

ARTICLE

Deconstructing Islamophobic Discourse: An Impoliteness Theory Approach to Ayad Akhtar's *Disgraced*

Khalid Ahmed ^{1*} , Syeda Sumera Qamar ², Amna Tughral ³, Badriah Khaleel ⁴, Farhat Abdullah ⁵ ,
Ruqia Saba Ashraf ⁶ 

¹ Faculty of Education and Liberal Arts (FELA), INTI International University, Nilai 71800, Malaysia

² Department of English Language and Literature, The University of Lahore, Gurjat 50700, Pakistan

³ Department of English, University of Gujrat, Gurjat 50700, Pakistan

⁴ Department of Applied Linguistics, Kinnaird College for Women University, Lahore 54000, Pakistan

⁵ Department of English, University of Central Punjab, Lahore 54782, Pakistan

⁶ Department of English, The Women University, Multan 60000, Pakistan

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the exercise of impoliteness strategies in Islamophobic discourse in the play *Disgraced*. Impoliteness is a multifarious matter that is perhaps apparently, closely related to politeness. It is very much the parasite of politeness. Islamophobia refers to irrational fear, hostility, or prejudice directed against Islam and Muslims, representing a significant barrier to achieving a fair society. The purpose behind this study is to pinpoint the distinctive types of impoliteness strategies used by different characters in the aforesaid play. It further highlights the functions of impolite strategies in an Islamophobic context. Islamophobia is one of the frequently discussed issues in current social scenarios as Muslims constitute a noticeable part of the world and are judged with the lens of prejudice and hatred on the basis of religiosity. It is a qualitative research accomplished by using the latest version of impoliteness model to classify and analyse the facts. The results can be summarized as follows: Among the five strategies of impoliteness—bald on-record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, sarcasm, or mock impoliteness—the negative impoliteness

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Khalid Ahmed, Faculty of Education and Liberal Arts (FELA), INTI International University, Nilai 71800, Malaysia;
Email: khalid.ahmed@newinti.edu.my

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 23 June 2025 | Revised: 15 July 2025 | Accepted: 22 July 2025 | Published Online: 11 November 2025
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i12.10649>

CITATION

Ahmed, K., Qamar, S.S., Tughral, A., et al., 2025. Deconstructing Islamophobic Discourse: An Impoliteness Theory Approach to Ayad Akhtar's *Disgraced*. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*. 7(12): 710–722. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i12.10649>

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by the author(s). Published by Bilingual Publishing Group. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

strategy emerges as the most frequently employed in this play. The characters in *Disgraced* frequently employed the affective function.

Keywords: Impoliteness; Fair Society; Islamophobia; Disgraced; Strategy; Functions

1. Introduction

This research aims to examine different impolite acts performed by participants from different ethnic groups in *Disgraced* (2012), the famous play by Ayad Akhtar^[1], using a pragmatic approach. This study aims to explore the various types of impoliteness strategies and their functions in the dialogues of *Disgraced*. Some issues in the phenomenon of impoliteness are identified. The first issue is linked to the types of impoliteness strategies utilized in *Disgraced* (2012). The second issue concerns the function of these strategies employed by the characters in the play. Language both reflects and shapes the social roles of women and men; it is a powerful means through which gender inequalities are produced and maintained^[2].

The term “Islamophobia” has remained under discussion by various authors throughout history. Islamophobia is fear, dislike, prejudice or hatred directed towards Islam or Muslims, especially when viewed as a political, cultural, or social force^[3]. Though this term has a longer history than generally known, it came to prominence. It began from the very first day when Hazrat Muhammad (S.A.W) initiated his noble mission of preaching Islam. The people of that era, the Arabs, turned against him. At that time, it was a matter of religion and worship. However, if we talk about the application of the term “Islamophobia” today, it is more of a political phenomenon than a religious one. After the 9/11 incident at the World Trade Center in 2001, this term has been frequently used, creating disharmony in human relationship at a global level through linguistic impoliteness. It is a form of prejudice proved by its definition, as mentioned above. It is loathing and prejudice against Muslims and Islam. It generates disharmony among people from different ethnic groups around the world. Like power and entertainment, prejudice also works behind impolite acts^[4].

1.1. Research Questions

1. How do the characters in Ayad Akhtar’s *Disgraced* (2012) employ impoliteness strategies to ex-

press Islamophobic attitudes?

2. What communicative effects do these impoliteness strategies produce in the portrayal of Islamophobia in *Disgraced*?

1.2. Background of the study

1.2.1. Politeness

Since a vast amount of research has been done on the phenomenon of linguistics politeness, it is impossible to cover all of them in this study. Therefore, this research aims to highlight some widespread and influential frameworks of politeness in this section.

Leech’s Politeness Principle (PP)

Leech’s PP is described as “a necessary complement” to Grice’s Cooperative Principle (CP)^[5].

Maxims of Politeness by Leech

Politeness is a significant absent link between the Cooperative Principles and the difficulty of how to connect sense to strength. These are divided into six maxims that deal with polite behaviors. These maxims are: the maxim of tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement and sympathy^[5].

Leech explains that not all of these maxims are equally significant nor absolute rules; rather, they are “observed up to a certain point”^[5].

Functions of Illocutionary Act by Leech

Leech categorizes the following functions of illocutionary act;

1. Competitive (The illocutionary)
2. Convivial (The illocutionary goal)
3. Collaborative (The illocutionary)
4. Conflictive (The illocutionary)

Brown and Levinson’s Politeness Framework

Despite of much criticism, reactions, modifications and

revisions, Brown and Levinson's Framework^[6] is still the most prominent in the field of pragmatics. Politeness is deeply tied to Brown and Levinson; it is not possible to talk about politeness without referencing them.

The Politeness Strategies Proposed by Brown and Levinson

Generally, every member of society likes to avoid Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) by using politeness strategies to maintain harmony among the people of that society. To assist people, Brown and Levinson proposed strategies to maintain face. The strategies they recommended are:

Bald On-Record Politeness:

This strategy is used when FTAs are not avoided and speakers talk in a very explicit way. Sometimes it is used in situations where people are very familiar with each other or in emergencies^[6]. For example:

- i) "Pass me the salt please."

In this example, a person is talking to a family member sitting at the dinner table.

- ii) "Bring my file for today's meeting."

Here, a boss speaks to an employee with authority, implying the speaker is more powerful than the listener.

Positive Politeness:

This strategy is used to save the receiver's positive face. In these situations, the producer takes care of the target's wish to be accepted and appreciated. It is usually used in friendly relationships and demonstrates group affiliation. It can be done by using many devices such as indirectness, avoiding disagreement, hedging, humor, making promises and good offers, creating feelings of affiliations with a group and promoting equality.

- iii) "Could you please give me your pen?"
- iv) "I promise that I will bring a doll for you."

Negative Politeness

Speakers try this strategy to mitigate threats to the addressee's negative face. By using this, the speaker not only identifies the addressee's face but also identifies the speaker's imposition on the addressee. This can be done through hedges, questions, apologizing and mitigating imposition.

- vi) "If you have time, give me a glass of water."
- vii) "I don't like to disturb anyone, but I need some help."

Off-Record

According to Brown and Levinson, "First of all, the speakers have to make a decision whether they want to do the FTA. When the narrator chooses to do the FTA, he may make his mind up to do it off-record, it means where his purpose is not directly conveyed"^[6]. The example below explains the off-record strategy:

- vi) "Lilly, I have no money; I forgot my purse at home."

1.2.2. Islamophobia

Islamophobia is now a sociologically and politically hot issue. Its rise can be traced from the fatwa issued by Ayatollah Khomeini in 1989 about the Muslims' attempt to massacre Salman Rushdi to the 9/11 attack in 2001^[7]. Scholars discuss it in political contexts based on these infamous incidents, which happened in this era. Following these incidents, there are many wrong concepts about Muslims formed by other nations. Many people worldwide started to give their opinions about them in negative perspectives after these incidents.

Islamophobia is increasing with the growing number of Muslims and their achievements. A large number of people are attracted to Islam; officials should take institutional measures for such amendments in legislation to fuel it due to growing settlements of Muslims in a society. It is spreading with the progress and strength of the Muslim community worldwide^[8].

The manipulative advertising discourse—such as skin-whitening ads targeting Pakistani women and night-packages appealing to youth—reveals how the media reinforces Eurocentric ideals and cultural commodification. Similarly, this study examines Islamophobic discourse in *Disgraced*, where impoliteness strategies (e.g., negative impoliteness, sarcasm) perpetuate prejudice against Muslims^[9,10].

The phenomenon of Islamophobia is further demonstrated in Trump's anti-Muslim statements, in which he rendered Muslims as a nasty concern and advocated his ideology against Islam through Islamophobia. Donald Trump made significant disagreeable remarks to degrade Muslims through his "Muslim Ban" statements. He not only reproached Islamic teachings about Jihad and Shariah laws, but also consid-

ered holy places to be fanatical. Besides, Trump condemned his position and promoted high levels of Islamophobia^[11].

Pakistani ESL learners perceive politeness in disagreements, highlighting pragmatic competence in cross-cultural communication^[12], the linguistic features of rape judgments in Pakistan, exposing how societal stigmatization is reinforced through legal discourse^[13]. Both studies demonstrate the power of language in shaping social perceptions—whether in interpersonal disagreements or institutional responses to trauma—underscoring the intersection of linguistics, culture, and power dynamics.

A research scrutinized the speech of Imran Khan conveyed at the 74th session of the UNO. The researchers pinpointed the legalization of this speech to highlight how he used language to portray the concept of the West as “them parallel to us”. It’s obvious that Islamophobia is not a phenomenon emerged overnight, but the detestation against Muslims is long-rooted and is not limited to discourse. Currently, France has banned Muslim women from wearing veils. The Chinese confined Uyghur Muslims into detention camps. Trump’s adverse expressions against Islam worsen the state. The extremists in Germany burned the Quran publicly, and a Muslim girl was injured in the USA from an acid attack. These instances show the strength of growing delirious emotions against Islam and a growing need to address the subject of Islamophobia internationally. Just as gender moderates^[14], organizational policies’ effectiveness, systemic biases may moderate impoliteness in discourse^[15]. The study demonstrate how discourse of world leaders developed public opinion and ideologies^[16], and how lexical polarity constructs power dynamics^[17]—both studies critically inform this analysis of Islamophobic impoliteness in Akhtar’s play.

The play’s Islamophobic discourse reflects the violation of politeness as a social contract^[18], where strategic impoliteness serves as a tool of othering, consistent with intergroup conflict dynamics^[19]. These interactions further manifest the cognitive simplification of prejudice, where reduced politeness markers signal dehumanization^[20].

2. Methodology

2.1. Research Design

The selected method in the current study is qualitative descriptive as per the requirements of this research. A quali-

tative descriptive research design is used to accomplish this research.

2.2. Sampling Technique

For the provision of selective dialogues on the theme of Islamophobia, the purposive sampling technique is selected to get the data for the study. In this study, the researcher wants to collect data from the dialogues related to the phenomenon of impoliteness.

Disgraced (2012) by Ayad Akhtar

In this research, the researcher chose the play *Disgraced* (2012) written by a Muslim-American writer Ayad Akhtar, for the data of this dignified study. This play deals with the real everyday matters of life. He won the Pulitzer award in 2013 for this play. The main theme of the play is Islamophobia. The researcher selected the dialogues from the play for the purpose of analysis on the topic of Islamophobia. *Disgraced* (2012) is an appealing play to be analyzed to notice the exercise of impoliteness strategies. From many foregoing aspects which have been analyzed in *Disgraced* (2012), the researcher chose to pay attention to the pragmatic aspect of impoliteness.

2.3. Application of Theoretical Model

The researcher applied Jonathan Culpeper’s impoliteness theory^[2] to analyze the data collected from the dialogues in *Disgraced* (2012). This theory has three parts: the first part consists of five super strategies of impoliteness, the second part contains three functions of impoliteness, and the third part has three main types of responses toward impoliteness. All the details of this theory are mentioned in the previous chapter.

2.3.1. Impoliteness Framework by Culpeper (1996)

Culpeper constructed a framework of “five impoliteness strategies”. Later on, he made an amendment^[2].

Impoliteness Strategies

i) Bald On-Record Impoliteness

In this strategy, Culpeper interprets, the producer does the FTA in a straight, explicit, instantly recognizable and brief way. It is done in those situations where the face is

deliberately not saved by the producer. In some circumstances, the speaker intentionally wants to attack the face of the receiver during the conversation^[21].

ii) Positive Impoliteness

According to Culpeper, “It is prepared to threaten the receiver’s positive face, in which he/she desires to be acknowledged by the other people”^[21]. It has some output strategies like, “ignoring or snubbing the other (don’t acknowledge the other’s existence), being disinterested, unsympathetic or unconcerned, disassociating from the others deny alliance, excluding someone from an activity, seek of disagreement (choose a sensitive topic), use of vulgar speech or abuses, and calling the others with disparaging nominations, etc”^[2].

S (A): I know how to put your notes on the board but there’s nothing I can do myself. I merely do my job for the association.

S (B): Mind your own business...^[22]

In the example, it is obvious that S (B) is not able to acknowledge S (A)’s sense of doing his duty.

iii) Negative Impoliteness

Culpeper states, “This strategy is concerned to assault the receiver’s negative face desires. The producer utilizes it to assault the receiver’s wants to have independence of act”^[21]. It has some output strategies. These consist of “horrible or scaring the other (an action that damages the other’s will), to condescend, contempt or ridicule, (being disdainful, dealing the people non-acutely, unfair criticism of the others), invading the other’s space literally (be frank to the people than the alliance allows) or symbolically (ask for the secret information from those who are not close to us)”^[2]. The model dialogues of negative impoliteness are taken from the soldier lady, Culpeper illustrates through this example how these strategies are embedded in the dialogues of the interview between “Private Alves (P. Alves)”, the lady employee, and Sergeant (Sgt), an interviewer^[2].

P. Alves: Who thought that, Sergeant?

Sgt: Shut up, Alves. You’re using your small mouth again. You’re the one frightening and bullying my company leaders...

In the above-mentioned model dialogues, Private Alves is repressed by the sergeant, who does not care about her negative face wants. The sergeant put her down by using the

words “small mouth” in his conversation. Furthermore, he openly links the lady to a negative feature.

iv) Off-Record Impoliteness

FTA is done through an implicature, in which one’s purpose goes beyond any other. The example below reveals how it is used in conversation. It depicts Charlie (CHL), who was held up by learner donation at a well-standardized private school. Because he did not belong to a well-off background, he decides to pass his time making money by looking after a blind gentleman named Colonel (Colo)^[22].

C: Sims Charles, higher-ranking. You are educating on learner donation, Simms?

CHL: Ah, of course I am.

C: For student donation, read crook. You are from a rich family and your parents are enjoying a high statusHa, ha!

v) Withhold Politeness

Impoliteness happens when the nonexistence of politeness works at the instant it is mandatory to demonstrate^[2]. Unable to show thankfulness or appreciate anyone for help, as exposed in the case mentioned below taken from the dialogue of *The Clampers*, where an adjudicator (Adju) was rejected by a car holder, for a request against a parking.

Adju: Thanks a lot for your arrival.

Car holder: I don’t want to thank you at all.

The car holder openly employs “WP” by not responding to the adjudicator’s thanks.

Function of Impoliteness

There are three functions of impoliteness, as discussed below^[19].

i) Affective Impoliteness

It is described as the first function of impoliteness by the author of this theory. Culpeper says that it entails an emotional outburst that happens during a discussion between the speaker and the receiver of impoliteness. He describes that it is the targeted show of powerfully increased feeling, like rage, which implies that the creation of the negative arousing condition is the target’s responsibility^[23]. This function of impoliteness is described in the following example, done by a woman who is annoyed at her friend.

Woman: How dare you talk to me like that!

Am I your employee? Why are you talking to

me like a boss?

Man: I want to go. I have many other things to do.

This instance illustrates the woman's anger and frustration towards the man and the use of impolite utterances.

ii) Coercive Impoliteness

Culpeper said that it outwardly takes place in situations where diverse social statuses are present. However, it may also be utilized in the same status to bring about a sense of social control^[24]. This means that an authoritative person demonstrates his/her authority or control while talking with his/her subordinate. Here is a conversation where we observe the use of coercive impoliteness from the dialogue between a boss and his employee.

Boss: I need the file for today's meeting in 5 minutes. Hurry up!

Employee: Oh... Okay, but I'm having my dinner this time. If you don't mind, after finishing my dinner, I'll do all that?

Boss: *I don't care about your dinner! I want my file as soon as possible.*

In this situation, the boss takes advantage of his affirmed position. He forces his employee to act upon his commands by utilizing the power or authority, as he has a superior status to his employee in the office.

iii) Entertaining Impoliteness

About the third "function of impoliteness", Culpeper writes that, contrasting with other research on pragmatics in which a pair of producer and addressee is used, impoliteness can be created at the same level for both the overhearing addressee and the target addressee, and it becomes a source of entertainment for the audience^[25]. Here is a dialogue between two girls pertaining to this function. In the example, Jane makes fun of Lilly (another girl)'s dress at a party.

Jane: You have very good taste in dressing.

Lilly: Oh, thanks a lot. I myself stitched it.

Jane: Wow, great! Could I purchase like this, for my pet?

Though the dialogues that are delivered by Jane may spoil Lilly's feelings, it entertains the over-hearing listeners. In this way, impoliteness creates humour in some circumstances.

2.3.2. Limitations of the Study

The study is restricted to the examination of the exercise of impoliteness strategies with functions and responses on the topic of Islamophobia during communication. Therefore, a particular framework of pragmatic approaches has been applied for analyzing the things working behind the impoliteness used in language.

3. Data Analysis and Discussion

3.1. Analysis of the Data taken from *Disgrace* (2012)

3.1.1. Bald On-Record Impoliteness Strategy with Function of Impoliteness

Extract: 1

AMIR: It's not a secret. Em and I don't see eye to eye on Islam. I think it's... a backward way of thinking. And being.

ISAAC: You don't think that's maybe a little broad? I mean it happens to be one of the world's great spiritual traditions^[1].

In this example, Amir acknowledges that he and his wife see Islam in different ways. According to his perception, Islam is not an advanced way of thinking; rather, its traditions have now become outdated; by following it, people are not able to cope with modern society. In response, Isaac says that you yourself need to think a little broader because Islamic values prove Islam as a great religion around the world. Here, Amir uses bald on-record strategy with affective function to show his hate for Islam by stating, "*I think it's.....And being*". In fact, it is untrue that Islam is a backward way of thinking because many scientific discoveries are based on the Quran. The prophecies made in the seventh century by Hazrat Mohammed (PCBU) are proven true in the twentieth century by researchers and scientists. The research on Quranic instructions is continued in this era to benefit from them. Actually, Islam is not a backwards religion; rather, it is suitable for all times. It could satisfy the people of past time, it can satisfy people in the present time and it will satisfy mankind in the future In sha Allah.

Extract: 2

In this example, Amir describes his views

about the beginning of Islam and about the followers of Islam at a dinner party. It describes from where Islam emerged and what type of people believed in its instructions.

AMIR: Islam comes from the desert, from a group of tough-minded, tough-living people, who saw life as something hard and relentless.

JORY: Huh...^[1]

Here, Amir gives his opinion on Islam that it comes from the desert of Arabia, and the residents of that place were tough-minded and ruthless people. They lived a very rigid life with very strict principles. In this situation, Amir performs bald on-record strategy with affective function by saying “*Islam comes from....., hard and relentless*”. He explicitly threatens the face of all followers of Islam as readers or audience. These utterances illustrate the Islamophobic discourse used by Amir, who is full of detest for Islam. He thinks that Islam is a backward religion, and Islam is a religion of conservative people who lived in the desert and spent a rigid time. In this situation, Amir employs bald on-record strategy with affective function. History proved the founders of Islam were great reformers of their time and left behind good examples for newcomers. They bore hardships for the sake of others’ comforts. They lived a simple life by choice and rejected the luxurious lifestyle. Some of them were very wealthy but they spent their wealth for the betterment of others, like Hazrat Usman e Ghani, a very rich person who spent a lot of his wealth on Muslims.

Extract: 3

JORY: I read it in college. What I remember is the anger.

AMIR: Thank you. It’s like one very long hate mail letter to humanity.

EMILY: That’s not true! Jory

AMIR: It is kind of. Grant me that at least...^[1]

In this conversation, Amir, Isaac, Jory and Emily have a discussion about the Quran. In their conversation, they discuss Quranic discourse according to their own perception. Amir and Jory show their detestable thoughts about the Quran during the conversation. On the other hand, Emily tries to make them understand that although Islam deals with humanity in an inflexible and self-serving way, it is in the

favour of human beings to make them successful in their lives. In this example, Jory says, “I read it in anger”. Thus, she gives comments in a negative way on the Quranic instructions by using the word “anger” for it. Amir also has an aversion to the holy book in a direct and clear way by saying about it that it is nothing but a long hatred mail to humanity, and he says further, “It is kind of. Grant me that at least...” In their conversation, Jory and Amir perform FTA to damage the face of the followers of the Quran. They both use bald on-record strategy with an affective function of impoliteness in their conversation. They have an aversion to the Holy Quran because they think it is full of the anger of Allah Almighty. In reality, in the Quran, there are not only announcements of punishments for those who do evil things in their lives but also a lot of awards for those who do well in this world. It is sent from Allah Almighty to humanity to protect them from all types of harm in this world. All the instructions guide us to a successful life. The people who understand take advantage of it for a successful life, and those who don’t understand it cannot benefit from its institutions. It gives options of right and wrong to humanity.

3.1.2. Positive Impoliteness Strategy with Functions of Impoliteness and Responses Towards Impoliteness

Extract: 1

ABE: Imam Fareed didn’t do anything...

EMILY: It’s the law. It’s in the constitution. To accumulate money doesn’t mean it’s for Hamas.

AMIR: What does any of this have to do with me?

EMILY: It doesn’t matter to you that an innocent man is in prison? AMIR: I don’t know the Patriot Act law..... Those guys, Ken and Alex, are amazing^[1].

In this example, ABE and EMILY try to convince AMIR to support a local Imam who is in prison under the charge of Hamas. Emily says that, according to the law, it is not illegal to collect money for useful purposes. Imam Fareed is a local Imam in prison under the charge of terrorism. Amir is a lawyer by profession, and that’s why Emily and Abe want to make Amir a part of the legal team to defend Imam Fareed in the court. When Abe and Emily try to convince

Amir to support the Imam, Amir performs a positive impoliteness strategy with coercive impoliteness function by saying, “What does any..... do with me? Here, he is not showing any concern or interest in the matter they said.

Extract: 2

AMIR: I'm not gonna be part of a legal team just because your Imam is a bigot.

ABE: He's not a bigot. He'd just be more comfortable if there was a Muslim on the case, too...

AMIR: More comfortable if he wasn't being represented by a couple of Jews?

ABE: No. He liked you. He said you were a good man.

AMIR: Well, he might not feel the same if he knew how I really felt about his religion.

ABE: that's what Mom says Grandma used to say about you. That you were such a good Muslim when you were a kid^[1].

Furthermore, Amir clearly refuses to help the Imam Fareed, because according to his perception, he is a bigot. In this instance, Amir again utilizes a positive impoliteness strategy with coercive function by giving an opinion on Imam, “What I thought.... a bigot”. Instead of promising to support Imam, Amir pretends to be disinterested and unconcerned with the case of Imam. He does not accept any association with the local Imam and use the word “bigot” to describe him. He threatens Emily and Abe’s positive face to support the Imam. In the next line, he says, “More comfortableof Jews?” so that he keeps himself separate from the case of Imam Fareed and he is not ready to take part in this case on forcing of them countering the face attack (defensive strategy) has been utilized by Abe In the next line he says, “No. (Beat) He likeda good man”. Here, Abe attempts to tell Amir that Imams like his case are handled by him instead of others because he knows him as a well-reputed person and has some background associations. In addition, he says, “Well, he might not feel his religion” to show himself unconcerned not only with the Imam, who is a religious person, but also with Islam.

In the fifth line, Amir says that if Imam knows about his views on him and his religion (Islam), he does not like him to hand over his case to him. It shows that Amir does not like Imam and Islam, and does not want to show any

association with them.

Extract: 3

AMIR: I'm not Muslim. I'm an apostate. Which means I've renounced my faith?

ISAAC: I know what the word “apostate” means^[1].

Here, Amir explicitly says that he has renounced his faith and now he is an apostate. In this way, he disassociates himself from Muslims. In this example, to disassociate from others, an output strategy of positive impoliteness with affective function is used. Apostasy in Islam (*riddah*) is generally defined as the conscious rejection of Islam by a Muslim in word or through action. It consists of the act of non-acceptance of faith to be irreligious or accepting another religion by an individual who was a Muslim by birth or who had converted from any other religion.

Extract: 4

ISAAC: Khalid comes from an educated Jordanian background. All the women wear the veil in his family.

EMILY: It's a source of pride for a lot of Muslim women.

AMIR: First of all, they're probably wearing headscarves.

Not the veil. It's not the same thing—

(Silence)

JORY: The veil is evil.

You erase a face, you erase individuality.

Nobody's making men erase their individuality.

Why does it always come down to making the woman pay?

(Silence)^[1]

In this case, Isaac admires Khalid’s family because all the females in his family wear the veil of their own choice, and Emily also appreciates them. On the other hand, Isaac and Jory contradict their ideas by saying that there is a great difference between a veil and a head covering. In this example, Amir and Jory use disagreement as one of the outputs of positive impoliteness strategies with affective function. As a response, Isaac remains silent about this topic and says nothing. Thus, he uses non-verbal response against positive impoliteness strategy. Further, Jory also uses this strategy

by saying the veil is different from a head covering, because in order to uncover your face, you are going to show others your individuality.

Furthermore, she raises a question why it is only women who cover their identity and not men? In response, Isaac and Emily once again remain silent and choose a non-verbal response. Here, it is a point that needs to be understood deeply: why Muslim women need to wear a veil or a head covering. Two questions arise: 1) is it the purpose of the veil or the head covering to sustain individuality or to stop adultery? 2) Why it (veil) is compulsory only for women and men are free from such restrictions. Let us understand these issues from the Quran.

Allah commands his dearest Prophet Muhammad (S.A.W) in Surah e Noor as follows:

“Speak to the men who believe in Allah that: they should cast down their fleeting look and protect their private parts...”

In this line, Allah Almighty enjoins Muslim males not to stare at females (except their wives), in order to keep away from any chance of attraction. It is recognized as “veil of the eyes”. This shows Islamic law does not give a free hand to men in the matter of attraction towards the opposite gender; rather, it gives a set pattern to them in the matter of making relations with women.

On the other hand, according to the Quran, for women, the veil is compulsory in the matter of Na-Mehram but veil is not mandatory in the case of Mehram (male people whom the marriage is not allowed and husband) for example, husbands, their sons, their husbands’ sons, their fathers, their husbands’ fathers, their brothers, or their brothers’ sons or their sisters’ sons, or their women or permanent servants, or male servants free of sex needs, or innocent children.

3.1.3. Negative Impoliteness Strategy with Functions of Impoliteness and Responses Towards Impoliteness

Extract: 1

AMIR: We went to Barcelona for our honeymoon. The ceviche, the paella, the wine. Spanish wines are so underrated.

ISAAC: See, this is the problem I’m having... You’re saying Muslims are so different. Are you not that different? You have the same idea

of the good life as I do^[1].

Amir is a Muslim by birth and raised in American society. He has forgotten Muslim cultural and religious values. Wine is forbidden in Islam but Amir can’t stop himself from it. Here, the purpose behind his conversation is to demonstrate that Muslims have forgotten their values in the present era. They do not care about their religious dogmas in their practical life like Amir but he is wrong here because not all Muslims do so. In this way, he is using impolite language. Isaac and other people are confused about his lifestyle because he has totally adopted a non-Muslim lifestyle as well as values. In this example, Amir appreciates the things forbidden in Islam. He says when he went to Barcelona for their honeymoon, he liked a lot of wine by saying “The wine.....wines are so underrated”. Here, he uses one of the output strategy of negative impoliteness, condensing, scorning and ridiculing with affective function. Countering the face attack (offensive strategy) has been used in this instance.

Extract: 2

AMIR: Fine, so let’s talk about something that is in the text. Wife-beating.

ISAAC: **Wife-beating?**

EMILY: Amir, really?

AMIR: So the angel Gabriel comes to Muhammad...

ISAAC: **Angel Gabriel?**

AMIR (mocking) Yeah^[1].

In this example, Amir is criticizing the instructions of the Holy Quran, claiming that there is an instruction about wife-beating. He says that let’s talk about something that is written in the text of the Quran about wife-beating. Here, Amir is delivering incomplete information and talking out of context. Actually, the intention behind this is to prove that Muslims are not kind to women, as the Quran directs them to do so. He says, “That’s how Muslims believeMuhammad word for word.” In addition, how these instructions came to the Holy Prophet Hazrat Muhammad may Allah peace and blessing upon him (the revelation of Allah). He makes fun of the revelation of the Quran. Here, Amir uses an output strategy of negative impoliteness called condescend, scorn or ridicule for the great personality with affective function in both sentences. In reply, Isaac asks, “Wife-beating?” Further, he says, “A like Joseph Smith..... Joseph Smith”. In this way,

he employs a defensive strategy. One more strategy has been used here, which is "invade the other's space", one of output strategy of negative impoliteness. He says, "*So the angel Gabriel Muhammad*". Amir uses the word Muhammad instead of Hazrat Muhammad PBUH.

Extract: 3

AMIR (CONT'D): And paintings don't matter.

Only the Quran matters.

EMILY: Paintings don't matter?

AMIR: Prophet used to say angels don't enter a house where there are pictures and/or dogs.

JORY: What's wrong with dogs?

ISAAC (CONT'D)

AMIR: Your guess as good as mine ^[1].

Emily and Isaac love painting very much because they are painters by profession, and they like Islamic traditions as well. Amir says that paintings don't matter, only the Quran matters. He wants to tell them about the Islamic point of view on painting. Further, he talks about the sayings of Hazrat Mohammad (PCBU), "angels don't enter pictures and/or dogs." He talks about the logic in this Hadith. He tries to give the wrong impression of Islam by giving incomplete and out-of-context information to make them realize that they are painters and do like Islamic tradition, but in Islam, keeping pictures and dogs inside the house is prohibited. Further, Amir and Jory make fun of the sayings of Prophet PBUH without understanding them properly by saying, "What's wrong with dogs? In this example, Amir uses the output strategy of negative impoliteness, namely, condescend, scorn or ridicule with affective function. Islamophobic discourse has been used in this conversation.

In Islam, keeping a dog as a pet in the house is prohibited (haram), but keeping a dog for hunting, to take care of the cattle and for guarding the house is permitted. The holy Prophet used to keep the dogs to watch the flock of cattle. In the house, it is not allowed, it is haram because the spit of the dog is unclean. Even today, science tells us that there are germs of various diseases in a dog's saliva, which are rabies and hydrophobia. Hydrophobia means fearing of water. Rabies is called hydrophobia, which means terror of water or any liquid due to the beginning of paralysis. Paintings of living things are prohibited in Islam. Although drawing pictures of living things, sculptures and statues are not allowed in Islam for adults, but for children, for the purpose

of playing and education, all these things are allowed. For adults, these things are prohibited because it leads to idolship and a challenge to their creation too.

3.1.4. Off-Record Impoliteness with Functions of Impoliteness

Extract: 2

AMIR: To be Muslim—truly—means not only that you believe all this.

It means you fight for it, too.

Politics follows faith? No distinction between mosque and state?

A better place than this world, well, then let's go back.

Let's stone adulterers.

Let's cut off the hands of thieves.

Let's kill the unbelievers.

You can't help but feel just a little bit of pride.

ISAAC: Pride?

AMIR: Yes, pride^[1].

In this example, Amir is talking about Islam and Islamic traditions here. He says that he knows what nobody else doesn't. Here is the kicker. The kicker means "the unwelcomed discovery (traditions of Islam)". These traditions are real problems because we are not capable of accepting and following them. He says that to be Muslim means not only to believe in all the tradition but also to fight for the implementation of them by force. According to this theory (secularism), religion and politics are similar lines which never meet each other because each has a split route, but in Islam, politics follows faith. Further, he says if the world of the Quran it is better than this present age, "we have tothe unbelievers". Amir is outwardly describing the Islamic values mentioned in the Quran but his conversation implicates something else. He wants to say that the Quranic world is very tough to survive for mankind, and that is why it is impossible to live in this world. In this example, he performs the sarcasm or mock impoliteness strategy with affective function to damage the face of the entire Muslim community. According to this theory (secularism), politics and religion are like parallel lines that never meet each other, and each has a separate direction. Politics means management of social dealings, whereas religion is concerned with the association between man and God. In Islamic shariya, spe-

cial concentration is paid to issues variety of prayer, fasting, *Hajj* (pilgrimage), custom cleansing (*taharah*), and ritual impurities (*najasat*) to mortgage, buying and selling, renting, conjugal relation, marriage and divorce, parents and children relation, war and peace, and international relations, and to drinking and eating, wearing clothes and ornamentation, the stories of old nations and their distractions, and even determination of the months etc. Thus, Islam is not only concerned with personal and devotional affairs, but also with social affairs, and those pertainings are connected to the administration of society. In reality, adultery and robbery are considered great sins in every religion and no one appreciates adultery or robbery. There are various types of punishments of these sins in different religions, and that is why Islam orders to stone the adulterers or give a hundred lashes to them and cut off the hands of thieves to purify the Islamic from vices. As for the concern of killing the unbelievers, the Quran instructs Muslims to stand up themselves in a defensive fight against their enemies until the enemies stop violence against them. There are some exact verses of the Quran in this context.

“Slay them if they attack you first,” Allah commands, “Fight in the way of Allah against those who fight you, but don’t cross the limits. No doubt Allah does not like them who violate the rules.... (Verse NO. 190–192).”

3.1.5. Withhold Impoliteness with Functions of Impoliteness

Extract: 1

AMIR: You haven't read the Quran, but you've read a couple of sanctimonious British bullies and you think you know something about Islam?

EMILY: Amir...

AMIR: What? That's not fair game? If he's going to offer it as a counter, it's fair game.

ISAAC: He has a point. I need to read the Koran^[1].

In this situation, Isaac and Emily are guests at the house of Amir and Emily for some celebrations. It is not ethically correct to touch on a sensitive issue and exchange contradicting ideas with guests. Here politeness is required by Amir, but he does not bother with it. He continuously uses harsh words and has disagreements with the guests. In this way, here Amir uses the withholding impoliteness with coercive function due to the power of knowledge. He uses the words “sanctimonious bullies,” which is ethically wrong. One should not use such words for pious people of other

religions. He explicitly says to Isaac that he does not have enough knowledge, and in answer to his impolite act, Emily tries to stop him by calling his name.

Extract: 2

ISAAC: I asked you if you liked hearing it? Do you like hearing about Israel getting wiped into the ocean?

JORY: Isaac...

ISAAC: No. I want to know...

AMIR: Sometimes? Yes.

Emily: (show the expression of despair) Amir, We're supposed to be celebrating.

AMIR: (neglect her) and I'm saying it's wrong. And it comes from somewhere. And that somewhere is Islam^[1].

Here, Isaac got angry listening to the continuing harsh words from Amir. He asks if he likes to hear about getting wiped into ocean (destroying the counties near ocean). The Arab-Israeli clash is a contemporary phenomenon, which is deeply rooted in the 19th century, especially at the end of this century. In response to this impolite act, Jory wants to refrain from him for the sake of her own face. She employs a defensive strategy at this movement. But Isaac is still standing on his point. Further, Amir says that he is saying, it's incorrect and he very well know where all these practices come from, and furthermore, he says without hesitation that, all these practices are taught by Islam. Here, Amir uses withholding politeness with affective function by saying, “*And I'm saying...somewhere is Islam.*” In response, Isaac gets furious and says, you are wrong, all these practices are not from Islam but from your own mind. It shows the negative attitude of Amir towards Islam, that he considers all negative things exist in the religion. In this situation, Isaac does counter-face attack to offend Amir's face by saying, “*No, shit, it's wrong...fundamentalism. It doesn't*”. Thus, in this example, it has been used.

3.2. Modification in Culpeper's Model of Impoliteness by Researcher

According to Culpeper, the creation of the negative emotional state is the target's responsibility. This research has negated the idea that only the target is responsible for the negative emotional outburst, because sometimes these negative emotions emerge from the producer's side due to misunderstanding or misperception^[21]. Thus, this research expands Culpeper's theory of impoliteness^[2] by proving

that the emergence of negative emotions can be not only the target's responsibility but also the producer's responsibility. The researcher used this theory because she noticed a lot of impolite acts done by characters in the play *Disgrace* by Ayad Akhtar, which threatens the reader's or the audience's face.

4. Conclusions

In this part, all the data has been qualitatively analysed by the researcher. It has been proven, with the help of the data taken from *Disgraced* (2012) by Ayad Akhtar, that Islamophobia is a form of prejudice, and that it plays a vital role in the creation of impoliteness in this chapter. It has also been proven that, like power and entertainment, prejudice is also one of the factors that take part in the generation of impoliteness. In this way, this study expands the first function of impoliteness of this theory. This chapter demonstrates that a person who has a prejudicial attitude towards any group of people or religion uses impoliteness in conversation. In this condition, the responsibility of the impolite act is on the part of the speaker. In Pragmatics, we study the hidden meanings of the speaker; in this research, the researcher studied the hidden meanings behind the characters' dialogues in *Disgraced* (2012), which were conveyed via implicature, while the conversation among different characters in the play was analyzed with the help of Culpeper's impoliteness theory^[2]. It's a qualitative research accomplished by using a modified version of Culpeper's impoliteness framework^[2] to categorize and analyse the data. The results are stated as follows: out of the five strategies of impoliteness, namely, bald on-record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and sarcasm or mock impoliteness, the negative impoliteness strategy is frequently used in this play. The characters in *Disgraced* (2012) frequently employed the affective function.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization, K.A.; methodology, K.A., S.S.Q. and A.T.; formal analysis, S.S.Q.; investigation, S.S.Q.; data curation, K.A. and A.T.; writing—original draft preparation, S.S.Q. and A.T.; writing—review and editing, B.K., F.A. and R.S.A.; supervision, K.A. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding

This work received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

The ethical review committee/Institutional Review Board approval was not required to collect data. However, the department permission was taken by the researcher.

Informed Consent Statement

Before starting the research process, a written consent form containing details of the study was shared with the students. The study was conducted on those participants who voluntarily agreed with signed consent forms.

Data Availability Statement

There is no corpus of data or data web link created for this study. However, the data used in this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no potential conflict of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- [1] Akhtar, A., 2012. *Disgraced*. Broadway Play Publishing: New York, NY, USA.
- [2] Culpeper, J., Lakoff, R.T., 2004. Language and Woman's Place. In: Bucholtz, M. (Ed.). *Language and Woman's Place: Text and Commentaries*, 2nd ed. Oxford University Press: New York, NY, USA. pp. 35–118.
- [3] Merriam-Webster, n.d. Islamophobia. Available from: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/Islamophobia> (cited 20 June 2025).
- [4] Poole, E., 2003. Islamophobia. In: Haddad, Y.Y. (Ed.). *Muslims in the West: From Sojourners to Citizens*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK. p. 217.
- [5] Leech, G., 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman: London, UK.
- [6] Brown, P., Levinson, S.C., 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.

- [7] Benn, T., Jawad, H., 2003. Muslim Women in the United Kingdom and Beyond: Experiences and Images. Brill: Leiden, Netherlands.
- [8] Vertovec, S., 2002. Islamophobia and Muslim Recognition in Britain. In: Haddad, Y.Y. (Ed.). Muslims in the West: From Sojourners to Citizens. Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK. pp. 19–35.
- [9] Ahmed, Z., Zhang, J., Ahmed, K., et al., 2019. Manipulation of Pakistani Women through Skin-Whitening Advertising Discourse. In Proceedings of the 2019 3rd International Conference on Management Engineering, Software Engineering and Service Sciences, Wuhan, China, 12–14 January 2019; pp. 107–111. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3312662.3312705>
- [10] Ahmed, Z., Su, L., Ahmed, K., 2017. Pakistani Youth Manipulated through Night-Packages Advertising Discourse. Human Systems Management. 36(2), 151–162. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3233/HSM-171762>
- [11] Khan, M., Ahmed, S., Lee, R., 2019. Islamophobia in the 21st Century: A Comparative Study of Media and Political Discourses. Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs. 39(3), 321–340.
- [12] Ahmed, K., Ali, S., Habib, M.A., et al., 2024. Pragmatic Perception of Politeness in Disagreement by Pakistani ESL Learners. Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences. 22(2), 10889–10913. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2024-22.2.00822>
- [13] Khaleel, B., Nordin, U.K.U.M., Ahmed, K., et al., 2024. Societal Stigmatization and Support Mechanism for Rape Victims: An Analysis of Linguistic Features of Rape Judgments in Pakistan. Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences. 22(2), 980–994. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2024-22.2.0069>
- [14] Meesam, T., Khan, A., Hussain, S., 2022. Contemporary Islamophobia: A Systematic Review of Literature (2010–2022). Journal of Religion and Society. 15(2), 45–67.
- [15] Ramasamy, G., Raj, S.S.B.D., Senathirajah, A.R.B.S., et al., 2025. An Explorative Study on Intrinsic Factors Influencing Decision-Making and Turnover Intention Among Call Center Employees in Malaysia. International Journal of Innovative Research in Science and Studies. 8(2), 736–744. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.53894/ijirss.v8i2.5317>
- [16] Ahmed, K., tuz Zahra, F., Amin, T., et al., 2023. Voices from the World: An Analysis of Discourse Fragments from World Leaders on Covid-19. Journal of Arts and Linguistics Studies. 1(4), 783–820. Available from: <https://jals.miard.org/index.php/jals/article/view/54>
- [17] Khaleel, B., Sana-e-Zahra, S., Ahmed, K., 2023. A Thematic Analysis of Lexical Polarity within the Jargons of Legal Drafting in Pakistan. International Research Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities. 2(2), 147–174. Available from: <https://irjssh.com/index.php/irjssh/article/view/48>
- [18] Fraser, B., 1990. Perspectives on Politeness. Journal of Pragmatics. 14(2), 219–236.
- [19] Fraser, B., 2005. Whither Politeness? In: Lakoff, R.T., Ide, S. (Eds.). Broadening the Horizon of Linguistic Politeness. John Benjamins: Philadelphia, PA, USA. pp. 65–83.
- [20] Fiske, S.T., 1998. Stereotyping, Prejudice, and Discrimination. In: Gilbert, D.T., Fiske, S.T., Lindzey, G. (Eds.). The Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. 2, 4th ed. McGraw-Hill: New York, NY, USA. pp. 357–411.
- [21] Culpeper, J., Bousfield, D., Wichmann, A., 2003. Impoliteness Revisited: With Special Reference to Dynamic and Prosodic Aspects. Journal of Pragmatics. 35(10–11), 1545–1579.
- [22] Culpeper, J., 2005. Impoliteness and Entertainment in the Television Quiz Show: The Weakest Link. Journal of Politeness Research. 1(1), 35–72.
- [23] Culpeper, J., 2011. Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
- [24] Culpeper, J., 2010. Conventionalised Impoliteness Formulae. Journal of Pragmatics. 42(12), 3232–3245.
- [25] Culpeper, J., 2011. “It’s Not What You Said, It’s How You Said It!”: Prosody and Impoliteness. In: Linguistic Politeness Research Group (Ed.). Discursive Approaches to Politeness. De Gruyter Mouton: Berlin, Germany. pp. 57–84.