



*Corresponding author:

Iman Noori Jassim

Al-nbar Education Directorate

Email: oali86824@gmail.com

Key words: Relevance theory, rudeness, cognitive principle, communicative principle.

Analyzing and Decoding Rudeness in 'Lord of the Flies' through Relevance Theory: A Pragmatic Analysis

A B S T R A C T

This study investigates rudeness phenomena in William Golden's novel (Lord of the Flies). Rudeness, a widespread element in human interaction, plays a role in shaping communication dynamics. This type of speech, which has a negative effect may contain certain structure and specific purposes that the writers want to convey. Utilizing relevance theory as a framework, this study examines how rudeness is depicted in William Golding's "Lord of the Flies". According to Sperber and Wilson's relevance theory, communication can be understood in a more nuanced way by focusing on the mental effort involved in making meanings and statements relevant. Qualitative analysis has been done on the data of this study. Furthermore, it adopts Wilson and Sperber's (1986), relevance theory as a model and Segarra's (2007) criteria to identify rudeness and its types. Based on the results of the study, rudeness has many aspects that are hard to grasp when taken out of context. It is possible to provide rudeness through many types of strategies, explicit or covert.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31185/lark.3779>

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 21 jul 2024

Accepted 23 Oct 2024

Available online 1 Jan 2025

تحليل وفك رموز الوقاحة في رواية "أمير الذباب" من خلال نظرية الصلة: تحليل تداولي

إيمان نوري جاسم/ مديرة تربية الأنبار

ملخص الدراسة

تتناول هذه الدراسة ظواهر الوقاحة في رواية ويليام غولدينغ "لورد الذباب". الوقاحة، بوصفه عنصراً شائعاً في التفاعلات الإنسانية، وهي تؤدي مهمّاً في تشكيل ديناميكيات الاتصال. يمكن أن تحتوي هذه الأنواع من الخطاب، التي تؤثر سلباً، في هياكل معينة وأهداف محددة يرغب الكتاب في نقلها. باستخدام نظرية الارتباط بوصفها إطاراً نظرياً، تفحص هذه الدراسة كيفية تصوير الوقاحة في رواية "لورد الذباب" لويليام غولدينغ. وفقاً لهذه النظرية، لسبيربر وويلسون، يمكن فهم الاتصال بطريقة أكثر دقة بالتركيز على الجهد الذهني المشترك في جعل المعاني والبيانات ذات صلة. تم إجراء تحليل نوعي على بيانات هذه الدراسة. فضلاً عن ذلك، تعتمد الدراسة نموذج نظرية الصلة لويلسون وسبيربر (1986) ومعايير سيجارا (2007) لتحديد الوقاحة وأنواعها. بناءً على نتائج الدراسة، توضح أن الوقاحة لها جوانب متعددة تصعب عزلها عن المحتوى، وغالباً ما يتم توصيلها باستراتيجيات متنوعة، سواء كانت صريحة أو مستترة. الكلمات المفتاحية: نظرية الارتباط، الوقاحة، المبدأ المعرفي، المبدأ التواصلية.

1.Introduction

The complex nature of communication and its effects on social behavior necessitate an effective approach in literary analysis. Relevance theory (henceforth RT), set out by Sperber and Wilson (1986), provides a comprehensive framework for understanding symbolic and conceptual exchange. According to RT, the main motivation for communicating is to ensure that what is said is as relevant to the other person's understanding as possible. This theory emphasizes the roles of the cognitive environment, inferential processes and context in determining the reception and understanding of signals in any particular social setting.

By analyzing William Golding's novel, "Lord of the Flies", through the lens of TR, we can observe how the protagonists, a group of youngsters left on an isolated island, gradually lose their manners and become disrespectful to one another. As the story progresses, the boys' interactions shift from

being characterized by structure and order, centered around the conch shell, to become more chaotic and combative. From the relevance-theoretic point of view, we can understand how the communication breakdown and shared understanding leads to this change. Specifically, the rules and norms associated with the conch shell become less significant, similar to how the boys' manners deteriorate, leading to rude and violent behavior that illustrates their descent into savagery. The study aims to investigate how the characters' exchange of symbols and ideas evolves and contributes to the portrayal of rudeness. This study depends on a TR to examine the different aspects of rudeness in the present day. In this study, the researcher presents specific questions that can be examined by analyzing portions of William Golding's novel (Lord of the Flies)." These questions include: What are the types of rudeness found in this novel?

And how can TR help us comprehend 'Lord of the Flies' characters' rudeness in light of communication failures? Finally, how do symbolic interactions, such as the use of the conch shell, demonstrate shifts in social dynamics and the deterioration of civility, specifically in relation to rudeness within the novel? Based on these questions, the study uses relevance theory to look at textual evidence and find additional layers of meaning in "Lord of the Flies," looking specifically at rudeness and what it means in the context of the novel. Insights on rudeness narrative purpose and reflection of broader societal critiques embedded in Golding's work can be gained by placing these findings within the larger theoretical framework. To accomplish this, we need to conduct in-depth studies of utterance interpretation in a range of communication scenarios in addition to expanding our theoretical knowledge in this field.

Especially when the thing being researched is bad behavior like rudeness that can be communicated indirectly. From the researcher's standpoint, studying rudeness through TR is exciting and important to uncover how rudeness emerges and spreads, thereby gaining insight into its implications for social behavior in challenging and isolated settings depicted in the novel.

2. Literature Review

2-1 Pragmatics

The field of pragmatics within linguistics investigates how speakers produce meaning through the use of language in everyday contexts. Exploring the social, cultural, and situational dimensions of communication, moves beyond a literal interpretation of words. The basic objective of pragmatics

is to explain the procedures that enable speakers to work out the hidden, indirect, or inferred meanings of utterances or complete texts. (Hassan, 2014-2016).

2.1.1 Relevance Theory

Grice's approach to communication is characterized by his belief that meaning is primarily a psychological phenomenon but only secondarily only as a linguistic one. According to Grice, the meanings intended by the speaker are fundamental, and the meanings of sentences can ultimately be comprehended by analyzing what the speakers intend to convey (Grice, 1967). Although psychology is mentioned, Grice's primary objectives are philosophical and semantic. His examination of speaker's meaning aimed to clarify conventional semantic concepts like sentence meaning and word meaning. Furthermore, his explanations of implication derivation are rational reconstructions of how a speaker's meaning could be inferred, rather than empirical hypotheses about the mental processes of listeners (Grice, 1989).

Additionally, May (1993) agrees with Grice's intuition that an utterance raises expectations of significance. According to May, any external stimuli or internal representation that serves as an input for cognitive processes may at some point be relevant to a person. Relevance is defined as the possible quality of ideas, memories, and inference conclusions.

Relevance theorists want to expand upon Grice's ideas by integrating them into a psychologically viable and empirically testable theory of explicit communication.

RT views the understanding of utterances as a process of inference. It involves taking into account the speaker's production of an utterance and the context in which it is said, and then reaching at an interpretation of the speaker's intended meaning.

In the mid-1980s, cognitive scientists Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson developed this theory, which is a subfield of pragmatics in the study of linguistics based on the idea of relevance to understanding communication. RT posits that humans biologically optimize relevant stimuli, such as language and communication forms, including voice, thoughts and mental representations, all of which feed cognitive processes. Human cognition has evolved structurally and in complexity under constant pressure to become more efficient. This evolution enabling perceptual mechanisms

to automatically detect potentially relevant stimuli. Additionally, memory retrieval mechanisms to activate relevant assumptions, and inferential mechanisms to process them productively.

The Principle of Relevance, which holds all communication efforts should be directed towards optimizing relevance for the recipient, is fundamental to the RT. According to this theory, communicators should maximize their impact on the audience's cognitive processes while minimizing their own (Sperber & Wilson, 1986).

There are two main principles to the TR : Cognitive Principle of Relevance and Communicative Principle of Relevance. According to the Relevance Principle in Cognitive, it is normal for people to look for information that is useful to them. People judge how useful information is by how much it adds to what they already know and how simple it is to understand. When we learn something new, we judge it by how hard it is to understand cognitive effort and how helpful it is cognitive affects. People think that information is highly important when it gives them big benefits with little work. Further, for there to be any cognitive effected, statements must be correctly comprehended. According to Rouchota and Jucker (1998:2), Sperber and Wilson view utterance interpretation as a hypothesis-forming process that is limited to the relevance principle. The addressee can take this to be the intended interpretation and cease processing if, after organizing a hypothesis to interpret the speech, it is determined to be consistent with the principle of relevance.

Concerning the Communicative Principle of Relevance, speakers often express more than the simple meaning of words, and listeners easily get the intended meaning. The TR explains how expressions can have several meanings in communication and how processing costs limit contextual processing. Sperber and Wilson's Second Principle of Relevance, the Communicative Principle, states that every explicit communication conveys its optimal relevance. According to Sperber and Wilson, inferential communication is a collaborative process that involves not only influencing an audience's thinking but also gaining their recognition of one's objective. Thus, when you talk to someone, you are assuming that the knowledge you give them will be useful enough for them to make the effort to understand it.

Further, Wilson and Sperber (1986) established specific rules, which the current study will utilize as the basis for its analytical model: the first one, subject to the same conditions, the significance of an input to the person at that particular moment increases with the amount of positive cognitive

effects it produces. The second, when all else is equal, the importance of the input to the individual at that moment decreases with increasing processing effort.

2.1.1.1 Application

Several fields of study have made use of RT, including translation, politeness, literature, media discourses, humor, and grammar.

Concerning grammar, RT is interested in how grammatical features limit the selection of possible interpretations. Thus, the cognitive contextualization relies heavily on the grammatical structure of statements. Connectives, conditionals, modals, adverbs, adverbials, tense, mood, etc. have all been covered from this perspective grammar.

In a relevance-theoretic perspective, humor is no longer a textual characteristic; rather, audience's mental processes understand humorous texts. This comedy relies on communicators' ability to read and manipulate others' emotions and thoughts. Knowing that the audience would likely pick the most relevant interpretation of the joke, the humorist can write a text that leads to an accessible interpretation that is later invalidated.

In terms of politeness, there is a social aspect to communication that doesn't seem to fit with the focus on the person in RT. However, a number of studies have tried to use TR to explain politeness. For example, RT has described politeness as a way of talking that fits or doesn't fit with what the listener and speaker already think about their relationship, which can lead to different interpretations based on relevance (Jary, 1998). In terms of translation, There is a trend to use the idea of similarity between the intended meanings of words in RT-based studies like Gutt's (2000).

2.1.2 Contextual Considerations:

The concept of "context" is used in the field of linguistics to describe the surrounding language that aids in understanding the meaning of a word, phrase, sentence, or other linguistic unit (Dash, 2008). Elements of the communication's context can be either linguistic (such as the words and grammar employed) or extra linguistic (such as the social or physical location in which it takes place). It is needed to remove ambiguity from statements or words that could signify different things based on context (Dohn et al. ,2018). Thus, in order to achieve exact grasp and successful

communication through language, context is essential. Rudeness, as a discursive concept, is context dependent. Here, we are dealing with a social environment in which any behavior might be considered rude or not. There is a lot of variation in what people think is rude and what is not rude. For example, the opponent may not find the so-called "mat" to be as rude as an order that doesn't use a single bad word, like "Get away!" (Zhelvis,2012)

This study examines the variations in rudeness in different situations, recognizing that a specific behavior can be perceived as either rude or acceptable, depending on the specific circumstances. In other words, Rudeness, as a discursive concept, is context dependent. Here, we are dealing with the environment of society in which any behavior might be considered rude or not. It is mostly up to the person being addressed to decide what is rude and what is not. As an example of this point, the phrase "shut up" was used numerous times in the novel "Lord of the Flies", which served as the sample for the current study. Some of these instances may have been humorous between friends or even between brothers.

2.1.3 The Concept of Rudeness

Numerous definitions of "rudeness" exist, but the researchers have selectively chosen those predominantly embraced by linguists and scholars. Rondina and Workman (2005) offer a broad definition, characterizing rudeness as any statement, action or lack of action that offends someone, causing discomfort or annoyance. DuBrin (2011) defines rudeness as insensitive or disrespectful behavior reflecting a disregard for others. Beebe's (1995) widely accepted definition frames rudeness as a face-threatening act or feature that violates socially sanctioned interaction norms within a given social context. Notably, Beebe claims that rudeness is not just considered as a personal offense, but also a violation of rules of society, considering it from both personal and social perspectives. Segarra (2007) emphasizes that rudeness is consistently intentional, conveying ignorance, carelessness to social manners, and intentional discourtesy. Conversely, rudeness, as Culpeper's second definition (2005) suggests, can be intentional or accidental when a person intentionally interacts a face-attack, and a hearer interprets a behavior as purposeful face attacking, or when both happen at the same time (Bousfield and Locher, 2008). In this instance, Terkourafi (2008) clarified the difference between rudeness and impoliteness, noting that impoliteness is sometimes unintentional due to the hearer's linguistic incompetence, whereas rudeness is

consistently intentional. In other words, there is a close relationship in the field of communication between being impolite and being rude. "Brown and Levinson (1978) found that both rudeness and impoliteness violate social norms and disregard established strategies for politeness. Culpeper (2011) explains that disobeying accepted social norms often indicates indifference or intentional disobedience toward rules of polite behavior. Beebe distinguishes rudeness as both an individual violation and an offense against societal standards, viewing it from both personal and social perspectives (Beebe, 1995)

However, distinct differences arise; for instance, impoliteness encompasses a broader range of subtle offenses, whereas rudeness often involves overt hostility (Zhelvis, 2012). Moreover, a minor distinction is that impoliteness is more commonly used in academia than rudeness. Furthermore, rudeness is associated with humanities, particularly history, while impoliteness is linked to linguistics and communication (Culpeper). Additionally, as stated by Rondina (2005, p.3), "Rudeness is anything you say or do or don't say or do that offends someone else, making them feel uncomfortable or inconvenienced." This provides a broad definition of rudeness. Not using polite words like "please" and "thank you" is just one example of rudeness. It intentionally disregards or hurts the feelings of others and fails to appreciate their important things. Impolite, offensive, disrespectful, unpleasant and self-absorbed are some of the adjectives used to describe rudeness (Jassim, 2021).

Segarra's (2007) categorization of rudeness, encompassing "rudeness of word", "rudeness of action", and "inaction rudeness", serves as the basis for this study. Consequently, the researchers aim to present a comprehensive understanding of rudeness as emerging linguistic phenomenon, as seen through the eyes of the researcher, and clarifying their meanings. Numerous researches have delved into different facets of rudeness, highlighting its social, linguistic and psychological components. For instance, Smith and Christensen (2020) investigated how rudeness affects dynamics at work and found that it had a negative influence on teamwork and production. Similarly, Jones et al. (2018) looked at the mental processes that lead to rudeness, focusing on how character behaviors and environmental influences play a part. Brown and Levinson (1978) laid the framework for understanding how rudeness is perceived and managed in communication by pioneering research on politeness theory in the discipline of linguistics.

2.1.3.1 Rudeness Types

In Segarra's book, "How to Become a True Professional," he categorized rudeness into three distinct types (2007). These include:

- Rudeness of Word: This form of rudeness occurs when an individual uses explicit language, employs street language, interrupts others excessively during conversations, shares inappropriate jokes, or poses personal questions to individuals with whom they lack an intimate relationship.
- Rudeness of Action: This category includes actions, whether verbal or non-verbal, that are utilized to show disdain and belittle others. Examples include ignoring others' feelings and opinions, showing incivility, or disregarding fundamental rules of etiquette.
- Inaction Rudeness: Inaction rudeness revolves around what a person refrains from doing rather than their actions. This includes neglecting others while they are speaking, failing to respond to requests for help, or exhibiting indifference and carelessness.

Segarra's classification provides a comprehensive insight into the various ways that rudeness can manifest, covering verbal expressions, actions and omissions in behavior.

3 Methodology

3.1 Research Design

A qualitative research design is used to examine rudeness in William Golding's "Lord of the Flies" through TR. The qualitative research seeks to understand the complex processes of incivility among narrative characters.

Through qualitative analysis, the study illuminates the symbolic and thematic aspects of incivility and its social and psychological meaning in the story. This study depends on William Golding's Lord of the Flies, published in 1954, which is a work of allegorical fiction. The study is restricted to analyzing only the situations of rudeness identified within the text.

3.2 Data Selection

The data used in this study is from the novel "Lord of the Flies", which was picked because it fits the operational definition of rudeness. In this investigation, utterances (words, phrases, sentences, etc.) serve as the data. The novel's characters' conversations provide a context for the data collected from each one. So, for the selection of extracts, a total of seven extracts are chosen at random from the complete novel "Lord of the Flies" to represent the types of rudeness found throughout the story. Since the study is qualitative and descriptive rather than quantitative, the samples are reduced in order to avoid unnecessary narrative and repetition. The researcher detected the rudeness phenomenon by applying Segarra's (2007) criteria to every phrase found in the chosen text. This criteria include: utilizes explicit language, street language, interrupting others, offering inappropriate jokes, or asking unfamiliar people personal questions, ignoring others' feelings and opinions, showing incivility, or disregarding fundamental rules of etiquette as well as neglecting others while they are speaking, failing to respond to requests for help, or exhibiting indifference.

3.3 Procedures for Data Analysis

In order to analyze data and respond to RQ1 and RQ2, the following techniques are used:

1. The analyzed utterances are identified and highlighted in bold typography.
- 2- Provide contextual hints on the specific data, including the speaker, the listeners and the occasion in which the extract was given.
3. A qualitative analysis will be conducted after each utterance.
4. A discussion on the findings will take place.

4. Data Analysis

The researcher has applied Wilson and Sperber's (1986) relevance theory as a model of the current study. Following the identification of rudeness and its types using Segarra's (2007) criteria, each speech in the study is then subjected to Wilson and Sperber's (1986) modal. The present study will use Sperber and Wilson's rules, which are mentioned in section (2-1) as its basic rules for analyzing the selected data to achieve research objectives.

These below are the extracts that will be analyzed pragmatically using TR taken from "Lord of the Flies" by William Golding:

Extract (1)

**“Piggy: It's hot! Ralph: What did you expect? : I didn't expect anything. My auntie—
Sucks to your auntie! Ralph: Aren't you going to swim?**

Piggy shook his head. I can't swim. I wasn't allowed. My asthma—

Ralph" Sucks to your ass-mar!" P13

This extract is one of the verbal exchanges between two characters, Ralph and Piggy, Ralph who holds the position of leader within the group, and Piggy, who is considered to be one of the group members. Piggy abstained from swimming due to his asthma issue, nevertheless, Ralph interrupted, deriding him.

The above extract is one of the rudeness of word lies in Ralph's offensive expressions toward Piggy. Ralph intentionally interrupts Piggy and embarrasses him. Piggy was unable to swim due to his health, but Ralph in this case didn't care. He intended to make fun of him so badly that he urged him to swim.

Application of TR in the given lines, Ralph's comments "What did you expect?" and "Sucks to your auntie!" show that he is not thinking very hard. He ignores Piggy's comments without thinking about what Piggy mean or how Piggy makes him feel.

According to the Cognitive Principle of Relevance, Ralph's dismissive responses suggest that Piggy's statements are not perceived as relevant. Ralph does not perceive the value in Piggy's complaints or explanations, and as a result, he makes minimal effort to comprehend or respond empathetically.

Ralph saying on the words provided “Sucks to your auntie!” and “Sucks to your ass-mar!” are meant to make Piggy's worries seem less important. These comments maximize the cognitive effects of Ralph (making him feel in charge and putting Piggy down) while minimizing the efforts he has to make to understand them.

These remarks have a major detrimental cognitive impact on Piggy. They strengthen his sense of helplessness and exclusion. Based on TR, Ralph's lack of effort and the significant negative impact on Piggy show that they are not on equal ground in their communication.

The Communicative Principle of Relevance states that Ralph's social dominance distorts his expectation of optimal relevance. Ralph talks as though Piggy should take his scolding comments for granted. Piggy has internalized these condescending attitudes and his answer (or lack thereof) reflects his lesser rank. The fact that he hardly says anything and only shakes his head suggests that he has accepted Ralph's framework for communication. Ralph's comments are rude. They denigrate Piggy's reasonable worries (heat, swimming, asthma). Ralph lacks empathy. Empathizing with Piggy would require more cognitive effort, according to TR. Ralph is rude because he doesn't engage.

Extract (2)

"Piggy stirred I'll come. Ralph turned to him. You're no good on a job like this. All the same—. We don't want you, said Jack, flatly. Three's enough.

Piggy's glasses flashed. I was with him when he found the conch. I was with him before anyone else was." P28

This extract was uttered by four boys who are talking about deciding to go explore the island. Jack and Ralph made fun of Piggy's desire to go with them and stopped him. It is one of the rudeness of word that occurred in Ralph's speech. Ralph is rude when he didn't care about Piggy's feelings and Ralph stated clearly that he was unsuitable for this duty. This extract is one of the rudeness of action that Ralph attempts to minimize Piggy and he speaks in a way that disregards other people's feelings and potentially embarrasses addressee. Therefore it can be considered rude.

According to TR, Ralph and Jack's sentences "You're no good at a job like this" and "We don't want you" don't take much thought. They say these rude things without giving it much thought or thinking or taking Piggy's feelings into account. Based on the Cognitive Principle of Relevance, these answers show that Ralph and Jack don't think Piggy's presence is helpful. They don't put in much effort to explain why they didn't include Piggy; instead, they use flat rejections.

Ralph and Jack's words have big bad effects on Piggy's thinking. The things they said to him make him feel even more left out and unsuitable. The way Piggy reacted, including his demand and flashing of his glasses, shows that he was feeling very upset. TR says Piggy has strong cognitive effects and feels left out and underrated despite what he does.

In terms of the Communicative Principle of Relevance, Ralph and Jack talk to Piggy with the expectation that he will understand and accept that he is being left out as normal. Their rude tone and lack of detail show that they think Piggy will agree with them. Piggy tries to show that he is relevant and important to the group by talking about what he has done in the past, like being with Ralph when he found the conch. Ralph's words and Jack's response are both clearly rude. Without giving Piggy any useful feedback, they turn down his offer to take part. Jack's cold tone and direct refusal make the exclusion seem even more an offensive and rudeness. It sends the message that more talk is not wanted or needed.

Extract (3)

"We used his specs, said Simon, smearing a black cheek with his forearm. He helped that way. I got the conch, said Piggy indignantly. You let me speak! The conch doesn't count on top of the mountain, said Jack. so you shut up." P51

This extract is one of the conversation between Simon, Jack and Piggy. When Piggy uses the conch, a representation of authority, to declare his right to speak, but Jack rejects Piggy's assertion, so undercut the conch's status and establish his own rule. This is one of the rudeness of word that occurred in Jack's comment where he cruelly disregarded Piggy's emotions and his opinions as well as he didn't follow basic rules of manners. In addition, Jack tried to ridicule and disrespect Piggy by saying "Shut Up" without any justification or cause. In this situation, Jack intentionally reduces Piggy and makes fun of him in front of the group. Here, the speaker's comment and uttered "shut up" in an attempt to offend the listener.

Regarding the application of TR in this excerpt, Simon's comment, 'We used his specs. He helped that way,' acknowledges Piggy's role. It takes a little cognitive work to accept Piggy's assistance in starting the fire.

According to the Cognitive Principle of Relevance, Simon's comment is intended to provide cognitive effects by acknowledging Piggy's indirect essential assistance, which is pertinent to the group's success.

Meanwhile, Piggy's claim in "I got the conch. You let me speak!" is an attempt to assert his right to communicate, motivated by the symbolic authority of the conch, which necessitates significant cognitive effort. His indignation suggests a profound emotional attachment to being respected and heard. The Cognitive Principle of Relevance posits that Piggy's assertion is intended to optimize cognitive effects by reminding the group of the established norms and his right to speak. In accordance with the Communicative Principle of Relevance, Simon communicates in hope that recognizing Piggy's contribution will be regarded as pertinent and significant for the sake of justice and group morale. Piggy's claim, bolstered by the conch, assumes that the group respects the guidelines and hierarchy it represents and anticipates that his right to speak will be respected. Jack speaks with the expectation that the gathering will recognize his claim of dominance and reject Piggy's, assuming that his authority exceeds the symbolic power of the conch.

Concerning rudeness, Jack's words are clearly rude, he ignores the conch's symbolic power and tells Piggy to be quiet. By saying that, the conch has no meaning in this situation, Jack also breaks the rules and disrespects the agreed-upon symbols of order. In addition, Jack's command to 'shut up' is a direct, rude attempt to silence Piggy, showing that he doesn't value his opinion or authority.

مجلة لارك للفلسفة واللسانيات والعلوم الاجتماعية

Extract (4)

"Piggy sat down with a grunt. Jack stood over him. His voice was vicious with humiliation. You would, would you? Fatty! Ralph made a step forward and Jack smacked Piggy's head. Piggy's glasses flew off and tinkled on the rocks. Piggy cried out in terror: My specs!". P 56

This extract shows Jack and Piggy engaged in a violent conflict when Jack hits Piggy and broke his glasses, which are a sign of his creative input, shows how power works in the group and how violence is rising. It is an example of a word and action rudeness that lies in Jack's speech, where he disregards fundamental norms of respectful behavior as he attempts to forcibly remove Piggy's glasses without paying attention to Piggy's cry and pleadings. Additionally, Jack mockingly refers to Piggy as "fat" while attempting to annoy him.

In the context of using TR, the statement, "You would, would you? Fatty!" Jack's taunt is filled with humiliation and demands only a small amount of mental effort. The purpose is to swiftly and efficiently insult and belittle Piggy. In accordance with the Cognitive Principle of Relevance, Jack

seeks to maximize negative cognitive impacts such as humiliation and terror while using the least effort. This serves to strengthen his control through aggressive behavior.

Consequently, Jack's physical assault on Piggy, specifically hitting him and breaking his spectacles, demands little cognitive exertion. However, it leads to substantial cognitive consequences for both Piggy and the entire group. The act of hostility and its consequences (broken glasses) are immediately perceived as an intensification of violence and a symbolic assault on Piggy's intellectual achievements. According to TR, this action by Jack conveys his control and highlights the uselessness of Piggy's resistance, resulting in significant negative cognitive effects such as fear and powerlessness.

Extract (5)

“Jack: You're always scared. I got the conch. Jack: We don't need the conch anymore. We know who ought to say things. What good did Simon do speaking, or Bill, or Walter? It's time some people knew they've got to keep quiet and leave deciding things to the rest of us. Ralph: You haven't got the conch, he said. Sit down. Jack's face went so white that the freckles showed as clear, brown flecks. He licked his lips and remained standing”. p123

In this situation, Ralph became angry because Jack spoke without permission. In the scene, Jack rejects the group's rules and embarrasses Piggy by refusing to speak. Jack contends that Ralph lacks effective leadership and criticizes him for merely giving orders without taking substantial actions. The above incident can be categorized as an act of rudeness during the group's interaction. Jack intentionally interrupted the speaker and refused to hear his opinion. Jack's speech can be characterized as rude, potentially causing the listener to feel negatively. He spoke in a high tone, show facial expressions of anger, and expressed his thoughts clearly and directly.

The application of TR is evident in Jack's statement "We don't need the conch anymore. We know who ought to say things”. Jack's comment shows a deliberate and minimally taxing effort to challenge the established rule symbolized by the conch, which traditionally grants the right to speak. He asserts his own authority to decide who may speak and under what circumstances.

According to TR, Jack's statement aims to maximize cognitive impact by questioning the existing hierarchy and asserting his control over decision-making.

In contrast, Ralph's response of "Sit down" requires cognitive effort as he reinforces the rule of the conch and strives to maintain fairness and order in the conversation. TR suggests Ralph's words are intended to have cognitive effects by reminding Jack of the agreed-upon rules and asserting authority through the conch. Jack's physical reaction described as "Jack's face went so white that the freckles showed as clear, brown flecks. He licked his lips and remained standing", indicates strong mental effects such as shock, anger and a perceived challenge to his authority. Regarding rudeness, Jack's disregard for the conch and established norms is inherently disrespectful as it undermines Ralph's attempts to uphold justice and order in communication. Furthermore, Jack's dismissive remark implies that he and his gathering should make decisions without regard for the law or fairness toward others. Jack's psychological response to Ralph's assertion of authority is evident in his physical reaction, where his discomfort and anger are expressed through his actions of licking his lips and paling.

مجلة لارك للفلسفة واللسانيات والعلوم الاجتماعية
Extract (6)

“ Jack: He's like Piggy. He says things like Piggy. He isn't a proper chief.” Jack clutched the conch to him. He's a coward himself.

For a moment he paused and then went on. On top, when Roger and I went on—he stayed back. I went too! After”.

“The two boys glared at each other through screens of hair. I went on too, said Ralph, then I ran away. So did you. Call me a coward then. Jack: He's not a hunter. He'd never have got us meat. He isn't perfect and we don't know anything about him. He just gives orders and expects people to obey for nothing. All this talk” p155

An important turning point occurs in this part when Jack attacks Ralph's character by drawing an unfavorable comparison between his acts and those of a leader. Ralph, on the other hand, defends himself against allegations of cowardice and focuses on previous incidents. Jack insults Ralph and uses the conch to challenge Ralph's leadership. It sheds light on the volatile group dynamics and

power struggle among the island's stranded boys. The above data is one of the rudeness of action as well as rudeness of word at the same time that occurred coming from Jack towards Ralph

The following sentence demonstrates the application of TR, "He's like Piggy. He says things like Piggy. He isn't a proper chief." Jack explicitly questions Ralph's leadership and weakens his authority by unfavorably comparing him to Piggy, whom Jack regards as weak. This remark tries to maximize cognitive impact by altering the group's opinion of Ralph's leadership abilities and reshaping the group's hierarchy.

According to the Cognitive Principle of Relevance, speakers aim to maximize relevance by balancing cognitive effort and cognitive effects. Jack's statements aim to minimize the cognitive effort required to challenge Ralph's leadership and assert his own authority as a suitable chief.

Jack's assertion that Ralph is a coward necessitates the group to engage in cognitive processing since it directly questions Ralph's character and competence to lead. The purpose of this statement is to manipulate the group's perception of Ralph's leadership skills and to redirect their support towards Jack, who is seen as a more resolute and competent leader.

In relation to the Communicative Principle of Relevance, Jack's physical act of tightly grasping the conch and his explicit remark, "Jack clutched the conch to him," highlights his claim of dominance in the conversation. This act amplifies the significance of his statements by indicating his superiority and disregarding Ralph's power represented by the conch. It confirms that the group processes and comprehends Jack's assertion of power clearly.

Regarding rudeness, Jack's rejection of Ralph's leadership skills and negative comments about him show that he doesn't value the group's established hierarchy and authority structures. Also, Jack's statement that Ralph is weak as a leader and a coward constitutes rudeness, as he directly attacks Ralph's character and credibility. In conclusion, Jack's claim that he is a good leader and his criticism of Ralph's leadership skills go against the norms of polite conversation and working together to make decisions. According to TR, Jack's actions and words show rudeness because he uses them to attack Ralph's power, show who is in charge, and change the way the group works to benefit himself.

Extract (7)

“Jack: You ran yourself! shouted Jack. Look at that bone in your hands! Ralph went crimson. I said you were hunters. That was your job”.

“Jack ignored him again. Who'll join my tribe and have fun?

I'm chief, said Ralph tremulously." P183

In this exchange, Ralph is interrupted by Jack, who tries to divide the group into two groups and rejects his leadership. As a whole, this utterance, there is a Rudeness of Action. The changing dynamics within their group are shown in this quote, which depicts a crucial moment when Jack challenges Ralph's authority. The power struggle between Ralph and his followers, as well as Jack's efforts to assert his supremacy, are reflected in this. Jack's words demonstrate how TR principles are applied to maximize relevance by balancing cognitive effort and cognitive effects. Jack, strategically, aims to make it easier for others to question Ralph's leadership while simultaneously making his own authority more acceptable.

In reference to the Cognitive Principle of Relevance, Jack's dismissal of Ralph's allegation "I'm chief" illustrates his deliberate use of cognitive strategies to undermine Ralph's authority. By disregarding Ralph's statement, Jack reduces the mental effort required to challenge Ralph's leadership and reinforces his own position as a more assertive leader.

Regarding the Communicative Principle of Relevance, Jack's exclamations "You ran yourself!" and "Look at that bone in your hands!" are intended to diminish Ralph's authority and establish Jack's dominance. By highlighting what he perceives as Ralph's leadership shortcomings, Jack seeks to reconfigure the group dynamic to place Ralph in a subordinate role to himself.

Jack's assertive tone and direct challenges to Ralph's authority are considered rude as they undermine respect for leadership and decorum. By disregarding Ralph's position and asserting his own authority, Jack disrupts the established leadership hierarchy. His invitation for others to join his tribe and criticism of Ralph's leadership style aim to alter group dynamics and turn people against Ralph.

Jack's disrespectful remarks and refusal to acknowledge Ralph's leadership jeopardize the group's established order and norms of behavior. Through his confrontational speech and actions, Jack challenges social conventions and attempts to reshape power relations. This behavior categorizes Jack's actions as rudeness within the context of TR.

5. Results and discussion:

The current findings attempt to address the research questions presented in the introduction of this study:

1. Regarding the appearance of rudeness through the lens of RT, at the first incident of rudeness, Piggy is the target of Jack, Ralph and Simon due to his looks. After then, Ralph (as a selected leader) is the target of rudeness from Jack who, via rude and aggressive behavior, is trying to take his authority. This situation shows the cognitive principle of TR. Jack's upsetting actions and words make the group work harder to understand and react to the changing power and influence dynamics. The boys, gradually, start acting in a way that isn't socially acceptable. Their growing hostility, offensive language and callousness toward one another are all signs of this.
2. According to the study's findings, there are two types of rudeness, among of the total of nine times. The rudeness of action appears (5) times with a percentage of (55.6%), followed by rudeness of word with (4) times with a percentage of (44.4%). Nevertheless, there is no presence of inaction rudeness. This could be attributed to the fact that the protagonists in the novel are youngsters, which poses a challenge for them to convey rudeness indirectly without using words or actions.
3. Due to the fact that rudeness is dependent on the context, it is clear that it possesses numerous characteristics that are difficult to grasp when taken out of context completely.
4. Findings show that rudeness expresses itself in a variety of ways in the data collected. The use of insults, directness, sarcasm, and a mocking tone are common strategies for expressing rudeness, according to a research on language behavior in rude utterances.
5. Remarkably, according to the findings, focused on the conch shell, which stands for power and order, their meanings, gradually, become more different as they become more alone and desperate. This difference of opinion causes people to misunderstand and reinterpret symbols, which leads to offenses and fights between them that result in rude behavior.
6. Further, the boys' actions become more rude as their personal readings of symbols become less connected to common social meanings. This is clear because they don't care about each other's feelings, act aggressively and rudely.

7. The boys employ insulting language and conduct verbal attacks in specific situations, indicating a level of rudeness in their behavior.
8. The boys' understanding of symbols reflects their psychological relationships and cognitive reflections, resulting in alterations in their behavior.
9. The consequences of isolation are clearly represented in the loss of the boys' social behavior, leading to caused rudeness and uncontrolled actions. So, behavioral variability is a result of the boys' individual readings of symbols and standards.
10. The analysis brought to light the influence that rudeness has on the progression of the plot and the characters of the story. The use of TR allowed for the identification of the manner in which rudeness acts as a driving force behind the escalation of conflict and the decline of morality within the story.

6. Conclusion

A TR analysis of rudeness in "Lord of the Flies" by William Golding is conducted in this study. Using this theory, the impact of the characters' interactions and language on the story's themes becomes clear. Subtle messages sent by rude actions and words could be understood with the help of TR . This method helps to shed the light on the story's power structures, social hierarchies and characters' internal conflicts. Finally, TR shows how the cognitive processes involve in figuring out what symbols and rules mean, which are very important in shaping how rude the characters in "Lord of the Flies" become. In the island's isolated setting, the breakdown in shared understanding and the personalization of meanings are two big reasons why social norms are falling apart and bad behavior is on the rise. In general, the novel's characters, such as Jack, use language and actions intentionally to maximize relevance, affect cognitive processing and form group dynamics based on Relevance Theory. Following the ideas of Relevance Theory in communication analysis, every part of Jack's actions in the data contributes to his larger goal of questioning Ralph's authority and establishing his own leadership.

7. References

Beebe, L. M., & Waring, H. Z. (2005). Pragmatic Development n Responding to Rudeness. In J. M. Frodeson & C. A. Holten (Eds.), *The Power of Context in Language Teaching and Learning*. Festschrift in honor of MArianne Celce-Murcia (pp. 67-79). Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle.

Bousfield, D. & Locher, M. (Eds.). (2008). Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978). Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena. In E. N. Goody (Ed.), Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction (pp. 56-289). [Source: Cambridge University Press]

Culpeper, J. (2011). Impoliteness": Using Language to Cause Offence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gutt, E.-A. (2000). Translation and relevance: Cognition and context (2nd ed.). Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Dash, N. S. (2008). Context and Contextual Word Meaning. Indian Statistical Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228339051>

Dohn, N. B., Hansen, S. B., & Klausen, S. H. (2018). On the Concept of Context. Societies, 8(3), Article 62. <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc8030062>

Dubrin, J. A. (2011). Impression Management in the Workplace: Research, Theory, and Practice. New York: Routledge.

Golding, William. (1954) Lord of the Flies. Global Village Contemporary Classics E-Book.

Golding, William.(1964). Lord of the Flies, ed. James R. Baker and Arthur P. Ziegler, Jr. (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1964), 30.

Grice, H.P. (1957). _Meaning_. Philosophical Review 66: 377-88. Reprinted in Steinberg and Jacobovits 1971: 53-9 and Grice 1989: 213-23.

_____ (1967). _Logic and Conversation_. William James lectures: in Cole and Morgan (1975: 41-58) and Davis (1991: 65-76).

_____ (1989) Studies in the Way of Words. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Hassan, A. F. (2014-2016). A Pragmatic Study of the Impact of Congregational Sermons of the Grand Ayatollah AL-Sistani on Iraqi Society. Lark Journal of Philosophy, Linguistics and Social Sciences, 3(38). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31185/lark.Vol3.Iss38.1536>

Jary, M. (1998) 'Relevance Theory and the Communication of Politeness.' Journal of Pragmatics 30, 1-19.

Jassim, I. N. & Ahmad, M., Sh. (2021). Journal of the College of Education for Women. Classism Hate Speech in Katherine Mansfield's Short Story 'The Doll's House': A Pragmatic Study. A Refereed Scientific Quarterly Journal for Human and Social Sciences Issued by the College of Education for Women-University of Baghdad-IRAQ. September 28, 2021 [Vol. 32(3)]P-ISSN: 1680-8738; E-ISSN: 2663-547X

Jones, R., et al. (2018). Psychological Mechanisms Underlying Rude Behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 115(3), 432-448. (Source: American Psychological Association).

Leech, G. (1983). Principles of Pragmatics. New York: Longman Inc.

Mey, J.(2001) . Pragmatics: An Introduction, 2nd ed. MA: Blackwell

Publishing.

Rondina, C.(2005). Rudeness: Deal With It Resource Guide. James Lorimer & Company Ltd., Publishers, Toronto. Chand, Raghubir & Nel, Etienne.2017. Societies, Social Inequalities and Marginalization . Marginal Regions in the 21st Century.p:3

Rouchota, V. and Jucker, A. (eds.). (1998) Current Issues in Relevance Theory. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company

Segarra, C. (2007). How to Become a True Professional. USA: Xulon Press.

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1986). Relevance: Communication and Cognition (1st edition). Oxford: Blackwell.

----- (1995). Relevance: Communication and Cognition, Second Edition. Oxford: Blackwell.

Smith, J., & Christensen, M. (2020). The Impact of Rudeness on Workplace Dynamics. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 41(5), 543-560. (Source: Wiley Online Library)

Zhelvis, I., Vladimir.(2012). Rudeness as a System of Strategies and an Object of Classification. Received 04.12.2012, received in revised form 11.12.2012, accepted 24.12.2012

مجلة لارك للفلسفة واللسانيات والعلوم الاجتماعية