

تحليل عملي للوقاحة في المناظرة الرئاسية النهائية بين كلينتون وترامب

A Pragmatic Analysis of Impoliteness in the Presidential Final Debate between Clinton and Trump

م.د. آمال أحمد حمزة

L. Dr. Aamal Ahmed Hamza

قسم الترجمة – كلية الآداب - الجامعة المستنصرية

aamalahmed@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq

Abstract:

This study investigates impoliteness in the 2016 presidential American final debate between Clinton and Trump held in Las Vegas University using a pragmatic approach. It is aimed at describing the types of impoliteness strategies, how they are linguistically represented and identifying their pragmatic functions. This research employed a qualitative and quantitative analyses. It follows the theoretical framework proposed by Culpeper (2003) to achieve its aims. Some of the results of this study are stated as follows. The five types of impoliteness strategies are used by Clinton and Trump with different percentage, Trump uses impoliteness strategies more than Clinton who prefers to use politeness strategies such as hedges. However, both Trump and Clinton uses sarcasm to minimize the importance of the opponent's saying. The study comes with a number of conclusion.

Introduction

The intricate and fascinating area of pragmatic impoliteness research is well worth exploring. Additionally, it's crucial for understanding how impolite or insulting language is used by others. It must be remembered that what is deemed disrespectful can change depending on the situation. For instance, what one culture deems impolite may be regarded as polite in another. Impoliteness is defined as a breach of the hearer's face . Face is a person's public self-image and maintain face is crucial for good social interaction. There are two types of face: positive face, which is the desire to be loved and respected and negative face, which is the desire to be free from imposition.

2. Literature review

In this section, the definitions of key concepts, theoretical model and some related studies of impoliteness are discussed.

2.1 What does Impoliteness Mean Linguistically?

In describing a behavior as being impolite, it might be thought that this behavior is rude, sexist, offensive or inappropriate. However, it is a real challenge to define the term 'impoliteness' ; it is the situation which determent behaviors , verbal in particular, as being impolite or not. Shouting for example, is considered impolite if it is directed to an older person, but it is not so if it is used in the midst of a football crowd. As such, it is the context which decides whether a behavior is impolite or not.

According to Culpeper (2005), there are two situations when impoliteness comes about:

- (1) The speaker communicates faces article intentionally, or
- (2) the hearer perceives or constructs behavior as being an intentional face – attacking .

In this case, impoliteness involves two elements : "a mental attitude held by a participant and comprised of negative evaluative beliefs about particular behaviors in particular social contexts and the activation of that attitude by those in context behaviors “ (Culpeper, 2011: 22).

To make the term clear, it is better to have a survey of impoliteness definitions:

“Rude behavior does not utilize politeness strategies where they would be expected, in such a way that the utterance can only almost plausibly be interpreted as intentionally and negatively confrontational (Lakoff 1989: 103).

“impoliteness, communicative strategies designed to attack face, and thereby cause social conflict and disharmony. (Culpeper et al, 2003:1546)

“ Impoliteness is behavior that is face aggravating in a particular context” (Locher & Bousfield 2006:3)

“Impoliteness constitutes the communication of intuitively gratuitous verbal face threatening acts (FIAs), which are purposefully delivered “ (1)unmitigated in context where mitigation is required, and or (2) with deliberate aggression, that is, with the face threat exacerbated, boosted, or maximized in same way to hearken the face damage inflicted.” (Bousfield 2008:72).

In the present paper it is Culpeper's view (2003) which will be adopted in delay with two features: intention and emotional aspects. The first feature shows whether the person who is impolite intends to offend the receiver or not and the second feature indicates that impoliteness often involves emotional consequences for the receiver.

2.2 The interrelation between politeness and impoliteness

For many years in languages study, linguistic politeness has occupied a central place in linguistic studies. Research have been carried out by a huge number of linguistic scholars in this field which led to the proposition of several theories on politeness. On the contrary, little attention has been paid to linguistic impoliteness. Only recently scholars such as Culpeper (1996,2001,2005), Bousfield (2005), and Watts (2008) have began to pay more attention to impoliteness.

Brown and Levinson were the first who have dealt with the concept of linguistic politeness and proposed it in a theory in 1987 which can be traced back to Goffman' s theory of face (1967). Mills (2009: 67) notes than the number of researches on politeness since 1990 has increased by “several hundred”. In his bibliographic collection, What's (2003) discusses 1200 titles concerning politeness. The year 2005 witnessed the launching of ***The Journal of Politeness Research*** which reflects the growing academic interest in the phenomenon. (Bousfield, 2008)

By contrast our understanding of impoliteness has merely crawled forward in the face of this rise interest for politeness phenomenon. Thus we find only

five papers deal with politeness in *The Journal of Pragmatics* issue 1977 in comparison with the huge number of researches in politeness.

However, some researchers such as Culpeper (2003), Locher (2006) and Haugh (2008) have argued that having adequate account of the dynamics of interpersonal communication means to consider both hostile and cooperative communication. Culpeper et al (2003) show the necessity of having an impoliteness framework by noting that

“ conflictive talk has been found to play a role – and often a central one – in, for example, army training discourse (Culpeper 1996), discourse (Lakoff 1989, Penman 1990), family discourse (Vuchinich 1990) , adolescent discourse (Labov 1972; Goodwin and Goodwin 1990), doctor – patient discourse (Mehan 1990), therapeutic discourse (Labov and Fanshel 1977), everyday conversation, (Beebe 1995) and fictional texts (Culpeper 1998, Liu 1986, Tannen 1990).”

(pp.1545-1546)

In comparing the theoretical framework of politeness to impoliteness, it is clear that politeness phenomenon has a huge number of theoretical models, whereas impoliteness research is still in its infancy (Locher, 2006). Nevertheless, a lack of variety of theoretical models is no longer a problem since there has been proliferation of existing models in recent years. Based on Bourdieu's (1991) notion in habits, Elen presented an alternative model of impoliteness. Its main tents are argumentatively, historicity, and discursiveness. Ellen's model impaired the emergence of the discursive

approach of impoliteness. Scholar who follows this model are Locher & Watts (2005), Mills (2003) and Watts (2003).

According to Watts (2003), the analyst needs to identify the norms of appropriateness for a given community of practice and then assess the utterance as being impolite against those norms. Mill (2009) considers these norms to be relative ; they are not straightforward and pre-existing entities.

The discursive approach helps to widen the horizons of politeness research which begin to cover research on impoliteness, a phenomenon which begins to receive an increase attention (Bousfield & Culpeper 2008).

2.3 The Concept of 'Face' in Impoliteness Theory.

The term “face” is used somehow different in impoliteness theory from that one in politeness theory. Spenser-Oatey (2008:642) gives a definition of 'face' by saying that it means “relating to attributes speakers want to be credited with and situational contingent.” As such, the term 'face' can imply various kinds of desire or face-wants that people have. It can be either positive or negative face, where the former refers to the desire to be appreciated, the latter refers to the basic claim to territories and personal perseveres. There would be lack of politeness when the face is attacked which would eventually leads to impoliteness in communication.

Culpeper (2011) believes that many notions are involved in the concept of face such as prestige, reputation, and self – esteem. He (ibid) proposes that the concept of face is not confined to the immediate aspects of an individual's self (e.g. appearance, disposition, abilities). It also includes the self identities with family, possession and school.

In his model, Culpeper (2011) has chosen 'rapport management' developed by Spenser – Oatey (2008) in order to analyze the types of offence involving face. According to Spenser – Oatey (ibid), there are three types of face : “quality”, “relational” and “social identity”. There are also two types of social rights. Following Spenser – Oatey’s approach, Culpeper (2011) distinguishes three levels of face :-

1. an individual level of representation (personal self).
2. an interpersonal level of representation (relation self)
3. a group level of representation (collective self).

2.4 Culpeper’s Models for Studying Impoliteness.

Culpeper’s interest in impoliteness is well known. He has devised an impoliteness model (Culpeper 1996), where he shows that impoliteness is not always “a haphazard product of say a heated argument” in some activity types, but can be developed by the participants “in a systematic way as part of what they perceive to be their job.” (P. 359) In cooperation with Bousfield and Wichmann, he revised this model in 2003. Once again, Culpeper made a revision for this models in 2005.

In this model, Culpeper and his co-authors have explored activity types like the courtroom where they suggest that “ impoliteness is a type of aggression”, and the courtroom is a “ legitimate form of that verbal aggression” in that “prosecutors are licensed to aggravate a witness’s face”.

In this model, Culpeper et al begin briefly reviewing the backdrop which classic politeness studies can provide. Then, they discuss certain notion which they have been considered by Watts (2005) to be “negation”,

“marked” and “inappropriate” behavior. These notions include “over-politeness”, “impoliteness”, and “rudeness”.

In this model, their aim is to show that there are various ways in which one's behaviors can be considered negative. They also attempted to investigate these behaviors which may be considered both negative and inappropriate in some sense.

Culpeper (2011) concludes that Quality Face is the most important type of face relating to impoliteness. Depending on the context culture, impoliteness has high costs. In some cases, it can be considered irrational, and in other cases, it may involve an unpleasant shocks.

2.4.1 Impoliteness Strategies

Culpeper's model (2006: 41) has presented strategies of impoliteness, which are systematically related to the degree of face threat from the least to the highest.

1. Bald on Record Impoliteness.

It is the most obvious and straightforward impoliteness. The face threatening act (FIA) is performed in a direct, unambiguous and concise way. In such circumstances, face is relevant and maximized (Brown Levinson, 1987:69).

2. Positive Impoliteness

It refers to the strategy which includes ignoring the other, excluding the other from an activity, by being disinterested, unsympathetic, using inappropriate identity markers, using obscure or secretive language, seeking disagreement, using taboo words, using

derogatory remarks. This is because of the desire to be appreciated or approved of.

3. Negative Impoliteness.

It attacks the addressee's negative face, which is the basic claim to territories , personal preservers, rights to non-distraction i.e., to freedom of action and freedom from imposition. Frighten, condescend, scorn or ridicule, be contemptuous, do not treat the other seriously, belittle the other, invade the other's space (literally or metaphorically), explicitly associate the other with a negative aspect (personalize use the pronouns "I" and "You", and put the other's indebtedness on record.

3. Sarcasm or Mock Politeness

Here, the FTA is performed with the use of politeness strategies that are obviously insincere, and thus remain surface realizations. Both of strategies are the same, performing impolite utterances because of clearly insincere intention. It is heavily related to the context and it is a surface politeness which can be interpreted in an impolite way because of certain contextual clues and the intention of not causing offense but rather to show social intimacy. Often one has to know the person well in order to understand that he is being sarcastic, mocking you, or that he is joking.

4. Withhold Politeness

It refers to politeness that is expected in a certain situation but is left out for some reasons. Some instances of withholding impoliteness involved the absence of manners that are expected from anyone in a normal interaction. (greeting, saying goodbye).

Culpeper et al (2003) come to the conclusion that the above mentioned strategies are more often mixed and rarely occur singularly and this is contrary to what Brown and Levnsion (1987) claim for politeness. There can be primary effects for one type of face and secondary for another.

2.5 Related Studies

Numerous studies have been done on impoliteness . Some of these include Lucky (2015) who studies impoliteness strategies in British TV-Series Sherlock and Primadinati (2015) who describes the types of impoliteness strategies addressed to the main character in Paranorman movie and his responses to them. In their analysis of selected British social interviews , Abbas and Al-Majdwai (2017) attempt to identify the pragmatic structure of impoliteness and Acheampong &Kwarteng (2021) identify responses toward the impoliteness strategies in their study of impolite natural Ghanaian conversations.

3. Methodology and Analysis

The aims of the present study is to answer the following questions:

1. Do Clinton and Trump use any impoliteness strategies in their debate?
2. How is impoliteness manifested in their discursal debate?
3. What are the functions of the impoliteness strategies employed in this data?
4. To observe the (im)politeness strategies exhibited by each campaign and to establish a comparison with regards to the impoliteness strategies used in their political discourse.

One of the relatively new phenomena in the United States is political discourse on social media. The data of the present paper studies is the 2016 presidential American final debate . The focus of the research is on their political discourse in the final debate held in Las Vegas University. A qualitative and quantitative analyses have been followed in this study for the sake of giving explanatory and objective description of the data under study.

5. Results and Discussion

In this debate, Clinton uses primarily **positive impoliteness** strategies which represent the second strongest expression of impoliteness. They occur **five times** in her discourse. They mainly focus on Trump's personal character and his political beliefs. While other impoliteness strategies such as **bold-on-record** and **negative impoliteness** strategies are infrequent. She hardly uses them to attack face.

On the contrary , Trump utilizes **bald –on- record impoliteness forty two times** which is the strongest expression of impoliteness. **Positive impoliteness** is the second strategy which he uses to criticize the political position of his opponent Clinton.

From the beginning, Trump uses his opponent first name as a **positive politeness** strategy and uses derogatory nomination, as in the following:

"But Hillary was so extremely upset, extremely angry."

"Now, you can say that that's OK and Hillary can say that that's OK. But it's not OK with me."

" Hillary Clinton wanted the wall."

"Hillary Clinton fought for the wall in 2006."

In certain cases, Trump uses in the same sentence both strategies ; **positive impoliteness** by calling her name and **bold-on-record** by attaching his opponent's face:

Trump: Hillary, you have no idea.

Trump: And you know, Hillary, ..you should have changed the law when you were a United States senator.

Clinton mainly relies on **positive politeness** strategies to attack her opponent. She achieves this aim by using the following strategies:

1. Ignore, or snub the other

She deliberately utilizes this strategy with her interviewer, Wallace, by going on speaking despite his attempts to interrupt her. The aim behind using this strategy is to complete her point of view:

Wallace: Secretary Clinton, I want to...

Clinton: We will not have open borders, that is...

Wallace: Well,. Let meSecretary....

Clinton: That is a rank mischaracterization

Wallace: Secretary Clinton...

Clinton: We will have secure borders.

Once again Clinton makes uses of this strategy with Trump as a means to show that she fails to acknowledge his presence and to insult him indirectly:

Trump:from everything I see, has no respect for this person

Clinton: Well, that's because he'd rather have a puppet as president of the United States.

Trump: No Puppet. No puppet

Trump: you're the puppet!

Clinton: It's pretty clear you won't admit

Trump: No , You're the puppet!

When Clinton mentions Trump's ties to Russia and to Russian president Vladimir Putin his reaction is so harsh , so he insults her and attacks her face directly by using **bald-on record strategy** (***No, you're the puppet***). This way of paying back the offense using the expression (***No, You!***) is suitable in preschools and kindergartens. It is not convincing on the presidential stage- especially because Trump has a lot of troubling ties to Russia , while Clinton doesn't.

Sometimes Trump's statements look unconnected and he uses harsh comments which is an indication of his lack of information. On the contrary, Clinton's statements appear so coherent with connected ideas due to her background in previous political debates, as it is obvious in the following:

Trump: Now, I want to build the wall. We need the wall. And the Border Patrol, ICE, they all want the wall. We stop the drugs. We shore up the border. One of my first acts will be to get all of the drug lords, all of the bad ones—we have some bad, bad people in this country. But we have bad hombers here, and we're going to get them out.

Clinton: Well, as he was talking , I was thinking about a young girl I met here in Les Vegas. Carla, who is very worried that her parents might be deported, because she was born in this country but they were not. They work hard, they do everything they can to give her a good life.

And you're right .I don't want to rip families apart..I don't want to be sending parents away from children.

In certain cases when he wants to deny the truth of Clinton's sayings, he uses a negative impoliteness strategy by putting the other's indebtedness on record. Keeping calm is her reaction to his violent attack since she relies on direct quoting as one of the means to show she is not responsible of what is said:

Trump: Look, she's been proven to be a liar on so many different ways.. This is just another lie.

Clinton: well, I'm just quoting you when you were asked....

Trump: There's no quote. You 're not going to find a quote from me.

Clinton: Well, first , when I hear Donald talk like that and know that his slogan is " Make America Great Again", I wonder when he thought America was great. And before he rushes and says, " You know, before you and President Obama were there," I think it's important to recognize that he has been criticizing our government for decades.

Through this debate both of them, Clinton and Trump, often use hedges but for different purposes. Clinton uses them to convince the receiver by mitigating the truth of what she says.:

You know, I think when we talk about the Supreme Court, it really raises the central issue in this election.

"I also believe there is an individual right to bear arms"

Trump makes use of hedges as a politeness strategy when he wants to defend his own opinion and to reject indirectly his opponent view :

Well, I think it's terrible. If you go with what Hillary is saying ..

Sarcasm or mock politeness is one of the strategies that has been used by Trump which is close to Leech's (1983) conception of irony "if you must cause offence, at least do so in a way which doesn't overtly conflict with PP, but allows the hearer to arrive at the offensive point of your remark indirectly, by way of an implicature." (1983:82). In the following, Trump tries to mock Clinton by commenting ironically on what she said:

Clinton: ...You know, he started off with his dad as a millionaire.

Trump: Yeah, yeah, we've heard –we've heard this before, Hillary.

Clinton: I started off with—my dad was a small –business man.

Trump: We've heard this before.

Clinton: And I think it –you know, it's a difference that affects how we see the world and what we want to do with the economy.

Trump: Thank you, Hillary.

Lots of Luck.Hillary. Thanks a lot for doing a great job.

Clinton also uses sarcasm to reduce the importance of what he said:

Trump: Iran is taking over Iraq. We don't gain anything

Clinton: This conspiracy theory, which he's been spewing out for quite some time.

A quantitative analysis is manifested in the table below in order to support the results found in the qualitative analysis.

Table (1) : Frequencies of impoliteness strategies in Trump's and Clinton's comments

Impoliteness strategies	Frequency in Clinton's comments	Percentage 100%	Frequencies in Trump's comments	Percentage%
Bald on record	42	64%	3	25%
Positive impoliteness	15	23%	7	58%
Negative impoliteness	2	3%	1	8%
Sarcasm	6	9%	1	8%
Total	65	100%	12	100%

6. Conclusion

1. Trump uses impoliteness strategies more than Clinton who prefers to use politeness strategies such as hedges .
2. Trump utilizes primarily bald-on-record impoliteness whereas Clinton utilizes primarily positive impoliteness strategies.

3. Both Trump and Clinton uses sarcasm to minimize the importance of the opponent's saying.
4. Trump almost certainly insult Clinton directly by using verbal strategy whereas Clinton sometimes uses non-verbal strategy by declining to shake hands with here opponent, and instead offering a head nod. This indicates that she doesn't want to touch the hand.
5. Unlike Trump's comments, Clinton's look so coherent reflecting her background political experience. On the contrary, he rambles without saying anything except to make factually absurd and unconnected statements.

References

- Abbas, Abber Naser& A-Majdwai , Ali Muhsin (2017). A Pragmatic Analysis of Impoliteness in Selected British Social Interviews. *International Journal of Science and Research*, Vol. 7, issue 9, p.536.
- Acheaman, Dorcas Oteng & Kwarteng, Michael. (2021). A Pragmatic Analysis of Impolitenss in Selected Ghanian Social Interactions. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Vol.3,issue: 3, pp. 32-36.
- Beebe, Leslie M.(1995).Polite Fictions: Instrumental Rudeness and Pragmatic Competence .In James E.Alati, Carolyn A.Strachele, Maggie Ronkin &Brent Gallenberger (eds.)Washington ,D.C.
- Bousfield,Derek.(2008).Impolitenessin Interaction.Philadelphia & Amsterdam:John Benjamins.
- Bousfield, Derek & Jonathan Culpeper.(2008). Impoliteness:Eclecticism and diaspora. An Introduction to the specialedition. *Journal of Politeness Research* 42.161-168.
- Culpeper,J. (1996). Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness.*Journal of Pragmatics* 25:349-367.
- Culpeper,J.,Derek B.,and Anne W.(2003). Impoliteness Re-visited:With special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35:1545-1579.

- Culpeper, J. (2005). Impoliteness and Entertainment in the television quiz show: The Weakest Link, *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, Behaviour, Culture* 1:35-72.
- Culpeper, J. (2010). Conventionalised Impoliteness Formulae. *Journal of pragmatics*, Volume 42, 3232-3245.
- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge University Press.
- Elen, Gino. (2001). *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Haugh, Michael. (2008). Intention in Pragmatics, *Intercultural Pragmatics* 5-2, 99-110.
- Locher, Miriam. (2006). Polite Behaviour within Relational Work: The Discursive Approach to Politeness. *Multilingual* 25(3). 249-267.
- Lucky B, Joan (2015).). A Pragmatic Analysis of Impoliteness Strategies in British TV Series Sherlock. Unpublished thesis. Faculty of Languages and Arts, Yogyakarta State University
- Mills, Sara. (2009). Impoliteness in a Cultural Context. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 4. 1047-1060.
- Primadianti, Nabella. (2015). A Pragmatic Analysis of Impoliteness in Paranorman Movie. Unpublished thesis. Faculty of Languages and Arts, Yogyakarta State University.
- Spencer-Oatey, Helen. (2005). (Im)politeness, face, and perceptions of rapport: Unpackaging their bases and interrelations. *Journal of Politeness Research*. 1. 95-119.
- Watts, Richards J. (2008). Rudeness, conceptual blending theory and relational Work. *Journal of Politeness Research* 4 (2). 289-317.