

*A Socio-Pragmatic Analysis of Impoliteness in
Iraqi Arabic Facebook Comments*

*Eba' M. Yahya Al-Rassam**

*Riyadh Ameen Hussein ***

تأريخ القبول: 2019/10/15

تأريخ التقديم: 2019/9/15

Abstract

This study aims at investigating Culpeper's (1996, 2005) impoliteness strategies by analyzing 300 Iraqi Arabic facebook comments (of which 150 comments are employed by males and 150 by females). These comments are collected from Iraqi formal facebook pages. It selects ten Arabic topics that come under the categories of entertainment, fashion, lifestyle, health, food, political state and social matters. For the purpose of this study, impolite comments are chosen from online communication. Our analysis demonstrates that all strategies of impoliteness are applicable in computer mediated communication except the one which is called "withhold politeness" that can be occurred only in face to face contact, not in written communication.

Moreover, the present study reveals a new strategy called "defamation" which is not part of Culpeper's strategies, but it occurs under the umbrella of impoliteness. Finally, it was investigated that the most used strategy among Culpeper's strategies is "positive impoliteness" which is used by male participants more than females. On the other hand, the less used strategy was "bald on record" and this is also used by men more than women.

Keywords: Facebook, lifestyle, communication.

1. Introduction

Kadar (2017: 7), provides a general definition for politeness by saying that "politeness is a key means by which humans work out

*Asst. Prof. / Dept. of English/ College of Arts / University of Mosul .

** M.A. Student / Dept. of English/ College of Arts / University of Mosul .

and maintain interpersonal relations". His definition comes from the assumption that people, during childhood, have been learned how to behave in a good manner with the society members.

Closely tied to politeness is the concept of impoliteness by which fresh blood has been brought into academia in pragmatics. Similarly, the phenomenon of impoliteness is not an easy term to define. A simple definition of impoliteness would be: "a face threatening act in a specific context" (Bousfield & Locher, 2008). The early 2000s witnessed an emergence in the understanding of conflictive interaction. One of the most essential papers in the field of impoliteness is Culpeper's (1996) seminal article that was inspired by Brown and Levinson's (1987) work on politeness. Culpeper (1996) built an impoliteness framework which is opposite to Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness.

Computer mediated communication (henceforth; CMC) is a tool by which two or more participants communicate with each other and maintain social relationships. It is a new trend that never stops developing around the world (Thurlow et al., 2004). In order to investigate how interpersonal issues of politeness and impoliteness are negotiated, some scholars move their attention to online communication. The discussion of social norms in the light of politeness and impoliteness phenomena have become the linguists' interest (Locher, 2010: 2-4).

Facebook is just one example of social network sites (SNSs) that people use to communicate with their community members who have similar interests and goals (Purcell, 2007: 12-13). Identifying impoliteness is not an easy task because some verbal behaviours, though impolite, are not always considered impolite. The interpretation of impolite behaviour depends heavily on the situation as well as on how one perceives what is said in a specific context. For example, shouting and using offensive language to an old man might be taken as extremely impolite, but when a footballer makes the same behaviour in the midst of audience might not be taken as impolite at all (Culpeper, 2011: 22).

2. Statement of The Problem

Culpeper's impoliteness strategies are investigated in different fields and languages, but these strategies are not examined by online

community (i.e., facebook) in Iraqi Arabic language. Therefore, the present research fills this gap by specifying and analyzing impolite facebook comments.

3. Research Questions

The study tries to find answers to the following questions:

1. What are the functions of impoliteness in facebook comments?
2. Are there certain strategies of impoliteness used by Iraqi speakers in facebook comments?
3. Can polite behavior be perceived as impolite?
4. Do men and women use the same levels of impoliteness during their comments or not?

4. Hypotheses

The study hypothesizes the followings:

1. People tend to use certain impoliteness strategies in facebook comments.
2. There are certain aspects affect the use of impoliteness like gender difference, cultural aspect and social status.
3. Impoliteness is motivated by certain topics like cigarette.

5. Aims of The Study

This study proposes to identify the impoliteness strategies used by people through using inappropriate forms of online communication in facebook comments which may cause social disharmony among participants. The current research aims at the following:

1. To investigate the functions and types of impoliteness strategies used by people within the boundary of Facebook comments.
2. To clarify how impoliteness strategies are affected by gender differences as a sociolinguistic variable.
3. To understand how certain topics affect the use of impoliteness.

6. Impoliteness

The best home for impoliteness studies is socio-pragmatics, because most work on politeness has been produced in this field and it seems natural that its apparent antithesis (impoliteness) should be here too, as impoliteness is geared towards 'explaining communicative behaviour'. According to Culpeper (2011a), impoliteness is a multidisciplinary field of study in that it can be studied within

different fields such as; psychology, sociology, history, media, business and literary studies. He claimed that impoliteness arises in social interaction. Brown and Levinson's theory states that any behaviour that attempts to protect the face of the addressee is polite; by contrast, any behaviour that attacks the face of the addressee is impolite, i.e. an impolite act is the absence of politeness. Impoliteness is considered as an intentionally planned act to attack others' face (Archer, 2008; Bousfield, 2008; Limberg, 2009). Culpeper briefly defined impoliteness as "the use of strategies that are designed to have the opposite effect – that of social disruption." (Culpeper, 1996: 350). This is the first definition which embodies a mirror of Brown and Levinson's definition of politeness. Then, Culpeper's (2005: 38) expanded his definition when he inserted the 'intention' of the speaker and considers it as an essential factor to perform impoliteness, "Impoliteness comes about when: (1) the speaker communicates face attack intentionally, or (2) the hearer perceives and/or constructs behavior as intentionally face-attacking, or a combination of (1) and (2)."

7. Types of Impoliteness

Culpeper describes three functional categories of impoliteness in his book: *Using Language to Cause Offence* (2011a) . These categories are:

7.1 Affective impoliteness

This can simply involve the targeted display of heightened emotion, typically anger, with the implication that the target is to blame for producing that negative emotional state (p. 221). In other words, when the speaker imposes his/her anger towards the hearer in some way and consequently, generates negative emotions inside of the hearer.

7.2 Coercive impoliteness

In this type, "the speaker attempts to increase some kind of power over the hearer by means of socially unacceptable speech patterns." The benefit could be material (e.g. the S uses impoliteness to force the hearer to do or give something), or symbolic (e.g. insulting the hearer to reduce his/her value and thereby increase one's own). "Coercive impoliteness occurs in situations where there is an imbalance of social structural power, i.e. the position that the

7.3 Entertaining impoliteness

Here, the primary target of the speech event is not to produce offensive language but rather to poke jokes or humorous event to make the audience have fun. However, this involves a potential victim and what is important here is that the audience can understand the probable impoliteness effects at the side of the target. Otherwise, it would not be entertaining impoliteness. (Culpeper, 2011: 233).

8. Culpeper's (1996, 2005) Model of Impoliteness

The adopted model of analysis in this research is based on Culpeper's impoliteness strategies which is first stated in Culpeper (1996) article "*Towards an anatomy of impoliteness*" and then repeated again in Culpeper (2003) and Culpeper (2005). Following the politeness strategies, specifically those of Brown and Levinson (1987), Culpeper built his impoliteness framework as a mirror of politeness. It is clear that impoliteness is the parasite of politeness. Culpeper demonstrates that it is important be aware of the fact that some areas of politeness are not well represented in Brown and Levinson's politeness model and that those deficiencies could be carried out into an impoliteness framework. Brown and Levinson have tackled little about paralinguistic or non-verbal politeness. Therefore, Culpeper confirmed that impoliteness can be represented verbally and nonverbally. Furthermore, Culpeper's model is considered as the most notable model of impoliteness proposed up to date. He reformulates his model of impoliteness to incorporate the discursive nature of social interaction. In this case, impoliteness was seen to damage someone's face and identity. This model is applicable to real-life data and it is tested across different discourses (Kamil & Fareed, 2017: 71). Culpeper (1996) takes Brown and Levinson's super-strategies and inverts them to describe impoliteness. As a result, impoliteness according to Culpeper consists of the following strategies:

8.1. Bald on Record

The face threatening act (henceforth; FTA) is performed to damage the hearer's face in a direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way,

e.g : "Open the door". There is an intention on the part of the S to attack the face of the H (Culpeper, 1996).

8.2. Positive Impoliteness

This strategy is designed to damage the addressee's positive face wants. Positive face means a person's desire to be liked, accepted or appreciated by others. Culpeper (1996) adds a range of sub-strategies to positive impoliteness. These sub-strategies are:

- Ignore or snub the others (fail to acknowledge the other's presence).
- Exclude the other from an activity.
- Dissociate from the other (e.g. deny association or common ground with the other; avoid sitting together).
- Be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic.
- Use inappropriate identity markers (e.g. use title and surname when a close relationship pertains, or a nickname when a distant relationship pertains).
- Use obscure or secretive language (e.g. mystify the other with jargon, or use a code known to others in the group, but not the target).
- Seek disagreement.
- Make the other feel uncomfortable (e.g. do not avoid silence, jokes, or use small talk).
- Use taboo words, swear or use abusive or profane language.
- Call the other names or use derogatory nominations.

8.3. Negative Impoliteness

This strategy is utilized to damage the hearer's negative face wants. Negative face means every person's want to be independent and free from imposition of others. Culpeper (1996) outlines sub-strategies to be involved:

- Frighten (instill a belief that a detrimental action will occur to the others).
- Condescend , scorn or ridicule (emphasizing relative power).
- Belittle the other (e.g., using diminutives).
- Be contemptuous.

- Not treat the other seriously.
- Invade the other's space – literally (e.g. position yourself closer to the other than the relationship permits) or metaphorically (e.g. ask for or speak about information which is too intimate given the relationship).
- Explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect - personalize, use the pronouns ' I ' and ' you '.
- Put the other's indebtedness on record , hinder or block the other physically or linguistically.

8.4. Sarcasm or Mock Politeness

The FTA is performed with the use of politeness strategies that are obviously insincere, i.e. on the surface, the utterances sound polite but the intended meaning is the opposite. For example, (How a smart student you are. Said by a teacher in sarcastic way to a student). Any strategy used insincerely is acceptable to perform sarcasm, not only a specific strategy. The role of sarcasm is to achieve social disharmony and it is of course, the opposite of mock impoliteness (banter) which is used for social harmony. Culpeper's clarification of sarcasm is close to Leech's (1983) conception of irony when he (Leech) points that Irony Principle (IP) occurs as following: "If you want to cause offence, at least do so in a way which doesn't overtly conflict with the politeness principle (PP), but allows the hearer to arrive at the offensive point of your remark indirectly, by ways of implicature."

8.5. Withhold Politeness

The absence of politeness works where it is expected to be (to keep silent or fail to act politely where it is expected) . For example, when failing to thank somebody for a favour or a present may be taken as deliberate impoliteness (Culpeper, 1996).

9. Notions Related to Impoliteness

Being impolite towards other participants by certain behavior is not actually the whole story about face attack, we can find other concepts that go hand in hand with impoliteness and play an essential role in creating face damage. According to Malaysia (2011: 2), the notion of defamation means "defaming someone or damaging someone's good name or reputation. In another way, it is a kind of untrue statement presented as a fact that causes injury or damage to the character of a specific person."

Rudeness is another concept that is also coupled with impoliteness. It is generally defined as "a kind of non-cooperative or competitive communicative behaviour which destabilizes the personal relationships of the interacting individuals, creates an emotional atmosphere of mutual irreverence and antipathy which primarily serves egocentric interests" (Kienpointner 1997 in Culpeper, 2011: 20). Rudeness, according to Segarra 2007 (in Nassrullah & Fadhil, 2015: 200) is always intentional: "The message behind rudeness is one of ignorance and indifference of good social manners and intentional discourtesy".

10. Procedure and Data Analysis

Two different approaches of analysis serve this study: descriptive qualitative approach used as a tool to elaborate perspective, feelings, impoliteness behavior, etc. This approach is supported by a quantitative approach which is also relevant to this study in order to draw statistics and accurate percentage of the number of the strategies used. The researcher selects (10) Iraqi Arabic posts on which people have commented and given their views. These posts are:

١. هل تؤيد حظر لعبة البووبي لكونها تساعد على العنف?
1. hal tuʔayid ʔaʔayid ʔaʔayid luʔbatl bōbji likawniha tusāʔd ʔalal ʔunf ?
Do you agree with banning (PUBG) for it encourages violence?
٢. هل تعلم أن حذاء الكعب العالي كان للرجال قبل النساء؟
2. hal taʔlam ʔanna ʔiḏāʔl kaʔbl ʔāli kāna rirrijāl qablan nisāʔ?
Do you know that high heels were made for men before women?
٣. الزي الموحد بين الرفض والقبول في الجامعات العراقية.
3. ʔazzyil muwaḥad baynar rafḏi walqubūl fiʔ jāmiʔātl ʔirāʔiyya
Uniform: between rejection and acceptance in Iraqi universities.
٤. نقابة الأطباء تلزم أطبائها بطباعة الوصفات الطبية.
4. naqābatl ʔaṭibbāʔ tulzim ʔaṭibbāihā biṭibāʔtl waʔfāt ṭbiyya
Association of Doctors forces doctors to print prescriptions.
٥. قلة النوم تؤدي الى زيادة الوزن.
5. qillatn nnōm tuʔadi ʔilā ziyādatl wazn
Less sleep causes fatness.
٦. أطعمة تفسد اذا قمت بخرنها في الثلاجة.
6. ʔaṭʔima tufsad ʔiḏā qumta bixaznihā fiṭṭillāja
Food that is rotted when keeping in the refrigerator.

٧. سيجارة الصباح ستعجل برحيلك عنا.

7. sījāratš šabāh satuṣajil birahīlika ṣanna

A morning cigarette quickens your death.

٨. خبر سار... البطاطس لا تسبب السمنة.

8. xabar sār ...?lbaṭāṭš lā tusabbibs sumna

Good news....potatoes don't cause fatness.

٩. هل المرأة لديها حقوق في العراق؟

9. halil marʔa ladayhā huqōq fil ʕirāq

Do women have rights in Iraq?

١٠. هل تؤيد انشاء سياج امني على الجسور للحد من الانتحار؟

10. hal tuʔayid ʔiṅfāʔ siyāj ʔami ṣalaj jusūr lilḥad minal ʔintiḥār

Do you agree with building a security fence on bridges to stop suicides?

These posts are summarized into micro topics as following:

1. Entertainment (pobg game).
2. Fashion (high heels).
3. Lifestyle (uniform).
4. Health (prescription, less sleep, food storage, cigarette).
5. Food (potatoes).
6. Political state (women's rights).
7. Social matters (suicide).

Culpeper's (1996, 2005) model of impoliteness strategies is going to be the scale for this research in order to analyze the 300 Facebook comments and also to refine whether these strategies are applicable to our data or not. Culpeper's strategies are going to be explained by giving illustrative examples for each one. Then, these strategies will be discussed in relation to gender difference in language as well as the influence of the topics to produce impoliteness.

1. Positive Impoliteness

This strategy is the most frequent strategy among Culpeper's strategies where it occurs 160 times (53.3%), of which 92 comments belong to males and the other 68 belong to females. This strategy has a number of sub-strategies as illustrated below:

a. Be disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic

Extract 1 : yaṣni xlṣat ilmawāḏīṣ

Eq.Tr : Are not there other issues?

In this comment, only few words are used as positive impoliteness by a male speaker (henceforth; S) to attack the topic which is about

"women's rights" and to show his disinterest criticizing them for choosing such a topic.

b. Seek disagreement

Extract 2 : *ṣārli sabḥataḥaf sana ḥadaxxn wmnṣ ṣubḥ wṣḥti ḥaḥsan mn*

ḥay wāhd riyādi.

Eq.Tr : I have been smoking for 17 years in the morning, and I am

healthier than any athlete.

This comment is about smoking. In a one-line expression, a male commenter is trying indirectly to say that "I don't agree with this" relying on a positive impoliteness strategy. He supports his disagreement by uttering that his health is better than anyone else though smoking for 17 years.

c. Make the other feel uncomfortable (e.g. by making jokes, using small talk).

Extract 3 : *ṣawurni wāni ḥaḥāwl ḥanḥr*

Eq.Tr : Film me while I commit suicide! (I want to be famous).

This comment is about suicide and it is also a positive impoliteness where a male commenter uses an innovative formulaic expression represented by the word "ṣawurni" means "film me" that works to insert some kind of humor or fun to the audience. The word "ṣawurni" is a new invented word by Iraqi community which can be said in contexts when a person acts pretentiously (to show off). This is also represents a jokey comment.

Extract 4 : *dgūlū putēta munu yḥrf funu baḥāṭṣ ḥnnās ḥabālhūm ḥsm*

ḥaḥadl ḥulamāḥl lōnān

Eq.Tr : You should say "boteta" (slang). Who knows what "Potato"

(standard) is? People think that it is the name of a Greek scientist!

This comment is written by a male participant concerning 'potato'. This comment has nothing to do with the topic because the speaker says something useless. Though he writes well-structured pattern

with the help of positive impoliteness strategy, unfortunately, his comment is useless since he selects random words to convey what he has in mind without thinking to the nonsense of words he produced.

d. Use taboo words, swear, abusive or profane language.

Extract 5 : ḥamīīīīīr

Eq.Tr : Donkeys

The topic was about "high heel" and there is a taboo word used by a male S to insult addressee (people who wanted high heels). The commenter metaphorically uses an animal's name to attack the people who wanted high heels to be for men.

2. Negative impoliteness

This strategy is used 55 times (18.3%), 14 comments were written by males and the rest 41 by females. As in positive impoliteness, we have noticed that some of Culpeper's sub-strategies of negative impoliteness were found in the data. These sub-strategies are:

a. Condescended, scorn or ridicule

Extract 6 : wallal marʔa madyūs ʕalēha blḥiḏāʔ mn ʔabūha wxūha
wzawjha matfūfr rāḥa ʔillā yilifhal qabr

Eq.Tr : I swear that women are stepped on by their fathers,
brothers

and husbands. They never rest till they die.

In this comment, the S is a female and the topic is about "women's rights". It is the only example that contains the sub-strategy of negative impoliteness which is "condescended" whereby the S dispraising and lowering herself altogether with other women.

b. Belittle the others (e.g. using diminutives)

Extract 7 : ʔakḥarhum mā yiʕrfūn kitābat ʔsml ʕilāj blnglīzi
walihāḏa

yṣrrūn ʕalwaṣfa bxaṭl ʔid

Eq.Tr : Most of them can't write the name of the medicines in
English. So, they insist on writing the prescription

using

handwriting.

Using another sub-strategy of negative impoliteness, a female commenter offends the doctors by belittling them for being unable to write the names of the prescriptions. This topic is about prescription.

c. Being contemptuous

Extract 8 : ?jjgāra wlli yidaxn ?jjgāra wāhd ?awsax mnl lāx

Eq.Tr : Cigarettes and smokers are dirtier than each other.

Again, another type of negative impoliteness is used by a male participant about cigarette to show his contempt for both the cigarette and the people who smoke cigarette.

d. Do not treat the others seriously

Extract 9 : ?āni šāli fahr ?adaxn fi ššabāh yaʕni ?ʒgad bāqīli
wb?ay sāʕa

?amūt law samahtum ?arīd dlwaqt tlmāḍbūt

Eq.Tr : I have been smoking in the morning for a month. Now,
how

much time do I have left (to die)? What time will I die?

Please, I want the exact time.

In this type of negative impoliteness strategy, a male commenter does not treat the posted advice seriously. He does not care about the importance of the matter and he asks for the time of his death. This comment is about cigarette.

3. Sarcasm or Mock Politeness

The frequency of this strategy is 19 comments (6.3%) of which 9 comments were used by males and 10 comments by females.

Extract10 : ?ktiʃāf jidīd

Eq.Tr : New discovery.

This comment is about high heel. To show disharmony, a male commenter makes use of a sarcastic form of language which says "new discovery" to create sarcasm. According to the S, it is too silly to post something like this and that they should not do so since it is not worth discussing and wasting time on. In face to face communication, this strategy is much clearer than CMC because it is performed with facial expressions or paralinguistic forms.

4. Bald on Record Impoliteness

This strategy has the least occurrence among other strategies where it is used 10 times, 3.3% (6 comments produced by males and 4 by females) in isolation as shown in the extract below, but it is also linked with other strategies as a combination to create complex strategy.

Extract 11 : ḥazrul mawāqʕl ?ibaḥiyya badall bōbji

Eq.Tr : Ban porn websites instead of Pubg.

The commenter is a male and the topic is about Pubg game. By making use of bald on record impoliteness strategy, the S or the commenter commits a FTA whereby he directs an imperative form of language towards the target. He asks for blocking porn web sites specifically by the verb "ḥazru" and leaving pubg game.

It is clear that all the previous examples are convenient to Culpeper's (1996, 2005) strategies of impoliteness. Nevertheless, other examples that appeared in the data involved a new strategy (i.e., a strategy that does not belong to Culpeper's model) but it still in the domain of impoliteness. In another way, some examples reveal impoliteness meanings but they do not fit any of Culpeper's strategies. The new strategy that is found in the data is defamation that people employ in their communication for the purpose of offending or attacking others.

1. Defamation

This strategy occupies 8% of the data (i.e., 24 comments out of 300 comments).

Extract 12: ʔafsad mukān hiyya ajjāmiṣāt tlyōm wlbs ṣṭālibāt faḥaddθ

walā ḥaraj

Eq.Tr : The most (morally) corrupt places are universities nowadays

and the clothes of the she-students are lewd!

This comment is about uniform. Blatantly, this pattern is used by a male S to attack the social position of universities as being unsound. This style of language is defamatory used to create a mess in the community. He adds to this, the she-students are naughty in their clothing and this is considered as breaking people's reputation.

Extract 13 : ʔakbar chaḏḏābīn

Eq.Tr : Biggest liars!

This is another context in which a male S explicitly shows his opinion about "less sleep" using an insulting form of language that causes face loss. He accuses the target (the people who posted the information) by being liars.

Furthermore, complex strategies are found in the data where they occupy 10.6% of the whole data. Here, the participants employ two different impoliteness strategies together as a combination in their contribution to convey an opinion, to show disharmony, to argue about something, etc. The structure of these complex strategies are:

1. Positive + Negative

Extract 14 : ?ayba qtrāh jfta bhayāti. ?lli yirīd yinthr ?aku ?alf tarīqa

Eq.Tr : The most stupid suggestion I ever heard in my life!

The

one who wants to commit suicide will not be prevented.

There are many ways to do so.

Two impoliteness strategies are used in this comment by a female. In the first part, negative impoliteness is used as a tool for the purpose of belittling the target (the people who posted the information) specifically with word "?ayba" which denotes diminutives. Whereas in the second part, positive impoliteness is used to convey disagreement with the post that represents a kind of solution to stop suicide. This comment is about suicide.

2. Positive + Bald on record

Extract 15 : mā ?dkum māwaḏīf ?aham mn hāy ? baṭlu halḥarakāt

Eq.Tr : Don't You have issues more important than this? Stop these

things/steps!

Another combination of two strategies occurred by a male commenter about high heel when he uses positive strategy in the first division, by which he shows disinterest about the topic posted, asking for posting more important subjects. The second piece of the comment has bald on record strategy represented by the verb "baṭlu", means "stop", through which the commenter conveys directly and imperatively his view to stop discussing silly issues.

4. Sarcasm + Negative

Extract 16 : funu hattafkīr ?jjhannami mn kul ?aqlkum ?ḏā bnētu syāj rāh

tmna?ūnl ?inthār wlli yfrab sam jtsawūla

Eq.Tr : What an amazing idea! Do you think that by building a fence you will stop suicide? What about those who drink poison?

Another two strategies found here by a female S. At the beginning, sarcasm is used to express disharmony about committing suicide. She uses a praising phrase at the surface, but the intended meaning is the opposite. Added to this, negative impoliteness by which the S scorns the idea about building a fence.

5. Negative + Defamation

Extract 17 : hāḍal ḥal sāḍaj jddan wlyaraḍ mnu huwal bōg

Eq.Tr : This solution is so naive, the purpose behind it is to steal.

The commenter is a female and her comment is about suicide. However, two brief and direct forms are used here. Concerning negative strategy, the S aims at belittling the suggestion mentioned in the post via using a diminutive word "sāḍaj". This word reveals impoliteness meaning used in the structure. Completing her comment, she uses defamation as a tool to reach her purpose which is breaking the social position of the target (the people who want to build fence as a way of protecting people from committing suicide).

11. Discussion and Findings

Throughout our analysis, we have noticed that most of Culpeper's strategies appeared in our data. It was found that the most used strategy is positive impoliteness, where it preoccupies 53.3% of the data (160 out of 300 comments; 92 belong to males and 68 belongs to females). Negative impoliteness is the second most frequent strategy where it takes 18.3% of the data (55 comments; 14 by males and 41 by females). The other strategy which is found in the data was sarcasm or mock politeness and it takes 6.3% of the data (19 comments; 9 by males and 10 by females). The least frequent strategy in the data was bald on record through which people shoot orders concisely. It was found that this strategy occupies 3.3% of the data (i.e., 10 comments; 6 comments by males and 4 by females). Obviously, these percentages were about pure Culpeper's strategies of impoliteness that occurred in our corpus as they are illustrated in the following table:

No.	Impoliteness Strategies	Male	Female	Total Number and Percentage
1	Positive impoliteness	92	68	160 (53.3%)
2	Negative impoliteness	14	41	55 (18.3%)
3	Sarcasm (mock politeness)	9	10	19 (6.3%)
4	Bald on record	6	4	10 (3.3%)
5	Withhold politeness	0	0	0%
	Total	121	123	244 (81.3%)

Table (1): Number and percentage of Culpeper's impoliteness strategies out of 300 comments.

As elaborated in the above table, in addition to the mentioned strategies, there is one strategy that did not appear in our data. This strategy is "withhold politeness" and the reason behind not finding examples is that "withhold politeness" is applicable only for spoken language, not for written discourses.

Furthermore, it was investigated that there are a number of examples (comments) in the data that are not suitable for any of Culpeper's strategies of impoliteness. Therefore, the researcher came up with a "new" impoliteness strategy that is used by facebook members and can be applied to our data. This new strategy is called defamation, and it is related to the phenomenon of impoliteness. Defamation was found to take 8% of the data (24 comments mediated equally between men and women), as illustrated in the following table.

No.	Relevant Strategy	Male	Female	Total Number and Percentage
1	Defamation	12	12	24 (8%)

Table (2): The number and percentage of the new strategy "defamation".

It was found that our data contains "complex strategies" used by members of facebook for the purpose of offending others. These complex strategies are used 32 times (10.6% of the data).

As far as the influence of the topics is concerned, it is clear that the use of impoliteness strategies is affected by the topic chosen. For example, bald on record was found to be used mostly in topics such

as; suicide, uniform, women's rights and pubg. Whereas the topics containing the low frequency of bald on record are; less sleep and high heel. Positive politeness strategy is used mostly in "pubg game and cigarette " and the least appearance of this strategy was in " high heel ". In the two topics (high heel and food storage), negative impoliteness was highly employed. While in "women's rights", negative impoliteness has the least appearance. Sarcasm was mostly used in "suicide and food storage" and the least occurrence of this strategy was in "high heel and prescription". Consequently, the following table gives us details about the occurrence of impoliteness strategies according to the topics tackled in this research.

No	Topics	Bald on Record	Positive Impoliteness	Negative Impoliteness	Sarcasm or Mock Impoliteness	Withhold Politeness	Total
1	Pubg game	2	20	3	2	0	27
2	High heel	1	9	14	1	0	25
3	Uniform	2	17	0	0	0	19
4	Prescription	0	12	4	1	0	17
5	Less sleep	1	13	5	2	0	21
6	Food storage	0	11	14	4	0	29
7	Cigarette	0	20	5	3	0	28
8	Potato	0	19	4	2	0	25
9	Women's right	2	24	2	0	0	28
10	Suicide	2	15	4	4	0	25
	Total	10	160	55	19	0	244

Table (3): The occurrence of impoliteness strategies according to the topics.

10. Conclusions

1. Most of Culpeper's strategies are used in written discourse for the purpose of damaging the face of an interactant in an online community.
2. "Withhold politeness" is the only strategy that did not occur in written discourse. Basically, this strategy is mostly used in face to face interaction where the addresser is supposed to thank somebody for a favor. Instead, he/she stays silent and this silence displays impoliteness.

3. There is a new strategy appeared to be used by members of online social media (facebook). This strategy is not mentioned in Culpeper' (1996, 2005) model of impoliteness strategies. Nevertheless, it is related to the phenomenon of impoliteness and because it can be used against others to make them feel upset or unhappy. This new strategy is defamation and it can be considered as an addition to Culpeper's model.

4. As it was hypothesized that both men and women tend to use certain impoliteness strategies in facebook comments, the results verified and proved this point. It is noticed that both males and females are predisposed to employ impoliteness strategies and they are more liable to such behavior in CMC rather than face to face interaction.

5. Additionally, men tend to utilize tabooed expressions that can be highly damaging to personal lives more than women do.

6. It was investigated that the most used strategy among Culpeper's strategies was "positive impoliteness" where it is utilized by male participants more than females, as a case of attempting to show disharmony or to cause FTA. By contrast, the least employed strategy was "bald on record" and this strategy is also used by male commenters more than female.

7. Complex strategies (two strategies) can be used in one sentence or comment to express impoliteness. When the commenter mixes two impoliteness strategies together, he/ she attempts to gather his/ her hostility to be conveyed more severely or undesirably towards the target.

8. There is a strong impact of the topics to the use of impoliteness strategies. By comparing two topics of this research like "prescription" and "cigarette", we can easily observe how these topics influence the use of impoliteness. In the former, almost all people agree that prescription is something essential for everybody's health and it is a crucial tool to continue life. As a result, few impoliteness strategies are used when discussing the topic. Whereas in the latter, there are so many contributions about the disadvantages of cigarettes. Some people support the idea of smoking and some are against, so that people argue with each other whether in face to face contact or in online communication. Thus, opposing arguments

are put forward and a kind of disagreement may occur which can lead to verbal fight or quarrelling and then, impoliteness phenomenon occurs.

9. Some utterances though polite in their structure, reveal impoliteness and indirectly reflect disagreement mixed with hidden insulting.

10. Typically, the employers are free in their contributions. This means that there is no regulation to control what is written on facebook. Thus, facebook users are not obliged to use politeness strategies.

11. The main reason behind using impoliteness in social media is that users do not feel embarrassed when they express what they want to say. People feel free to write whatever they think, unlike face to face communication in which people prefer to produce politeness.

12. It is clear that CMC is rich of social conflict or disharmony. This means that impoliteness is highly prominent in CMC and much more than real life communication. Probably because CMC is virtual life by which the users can hide his/her real personality. As a result, the commenter freely expresses his/her anger without any hesitance.

Bibliography

Thurlow Crispin, Laura Lengel and Alice Tomic, (2004). Mediated Communication: social interaction and internet. The Alden Press.

Culpeper, Jonathan. (2011). Impoliteness: Using Language to Offence. Cambridge University Press, New York

Culpeper, Jonathan, (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. Journal of Pragmatics 25 (3): 349-367.

Culpeper, Jonathan, (2005). Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The Weakest Link. Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture 1, 35–72.

Daniel Z. Kadar, (2017). Politeness, Impoliteness and Ritual. United Kingdom: University Printing House.

Hughes, Geoffrey. (2006). An encyclopedia of swearing: The social history of oaths, profanity, foul language, and ethnic slurs in the English-speaking world. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe.

Hiba N. Mohammed and Nawal F. Abba, (2015). Impoliteness in Literary Discourse: A Pragmatic Study.

Kamil, Salwa Ibrahim and Al-Hindawi Fareed Hameed. (2017), The Pragmatics of Manipulation in British and American Political Debates. Anchor Academic Publishing, Hamburg 2017.

Locher, Miriam A., Bousfield, Derek, (2008). Introduction: impoliteness and power in language. In: Bousfield, Derek, Locher, Miriam (Eds.), Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Inter play with Power in Theory and in Practice. Mouton de Gruyter Berlin and New York, pp. 1–13.

Locher, Miriam A., (2010). Introduction: Politeness and impoliteness in computer-mediated communication. Journal of Politeness Research 6 (2010), 15.

Sarawak, Malaysia, (2011). Academicians' Perspective On Defamation. International Conference on Social Science and Humanity, IACSIT Press, Singapore.

تحليل اجتماعي- تداولي للتعليقات غير المؤدبة باللغة العربية-العراقية على

الفييس بوك

أ.م.د.إياد مظفر يحيى الرسام و م.د.رياض أمين حسين

المستخلص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى فحص الاستراتيجيات غير الادبية لكلبيير (٢٠٠٥، ١٩٩٦) عن طريق تحليل (٣٠٠) تعليق باللغة العربية (العراقية) على صفحة الفييس بوك. هذه التعليقات قد تم جمعها من صفحات العراقية الرسمية على الفييس بوك. تناولت هذه الدراسة عشرة مواضيع عربية تدرج تحت فئة (الترفيه , والأزياء, وأسلوب الحياة, والصحة , والغذاء, والطبقة السياسية و الشؤون الاجتماعية). في هذه الدراسة تم اختيار تعليقات غير مهذبة في الاسلوب من التواصل الاجتماعي (فييس بوك). يوضح لنا التحليل أن جميع الاستراتيجيات غير المهذبة قابلة للتطبيق في التواصل عبر اجهزة الكمبيوتر باستثناء تلك التي تسمى باستراتيجي حجب المداراة "withhold politeness" التي يمكن أن تظهر فقط في التواصل عبر المقابلات الشخصية ، وليس في التواصل عبر الكتابة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الفييس بوك، أسلوب حياة، تواصل .