

Impoliteness in Egyptian Political Campaign Discourse: A Pragmatic Analysis of Mousa-Aboufotouh Presidential Debate

May Samir Mahmoud El-Falaky¹

Abstract

This article is intended to analyze verbal impoliteness in the first and only Egyptian televised presidential debate. The objective of this article is to examine how impoliteness strategies are indirectly utilized by the presidential candidates Mousa and Aboufotouh. The analysis pinpoints the intended implications resulting from this linguistic phenomenon. The study is capitalized on Culpeper's Theory of Impoliteness (1996, 2005) as its framework to deduce how impoliteness can intentionally be used to save/threaten the face of competing politicians.

Keywords: impoliteness; face threatening acts; debates; ideologies; political discourse, implicature

1 Introduction

The political status in Egypt after the revolution of 25th of January in 2011 witnessed enormous changes where politicians of different political and ideological backgrounds sought to win the presidency. In 2012, two presidential candidates from two different political backgrounds sat for the first and only presidential debate in the Middle East. Amr Mousa is the former Minister of Foreign affairs at the reign of the ousted regime belonging to the National Democratic Party (NDP). On the other hand, Abdel-Moneim Aboufotouh is the former member of the Brotherhood's Guidance Bureau from 1987 until 2009. Aboufotouh is known for his Islamist ideological beliefs called for by the Muslim Brothers (MBs), a banned activist group in Egypt. This paper is intended to demonstrate how the strategies of impoliteness are employed by two politicians of different political ideologies in order to legitimize the SELF and de-legitimize the OTHER. The purpose of this paper, thus, is to carry out a pragmatic analysis of political campaign discourse as represented in the Egyptian presidential debate between Mousa and Aboufotouh amidst the campaign of presidency in 2012. The Theory of Impoliteness (Culpeper, 1996, 2005) is utilized as a framework in this study.

2 Review of Literature

Verbal interaction is one of the social means of communication that maintains interpersonal relations between the social members. Pragmatics is one of the realms notably concerned with how such interactions develop to achieve the intended social functions. Debates are considered a critical form of political campaign discourse whose linguistic features reveal how such genre achieves its socio-cultural intents within the social and cultural contexts of the Arab countries.

2.1 Debates: A Form of Political Campaign Discourse

Political campaign discourse has a variety of forms, one of which is debates which belong to the genre of campaign discourse having its own linguistic and stylistic structure. In general, debates are characterized by a number of features. In terms of turn taking techniques, televised debates are characterized by having at least one moderator who controls the topics, order, size and the length of each turn.

¹ Arab Academy for Science & Technology and Maritime Transport, College of Language and Communication

Televised debates are critical means of communication allowing candidates to create and develop their images to the audience to attract their votes, and in some cases alter prevailing negative opinions (Benoit and Pier, 2002; Benoit and Henson, 2007). In Arab countries, however, political debates are not common, and this makes the analysis of the current corpus worth of study. Historically, the ruling periods of Arab presidents end only by the death of a president and the succession of another parliament-nominated candidate. After the Revolution of the 25th of January in 2011, the Egyptians called for the step down of Mubarak's regime and the election of a new democratic president. In year 2012, the first presidential election was called for, and a sum of 12 politicians nominated themselves for presidency. This debate was planned to be one of a successive series of debates, but the political situation in Egypt at that time was not as stable as it should be to continue such campaign. Mousa-Aboufotouh was the first and only presidential debate in the Arab countries.

2.2 The Theory of Impoliteness

In terms of the politeness theory, speakers and hearers have a 'face' or public self-image (Brown and Levinson (1987). Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs) occur when a speaker opts for attacking or distorting the self-image of the OTHER. Culpeper (1996), on the other hand, proposed the Theory of Impoliteness which may appear to be the converse of politeness, but it is not (Harris, 2001). The concept of impoliteness is more a socio-cultural phenomenon than a linguistic repertoire adopted by language users to threaten the face of the hearer. Much research investigates (im)politeness, although it is a young academic field (Culpeper, Haugh, and , Kádár, 2017). Since the 1970s and the proliferation of the Theory of Politeness, researchers seek to review how participants tend to maintain social relations to achieve social goals. By defining the Theory of Impoliteness, Culpeper (1996) opens the gate for describing the process from different aspects. The study is based on five main 'impoliteness super-strategies' as defined by Culpeper (1996, 2005):

- Bald on record impoliteness** FTAs are performed in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way(p.265)
- Positive impoliteness**
1. The use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants
 2. Positive impoliteness output strategies:
 3. Ignore, snub the other - fail to acknowledge the other's presence.
 4. Exclude the other from an activity
 5. Disassociate from the other and deny association or common ground with the other.
 6. Be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic
 7. Use inappropriate identity markers
 8. Use obscure or secretive language
 9. Seek disagreement - select a sensitive topic.
 10. Make the other feel uncomfortable.
 11. Use taboo words
 12. Call the other names - use derogatory nominations.
- Negative impoliteness**
1. The use of strategies designed to damage the addressee's negative face wants
 2. Frighten - instill a belief that action detrimental to the other will occur.
 3. Condescend, scorn or ridicule - emphasize your relative power.
 4. Do not treat the other seriously.
 5. Invade the other's space
 6. Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect
 7. Put the other's indebtedness on record
- Sarcasm or mock politeness.** The FTA is performed with use of politeness strategies that are obviously insincere, and thus remain surface realizations.
- Withhold politeness.** The absence of politeness work where it would be expected.

Going further in impoliteness, Culpeper (2010) discusses the conventions regulating language forms of impoliteness and their contexts. According to Culpeper, “A Conventionalised impoliteness formula is a form of language in which context-specific impoliteness effects are conventionalised” (2010, p. 3243). In this sense, Culpeper explores how impoliteness rules are applicable to various 'in-group' and 'out-group' contexts. Culpeper (2010, p.3245) summarizes the conventionalized impoliteness formulae as follows:

Insults

Personalized negative vocatives [e.g. You rotten moron];

Personalized negative assertions [e.g. you are such a stupid];

Personalized negative references [e.g. Your stinking corpse];

Personalized third-person negative references [She's nutz]

Pointed criticisms/complaints [e.g. that is absolutely bad]

Challenging or unpalatable questions and/or presuppositions [e.g. why do you make my life impossible?]

Condescensions - [that] [’s/is being] [babyish]

Message enforcers [e.g. listen here]

Dismissals [e.g. go away]

Silencers [e.g. shut your stinking mouth]

Threats [e.g. I’ll smash your face]

Negative expressive [e.g. curses, ill-wishes]

In Culpeper’s view, studying conventionalized impoliteness begins with collecting specific utterances that can be judged as impolite in terms of their co-text, retrospective comments and other non-verbal reactions.

2.3 Impoliteness: a Socio-cultural Phenomenon

Both the Theory of Politeness (Brown and Levinson, 1978, 1987) and the Theory of Impoliteness (Culpeper, 1996, 2005) are developed to examine the nature of social 'face' and its role in construing how social meanings are communicated (Goldsmith, 2008; Mills 2009; Blum-Kulka and Hamo, 2011). Despite the cultural empirical difference, the concept of 'face' is regarded as universal and can be applied on various genres of discourse. Similarly, the study of politeness and impoliteness is integrating with social macro-categories such as class, race and gender divisions (Kotthoff, 2011) where all help in examining social values and evaluations (Kristiansen, 2011) as well as speakers’ overt and covert social goals (Sorlin, 2017).

Other studies are dedicated to examining the nature of impoliteness from the emotional argumentative point of view. For instance, Kienpointner (2018) ascribes impoliteness to negative emotional arguments as what is called ‘destructive arguments’. According to Kienpointner, there is a close relation between impoliteness and the understanding of the propositions in the utterances. “Impoliteness/Rudeness is a kind of prototypically non-cooperative or competitive communicative behavior... which is partially determined by concepts of power, distance, emotional attitudes and cost-benefit scales which are generally accepted in a speech community” (Kienpointner, 2018, p.245).

In the same sense, abusive *ad hominem* attack is critically important in variant types of political discourse because mental abilities and deficiencies are crucial issues for politicians (Bazerman, 1997; Jasinski, 2001; Kienpointner, 2008). Kienpointner (2008) examines impoliteness variants resulting from ‘ad hominem’ or personal attacks amongst political competing candidates. Kienpointner (2008, p.248) discusses emotional impoliteness especially ‘argumentum ad hominem’ listing the sub-type strategies as follows:

1. Direct personal attacks questioning the physical and mental abilities of the attacked person, often combined with insults and swearwords (“abusive *ad hominem*”);
2. Accusations of being inherently and permanently biased (“poisoning the well”);
3. Reproaches concerning the membership within a social group, which, according to the speaker, has negative properties (“guilt by association”).

Critically, impoliteness is a cultural rather than an individual phenomenon (Mills, 2009). According to Mills (2009), examining politeness on the individual level will result in drawing false stereotypical knowledge about cultures.

Mills argues, "...judgments about impoliteness at a social level tend to be ideological rather than analytical and draw on models of individual interaction"(2009, p.1049).

Seeking to answer the question of the object of the Theory of (Im)politeness, Terkourafi (2011) researched a set of discourses from different cultures. She deduced an inevitable movement from first to second-order (im)politeness. In this sense, *(im)politeness 1* is associated with a limited account of forms or behaviors while *(im)politeness 2* (or theory of im/politeness) is regarded as motivation for indirectness and has thus been constituting additional social meaning (Terkourafi, 2011). Mills (2005) attributed the use of impoliteness to the intention and the motivation of the speaker and is thus related specifically to Mill's claim as 'Communities of Practice'.

2.4 Impoliteness in mediated discourse

(Im)politeness research has proliferated to various fields of communication (Culpeper, Haugh, and Kádár, 2017). "(Im)politeness is now a thoroughly multidisciplinary affair. It spreads from its original home in pragmatics and interactional sociolinguistics into management, health research, legal research, politics, humor studies and many other fields" (Culpeper, Haugh, and Kádár, 2017p. 6).

Along this vein, a growing body of research exists on the presidential campaigns based on the theories of pragmatic function (Limberg, 2009; Lorenzo-Dus, 2009). Lorenzo-Dus (2009) explores impoliteness in broadcast talk examining the linguistic behavior of the recipients with the studio to expound power relations within the corpus of a televised talk show. Lorenzo-Dus pinpoints the importance of the "local and cultural norms in ascribing impoliteness to certain communicative behavior" (p.159). This means that impoliteness is contextual in nature. That is, in order to evaluate a certain linguistic behavior as 'impolite', one has to construe the context in which 'impoliteness' is practiced. Such context-specific situations are also affected by "the view of members of particular communities of practice and/or speech communities" (Kienpointner and Stopfner, 2017, p.69). Kienpointner and Stopfner (2017) add that impoliteness is construed by understanding the nature of subgroups and their context of culture. They analyzed ideological aspects of impoliteness in their case study about a TV debate before the election of the Austrian Parliament in 2006. Kienpointner and Stopfner (2017) pinpoint attacks and counter-attacks cause 'face-damage' to the political participants before the elections.

3 Methodology

The debate was recorded and transcribed in its entirety. The transcript, totaling over 18,845 words, was quantitatively and qualitatively evaluated according to impoliteness strategies within the framework of the Impoliteness Theory (Culpeper, 1996, 2005).

The whole debate is manually coded and the utterances of presidential candidates, excluding the mediators, are coded in terms of the strategies adopted by the speaker. The utterance unit of measurement is the sentence in the debate that comprises 492 sentences (40 turns for each candidate). In order to explore the efficacy of the Theory of Impoliteness on political campaign discourse, I have marked the sentences in terms of the frequency of impoliteness sub-strategies. The objective is to compare quantitatively the rhetorical trend in this one and only Arab presidential debate. To achieve its intents, the study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. What impoliteness strategies are employed by Mousa and Aboufotouh?
2. What are the socio-cultural implications resulting from the employment of the impoliteness strategies?

4 Analysis & Discussion

Out of the five super-strategies, only three are employed by the presidential candidates. The reason why not all the strategies are totally used is ascribed to the formality nature of such genre of discourse. Presidential candidates attempt to avoid risking their own self-image; however, by discussing some themes, they breached the linguistic norms of presidential debates. In fact, this one and only debate caused the presidential candidates to lose the presidency race and gaining negative feedback from the viewers.

IMPOLITENESS SUPER STRATEGIES	Aboufotouh	Mousa
Sarcasm or Mock Politeness	13	27
Positive Impoliteness	22	18
Negative Impoliteness	23	21

Table 1- Frequency of Impoliteness Super Strategies

Table (1) shows approximate assimilation of the utilization of the positive and negative super-strategies. The table above shows how some impoliteness strategies are employed by the two presidential candidates. A closer look at the distribution of the strategies shows how Aboufotouh threatens the 'face' of Mousa more than Mousa did to him. The different political stances between the two candidates drive them to use impoliteness. They intentionally tend to threaten the positive and negative face of each other. Mock politeness can be seen when the participants use the *first name + surname* as a distancing strategy following the negative politeness strategies for sarcastic purposes. Both are utilizing the formality nature of debates to ridicule each other. Table (2) shows that both candidates utilize positive impoliteness sub-strategies. This linguistic repertoire shows how they are not concerned about attacking and undermining the opponent's self-image in front of the Egyptian voters. Although both candidates did not use swear words, policy and character attacks are clear through stating simple facts about each other reflecting their abilities in governing the country if they won the presidency. Their commentaries and remarks reflect impoliteness and triggers offensive implicature. The following table shows the distribution of positive impoliteness strategies.

POSITIVE STRATEGIES	IMPOLITENESS OUTPUT	SUB-	Aboufotouh	Mousa
Deny common ground with h			7	3
Make h feel uncomfortable			7	2
Use inappropriate identity markers			4	6
Seek disagreement			2	4
Exclude h from activity			2	3

Table 2-Frequency of Positive Impoliteness Sub-strategies

Table (2) shows that Aboufotouh is more aggressive in attacking Mousa by employing the two strategies, namely, 'Deny common ground with h' and 'Make h feel uncomfortable'. As a defending mechanism, Mousa uses 'inappropriate identity markers' to threaten the face wants of Aboufotouh.

Denying common ground with Mousa, Aboufotouh seeks to disassociate himself from Mousa and his political beliefs. In this vein, indirect acclaims such as the following are stated by Aboufotouh to Mousa and vice versa.

Example 1

أبو الفتوح: انني لا انتمي لمنظومة الفساد من مبارك و عصابته هم الذين أقصدهم حمدوا و حموا هذا النظام بشكل مباشر أو غير مباشر و لا أتسامح في حقوق الشعب المصري أبدا

Aboufotouh: I do not belong to the corruption regime of Mubarak and his gangster. They are the ones I mean. They praised and protected this regime directly or indirectly and I never forgive when it comes to the rights of the Egyptian people.

In example (1), Aboufotouh threatens Mousa's positive face when he denies common ground with Mousa. In this example, Aboufotouh expresses his renunciation and disapproval of Mubarak's regime which Mousa has been part of for years. Another overlapping strategy is the strategy of 'calling H names'. Here, Aboufotouh says that those who support Mubarak are his *'gangster' عصابته*. This is an obvious breaching of the linguistic norm of such formal debates where the two participating parties should be using a formal and polite language rather than calling each other names as in the example (1). In the utterance *'I never forgive when it comes to the rights of the Egyptian people' لا أتسامح في حقوق الشعب المصري أبدا*, Aboufotouh tries to show his support to the revolutionists' calls and needs. He expresses his empathy to the protestors' requirements and at the same time seeks their approval to him being the coming president. Mousa also employed the same strategy but not with the same frequency.

Example 2

موسى: الشعب لم يقبل التشكيل الذي فرض على اللجنة و كاد يفرض على المصريين لماذا لأن الشعب يعلم أن الدستور حقه و مش حق فئة واحدة
Mousa: The people did not accept the structure imposed on the [constitution] committee and almost imposed on the Egyptians. Why is that? Because the people know that the constitution is considered their own right and not the right of a sole group

In the example above, Mousa threatens Aboufotouh's positive face by using the 'deny common ground' strategy.

This strategy helps Mousa to express his implicit disapproval of Aboufotouh's policy without needing to say it bluntly. Mousa is acclaiming the Egyptian's rights to have their own constitution and he is indirectly announcing his supports to this right and denying that this is not the MBs goal. Aboufotouh, on the other hand, has opted to make Mousa feel uncomfortable by referring to the ousted regime without direct reference to his opponent, Mousa. Examples (3) and (4) illustrate how insinuations cause uncomfortable feeling to the presidential candidates.

Example 3

أبو الفتوح: هذه الثورة من أجل إسقاط نظام تميز بالاستبداد و الفساد على مدار 30 سنة بكل رموزه الذين شاركوا في الفساد و سكتوا عن الفساد.
Aboufotouh: This revolution aims at overthrowing a regime that is characterized by tyranny and corruption for 30 years including all its representatives who participated in and had been silenced over this corruption.

The utterance shows his disapproval of Mubarak's regime and his members in an indirect reference to Mousa. For this, certain pragmatic references to the previous regime are made such as ousting *a regime, sovereignty* and *corruption*. Similarly references to its members are made using attributes such as *representatives, participated in the corruption, ignored such corruption*. Without explicitly stating it, the utterance above is directed to Mousa and is intended to make him feel uncomfortable hearing this said.

Example 4

موسى: أحداث العباسية كانت خطيرة و مع الاسف استغلت من جانب البعض لمسائل انتخابية

Mousa: Al-Abasseyia incidences were critical and unfortunately were exploited for electoral purposes.

At the time when this statement was said, Egypt was going through a chaotic and critical situation in Al Abbaseya, a famous square in Cairo. The above statement is Mousa's commentary on the massacre that happened when masked gunmen killed many of those who were demonstrating in front of the Ministry of Defense. The above statement attempts to make Aboufotouh uncomfortable by delegitimizing certain groups or parties that politically exploited the Abbaseya events for their own political interests. In this sense, Mousa insinuates that Aboufotouh and MBs are using this incident to serve his political position.

Intending to intensify the face threatening acts to each other, Mousa and Aboufotouh point more explicitly to their condemned inappropriate identity markers. Seeking to threaten the positive face of Aboufotouh (Example 4), Mousa frequently asserts the identity of Aboufotouh as being a member of the MBs which is known to have violent activities towards the Egyptian people. The same strategy is adopted by Aboufotouh (Example 5) who emphasized the fact that Mousa is an integral member of the ousted regime against which the Egyptians revolted.

Example 5

موسى: أنت كنت جزء من المعارضة الإخوانية ... أنت كنت معارض سياسي في إطار الإخوان المسلمين و ليس في الضرر الذي حصل للوطن و ليس الإطار الوطني. أنت كنت عضو في جماعة الإخوان المسلمين و مسئول و نائب المرشد العام

Mousa: You were part of the Brotherhood opposition... You were a political member within the framework of the Muslim Brotherhood and not part of the damage that happened to the homeland and not the national frame. You were a member of the Muslim Brotherhood and the Deputy General Guidance of Muslim Brother Bureau.

In example (5), Mousa refers to the political stance of Aboufotouh which is, according to some Egyptian voters, an 'inappropriate identity marker'. Being a member of the MBs and the Deputy General Guidance of Muslim Brother Bureau is a direct accusation to Aboufotouh who is assimilated to what his in-group did in the past. Thus, Aboufotouh is accused of suppressing the Egyptians that way. In this sense, Mousa is threatening the Egyptian people of giving Aboufotouh their votes.

Example 6

أبو الفتوح: هل يتصور الاستاذ عمرو موسى و انه كان وزيرا في النظام السابق الذي ثار عليه الشعب المصري بعد 30 سنة ان النظام الذي صنع المشكلة ممكن يأتي برموزه أو رجل من رجاله؟

Aboufotouh: Does Amr Moussa imagine that being a minister in the previous regime, which the Egyptian people revolted against after 30 years, that regime, that caused the problem, can it recall its representatives or his men?

In the above example, Aboufotouh asks an 'on record' impolite question irritating Mousa and threatening the Egyptians of choosing Mousa as a president after demonstrating against the government which Mousa had been part of. This utterance shows Aboufotouh's reference to Mousa's inappropriate political stance and identity.

This positive impoliteness strategy is shown in Aboufotouh's references to Mousa who was a minister in the previous regime to which the Egyptian people revolted against after 30 years - كان وزيراً في النظام السابق الذي ثار عليه الشعب - 'الذي صنع المشكلة' and 'المصري بعد 30 سنة' which led to the political unrests at the time of the 25th of January Revolution. Both statements express Aboufotouh's usage of inappropriate identity markers by associating Mousa with Mubarak's regime. This is an attempt of gaining the people's disapproval of Mousa to be their president by reminding them which political position he stands for.

From another perspective, Mousa seeks to challenge the topics raised by Aboufotouh and refute them. As seen in Table (2), seeking disagreement with the hearer is an impoliteness strategy used more by Mousa than Aboufotouh. Conversely, Aboufotouh seeks to open new topics rather than focusing and rebutting Mousa's arguments.

Example 7

موسى : إن الدكتور عبد المنعم قد تكلم عن الضرائب و أدخل الدعم فيه و هذا مختلف لأن الدعم موضوع اجتماعي بمصر

Mousa: Dr. Abdel Moneim talked about taxes and subsidy, and this is different because subsidy is a social issue in Egypt.

In this example Mousa contradicts Aboufotouh's arguments about taxes and subsidy. According to Mousa, Aboufotouh is interfering erroneous things and is not clear about what he is saying. Thus, Mousa is proclaiming his disagreement offering his own definition of the issue. The same strategy is adopted by Aboufotouh, though with minimum frequency. Aboufotouh is observed to announce his disagreement through other statements such as هو 'The expression said by Mr. Amr Mousa is imprecise and incorrect'.

The following examples show how both candidates seek to ascribe themselves with features and exclude the other from such attributes. Using such strategy, presidential candidates, as individuals, seek stereotyping scheming of the unfair OTHER.

Example 8

أبو الفتوح: ونحن نبدأ دولة جمهورية ديمقراطية وحرية فأماننا وقت حتى تقوم الأحزاب وتقوى وتصيح عندها قدرة على تداول السلطة . وبالتالي سينتهي في الدستور الجديد إن شاء الله وأنا أرى ذلك بوجه عام موجود بين الأحزاب الكبيرة مثل حزب الحرية والعدالة وحزب النور وحزب الوفد وبين عدد من الشخصيات العامة.

Aboufotouh: We are starting a democratic and free republic, so we have the time for parties to get strengthened and become capable of exchanging power. Thus, the new constitution will be done, God willing, and I see that in general exists among the large parties such as the Party of Liberty and Justice and the Party of Al Nour and the Wafd Party and a number of public figures.

In this example, Aboufotouh uses a positive impoliteness strategy to threaten Mousa's positive face. Here, Aboufotouh positively describes three Egyptian political parties, namely Liberty and Justice and Al-Nour, as two Islamist parties and Alwafd as an opposition party. In this description, Aboufotouh uses the adjective 'كبيرة' to shed light on those parties in particular as being the most influential in the country. This gives an implicit reference to how Aboufotouh tries to snub Mousa's political identity.

Example 9

موسى: شغلت مناصب كثيرة واستطعت القيام بها على أعلى درجة من الاهتمام والاخلاص والايمان والأمانة ومصر الآن في أزمة وجودية ضرورية أنه يقودها رجل دولة فاهم العالم ماشى إزاي المنطقة ماشية إزاي الظروف الدولية تساعد ولا متساعدشى ومتى نلجأ ولما نلجأ ومتى نتصرف ومتى يكون تصرفنا بحذر هذه أمور لها موازين والموازن تقوم على تجارب وعلى خبرة البلد فى وضع غير طبيعى البلد فى وضع خلل البلد مهدد بالانقسام .

Mousa: I held many positions and I have been able to do this is the highest degree of care, loyalty, faith, honesty. Egypt now faces an existential crisis and it is necessary that it should be led by a statesman who understands how the world is going on, how the region is going on, and how the international conditions could or could not help it; and when and to whom we shall resort to and when to act and when to act discretely. All these things should be balanced and should be based on experiences as well as the country's knowledge about an abnormal situation that threatens the country of detachment.

In this example, Mousa excludes Aboufotouh from his statement as a technique to damage his positive face wants. In this example, Mousa attempts to enlist some of the significant roles he played in the Egyptian policies. Mousa, in this utterance, emphasizes how sincere he was in serving the country. The whole utterance excludes Aboufotouh from those accomplishments. Referring to himself, Mousa highlights the Egyptians' need of a leader who has similar enormous political capabilities. This is how Mousa tends to exclude Aboufotouh from being able to be the coming

president for he has never took part in any governmental services before. Mousa here is seen to be propagating himself by using the positive impoliteness strategy of excluding Aboulfotouh.

Such mixture of positive impoliteness strategies is aggravated by the use of negative impoliteness strategies such as condensed scorn or ridicule. As seen in Table 1, the frequency of the negative politeness strategies is close to the frequency of the positive sub-strategies. However, the only used output sub-strategies are scorning and associating the hearer with negative aspects. The reason for the unemployment of the other strategies may be ascribed to the fear of appearing with a vulgar behavior that is not typical of a presidential nominee.

NEGATIVE IMPOLITENESS OUTPUT SUB- STRATEGIES	Aboulfotouh	Mousa
Scorn or ridicule	9	12
Associate h with a negative aspect	14	9

Table 3-Frequency of Negative Impoliteness Sub-strategies

Table (3) shows discrepancy in the use of the negative impoliteness sub-strategies between the two candidates. Mousa scorned and ridiculed Aboulfotouh more frequently than the other way round. On the other hand, Aboulfotouh associated Mousa with negative aspects more than Mousa did. The association of Mousa with negative aspects irritated him and caused him to scorn his arguments and political stance. The mostly used strategies in the whole impoliteness framework are those of scorning the other and associating the other with negative aspects. The use of these negative face-attacking strategies indicates that both candidates sought to distort each other's image in front of the Egyptian voters. Apparently, both have interchangeably used the strategies aggressively.

Example 10

موسى: السيد عمرو موسى فى عام 2010 أعلن تأييده لترشيح الرئيس حسنى مبارك فهل كان لسه يريد لمصر أن تستمر فى حالة التردى التى تسبب فيها حسنى مبارك لمدة 30 سنة فترة أخرى حين كان يقول منذ قليل انه يريد أن يسقط هذا النظام؟

Aboulfotouh: Mr. Amr Moussa in 2010 announced his support for the nomination of President Hosni Mubarak. Did he want Egypt to continue in that state of deterioration which is caused by Hosni Mubarak for another 30 years when he was saying that he wants to overthrow this regime?

In example (10), Aboulfotouh scorns and ridicules Mousa by referring to his support of Mubarak's nomination for presidency in 2010, while he has said earlier in the debate that he was with the ousting that regime. Using this ironic utterance, Aboulfotouh shows the Egyptian electorates how insincere Mousa is. It is one of many other instances when Aboulfotouh resorts to the 'badOTHER' versus the 'goodSELF' representation.

Example 11

موسى: أنا أدري أن الدكتور عبد المنعم قال نعم للتعديلات الدستورية فى مارس الماضى وهو قال كده وبالتالي أنا مش فاهم متى التحق بالثورة إذا كان بداية الموقف كان نعم للتعديلات الدستورية رغم أننا جميعا الثورة والثوار والناس الذين يفهمون بعنى إيه ثورة صوتنا ضد هذا التعديل إنما أنت هل أسهمت إسهاما واضحا فى إنشاء الجماعة الإسلامية المدانة بقتل ألف من المصريين منهم أقباط وسيدات وأطفال وغيرهم

Mousa: I know that Dr. Abdel Moneim said yes to the constitutional amendments in March last year, and he said so. So I do not understand when did he join the revolution if at the beginning of the situation he approved the constitutional amendments, even though we, as revolutionists and the whole people, who understand what is the revolution is, voted against these amendments. You made clear contributions to the establishment of that Islamic Group which is convicted of the murder of thousands of Egyptians, including Copts, women, children and others.

In this example, Mousa defends himself by scorning and ridiculing Aboulfotouh. He uses this negative impoliteness strategy to threaten Aboulfotouh's negative face in an attempt to increase antagonistic feelings from Aboulfotouh's opponents. Mousa scornfully highlights Aboulfotouh's false claims about joining the 25th of January Revolution and about modifying the Egyptian constitution which he now opposes. Furthermore, Mousa ridicules Aboulfotouh by ironically expressing his surprise about how Aboulfotouh describes his SELF in a positive way. The following two examples intensify the threats to the negative face of the presidential candidates. Using the output strategy of 'associating h with negative aspects', the candidates seek to attack the policies of each other highlighting the failure in ruling Egypt as presidents.

Example 12

أبو الفتوح: في هذا وقت كان فيه السيد عمرو موسى وزيرا للخارجية تدهورت علاقات مصر الأفريقية وانكمش دورها العربي وانهارت علاقتها بكثير من دول العالم الاسلامي وتم العدوان على العراق وعلى غزة ودخل الأمريكان إلى العراق كل هذا وتم في حالة صمت للنظام السابق الذي كان السيد عمرو موسى وزيرا فيه رغم أنه يحاول ظهور نفسه كأنه معارض سياسي

Aboufotouh: *At that time Mr. Amr Moussa was a foreign minister and the Egyptian relations with Africa had deteriorated and its Arab role collapsed and its relationship with many countries of the Islamic world had collapsed. The aggression against Iraq and Gaza was committed and the Americans entered Iraq. All this was done in a state of regime silence. Despite that, he is trying to appear as a political opposition.*

In example (12) Aboufotouh threatens Mousa's negative face wants. Through his utterance, Aboufotouh associates Mousa with the negative aspect of being the worst minister of foreign affairs. Using verbs such as 'انهارت' *'collapsed'* and lexicalization such as 'العدوان' *'aggression'* and صمت *'silence'*, Aboufotouh list negative incidents through the administration period of Mousa. It is worth mentioning that these strategies are adopted by Aboufotouh all through the debate.

Example 13

موسى: اشرح يادكتور عبد المنعم لماذا صوت بنعم ويشرح لنا أيضا دوره في الجماعة الاسلامية الذي هو ألفها وكيف تعيش مع هذه الدم .
Moses: *Explain to us, Dr. Abdolmoneam, why did you vote with 'yes' and shall he also explain to us his role in the Islamic Group, which he has witnessed and how he lived with this bloodshed*

Mousa in the above example uses a negative impoliteness strategy of associating Aboufotouh with the negative aspect of being behind the bloodshed that occurred at the time where the MBs exercised its violent activities in the 1980s. Mousa implicitly accuses Aboufotouh of being a member of a party that does not want Egyptian's safety and prosperity, but rather their destruction and instability. In addition, Mousa ends his statement by imposing a question to Aboufotouh asking him how he puts up with all the blood he and his party has been the cause of. In that sense, he ends his statement with an accusation in the form of a question. Mousa also used a distancing technique by shifting from the first person pronominal use to the third person so as ignore his existence and the face-to-face intimate nature of interaction. Using this linguistic style helps in increasing the intense of attack to the face wants of the hearer.

5 Conclusion

In the light of the results in this paper, one could argue that impoliteness exists in the discourse of political campaign. Seeking power, impoliteness is employed for gaining power over the rival rather than venting negative feelings against him. Using impoliteness is intended to distort the self-image of the opponent on his policies rather than his character. A political debate is seen as an intentional confrontational context where the face of the participants can easily be threatened. The use of discrete linguistic tools is the norm to save the face of the Other and expecting the same to the Self. However, by analyzing the current debate aggressive face threatening acts do exist and antagonistic atmosphere can be created and called for. The study finds out three socio-cultural implications inferred from using impoliteness in political debates in Arab countries:

- (a) In political debates, candidates have concerns about not only their personal face but also their social group's face as well.
- (b) Factual information can damage the hearers face despite their truthfulness.
- (c) Rudeness and insults are not the only means of being impolite. Face threatening acts can be accompanied by politeness strategies.

The analysis of such genre of political discourse can portray a scheme according to which we can construe how presidential debates proceed in non-western countries. Mousa-Aboufotouh Egyptian presidential debate is critically one of a kind.

References

- Baxter, L. A. & Braithwaite, D. O. (Eds.) (2008). *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781483329529.
- Bazerman, C., Gray, W., Hofstadter, D., Miller, H., Myers, G., & Crick, F. (1997). Language, persuasion, and argument. In J. H. Collier (Ed.), *Scientific and technical communication: Theory, practice, and policy* (pp. 145-174). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781483327815.n5.

- Blum-Kulka, S. & Hamo, M. (2011). Discourse Pragmatics. In T.A. Van Dijk (Ed.) *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction* (pp.143-164). London: SAGE Publications Ltd. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446289014.68.n8>.
- Brown, P. & S. Levinson. (1987) *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, L. (2016). *Tactics of Interruption: Provoking Participation in Performance art* (Order No. 10303351). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1857847578). Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1857847578?accountid=178282>
- Carroll, C. (Ed.) (2016). *The SAGE encyclopedia of corporate reputation* (Vols. 1-2). Thousand Oaks,, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781483376493.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of Impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25, 349–67. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166%2895%2900014-3>.
- Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and Entertainment in the Television Quiz Show: “The Weakest Link”. *Journal of Politeness Research* (1), 35-72.
- Culpeper, J. (2010). Conventionalised Impoliteness Formulae. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 42, 3232-3245. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.1986.tb00087.x
- Culpeper, J., Haugh, M., Kádár, D. (2017). Introduction. In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh, and D. Kádár (Eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness* (pp. 1-8). London: Palgrave Publications.
- Ergül, H. (2014). Politeness. In S. Attardo (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of humor studies* (pp. 584-585). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781483346175.n258.
- Goldsmith, D. (2008). Politeness Theory: How We Use Language to Save Face. In L. A. Baxter & D. O. Braithwaite (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 255-268). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781483329529.n19.
- Harris, S. (2001). Being Politically Impolite: Extending Politeness Theory To Adversarial Political Discourse. *Discourse & Society*, 12(4), 451-472.
- Harvey, K. (2014). Egypt. In *Encyclopedia of Social Media And Politics* (pp. 440-443). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781452244723.n176.
- Jasinski, J. (2001). Fallacy. In *Rhetoric & Society: Sourcebook on rhetoric: Key concepts in contemporary rhetorical studies* (pp. 241-245). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781452233222.n55.
- Kecskes, I. (2015). Pragmatics. In J. Bennett (Ed.), *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Intercultural Competence* (pp. 689-690). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781483346267.n226.
- Kienpointner, M. (2008). Impoliteness and Emotional Arguments. *Journal of Politeness Research*, (4), 243-265. DOI 10.1515/JPLR.2008.012.
- Kienpointner, M & Stopfner, M. (2017). Ideology and (Im)politeness. In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh, and D. Kádár (Eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness* (pp.61-88). London: Palgrave Publications.
- Kotthoff, H. (2011). Sociolinguistic Potentials of Face-To-Face Interaction. In R. Wodak, B. Johnstone & P. Kerswill *The SAGE Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (pp. 315-329). London: SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781446200957.n23.
- Kristiansen, T. (2011). Attitudes, Ideology and Awareness. In R. Wodak, B. Johnstone & P. Kerswill (Eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Sociolinguistics* (Pp. 265-278). London: SAGE Publications Ltd. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446200957.n20>.
- Limberg, H. (2009). Impoliteness and Threat Responses. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 41, 1376–1394. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.02.003>.
- Lorenzo-dus, N. (2009). “You’re barking mad, I’m out”: Impoliteness and Broadcast Talk. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 5, 159-187, DOI 10.1515/JPLR.2009.010.
- Mills, S. (2005). Gender and Impoliteness. *Journal of Politeness Research*. 1, 263-280. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.2.263>
- Mills, S. (2009). Impoliteness in a Cultural Context. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 41, 1047–1060.
- Samoilenko, S. (2016). Ad Hominem Argument. In C. Carroll (Ed.), *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Corporate Reputation* (pp. 17-19). Thousand Oaks,, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781483376493.n12.
- Samoilenko, S. (2016). Character Assassination. In C. Carroll (Ed.), *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Corporate Reputation* (pp. 116-118). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9781483376493.n52.
- Seta, G. (2018). Trolling, and Other Problematic Social Media Practices. In J. Burgess, A. Marwick & T. Poell *The sage Handbook of Social Media* (pp. 390-411). London: SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781473984066.n22.

- Siddiqui, F.R. (2017). *Political Islam and the Arab Uprising: Islamist Politics in Changing Times*. London: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: 10.4135/9789353280048.n4
- Sorlin, S. (2017). The Pragmatics of Manipulation: Exploiting Im/politeness Theories. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 121, 132-146. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2017.10.002.
- Terkourafi, M. (2011). From Politeness1 to Politeness2: Tracking norms of im/politeness across time and space. *Journal of Politeness Research*. 7, 159-185. DOI:10.1515/JPLR.2011.009.
- Thulfiqar, H. M. (2016). *The Conflict For Power In The Iraqi Political Discourse Across Mainstream Media And Social Media: (De)Legitimization, Rapport, Sociopolitical Identities And Impoliteness* (Order No. 10293462). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (1837040130). Retrieved from <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1837040130?accountid=178282>.
- Tracy , K. (2017). Facework and (Im)politeness in Political Exchanges. In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh, and D. Kádár (Eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness* (pp.739-758). London: Palgrave Publications.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2000). Values. In *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach* (pp. 74-77). London: SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781446217856.n6.
- Vogel C. (2015) Some Puzzles of Politeness and Impoliteness within a Formal Semantics of Offensive Language. In D'Errico F., Poggi I., Vinciarelli A., Vincze L. (Eds.) *Conflict and Multimodal Communication. Computational Social Sciences*. Springer, Cham pp 223-241.
- Vogel, C. (2014). Denoting Offence. *Journal Cognitive Computation*, 6 (4), 628-639. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12559-014-9289-5>.
- Walton, N. (1998). *Ad Hominem Arguments*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Wodak, R., Johnstone, B. & Kerswill, P. (2011). *The SAGE Handbook of Sociolinguistics* London: SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781446200957.
- Zunes, S. (2014). Friendly Tyrants? The Arab Spring and the Egyptian Revolution. In R. G. Carter *Contemporary Cases in U.S. Foreign Policy: From Terrorism to Trade* (pp. 222-248). Washington: CQ Press doi: 10.4135/9781506335315.n9.