

A Pragmatic Study of Face Threatening Acts in Selected Phone-ins from Religious TV Programs: The Case of ‘*Al-Maw’eza Al-Hasana*’

Nada Fahim, Salwa Farag, and Samah Ahmed

Helwan University

A Pragmatic Study of Face Threatening Acts in Selected Phone-ins from Religious TV Programs: The Case of ‘*Al-Maw’ezza Al-Hasana*’

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to study how and why two TV presenters in similar contexts can manifest similar and/or different linguistic styles. In order to achieve this purpose, the researcher investigates how the two presenters of the Islamic TV program ‘*Al-Maw’ezza Al-Hasana*’. (i.e., presenter A and presenter B) exploit linguistic techniques to perform and/or mitigate Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) which are directed against the phone-in callers (e.g., FTAs of criticisms, requests, advice and warnings). Therefore, this research focuses on pragmatic theories in order to examine politeness strategies which each presenter uses to maintain the callers’ face, and whether those strategies clash with clarity of the information conveyed. This study relies on Brown and Levinson’s Politeness Model (1987) and Grice’s Cooperative principle (1975, 1989). The data are ten phone-ins between random callers and the two presenters of the TV program. The phone-ins are selected based on similarity of topic (e.g., inheritance and doing good to one’s kith and kin). The results of the study showed that the two presenters shared some linguistic choices, such as preferring positive politeness and off-record strategies. However, unlike presenter B, presenter A used a powerful language by performing dangerous FTAs towards the callers, which made his mitigation strategies less effective. On the other hand, presenter B maintained the caller’s face more successfully as he avoided dangerous FTAs, and he mitigated minor FTAs with various redressing strategies. Finally, regardless of the different linguistic preferences of each presenter, clarity and honesty of the information conveyed remained an essential characteristic in their interactions.

Keywords: Face Threatening Acts (FTAs), politeness strategies, TV presenters, phone-ins, Cooperative Principle (CP), religious discourse, Arabic

1. Introduction

Pragmatics is concerned with how language is used in different contexts. Correspondingly, language usage in religious discourse, as one of the most important human domains, should also be studied and analyzed. Hence, the aim of this study is to examine the TV program '*Al-Maweza Al Hasana*' as a popular example of religious discourse in Egypt where the callers have participated to ask for the presenters' religious verdicts (Hasan, 2018). Moreover, the context of '*Al-Maweza Al Hasana*' provides rich examples of how TV presenters perform acts which threaten the caller's positive and/or negative face wants (e.g., by criticizing particular behaviors or by commanding particular actions). Nevertheless, this TV program has been presented by two presenters (i.e., presenter A and presenter B) who have interacted with the callers within similar situations. However, each presenter has illustrated a distinctive linguistic attitude; thus this study is an attempt to uncover these linguistic distinctions between the two presenters by focusing on Face Threatening Acts (henceforth, FTAs) which threaten callers' faces, and how the two presenters perform and/or reduce them by politeness strategies.

In the Middle East, in Egypt in particular, religious discourse has been received with high respect; thus it becomes necessarily required to study how linguistic devices can be exploited in such social arena. Besides, linguists have always attempted to reach a better understanding of how language is constructed, how it functions, and how it is finally interpreted by interlocutors. It is believed that in the case of '*Al-Maweza Al Hasana*', the two presenters interact with the callers differently despite the fact that topics discussed, as well as the context, are similar. Therefore, the study in hand aims to reveal similarities and/or differences between the two presenters by focusing on how they perform and/or mitigate FTAs which are directed towards the phone-in callers in the light of Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness model. It also aims to examine the applicability of Brown and Levinson's politeness model to the data in hand.

Furthermore, this study sets out to analyze how FTAs are performed and/or mitigated in religious discourse, where a clash between being polite and being honest may exist. Similarly, this study investigates how and why two TV presenters in almost identical contexts may show different linguistic preferences. Hence, this study fills a gap in the pragmatic field by examining how some pragmatic concepts (e.g., politeness, indirectness and FTAs) are applied in Arabic religious contexts. Moreover, the data of this study are spontaneous, thus the data are expected to illustrate how linguistic strategies are employed in naturally occurring Arabic.

2. Literature Review

Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory has been based on face-threatening acts. The term 'face' was firstly introduced by Goffman (1967), and it was used by Brown and Levinson (1987) to refer to the individual self-esteem which the individual has always desired to protect from external 'threats'. Besides, Brown and Levinson (1987) distinguished between (a) positive face wants and (b) negative face wants as the former aimed to preserve commonality of the individual interests, whereas the latter aimed to preserve liberty of the individual actions. In addition, Brown and Levinson (1987: p. 65) defined the term 'act' as "what is needed to be done by a verbal or non-verbal communication". Consequently, Brown

and Levinson (1987) demonstrated a number of acts which were intrinsically face-threatening, such as criticism, promises, apologies and requests. Despite the fact that Brown and Levinson (1987) illustrated how some acts could threaten the speaker's face (e.g., apologies) while other acts could threaten the hearer's face (e.g., advice), Gil (2012: 407-408) argued that every speech act was face-threatening to both of the speaker and the hearer, and that those threats ranged from 'weak threat' to 'strong invasion' of face (i.e., this paper, however focuses on the hearer's face threats).

Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness model was influenced by Grice's (1975, 1989) Cooperative Principle (CP). Grice (1975) argued that all individuals had an intrinsic desire to communicate successfully with one another, therefore they must have been, to some degree, conversationally cooperative. Moreover, Grice (1975) defined four conversational maxims which indicated to which degree a person was conversationally cooperative; *Quantity maxim* (i.e., to give the needed amount of information required), *Quality maxim*: to say the truth, *Relation maxim* (i.e., to be relevant as required), and *Manner maxim* (i.e., to be clear as required). Therefore, any breaching of any of the previous maxims should have created an 'implicature' (Thomas, 1995). The term 'implicature' was defined by Gazdar (1979: 38) to be "a proposition that is implied by the utterance of the sentence in a context even though that proposition is not a part or not an entailment". Nevertheless, there were two types of implicatures as demonstrated by Grice (1975): conversational and conventional implicatures, where the former referred to implicatures whose meaning varied according to the context, while the latter referred to implicatures whose meaning was fixed regardless of the context they occurred in.

Consequently, six types of breaching maxims were introduced. First, Grice illustrated 4 types of breaching conversational maxims: (a) *flouting maxims* (i.e., maxims were non-observed in order to provoke the hearer to infer an encoded implicature); (b) *violating maxims* (i.e., maxims were non-observed in order to deceive the hearer); (c) *clash of maxims* (i.e., a maxim was non-observed in order to observe another maxim); and (d) *opting out maxims* (i.e., a maxim was opted out when the speaker clearly asserted their unwillingness to observe it). Second, Thomas (1995) added two more types of breaching Grice's maxims: (e) *suspending maxims* (i.e., a maxim was suspended when it was neglected in a particular society); and (f) *infringing maxims* (i.e., a maxim was infringed when it was non-observed unintentionally).

On the other hand, Brown and Levinson (1987) identified four strategies to do FTAs: (a) *bald-on-record* (without redress); (b) on-record redressed with *positive politeness* strategies; (c) on-record redressed with *negative politeness* strategies; and (d) off-record (i.e., through breaching Gricean maxims to generate implicatures). Brown and Levinson (1987) also claimed that the preference between FTA performing strategies relied on more than one aspect. Firstly, choosing a particular strategy to perform FTAs relied on to what extent the speaker was willing to deliver the FTA's meaning, to be practical, and to maintain the hearer's face. Secondly, the choice of a certain FTA strategy was also influenced by which payoffs the speaker wanted to gain; for example, by employing bald-on-record strategy, the speaker gained the advantage of clarity and honesty, while by employing positive and/or negative politeness the speaker could show a respect to the hearer's face wants. Similarly, by going off-record, the speaker had the privilege of disclaiming responsibility of a particular FTA. Finally, the interaction between the social factors of power relationship (P), social

distancing (D), and ranking of imposition (R) has also affected the choice between FTA strategies.

Brown and Levinson (1987) introduced a number of super strategies which other output strategies emerged from. First, **bald-on-record FTAs** could be done by ignoring face needs (e.g., using imperatives) as in cases of emergencies and task-oriented interactions; they could also be used when the speaker was more powerful than the hearer or when the speaker wanted to be rude to the hearer. However, bald-on-record FTAs could be used when the acts involved were for the hearer's interest; thus they could be emphasized by a positive politeness hedge or mitigated by a negative politeness respect term (e.g., 'Sir' and 'Ma'am'). Second, on-record FTAs could be redressed by positive politeness strategies by addressing the hearer's positive face needs. For instance, the speaker could presume sharing common ground with the hearer by using in-group slang and in-group identity markers (e.g., 'folks' and 'my dear'). Claiming reflexivity with the hearer was another positive politeness strategy based on which the speaker could include themselves with the hearer in activities (e.g., by using inclusive-we pronoun) and could ask them to give reasons. Third, on-record FTAs could be mitigated by negative politeness strategies which aimed to assure the hearer's freedom of action and avoided making any assumptions of the hearer. For example, the speaker could show their desire to avoid coercing the hearer by: (a) minimizing the imposition R of the FTA (e.g., by using 'a bit', 'just' and 'little'); (b) using hedges and questions; (c) impersonalizing the speaker or the hearer from the FTA (e.g., as in generalizing the FTA to include others or by using passivization and nominalization). Finally, FTAs could be performed by off-record strategies through inviting conversational implicatures (e.g., breaching Quality maxim by metaphors, rhetorical questions and sarcasm).

Despite the fact that Grice's contributions were fundamental in many theories, his CP was criticized of being inadequate (e.g., Christie, 2007; Watts, 2003). Consequently, Brown and Levinson's (1987) model was also criticized (Leech, 2007; Thomas, 1995). This criticism relied on the claim that Brown and Levinson's model (1987) was focused on examining politeness on the utterance level while ignoring the complexity of politeness nature and how it could be influenced by dynamic elements, such as identity and context of practice (Mills, 2003). Nevertheless, some researchers, such as Locher (2006) and Sifianou (1992), argued that generalizations about politeness were inaccurate as it varied according to context, while other researchers, such as Mills (2011), claimed that politeness generalizations were possible if it was investigated in context while paying attention to other available linguistic varieties, even the rare ones. As a result, other theories emerged which were more discourse-centered, such as Relevance Theory (1986).

Therefore, Mills (2003: 58) suggested an approach which was "concerned with the way that assessments of what politeness consists of are developed by individuals engaging with others in communities of practice, in the process of mapping out identities and positions for themselves and others within hierarchies and affiliative networks". As a result, the following section provides a general account of culture and identity and how they can relate to politeness.

2.1. Culture, Identity and Politeness

Culture was defined by Fay (1996: 55) as "a complex set of shared beliefs, values and concepts which enables a group to make sense of its life and which provides it with directions

for how to live". However, other researchers debated that the previous definition was inaccurate (e.g., Holliday *et al.*, 2004; Kadar and Mills, 2011). For instance, Kadar and Mills (2011) believed that people were not 'passive recipients' as how Fay (1996) suggested, and thus researchers should have taken into consideration the dynamic element of linguistic strategies. Similarly, Holliday *et al.* (2004: 3) viewed culture as being "constructing and constructed by people", and thus interactions in particular contexts included identity negotiation. Nevertheless, Culpeper (2011) described identity as a 'self-schema' while Benwell and Stokoe (2006) regarded culture to be an important factor which influenced identity. Besides, Constantin and Rautz (2003) believed in the diversity of one's identity and how it could manifest variously based on context of practice.

Based on the previous discussion, politeness as a social phenomenon cannot be best described by generalizations, and thus framing it within a context becomes essential. Furthermore, despite the criticisms against Brown and Levinson's politeness model, Schlund (2014: 274) argued that "[t]he merit of Brown and Levinson's account is also demonstrated by the fact that their terminology is firmly established in linguistic politeness research". As a result, this study aims to examine linguistic strategies of two presenters in similar contexts by exploiting Brown and Levinson's politeness model (1987) and Gricean CP (1975, 1989) in an attempt to reveal to what extent the two presenters are different and/or similar.

3. Methodology

The data include five phone-ins for each one of the two presenters. The phone-ins are extracted from their full episodes on Youtube (i.e., they are taken out from the official channel of the program '*Dream TV Egypt*') based on similarity of the issues discussed. Correspondingly, the data tackle the following five topics of: inheritance, family problems, doing good to one's kith and kin, dutifulness to parents and giving consolations. Moreover, the 10 phone-ins present an example of natural spoken Arabic between random callers and the two presenters.

Despite the fact that Gricean CP (1975, 1989) and Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory (1987) have been criticized, their influences are undeniable as they have opened the gate for other researchers' discussions and developments. Thus, this study uses Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness model and Grice's (1975, 1989) CP as they have provided good frameworks by which the researcher can answer her research questions. First, the researcher transcribes the analyzed parts according to Schenkein's (1978) transcription conventions, then she translates them into English. Besides, a combined framework is essential as Brown and Levinson's politeness theory (1987) focuses on how FTAs are performed, while Gricean CP (1975, 1989) investigates indirectness in off-record FTAs.

3.1. Brown and Levinson's Politeness Model (1987)

Brown and Levinson (1987) have provided a detailed model on how FTAs can be possibly done. First, bald-on-record strategies (i.e., to perform a direct FTA); second, redressed on-record strategies (i.e., to redress the FTA with positive politeness strategies and/or negative politeness strategies); third, off-record strategies (i.e., to perform indirect FTAs by breaching Gricean maxims in order to generate hints/implicatures).

For instance, claiming commonality or familiarity with the hearer is a super positive politeness strategy that includes other sub-strategies, such as using in-group language, including the hearer and the speaker in the activity and avoiding disagreement with the hearer. Similarly, negative politeness strategies mainly aim to reduce impingement on the hearer as in impersonalizing the hearer or minimizing the rank of imposition (R).

4. Analysis

Presenter A and presenter B regularly perform and redress FTAs by almost all the redressing strategies that Brown and Levinson have illustrated (1987). However, some strategies of doing FTAs are more preferred by the two presenters (e.g., positive politeness and off-record strategies), while other strategies are exploited differently by the two presenters (e.g., negative politeness strategies and bald-on-record strategies). According to the frequencies in Table 4.1, the two presenters regularly employ positive politeness (38.9%). They also frequently use off-record FTAs (28.3%). On the other hand, negative politeness (20%) and bald-on-record FTAs (12.9%) are used less frequently by the two presenters.

Table 4.1: Frequencies of FTAs Super-Strategies Applied by the Two Presenters

Super-Strategy	Presenter A		Presenter B	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Bald-on-Record	102	15.8%	55	9.6%
Positive Politeness	271	41.9%	203	35.4%
Negative Politeness	100	15.5%	144	25.1%
Off-Record FTAs	174	26.9%	171	29.8%
Total Strategies	647	100%	573	100%

The following two sections (Section 4.1 and Section 4.2) illustrate some examples of bald-on-record FTAs and off-record FTAs, and how the two presenters usually mitigate them with positive and/or negative politeness. Those examples are transcribed according to Schenkein's (1978) transcription conventions (see Appendix I) in order to provide a clearer description of the conversational aspects of the spoken data in hand. Nevertheless, the examples are contextualized and translated into English.

4.1. On-Record FTAs

Brown and Levinson (1987) have argued that when the speaker decides to perform an FTA on-record this can be done through applying positive and/or negative politeness strategies (redressed on-record FTAs) or it can be done through applying bald-on-record strategies which are not mitigated with any politeness strategies (bald-on-record FTAs). Firstly, the speaker can mitigate FTAs with strategies which aim to enhance the hearer's positive face by assuring them that their needs and wants are valued and even appreciated through using in-group language (e.g., slang), in-group identity markers (e.g., endearment terms) and assuming commonality with the hearer. Secondly, the speaker can mitigate their FTAs by negative politeness techniques which aim to preserve the hearer's negative face through assuring their freedom of action; for example, the speaker may choose to minimize

imposition R or to passivize the FTA by omitting the agent and/or the receiver of FTAs. Thirdly, bald-on-record FTAs can be performed, for example, by direct criticisms, direct disagreements and imperatives.

In addition, compared to presenter B, presenter A uses bald-on-record FTAs more recurrently to perform direct face threats to the hearer, whereas his employed politeness techniques sometimes fail to reduce the face threats as a result of the aggravating nature of the performed FTAs (see Excerpt 4.1). On the other hand, presenter B prefers to redress most of his performed FTAs with positive and/or negative politeness strategies; he rarely employs bald-on record FTAs, but when he does, it is usually for clarity or for the general good of the caller; his redressing strategies successfully mitigate the FTA involved since those FTAs are of a minor risk (see Excerpt 4.2). As a result, presenter B shows more awareness of the caller's face, whereas presenter A seems to give less concern to the hearer's face; the thing which makes presenter A's linguistic style more powerful and face threatening than presenter B's.

For instance, in Excerpt 4.1 the caller of this phone-in (henceforth, C1) starts with complaining about how her rich mother-in-law mistreats C1's husband since she refuses to give him a small amount of money (i.e., one thousand Egyptian Pounds) which he needs to travel to Saudi Arabia (i.e., where he should start his work). However, presenter A (PA) disagrees with C1's claims since the amount of money is not big, and maybe C1 is prejudice against her mother-in-law. Thus, presenter A requires C1 to help her husband, stop her accusations, and finally he criticizes her. In order to perform the previous FTAs, presenter A performs a redressed FTA (i.e., Line 2), and two bald-on-record FTAs (i.e., Lines 6 and 7).

Excerpt 4.1 – Minute 40:52 – Episode April 22nd 2016

- (1) C1: =هي مامته ما بتساعدوش خالص أنا بتكلم ف(كده)
- (2) PA: [ألف جنيه ده أنتي على رأي محمد والناس اللي بيتكلموا قبل كده] ←
- حتى اا بتاع خاتم من صباeck يا حبيبتني؟ والحلق=
- (3) C1: أنا مش على [الألف جنيه]
- (4) PA: [اللي هييجيبك غيره من خميس مشيط قد كده] خميس مشيط دي فيها ذهب
- (5) C1: [أنا بتكلم على معاملة حماتي!]
- (6) PA: لأ سيبك من معاملة حماتك بقي= ←
- (7) PA: =ما إنتي بردو [ما إنتي بردو نص كم أهو (.)] ←
- 1) 'C1: =his (i.e., the caller's husband) mom never helps him that's what I'm talkin'[about'
→ 2) 'PA: [a thousand pounds as how
Mohamed
A A A TINY ring from and others who called before you have suggested it's just
your
finger my dear? or the earrings='
- 3) 'C1: I'm not talkin' about [the one thousand pounds'
4) 'PA: [which he will buy again for you from Khamis Mushait
[Khamis
Mushait (i.e., a city in Saudi Arabia) has tons of gold'
5) 'C1: [I'm

talkin' about my mother-in-law's treatment!'

→6) 'PA: no, forget about your mother-in-law's treatment then='

→7) 'PA: =you're also [you're also a crumb (.)'

First, in line (1), C1 asserts that her mother-in-law does not help C1's husband; thus, in line (2), presenter A utilizes two negative politeness strategies (i.e., passivization and minimizing imposition R) and a positive politeness strategy (i.e., using an endearment term) to redress his on-record request to C1 (i.e., asking her to help her husband by selling her jewelry). First, presenter A impersonalizes himself from the FTA by putting his request as a suggestion of others who have called before C1 "as how Mohamed and others who called before you have suggested / على رأي محمد والناس اللي بيتكلموا قبل كده" (Line 2). Second, presenter A minimizes imposition R of his request by "it's just A A TINY ring from your finger من بتاع خاتم من حتة // بتاع خاتم من حتة // صباعك" (Line 2). Third, presenter A redresses his request by assuming common ground with C1 when he uses the endearment term 'my dear' (Line 2). Nevertheless, in lines (3) and (5), C1 tries to clarify that her complaint is about her mother-in-law's mistreatment rather than the one thousand pounds, however presenter A attacks her face by dropping the topic she raises; he uses the imperative "لأ سيبك من معاملة حماتك" / no forget about your mother-in-law's treatment" (Line 6) to prevent the caller from illustrating the topic any further. Moreover, presenter A attacks C1's face again by using the in-group slang "you're also a crumb/ ما إنتي / بردو نص كم" (Line 7) by which he accuses her to be helpless to her husband since she has not given him her jewelry.

Despite the fact that the previous FTAs in Excerpt 4.1 are on-record, they still include other off-record FTAs. Firstly, in line (2) when presenter A redresses his request, this request implies an indirect criticism against C1 that she is not helpful enough to her husband; instead of waiting others to help her husband, she could have simply sold some of her jewelry as the needed amount of money is not big. However, the previous FTA in line (2) is based on presenter A's assumption that the caller has jewelry which may not be true (i.e., this FTA threatens the caller by coercing her to do some action and also by imposing particular assumptions of her). Similarly, in line (6), when presenter A directly requires C1 to stop proceeding the topic she raises, he may indirectly stop C1 from continuing false accusations against her mother-in-law (i.e., criticizing C1's claims directly could have been more face-aggravating to C1). C1's face threat is still high though since the sudden interruption can be interpreted as being careless to C1's ideas or feelings (i.e., threatening her positive face), and also forcing C1 to stop some action (i.e., threatening her negative face). Therefore, presenter A strongly attacks wrong behaviors with a minimum regard to the caller's face in order to achieve clarity of the message conveyed.

On the other hand, in Excerpt 4.2, the caller of this phone-in (henceforth, C2) is hesitant whether to visit her sick aunt since she has offended C2 years ago, and C2 swore not to visit her again. However, preserving kin relationships is highly rewarded by God, therefore presenter B (PB) gives C2 direct requests (i.e., bald-on-record FTAs) to preserve this relationship, and to be fair to C2's aunt, he asks C2 to reflect on herself as her aunt might have an excuse. Nevertheless, presenter B shows awareness of some C2's face needs, thus he reduces C2's face threats to some degree by employing in-group identity markers, asking C2 for reasons, and he hedges his claims about C2.

Excerpt 4.2 – Minutes 41:54 and 01:01:25 – Episode October 28th 2016

(1) C2: لأنني رحت؟ فبقت إيه، جايبة أوضة نوم بقت تقولي إيه؟ ((يحاول المقدم أن يخفي ضحكته)) الله أكبر عليكي تعالي إتفرجي الله أكبر. الله أكبر قل أعود برب الفلق. قل أعود برب الناس،

(2) C2: فدلوقتي هي مريضة، ومش عارفة أعمل إيه. ((يستمتع المقدم بوجه ضاحك)) وأنا حلفت ما أروح عندها .

(3) PB: ((مبتسماً)) روعي وكبري دماغك. وما تبصيلهاش. ←

(4) PB: ((موجهاً كلامه لخالة المتصلة)) هي ما طلبت منك إنها تشوف أوضة النوم اللي إنتي جايهاها !

(5) PB: وانتي كمان يا ست فاطمة لازم تقعدتي مع نفسك. وتراجعي نفسك. ←

(6) PB: ليه هي (الخالة) قالت قدامك كده!

(7) PB: شوفي! نفسك. ←

(8) PB: ما يمكن إنتي من غير ما تقصدي بتقولي كلمة، تحسسي اللي قدامك إنك بتحسديه وإنتي مش بتحسديه. ←

- 1) 'C2: Because when I went (i.e., to the house of the caller's aunt)? She (i.e., the caller's aunt) did what, she had a new bedroom, then she said what? she said Allah is greater than you ((the presenter is trying to hide his laughs)) come in and see it Allahu Akbar (i.e., Allah is the Greatest). Allahu Akbar say I seek refuge in the Lord of daybreak (i.e., Surat Al-Falaq).say I seek refuge in the Lord of mankind (i.e., Surat An-Nas),'
- 2) 'C2: now she's (i.e., the caller's aunt) sick, and I don't know what to do. ((the presenter is listening with a smiley face)) as I swore to God that I will never visit her again.'
- 3) 'PB: ((with a smile)) go and TAKE IT EASY and don't look at her (i.e., the caller's aunt).'
- 4) 'PB: ((directing his speech to the caller's aunt)) she didn't ask you to show her the bedroom YOU GOT!'
- 5) 'PB: Sit (i.e., a term of address used for women to reflect familiarity and respect) Fatima you also have to judge YOURSELF. and to rethink.'
- 6) 'PB: why did she (i.e., the caller's aunt) say such a thing in front of you!'
- 7) 'PB: LOOK AT! yourself.'
- 8) 'PB: probably unintentionally you say a word, by which the one in front of you may feel that you envy them WHILE YOU DON'T.'

In lines (1) and (2) (i.e., Excerpt 4.2), C2 describes her problem that her aunt, many years ago, was showing C2 a new bedroom while reciting protection supplications and Qur'an verses (e.g., Surat An-Nas and Surat Al-Falaq), in the presence of C2, to be safe from the harms of the evil eye. The previous attitude of the aunt has a serious face threat against C2 as it implicitly accuses her to be an envier, thus those prayers were needed to protect the aunt and her belongings from C2's eyes. Therefore, in line (3) presenter B uses bald-on-record strategies by commanding C2 to go and visit her aunt as it is highly rewarded by God; presenter B uses direct imperatives "go and TAKE IT EASY and don't look at her روجي وكبري /وما تبصليهاش/تماغك" (Line 3) as the acts involved should benefit C2 by motivating her to preserve kin relationship. Despite the fact that the previous FTAs are for the general good of the hearer, their face threats remain high since presenter B commits C2 to do some actions which she may not want to do regardless of how she may feel about it. Furthermore, in lines (5) and (7), presenter B tries to be just to C2's aunt that maybe she had some excuse to act in such a way, thus he mitigates other bald-on-record requests to C2, as in "you also have to judge yourself. and to rethink...LOOK AT yourself" (Lines 5 to 7). The previous requests (i.e., Lines 5 to 7) are mitigated by the positive politeness strategy of using in-group identity marker 'Sit/ست' which is used to reflect familiarity, but also respect for C2, and also by the positive politeness strategy of asking C2 to think of possible reasons by which presenter B assumes common grounds with C2, as in 'why did she (i.e., the caller's aunt) say such a thing in front of you!' (Line 6). Nevertheless, in line (8), presenter B applies the negative politeness technique of using hedges to reduce his assumptions of C2, as in 'probably unintentionally you say a word, by which the one in front of you may feel that you envy them WHILE YOU DON'T' (Line 8). However, the previous mitigated requests, in lines (5) and (7), are still face threatening since they imply off-record accusations that C2 can be an envier as how her aunt believes. Similarly, the word choice in 'don't look at her' (Line 3) may imply an off-record accusation of C2 to be an envier, thus she should not look at her aunt.

In conclusion, presenter A and presenter B are similar in their preference to be honest with their callers by employing on-record strategies, however they are different in the nature of FTAs they perform and the strategies they choose to do them. First, presenter A performs some face-aggravating acts to attack wrong deeds of the caller with minimum concern of the caller's face needs. Therefore, presenter A applies more bald-on-record FTAs (15.8%) mostly to attack the caller's face, and in many occasions his redressing strategies fail to reduce the danger of those face-invading acts. On the other hand, presenter B shows more regard to the caller's face needs, thus he recurrently applies mitigation strategies to reduce possible face threats involved in the performed FTAs. Presenter B also avoids bald-on-record FTAs as he performs them in few occurrences (9.6%) when honesty is needed or when the FTA involved is for the caller's general good. Presenter B also avoids face-invading FTAs; thus his mitigation strategies are successful most of the time. Finally, bald-on-record strategies do not always guarantee directness of the meaning conveyed since they also can imply possible off-record FTAs.

4.2. Off-Record FTAs

Brown and Levinson (1987: 211) have illustrated that by choosing this strategy of going off-record to perform FTAs, the speaker gives themselves an 'out' from taking responsibility of the FTAs involved. They also have argued that the main element of those indirect utterances is that they must have some 'trigger' or a 'hint' by which the hearer can be provoked to search for possible inferences (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 213). Moreover,

Brown and Levinson (1987: 213) have debated that “[t]he basic way to do this [giving the hearer a hint] is to invite conversational implicatures by violating, in some way, the Gricean Maxims of efficient communication”. Therefore, off-record FTAs seem to rely strongly on the non-observance of conversational maxims. Hence, off-record strategies are supposed to be more indirect and, correspondingly, more polite than negative politeness since its mechanism opens the door to disclaim responsibility of FTAs involved by allowing different possible interpretations (Brown and Levinson, 1987). However, when presenter A and presenter B employ this off-record strategy, it is found that the ambiguity it creates can aggravate the caller’s face in many occasions; off-record FTAs can suggest dangerous face-threatening inferences as illustrated in Excerpts 4.3 and 4.4.

Firstly, in Excerpt 4.3, the caller (C1) complains about how her mother-in-law is unjust to C1’s husband; she prefers his brother over him, and she refuses to support C1’s husband financially despite the fact that she is rich and he has no job yet. As a result, presenter A (PA) directs his speech to the mother-in-law to warn her and to condemn her attitude through performing off-record FTAs.

Excerpt 4.3 – Minute 36:25 – Episode April 22nd 2016

C1: بس:: هي يعني بتعامل أخ عن أخ، يعني [زوجي مخلص في كلية تجارة وما فيش] شغل المفروض تقف جنبه وتساعده،

.

.

.

PA (2): ويقول لحماتك كلمة جميلة

.

.

.

PA (3): أما إذا كنتي قادرة، على (.) أن (.) يبقى فلا يرحل،

PA (4): فاعلمي أنكى أنتي التي رحلتى وليس هو كما قال المتنبى فالراحلون هم (.) ←

.

.

.

PA (5): من استطاع أن ينفع منكم أخاه فلينفعه، قال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم= ←

PA (6): فما بالك بالأب والأم بفلذات الأكباد. ←

PA (7): لكن بعض القلوب بيجلها صدأ، ←

- 1) ‘C1: but:: she’s like preferring A SON over a son, I mean[my husband has graduated from the Faculty of Commerce and there’s no[job she (i.e., the caller’s mother-in-law) should support him and help him,’

.

.

.

- 2) ‘PA: I’ll tell your mother-in-law A NICE word’

.

.

.

- 3) ‘PA: but if you are capable. to (.) make (.) him stay (i.e., by helping him) and never

- leave,’
- 4) ‘PA: then know that you are the one who truly left not HIM as said by Al-Mutanabbi (i.e., an Abbasid poet) then THEY are the ones who truly left (.)’
-
-
-
- 5) ‘PA: whoever among you is able to benefit his brother (i.e., another human being) let him do so, said by Prophet Muhammed Peace Be Upon Him=’
- 6) ‘PA: = then what about THE FATHER and the mother with their own FLESH and blood (i.e. children).’
- 7) ‘PA: ‘but some hearts get rusted,’

In line (1), C1 describes how her rich mother-in-law ignores the bad financial conditions of C1’s husband, and that his brother is better than him for C1’s mother-in-law. Thus, presenter A (PA) warns the mother-in-law that she should not leave her son travel abroad as long she can help him to stay (i.e., Lines 2-7). In lines (3) and (4), he performs an off-record criticism/warning to the mother-in-law by flouting Quality and Manner maxims; he generates an implicature by the vague metaphoric expression “*then know that you are the one who truly left not him*/ *فَاعْلَمِي أَنْكَ أَنْتِي اللَّتِي رَحَلْتِي وَلَيْسَ هُوَ*” (Line 4) which he illustrates later to be relevant to a quotation of Al-Mutanabbi (i.e., an Arab poet from the Abbasid era). The previous off-record FTA breaches Quality maxim by using unreal poetic image of the mother-in-law to be the one who truly leaves her son’s life for good if she disappoints him. Presenter A also flouts Manner maxim when he relates his metaphoric image to a poetic line of Al-Mutanabbi “*then they are the ones who truly left*/ *فَالرَّاحِلُونَ هُمُ*” (Line 4) in which Al-Mutanabbi was criticizing those people who let their beloved ones leave when they could have made them stay instead. Similarly, in lines (5) and (6), presenter A non-observes Manner maxim by using a Hadith (i.e., a tradition) of the Prophet PBUH and indefinites in order to generate hints that what is said should be somehow related to the context of the talk. Presenter A flouts Manner maxim when he uses a Hadith ‘*Whoever among you is able to benefit his brother (i.e., another human being) let him do so*/ *مَنْ اسْتَطَاعَ أَنْ يَنْفَعُ مِنْكُمْ أَخَاهُ فَلْيَنْفَعْهُ*” (Line 5), and indefinites in “*...the father and the mother with their own flesh and blood (i.e. Children)*/ *الْأَبُ وَالْأُمُ بِفُلْدَاتِ الْأَكْبَادِ*” (Line 6) to over generalize the vague FTAs involved (e.g., the FTA can be a request to C1’s mother-in-law to help her son or it can be a condemnation of the mother-in-law if she refuses to help him) by including all humans in general (i.e., Line 5), and parents in particular (i.e., Line 6). In addition, presenter A generates hints of off-record FTAs in lines (6) and (7) by flouting Quality maxim which is also expected to be relevant to the context of the talk exchange. Quality maxim is breached by the figurative images presenter A exploits: (a) to exaggerate the preciousness of one’s own children, as in “*flesh and blood*/ *فُلْدَاتِ الْأَكْبَادِ*” (Line 6); and (b) to criticize cruel people, as in “*some hearts get rusted*/ *بَعْضُ الْقُلُوبِ بِيَجْلُهَا صَدَأٌ*” (Line 7).

The previous breaching of Gricean maxims (i.e., Lines 5-7) generates implicatures of some face-invading acts against the C1’s mother-in-law which can be inferred by the following rational process: (a) a real Muslim obeys the Prophet’s instructions PBUH, and should help who are in need; (b) parents should be more caring and helpful to their children; (c) some people have no compassion or rusted hearts (i.e., as they act differently to what is expected); (d) according to Grice (1989), all talk exchanges should be relevant somehow to context in order to conduct an efficient communication. Therefore, by relating the previous

hints together, C1's mother-in-law, who does not help her son (her flesh and blood), is accused of being a cruel-hearted woman who contradicts maternal kindness (i.e., to be helpful to her son) and the guidance of her religion (i.e., to help anyone who needs help). Moreover, the previous FTAs are not done on-record, thus according to Brown and Levinson (1987), presenter A should have an 'out' from being responsible for the previous FTAs (i.e., it can be claimed that presenter A is talking generally and he does not intend to C1's mother-in-law in particular). However, according to the present context, it is hard or even impossible to receive the previous FTAs as irrelevant to C1's mother-in-law.

Similarly, presenter B performs off-record FTAs by flouting conversational maxims. However, in most cases, presenter B performs FTAs of minor risks and enhances them with redressing strategies. Thus, presenter B seems to regard the caller's face more successfully compared to presenter A as illustrated in Excerpt 4.4. In Excerpt 4.4, the caller (henceforth, C3) is asking whether he can transfer his rural house (i.e., a building) to his only daughter since he is worried that his brothers will mistreat her after his death. However, this case of property transference can harm other heirs, thus Islam conditions it. Therefore, presenter B performs off-record criticisms and requests to C3 by generating hints, but he shows awareness of their possible threats, thus he mitigates them with in-group identity markers, including the speaker and the hearer in the activity, and indefinites.

Excerpt 4.4 – Minute 01:11:00 – Episode October 28th 2016

- (1) C3: =و عندي بيت. هل ينفع اكتبه لها،
.
.
.
(2) PB: ((متكماً)) هو إنت أخواتك كلهم مستنينك تموت عشان يورثو فيها يعني ((بدون تهكم)) ولا إنت حاسس إن إخوانك كويسين ولا وحشين ولا ايه؟ ←
(3) C3: والله هو ساعات كويسين، وساعات يعني كده. (كلام غير واضح) مش ضامن يعني.
.
.
.
(4) PB: فعم محمود- عم طه بيقولي يعني ساعات كويسين وساعات مش كويسين؟! ←
(5) PB: ليه بنقدر البلاء قبل وقوعه يا جماعة؟! ←
(6) PB: ما هو إحنا مش عاوزين نتحايل بالشرع، = ←
(7) PB: = أحياناً (.) في فتاوى (.) ينفع إن إحنا نقولها بس مبنرضاش نقولها على الهوا علشان عارفين! ←
(8) PB: إن الناس هتستخدمها غلط. ←
.
.
.
(9) PB: أنا الفتوى اللي أنا بقولها دي ، ←
(10) PB: مش عايزك تستخدمها غلط؟! ←

- 1) 'C3: =and I have a house (i.e., a rural building). can I transfer it to her (i.e., the caller's only daughter),'

.
.
.

- 2) 'PB: ((Sarcastically)) then all of your brothers are waiting you to die to inherit it (i.e., the rural building) ((with a serious tone)) or do you feel that your brothers are good or bad or what?
- 3) 'C3: WELL sometimes they're (i.e., the caller's brothers) good. and sometimes they're like you know. (unclear words) I'm not sure.'
- .
- .
- .
- 4) 'PB: so uncle Mahmoud-uncle Taha (i.e., the caller) tells me well sometimes they're (i.e., the caller's brothers) good and sometimes they're not good?!
- 5) 'PB: why do we expect the crisis before it actually happens folks?!
- 6) 'PB: as we don't want to circumvent the law (i.e., God's law),='
- 7) 'PB: =SOMETIMES (.) there are Fatwas (i.e., religious verdicts) (.) that we can give but
- we don't want to give them on air because we know!'
- 8) 'PB: that people will use them wrongly.'
- .
- .
- .
- 9) 'PB: this Fatwa I'm giving,'
- 10) 'PB: I DON'T WANT YOU (i.e., the caller) to use it wrongly?!'

In lines (1) and (3), C3 describes his problem that he does not trust his brothers, so he wants to know whether he can transfer his rural house to his only daughter to keep her safe from her uncles. However, in lines (2) and (5), presenter B performs off-record criticisms of C3's suspicions by flouting Quality maxim and Manner maxim. First, presenter B breaches Quality maxim by the unreal sarcastic image he uses in "*then all of your brothers are waiting you to die to inherit it (i.e., the rural building)*/هو إنت أخواتك كلهم مستنينك تموت عشان يورثو فيها يعني" (Line 2), and the rhetorical question "*why do we expect the crisis before it actually happens folks?!/ليه بنقدر البلاء قبل وقوعه باجماعة*" (Line 5). In addition, presenter B flouts Manner maxim in "*why do we expect the crisis before it actually happens folks?!/ليه بنقدر البلاء قبل وقوعه باجماعة*" (Line 5) by using an Egyptian proverb; the proverb over generalizes the FTA as it criticizes those who are pessimistic and expect the worst scenarios. Presenter B also performs off-record requests in lines (7) and (8) by flouting Quantity and Manner maxims as he gives more information about other occasions which do not relate directly to the talk exchange. For example, he brings up another incidents in which presenter B and other presenters refuse to give particular Fatwas (i.e., religious verdicts) since the hearer can misuse them "*sometimes there're Fatwas that we can give but we don't want to give them on air because we know that people will use them wrongly/أحيانا في فتاوى ينفع إن إحنا نقولها بس مبنرضاش نقولها على الهوا عشان عارفين إن الناس هتستخدمها غلط*" (Lines 7-8); this non-observance of Relevance maxim can function as an off-record piece of advice (i.e., to advise the caller to use the verdict wisely rather than repeating others' mistakes) or it can function as a criticism/accusation (i.e., expecting the caller to misuse the Fatwa). In lines (9) and (10), presenter B finally puts the FTA in lines (7) and (8) on-record that it is a piece of advice rather than an accusation (i.e., the piece of advice has a lower face-threat than accusations in this context). As a result, going off-record in the previous excerpt seems to expose more danger to C3's face wants than going on-record.

In Excerpt 4.4, presenter B also proves that he is aware of some of the caller's needs, thus he redresses his off-record FTAs with some politeness strategies. First, he reduces the possible face threats of his sarcasm in line (2) by changing his sarcastic tone into a serious one, and by turning it into a real question, as in “((with a serious tone)) or do you feel that your brothers are good or bad or what *بدون تهكم)) ولا أنت حاسس إن إخوانك كويسين ولا وحشيين ولا (ليه/يه))*” (Line 2). Nevertheless, presenter B uses inclusive-we pronoun to mitigate his off-record criticism by including himself in the FTA with C3, as in “*why do we expect.../ليه... بنقدر...*” (Line 5); he also uses an in-group identity marker “*folks/يا جماعة*” (Line 5) to mitigate the previous FTA. Finally, in lines (7) and (8), presenter B preserves C3's face to some degree by asserting that misusing Fatwas is a common problem that presenters can have in some occasions, thus he uses indefinites “*people /الناس*” (Line 8), and the exclusive-we pronoun which refers to presenter B and other presenters “*we can give...but we don't want to give...because we know/علشان عارفين... مبترضاش نقولها... بس مبترضاش نقولها*” (Line 7).

In conclusion, off-record FTAs are mostly triggered by conversational implicatures whose meanings can be rendered through available contextual clues. However, most off-record FTAs are not completely indirect; their implied meanings are mostly conventional and understood by the hearer. Therefore, off-record FTAs in the study contexts are not as safe as how Brown and Levinson (1987) have argued. In addition, in many occasions, off-record FTAs are found more face-threatening than on-record ones since they can suggest many possible inferences.

5. Findings and Discussion

Presenter A and Presenter B have presented the religious TV program ‘*Al-Maw'ezza Al-Hasana*’ where they have answered the caller's questions by receiving their phone-ins. Thus, the contexts are almost the same since the topics discussed, purpose of communication, and type of interaction are all similar. By analyzing 1220 instances of FTA strategies (see Table 4.1), some linguistic similarities and differences are found between the two presenters.

In the light of the research questions, the study concludes that the two presenters share common linguistic choices. First, the two presenters redress almost all of their performed FTAs with various politeness strategies as illustrated by Brown and Levinson (1987). For example, positive politeness and off-record mechanisms are the most common mitigation strategies of the two presenters, since the former is used about 38.9%, while the latter is used 28.3%. The two presenters also show tendency to mix between different super-strategies (e.g., positive politeness and off-record strategies or negative politeness and bald-on-record strategies). Consequently, the two presenters seem to expend effort by maintaining the caller's face to some degree by redressing performed FTAs. In addition, the two presenters' apparent preference of positive politeness techniques reflects their desire to assuming camaraderie with the caller as a major mitigation strategy. In addition, the two presenters' tendency to perform off-record FTAs also indicates their skillfulness in manipulating various conversational maxims while performing and/or redressing FTAs.

Second, each presenter illustrates distinctive linguistic choices during mitigating and/or performing FTAs. First, presenter A uses positive politeness (41.9%) more than presenter B (35.4%), while the latter employs negative politeness (25.1%) more than the former (15.5%). Therefore, presenter A tends to make more assumptions of the hearer than

presenter B, while the latter frequently avoids coercing the hearer to some degree by employing more negative politeness than the former. Similarly, presenter A is also found to perform various face-invading acts since he employs bald-on-record FTAs more frequently (15.8%). However, presenter B prefers to mitigate acts of minor face threats with various politeness strategies, and he limits bald-on-record FTAs to few occasions (9.6%) where the acts involved are for the caller's interest or where clarity is a necessity. Regardless of the fact that the two presenters apply almost all politeness strategies as illustrated by Brown and Levinson (1987), presenter A exploits politeness strategies to achieve different goals; for example, presenter A makes many assumptions of the hearer to attack their wrong deeds and behaviors. Thus, presenter A uses a strategy which is supposed to enhance the caller's positive face in order to reduce the caller's ego. Similarly, sometimes presenter A applies positive politeness strategies to threaten the caller's negative face by imposing presenter A's expectations of the hearer (see Excerpt 4.1).

Based on the previous findings, it seems that similarity of contexts and social factors does not completely guarantee similarity of linguistic styles exploited by the speaker. For example, presenter A shows more boldness and power in his linguistic choices than presenter B. First, presenter A shows more preference of bald-on-record FTAs which relates to directness and clarity, while presenter B rarely uses it. Second, presenter B frequently applies negative politeness strategies which relates to etiquette and social distance at the time when this strategy is the least preferred one for presenter A; it can be an indicator that presenter A prefers to impose particular FTAs on the hearer (e.g., making assumptions about the hearer's needs, behaviors and ideas), unlike presenter B who recurrently reduces impositions of FTAs by negative politeness strategies. Third, presenter A usually performs dangerous FTAs of high risks (see Excerpts 4.1 and 4.3), unlike presenter B who usually performs FTAs of low risks (see Excerpts 4.2 and 4.4). For example, in most cases, presenter A condemns wrong behaviors clearly regardless of what face-threats this may include, while presenter B shows linguistic caution in choosing appropriate redressed FTAs which conveys the meaning with the least face-damage possible. Besides, presenter B employs smiles and happy faces in various instances (see Excerpt 4.2) either to enhance the caller's positive face (i.e., by expressing appreciation) and/or to maintain the caller's negative face (i.e., by minimize imposition of particular FTAs). Therefore, presenter B illustrates a more conservative linguistic attitude by regarding the caller's face needs as much as possible; presenter B recurrently performs FTAs of a low possibility to invade the caller's face, thus his redressing strategies seem to maintain the caller's face needs more efficiently.

Possible explanations of the previously-described differences can be that linguistic choices are a free behavior, and generalizations can lead to inaccuracy. For instance, a particular context can be associated with some stereotypical norms, however participants with language competence may utilize a particular linguistic choice which seems appropriate at that time. Besides, those choices may be influenced by the presenter's ideology, identity, or how they want to be seen. Presenter A, for instance, may be expressing his own personality as a man who manifests his powerful status and his strong personality by using risky, but honest, FTAs to correct the hearer's actions with no fear of consequences. On the other hand, presenter B may also be manifesting a particular personality which is aware of the hearer's face needs, thus he attempts to preserve them as possible without risking the clarity and honesty of information conveyed.

5.1. Implications of Politeness and In/directness

This study finds Brown and Levinson's politeness model (1987) and Gricean CP (1975, 1989) to be helpful in analyzing linguistic differences by focusing on utterances structure, however Brown and Levinson's model (1987) is found incapable of describing mitigation strategies in the data precisely. First, indirectness of expressions does not always guarantee a minimized face threat as claimed since the data have proven the high riskiness of indirectness in many occasions (i.e., see Section 4.2). Moreover, bald-on-record FTAs are not always risky; it is found that this strategy can be safer by excluding dangerous inferences of implicatures (see Excerpt 4.4). Furthermore, not all bald-on-record FTAs are completely direct; sometimes when bald-on-record strategy is used, indirect implicatures may also be present (see Section 4.1). Nevertheless, effusion of redressing strategies does not always guarantee maintaining the face of the hearer (see Excerpts 4.1 and 4.3); mitigation strategies function effectively when the FTA involved is of a minor risk (e.g., FTAs used by presenter B), however their function seems less effective when the FTA involved is of a high risk (e.g., FTAs used by presenter A). Furthermore, Gricean conversational maxims are found helpful in analyzing implicatures (see Section 4.2), however they overlap most of the time (e.g., breaching Relevance maxim should include breaching of Quantity maxim by giving more information than required). In conclusion, the study reaches the that Brown and Levinson's politeness theory can provide a good framework for the data under investigation as it realizes linguistic variations in the context, however it should not be regarded static; politeness strategies can be used to describe most conventionalized linguistic choices to which other linguistic deviations can be compared. Since interlocutors freely construct new linguistic devices to achieve their goals in different situations, generalizations can lead to inaccurate results. Nevertheless, language as a human behavior has always been dynamic, so it cannot be constrained to particular stereotypical norms. In addition, politeness and impoliteness should not be examined as opposite polars since it is hard to determine what is appropriate for someone to say in some context when such perceptions are culturally and ideologically constructed. Therefore, it is necessary to study linguistic deviations and to receive them as a manifestation of individual creativity.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, this study has explored to what extent two TV presenters in similar contexts may illustrate different linguistic styles; presenter A and presenter B show different linguistic preferences, despite the fact that they have shared some linguistic preferences (e.g., preferring to perform and/or mitigate FTA with positive politeness strategies). Furthermore, the previous findings have been reached through analyzing FTAs strategies according to Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness model and Grice's CP (1975). Presenter A is found to employ a powerful language by which he has expressed his clear condemnation of mistaken behaviors regardless of the face threats and the face invasions which may result. However, presenter B shows continuous attempts to fulfill the caller's face needs as much as possible without affecting clarity or honesty of the information conveyed. Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness and Grice's (1975) CP are found suitable to the data in hand, however the former sometimes fails to describe FTA strategies precisely, while the latter usually overlaps.

REFERENCES

- Benwell, B. and Stokoe, S. (2006). *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh : Edinburgh University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Studies in interactional sociolinguistics. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Christie, C. (2007). 'Relevance Theory and Politeness'. In *Journal of Pragmatics*, 3, 269-294.
- Constantin, S. and Rautz, G. (2003). 'Culture and Identity'. In *Journal of European Integration*, 25 (3), 189-205.
- Culpeper, J. (2011). *Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dream TV Egypt. (2016, April 22). *Al-Maw'eza Al-Hasana| 22-4-2016 With Dr.Mabrouk Attia* [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vZe7x0Q-uPg&t=11s>
- Dream TV Egypt. (2016, October 28). *Al-Maw'eza Al-Hasana| With Sheikh Eslam Al-Nawawyepisode28-10-2016*[Videofile]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4c52NVPrJdE&t=4249s>
- Fay, B. (1996). *Contemporary Philosophy of Social Science: A Multicultural Approach*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gazdar, G. (1979). *Pragmatics, Implicature, Presupposition and Logical Form*. London: Academic Press Inc.
- Gil, J. M. (2012). 'Face-Threatening Speech Acts and Face-Invasive'. In *Macrothink Institute International Journal of Linguistics*, 400-411.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. In: P. Cole and J.L. Morgan, eds., *Syntax and semantics*, Vol. 3: Speech acts, 41-58. New York: Academic Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press.
- Hasan, Z. M. (2018). *Fatawā Al-fuḍa'yat.. T'thīruha 'ala El-Jumhūr* [Religious Verdicts on TV Channels and Its effect on the Audience]. Cairo: Al Arabia Publishing and Distributing.
- Holliday, A., Kullman, J. and Martin, H. (2004). *Inter-Cultural Communication*. London: Routledge.
- Kadar, D. Z. and Mills, S. (eds.), (2011). *Politeness in East Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kerkam, Z. M. (2015). *A comparison of Arabic and English Directness and Indirectness: Cross-Cultural Politeness*. (Doctoral dissertation, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield).
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Leech, G. N. (2007). 'Politeness: Is There an East-West Divide?'. In *Journal of Politeness Research*, 3, 167-206.
- Locher, M. (2006). 'Polite Behaviour within Relational Work: The Discursive Approach to Politeness'. *Multilingua*, 25 (3), 249-267.

- Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mills, S. (2011). 'Discursive Approaches to Politeness and Impoliteness'. In *Discursive Approaches to Politeness*. Linguistic Politeness Research Group (eds.), 19-56. Berlin: DeGruyter Mouton.
- Schenkein, J. (1978). *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*. New York: ACADEMIC PRESS, INC.
- Schlund, K. (2014). 'On form and function of politeness formulae'. In *Journal of Politeness Research*, 10(2), 271-296.
- Sifianou, M. (1992). *Politeness Phenomena in England and Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sperber, D. and Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Watts, R. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix I:**Transcription Conventions**

The data used in analysis sections include some transcription symbols which are explained in Schenkein's transcript notation (1978: xi-xvi) as the following:

Symbol	Usage
[[spontaneous utterances
[overlapping utterances
]	the end of overlap
=	latching utterances
(0.0)	timed pause
((pause))	untimed pause
:	prolonged sounds
.	falling intonations
,	continuing intonations
?	raising intonations
-	sudden cutoffs or stammered words
!	animated tones
CAPITALIZED/ <i>italic</i>	stressed words
(())	expressing particular actions within the utterance context (e.g., coughing, smiling)
()	empty or filled with whatever sounds/words recognized
> <	surround words which are uttered quickly
< >	surround words which are uttered slowly
↓	shifts of down pitches (i.e., added before the word)
↑	shifts of up pitches (i.e., added before the word)
→	draws the reader's attention to a particular utterance
...	a partial reporting of an utterance
.	omitted turns in the fragment
.	
.	

Note: Adapted from *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*, by Schenkein, J., 1978, pp. x-xvi, New York: ACADEMIC PRESS, INC.