analysis of “Beginner’s Advice”

Appendix (D)

Turn no	Text	Translation of the Arabic version	Power	Type of face threatened	Damage direction	Markedness
1.	<p>School nurse</p> <p>لا لم انحف , شعري لم يتغير أبدا و ليس لديكم مرض الهبل ولا يوجد بعبع في التمارين الرياضية. لذلك لن تعفيا من التمارين</p> <p>Oh! you don't have the bubonic plague, no you can't have a second opinion on that therefore, no you cannot get a note to skip gym class.</p>	<p>No, I did not lose weight, you do not have the idiocy disease, and there is no bogymen in the sports exercises, so you will not get exempted from the sports class</p>	Legitimate power	Positive	Addressee	Unmarked use of assertive because rebutting the hypothetical argument of the boys implies that the nurse has been through the same conversation before.
2.	<p>Gumball</p> <p>إنسى الموضوع اللهم إنني أحترمك كطبيبة.</p> <p>أقدر التصاقك أقصد إخلاصك أقصد... بعملك</p>	<p>Forget it! dear God how I respect you as a doctor.</p> <p>I mean... your adhesiveness, I mean</p>	Legitimate	Positive	Addressee	A polite, positively marked use of assertives to praise, respect and show admiration to the nurse.

	<p>وفاءك اتشرف بمصافحتك</p> <p>what was that?! Don't worry about it. What's more important is that respect you as a professional, and I commend you for your dedication to medical practice, and for this, I would like to personally shake you by the hand</p>	<p>devotion to your work. I am honored to Shake hands with you</p>				<p>The markedness arises from the implied association between putting forward these positive acts and the illegal action of bribe. In other words, sweet talk is used to mitigate the effect of a negatively marked action.</p>
3.	<p>School nurse</p> <p>المرمضة : تعطيني ربع دولار؟ Did you just give me a quarter?!</p>	<p>Are you giving me a quarter?</p>	Legitimate	Positive	Addressee	<p>In this context, the act can be interpreted in two ways:</p> <p>An unmarked commissive in the form of a refusal of the bribe ,or a negatively marked objection to</p>

						the amount of the bribe.
4.	Gumball غامبول : ولدي الكثير مثله ما رايك في الف سنت ينطح سنت And there's plenty more where that came from!	I have more like that. What do you think about a thousand cent knocking one another.	reward	Positive	Addressee	A negatively marked offer of an increase in the amount of a bribe with a comic layout that makes it feel acceptable
5.	Gumball غامبول : ما رايك في مئه سنت ؟ how does a thousand cents sound to you?	What about 100 cent ?	reward	positive	Addressee	A negatively marked offer of an increase in the amount of a bribe
6.	School nurse الممرضة: دولار ؟ A dollar	A dollar?	Legitimate	Positive	Addressee	In this context, this act can be interpreted in two ways: first, an unmarked refusal of the bribe of the student (Gumball) or a negatively marked refusal of the amount of money

						presented as a bribe.
7.	<p>إذا كتبت الإعفاء هل ستحل عني؟</p> <p>if I just wrote you a note now, would you promise never to come back</p>	<p>If I write the note, will you let me be and get out of my face</p>	Legitimate	positive	Addressee	<p>A marked use of a directive in the form of a question that carries the implied meaning of an offer that is basically unethical because the nurse will write a fake note just to get rid of the annoying boys.</p>
8.	<p>School nurse</p> <p>غامبول : اعدك</p> <p>I swear</p>	I promise	Legitimate	positive	Addressee	<p>A marked use of a commissive because Gumball is promising to stop annoying the nurse if she gives him the fake sick leave</p>
9.	<p>Gumball</p> <p>يصفاح جامبول الممرضة وفي أثناء ذلك يعطيها شيئا .</p>	<p>(While Gumball shakes hand with the nurse, he passes</p>	reward	positive	Addressee	<p>First, there is the negatively marked act of taking a bribe from a</p>

	<p>الممرضة: هاي ... هذه رسالة شكر!</p> <p>(He hands her something and takes sick leave, and goes away)</p> <p>Nurse: Hey, that's an IOU!</p>	<p>something to her)</p> <p>Nurse: Hey, that's a thank you note!</p>				<p>student, then the negatively marked use of an expressive complaining after being scammed by Gumball.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

Analysis of "The Coach"