# A Pragmatic Analysis of Loanwords Used in the Egyptian Media

Dr. Maha Fathi Mohamed
Associate Professor – English Language
Misr International University

د. مها فتحى محمد
أستاذ مساعد – اللغة الإنجليزية
جامعة مصر للعلوم والتكنولوجيا

# A Pragmatic Analysis of Loanwords Used in the Egyptian Media

## Introduction

In the past few decades, linguists have started to focus their attention on the importance of the study of pragmatics, in other words, the way language is used in actual contexts (Alaoui, 2011, p. 7). This is true since language is not an isolated entity but is closely knit to the social and interpersonal contexts it is used in. Language is used to state one's attitudes regarding oneself and the world, his/her belonging to a certain social group or class as well as the degree of formality with others (Meyerhoff). As such, the study of language in relation to pragmatics adds to the value of a research.

Such interest was not reflected in studies related to the adoption and adaptation of foreign words into the Arabic language. The focus has always been on other aspects such as semantics of loanwords, what specific word classes are borrowed or the phonological and morphological inflections of loanwords. The present study is an attempt to curb that defect by studying, not only the phonological and morphological changes of certain loanwords introduced in the Egyptian media, but also the relation between such adopted words and the two pragmatic concepts: Grice's cooperative principle (CP) and Leech's politeness principles (PP).

## Statement of the Problem and Research Questions

People in Egypt speak Arabic and employ more than one variety of it. There exists classical Arabic which is a highly codified variety usually used by clergymen in religious contexts, colloquial Egyptian Arabic (EA) with its various dialects used by all sectors of the Egyptian society and finally, a combination of the previous two varieties, the Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) "…used in formal speaking situations such as...news broadcasts and speeches, and in all formal writing such as official correspondence, literature and newspapers." (Thompson, 2013).The aim of the present research is to study the loanwords recently borrowed from English and used in MSA in Egyptian newspapers and on

the radio and television and how they are adapted by EA and understood by Egyptians.

With the exception of very few words that have been frequently used such as democracy, loanwords used in EA have been terms associated with tangible objects. For example, in relation to houses there are /balako:na/[1] or 'balcony', and /ru:f/ which means 'roof'. Others related to technology are /kɒmbjutar/ or computer, /dɪɪbfrɪ:zar/ or deep freezer and /fɪdu:/ or 'video'. Words related to cars are /?utubɪ:s/ or 'bus', /bawarstɪɪrɪŋ/ or 'power steering' and /ɒtɒmatɪk/ i.e. 'automatic', while vocabulary related to food is /bɪtsa:/ or 'pizza' and /subarmarket/ or 'supermarket'.

However, in the last few years, the Egyptian media, whether audio, visual or printed, have adopted a number of borrowed English words which express abstract concepts related to social and political issues. Newspaper writers and reporters as well as television and radio anchors and talk show interviewers and interviewees have been using them frequently, without providing explanations for them. Some examples are /lɪbra:lɪjæh/ or 'liberalism', /teknɒkrat/or 'technocrat' and /bərægmætɪjæh/or 'pragmatism'. The problem here lies in the fact that a large number of the Egyptians hearing or reading these borrowed words have come to reiterate them without understanding what they mean or even being able to guess from contexts the messages they carry. This situation defies the rule that communication, whether in its oral or written forms, is based on understanding messages conveyed between the speaker/writer (henceforth referred to as 'S') and the hearer/reader or any third party not physically present (henceforth referred to as 'H').

The present paper studies this phenomenon from a number of novel angles. It is not only concerned with the phonological or morphological adaptations of the new loanwords, but also aims to investigate the relationship between this phenomenon and the cooperative principle (CP), politeness principle (PP) and face threatening acts (FTAs). It is also concerned with revealing how loanwords are exploited by their users in the media to promote themselves as a special group of elites in

the society. Along these lines the research will focus on answering the following questions:

a) To what extent have these borrowed words integrated phonologically and morphologically into the EA?
b) Do many Egyptians understand what they mean?
c) What CP and PP maxims are users of these borrowed words violating and why do they use them?

## Literature Review

### The Phenomenon of Loanwords

Languages, throughout history, have never been static. They have been lending and borrowing words as a linguistic phenomenon and a manifestation of culture exchange. If a language is unable to express new concepts, experiences and innovations, it resorts to adopting words in its native language as a solution. Such adaptation enriches languages since "a pure language is a poor one whereby 'purity' means that a language which does not borrow any word or concept from other languages is an isolated language" (AlBtoush, 2014, p.100). This process "is technically designated by such terms as 'borrowing' 'loaning' or 'adoption' (AlQinai, 2001, p. 109). The present study will use the three terms alternately to refer to the same concept.

When lending a word, the source language (SL) does not lose anything since such a word remains as part of its vocabulary. Along the same lines, the borrowing language, or the recipient language (RL), is not required to return any loanword. As such, it's a win-win situation where the SL and the RL interchange concepts and culture for words.

The SL community is usually an advantageous society that is characterized by power, prestige and/or wealth at one point in time (Ngom, 2002). Accordingly the RL society starts to borrow words from it and this is for two main reasons. The first is adopting words that are associated with technological advancements or new products and the second is related to personal emotional needs such as showing off, reflecting modernity, being well educated, or belonging to a distinguished group (Onysko, 2004).

The process of adaptation of loanwords in a society takes a number of steps. The first step is taken by bilinguals who start to code switch in their conversations between the native language and the SL. In a later stage, the loanwords begin to gain gradual acceptance and are phonologically and morphologically modified to fit the RL until they are completely integrated into it. Monolinguals then use them without even realizing they are foreign (Fromkin et al, 2003; Smith, 2008).

A number of factors that affect the degree of integration of a loanword into the RL are presented by Hafez (1996). The first factor is the extent to which a loan word can fit the phonological or morphological nature of the RL and the second is a speaker's views regarding the process of borrowing itself. Some may see it as a kind of unacceptable linguistic invasion and thus refrain from using any as a sign of being faithful to their native language. The third factor is the intention of some not to integrate foreign words to keep them intact, so when they use them they appear to have more prestige over others. Another reason Hafez gives is when certain social classes refrain from using the integrated form of a word because, in their eyes, being used by laymen decreases its prestige and, in turn, the speaker's. One other factor is time. The more a word is used over a long period of time, the more likely that it will integrate into the RL even if it keeps the phonological and morphological rules of the SL. One example she gives is the word /*braavo*/ for 'bravo', commonly used now by Egyptians despite the fact that EA does not allow for initial consonant clusters.

Walters (2003) states that English, today, is the prestigious language others are borrowing from. It has become an international means of communication because "during the 20th century, numerous technological inventions and developments, such as the telephone, fax, electronic mail, internet, etc. have facilitated communication between people from all walks of life and the language that is used most is English" (Coury, 2001, p. 21). This fact is also established by Cortes et al (2005) when they maintained that "English has become a universal lingua franca whose influence is manifest in many modern languages, a phenomenon that is motivated by the political and social pre-eminence of the United States…Also in recent times, increasing globalization and

tools of mass communication such as the internet…have strengthened the position of English as a global language" (pp. 35-36).

English loanwords have entered the languages of countries all over the world in a very fast way through pop songs, culture of the youth, technology, the media and advertising.  It has thus invaded, among other languages, German (Onysko, 2004), Korean (Boersma & Hamann, 2009), Spanish (Cortes et al, 2005), Senegal (Ngom, 2002), Japanese (Shepherd), Scandinavian languages (Greenall, 2005) and Jordanian Arabic (AlBatoush, 2014).

### CP, PP and FTAs

Paul Grice (1975) introduced the Cooperative Principle which states that the speaker and hearer need to reach a kind of cooperation between them to achieve understanding. Four tools or maxims govern the CP. They are: quality (do not give false statements or statements that bear no evidence), quantity (be as informative as needed), relevance (do not say anything irrelevant) and finally manner (refrain from providing unclear or obscure utterances).

In any conversation, utterances produced either have an explicit or an implicit meaning. On the one hand, an explicit meaning is directly predicted from the semantic meaning of the utterance along with its syntactic structure. On the other hand, an implicit meaning is understood beyond the rules of semantics and syntax. Grice "…is concerned with this distinction between *saying* and *meaning.* How do speakers know how to generate these implicit meanings, and how can they assume that their addressees will reliably understand their intended meaning?" (Davies, 2000, p. 2).

Sometimes the speaker violates a maxim by saying what is untrue, too short or too long, irrelevant and ambiguous or unclear. When this happens, a speaker is said to perform one of the following acts: (i) opt out a maxim e.g. when he/she uses hedges; (ii) fringe a maxim by unintentionally failing to follow it because of language incompetence; (iii) flout it by saying something absurd for the H to know that he/she is saying something different or (iv) violate it by lying.

Despite the great importance of CP, it failed to address the concept of politeness in any act of communication, although Grice himself noted its importance (Alaoui, 2011). Geoffrey Leech (1983) explained the above idea by stating that CP in itself cannot explain "(i) why people are often so indirect in conveying what they mean; and (ii) what is the relation between the sense [the semantic meaning of an utterance] and the force [the pragmatic meaning of an utterance] when non-declarative kind of sentences are being considered" (p. 80).This means that people are usually indirect when speaking because they intend to be polite and in order to do so they resort to flouting the CP maxims.

Leech introduced the PP to complement the CP and he took Brown & Levinson's (1978) premise of face or "the public self-image that every member wants for himself" (p. 66) as the base on which he built his theory. The idea of face assumes that every person has a positive face that urges one to have an image that is "appreciated, understood, liked, approved of and ratified by others. On the other hand, negative face is seen as every person's desire to be free from imposition, to have his/her territory, and not to be impeded by others" (Amany et al, 2014, p. 502). In an act of communication, face must be constantly attended to. But when an act threatens the self esteem of a person, it becomes an FTA resulting in loss of face.

In PP the focus is on the other or the H, rather than the self or the S, and the goal becomes maximizing the importance of the other and saving his face while minimizing the importance of the self. This aim is achieved when the S and H are polite to each other but if they are not, there will be no cooperative interaction and thus communication will fail (Leech, 1983).

To describe the relationship between the self and the other, Leech introduced a number of maxims. They are described by Salman (2013) as "… the tact maxim means minimizing cost to other. That is to say, in proposing a certain action, the speaker should direct the illocution towards a positive result, by limiting the addressee's option of saying 'No'…Generosity maxim means minimizing benefit to self by putting others' interests first. Approbation means avoiding saying unpleasant

things about others such as in flattery and congratulations…Modesty refers to minimizing praise of self such as in the case of offering apologies. Agreement indicates minimizing disagreement between self and other. Finally, sympathy means minimizing antipathy between the self and the other" (p.26).

## Research Methodology

### Sample and Population

Data for the study was collected synchronically to give an overview of the most robust change in today's EA in relation to loanwords. The corpus of loanwords comprised for this purpose was collected during the month of June 2014. They were social and political articles written in Al- Ahram national Egyptian newspaper and recordings of the daily 6o'clock TV news and 5o'clock radio news in addition to10 TV and 10 radio talk shows discussing social and political issues. It was important to collect information from all the above media means because they constitute the most important sources of news for all social and educational levels of the Egyptian society.

The loanwords from all sources were gathered and arranged according to frequency of usage, from most used to least referred to. The result was choosing 20 words whose range of usage was between 20 times to 45 times. They were, by order of most to least frequent: democracy, parliament, diplomacy, strategy, liberalism, protocol, ideology, imperialism, logistics, dictatorship, fascism, anarchy, militia, pragmatism, bureaucracy, technocrat, lobby, quota, dogma, and veto.

The researcher also interviewed 61 Egyptian subjects who represented a diversity of gender, age, level of education and social class. They were 33 females and 28 males. Their ages ranged between 27 and 50. The females were 6 PhD holders, 21 BA/Bsc/MA/Msc holders, 3 high school graduates and 3 illiterates, while the males were 3 PhD holders, 20 BA/BSc/MA/Msc holders and 5 high school graduates. All university and post graduate certificate holders were bilinguals, speaking Arabic and English. They were graduates of Alsun (English Department), Business, Pharmacy, Engineering, Mass Communication and Dentistry schools. High school graduates were monolinguals. 70% of the participants were

from the middle social class in Egypt, 10% from the upper class and 20% from the lower class.

The interview consisted of three parts. In the first part, every participant was given a list of 20 sentences, each including one of the 20 loanwords (Appendix 1). Participants read the sentences aloud and illiterate subjects repeated them after being read by the researcher. All readings were recorded to identify how these loanwords are pronounced in EA, specify the phonological changes each word underwent and evaluate the degree of their integration into the RL. In the second part of the interview, participants were asked to orally give the meaning of every loanword as well as specify any other derivatives of the words they heard or read. Finally, in part 3, participants were given two open ended questions intending to assess their opinion on the usage of the 20 loanwords: (1) Why do you think such words have no Arabic equivalents? & (2) Does it bother you that there are no Arabic equivalents for them? The researcher wrote down all answers to parts 2 and 3.

## Results

**Answers to Research Question 1(Phonological and Morphological Changes)**

In response to the first research question, the following analysis investigates the phonological and morphological adaptations each loanword underwent and the extent to which they fit the rules of EA. Table 1 below presents the 20 loanwords and their English and Arabic transcribed pronunciations (Arabic transcriptions will be italicized wherever written for ease of distinction from English ones).

| Loanword | English Pronunciation | Arabic Pronunciation |
|---|---|---|
| Anarchy | /ænəkɪ/ | /ʔænarkɛɪjaah/ |
| Militia | /mɪlɪʃə/ | /mɛlɛʃijaah/ |
| Democracy | /dɪmɒkrəsɪ/ | /dɪmɒqrratɪjaah/ |
| Dogma | /dɒgmə/ | /dɒgmætɛɪjæh/ |
| Veto | /vɪtə/ | /fɪtɔ/ |
| Parliament | /pa:ləmənt/ | /barlæmaan/ |
| Protocol | /prəutəkɒl | /bərɔtukɔl / |

| Lobby | /lɒbɪ/ | /luubɪ/ |
|---|---|---|
| Ideology | /əɪdɪɒlədʒɪ/ | /ʔɪadjɔlʊʒɪjæh or ʔɪadjɔlʊgɪjæh/ |
| Imperialism | /ɪmpɪərɪəlɪzəm/ | /ʔƐmbƐrjælɪjæh/ |
| Logistics | /ləʊdʒɪstɪks/ | /lɒʒƐstɪjæh/ |
| Liberalism | /lɪbərəlɪzəm/ | /lɪbraalɪjæh/ |
| Dictatorship | /dɪkteɪtəʃɪp/ | /dɪktaatʊʊrjæh/ |
| Diplomacy | /dɪpləʊməsɪ/ | /dɪblʊmaasɪjæh/ |
| Pragmatism | /prægmətɪzəm/ | /bərægmætɪjæh/ |
| Strategy | /stætɪdʒɪ/ | /Ɛsterætɪʒɪjæh or Ɛsterætɪgɪjæh/ |
| Bureaucracy | /bjʊərəʊkrəʊt/ | /bƐrʊqrætɪjæh |
| Fascism | /fɒʃɪzəm/ | /fɒʃɪjæh/ |
| Technocrat | /teknəʊkræt/ | //teknɒkrat/ |
| Quota | /kɔtə/ | /kʊʊtæ/ |

Table 1: Loanwords and their English and Arabic Pronunciations

When studying the noun integration of the loanwords in Table 1, one notices the following. In relation to consonant clusters (Cc), Arabic allows no more than 2 Cc and they come in medial or final positions and not in an initial position. When integrating a loanword with 2 initial Cc, or with 3 or more consonant clusters (Ccc) a vowel, referred to as intrusive, is added to break the cluster (Thompson, 2013).These rules were reflected in the pronunciation of the following loanwords /prəutəkɒl/ where the syllable initial /pr/ became separated by the vowel /ə/ to become /*bərɔtukɔl*/ and in the word /prægmətɪzəm/ the sounds /b/ and /r/ were separated by the vowel /ə/ to become /bərægmætɪjæh/. The Ccc which occurred were integrated by placing a vowel after the second of three consonants (McCarthy & Prince, 1993) such as the word /stætɪdʒɪ/. To avoid the three initial consonant sounds /str/, because in Arabic all sounds in a word are pronounced even the /r/, the vowel sound /e/ came between the /t/ and the /r/ to be /Ɛ*sterætɪʒɪjæh*/.

The /r/ sound in Arabic is always pronounced while in English it is sometimes replaced by a /ə/ (Amer). So, the /r/ in the words

/barlæmaan/, /dɪktaatʊʊrɪjæh/ and /ʔænarkɛɪjæh/ is fully pronounced. Also in Arabic each and every letter in a word is pronounced so every /ə/ is transferred to its original full sound like the words /kʊʊtæ/, /lɪbraalɪjæh/ and /dɪktaatʊʊrjæh/.

Some English consonant sounds are not present in EA such as /p/ which becomes /b/, /v/ usually pronounced as /f/ and the /dʒ/ sound pronounced as /ʒ/ or sometimes /g/ (Amer). This is what happened with the words /*barlæmaan*/, /*bərɔtukɔl*/, /*ʔɛmbɛrjælɪjæh*/ and /*bərægmætɪjæh*/ where the /p/ became /b/. The sound /v/ in the word /vɪtə/ shifted to /f/ and the word became /*fɪtɔ*/. Also the sound /dʒ/ in the word /strætɪdʒɪ/ became /ʒ/ or /g/ in the Arabic pronunciations /ɛsterætɪ**ʒ**ɪjæh/ or /ɛsteræt**ɪgɪjæh**/. This change brings no difference in the meaning of the word since both sounds are not two different phonemes in EA.

Another consonant sound that was altered in loanwords was the velar /k/ to become the uvular consonant produced from the back of the oral cavity /q/ (Thompson, 2013). This happened with sounds that are followed by the trill /r/ such as /dɪmɒkrəsɪ/ which became /dɪmɒ**q**ratɪjæh/, /teknəʊkræt/ to be /*teknɒkrat*/ and /bjʊərəʊkrəʊt/, changing to /b**ɛrʊqr**ætɪjæh/.

Also in Arabic, a consonant may be geminated, or doubled, which reflects the presence of the Arabic "shadda = stress", indicating two consonants and no vowel between them such as the word /qitta/ or cat (Wikipedia, Arabic Language). This is exemplified in the word /dɪmɒq**rr**atɪjæh/.

In Arabic, words cannot begin with a vowel so they are preceded by the glottal stop /ʔ/ (Thompson, 2013). This is shown in the words /əɪdɪɒlədʒɪ/ to become /*ʔɪadjɔlʊʒɪjæh*/ and /ɪmpɪərɪəlɪzəm/ to be /*ʔɛmbɛrjælɪjæh*/.

Word stress in EA follows 3 basic rules (Thompson, 2013; Halpern) which the loanwords have adapted to. They are: a) if a word consists of a number of consonant + vowel (CVCVCV) syllables, the primary stress falls on the first syllable such as /*ʔænarkɛɪjæh*/, /*mɛlɛʃɪjæh*/ and /*dɪmɒqrratɪjæh*/ whose stress in English fell on the

second syllable, last syllable and third syllable, respectively; b) if the word has only one long syllable, that long syllable bears the primary stress /dɪblʊ**maa**sɪjæh/ while in English stress falls on the second syllable; and c) if a word bears more than one long syllable, the one closest to the end of the word receives the primary stress such as the word /dɪktaatʊʊrjæh/ whose stress in English is on the second syllable.

## Morphology

In EA nouns are either animate or inanimate and both may be inflected for number which can take either the form of a sound plural by adding the suffix/-iin/ for masculine and the suffix /-aat/ for feminine or have a broken plural inflection such as /helm/ that becomes /ʔahlaam/. Nouns can also be inflected for gender, feminine/ masculine, or adjectives to be animate masculine, animate feminine or inanimate.

## Plural Inflection

Fifty five percent of the loanwords were inflected for plural inanimate by adding the suffix /-ɑɑt/. They are /mƐlƐʃɪjaat/ e.g. ميليشيات قتالية (fighting militia); /dɪmʊkrratɪjaat/, such as ديمقراطيات عالمية (worldwide democracies); /bɑrlæmaanɑɑt/ e.g. برلمانيات عالمية (worldwide parliaments); /ʔƐmbƐrjælɪjaat/ such as امبرياليات عالمية (worldwide imperialism) /lʊʒƐstɪjaat/, e.g. لوجستيات الفكرة (logistics of the idea); /dɪblʊmaasɪjaat/ e.g. دبلوماسيات الدولة (state diplomacies); /Ɛsteræɪʒɪjaat/ استراتيجيات الدولة e.g (state strategies) ; /bƐrʊqrætɪjaat/, such as بيروقراطيات الدولة (state bureaucrarcies); /ʔɪadjɔlʊʒɪjaat/ e.g. ايديولوجيات عالمية الدولة (worldwide ideologies); /dɪktaatʊʊrjaat/ such as بروتوكولات العمل (protocols of a job). It should be noted here that before the suffix /- ɑɑt /, the palatal Arabic sound represented by the symbol /j/ is added to break vowel clustering.

Forty five percent was inflected for plural masculine by receiving the suffix /-uun/. They are the words /ʔƐmbƐrjælɪjuun/, /dɪmʊqrratɪjuun/, /bɑrlæmaanjuun/, /lɪbraalɪjuun/ /dɪktaatʊʊrɪjuun/, /dɪblʊmaasɪjuun/, /Ɛsteræɪʒɪjuun/, /bƐrʊqrætɪjuun/ and /fʊʃɪjuun/.  Also in the plural masculine inflection when a word ends with a vowel, the palatal Arabic sound represented by the symbol /j/ is added to break vowel clustering.

As for the plural feminine, 15% only of the words were inflected by adding the suffix /-ɑɑt/. They are */bɑrlæmɑɑnɪjɑɑt/, /dɪktɑɑtʊʊrɪjɑɑt/* and */dɪblʊmɑɑsɪjɑɑt/* and the sound /j/ was added to break vowel clustering.

**Adjective and Adverb Derivations**

Loanwords inflected for adjective inanimate constituted the largest percentage (75%). They took either the masculine (m) adjective suffix /-ɪɪ/ or the feminine (f) adjective suffix /-ɑɑh/ or both. This was done in accordance with the rule in EA grammar that allows dividing inanimate adjectives to (m) and (f). They are */ʔænarkƐɪɪ/* such as فكر اناركي (anarchic thinking) and */ʔænarkƐɪjɑɑh/* e.g. فكرة اناركية (anarchic idea); */dɪmʋqrrɑtɪjɑɑh/* e.g. فكرة ديمقراطية (democratic idea) and */dɪmʋqrrɑtɪɪ/* as in فكر ديمقراطي (democratic thinking); /ʔɪɑdjɔlʊʒɪɪ/ like فكر ايديولوجي (ideologic thinking); */lɪbrɑɑlɪjæh/* e.g. فكرة ليبرالية (liberal idea) and */lɪbrɑɑlɪɪ/* in فكر ليبرالي (liberal thinking); */dɪktɑɑtʊʊrɪɪ/* as in تصرف ديكتاتوري (dictatorial act); */dɪblʊmɑɑsɪjɑɑh/*, e.g. دبلوماسية دولية (world diplomacy) and */dɪblʊmɑɑsɪɪ/* such as فكر دبلوماسي or 'diplomatic thinking'; */bəræɡmætɪjæh/* as in فكرة براجماتية (pragmatic idea) and */bəræɡmætɪɪ/* e.g. فكر براجماتي (pragmatic thinking); */Ɛsterætɪʒɪjɑɑh/* e.g. فكرة استراتيجية (strategic idea) and */Ɛsterætɪʒɪɪ/* e.g. فكر استراتيجي (strategic thinking); */bƐrʋqrætɪjɑɑh/* e.g. حكومة بيروقراطية (a bureaucratic government) and */bƐrʋqrætɪɪ/* e.g. فكر بيروقراطي (bureaucratic thinking); */fʋʃɪjɑɑh/* e.g. فكرة فاشية (fascistic idea) and */fʋʃɪɪ/* e.g. فكر فاشي (fascistic thinking); */teknʋkrat/* such as حكومة تكنوقراط (a government of technocrat). It is also noted that when inflecting a feminine adjective and the word ends with a vowel, the Arabic palatal consonant sound /j/ is inserted to break vowel clustering.

Those loanwords inflected for masculine animate adjectives (55%) were formed by adding the suffix /-ɪɪ/. They are */ʔænarkƐɪɪ/, /dɪmʋqrrɑtɪɪ/, /lɪbrɑɑlɪɪ/, /dɪktætʊʊrɪɪ/, /dɪblʊmɑɑsɪɪ/, /ʔƐmbƐrjælɪjɑɑt/ /bəræɡmætɪɪ/, /bƐrʋqrætɪɪ/, /fʋʃɪɪ/, /bɑrlæmɑɑnɪɪ/* and */dʋɡmætɪɪ/. The* animate feminine adjectives (20%) were derived by adding the suffix /-ɑɑh/. They are */dɪmʋqrrɑtɪjɑɑh /, /dɪblʊmɑɑsɪjɑɑh/, / dɪktɑɑtʊʊrɪjɑɑh/*, and */bɑrlæmɑɑnɪjɑɑh/.*

15% only of the loanwords had adverb derivations by adding the suffix /-enn/. Duplication of the /n/ in the above suffix represents the Arabic 'Tanween'. The words are /dɪmɒqrratɪyenn/ such as تصرفاً ديمقراطياً (acted democratically); /dɪblʊmaasɪjenn/, as in تصرفاً دبلوماسياً (acted diplomatically); and /bərɔtukɔlɪjenn/, e.g. تصرفاً بيروقراطياً (acted bureaucratically).

## Answers to Research Question 2

In answer to number two in the research questions regarding whether the meanings of the words are understood or not, analyzing participants' answers showed that although some subjects gave the correct meanings, a large number gave wrong answers or said they did not know what the words mean.

While all PhD holders gave the correct meaning of 8 words out of the 20 (40%) the other 12 words were problematic for them. The problem loanwords and the percentage of PhD subjects who did not know their meanings are imperialism (55%), logistics (44%), anarchy (33%), militia, lobby, ideology, technocrat, pragmatism, bureaucracy (22%) and liberalism (11%).

BA participants had difficulty with 15 words (75%). Words were imperialism, dogma, pragmatism, anarchy (17%), bureaucracy (14.6%), fascism (12%), militia, ideology, liberalism, democracy (4.8%), logistics, lobby, technocrat, quota and diplomacy (2.4%).

HS participants had problems with all the 20 words (100%). 62.5% did not know the meaning of the word anarchy; 50% did not understand imperialism, fascism, logistics, lobby, dogma, ideology, technocrat, pragmatism, and liberalism; 37.5%did not know the words militia, bureaucracy, quota, protocol while 25% had problems with democracy, dictatorship and finally, 12.5 with diplomacy, strategy, parliament and veto.

As for the 3 illiterate subjects, although all gave each word a meaning, no one got a correct one and none said she did not know what a word meant.

The conclusion of the above analysis is that not one word was understood by all the participants in the present research. All educational levels had problems with at least 2 words, even Alsun English Department professors. Some meanings given had nothing to do with the true definitions of the words. For example, the words pragmatism, ideology, lobby, fascism and quota were given the meanings, respectively, "a discussion that leads to nowhere" (a meaning given by a BA holder), "related to psychology" (MA holder), "political party" (PhD holder), "one man show" (high school graduate) and "a kind of scale for measurement" (high school graduate). The word logistics was given the definition "a specialty in business administration" (MSc holder), dogma to mean "like a DNA" (PhD holder) and protocol means "to better oneself" (high school graduate).

When answering the question "Why do you think such words have no Arabic equivalents?" subjects, except for illiterate ones who had absolutely no comment on the question, gave answers that were close in meaning. Overall, their responses were negative, putting the blame on the users of the words for resorting to them without putting into consideration the Hs who had no clue as to the meaning of many. Respondents believed that Ss' main aim was showing off rather than pay attention to the unwritten accord of communication that governs the relationship between S and H which demands understanding the message each is giving. Examples of the answers they gave were: "This reflects the new culture in Egypt of speaking in politics and saying anything" (PhD holder); " To give the impression that it is big talk when it is not" (PhD holder); "To show s/he is knowledgeable" (BSc holder); "To draw an aura around themselves" (BA holder); "They like to philosophize" (high school graduate); "They want to keep the meaning to themselves" (high school graduate); "To prove they are the only cultured persons" (high school graduate).

As for question (2) "Does it bother you that there are no Arabic equivalents for these loanwords?" answers were given by literate participants only because illiterates said they had no opinion to give. The responses presented 2 views. There were those concerned about, as put by Greenall (2005) "the 'pollution' and possible future eradication of their

language" (p. 212). They constituted 59% of the literate sample. This group felt that this situation should not go on because it is degrading to the Arabic language that is characterized by its rich lexicon that can express any concept or new idea very efficiently. They reiterated that idea by giving the following comments: "Arabic is so rich. Why do we need to resort to another language?" (PhD holder); "We need to think more highly of our Arabic language and find equivalents for these words." (BA holder); "Dependence on loanwords gives the impression that Arabic is a second hand language." (MA holder); and "There have got to be equivalents to these words" (MA holder).

On the other hand the remaining 49% did not worry so much that English seems to be claiming some territory within Arabic. They see the situation as causing no problem as long as people understand what these borrowed words mean and use them correctly. Some answers of this group were "I do not mind using loanwords as long as people understand their meanings." (MA holder); "Knowing what they mean is the most important issue." (PhD holder); and "No, but their users should make sure that they are understood by all social classes in Egypt" (high school graduate).

## Discussion
### Phonological and Morphological Adaptations
Loanwords used in the present study, as analyzed above, witnessed a number of phonological and morphological adaptations in order to fit EA rules, however, they have not completely integrated in the RL. Full integration requires deriving as many words as possible equivalent to all parts of speech which is definitely not the case here. The reason is that in EA, the derivation of new words is mainly formed by first extracting the verb root and then formulating other words from it. For example, from the verb root /l`b/ or play, a perfective /la`aba/, a passive participle /mal`oob/ and imperfective /jel`aab/ are formed. This means that as long as a loanword is not inflected for a verb, which is happening with the 20 words in the present research, no new forms of that word will be added to the RL. As such, one concludes that although these 20 loanwords are starting to gain more ground in the integration process into Arabic, they still have a long way for a complete integration to occur and

reach the point where they are referred to as "Arabized" foreign words used by monolinguals without realizing they are not Arabic.

**Relationship between the above Loanwords and CP, PP and FTA**

The forthcoming discussion responds to the third research question that addresses the relationship between the 20 loanwords and the CP, PP and FTA. It shows how Ss violate communication rules to gain benefit for themselves.

The S needs to pay attention to the fact that "Though H cares about the utterance … he cares more about how he is treated and how important he is in the other participant's mind" (Wang, 2009, p. 292) i.e., saving his face. As such, S has got to care for the H's needs more than his/hers as well as put his/her interest first. Results presented in this research show the opposite. The Ss overtly violated a number of maxims by providing unclear and ambiguous vocabulary. This was made clear in the answers to the second research question. A very big number of the participants did not know the meaning of many of the words even the PhD subjects.

In such a situation using any of the 20 words means that the S puts his interest, rather than the H's, first. Such an act expresses indifference towards the H's positive face and a disregard to his/her emotional well being, interests, needs and wants. When the H has no clue as to the meaning of many of these words, the S's duty is to be clearer by either providing explanations or giving alternatives to the loanwords. If this does not happen the H will be excluded from the communication activity, forcing him/her to feel improperly treated, and so loses face and the situation becomes an FTA.

Grice's cooperative principle and Leech's politeness principles are built on the fact that the H and S co-operate in a polite way to achieve successful communication between them. Such success is reached by understanding the messages each is giving and so saving face of both the addressee and the addressed. Usage of the above loanwords in the Egyptian media, however, does not reflect mutual understanding of messages. On the contrary, it paves the way for misunderstandings and

for violating a number of the maxims of the two principles thus becoming a FTA.

Using any of the above loanwords violates Grice's maxims of quantity and manner. Quantity maxim is broken by the S when s/he does not give H enough information to know what is being talked about, which is the case here. Meanings of the words are not clear and the H finds them empty with no understandable content. On the other hand, there is violation of the manner maxim by the S who intentionally provides obscure utterances and ambiguous messages s/he knows the H will not understand. Hs, even when trying to use implicature and attempt to grasp the meaning from the context, fail.

Using these loanwords also violates the PP maxims of generosity and sympathy. The generosity maxim means to minimize benefit and maximize cost to self. This is violated because speakers using loanwords in the context of the present study are maximizing the benefit and minimizing the cost to the self. At the same time they are minimizing the benefit and maximizing the cost to the other. S's (the self's) main intention from the communication here is to attend to himself/herself and to his/her prestige by showing off, building an imaginary brain wall between him/her and the H and adding an air of power and mystery to his/her utterances. All this is done at the expense of the H (the other) who starts to perceive an unequal power relationship between him/her and the S. Intentionally sending of an unclear message engraves the idea that the H is underestimated and looked down upon by the S.

Usage of the above loanwords also violates the sympathy maxim which entails showing interest in and sympathy with the H by creating common grounds between H and S. In the present situation the S is not doing so. Instead of building common grounds, S tries to demonstrate superiority which, in turn, increases antipathy between the self and the other who does not understand the message conveyed. Thus, feelings of dislike, anger and opposition on the part of the H are created, constructing a strong FTA.

**Conclusion**

The sample population in the study, although not very big, was representative of many sectors in the Egyptian society. It included varying educational levels and different genders and ages that represented a wide range of social classes. Despite that variation, almost all the population faced problems with the meanings of many of the loanwords in the study, a situation that defies the rules of co-operation and politeness in a communication process.

One apparent conclusion from the above is that loanwords are used by Ss in the media today, not because Arabic is not capable of producing a word that suits the concepts they reflect, but they use them as a means of exploiting the language to advocate false prestige and importance for themselves and their authority. Ss do not intend to convey a true message as much as they attempt to play upon words and spread an air of ambiguity to alienate themselves from the Hs and convey the mental message that says, "We are superior, knowledgeable and cultured while others (Hs) are inferior, ignorant and uncultured". This situation will continue as long as there are no true endeavors to make the Hs understand the meanings of these loanwords, either by giving their definitions while being used or by finding Arabic equivalents for them.

Some may attribute the presence of such a situation to the flux of new words coined for new concepts which are not met by quick endeavors to find Arabic equivalents for them. If this is true and translators in Egypt are not able to face that flow, then the worse scenario is still to come. Once the media keep using the borrowed words, people will get to know and accept them, even without understanding what they mean. The result will be reiterating the loanwords without using them in their proper contexts.

To maintain the status of Arabic language in the modern era, I believe there is no other solution but to find the means to speed up the process of translating newly coined concepts. Until this goal is achieved, the least that could be done is give explanations with the loanwords when used until they become understood by all Egyptians.

**Appendix 1**

**Sentences given to participants to read**

- هناك مشكلة في الكفاءات و **التكنوقراط**.
- السبب الأساسي هو **كوتة** القائمة.
- هناك جرائم ترتكب من قبل **الميليشيات** المتطرفة.
- لقد تم وضع **استراتيجية** مصرية تجاه أفريقيا.
- لابد من دراسة **لوجستيات** المشروع.
- هذا التصرف يندرج ضمن **الفاشية** الدينية.
- هناك تناقض في تطبيقات هذه **الأيدلوجية**.
- لا يجب الخضوع **للأمبريالية** العالمية.
- يجب إيجاد حلول لمواجهة **لوبي** الزراعة و الصناعة.
- **الليبرالية** هي الفكر المتفتح.
- الهدف هو البعد عن **الدكتاتورية** و الحزب الواحد .
- **الدبلوماسية** تعنى ان تتصرف بحكمة.
- لابد من كسر **البيروقراطية** الحكومية.
- انها فكره **برجماتية** حتمية.
- تحب الولايات المتحده استخدام حكم **الفيتو**.
- سوف يتكون **البرلمان** الجديد لاحقا.
- هناك **بروتوكول** خاص بالحفلات.
- يجب الحذر من **الاناركية**.
- **الديمقراطية** هى اساس الحكم السليم.
- **الدوجماتية** هى مشكلة الفكر الاقصائي.

## Works Cited

Alaoui, S. M. (2011). Politeness Principle : A Cooperative Study of English & Moroccan Arabic Requests, Offers and Thanks. *European Journal of Social Sciences* , Vol.20 no.1, pp.7-15.

Al Batoush, M. A. (2014). English Loanwords in Colloquial Jordanian Arabic. *International Journal of Linguistic,* 6(2), 98-108.

Al-Qinai, J. (2001). Morphemic of Loan -words in Translation. In *Language & Translation*. King Saud University, Vol.13, p.109.

Amany, F., Davoudi, M., & Jaghi, M. (2014). A Corpus-Based Study on the Translation of Politeness Strategies with Emphasis on

Address Terms. *International Journal of Language Learning & Applied Linguistics World*, Vol.5no.1, pp. 502-522.

Amer, M. W. An Investigation into the Differences between English and Arabic Consonant & Vowel Sounds: A Contrastive Study with Pedagogical Implications. Retrieved from www.pdffactory.com.

Boersma, P. & Hamann, S. (2009). Loanword Adaptation as First -Language Phonological Perception. *Loanword Phonology*. pp.11-58.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1978). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge Uni. Press.

Coury, J. (2001). English as a Lingua Franca in the Brazilian Academic World. *Karen's Linguistics Issues*.

p. 21.

Cortes, I., Ramirez, J., Rivera, M., Viada, M., & Fayer, J. (2005). Damehamburger Plaincon Ketchup y Papitas. *English Today*, Vol.82 no.2, pp. 35-42.

Davies, B. (2000). Grice's Cooperative Principle: Getting the Meaning Across. *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics*. Vol. 8, pp 1-26.

Fromkin, V., Rodman, R. & Hyams, N. (2003). *An Introduction to Language*. (7th ed.) Boston: Thomson, Heinle.

Greenall, A. (2005). To Translate or not to Translate: Attitudes to English Loanwords in Norwegian. In Preister, B., Fabricius, A., Haberland, H., Kjærbeck, S. & Risager, K. (eds). *The Consequences of Mobility*. Roskilde: Roskilde University, Dept. of Language and Culture.

Grice, H. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In Cole, P. & Morgan, J., (eds). *Pragmatics (Syntax and Semantics)* Vol. 9. New York: Academic Press.

Hafez, O. (1996). Phonological and Morphological Integration of Loanwords onto Egyptian Arabic. *Egypte/Monde Arabe*, Premiere Serie, no. 27-28, pp. 383-410.

Halpern, J. Word Stress and Vowel Neutralization in Modern Standard Arabic. *The CJK Dictionary Institute*.

Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

McCarthy, J., & Prince, A. (1993). *Prosodic Morphology I : Constraint Interaction & Satisfaction*. University of Massachusetts, Amherst & Rutgers University.

Meyerhoff, M. Sociolinguistic Variation and Change. *Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems*. Retrieved from http://www.eolss net/ Eolss-sample All Chapter. Aspx.

Ngom, F. (2002). Linguistic Borrowing as Evidence of the Social History of the Senegalese Speech Community. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*. Vol. 158. pp. 37-51.

Onysko, A. (2004). Anglicisms in German. From Iniquitous to Ubiquitous? *English Today*. Vol. (77), no. I, pp.59-64.

Salman, S. (2013). The Decision Making Process in Interpreting Political Speeches: A Pragmatic – Narrative Approach. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation*, Ain Shams University, Egypt.

Shepherd, J. Loanwords: A Pitfall of All Students. *The Internet TESL Journal.*

Smith, D. (2008) Friday Loanword: What is a Loan word? Retrieved Dec. 30 from http://www.telecomtally.com/fridayloanwordwhatiasloanword.htm/

Thompson, I. (2013). Arabic (Modern Standard). Retrieved from http://aboutworldlanguages. com/arabic-modern-standard.

Walters, J. (2003). Why is English the International Lingua France? Retrieved from http://www.translationdirectory.com/article171.htm

Wang, Z. (2009). Raising and Lowering Speaker's and Hearer's Position in the Politeness Principle in Intercultural Communication. *Intercultural Communication Studies*. Vol. XVIII no. 1. pp. 286-297.