

## Linguistic Politeness and Media Education: A Lingua-Pragmatic Study of Changing trends in ‘Forms of Address’ in Egyptian Media Talk Shows

Abdulfattah Omar<sup>1</sup>, Mohammed Ilyas<sup>2</sup> · Mohamed Ali Mohamed Kassem<sup>3</sup>

### Abstract

This study addressed the issue of linguistic politeness and media education in its socio-cultural perspectives through the adoption of a lingua pragmatic approach of the Egyptian media, particularly their talk shows which are recognized education platforms in pragmatics. The selected talk shows from the Egyptian TV channels aired during the period 2011 to 2013 were used to investigate the changes that were felt in linguistic politeness, particularly in ‘forms of address’ used by presenter(s) of these shows. The study premised that these changes could contribute to media education in the form of enhancing media literacy about lingua-pragmatic aspects of ‘forms of addresses used on various media platforms. The study also followed the proposition that there existed a close relationship between linguistic politeness and pragmatics that often makes media as a means of social education. Secondly, a ‘form of address’ constitutes a well-defined media-educational pragmatic subject as revealed in its distinct lexical classes such as titles, personal names, nicknames and pronominal systems. These pragmatic strategies are often culturally bound and systematically applied by speakers within their community. The study cites instances of change in ‘Forms of address’ and the linguistic politeness culturally linked with the Arabic language. The findings reveal the extent to which socio-cultural and political events influenced the use of lingua-pragmatic terms like forms of address and the level of politeness embedded in them. The study has educational implications as it reveals how social and environmental factors shape people’s opinions and their use of language. The findings of this study would also offer novel learning opportunities for media personnel.

**Keywords:** *forms of address, media literacy, social education, lingua-pragmatics, media talk shows*

### Introduction

Lingua-pragmatics is a field of linguistics that studies “fixed” language forms having fixed socio-pragmatic meanings (Malyuga and Orlovo, 2017; Shamma, 2006). Lingua-pragmatics is particularly useful in developing social bonds through culture-specific politeness in interpersonal communication. These “fixed” forms define the speaker’s attitude towards the hearer but also represent such norms of speaker’s language through which the speaker could use the language to address, request, blame, contradict, interrupt or apologize with other members of their community. If the speaker fails to use appropriate forms corresponding to these norms, it would deem to be a pragmatic failure. All such forms are within the scope of lingua-pragmatics. Speakers with same cultural background and who speak the same language can easily understand these lingua-

<sup>1-2</sup> Department of English, College of Sciences and Humanities, Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Education in the New Valley, Assiut University, Egypt

\*Correspondence: Abdulfattah Omar, Department of English, College of Sciences and Humanities, Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia. E-mail: a.omar@psau.edu.sa

pragmatic forms but non-native speakers face difficulties in understanding the message carried by these forms. Hence, lingua-pragmatic forms can be said to be totally language-specific and culture-specific. One of the forms of lingua-pragmatics is expressions of politeness in multiple situations.

Politeness is defined as showing a respectful behaviour for others. Expressions such as “thank you”, “please” and “you are welcome” show politeness and etiquettes of the western culture; in Arab culture, the politeness is reflected in giving respect to elders, greeting people, and helping the needy. Haugh (2004) identifies four pre-requisites of politeness: “a ‘conflict avoiding behavior’, a ‘socially appropriate behavior’, ‘and consideration for the feelings of others’ and ‘evaluation of the speaker’s behavior by the addressee as polite’.” Brown and Levinson (1978) have suggested that speakers employ politeness strategies in order to achieve successful communication and maintain social harmony. Speakers also use polite forms of language/ indirect linguistic forms in order to save their image and/or face the image of their recipients.

Media education, in the twentieth century dates back to 1920s when France initiated cinema education in universities (Martineau, 1988) as well as promoted education of newspaper journalists. Gradually it spread to other countries and to various media disciplines such as press, radio, television, video, advertisement and Internet in the recent past. Initially curriculum for media education was an issue but a few British media educators decided to integrate media education with Linguistics and Arts (Buckingham, 2003). Language became a strong medium to express both aesthetics and skills required in various media disciplines such as film studies, mass communication, documentaries, and media-narratives. Universities designed the curricula of such courses with contents based on visual language in a most pragmatic manner. Language also helped in resolving the ambiguities caused by good or bad aesthetics or when it was required to judge the artistic value of a media text. Nowadays media education and various language genres are blended together to develop a unified pedagogical approach.

This study addresses the issue of linguistic politeness in Egyptian talk show programs after the Egyptian Revolution in 2011. These talk shows represent media in this study. The study explores the relationship between politeness on one side and speaker’s authority and changing power relations on the other side. It seeks to generate an empirically grounded analysis of the shifts in politeness paradigms as evident in Egyptian Arabic talk show programs. These talk show programs reflect socio-cultural differences; they rewrite cultural scripts; alter people’s perceptions, social relationships, and their relationships to the natural world as well (Donsbach, 2015, Timberg and Erler, 2002, Woo and Dominick, 2001). Furthermore, the Talk shows selected for this study are rich with interviews which the hosts conducted with people of different positions and social classes. Hence, this study also illustrates that talk show programs potentially offer a good opportunity to explore lingua-pragmatics and also understand socio-cultural differences between the speakers and the hearers.

This article is organized as follows. Part 1 is the present introduction. Part 2 introduces the Egyptian Talk shows sampled for this study. Part 3 defines the research problem and research questions. Part 4 is a brief survey of past studies. This section is divided into the three variables of this study: Linguistic politeness, Cross-cultural aspects and Forms of address. Part 5 outlines the methods and procedures of the study. Part 6 is analysis and discussion. Part 7 is conclusion.

## Egyptian Talk Shows in Arabic

As a sample of this study, the researchers used six talk shows in Arabic aired on different Egyptian TV channels between 2011 and 2013 and found archived on the YouTube. These talk shows are Bassem Yusuf's *Al-Bernameg* (The Program), Lamees Hadidi's *Huna Al Asima* (Here is the Capital), Moataz Demerdash's *Misr Algadida* (New Egypt), Yusri Fuda's *Akher Kalam* (The Final Say), Tamer Amin's *Tahia Masr* (Viva Egypt) and Khairy Ramadan's *Mumken* (It is Possible).

### *Bassem Yusuf's Al-Bernameg (The Program)*

Yusuf is a famous Egyptian satirist and columnist and former cardiac surgeon, who hosted *Al-Bernameg* (The Program), a satire talk show program from 2011 to 2014. The show started on ON TV in 2011 before Yusuf moved to CBC where he had to terminate his contract with the channel and stop the program in 2014. In this show, Yusuf was greatly influenced by Jon Stewart, the host of the American talk show *Daily Show*. Although the show opens with a long monologue in which Yusuf mocks the social and political events of Egypt and the way the events are treated by other media organization, the last segment of the program is devoted to a celebrity interview, with guests ranging from actors and musicians to nonfiction authors and political figures.

### *Lamees Hadidi's Huna Al Asima (Here is the Capital)*

The program started in 2011 after the Egyptian Revolution. It is aired from Saturday to Wednesday and is concerned with addressing domestic and regional issues and policies. The program is broadcast on CBC and is one of the most popular programs in Egypt. Lamees has so far hosted a number of top officials and the President of Egypt himself.

### *Moataz Demerdash's Misr Algadida (New Egypt)*

This was an evening talk show that was aired from Sunday to Wednesday between 2011 and 2014. As its title suggests, the program was concerned with the social, political, and religious developments that were taking place in Egypt after the revolution.

### *Yusri Fuda's Akher Kalam (The Final Say)*

*Akher Kalam* was an evening talk show represented by Yusri Fuda, one of the most prominent journalists, reporters, and TV hosts in the Arab world. The program was aired on ON TV from Monday to Friday from 2011 to 2013. The program gained a great popularity due to the serious interviews that Fuda hosted with different people and officials.

### *Tamer Amin's Tahia Masr (Viva Egypt)*

The program was aired from Saturday to Wednesday on Rotana, one of the most widespread satellite channels in the Arab world. The program started in 2011 immediately after the Revolution and ended in 2014 when Amin announced that he was moving to LTC.

### *Khairy Ramadan's Mumken (It is Possible).*

This weekly talk show was aired on Wednesdays on CBC. It started in 2011 and is still being aired. It is an interview program that is concerned with human, religious, and artistic dimensions. There are also discussions of social and political developments that took place in Egypt and worldwide after the Revolution.

### **Problem Statement and Research Questions**

Previous studies have dealt with socio-cultural and cross cultural pragmatic norms in relation to linguistic politeness, particularly in the use of forms of address (Boubendir, 2012;2015; Al-Qahtani, 2009;; Kerkam, 2013; Khamam, 2013). In Arabic, forms of address and linguistic politeness are generally given high significance and priority by speakers. This was found practiced in TV programs including the talk show programs in Egypt prior to the Revolution. Hosts paid a great attention to the use of address forms with their guests who were government top officials, highly skilled professionals, footballers and businessmen. The element of linguistic politeness particularly in address forms was quite obvious in these talk shows. However, with the outbreak of the Egyptian Revolution in 2011, a few talk show programs showed a more daring attitude as can be observed particularly in their restructuring the use of address forms. Prior to the Revolution, TV programs in Egypt whether owned by the state or private organization used very polite forms of address with the guests, a few of whom were also government officials. During that period, criticizing official government policies or use of inappropriate forms of address was simply unthinkable.

Abdullah (2014) comments that the talk show programs have increased a great popularity as mass media genre and come to play a significant role in the public cause with the outbreak of the Egyptian Revolution in 2011. The author adds that talk show programs are one of the most striking features of the Egyptian media because exchanging opinions and venting feelings live on TV are considered novel practices, novel to media education practices followed in Egyptian media in current times. Now, talk show programs have freed themselves from the taboos and traditional practices of governmental TV channels, thus declaring the freedom of press and arrival of democratization in media education in Egypt. This is clearly reflected in the change in the use of the lingua-pragmatic examples of 'address forms' as a useful subject in media aesthetics too. In the light of this argument, this study tends to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the relationship between linguistic politeness and the use of address forms in Egyptian talk shows programs?
2. What are the new developments in forms of address seen in Egyptian Arabic after the Revolution of 2011?
3. How do forms of address constitute a well-defined pragmatic field of media education as exhibited through various lexical classes?

## Literature Review

### *Linguistic politeness*

Linguistic politeness is a set of conversational strategies that are employed in order to maintain social relationships and avoid interpersonal conflicts. Held (2005) finds a specific type of linguistic structure in politeness which “expresses the speaker’s attitude” and is therefore understood by “pragmatic means” rather than by semantic (2005: 134). Consistent with Yule’s (1996) concept of a linguistic interaction being a social interaction, one can argue that the linguistic politeness also represents the social regulations and practices that shape a speaker’s utterances. Hence, if a person uses expressions such as “Thank you” or “I appreciate this” quite often within his group, he tends to exhibit a linguistic behavior required to maintain the “equilibrium of interpersonal relationship” in a social group (Watts, 2005). The absence or omission of such behavior would be termed as impolite. Crystal (2003) also defines politeness as “a term which characterizes linguistic features mediating norms of social behavior, in relation to such notions as courtesy, rapport, deference, and distance. Such features include the use of special discourse markers (e.g. “please”), appropriate tones of voice, and acceptable forms of address e.g. the choice of intimate v. distant pronouns, or of first vs. last names” (2003:358).

The Theory of Politeness was postulated by Brown and Levinson (1978) who see politeness as a conscious and free decision of an individual to involve into a “purposeful-rational activity” (Kasper, 2009) and create a public self-image or “face” akin to one’s self-esteem (Huang, 2007). Brown and Levinson (1978) observe a mutual vulnerability of face since any individual’s face might be harmed by any other individual and emphasizes upon practising politeness to defend one’s face. In Arabic the “face” is frequently associated with matters of politeness (Shammas, 2005) as could be seen in expressions of politeness like ‘حفظوا ماء وجهنا’ to mean ‘They preserved our face/image’ or a face-saving gesture; ‘استحیی’ ‘He blushed’ to show that he was shy (Boubendir, 2012; 2015). Farhat (2009) further explains how the cultural expression ‘*wajih*’ meaning ‘face’ in Arabic is metaphorically used to mean ‘respect,’ ‘shame,’ ‘honor,’ and ‘dignity.’ Culturally therefore ‘face’ has come to be a significant determinant of the Arabic code of politeness preventing people from violating socio-cultural rules and maintain personal ethics.

Brown and Levinson (1978) having employed Grice’s (1975) and Goffman’s (1972) notions of politeness, take a step further and considers that politeness is based on conflict avoidance. This is essentially achieved using face which is “something that is emotionally invested, and can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction” (Brown & Levinson, 1978: 66). They also argue that speakers as well as hearers strategically manage their face-threatening acts (FTAs) in a conversation. They argue that a FTA is a speech act that damages the face or self-image of the speaker or hearer if his wants or desires are not supported or approved of. They suggested a few FTAs such as requests, disagreements, criticism, accusations, insults, interruptions and complaints. A request to the hearer, for instance, threatens the hearer’s negative face as he might feel some compulsions to complete the request, or the request might restrict his independence. A request can also pose a threat to the positive face of the speaker if the hearer intends to decline it. Similarly, a disagreement is a threat to the positive face of the hearer as it is a disappointment over non-acceptance of his opinions. It may not be possible to avoid such FTAs in conversations but such strategies can be developed to minimize them. A disagreement threatens the positive face, because of the fact that it implies a lack of acceptance for the hearer’s opinions.

In a conversation, positive face is the result of a strategy when the speaker tends to have social approval and acceptance; while the negative face looks for independence and freedom of action. So speakers and hearers must make a balance between both positive and negative face strategies.

Although politeness theory was extensively developed by Brown and Levinson (1978), the starting point was Grice's Cooperation Principle model which requires that in order to be polite participants in a conversation should not lose face. In this model, Grice (1975) offers new insights into pragmatics. The theory is based on the realization that communication is a cooperative effort between the speaker and the hearer or recipient. The speaker must choose his words so that the hearer can understand the intent, and the latter must try to figure out what the former meant. Grice's theory thus emphasizes the social and contextual aspects of discourse. Many scholars have agreed to Grice's model of linguistic politeness (Bousfield, 2015; Bousfield and Locher, 2008; Hickey and Stewart, 2005; Lakoff, 1989; Leech, 2003; Watts, 1989).

Grice's Cooperative principle is based on four categories: Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. Nevertheless, Grice realized that in many situations, speakers are not committed to these principles. A speaker may violate one or more of these maxims for some reason. This means that there is a gap between what is said and what is implicated. Grice explained it in terms of conversational implicature. One reason for violating the Cooperative Principles (CPs) is indirectness. In other words, a speaker may violate one or more of the CPs to be polite.

Similarly, Goffman's (1972) notions of politeness reflected in his *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. Goffman postulates very categorically that face-to-face interaction between two individuals requires communication strategies in which both the speaker and the listener must be concerned about the projection of their face in public. He gives the example of a theatrical or a stage performance where participants who interact socially must avoid embarrassment for self and for others. He calls society heterogeneous which means humans act differently in every context. Hence, unlike a theatrical performance or a talk show, as in the context of the current study, individual actors or speakers have to face an audience. According to Goffman (1972), while the speaker in a public appearance offers a positive self-concept of himself by being polite, at the same time he hides backstage his private societal roles and identities that he would not like to be a part of the face to face interaction. There seems to be a dichotomy of politeness varying in different roles, situations and purposes.

Leech (1983), for instance, also argued that politeness can be investigated in terms of the pragmatic theory and Grice's Cooperative Principle. The basic assumption of Leech's theory is that participants in an interaction tend to maintain an atmosphere of relative harmony by employing politeness maxims which include among others tact, modesty, and generosity. To put it simply, Leech explains that a successful interaction requires from speakers to maximize politeness forms and minimize impoliteness forms. Modesty and agreement are examples of polite forms while orders or commands are examples of impolite forms. Politeness thus is based on the speaker's using polite forms and avoiding impolite forms. According to Leech, politeness is measured by the speaker's effort to maximize politeness forms and minimizing impoliteness forms. The main implication of Leech's theory for this article is that there is a strong correlation between linguistic politeness and address system on one side and pragmatics on the other side.

In spite of its popularity, Brown and Levinson's politeness theory received a lot of criticism (Mills and Grainger, 2015). One major issue that has been raised in relation to the theory is its universality. Mills and Grainger (2015) argue that the universal rules adopted by Brown and Levinson (1978) are not applicable to all languages and cultures. This is expressed in terms of ethnocentricity. Moreover, there are cross-cultural differences that make the theory inappropriate (Holmes, 1990; Holmes and Stubbe, 2003), particularly when address terms show politeness with reference to translation from Arabic into English (Ethelb, 2015).

#### *Cross-cultural aspects and politeness*

The English speaking bilingual Arabs have used varying expressions of politeness for different purposes in a conversation. For instance, they would use English words like 'Hello' or 'Welcome' as equivalent to the Arabic 'marhaba', 'ahala wasahla' in greetings. The pragmatic norms of language can be seen determined by culture in both bilinguals and Arabic monolinguals in Egypt. Several research studies (Al-Zumor, 2003; Al-Rifa'i, 2004; Shamma, 2005; Al-Kahtani, 2005; Al-Khatib, 2006; Nureddeen, 2008; Al-Fattah, 2010) have proved the influence of culture having an influence in shaping the pragmatic norms of users of a second or a foreign language in the Arabic context. Attention may be drawn to studies such as Al-Kahtani (2005) who investigated politeness in refusal norms in three different culture groups: Americans, Arabs and Japanese. The study found several semantic differences with respect to politeness. Ponniah & Samuveli (2017) who identified demographical factors affecting the social etiquettes of bilingual Malaysian Tamils speaking English and Malay language. Al-Khatib (2006) carried out a study on pragmatics of making invitation and its acceptance in Jordanian culture. This study aims to explore the nature of invitation making and acceptance in Jordanian society from a pragmatic point of view. The study found several socio-pragmatic constraints in the expression of politeness. Nureddeen's (2008) study focused on the pragmatic norm of 'apology strategies' in Sudanese Arabic and discusses socio-cultural attitudes.

All these studies negated the principle of universality of politeness proposed by Brown and Levinson (1978). Their findings show that politeness is a culture specific variable. An expression of request or apology or even a form of address perceived as polite in Arabic may not be considered so in English and vice versa. Hence speakers of Arabic should not be considered rude or impolite if they adopt a native style of politeness that does not match with that of native English speakers. Speakers thus can never be accused of violating the socio-cultural rules if their expressions are evaluated from outside their own socio-cultural parameters

#### *Media Education*

Media education and information literacy has recently evolved as a pedagogy for the personal development (Fedorov & Novikova, 2005; Korilova & Magsumov, 2017) that builds up social and public opinion of individuals in a society using the education-through-information approach (Penzin, 2004; Baranov, 2002); with the help of media materials and media literary texts (Potter, 2001; Tyner, 200; Silverblatt, 2001); and mass media methods (Fedorov and Sharikov, 2005); all constituting a pedagogic theory and building an independent branch of education. The role of language in media education is that it introduces literature, folklore, songs, music, theatre, and other types of art and media literary texts. Specifically speaking, a language introduces media personnel with a nation's culture, creating awareness about its aesthetics and literary background.

Bazalgette (1997; 2004) finds that media language formulates an individual's critical thinking, his media literacy and his ability to understand media texts. Alshorooqi and Rawadieh (2017) have drawn attention of media implications in Bahrain's Arabic language textbooks which followed media literacy principles and standards set by UNESCO. In another study, Dudareva and Goeva (2017) made use of archetypal semantics and metaphysics to analyze the Russian folklore. A study of linguistic politeness particularly in forms of address in Egyptian talk shows hence becomes a significant subject of study under media education.

### *Pronominal Forms of address*

Brown and Gilman (1960) investigated the pronominal expressions in three European languages: French, Italian, and German. While the first two languages are classified under Latin languages, German is classified as an old Germanic language. In their study, the authors asked respondents who were mostly bilinguals to determine which pronoun they would use in addressing their recipients. The study found out that their use of pronouns was associated with the context in which they were used. Moreover, the use of both formal and informal pronouns was correlated with the social status of respondents and with the degree of solidarity between them. This study was however criticized for its many drawbacks and shortcomings such as the sample was not representative of speakers of the languages under study or the intuition about a particular pragmatic behavior in certain situations was shown to differ widely from actual behavior. These drawbacks have adversely affected the reliability of this study.

Similarly, Bates and Benigni (1975) investigated the relationship between linguistic politeness and the use of pronouns in Italian. The study is based on examining a varied group of 117 subjects differing in age, sex, and socioeconomic background. The study hypothesized that the use of pronouns was dependent on social class, regional origin, political affiliation, sex and significantly the age as determining factors. The study has a considerable evidence of the use of pronouns when speakers addressed their recipients based on their age. The older recipients got more respect as was reflected in the use of the pronominal system. The authors found the evidence that age also triggered nonreciprocal use of pronouns. In another study, Paulston (1976) investigated the relationship between politeness and address forms in the use of pronominal system in Swedish. In Sweden, the socialist government had introduced a general change to the informal pronoun which people used in all situations. Paulston observed, however, that pronoun avoidance was common and that the formal pronoun was still used by many, especially when the speaker wished to indicate distance with the audience.

Fang and Heng (1983), in their investigation of the effect of Revolution on the use of form of address in Chinese, suggest that address norms have been widely affected by the social and political changes that accompanied the Socialist revolution in China. They observed that forms of address particularly pronouns were changed in the Revolution and found out a significant relationship between these changes and the social and political changes that took place in general.

### **Methods and Procedures**

This study examines and analyzes forms of address in conversations, particularly talk shows aired after the Egyptian Revolution of 2011. The study adopted a pragmatic perspective within the role and context of Egyptian Arabic in which the forms of address were seen evolving in the post-



Revolution era. The rationale of this study rests in maintaining the belief that there is a close relationship between linguistic politeness and changing social power relations useful for media education. For the purposes of the study, data were abstracted from the interview segments of the six TV talk show programs popular in Egypt. It has been taken into consideration that participants represent different categories and different social classes. These excerpts also served as evidence of media literacy and the use of a media discourse peculiar to talk shows.

### Analysis and Discussions

The study made use of extracts of 40 interviews on Yusuf's Talk show (*Akher Kalam*) with a view to understand how much language contributed to media literacy. It was observed that the host made a frequent use of the second person singular when addressing his guests. In all of his interviews with the political leaders, top government officials, and religious leaders, Yusuf used the second person singular pronouns (which are traditionally considered as an impolite form in Arabic). Likewise, Amin in his talk show (*Tahia Masr*) used second person singular pronouns frequently when addressing his guests who were political leaders or government officials. In 10 interviews selected from Amin's show (with political leaders and top government officials), second person singular pronouns were used 46 times while second person plural pronouns were used 110 times.

Yusuf accepted linguistic politeness strategies in talking to elder people or people who were older than he was. He also considered the age variable in addressing his guests who were with no political or religious background. On the contrary, Hadidi, Fuda, Ramadan, and Demerdash (hosts of other talk shows) have never used second person singular in their interviews with political leaders, ministers, and professionals. They use second person plural pronouns in addressing them. In her show (*Huna Al Asima*), Hadidi was seen showing a higher degree of politeness using forms such as *hadretak* (حضرتك), *sadatak* (سعدتك), *afandem* (افندم), and *fakhamtak* (equivalent to Your Excellency and Your Honor) which are deep-rooted and have traditionally been an integrated part in the polite system of Arabic. However, she used second person plural forms with all her older guests she interviewed and second person singular pronouns and forms with the younger members. This however is not considered an impolite use of language in Arabic since the idea is that younger should show respect for older, not vice versa.

An interesting observation found in the transcripts of these talk shows that address terms like *hadretak* (حضرتك), *sadatak* (سعدتك), *afandem* (افندم), and *fakhamtak*, which were very frequent in Egyptian talk shows before the Egyptian Revolution in 2011, have now come to be less used in these programs. These four address terms never appeared in the interviews by Yusuf, Amin, Demerdash, and Fuda. Only *hadretak* (حضرتك) was an exception, and was used only in four of Ramadan's interviews. It can be suggested that the use of the established address forms that stood for politeness and honor, and which were deep-rooted and traditionally integrated in the politeness tradition of the Arabic language, have been influenced by the outbreak of the Egyptian Revolution. These findings are consistent with Ali (2016) who hinted at lesser use of the traditional Arabic in social and personal communication particularly mass media marking a paradigm shift from Arabic Localization to Arabic Globalization in such situations that affect a language globally. This shift is a further evidence to show how language affects a media person's aesthetics and cultural ethos.

Likewise, in Arab societies, individuals are generally expected to show respect for others when addressing them by means of forms of address available to each individual speaker. In his interview

with the head of the Farmers Syndicate in Egypt, for instance, Ramadan used address forms like *عمى* (*ammy* (uncle) and *Haj* (a title usually used with uneducated people to show respect). Evidence suggest that in talk show programs, forms of address such as personal names, mocking names, pronouns, and titles have a great implication on the success/failure of the interaction process. In Egyptian Arabic these forms of address also constituted a well-defined pragmatic field since their implications are not explicitly revealed in utterances but communicated through such forms of address. The use of such forms of address by Arab speakers is also associated with a number of biographical characteristics of interlocutors such as age, sex, educational background, social status, kinship, formality of the context, etc. In talk show programs, such social variables provide the basis of the structure of behavior in face-to-face encounters and influence choice of pronominal forms and other forms of address. These variables are also often associated with the social status and role relations of interlocutors. This finding is consistent with Sadeghi (2015) who found cultural context dominant in studying the social, psychological and behavioral aspects of an educational cluster.

Another interesting characteristic that has always attracted the attention of researchers is the relationship between politeness and pronominal system in Arabic, wherein the pronominal system in Arabic has a communicative function too (Eid, 1983, Yassin, 1975, Holes, 1994). For instance, in Arabic, there are two forms of the 2<sup>nd</sup> person pronouns, one singular and one plural. The hosts of the sampled TV talk shows made the use of the 2<sup>nd</sup> person plural pronoun to show a greater degree of politeness to their guests. Both the hosts and guests were expected to show respect in their address to each other or when referring to someone else. If the guest was a government official or a person of high social rank like presidents, ministers, political and religious leaders, the host showed high esteem and respect for his guest. The host used forms of address such as ‘Your Excellency’, ‘Mr. President’, ‘Mr Minister’, and ‘Your Highness’. On several occasions, hosts were seen using such forms instead of ordinary pronominal system ‘such as ‘you’ or ‘his/her’ while addressing their hearers. The objective is to show a greater degree of politeness to a person’s social status. This finding is not consistent with Ilyas (2016) who related this phenomenon with a person’s intelligence level and recommended Language Quotient methods to determine this intelligence.

It was also observed that hosts avoided the use of imperatives. In Arabic, imperative forms indicate the relative social relationships between interlocutors (Braun, 1988, El-Anani, 1971, Yassin, 1975). So in a talk show with a guest of a higher rank or social status, hosts usually try to avoid the use of imperatives and if unavoidable they use words such as *ممکن* ‘mumkin’ (equivalent to ‘please’) *بعد اذنك* ‘badeznak’ (equivalent to ‘if you please’) along with the imperative forms and succeed in retaining the politeness of speech.

Another prominent feature evident in these Talk shows was that the hosts made use of titles when addressing professional hosts which included doctors, professors, engineers, players, teachers, or even drivers. They used titles such as *دكتور* *doktoor* (Dr.), *باشمهندس* *bash muhandes* (Senior Engineer), *استاذ - استاذة* *ustaz* (Mr.), *اسطى* *ustah* (a term for highly skilled people but who are usually not educated), and *كابتن* *kapten* (Captain), a term used to address footballers, players and athletes. However, titles were used with first names, not family names as in English. It is worth noting that a title like *ustah* is not accepted by educated craftsmen who consider its use as abusive and offensive (Table 1).

**Table 1***Examples of Forms of Address used in Egyptian talk shows*

Arabic 'Form of Address'	English Equivalent
<i>samahet el-sheikh, fadelatekom</i>	His Eminence
<i>samahatokom al-alem al-jaleel</i>	Your eminence great scholar
<i>fadelet el-sheikh</i>	
<i>fakhamat alrayiys</i>	Your Excellency Mr. President'
<i>bash muhandes, doktoor</i>	Senior Engineer, University Professor/Dcotor
<i>ustah</i>	Professional
<b>'Forms of Address' Less in n use after 2011 revolution</b>	
<i>حضرتك hadretak, سعدتك sadatak, افندم afandem, and fakhamtak</i>	Your Excellency and Your Honor

Table 1 exhibits a few examples of 'forms of address' found in these talk shows. The selected data also indicate that all the hosts except Bassem Yusuf tended to use very polite forms of address when interviewing or talking about clergymen and religious leaders. In his interviews, Khairy also used titles such as 'samahet el-sheikh', 'fadelatekom', 'fadelet el-sheikh'. Hadidi also used 'fadelet el-sheikh' and 'samahatokom'. Fuda tended to use address titles like 'al-alem al-jaleel' (equivalent to the great scholar). Aminand Demerdash used 'fadelet el-sheikh'. These are polite forms of address popularly used in Egyptian Arabic to show respect for clergymen and religious leaders. Moreover, it is also a tradition in Egyptian Arabic to show respect for clergymen (Sabry, 2015).

Table 2 lists a few vowels and consonants used in the transcription of the examples of 'forms of address.' This list is however suggestive as the current study is not dealing with issues of linguistic transcription. Even in the interview transcripts of these talk shows, there were no issues related to transcription.

**Table 2***Examples of vowels and consonants (IPA) used in transcription*

Alphabet	Romanization	Arabic character
Vowels	a	ع
	u	أ
	ee	ي
	e	إ
Consonants	f	ف
	h	ح
	sh	ش
	k	ك
	kh	خ

Last, but not the least, it was also felt that in spite of the hot debates, whenever any controversial issue was discussed in an interview, the hosts in general used loiter forms of address. This can be

attributed to the idea that with the outbreak of the Egyptian Revolution in 2011, there was a tendency from many young people, reformers, media leaders, and scholars to adopt more liberal values. The implication is that although the Egyptian Revolution led to many changes with the use of address forms in talk show programs, the address system in Arabic still considered linguistic politeness rules. It was only Bassem Yusuf who freed himself from the linguistic and social restrictions of using polite forms of address with the government officials, political leaders, and religious leaders he interviewed.

The evidence of this study also hints at the evolution of a new type of lingua-pragmatic shift appearing in the form of media literacy about the use of language using a particular media platform. The study was confined to talk shows; however, these implications could be seen in other media platforms including the print and social media. The findings of this study also exemplify a close relationship between linguistic politeness and pragmatics proving that it makes media as a means of social education particularly the 'form of address' being accepted as a well-defined media-educational pragmatic subject. This is also a clear indication of the transformation in the use of language by the media personnel. This reflects how a socio-cultural event or a political revolution can influence the public discourse and bring a change in their opinions and beliefs. Such a change is reflected through language in their aesthetics, behaviour and articulation of thoughts and emotions.

### **Conclusion**

The evidence of the study reveals that the Egyptian Revolution of 2011 influenced the form of address and other address terms used in talk show programs. This revelation is based on an investigation of the use of lingua-pragmatic terms like forms of address and the level of politeness embedded in them. The research was based on six Egyptian talk show programs. It is found out that after the Revolution of 2011 there is now an increase in the use of second person singular pronouns which was earlier considered impolite. There is also a less use of polite forms such as *حضرتك* hadretak, *سعدتك* sa'datak, *افندم* afandem, and *فكhamtak*. Despite these changes, the personal address system in talks and conversations in Egyptian Arabic is still largely committed to linguistic politeness rules of the Arabic language. This study reiterates that address forms are socially and culturally bound. It also shows how the environmental factors like the Revolution of 2011 influence the lexicon and semantic aspects of a language. The findings are a revelation for the media personnel guiding them to mould their language in order to agree to the changing paradigms in the domain of media literacy.

The implications of the study are educational too as the study will open new avenues of language learning, both in field of pragmatics and in media education with socio-cultural perspectives, The findings of this research also support the view that language learning can be influenced by many aspects of human experience. Like during the Industrial Revolution new words had to be invented and old ones modified to semantically cope up with the technological changes. The Revolution demanded inclusion of new technical words into the vocabulary just as new products and new machinery were being manufactured. The neologisms had promoted the increase of loan words and coinage of new words. Hence the Revolutions of 2011 in Egypt would not be an exception if it affected the language pragmatically, adding new meaning to words, phrases and statements or

even coining new ones, as shown in this study. This is also a great contribution to media education programmes that look for new ideas to develop social literacy.

Findings helped to answer the research questions of the current study. It was found out that unlike other cultures of the West that used first name for addressing their guests, the Egyptians used terms that indicate the profession such as *Captain, Dr, Prof*, in order to show respect as was also seen in the use of the term as *ammy*, meaning *my uncle* or *Haj*. Moreover, the use of these professional titles was associated with first names, not family names as is the case in most Western English speaking countries. The findings also supported the researcher's proposition that there was a closer relationship between linguistic politeness and forms of address. The Egyptian Arabic has many different ways to address people, varying according to age, gender, and social class of the person being addressed. It was found out that in Egyptian Arabic, it was impolite to call people who were older or of a higher social class by their first names, while in other cultures, it was accepted to call people by their first names once introduced. The use of less polite forms was associated with the host's desire in denouncing his addressee. In the case of Yusuf's *Albernameg*, he tended to mock the political and religious figures in a way that reflects lack of respect. In his show, Yusuf revolted against the established politeness codes which were long used in the Egyptian media.

Although the address system in Egyptian Arabic is still in large committed to linguistic politeness rules, the coming years may witness a great shift in the paradigms of linguistic politeness. Viewers and audience of these talk shows may have liked Yusuf's changed strategies in addressing guests which can often be termed as Arabic impoliteness strategies or lack of respect but it was a general opinion that political and religious leaders should be addressed appropriately. Media education and social literacy programmes should also take cognizance of these changes and interpret their impact on public aesthetics and the linguistic politeness of the Egyptian Arabic. Language has always played a vital role in developing media education and strengthened its mass media literacy; hence such changes cannot be ignored and given due attention in future studies.

### References

- Abdullah, R. (2014) *Egypt's Media in the Midst of Revolution*, Washington, Carnegie.
- Al-Fattah, M. (2010), Apology Strategies of Yemeni EFL University Students", *The Modern Journal of Applied Linguistics*: 223-249.
- Al-Kahtani, S. (2005), *Refusals Realizations in Three Different Cultures: A Speech Act Theoretically-based Cross-culturally study*, Department of Language and Translation King Saud University, Riyadh. Available from: <http://faculty.ksu.edu.sa/saad/Documents/Refusal.pdf>
- Al-Khatib, M. (2006). The Pragmatics of Invitation Making and Acceptance in Jordanian Society *Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 5:272-294.
- Al-Qahtani, H. A. (2009) Female Use of Politeness Strategies in the Speech Act of Offering: A Contrastive Study between Spoken Saudi Arabic and Spoken British English *Department of English Language and Literature*. Riyadh, King Saud University.
- Al-Rifa'i, K. (2004). *Linguistic Politeness in Arabic and English*, Unpublished MA Dissertation, Syria: Damascus University

- Al-Zumor, A. (2003). *A pragmatic Analysis of Speech Acts as Produced by Native Speakers of Arabic*, Unpublished PhD thesis, Department of Linguistics, Aligarh: India, Aligarh Muslim University.
- Ali, M. A. (2016). Artificial intelligence and natural language processing: the Arabic corpora in online translation software. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, 3(9): 59-66
- Alshorooqi, F., and Rawadieh, S. M. (2017). Media Implications in Bahrain's textbooks in light of UNESCO's media literacy principles *Journal of Social Studies Education Research* Vol 8, No 3 (2017), 259-281
- Baranov, O. (2002). *Media Education in School and University*(in Russian).Tver: Tver State University, 87. (quoted in Fedorov, Alexander (2008). *Media Education Around The World: Brief History*, *Acta Didactica Napocensia* Vol 1 : No 2.)
- Bazalgette, C. (1997). *An Agenda of the Second Phase of Media Literacy Development Media Literacy in the Information Age* New Brunswick (U.S.A.) and London (U.K.): Transaction Publishers, pp.69-78.
- Bazalgette, P. (2004). "My Life in Media: Peter Bazalgette". *The Independent* (London, UK). 8 November 2004.
- Bates, A. & Benigni, L. (1975). "Rules of address in Italy: a sociological survey", *Language in Society*, 3: 271–288.
- Boubendir, F. Z. (2012). Linguistic Politeness in English and Arabic and its Implications for Translation *The Department of English* The University of Petra
- Boubendir, F. Z. (2015). Politeness Theory. *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*, 4, 1-15.
- Bousfield, D., & Locher, M. A. (2008). *Impoliteness in language: studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice*, New York, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brown, R. & Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity In T. A. Sebook (ed.) *Style in Language*, MIT Press, PPs. 253-276.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Buckingham, D. (2003). *Media Education: Literacy, Learning and Contemporary Culture*. Cambridge, UK: Polity, 219 p.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *A dictionary of linguistics & phonetics* Malden, Mass Oxford, Blackwell.
- Donsbach, W. (2015). *The Concise Encyclopedia of Communication*, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Dudareva, M. and Goeva, N. (2017). White Willow in Russian Literature: Folklore "Roots" of Image *Journal of Social Studies Education Research* Vol 8, No 3 (2017), 291-299.

- Ethelb, H. (2015). Using Address Terms in showing Politeness with Reference to Their Translation from Arabic into English, *International Journal of Comparative Literature & Translation Studies*, 3, 27-37.
- Fang, H. & Heng, J. H. (1983). Social changes and changing address norms in China *Language in Society*, 12: 495-507.
- Farhat, S.H. (2009). *Politeness Phenomena in Palestinian Arabic and Australian English: A Cross-Cultural Study of Selected Contemporary Plays*, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Australia: Australian Catholic University.
- Fedorov, A.V., Novikova, O.A. (2005). 'Media education in the leading countries of the West' *Taganrog: Kuchma*. Pp. 270.
- Fedorov, A.V., Sharikov, A.V. (2005). 'The pioneer of Russian media education' *Art and Education* Vol. 6: 67-79.
- Fedorov, Alexander (2008). Media Education Around The World: Brief History, *Acta Didactica Napocensia* Vol 1 : No 2.)
- Goffman, E. (1972) *Interaction Ritual : Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour*, London, Allen Lane.
- Grice, H. P. (1975) Logic and Conversation. In Morgan, P. C. A. J. (Ed.) *Syntax and Semantics*. New York, Academic Press.
- Haugh, M. (2004), Revisiting the Conceptualisation of Politeness in English and Japanese. *Multilingua*, 23: 85-109.
- Held, G. (2005). Politeness in linguistic research In K. Ehlich & S. Ide (Eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory and practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hickey, L. & Stewart, M. (2005). *Politeness in Europe*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.
- Holmes, J. (1990). Politeness Strategies in New Zealand Women's Speech In Bell, A. H., J (Ed.) *New Zealand Ways of Speaking English*. Avon, Multilingual matters LTD.
- Holmes, J. and M. Stubbe (2003). *Power and Politeness in the Workplace: A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Talk at Work*, UK: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Ilyas, M. (2016). Language quotient (LQ): new models of language learning. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, 3(9): 44-50
- Kasper, G. (2009). Politeness. In F. Brisard, F. Östman & J. Verschueren (Eds.), *Pragmatics of Interaction*. Amsterdam, NLD: John Benjamin Publishing Company
- Kerkam, Z. (2013). Cross-cultural politeness: A comparison of Arabic and English indirectness. *The 1st Postgraduate Conference on Linguistic Politeness*, University of Huddersfield.
- Khamam, R. (2013). Politeness between the Middle East and the West: A cross-cultural linguistic study of Syrian Arabic and British English requests. *The 1st Postgraduate Conference on Linguistic Politeness* University of Huddersfield
- Korilova, I.V., Magsumov, T.A. (2017). Emancipation in educational system: Formation of women's higher education in Russia. *European Journal of Contemporary Education* (2), 6: 352- 366. DOI: 10.13187/ejced.2017.2.352

- Lakoff, R. T. (1989). The limits of politeness: therapeutic and courtroom discourse. *Multilingua. Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 8, 101-130.
- Leech, G. N. (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics*, London; New York, Longman
- Malyuga, E. N. & Orlova, S. N. (2017). *Linguistic Pragmatics of Intercultural Professional and Business Communication*. Springer.
- Martineau, M. (Ed.) (1988). *L'enseignement du cinema et de l'audiovisuel*. Paris: CinemAction, 299 p. (quoted in Fedorov, Alexander (2008). Media Education Around The World: Brief History, *Acta Didactica Napocensia* Vol 1 : No 2.)
- Mills, S. & Grainger, K. (2015). *Directness and Indirectness Across Cultures*, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nureddeen, F. (2008). Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Apology Strategies in Sudanese Arabic, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 40, (2): 279-306.
- Pastor, M. D. G. (2001). *Pragmatics and the 2000 US Elections: Issues of Politeness and Power in Political Campaign Debates: SELL monographs.*, Valencia, Lengua Inglesa, Universitat de València.
- Paulston, C. B. (1976). Pronouns of Address in Swedish: Social Class Semantics and Changing System. *Language in Society*. 5: 359-386.
- Penzin, S. (2004). *Film Education and Modern Times*(in Russian). Voronezh: Voronezh State University, pp.151-163. (quoted in Fedorov, Alexander (2008). Media Education Around The World: Brief History, *Acta Didactica Napocensia* Vol 1 : No 2.)
- Ponniah K, Thamburaj KP, and Samuvel SJI (2017). Language attitude among Tamil language teachers. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, 4(6): 142-147
- Potter, W.J. (2001). *Media Literacy*. Thousand Oaks - London: Sage Publication, 423 p.
- Sabry, M. (2015). Address System in Egyptian Arabic as Reflected in the Novels of Naguib Mahfouz. *Rowayat*, 6, 24-38.
- Sadeghi, Sayed Hadi (2015). Cultural context and e- practice: an assessment on USA institutions. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, 2(9): 32-36.
- Shammas, N. (2006). Social Context, Values and Cultural Identity: A Method for Assessment of Arab and American Attitude to Politeness", *International Journal of Language, Society and Culture*.
- Silverblatt, A. (2001). *Media Literacy*. Westport, Connecticut - London: Praeger, 449 p.
- Timberg, B. M. & Erler, R. J. (2002). *Television Talk: A History of the TV Talk Show*, Texas, University of Texas Press.
- Tyner, K. (2000). Directions and Challenges for Media Education. *Telemedium. The Journal of Media Literacy*. Vol. 46. N 1, p.4.



- Watts, R. J. (1989). Relevance and relational work: linguistic politeness as politeness behavior. *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 8, 131-166.
- Watts, R. J. (2005). Linguistic politeness research: Quo vadis? In K. Ehlich & S. Ide (Eds.), *Politeness in language : Studies in its history, theory and practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Woo, H. & Dominick, J. (2001). Daytime television talk shows and the cultivation effect among US and international students. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 45, 598-614.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.