

*Mari Khukhunaishvili*

**INTERCONNECTIONS BETWEEN IDENTITY CO-CONSTRUCTION AND  
IMPOLITENESS IN AMERICAN FAMILY DISCOURSE**

**Abstract**

Based on the principles of Discursive, i.e. Genre approach to Im/politeness, under which both identity construction and impoliteness assessments are inextricably linked to particular genre conventions, the aim of this paper is to observe interconnections between identity co-construction and impoliteness in American family discourse. Studying family discourse is important not only from the point of identity co-construction and human socialization but also due to the fact that the conflicts and strategies detected in verbal interaction in the family setting are found in wider society. The research is grounded on the study of the verbal interaction in American pseudo-documentary TV series "Modern Family". The sequences in the data include verbal interaction between judgmental, hot-tempered, loud Jay Pritchett - the oldest member of the family- and other family members. This article provides a close analysis of linguistic resources used by Jay to construct his local identities and looks at the role of impoliteness in the process of identity co-construction within the family discourse. The theoretical basis for the research combines the Socio-constructivist approaches to identity construction, and Discursive, i.e. Genre approach to the study of Im/politeness.

**Keywords:** *Identity, impoliteness, family discourse.*

**1. Introduction**

Theoretical basis for the present research combines the Socio-constructivist approaches to identity construction (Anton and Peterson, 2003; Joseph, 2004; Bucholtz and Hall, 2005; De Fina et al., 2006), which view identity as a discursive practice, socially constructed, not product, but a process and

discursive, i.e. genre approach to the study of Im/politeness (Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, 2010), under which both identity construction and impoliteness assessments are linked to particular genre conventions. The aim of this paper is to observe interconnections between identity co-construction and impoliteness in American family discourse; and to test Garcés-Conejos Blitvich's (2009, 2010) thesis that impoliteness assessments may ensue when identities and positions that speakers claim for themselves are not verified by their interlocutors; when there is a mismatch between the social, generic, norms of the interaction and the participants' background and expectations, i.e. experiential norms; and when the speaker violates the (pre)genre established limits about what is acceptable as a normal course of events. The study was conducted on the basis of American pseudo-documentary TV series "Modern Family".

"Modern Family" is an American television mockumentary family sitcom created by Christopher Lloyd and Steven Levitan. The two premised the idea of the TV series on the stories of their own "modern families". As the name suggests, this family symbolizes a present-day American family, and episodes are humorously based on situations which many families experience in real life. The show presents the everyday lives of the Pritchett-Dunphy-Tucker clan, living in suburban Los Angeles, and interrelated through the oldest member of the family Jay Pritchett, his daughter Claire and his son Mitchell. Consider the list of all the family members: The Pritchetts' "step-" family- Jay Pritchett, his Colombian wife Gloria Delgado Pritchett, Gloria's son from previous marriage Manuel "Manny" Delgado, and Jay and Gloria's son Fulgencio Joseph "Joe"; The Dunphies' nuclear family- Jay's daughter Claire Pritchett Dunphy, her husband Phil Dunphy, and their children Hailey, Alex and Luke Dunphies; The Tuckers' same-sex family- Jay's son Mitchell Pritchett, his partner Cameron Tucker, and their daughter Lily Tucker-Pritchett. "These three families are unique unto themselves, and together they give us an honest and often hilarious look into the sometimes warm, sometimes twisted, embrace of the modern family" ("About Modern Family", n.d.). The sequences in the data include verbal interaction between judgmental, hot-tempered, loud Jay Pritchett and other family members.

First aired on ABC (American Broadcasting Company) on September 23, 2009, "Modern Family" was an instant hit. During 2010-2011 it was the highest rated scripted show in the 18-49 demographic, and the third highest rated overall sitcom behind "The Big Bang Theory" and "Two and a Half Man" (Gorman, 2011). The show has been nominated for and won many awards, including Primetime Emmy

Awards and Golden Globe Award for Best Television Series- Musical or Comedy (“It was a big night for big names at Golden Globes”, 2012).

## **2. Building up Identities**

In Socio-constructivist terms (Anton and Peterson 2003; Joseph 2004; Bucholtz and Hall 2005; De Fina et al. 2006), identity is viewed not as an individual’s innate characteristic, but as something that is subject to construction, contextualization and negotiation processes. In other words, an individual cannot construct their own identity autonomously, but they need other individuals, i.e. social environment and specific contexts, i.e. local- genre based-interactional occasions in order to carry out identity work. Through discursive practice within a particular cultural, social and historical context, individuals perform/enact, verify, challenge, resist and contest each other’s claimed identities. Following Burke and Stets (2009), identity verification is a fundamental part of identity operation. Hence, an individual’s interpersonal/social relations stand as a crucial part of the process of identity co-construction (Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999). According to Joseph (2004: 81), identity belongs equally to both parties- the one who claims it, and the one who interprets it.

Anton and Peterson (2003) relate identity construction to subject positions, which they define as our particular viewpoint on the world based on our individual experiences and knowledge. They distinguish between subject positions that individuals claim for themselves, self-asserted, and those that are ascribed to them by others, other-asserted. Through the subject positions, people claim epistemic privilege (i.e. disqualifying others’ opinions, and claiming to have a better or correct one) or epistemic qualification (i.e. accepting multiple viewpoints to claim equal validity of their own positions).

In order for any particular identity to be recognizable, the repetition of its performance is essential. This does not exclude the possibility of change, i.e. each performance may incorporate new elements (Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, 2013).

### **3. Impoliteness Assessments**

A discursive, i.e. Genre approach to Im/politeness is based on genre notions provided by Swales (1990) and Fairclough (2003). Special importance has been given to the following statement: “particular representations (discourses) may be enacted in particular ways of Acting and Relating (genres), and inculcated in particular ways of Identifying (styles)” (Fairclough 2003: 29). According to Genre approach, both identity and impoliteness are co-constructed within culturally recognized genres, at the level of style.

Swales (1990:58) presents the following definition of Genre: “A class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. These purposes [...] constitute the rationale for the genre. This rationale shapes the schematic structure of the discourse and influences and constrains the choice of content and style...”.

As it is commonly accepted, the purpose of a family discourse community is love, help, guidance, respect, providing moral, economic, educational, etc. support and insight. Even though the family is considered to be an environment in which face-threatening behaviour is expected to some extent with the intention of achieving a higher purpose (Culpeper, 2008), there are boundaries indicating what kind of behaviour can be considered off limits, i.e. interpreted as impolite. Although these boundaries are not always clearly drawn. As Garcés-Conejos Blitvich (2013) states it, “those limits are not absolute, but often fuzzy, and always situated, co-constructed and negotiated at the level of style”.

Following Garcés-Conejos Blitvich (2010, 2013), impoliteness interpretations may ensue when: (i) identities and positioning that speakers are trying to construct are not verified by their interlocutors; (ii) when there is a mismatch between the social, generic, norms of the interaction and the participants’ background and expectations, i.e. experiential norms; (iii) when the face-threatening behaviour goes beyond the genre-established limits of what is acceptable as the normal course of events.

### **4. Methodology**

The study draws on the examination of the verbal interaction in American pseudo-documentary TV series "Modern Family". From the corpus of 100 episodes, interactional sequences in which

impoliteness was detected, have been transcribed and analyzed using a qualitative, discourse-analytic method since identity construction centrally entails discursive work (Georgakopoulou, 2007). The sequences in the data include verbal interaction between judgmental, hot-tempered, loud Jay Pritchett - the oldest member of the family- and other members. Applying the dual, top-down and bottom-up approach, a number of patterns of identity co-construction in relation to impoliteness have been identified, such as non-verification of others' claimed identities/positionings by the speaker, and violating the (pre)genre established norms/constraints of interaction. Analytic framework for the research combines the Socio-constructivist approaches to identity construction (Anton and Peterson, 2003; Joseph, 2004; Bucholtz and Hall, 2005; De Fina et al., 2006), and Discursive, i.e. Genre approach to the study of Im/politeness (Garcés-Conejos Blitvich 2010), which claims that genre notions, as understood by Fairclough (2003), can provide an overarching unit of analysis that integrates both top-down and bottom-up analysis of im/politeness. Based on the same (Discursive/Genre) approach, both identity construction and impoliteness assessments are inextricably linked to norms associated with particular genre practices. More precisely, the genre itself being both social and cognitive, and individual and social (Miller, 1984; Unger, 2006) provides top-down norms/expectations, i.e. predictive theoretical basis, which can be recognized by analysts, but these norms are always co-constructed at the level of style/identification. The analyst also needs to make sure that his/her assessment coincides with participants' positionings (Haugh, 2007, 2009). Therefore, integrating a bottom-up approach is essential, as it would accommodate the emergence of im/politeness phenomena as constructed in interaction.

Following Joseph's (2004) claim: "If identity, face, stance or politeness are to be investigated empirically, it must be in terms not of the speaker's intentions, which are impervious to observation, but of hearers' interpretations, which are open to observation, questioning, cross-checking, and other methodological reassurances". In all the cases throughout this study, when assessing a particular behaviour as impolite, a bottom-up (discursive, emergent) and a top-down (theory-based) approach has been deployed in order to make sure that the analyst's assessments coincide with the participants' interpretations of a given behavior as impolite.

## **5. Results and Discussion**

The findings of the study of interconnections between identity co-construction and impoliteness in American family discourse on the example of the verbal interaction in American TV series “Modern Family”, are discussed in this sub-chapter in terms of one of the most distinctive local identity categories (Bucholtz and Hall 2005: 592) throughout the corpus, labeled in the present study as: Mr. Tough Talk, Mr. Straight Shooter; Mr. King of Mockery, which involves the interaction between the oldest member of the family- judgmental, hot-tempered, loud Jay Pritchett- and other family members.

Frequent strategies deployed by Jay throughout the corpus involved self-asserted claims to epistemic privilege, authority and the quality for himself to be honest, caring, fun dad/grandad/husband; Presenting subjective opinion as fact; and Mockery. As a result, a number of different behaviors, such as distress, explicit verbal/non-verbal disagreements were triggered, as demonstrated in the examples below. (Transcription conventions are presented in an Appendix).

(1) Example

(Cameron “Cam” [C] and Mitchell “Mitch” [M]- a gay couple; Claire [Cl]- Mitch’s sister; Jay [J]- Mitch and Claire’s father). After being a couple for five years, Cam [C] and Mitch [M] have adopted a baby girl from Vietnam. The extract below describes the scene in which they invited Mitch’s family over to share their big news with them.

MCU-J	J	1	<i>SO HOW WAS YOUR <u>TRIP</u>?</i>
MS-M,	M	2	<i>It was good(.)it was good actually(.) but about that</i>
looking		3	<i>I(.)I have something that I need to tell you guys (2)</i>
nervous		4	<i>We didn't just go to Vietnam for pleasure (.)</i>
		5	<i>We (2) KINDA HAVE SOME <u>BIG NEWS</u> (looks excited)</i>
LS-J	J	6	<i>Oh <u>God</u> (.) if Cam comes out here with <u>boobs</u> (.)</i>
		7	<i>I'm <u>leaving</u></i>
LS-Cl	Cl	8	<i>Dad? (looks embarrassed)</i>
			[...]

*Online Journal of Humanities*  
*E ISSN 2346-8149, Issue IV, June, 2019*

---

CU-M            M    12    *Anyway (2) so about a year ago (.) Cam and I sort have*  
                          13    *feeling this longing (.) you know for something more like (2)*  
                          14    *maybe a baby?*

LS-J            J    15    *Whoa (.) that's a bad idea*

MCU-M,  
looking  
worried        M    16    *What do you mean(.) bad idea?*

MLS-J            J    17    *Well(.) kids need a mother (.) I mean (.)*  
                          18    *if you two guys are bored get a DOG (smiling sarcastically)*

CU-M            M    19    *OK we're not bored (.) dad*  
                          [...]

CU-CI            CI   22    *I think what dad is trying to say is that (.) Mitchell*

CU-M,  
smiling  
ironically      23    *you're a little uptight (.) kids bring chaos (.) and*

CU-CI            24    *you don't handle well*

                          M    25    *That's not what dad's saying (.) that's what you're saying (.)*

                          26    *And it's insulting in a whole different way*

                          [...]

Dramatic music playing loudly, C enters holding a baby MLS-Family

MS-Family,    M    35    *We've adopted a baby (.) Her name is Lilly*

CI    looking  
excited

- CU-C,            C    36    *Exciting?*  
looking  
excited
- MS-J,            [...]     
looking  
astonished
- MS-J            J    44    *EXCUSE me (.) Okay (.) I know that I said I thought*  
45    *this was a bad idea (.) But (2) What do I know?*  
46    *I mean (.) It's not like I wrote the book on fatherhood (.)*  
47    *I'm trying whole my life to get it right*  
48    *I'm still screwing up*  
[...]  
52    *Anyway (.) I'm happy for ya*

In this example we can see that when Mitch announces that they have some big news (line 5), before even letting him say what the news is, Jay directly contributes with an interjection indicating disapproval – *Oh God* (line 6). Note the emphasis on God, implying his negative expectations, and resorts straight to using stereotypical knowledge about Cam: *If Cam comes out there with boobs (.) I'm leaving* (lines 6-7), inferring that as far as Cam is gay, he would necessarily desire to look like a woman (other-asserted subject position). Claire seems to be embarrassed for her father's remark: *Dad?* (line 8). Claire's reaction indicates that Jay's straightforward formulation of his judgement can be considered to be a deviation from the genre sanctioned norms and expectations.

Mitch's introductory speech before making a big statement: *Anyway (.) so about a year ago (.) Cam and I sort have feeling this longing for something more like (.) maybe a baby?* (lines 12, 13, 14)- is followed by Jay's strictly negative evaluation, which he begins with an interjection: Whoa (line 15) bearing negative connotation in this context; preceding the forthcoming disagreement: *that's a bad idea*



(line 15)- without anyone asking for his opinion. After this he goes on to support his position with an argument: *Well(.) kids need a mother (.) I mean (.) if you two guys are bored get a DOG (.)* (lines 17-18). Here he begins with a discourse marker *Well*, followed by his reason, which he states as a fact, and sarcastic advice for the couple to get a dog rather than a baby. In this extract Jay implicitly self-asserts epistemic privilege by presenting his subjective opinion as fact: *Whoa that's a bad idea* (line 15). By doing this, he claims to be someone entitled to have a final word and tell others what a better or correct action/decision is. His performance also demonstrates claims for himself to be brutally honest. He does this in a way that does not verify Mitch and Cam's claimed identity/positioning as a responsible couple who is capable of raising a baby. This leads to distress which unfolds in Mitch's explicit assessment of the behaviour as *insulting* (line 26). Finally, when the couple reveal their big secret, and once they have already adopted a baby, Jay apologizes to them: *EXCUSE me (.) Okay (.) I know that I said I thought this was a bad idea (.) But (2) What do I know?* (lines 44-45). Note the stress on I in *What do I know*-through which Jay disqualifies his own claim for epistemic privilege and reaffirms Mitch's and Cam's claimed identities/positionings, resulting in a peaceful resolution of the disagreement.

(2) Example

MCU-L	P	1	<i><u>My son</u> has been riding his <u>sister's</u> old bike</i>
MCU- P and Cl	Cl	2	<i><u>Until</u> he's <u>responsible</u> enough to take care of his <u>own</u> bike</i>
talking to the camera		3	<i>Look (.) he spilled a soda on my computer (.)</i>
		4	<i>He ruined our digital camera (.)</i>
		5	<i>taking pictures of himself [underwater</i>
	P	6	<i>[It's a <u>girl's</u> bike</i>
CU-P		7	<i>I'm <u>all</u> for teaching him a lesson (.) But I worry about the</i>
CU-P and Cl		8	<i><u>ridicule</u> he might get from some loud-mouth <u>bully</u></i>
MS-J and L. L. J	J	9	<i>(horn honks) (laughing) heeey (.) Nice bike <u>Sally?</u></i>
looking angry.			

P-looking upset

MS-Cl, P and L    Cl    10    *Dad?*

MCU-J looking    J    11    *Come on (.) He looks like little Bo Peep on that thing.*  
 annoyed

MS-P, Cl and L    P    12    *Actually (.) not for long (.)*

13    *He's getting a new bike this afternoon*

L    14    *I am?*

P    15    *Mm-hmm*

L looks excited;    Cl    16    *He is?*

J's            facial  
 expression-

“Mr. Know it  
 all”

Here Jay's involvement commences with another frequent technique in the corpus- mockery. By calling his grandson a girl's name, because of riding a girl's bike, Jay questions his essential identity as a boy, which generally is a sensitive issue for boys. Luke's facial expression demonstrates his anger and distress for this comment (other-asserted subject position). Claire's reaction- *Dad?* (line 10)- serves as an indicator that this kind of conduct is not a normal course of events and is a deviation from norms and expectations within the given discourse practice. Jay gets slightly angry about Claire's reaction, and turns to using rudeness disclaimer- *come on(.)* (line 11), followed by another face-threat towards Luke- further teasing him by comparing him with a “Little Bo-Peep”, who is a girl from an old English nursery rhyme- *He looks like little Bo Peep on that thing* (line 11). By doing this Jay strives to support his position as an honest and caring Grandpa/Dad, who wants his grandson to have a boy's bike and look like a boy. Phil looks worried, and with the intention of protecting his son and verifying his essential identity, he spontaneously decides to buy him a new bike, which is against their initial agreement. By this, Phil verifies Jay's claimed subject position/identity as someone of authority, who is empowered to dictate other members of the family what a better or necessary action or decision is,

most importantly, doing this through mockery. Note paralinguistic features- Jay's facial expression and a gesturing as a response to Phil's on-the-spot decision. The sequence is cut off at this point, therefore ending with an emphasis on the "I know better" attitude of *Mr. Tough Talk, Mr. Straight Shooter, Mr. King of mockery*.

(3) Example

MCU-J G 1 *Manny's father is taking him for a couple of days to Disneyland*  
and

G talking 2 *So we're gonna go (.) to the wine country*  
to

the J 3 *We're gonna drink some WINE (2.) eat some good food (2.)*  
camera

4 *You know (.) we would do something like this a lot more often*

5 *If it wasn't for (.) you know (.) Manny*

G 6 *It's good (.) He keeps us grounded*

CU-J and J 7 *Yeah (2.) Like fog at an airport*

G

G with a

confused

smile

Here Jay's theatrical comparison of Manny with fog contributes to humour- Manny keeps the couple grounded *Like fog at an airport* (line 7). Judging by Gloria's facial expression, who looks confused, we can conclude that Jay's behaviour was not an expected course of interaction for her, i.e. it was against her experiential norms. Jay again self-asserts a subject position of someone of authority, *Mr. Straight Shooter, Mr. King of Mockery*, who is entitled to make jokes without bearing others' feelings in mind, and crossing the genre established limits of what is acceptable as the normal course of events. He tacitly justifies his behaviour by his feature of being roughly honest- *You know (.) we would do*

something like this a lot more often *If it wasn't for* (.) you know (.) Manny (lines 4-5). This kind of conduct leads to distress expressed in non-verbal feature- Gloria's facial expression, who is confused, as it was a joke, and leaves her husband's self-asserted subject position unchallenged.

(4) Example

MS-C, J, M and C. J sipping	C	1	<i>It's a French-Canadian delicacy called <u>poutine</u></i>
wine,			
glances over the dish	Cl	2	<i>Mm</i>
	J	3	<i>Well it looks like <u>vomit</u> so</i>
Cl looks shocked (in disbelief)		4	<i>I'm not &lt;<u>pou</u>&gt;ting it in my mouth</i>
with her eyes widened; M drops			
the fork noisily on the plate-J			
looks at him surprised. C looks			
offended, takes the dish away			
immediately			

In this example Jay uses a discourse marker “well”, followed by his straightforward negative evaluation of the dish- *Well it looks like vomit* (line 3)- which is a statement of his subjective opinion as fact. Note the added stress on the evaluative element- vomit- one of the worst possible assessments of a dish; and witty wordplay on its name: *I'm not <pou>ting it in my mouth* (line 4)- pronounced emphatically at slow speech rate. By this behaviour, Jay self-asserts a subject position of someone entitled to judge and mock others and deliver his “honest” opinions in a disrespectful, offensive, viciously rude manner. He resists Cam's claimed subject position/identity as a good cook. Note the paralinguistic emphasis on the facial shock, distress and frustration of his interlocutors, demonstrating that Jay crossed the genre-established limits of what is acceptable as the normal course of events, and his conduct is interpreted as impolite.

## 6. Conclusions

The aim of this research was to study interconnections between identity co-construction and impoliteness in American family discourse on the example of the verbal interaction in American TV series “Modern Family”; and to test Garcés-Conejos Blitvich’s (2009, 2010) thesis that impoliteness assessments may ensue when identities and positions that speakers claim for themselves are not verified by their interlocutors; when there is a mismatch between the social, generic, norms of the interaction and the participants’ background and expectations, i.e. experiential norms; and when the speaker violates the (pre)genre established limits about what is acceptable as a normal course of events. A bottom-up and top-down approach has been adopted in order to detect locally, discursively emergent patterns of impoliteness, and analyze them within a theoretical framework- Genre approach to impoliteness. Close analysis of the interactional sequences resulted in the identification of a number of patterns of identity co-construction in relation to impoliteness, such as non-verification of others’ claimed identities/positionings by the speaker, and violating the (pre)genre established norms/constraints of interaction. Impoliteness was revealed at the lexico-grammatical level and interactionally, based on metapragmatic comments (Eelen, 2001). Findings have been discussed in terms of one of the most distinctive local identity categories throughout the corpus, labeled in the present study as: Mr. Tough Talk, Mr. Straight Shooter; Mr. King of Mockery, which involved the interaction between the oldest member of the family- judgmental, hot-tempered, loud Jay Pritchett, and other family members. Through the above-mentioned local identity categories, the character (Jay) strove to support his identity as an honest, caring, authoritative, fun head of the family. Frequent strategies deployed by him throughout the corpus were a mockery and self-asserted claims to epistemic privilege, authority and demonstration of power. Most importantly, Jay’s local identity categories were co-constructed in a manner that did not verify others’ claimed identities and positions. This was interpreted as impolite by his interlocutors, which means that impoliteness and identity have been found to be interconnected in the interactional sequences throughout the corpus (Garcés-Conejos Blitvich’s, 2009). As a result, a number of different behaviours were triggered such as distress (examples 1, 2, 3, 4) and explicit verbal/non-verbal disagreements (examples 1, 2, 3, 4). Findings of the research within a specific genre- family discourse- confirmed Garcés-Conejos Blitvich’s (2009, 2010)

thesis that impoliteness assessments may ensue when identities and positions that speakers claim for themselves are not verified by their interlocutors; when there is a mismatch between the social, generic, norms of the interaction and the participants' background and expectations, i.e. experiential norms; and when the speaker violates the (pre)genre establish limits about what is acceptable as a normal course of events.

## References

1. About Modern Family. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://abc.go.com/shows/modern-family/about-the-show> May 8, 2019
2. Anton, Corey & Valeri Peterson. 2003. Who said what: Subject positions, rhetorical strategies and good faith. *Communication Studies* 54(4). 403–419.
3. Bucholtz, Mary & Kira Hall. 2005. Identity and interaction: a socio-cultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies* 7(4/5). 585–614.
4. Burke, Peter J. & Jan E. Stets. 2009. *Identity theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
5. Chouliaraki, Lilie & Fairclough, Norman. 1999. *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
6. De Fina, Anna, Deborah Schiffrin & Michael Bamberg (eds.). 2006. *Discourse and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Eelen, Gino. 2001. *A critique of politeness theories*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
8. Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
9. Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, Pilar. 2009. Impoliteness and identity in the American news media: The “Culture Wars”. *Journal of Politeness Research* 5(2). 273–304.
10. Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, Pilar. 2010. A genre approach to the study of im-politeness. *International Review of Pragmatics* 2. 46–94.
11. Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, Pilar, Patricia Bou-Franch & Nuria Lorenzo-Dus. 2013. Identity and impoliteness: The expert in the talent show *Idol*. *Journal of Politeness Research* 2013; 9(1): 97–121.
12. Georgakopoulou, Alexandra. 2007. *Small stories, interaction and identities*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
13. Gorman, Bill (May 26, 2011a). “2010-11 Season Broadcast Primetime Show Viewership Averages”. *TV by the Numbers. Tribune Digital Ventures*. Retrieved May 8, 2019
14. Gorman, Bill (May 26, 2011b). “2010-11 Season Broadcast Primetime Show 18-49 Ratings Averages”. *TV by the Numbers. Tribune Digital Ventures*. Retrieved May 8, 2019
15. Haugh, Michael. 2007. The discursive challenge to politeness research: an interactional alternative. *Journal of Politeness Research* 3: 95 - 317.

16. Haugh, Michael. 2009. Face and interaction. In F. Bargiela-Chiappini and M. Haugh (eds.), *Face, Communication and Social Interaction*, 1 - 30. London: Equinox.
17. ["It was a big night for big names at Golden Globes"](http://www.today.msnbc.msn.com/archive/2012/01/16/entertainment/1277111). *Today.msnbc.msn.com*. January 16, 2012. Retrieved May 8, 2019
18. Joseph, John. 2004. *Language and identity: National, ethnic, religious*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
19. Lorenzo-Dus, Nuria. 2009. 'You're barking mad – I'm out': Impoliteness and broadcast talk, *Journal of Politeness Research* 5(2). 159–187.
20. Miller, Carolyn. 1984. Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70. 151–167.
21. Swales, John. 1990. *Genre analysis. English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
22. Unger, Christoph. 2006. *Genre, Relevance, and Global Coherence: The Pragmatics of Discourse Type*. Basingtoke: Palgrave.

## **Appendix**

*Transcription conventions (from Lorenzo-Dus, 2009)*

CU / MCU close up / medium-close up camera shot

MS / MLS medium shot / medium-long range camera shot

LS long range camera angle

word marked stress

WORD increased volume

(.) short pause

(2.0) longer pause, in seconds

(laugh) paralinguistic / non-verbal features of communication

? rising intonation



[ overlapping conversation (interruptions)

(xxx) inaudible speech

- word or syllable abruptly cut-off

**Author's email: khukhunaishvilimari@gmail.com**

**Author's biographical data**

The author of the present article is a PHD student at Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University (TSU). She works in the field of Sociolinguistics. Her current research interest is studying the relationships between impoliteness and identity phenomena in a specific genre- American and Georgian Family Discourse. The author works as an English teacher at Tbilisi State University, and has a wealth of relevant experience.