

Impoliteness Strategies in English and Arabic Facebook Comments

Najla Majeed Hammod

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

E-mail: najlaMH135@gmail.com

Asst. Prof. Arwa Abdul-Rassul (Ph.D.)

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

E-mail: drarwaalsalman@gmail.com

Received: August 31, 2017 Accepted: September 6, 2017 Published: September 21, 2017

doi:10.5296/ijl.v9i5.11895

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v9i5.11895>

Abstract

The study investigates Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness strategies in English and Arabic Facebook comments. The study aims at describing the types of impoliteness strategies used by facebookers in online contexts, and what factors may affect this use. As such, six pages are selected and there are four strategies found in Facebook contexts: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, sarcasm/mock impoliteness. Positive and negative impoliteness are the most frequent types, whereas, withdraw politeness does not exist in online contexts. The findings show a great similarity between English and Arabic data in the most used strategies, but the topics that cause the use of impoliteness were different.

Keywords: Impoliteness, Social media, Impoliteness in Facebook

1. Introduction

Social network sites, like Facebook, paved the way for scholars and attract them for doing research in online contexts. Facebook has many features which attract users, one of these strategies is the ability to participate in public pages by commenting, and even reply to comments. The interest in studying computer-mediated communication (CMC) has increased, especially in social media sites (Facebook in particular). This new context and the different topics and events that the users of Facebook engaged in can affect the use of impoliteness language.

1.1 Significance of the Study

The significance of the current study encompasses several domains including pragmatics (particularly impoliteness studies), and sociolinguistic studies. First and foremost this study adds value to previous researches of impoliteness, particularly among facebookers. Also, it enriches the Arabic studies with the newly interest of impoliteness and online contexts. To the researcher's knowledge, the present study is the first Arabic online impoliteness study that collects data using the comments of facebookers in three different topics. The current study hoping to contribute in discussing different events in Facebook community.

1.2 Objectives

1.2.1 To identify the types of impoliteness strategies in English and Arabic Facebook.

1.2.2 To highlight the influence of topic on the use of impoliteness strategies in English and Arabic contexts.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Impoliteness

The normal phenomenon in the social interaction is politeness, which means to keep harmony and communication, besides showing respect to others. But the opposite phenomenon 'impoliteness' is as important as politeness. It is the salient and the abnormal behaviour in the interaction which causes the disharmony. It is so, because "it appears to go against the canons of acceptable, appropriate behaviour operative for the ongoing social interaction" (Watts, 2003).

Before presenting impoliteness framework, few lines are needed to clarify what impoliteness is. In fact, there is no full agreement among theorists about what it is exactly, because it is related to other terms like intention and rudeness. Locher and Bousfield (2008) state that it is important to focus on the speaker and hearer interpretation, beside the effect of context. These factors are important to explain any phenomenon socially. They (ibid, 3) describe impoliteness as "a behaviour that is face-aggravating in a particular context". Culpeper (1996) defines politeness as "the use of strategies that are designed to have the opposite effect – that is of social disruption". These strategies are oriented towards attacking face which is an emotionally sensitive concept of the self. In this definition, the two orders (first and second) are gathered. So, studying the use of impoliteness is very important in any communication,

because as there is cooperative communication, there is a hostile one. Culpeper (2008) also states that impoliteness is "a communicative behaviour intending to cause the 'face loss' of a target or perceived by the target to be so", and this occurs when there is a conflict between the participants, or their interests are not the same. Culpeper (2013) states that impoliteness plays a very important role in many discourses.

2.2 Impoliteness Framework

Impoliteness framework of this study is based on Culpeper's (1996) which follows Brown and Livenson's model of politeness. He formulates a parallel frame for impoliteness. It is regarded as complementary for politeness theory, because politeness is better understood with reference to impoliteness phenomenon (Bousfield, 2008a; and Mohammed and Abbas, 2015). What makes Culpeper's model more prominent is that Culpeper's model is tested across different discourses, and it is practical for the data of real-life (Bousfield, 2008a).

Culpeper's (1996) paper 'Towards an anatomy of impoliteness' is the source for many studies of impoliteness. Culpeper refuses that impoliteness is 'marginal' in the social interaction. In contrary, it is an affecting phenomenon, and must be studied deeply (Mohammed and Abbas, 2015). Culpeper formulates five superstrategies. These strategies are the opposite of politeness strategies; they are formed to attack face.

1-Bald on record impoliteness: the FTA has a direct, clear, and unambiguous threat to the H's face in contexts where face is relevant and maximised. So, the attack of face occurs with the intention of the S to do the FTA. Culpeper's strategy differs from Brown and Levinson's bald on record politeness strategy in that the latter occurs in 'specific circumstances' where the threat of face is very small (like in the urgency cases), or when it is performed from a powerful participant (Culpeper, 1996; Culpeper, Bousfield, and Wichmann, 2003).

2-Positive impoliteness: Archer (2008) assumes that when the FTA occurs to damage the positive face of the H, it will be a positive impoliteness strategy. There are many other substrategies within this strategy, as follows:

- Ignoring and snubbing the other. The S fails to acknowledge the other's presence.
- Excluding the other participants from an activity.
- Disassociating from the other. The S denies association or common ground with the other; so he avoids sitting together.
- Being disinterested, unconcerned, unsympathetic.
- Using inappropriate identity markers. The S uses title and surname when a close relationship pertains, or a nickname when a distant relationship pertains.
- Using an obscure or secretive language. The S mystifies the other with jargon, or uses a code known to others in the group, but not the target addressee.
- Seeking disagreement. The S selects a sensitive topic. -
- Making the other feel uncomfortable. The S does not avoid silence, joke, or uses small talk.

-Using taboo words – swear, or using abusive or profane language.

-Calling the other names. The S uses derogatory nominations.

(Culpeper, 1996).

3-Negative impoliteness: the FTAs that attack the negative face of the H are called negative impoliteness strategies (Culpeper, 2005). As with positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness also has substrategies as follows:

-Frightening. The S threatens others that some detrimental actions will occur to them.

-Condescending, scorning, or ridiculing. The S emphasizes your relative power. The S is contemptuous.

-Do not treat the other seriously. The S belittles the other (e.g. using diminutives).

-Invading the other's space either literally (e.g. position yourself closer to other than the relationship permits) or metaphorically (e.g. ask for or speak about information which too intimate to be shared).

-Explicitly associating the other with a negative aspect. The S personalizes using the pronouns 'I' and 'you'.

-Putting the other's indebtedness on record (Culpeper, 1996).

4-Sarcasm or mock impoliteness: this strategy is all about insincerity, and what is performed is the opposite of what is meant. The superficial FTA used is a politeness strategy, and the polite meaning of this strategy remains on the surface, whereas the intended meaning is impolite. There is no specific strategy to be used. Many strategies can be used as acceptable ones, but deeply they may mean the opposite (Culpeper, 1996; Bousfield, 2008a; and Mohammed and Abbas, 2015).

5-Withhold politeness: as with the last strategy in Brown and Levinson's model of avoiding doing acts, this strategy is also about the avoidance of or failing in performing the polite strategy, the time it is expected to be performed. For example, when someone fails to thank somebody else for a favourite or a present, it is interpreted as impoliteness (Culpeper, 1996; 2005; and Bousfield, 2008a).

2.3 Social Media

Social media is a popular media, which have many websites, that attracts the users of internet to follow them, so it is a general term related to the social uses of internet communication. Social media are environments for social interaction, uploading contents, and shaping identity. They help the users to share their experiences and opinions with one another (Miller, 2008; Yus, 2014; and Al-Shlool, 2016). Social media websites first are used by college students, but now with all what they offer, it is not surprising that many people are using them to keep in touch, and communicate with other users (Miller, 2008).

Facebook is one of the social networking sites. It is a rich medium for the researchers who are interested in social networks to do their investigations (Al-Shlool, 2016). Facebook is regarded as one of the largest social network in the world as it enables its users to manage, maintain, and enhance their social connections (Abram and Pearlman, 2010).

3. Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The study adopts Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness strategies to identify the existence of impoliteness in comments on Facebook and what types that are frequently used. The pragmatic analysis is supported by a discursive analysis is important to see the effects of topics and contexts on this phenomenon. Cutting (2002) defines pragmatics and discourse analysis as "approaches to study language's relation to the contextual background features". So, the discursive level of any text is important to explain the dynamics of impoliteness. Bousfield (2008b) explains discourse beginnings, saying that context or the activity type is essential to understand the triggers of impoliteness. He (ibid) states that "impoliteness does not exist in a vacuum and it does not in normal circumstances just spring from 'out of the blue'". So, context (in all its types) is important in this phenomenon. Bousfield (ibid) also explains the utterance level of impoliteness, stating that there are simple and complex impoliteness; simple impoliteness is an utterance with an impoliteness strategy, whereas the complex consists of more than one impoliteness strategy within a single utterance. Also, quantitative analysis which is presented to have accurate results about numbers and statistics of impoliteness.

3.2 Procedures

The first step taken is collecting data by finding out authenticable English and Arabic pages on Facebook in order to collect impolite comments from these pages. Then, to analyse English and Arabic comments according to the adopted pragmatic model (Culpeper's 1996) putting in mind the discursive factors that affects this analysis. Statistics is made to find the percentage of each strategy. Finally, results of English and Arabic comments are compared to find conclusions.

3.3 Data

The sources of data are taken from Facebook website. In fact, online texts are not easy to locate and collect. There must be some considerations in selecting online language sources. In this study there are some considerations concerned in the process of collecting. First of all, locate authenticable Facebook pages both in English and Arabic Language. These pages must be public and represent groups or institutions. The pages are popular; they are liked by millions facebookers. The chosen pages represent different topics that are important in our life. The comments chosen to be analysed are impolite ones. The period of collecting lasts for three months (May 2016- July 2016). The pages chosen for the purpose of this study are:

3.3.1 English Facebook Web Pages

Three different pages are chosen to represent the English Facebook. These pages are:

a. Entertainment Tonight, an entertainment TV show,
<https://www.facebook.com/EntertainmentTonight/>

This page is liked by 4 841 882 facebookers. It is an official page of Entertainment Tonight, the most watched entertainment news program which gets the latest celebrity gossips, Hollywood news, red carpet fashions and events, celebrity trends, movie news.

b. The Doctors, a medical TV program,

<https://www.facebook.com/TheDoctors/?fref=ts>

This page is liked by 3 949 686 facebookers. It is the official page of this program. The program is a team of physicians with different specialties answer health questions which people are too afraid to speak up.

c. RT, a news media.

https://www.facebook.com/RTnews/?hc_ref=NEWSFEED

This page is liked 4 478 531. It is the official page of the news media channel RT which is a pioneer broadcasting with bureaus in Moscow, London, and Washington. This page shares different types of news.

3.3.2 Arabic Facebook web pages

Three different pages are chosen to represent the Arabic Facebook which as much as possible are parallel to the English ones. These pages are:

a. ET, an entertainment TV show.

<https://www.facebook.com/ETbilArabi/?fref=ts>

This page is liked by 4 018 748 facebookers. It is the official page of the Arabic version of the world class entertainment show Entertainment Tonight.

b. Green Apple التفاح الأخضر

https://www.facebook.com/GreenAppleShow/?ref=br_rs

This page is liked by 16 758 090. It is the official page of the Arabic T.V. programme Green Apple. This page shares different topics concerned with health, nurture, fitness, and environment advices.

c. RT Arabic, a news media.

https://www.facebook.com/rtarabic.ru/?hc_ref=NEWSFEED&fref=nf

This page is liked by 11,811,378. It is the official page of the news channel RT Arabic. The page shares news about politics, economy, culture, sports, press, and documentary.

4. Analysis and Results

Impoliteness strategies are investigated according to the adopted model of impoliteness. In the analysis, the data are arranged according to the pages, so that each topic comments are analysed in isolation to see the effect of topics upon the use of impoliteness.

4.1 English Analysis

The English data are collected from three official and standard pages on Facebook. These pages are followed by millions. They are very popular, and active. Some posts are selected randomly from these pages to be the contexts of the comments.

a. Entertainment tonight

context/ A post about a famous singer who was involved in a car collision.

<Justin Bieber was involved in a car collision following church services in Beverly Hills on Wednesday night>

(1) Damn evil paparazzi smh. The true killers of Princess Diana. If they weren't chasing her. They never would've died fleeing them.

The commenter curses the church and snubs the priests for being such evils. Also, the S uses acronym 'smh' to say he is shocked from this news saying that it shakes his head. the second part of the comment is a direct accusation that the church is responsible of the killing of Princess Diana. It is positive impoliteness.

(2) I don't even love this clown but the photographers are all up these people's butt 24/7. Get out of the way.

The commenter directly expresses his dislike towards this singer, calling him a clown. Also, the S complaints what the photographers do of following such person 24 hours around the week, asking them directly to get out of the way. There are two strategies used: bald on record impoliteness and positive impoliteness.

(3) I was involved in a traffic collision and ET did not report it. What makes the ET author of this article think people care about this bozo????? Cmon bru.

The commenter, speaking in sarcasm way, expressing his disgusting of sharing such news, saying that even he made a collision and no one reported it. The S complaints that report claiming that no one cares about it as a way of expressing his dislike to that singer. The five questions mark emphasize that the commenter is not interested in such post. Lastly, the commenter uses small versions of words that are widely used in internet interaction. These words are 'Cmon' for 'come on', and 'bru' for 'brother'. Again, two of Culpeper's strategies are used, sarcasm and positive impoliteness.

(4) Here comes all the bullshit comments about how bad of the person Justin is

The commenter here criticizes the other facebookers for their bad comments by using the taboo word 'bullshit' to describe what their opinions and comments. It is positive impoliteness.

(5) *No point to church if your still an arsehole*

The S uses the taboo word 'arsehole' to insult the singer. It is very abusive word. It is positive impoliteness.

b. The Doctors

Context/ A post about a man who wants to transform into genderless.

<A 23-year-old man who hopes to transform into a genderless alien explain why he wants his genitalia, nipples, and belly button surgically removed.>

(1) *This right here is mental illness!!! I get being gay, lesbian, trans but nonbionary is going way to far that when you say hey I'm sick and have a mental illness when you want no gentiles and not be a certain sex. You are either male or female.*

The commenter is so disgusting and contemptuous. The S calls this issue as mental illness, and he is so shocked of that and this is clear in the exclamation marks. The S discusses the other ways which may be more acceptable, like being gay, lesbian, or even transform the gender, but to be genderless is something weird and cannot be accepted. It is negative impoliteness.

(2) *So he says he wants his nipples & belly button removes to give him more of a sexy kind of look, hmmm, why use the word 'sexy' if he wants to remove his genitalia & be sexless.. This boy needs therapy . smh*

In sarcasm way, the S makes fun of that man expressing how he contradicts himself, he wants to be sexless to look sexy. The commenter is shocked of that which is expressed by acronym smh 'shaking my head'. also, the S implies that that man is ill and needs therapy. There are two of Culpeper's strategies used here, sarcasm, and positive impoliteness.

(3) *What a freak! This person needs serious psychological help. This whole generation has gone to hell in a hand basket.*

The S directly insults that man as being ill, and describes this issue as freak. Then the commenter complains the new generation and how bad it is. It is positive impoliteness.

(4) *You can't be genderless. You can't be an alien. Unless you've got magic that turns your DNA into something different.....'You can't make a silk purse from a sow's ear'.*

The commenter refuses what this man wants to do, expressing his disagreement. The S is disinterested in this issue, and expresses its impossibility. It is positive impoliteness.

(5) *Is what this person doing hurting you personally and if so how and if not then shut up let people be who they want to be... I don't understand why people can't say well and that's not for me and move on..*

The commenter shows his disgusting of the other commenters who refused such thing, asking them to shut up if they are not hurt personally. The S claims that people nowadays interject themselves badly in what others do. The S is snubs them for that. There are two strategies used here, bald on record impoliteness, and positive impoliteness.

c. RT

context 3: A post about a blaze in a building in London.

<Terrifying videos of West London Tower blaze>

(1) I'm wondering why the first word I heard on the first video were 'Allahu Akbur'??? At a time where 120 homes are in the process of being destroyed and someone is saying 'God is great', followed by a little chuckle ... I mean is it just me or is that a big odd?

The commenter implies her snubs and disinterest in something she notices in the video. The S expresses her disgusting, and wondering if she is the only one who notices that. It is positive impoliteness. In fact, this comment gets many replies as follow.

(2) Guys stop this shit, people have lost lives, a kid has jumped through a window and everyone of you commenting about religion? Disgusting .. for once in your pathetic lives be human..

This comment is a reply for comment (1). It contains many strategies. First of all, the S directly attacks the commenter of (1) for such accusation. It is bald on record impoliteness, besides using the abusive word (shit) metaphorically to describe her speech. The S scorns her and others for their accusation showing how it is a disgusting thing to do. The S also belittles them for not being human and such opinions do not reflect humanity. There are three Culpeper's strategies used here: bald on record, positive, and negative impoliteness.

(3) I am human. I care about people and humanity so much so that I'm wondering why some fucker is saying god is great at such a traumatic time !???

The commenter is the same of (1), replies to (2) who makes some attacks and accusations. The S defends herself for being human and that her speech shows her care about humanity. She repeats her accusation make more abusive by using taboo word (fucker). She snubs them for saying 'God is great'. The commenter uses exclamation mark and three question marks to insist and emphasize her opinion. It is positive impoliteness. She insults some people in the video as being fuckers.

(4) Don't try to make stupid things out of your stupidity

Again, this is a reply to comment (1) and attacks her directly. The S scorns her and associates her with negative aspect (stupidity). This comment has two strategies, bald on record impoliteness and negative impoliteness. There is a violation of tact with unmitigated directive.

(5) People have died in this tragedy. WTF has religion got to do with it?? Fucking dickheads!!!

Once again, this comment is a reply to comment (1). The S snubs the facebookers for their racism comment and expressing his anger and disgusting of that. His question is a rhetorical one which is used to imply a strong assertion that religion has nothing to do with this tragedy. Then, the commenter insults others using taboo words (Fucking dickheads) to describe how stupid they are and their thinking. WTF is an acronym of 'what the fuck' which also contains swearing word. It is positive impoliteness,

The analysis is a strong evidence of the usability and applicability of the model adopted. The model has been adopted to three different Facebook pages comments. The comments have been randomly selected, and they vary from very long to very short comments. It has been found that the use of impoliteness in English Facebook comments is effected by the context and the type of pages the facebookers activate in. the content of the post has a direct effect on that impolite comments. Moreover, many facebookers are affected by the other impolite comment and reply to it. The facebookers find themselves part of this community and participate freely in expressing their opinions and contradict others. This gives them more power and encourage them to interact. Besides, the far distance between the S and Os, unknown identity even with a full name which might be fake, and the absent of types of threat except the verbal one, all these things effect the use of impoliteness.

According to Culpeper's strategies, positive and negative impoliteness are the most used strategies. Whereas withdraw politeness does not exist because it needs face to face interaction to be identified. Also, the strategies can occur together in one comment, so it is complex impoliteness. This complexity makes the usage of impoliteness strategies more than the total number of the comments. The analysis also shows that impoliteness are used in medical contexts more than the others, and entertainment topic and news are the less and get simpler impoliteness.

Table 1. The Frequency of Culpeper's Impoliteness Strategies in English data analysis

Strategy of impoliteness	Entertainment Tonight		The Doctors		RT		Total Frequency	Total Percentage
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage		
Bald on record impoliteness	2	8%	4	14.28 6%	3	12%	9	11.53 8%
Positive impoliteness	13	52%	11	39.28 6%	11	44%	35	44.87 2%
Negative impoliteness	6	24%	11	39.28 6%	10	40%	27	34.61 5%
Sarcasm/ mock impoliteness	4	16%	2	7.142 %	1	4%	7	8.974 %
Withhold	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%

b. Green Apple التفاح الأخضر

Context / A post about prevent keeping some food in fridge, like eggs and bananas.

<أطعمة لا يجب حفظها أبداً في الثلاجة! .. منها البيض والموز>

"لا أتفق معكم. البيض ومنتجات الألبان من المولد سريعة التلف التي تستدعي درجة حفظ منخفضة, البيض 6م. والحليب ومشتقاته 4م. أما بالنسبة للحوم المجمدة فيتم إزالة تجميدها في الثلاجة ليتم استخدام فوراً ولا يعاد تجميدها, أما الخضراوات والفواكه يمكن تركها في الظل بعيداً عن أشعة الشمس في درجة حرارة الغرفة ولكن ليس لفترة طويلة لأنها تفسد. انتبهوا للمعلومات التي تنشروها, نحن 'بيضة تزن 70 غراماً قادرة على قتل رجل يزن 70 كيلو غراماً' هناك مقولة تقول في فصل الصيف وهو فصل تكثر فيه التسممات الغذائية وعدم احترام سلسلة التبريد يمكن أن تؤدي إلى تسممات وبالتالي إلى وفيات, وانتم تغالطون عندما تقولون عدم حفظ البيض والألبان في الثلاجة, تحفظ في الثلاجة ولكن تستهلك بسرعة."

<I disagree, eggs and dairy are perishables which needs low temperature, egg 6, and milk 4, ...

It is said that 'small egg may kill a huge man'. Be careful to what you post. It is summer and we may be poisoned and die. You are wrong when you say do not keep eggs and dairy in fridge>

The commenter wrote a very long comment to express his opinion about this post. First, the S expresses his disagreement with what is shared on Facebook, writing full information about how to store vegetables and fruits. The S starts the second part with proverb to give more emphasis to his opinion and warns of the wrong information shared. Then, he directs them to be more careful to what they post, emphasizing one more they are wrong and this may lead to unwanted results. There are two strategies used, bald on record impoliteness and positive impoliteness.

"هل هو تعليق مضحك سيد عبد الرحمن"

<is it a funny comment Mr Abdu Al-Rahman>

This comment is a reply for comment (33) from the same commenter. First of all, in Facebook, there is a bottom enables the facebookers to react to the comments with 'like, laugh, or anger, etc.' One facebooker reacts with laugh about comment (33) which makes him feel offensive of that. So that, the S give a direct question with anger tone of that reaction. It is clear that the s is not happy with that, especially there is nothing funny in the comment. It is positive impoliteness.

معلومات غير صحيحة

<false information>

Directly and briefly, the commenter expresses his opinion about this information and how he disagrees with the shared information. It is positive impoliteness. There is also an indirect accusation for not being sincere in what they post.

c. RT Arabic

Context 1: A post about the prohibition of foreign names in Egypt for the new born babies.

<مصر وحظر الأسماء الأجنبية للمواليد الجدد>

"أمة التخلف والرجعية قبل حظر الأسماء الأجنبية أحظرو الآلات والأجهزة بين أيديكم يا شعوب التخلف"

<A nation of tardiness and recessiveness, before prohibiting foreign names, prevent all tools and devices in your hands, tardy nation>

The S directly insults who did this statement generalizes that all the nations are foolish. It also implies insult that you are just useless and cannot even make your daily things alone and everything you have is exported. The commenter scorns them saying that if you really do not want to use foreign things so prevent the devices you use. The S is so disgusting. It is negative impoliteness.

"واحد برلماني فاضي فكر يعمل قانون ويطرحة للمناقشة وفي الآخر سحبه لأنه قانون تافه وأهبل وكل واحد حر يسمي ولأده زي ما هو عايز"

<such a lowbrow parliamentarian thinks to prescribe a law and raise it to argumentation, but then he cancels it because it is a trivial enactment and everyone is free to name his child>

The S makes two insults, one against the parliamentarian and the other against the enactment. The commenter scorns this parliamentarian for being such an idiot, because what he presents is useless, not important, and just a wasting of time. Also, the commenter states that each parents to name their child. It is negative impoliteness.

"بعد ما باعوا البلد مش بعيد على #برلمان_العار انه يعمل اي حاجة"

<after perfidy the country, shameless parliament can do anything>

The commenter is so disgusting, and it is a chance to express that disgust towards the parliament. The S accuses them of perfidy the country, so it is not surprising after that to do anything. He scorns them. It is negative impoliteness.

"شوف البياخة يعني تركو الفقر والفساد والتخلف وركزو على شغلات تافهة تفووووووووو"

<banality! They ignore poverty, corruption, and tardiness, and paid attention to such nonsense! (Spiting)>

The commenter scorns them for discussing such unimportant thing describing that as banality. The s insults them for their triviality . Then he spits to show how disgusting is this thing. It is negative impoliteness.

"بلكزمة للتخلف"

<fuck tardiness>

The commenter uses swear word to express his refusing to such enactment. Briefly, the S insults them and complaints this tardiness we live in. It is positive impoliteness.

The analysis shows that the adopted model is applicable in Arabic contexts and could be tested in different contexts. The researcher adopts the model on three different types of Facebook pages with different topics to find out the most used impoliteness strategies, as well

as, the type of topics that have most impolite comments. It has been found that the content of the post is the basic trigger of the use of impoliteness. So, the type of the page affects the use of impoliteness. Also, facebookers do not have much effect on each other, and there are few comments which are replied to. It is worth mentioning that Anonymity is not found much nowadays and it is not a strong trigger of impoliteness. There is no much use of taboo word and hostile in these standard contexts. Moreover, most comments have complex impoliteness, and one can find more than one strategy in the same utterance.

According to Culpeper's strategies, the positive and negative impoliteness are the most used strategies, and the former is a little more. Again, we did not find withhold politeness in Arabic Facebook comments. Bald on record impoliteness and sarcasm are the less two strategies used. There are some comments which have complex impoliteness, so that the total number of impoliteness strategies are more than the total number of comments. The analysis shows that the page of news has the less number of strategies, which means that it has mostly simple impoliteness. The entertainment page has the highest number of strategies.

Table 2. The Frequency of Culpeper's Impoliteness Strategies in Arabic data analysis

Strategy of impoliteness	بالعربي ET		التفاح الأخضر Green apple		RT Arabic		Total Frequency	Total Percentage
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage		
Bald on record impoliteness	2	7.692 %	2	8%	2	9.524 %	6	8.333%
Positive impoliteness	8	30.76 9%	16	64%	8	38.09 5%	32	44.444 %
Negative impoliteness	14	53.84 6%	5	20%	9	42.85 7%	28	38.888 %
Sarcasm/ mock impoliteness	2	7.692 %	2	8%	2	9.524 %	6	8.333%
Withhold politeness	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total number of strategies	26	99.99 9%	25	100%	21	100%	72	99.998 %

4.3 Comparison and Discussion

In this section, there is a comparison between the English and Arabic results of the analysis, as well as, a discussion the main points of the analysis. It is worth mentioning that 160 comments are analysed to find out the strategies, 60 for each language.

Throughout the analysis, it is found that the model is applicable to the two languages within different contexts. The topic of the page affects the use of impoliteness in the two languages. In the English contexts, the medical topic has the most complex impoliteness, basically by

using positive and negative Culpeper's impoliteness strategies. In Arabic contexts, the entertainment page has the most complex impoliteness. Again, the most used strategies in this page are negative and positive impoliteness.

In general, positive and negative Culpeper's impoliteness strategies are the most used in both languages. Withdraw politeness strategy never appears in Facebook community. Also, facebookers usually use complex impoliteness. Moreover, English contexts show more complexity in the use of Culpeper's strategies than Arabic contexts.

5. Conclusion

To the best of my knowledge, this thesis is the first in its kind: an attempt to focus on impoliteness in Facebook contexts both in English and Arabic languages. This study comes up with the following conclusions:

1. The adopted model (Culpeper's 1996) is applicable in CMC, Facebook in particular.
2. A wide use of impoliteness strategies is there in English and Arabic Facebook.
3. Four of Culpeper's strategies are found in online contexts: bald on record impoliteness, positive impoliteness, negative impoliteness, and sarcasm. Whereas, the fifth strategy (withdraw politeness) does not exist in online contexts.
4. Both English and Arabic Facebook have nearly similar results of the most used strategies. Impoliteness is used to attack positive and negative face.
5. Most of the comments contain complex impoliteness. English Facebook is more complex in the use of Culpeper's strategies than Arabic.
6. The type of the page and the content of the post affect the use of impoliteness both in English and Arabic Facebook. So, context has a direct influence on the use of impoliteness.
7. Commenters of English Facebook are affected by the other impolite comments, and reply to these comments in impolite ways. Arabic Facebook shows less effect of other commenters.
8. English facebookers are more impolite in medical pages than Arabs. While, Arab facebookers are more impolite in entertainment pages.
9. Anonymity is not the main factor on the use of impoliteness. Facebookers with full names use impoliteness freely, even with abusive content, both in English and Arabic Facebook.

Reference

Abram, C., & Pearlman, L. (2010). *Facebook For Dummies* (2nd Ed.) Indiana: Wiley Publishing, Inc.

Al-Shloul, S. (2015). (Im) Politeness and Gender in the Arabic Discourse of Social Media Network Websites: Facebook as a Norm. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 8(3), 1948-5425. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v8i3.9301>

- Archer, D. E. (2008). Verbal aggression and impoliteness: Related or synonymous?'. In Bousfield, Derek, and Locher, Miriam A. (eds.) *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bousfield, D. (2008a) *Impoliteness in Interaction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bousfield, D. (2008b). Impoliteness in the struggle for power. In Bousfield, Derek, and Locher, Miriam A. (eds.) *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Culpeper, J. (2013). Impoliteness: Questions and Answers. In Jamet, Denis & Jobert, Manuel (Eds.), *Aspects of Linguistic Impoliteness*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Culpeper, J. (2008). Reflections on impoliteness, relational work and power. In Bousfield, Derek, & Miriam A. Locher (Eds.), *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25, 349-67.
- Culpeper, J., Bousfield, D., & Wichmann, A. (2003). Impoliteness reviewed: With special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35, 1545-1579.
- Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Locher, M. A., & Bousfield, D. (2008). Introduction: Impoliteness and power in language. In: Bousfield, Derek and Locher, Miriam A. (Eds.) *Impoliteness in Language: Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Miller, M. (2011). *Facebook for Grown-Ups*. Indiana: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Mohammed , H. N., & Abbas, N. F. (2015). Pragmatics of Impoliteness and Rudeness. *American International Journal of Social Science*, 4(6), 195-205.
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yus, F. (2016). Social media. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261989681>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)