



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN SOCIAL SCIENCES & HUMANITIES

An International Open-Access Peer Reviewed Refereed Journal

Impact Factor: 6.064

E-ISSN: 2249 – 4642

P-ISSN: 2454 - 4671

IMPOLITENESS IN ENGLISH AND ARABIC PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONING

Prof. Dr. Qasim Abbas Dhayef Al-Tufayl, Kadhim Ketab Rhaif

Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Babylon,
Iraq

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.37648/ijrssh.v12i04.039>

Paper Received:

04 November 2022

Paper Accepted:

01 December 2022

Paper Received After Correction:

05 December 2022

Paper Published:

08 December 2022



How to cite the article: Qasim A.D.A., Kadhim K.R.(2022)

Impoliteness in English and Arabic Parliamentary Questioning, *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences & Humanities*, Oct-Dec 2022 Vol. 12, Issue 4; 725-741 DOI: <http://doi.org/10.37648/ijrssh.v12i04.039>

ABSTRACT

The study aims at investigating the types of impoliteness used in English and Arabic parliamentary questioning. The first thing that has to be done in order for this study to accomplish its objectives is to compile a list of authentic English and Arabic parliamentary questioning sessions. It has been decided that questioning in the United States Congress will serve as a suitable counterpart for questioning in the Iraqi parliament. As a result, the American parliamentary questioning to Secretary of State Clinton in the congress in 2017 is selected to represent the English data, whereas the Iraqi parliamentary questioning to Minister of Health in 2017 is selected to. After that, an analysis of the selected data is performed using Culpeper's (2011) model as a starting point. The results show that English and Arabic parliamentary questions often use impoliteness. Both languages treat impoliteness differently. English, unlike Arabic, prefers conventional triggers over implicational ones. Although both languages use conventional impoliteness triggers, they use implicational impoliteness triggers differently.

Keywords: *impoliteness, parliamentary questioning, Culpeper's (2011) model, and politicians.*

INTRODUCTION

Linguistic politeness has long been a focus of language research. Numerous linguists have studied politeness in language across many different cultures. Therefore, many theories on polite language have been proposed, and politeness is now a well-established academic field. The study of linguistic rudeness has lagged far behind that of linguistic politeness. To fill this gap, researchers like Jonathan Culpeper and Derek Bousfield, have attempted toward redressing this imbalance. Culpeper (1996: 350) describes impoliteness as "the use of strategies that are designed to have the opposite effect - that of social disruption." Notwithstanding, Culpeper (2005) enhances his prior definition and indicates

that his findings have revealed that impoliteness is not necessarily consisted of disagreement and social disharmony. He (ibid.: 38) proposes a new definition of impoliteness which takes the hearer's role into account in addition to the speaker's. In this regard, Watts (2003) incorporates impoliteness in his attempts to present politeness theory. However, Watt (ibid.) puts more emphasis on politeness rather than impoliteness is remarkable because impolite behaviour is more likely to be commented on and judged.

The term rudeness is often used interchangeably with impoliteness, and both words have a number of other meanings. In linguistic pragmatics, the following terms are frequently used to describe acts of impoliteness: rudeness,

impoliteness, aggravated/aggravating language/facework, aggressive facework, face-attack, verbal aggression, abusive language. Lakoff equalizes the concept of impolite behaviour to rude behaviour. Similarly, Locher and Bousfield (2008: 3) define impoliteness as "behaviour that is face-aggravating in a particular context."

A Parliamentary Question is a formal inquiry posed by a member of parliament to a minister of the government concerning an issue that is under their purview. They can either ask them verbally or in writing. They are utilised to enquire about information or to exert pressure on the government to take action. (Olivier and Shane, 2011). The formal initiative for parliamentary questions usually rests with individual members of parliament, and the answers are typically provided by individual ministers. The failure to answer a parliamentary question adequately, or the disclosure of politically embarrassing information may have significant consequences for a government's reputation (ibid.)

The Concept of Impoliteness

It is impossible, from a theoretical standpoint, to separate the study of impolite behaviour from that of polite behaviour. Goffman (1955), the pioneer in the field of politeness study, is credited as

being the one who originally developed the idea of 'face.' Lakoff (1973), Brown and Levinson (1978/1987), and Leech (1983) are, without a doubt, foundational publications in the field of politeness research. First and foremost, Culpeper's (1996) work brings attention to impolite behaviour. He makes an effort to construct a framework for impolite behaviour, which runs counter to Brown and Levinson's (1987) idea of polite behaviour.

Culpeper (1996) writes a seminal article on impoliteness. He (ibid.: 8) identifies impoliteness as "the parasite of politeness" and the politeness strategies are the opposite of impoliteness strategies. The opposite here refers to its orientation to face. Politeness strategy is utilized to enhance or support face which can avoid conflict while impoliteness strategies are used to attack face which cause social disharmony. As Culpeper (ibid.) defines impoliteness as the use of strategies to attack the interlocutor's face and create social disruption. For this, Culpeper proposes five super strategies that speaker use to make impolite utterances as follows: Bald on record impoliteness, Positive impoliteness, Negative impoliteness, Sarcasm or mock politeness.

Later, Culpeper (2011:174) purposes a bottom-up model to investigate

impoliteness triggers that aim to reveal the sociocultural background of particular communities. According to him (ibid.), there are some linguistic expressions, such as curse words and insults, that are regarded as impolite regardless of the context in which they are used. He maintains that "impoliteness is partly inherent in the expression of one's linguistic self". In addition to this, he clarifies that despite the fact that language statements themselves might be intrinsically polite or impolite. It is possible for lexicography to amplify the impolite message that is sent by a conventional expression.

In addition, Culpeper (ibid. 223) classifies the purposes of impoliteness into four distinct categories, namely affective, coercive, entertaining, and institutional. Affective impoliteness may be defined as "the targeted display of heightened emotion, typically anger, with the implication that the target is to blame for producing that negative emotional state". When a speaker uses improper speech patterns in an attempt to exert influence over an audience member, this behaviour is known as coercive impoliteness. The third category is known as entertaining impoliteness, and it is characterised by the intentional targeting of a third-party audience in order to produce a comedic impact. The last category is known as

institutional impoliteness, and it occurs when a speaker takes advantage of the dominant group supporting an institution.

Culpeper (ibid.) divides impoliteness into two main groups: conventionalized and implicational impoliteness. The former includes the following subcategories: insults, pointed criticisms/complaints, unpalatable questions and/or presuppositions, condescension, message enforcers, dismissals, silencers, threats, and negative expressive. The latter contains triggers of convention driven (internal / external), form driven, and context driven (unmarked behaviour/absence of behaviour).

IMPOLITENESS AND CULTURE

In a broad sense, a community's culture consists of its members' shared worldview. According to Spencer-Oatey (2008), "culture is a fuzzy set of attitudes, beliefs, behavioural conventions, and basic assumptions and values that are shared by a group of people, and that influence each member's behaviour and each member's interpretations of the 'meaning' of other people's behaviour." Kádár and Mills (2011) contend that "cultural norms are mythical; the nation cannot speak with one voice". This demonstrates that many cultures are responsible for producing

several distinct interpretations of utterances.

The fact that many cultures attach distinct meanings and beliefs to various varieties of language can at times lead to communication breakdowns that are fraught with ambiguity. Since each language has its own culture-specific pragmatic features, it is difficult to give universal rules for the use of impoliteness techniques between cultures. As a result, it is difficult to propose universal rules for the use of impoliteness strategies across cultures. Impoliteness is a notion that is shared by all cultures; yet, the methods that are utilised to be impolite would vary from one society to the next (Rababa'h & Rabab'ah, 2021). Hence, when impoliteness is studied within a setting that is distinctive to a culture, its perception is significantly impacted by that culture.

PREVIOUS STUDIES

The concept of impoliteness has been the target of many researcher in English and Arabic. To mention, Rassul and Hammoud (2017) investigate Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness strategies in English and Arabic Facebook comments. They found that positive and negative impoliteness are the most frequent types in both English and Arabic data. From a sociopragmatic

perspective, Rassam and Hussain (2021) investigate the impoliteness strategies used in Iraqi Arabic Facebook basing on Culpeper's (1996) model as well. They found that the most used strategy among Culpeper's strategies is "positive impoliteness".

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The current study aims to fill a gap in the literature of impoliteness in English and Arabic in parliamentary questioning events basing on Culpeper's (2011) bottom-up model of impoliteness. Therefore, the study aims at:

1. identifying impoliteness triggers in American and Iraqi parliamentary questioning.
2. highlighting the influence of the impoliteness triggers on the whole theme of the data.

METHODOLOGY

To achieve the aims of this study, the first step is deducted to find out authenticable English and Arabic parliamentary questioning events (see Appendix). American congressional questioning is chosen as an equivalent to Iraqi parliamentary questioning. Consequently, the American parliamentary questioning to Secretary of State Clinton in the congress in 2017 is selected to represent the English

data whereas the Iraqi parliamentary questioning to Minister of Health in 2017 is selected to represent the Arabic data. British parliamentary questioning it is avoided as an equivalent to Iraqi parliamentary questioning because the British one is mostly restricted to questioning the prime minister rather than ministers. Then, the selected data are analysed with reference to Culpeper's (2011) model. This model is selected to fulfil the aims of this study because it is more concerned with investigating the impoliteness triggers that are related the sociocultural knowledge in particular communities. Finally, results of English and Arabic questioning are compared to find conclusions.

DATA ANALYSIS

This section is concerned with presenting samples for analysing the English and Arabic data.

English Analysis:

Excerpt 1:

“ROSKAM: Good morning, Secretary Clinton. Jake Sullivan, your chief foreign policy adviser, wrote a tick-tock that you are “the public face of the U.S. effort in Libya and instrumental in tightening the noose around Gadhafi and his regime.” But that didn't come easy, did it? That didn't

come easy, did it, that leadership role and that public face and so forth that I just mentioned?”

In this excerpt, the congressman Roskam shows his disrespect to Secretary Clinton when he presents his unpalatable question as a conventional impoliteness trigger to doubt and discredit the opinion of her adviser in her as public face of the US in Libya. In other words, he wants to tell her that such description for her role is in contrast with the truth and the actual results that she has presented.

Excerpt 2:

“Clinton: There were a number of reasons for that. And I think it is important to remind the American people where we were at the time when the people of Libya, like people across the region, rose up demanding freedom and democracy, a chance to chart their own futures. And Gadhafi...”

ROSKAM: I take your point.

In this excerpt, Secretary Clinton is explaining the situation in Libya and how the people of Libya are eager to get freedom and democracy, but she is interrupted and stopped by the congressman Roskam by using the statement “*I take your point*” as a silencer form of conventional impoliteness.

Excerpt 3:

“ROSKAM: They were -- they were pushing back, but you overcame those objections. But then you had another big obstacle, **didn't you?**, and that was -- that was the White House itself. There were senior voices within the White House that were opposed to military action -- Vice President Biden, Department of Defense, Secretary Gates, the National Security Council and so forth. But you persuaded President Obama to intervene militarily.

Isn't that right?”

“CLINTON: I think it's fair to say there were concerns and there were varying opinions about what to do, how to do it, and the like. At the end of the day, this was the president's decision.”

In this excerpt, the congressman Roskam blames Secretary Clinton for crashing opposing opinions that call for not involving in Libya. The asker shows a conventional impoliteness through using tag questions (**didn't you?** and **Isn't that right?**) as message reinforcers to strength his claims. On the other hand, Secretary Clinton uses implicational from driven impoliteness through expressing her “snide remarks” to the congressman Roskam to criticize him indirectly when she tries to decrease his claims about her role in

convincing president Obama to be involved in Libya.

Excerpt 4:

“ROSKAM: Well I think you are underselling yourself. You got the State Department on board. You convinced the president, you overcame the objections of Vice President Biden and Secretary of Defense Gates, the National Security Council. And you had another obstacle then, and that was the United Nations. And you were able to persuade the Russians, of all things, to abstain, and had you not been successful in arguing that abstention, the Security Council Resolution 1973 wouldn't have passed because the Russians had a veto. So, you overcame that obstacle as well, **right? Isn't that right?”**

“CLINTON: Well congressman, it is right that doing my due diligence and reviewing the various options and the potential consequences of pursuing each of them”.

In this excerpt, Congressman Roskam displays a conventional impoliteness towards Secretary Clinton by directing pointed criticism and complaint for her efforts to involve the US and other countries in the war in Libya. Such impoliteness strategy is echoed through using the message enforcers “**right? Isn't that right?**” at the end of the criticism.

Moreover, Secretary Clinton again uses implicational form driven impoliteness through expressing her “snide remarks” to the congressman Roskam to criticize him indirectly that he is not aware of the responsibilities of the Secretary of State which she has occupied.

Excerpt 5:

“ROSKAM: So, to put this in totality, you were able to overcome opposition within the State Department. You were able to persuade the president. You were able to persuade the United Nations and the international community. You made the call to the Arabs and brought them home. You saw it. You drove it. You articulated it. And you persuaded people. Did I get that wrong?”

“CLINTON: Well, congressman, I was the secretary of state. My job was to conduct the diplomacy. And the diplomacy consisted of a long series of meetings and phone calls both here in our country and abroad to take the measure of what people were saying and whether they meant it.”

Excerpt 6:

“ROSKAM: Actually, you summed it up best when you e-mailed your senior staff and you said of this interchange, you said, "It's good to remind ourselves and the rest

of the world that this couldn't have happened without us." And you were right, Secretary Clinton”.

In this excerpt, Congressman Roskam shows implicational impoliteness with conventional external driven through sarcasm as what he said contrast with the external context. He says that Secretary Clinton was right when she said that "It's good to remind ourselves and the rest of the world that this couldn't have happened without us."

Excerpt 7:

“Our Libya policy be couldn't have happened without you because you were its chief architect. And I said we were going to go back to Ambassador Mulla's warning about using military for regime change, and he said, "Long-term things weren't going to turn out very well. And he was right. After your plan, things in Libya today are a disaster.”

In this excerpt, the asker resorts to pointed criticism and complaint to express a conventional impoliteness to the consequences of Clinton's bad performance on the case. He attributes all the failure in Libya to her irresponsible plan.

Arabic Analysis**Excerpt 1:**

النائب عواد: "عدم توفير مادة مهمة وهذه المادة هي مادة الألبومين. لا ومتعاقدين مع شركة بسعر إثني عشر مليون دولار. السيدة الوزيرة نعم قالت أنه الشركة قامت بالتعويض عن ذلك. المبلغ الذي بذمة الشركة قبل سنتين. تعوض بمواد جديدة سياق التعويض لدى شركة كماديا. وهذا سياق التعويض للوزيرة خالفته. سياق التعويض فقط للمواد منتهية المفعول أو الفاشلة. هذه أموال بذمة الشركة وسنتين. وما سددها فلم الوزيرة تحيل عقد باثني عشر مليون دولار الى شركة ناكله. وتصر على هذه الإحالة لمادة منقذة للحياة. مادة مهمة جدا وخلال هذه السنتين ونصف نراها نحن جدا وهذه المادة موجودة في الأسواق المحلية. حتى إذا رجل كبير بالسن كل يومين من يجيبوا لهذه المادة. وهذه النقطة المهمة لأذكر لك إياها انه الشركة مقارنة مع عقود أخرى. هناك تناقضات دائما في العقود. ومتعمدة بالاحالة على شركات معينة".

[MP Awad: Not providing an important substance, and this substance is albumin. No, and contractors with a company at a price of twelve million dollars. Madam Minister, yes, she said that the company compensated for that. The amount owed by the company two years ago. This is the context of compensation for the Minister violated it. Compensation context only for expired or failed materials. This is the money owed by the company for two years. However, the minister's referred a contract worth twelve million dollars to the same company. She insists on referring this to a life-saving substance, a very important substance, and during these two and a half years, we see it very much, and this substance is present in the local markets. Even if an old man every two days who would answer this article. And this important point to mention to you is that it is the company if compared to other contracts, there are always contradictions. Deliberate assignment to certain companies.]

الوزيرة عديلة: "هذا موضوع ثاني. رجاءا لينفتح الحديث، أعني الالتزام بالسؤال والتعليق على السؤال".

[Minister Adela: This is another issue. Please don't make the conversation open, I mean stick to the question and comment on the question.]

In this excerpt, MP Awad presents a direct criticism (conventional impoliteness) to the Minister Adela for not providing albumin for the Iraqi hospitals, though she had assigned a contract with a private company to provide this material before two years. The company had received the required amount without supplying the required material despite the existence of

this material in local markets. Another type of impoliteness appears in MP Awad's question when he ironically refers to the insistence of Minister Adela to contract with the same company again and the way the contracts are signed with particular companies. This is an implicational impoliteness because he shows how MP Awad's contradictions when dealing with contracting companies. This an implied accusation that she had private business and corruption with such companies. However, MP Awad displays a kind of conventional impoliteness when she tries to stop MP Awad to continue his elaboration and analysis of the case using the statement *"This is another issue. Please don't make the conversation open, I mean stick to the question and comment on the question"* as a silencer.

Excerpt 2:

النائب عواد: "مالكم في عدم اتخاذ الإجراءات الاحترازية والوقائية لمنع انتشار الكبد الفيروسي وتسببه بزيادة أعداد المصابين بالتهاب الكبد الفيروسي نوع بوسي عالي الخطورة وتسبب بوفاة العديد من المواطنين؟ كذلك تعمدت بعدم توفير اللقاح المطلوب بالرغم من وجود مناقصة بالرقم واحد وثلاثين لسنة 2015؟"

[MP Awad: What is wrong with you in not taking precautionary and preventive measures to prevent the spread of the viral hepatitis and cause it to increase the number of people infected with viral hepatitis, a high-risk type of BOC that caused the death of many citizens? She also deliberately did not provide the required vaccine despite the existence of a tender number thirty-one for the year 2015]

In this excerpt, MP Awad exhibits a conventional impoliteness when criticizing Minister Adela for not taking precautionary and preventive measures to prevent the spread of the viral hepatitis and for not providing required vaccine. He also resorts to producing implicational impoliteness when ironically blames her for not providing the vaccine though the documents showed that she had a contract for providing the vaccine. This is also an implied accusation that she had some kind of corruption.

Excerpt 3:

الوزيرة عديلة: "لا يوجد أي إهمال في اتخاذ الإجراءات الاحترازية والوقائية، بل يعتبر النظام للسيطرة على التهاب الكبد الفيروسي بالعراق من أرقى النظم للسيطرة على الأمراض الانتقالية. وهذا يعني تقارير من منظمة الصحة العالمية كون أن في العراق أكثر من سبعة آلاف كادر طبي ومتمتتين وستين مستشفى وأكثر من ألف وخمسمائة مركز صحي وأيضاً عشرين مختبر تخصصي يعني يجري عمليات الفحص الفيروسي في كل أنحاء العراق تقوم هذه المؤسسات بعمليات الفحص والتوصل إلى حالات الإصابة. سيادة الرئيس نحن يعني كوزارة وهي وزارة يعني عمرها يقارب المئة سنة، عندها يعني

السياسة ومرتبطة بمنظمة الصحة العالمية ولوائح صحية عالمية وبالتالي نتبع الآلية التي تعمل بها هذه المنظمات الدولية".

[Minister Adela: There is no negligence in taking precautionary and preventive measures. Rather, the system for controlling viral hepatitis in Iraq is considered one of the finest systems for controlling communicable diseases. This means reports from the World Health Organization, given that Iraq has more than seven thousand medical staff, two hundred and sixty hospitals, more than one thousand five hundred health centers, as well as twenty specialized laboratories, meaning that viral examinations are conducted throughout Iraq. These institutions conduct examinations and find cases of infection. Mr. President, we, I mean, as a ministry, which is a ministry that is nearly a hundred years old, then I mean politics and is linked to the World Health Organization and international health regulations, and therefore we follow the mechanism by which these international organizations operate.]

Minister Adela embodies her reply to this question with an implicational impoliteness when she used external information as evidence to deny and refutes the accusations raised by MP Awad. He mentions that her ministry is linked to the World Health Organization and international health regulations, and therefore she says that what has been raised is incorrect.

Excerpt 4:

النائب عواد: "قيمة هذه المواد (الأثاث) واحد وثلاثين مليون وتسعمئة وخمسة وثلاثين دينار. هذه القائمة الأولى بسنة 2017 وتقول ليس لدينا أموال لنشتري. يعني أهم من لقاح الكبد الفيروسي لهم كرسي خشب بهذه الأعداد.. حتى الوزيرة تقول هذا أثاث طبي هذا مكتوب السعر أثاث الطبي أثاث الكرسي الخشب أثاث طبي كرسي خشب نشتره ونحن ليس عندنا لقاحات."

[MP Awad: The value of these materials (furniture) is thirty-one million nine hundred and thirty-five dinars. This is the first list in 2017, and the Minister says we have no money to buy. I mean, it is more important than the hepatitis vaccine. They have a wooden chair with these numbers. Even the minister says this is medical furniture. This is written. The price is medical furniture. Wood chair furniture. Medical furniture is a wooden chair that we buy and we do not have vaccines.]

MP Awad, in this excerpt, launches conventional impoliteness by directing pointed criticisms and complaints to the minister for supplying medical furniture and leaving the vaccine. An implicational impoliteness appears in his ironic mimicry to her statement that she had no enough money to by vaccine and provided her evidence which is in contract with her statement.

Excerpt 5:

الوزيرة عديلة: "يا سيادة الرئيس. أولا السيد النائب يقارنها مع الحذاء الطبي الذي يحتاجه الطبيب والممرض والمقدر بصالة العمليات هي جزء من متطلبات حتى الطبيب يشتغل بصالة العمليات. الاثاث الذي يقول عليه السيد النائب يعني أنا لا أدري عندما يأتي الكادر الطبي يبذل هدمه مال العمليات ويدخل إلى صالة العمليات وينزع الطبيب ملابس أبو قميص أو بنطلونه وتنزع الطبيبة ملابسها وتلبس ملابس العمليات. لا أعرف أين يذبحهم بالكاع يعني السيد النائب يقول الوزيرة جابت كراسي. يعني لا أدري هل يقبل المجلس النواب أنه طبيب يقعد بالكاع يفحص المريض مثل ما السيد النائب أرادنا"

[Minister Adela: Mr. President. First, the representative compares it with the medical shoes needed by the doctor and the nurse, who are assessed in the operating room. They are part of the requirements for even the doctor working in the operating room. The furniture on which the representative says, I mean, I do not know when the medical staff comes to change their clothes for operations, enters the operating room, and the doctor takes off clothes, shirts or pants, and the female doctor takes off her clothes and puts on the operating clothes. I don't know where he puts them in the ground, I mean, the deputy says the minister bought chairs and chairs. I mean, I don't know whether the House of Representatives accepts that he is a doctor sitting on the ground examining the patient as the representative wanted us.]

Minister Adela, in this excerpt, exposes an implicational impoliteness in resorting to sarcasm to refute the MP's accusation for her in prioritization to buying furniture rather vaccine. She wonders whether the doctors sit on the ground when examining patients or put their clothes on the ground when to change. Additionally, she claims that the MP asks the doctors for sitting on the ground though he did not. This is unmarked behavior of impoliteness driven form the context.

Excerpt 6:

الوزيرة عديلة: "قلت هذا عقود نحن نرسلها إلى وزارة المالية وتمول بعدين وضعنا آلية بعد معانا. رحنت رئيس الوزراء وقلت الأخ أن نحدد وزارة المالية بالكتب مالنا وضع أولوياتنا للصرف ولا يجهزون لنا عقود. نحن ليس عندنا أولوية وأعتقد هذا شرحتة يمكن أكثر من مرة للسادة أعضاء مجلس النواب بس ما أعرف السيد النائب ما منتبه"

[Minister Adela: I said these are contracts, we send them to the Ministry of Finance and they are financed, then we put a mechanism after that with us. I went to the Prime Minister and told the brother that we specify to the Ministry of Finance by letters and set our priorities for spending, and they do not prepare contracts for us. We do not have a priority, and I think this explained it more than once to the gentlemen members of the House of Representatives, but I do not know why Mr. Representative is not attentive]

In this excerpt, Minister Adela re-explains to the parliament the way in which the financing is executed between her ministry and the ministry of finance, attributing that the prioritization is not decide by her ministry. He ends this explanation with a kind of conventional impoliteness when she raises an unpalatable question to the whole parliament about the reason that makes MP Awad not attentive.

Excerpt 7:

النائب عواد: "جايب فد مقارنه مع الاستثناءات سياده الرئيس جايب مقارنه من الاستثناءات مال 2016 ومسوي مقارنه من الاستثناءات مال 2013 او 2012 حتى نشوف ولا الوزير استخدم الصلاحيات"

[MP Awad: I am only answering a comparison with the exceptions, Mr. President, a comparison of the exceptions in 2016 and a comparison of the exceptions in 2013 or 2012 so that we can see if this minister actually used the natural powers]

الوزيرة عديلة: "إذا حضرتك يعني تتهمني بانه ان خالفت قوانين وضوابط القانون اللي يجين لي انه انا استنتى وفق صلاحيتي. القانون يقول لا تعطيه لاي واحد وهي صلاحية حصريه لي كوزير. اذا انا متهم بقتل هذه الاشياء ومسويه كوارث بوزاره الصحة وحضرتك حريص على الصحة لان انا استنتيت عدد من الناس، ليش حضرتك تقدمت بعدد من طلبات الاستثناء لاقاربك لمكتبي؟"

[Minister Adela: If your presence means, you accuse me that if I violate the laws and regulations of the law that allows me to be exempted according to my authority. The law says don't give it to anyone and it's my exclusive power as a minister. If I am accused of killing

these things and setting up disasters at the Ministry of Health, and you are keen on health because I have asked a number of people, why did you submit a number of requests for exceptions to your relatives to my office?]

In this excerpt, a kind of implicational impoliteness is revealed that MP Awad's using of actual information as evidence to compare the exceptions given by Minister Adela with those given by previous ministers to demonstrate that he has used her power improperly. On the other hand, Minister Adela herself employs unpalatable question and presupposition to counter back his question when asks him back when he has submitted requests of exceptions if he blames her for giving them.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis shows that both English and Arabic parliamentary questionings are embodied with impoliteness triggers due to the political sensitivity of the event. Each part of the event wants to present himself as a strong politician to the public. Table 1 below indicates that the two languages have a great difference in their utilization in term of the major types of impoliteness strategies. English displays a preference to conventional impoliteness whereas Arabic prefers the implicational impoliteness.

Table 1: The impoliteness strategies in English and Arabic

Impoliteness strategies	American impoliteness		Iraqi impoliteness	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Conventional impoliteness	52	64.20%	40	39.22%
Implicational impoliteness	29	35.80%	62	60.78%
Total	81	100.00	102	100.00

Within the utilization of conventional impoliteness triggers, both English and Arabic denote preferences to pointed criticism and complaints, unpalatable questions and/or presuppositions, message reinforces, and silencers, respectively. Moreover, both language show avoidance of the same triggers in the parliamentary questioning genre. That is, they

avoid insults, dismissals, threats, and negative expressive. However, English, unlike Arabic, employs condescension to some extent in formulating the impoliteness triggers.

Table 2: The conventional impoliteness triggers in English and Arabic

Conventional impoliteness triggers	American impoliteness		Iraqi impoliteness	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Insults	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Pointed criticism and complaints	19	36.54%	21	52.50%
Unpalatable questions and/or presuppositions	14	26.92%	8	20.00%
Condescensions	2	3.85%	0	0.00%
Message reinforces	10	19.23%	6	15.00%
Dismissals	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Silencers	7	13.46%	5	12.50%
Threats	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Negative expressives	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Total	52	100.00	40	100.00

With reference to the Implicational impoliteness triggers in table 3 below, English reveals its heavy reliance on convention driven (external) and context driven (unmarked behaviour) triggers with the respective percentages 44.83% and 31.03%. However, Arabic relies more on form driven and convention driven (external) with the respective percentages 45.16% and 30.65%.

Table 3: Implicational impoliteness triggers in English and Arabic

Implicational impoliteness triggers	American impoliteness		Iraqi impoliteness	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Convention driven / internal	5	17.24%	9	14.52%
Convention driven / external	13	44.83%	19	30.65%
Form driven	2	6.90%	28	45.16%

Context driven / unmarked behaviour	9	31.03%	6	9.68%
Total	29	100.00	62	100.00

CONCLUSION

From the data analysis, it can be concluded that there is a wide use of impoliteness strategies in English and Arabic parliamentary questioning. The most common forms of impoliteness are handled quite differently across the two languages. Whereas Arabic speakers lean more toward implicational triggers, English speakers favour more conventional ones. Within the utilization of conventional impoliteness triggers, both English and Arabic denote preferences and avoidance to the same triggers except that of condescension where only English utilizes them. Nevertheless, the two languages differ in their employment of the implicational impoliteness triggers in the parliamentary questioning. It is clear that English places a significant amount of dependence on convention-driven (external) and context-driven (unmarked behaviour) triggers. Arabic, on the other hand, is more form driven and convention driven than English. In addition, the adopted model (Culpeper's 2011) is applicable to both English and Arabic parliamentary questioning.

Financial support and sponsorship: Nil

Conflict of Interest: None

REFERENCES

1. Bousfield, D., & Locher, M. A. (Eds.). (2008). *Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice* (Vol. 21). Walter de Gruyter.
2. Brown, P. and Stephen L. (1978). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
3. Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of pragmatics*, 25(3), 349-367.
4. Culpeper, Jonathan. 2005. Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: The Weakest Link. *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture* 1(1). 35–72. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.35>
5. Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using language to cause offence* (Vol. 28). Cambridge University Press.
6. Goffman, Erving. 1955. On Facework: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction. *Psychiatry: Journal of Interpersonal Relations* 18 (3): 213–231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00332747.1955.11023008>
7. Lakoff, Robin. 1973. The Logic of Politeness or, Minding your P's and Q's. In *Papers from the 9th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. by C. Corum, T. Cedric Smith-Stark, and A. Weiser, 292–305. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
8. Leech, Geoffrey. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman
9. Kádár, D. & S.Mills (2011). *Politeness in East Asia*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
10. Olivier R. & Shane M. (2011). Questioning Parliamentary Questions. *The Journal of Legislative Studies* (17)3, 394-404, DOI: [10.1080/13572334.2011.595132](https://doi.org/10.1080/13572334.2011.595132)
11. Rababa'h, B. & Rabab'ah, G. (2021). The impact of culture and gender on impoliteness strategies in Jordanian and American Tv sitcoms. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 11(2), 151-163.

12. Rassam, A. & Hussein, R. (2021). A Socio-Pragmatic Analysis of Impoliteness in Iraqi Arabic Facebook Comments. *Adab AL Rafidayn*, 51(84.1).
13. Rassul, A. & Hammod, N. , (2017). Impoliteness strategies in English and Arabic Facebook comments. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 9(5), 97-112.
14. Spencer-Oatey, H. (2008). *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures* (2nd. edn.). London: Continuum.
15. Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX: SELECTED DATA

- YouTube link to the English data: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vpCRL_KVC1k&t=6071s
- YouTube link to the Arabic data: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yLZuuR08Wnc&t=608s>

