

**Conflict Avoidance in Political Televised Interactions:
A Politeness-Translation Perspective⁽¹⁾**

Ali Yousif Al-Baroodi

Assistant Lecturer

University of Mosul

Dr. Anis Behnam Naoum

professor

Catholic University in Erbil-

CUE

علي يوسف البارودي

مدرس مساعد

جامعة الموصل

د. أنيس بهنام نعوم

أستاذ

الجامعة الكاثوليكية- أربيل

Anis.behnam@cue.edu.krd

ali.y@uomosul.edu.iq

الكلمات المفتاحية: صراع، حوار، حذف

Keywords: conflict, dialogue, deletion

الملخص

تناولت هذه الدراسة "تجنب الصراع" بوصفه استراتيجية ترجمة في ترجمة الحوارات السياسية المتلفزة الى اللغة الإنكليزية، وبما أن تجنب الصراع يعد واحداً من أبرز وظائف السلوك اللفظي التأديبي، فإن المترجمين قد يخرقون معايير التأديب من أجل تحقيق غايات معينة تتناسب مع مساهمهم الفكري، فمن أجل تحقيق تجنب الصراع، فإن المترجمين قد يلجؤون إلى الإضافة أو الحذف أو الاستبدال من أجل نقل المعنى المقصود إلى المتلقي الهدف وإرضاء توقعاته.

(1) An abridged and modified form of an MA thesis entitled "Politeness Maxims and Conflict Avoidance in Translating Arabic political Televised Debates into English" by Ali Yousif Al-Baroodi 2012, and supervised by Prof. Dr. Anis Behnam Naoum.

Abstract

The study investigates conflict avoidance (as a translation strategy) in translating Arabic political televised debates into English. As conflict avoidance in political debates is one of the key functions of politeness, translators would violate some maxims of politeness so as to achieve certain ends which go with their line of thinking. Therefore, to achieve conflict avoidance, translators may add, delete, or substitute to successfully convey the desired meaning to their TL readers and be up to their readers' expectation.

Introduction

Politeness as a socio-cultural phenomenon is regarded as one of the most problematic translation issues. This statement could be reflected in many aspects as what is polite in one culture may be a taboo in another. Therefore the source of troubles in translating political debates could be attributed either to the pragamalinguistic incompetence of the translators or their inadequate cultural background. Moreover, as conflict avoidance in political debates is one of the key functions of politeness, translators would violate some maxims of politeness so as to achieve certain ends which go with their line of thinking. Therefore, to achieve conflict avoidance, translators may add, delete, or substitute to successfully convey the desired meaning to their TL readers and be up to their readers' expectation.

Building on the fact that the politeness of linguistic acts is determined by their occurrence in communicative context rather than by the inherent properties of language, it is hypothesized that politeness is mostly attributable to speaker's conduct whether in a form of language use or other behavior patterns which assess (im) politeness of them according to the social values and norms. Moreover, size of the imposition and the formality of the situation are two important contextual factors which could be hypothesized as being closely related. The formula could be put as this: the greater the imposition the more formal interlocutor should be.

The model adopted in the current study is based on Leech's (1983) theory of general pragmatics whose focal point is how the linguistic form could be related to force. The rhetorical dimension (i.e. the effective use of language in everyday interaction) is divided into two main categories: the textual and interpersonal. The central concept in Leech's model is that of cost-benefit scale of politeness related to both the speaker and hearer. That is how to minimize the cost and

maximize the benefit. Six maxims are proposed and adopted to analyze the data collected: Tact, Generosity, Approbation, Modesty, agreement, and sympathy.

This study is expected to provide the translators with workable tools to bridge possible areas of polite, ideological gaps between SL and TL communities that may result in communication breakdown. Moreover, the study would hopefully yield better descriptions and realizations of the linguistic behavior which consequently results in a successful translation act.

2. Politeness and Conflict Avoidance

Fraser (1990) presented a four-folded view of politeness: the social norm view, the conversational contract view, the face saving view, and the conversational maxim view. **The Social Norm View** frames politeness theory within the limits of social norms. Fraser (1990:220) states that "each society has a particular set of norms consisting of more or less explicit rules that prescribe certain behavior a state of affairs, or a way of thinking in a context.

The Conversational Contract View simply states that "on entering into a given conversation, each party brings an understanding of some initial set of rights and obligations that will determine, at least for the preliminary stages, the limits of interaction" (Fraser and Nolen 1981:93). The role of these rights and obligations is to restrict the interlocutors linguistic choices according to the context involved .

The Face Saving View is considered to be one of the most influential and, to some extent, the most controversial views. Brown and Levinson (1978:66) invested the notion of face to present a universally applicable theory. For them, face is the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself. It is of vulnerable nature

since it can be obtained, lost, enhanced, and threatened and so on. They, then, characterized face with a dualistic feature as it is of negative and positive value which they define in terms of wants of both speaker and hearer; the negative is used to mean "freedom from action and imposition, whereas the positive face is designed to mean "appreciation and being approved of" (Brown and Levinson, 1987:61).

As far as **the Conversational Maxim View** is concerned, we find it essential to refer to three main contributions to politeness studies: Grice (1975), Lakoff (1973), and Leech (1983). The principal aim behind Grice's Cooperative Principle was to show how speakers express themselves clearly and efficiently. For this end, he proposed four maxims (Quantity, Quality, Relevance, and Manner) used in everyday interaction to communicate smoothly and effectively. However, when one of the maxims is violated implicature arises.

Lakoff (1979:64, cited in Fraser 1990) states that politeness is a "device used in order to reduce friction in personal interaction". Therefore, she suggests two maxims: Be clear (Essentially Grice's Maxims) and Be polite. The "Be polite" rule is branched down into three additional sub-rules: Don't impose, Give options, and Make A feel good. The applicability of one or all of these rules is more or less depending on the politeness situation and the contextual variables governing our life. The more formal the situation, the less politeness is employed and vice versa.

Leech (1983:81), on the other hand, defines Politeness Principle as "minimize the expression of impolite belief, maximize the expression of polite belief". The central point to this model is the cost-benefit scale to both speaker and hearer. Politeness for this purpose is a device employed to minimize the cost and maximize the benefit. Analogous to Grice, Leech proposed a set of six interpersonal maxims summarized from Leech (1983:119):

Tact Maxim: Minimize hearer costs; maximize hearer benefit.

Generosity Maxim: Minimize your own benefit; maximize your hearer's benefit.

Approbation Maxim: Minimize hearer dispraise; maximize hearer praise.

Modesty Maxim: Minimize self-praise; maximize self-dispraise.

Agreement Maxim: Minimize disagreement between yourself and others; maximize agreement between yourself and others.

Sympathy Maxim: Minimize antipathy between yourself and others; maximize sympathy between yourself and others.

However, Brown and Levinson (1987:4) argued against Leech's conceptualization of the maxim-based approach to politeness stating that "if we are permitted to invent a maxim for every regularity in language use, not only will we have a non-finite number of maxims, but also the pragmatic theory will be too unconstrained to permit the recognition of any counter examples".

Taken the four approaches all in all, Brown and Levinson and Leech remain the most influential approaches as they concentrate on the functional descriptive and detailed account of politeness which stands against the old-fashioned prescriptive and norm based orientation.

3. Politeness and Political Televised Debates

If we check the vast literature, we would obviously notice that politeness has basically depended on interactive settings i.e. real-life instances in which the participants are spontaneously behaving so as to guarantee the maximum range of objectivity. The political televised debate is one of those institutional settings on which much attention was paid. The choice could be attributed to the conflictive nature of

this genre and how according to such circumstances participants may behave.

3.1 Features of Political Televised Debates

The key features of TV genre that distinguish it from other types of genre are argumentation, disharmony and conflict, turn taking, and questions.

Argumentation is clearly manifested in political genre, televised debates in particular. The issue could be attributed to the different ideologies the participants hold. This in fact shows why we easily note some indicators such as the use of 'in my opinion', 'to my mind', 'the way I see it' or 'thus' or 'therefore', and so on which are termed "argumentative indicators". Van Eemeren et al., (2007:1) state that "these indicators are strategically used to introduce a standpoint". Interviewees may use a demonstrative style in which they argue against or for an opinion by giving a plausible evidence to be objective and convincing at the same time. However, in political interaction, participants are chosen from two completely different and opposing parties. When coming to such environment, it's hard to expect them be harmonious and agreeing to each other's points. In this regard, confrontations arise which may sometimes be motivated by the opposing agenda each party fiercely defend.

Turn taking is considered to be one of the most important and most evident features of face to face interaction, political debates in particular. It states that each participant in the debate has the right of speaking, his\her turn, without being interrupted during talk exchange. Clayman and Heritage (2010:215) affirm the significance of turn taking as it plays an organizational role. Moreover, the participants take their opportunities to fully and intelligibly present their opinions. It also determines the permissible conduct of participants as when this system is obeyed, the debate is to go easy and without much conflict

and disharmony. Martínez (2000:89) states that "sometimes the end of turn units is misprojected, and consequently two or more participants speak at the same time. In this case, their turns are said to overlap". That's why Levinson (1983:297) proposed the "Local Management System" which is aimed at constituting a means to an orderly transition from one speaker to another. It is a set of essential principles in verbal communication which are founded on a joint effort between participants". It is to be noted that the interviewer must have control on his participants by trying to prevent interruption and make the debate take the right course.

The TV debate is structured as a constellation of question-answer system. Functionally speaking, Heritage (2002:427) defines questions as "a form of social action designed to seek information and accomplished in a turn at talk by means of interrogative syntax". The sequence of questioning in TV debates is managed by the interviewer whose task is, first, to ask the participants, and second to convey question from one participant to another. However, as there may be no one to one correspondence between form and function, questions in TV debates are not always used to seek information; rather, they are strategically employed by participants or interviewer with an argumentative flavor. Clayman and Heritage (2010:231) argues that negated yes-no, or Wh-questions are laden with presuppositions as there is something that was supposed to happen, but simply did not. In this sense, questions are used in TV debates to accuse, challenge, and weigh much burden on the questionee part. Another important factor is the intonation of questioning as it determines the function of it such as questioning, accusing, augmenting, challenging, or even mocking.

3.2 Components of Political Televised Debates

Some independent components distinguish TDs from other types: topic, time, participants, interviewer, interviewees, and audience.

Choosing the topic of TV debates is not randomly accomplished; it is rather based on the heated and controversial events on both the public and political arena. It should also be of interest to public so as to match the up to the minute developments in a certain country or region such as tax raise, political decisions, or economic austerity. Time is another component that usually occupies a prime time hour (according to the policy of the TV channel) on satellite channels so as to attract as many viewers as possible. Moreover, TDs have specific, conventionalized, and institutionalized number and type of participants (interviewer and interviewees); the interaction among them is clearly a matter of giving question and receiving answers. Clayman and Heritage (2002:7) define the interviewer as "professional journalist rather than a partisan advocate or celebrity entertainer". The key task of interviewers is to manage and control the debate and try to keep the participants on a common ground and lessen disagreements so as to keep communication alive; and "to remain formally neutral in accordance with deep-seated norms of the journalistic profession". However, as the conflict range arises in such debates, the formal features of TV debates become at risk. It is expected that IEs would seek power through making straightforward disagreements and attack other's floors by interrupting and ruining the sequencing structure of turn taking. Such cases are doomed as odd since, in terms of power, IEs are inferior to IRs who have the authority of managing, asking, interrupting to put the debate on the right track.

4. Politeness and Translation

The study of politeness and translation requires a wide experience and knowledge so as to rummage through not only linguistic systems of two societies, but also the cultural norms governing them. These norms may not be expected to be similar as what's compliment in one society could be quite problematic and undesirable behavior in another. Hatim and Mason (1997:68) argue that "the dynamics of politeness can be relayed trans-culturally, but will require a degree of linguistic modification at the level of texture". This difference, if not accommodated, may be a source of trouble, misunderstanding, and failure in cross-cultural communication.

Julianne house (1999b:63), armed with her previous experience in English-German intercultural studies on politeness, applied her model to the field of translation .She first defined translation as a "cross-linguistic sociocultural practice in which a text in one language is replaced by a functionally equivalent text in another". Building on this start, she puts some questions into serious discussions such as "how can one make sure in translation that politeness as exhibited in the original is carried over in the TL?, and how can one go about reaching politeness equivalence in translation"(ibid:63). To answer such questions, the translator should have adequate linguistic and cultural competence to be able to convey the message as accurate as possible since s\he does not translate language only, but also the culture in which that language is embedded.

House (1996, 1998, 2002) concentrates on giving a detailed description on the best means and strategies to translate politeness across languages and cultures. She presents the covert vs overt dichotomy to mark translator's role whether to adopt certain standards rather than others. The role of the translator in overt translation is to

make the SL features quite accessible to the TL audience by conveying in quite detailed manner most of the linguistic as well as pragmatic components of the SL, to maintain the flavor of the SL culture. House (2002:99) describes the role of the translator in this type as "producing translation which allows culturally different persons to gain an impression of, and feel for, the cultural impact that the original text has on source culture members permitting them to observe and be worked upon by the original text".

However, this type of translation may not be quite effective especially when the SL and TL languages and cultures are quite remote from each other. Hence, much of the communication failure is due to exact conveying of the SL components which the TL reader may find odd and hard to understand. On the other end of the line, House proposes covert translation. The role of the translator in this type is" to re-create an equivalent speech event and reproduce or represent in the translation text the function the original has in its linguistic-cultural framework, i.e. functional equivalence is aimed at and often achieved in covert translation" House(2002:100).

Building on what has been already stated, one may conclude that translation is not a random independently accomplished process; it is rather an interactive one as the translator holds somehow a negotiation with the text s\he is working on. This interaction may come from the different concepts we hold toward world phenomena. On this basis, Naoum (2001:63) mentions three worlds: the world of the SL, the World of the TL, and the World of the Translator. Conceptualizing any information should be understood differently when coming across these worlds. Farghal and Shunnaq (1999:9) talk of the same when drawing a triangle at the end of each side lies a factor: Audience, Author, and Text. All these instances apply to politeness in political interaction. When IEs reach the climax, each side would consider the

statement of the other as impolite since it stands completely opposite to their ideologies. Translators in such instances are expected to align toward one of the two views and make modification to attenuate the force of certain utterance.

5. Data Analysis

An extract has been carefully selected from one of the most Arabic heated TV debates, the Opposite Direction (Al-Itijaahul-mu'aakis)⁽¹⁾. The extract is pragmatically analyzed and then given to four graduate students of the Translation Department to translate into Arabic. The renderings are examined in line with the model adopted (Leech1983). The appropriate and the inappropriate ones are distinguished and traced back according to their causes and motivations. A proposed rendering is furnished when necessary so as to reflect the most suitable way to translate the selected extracts.

5.1 SL Analysis

١ محمد العربي: يا سيدي أولاً أتمنى الا يحتكر الكلمة حتى لا ندخل في مقاطعة.. (يبدأ دوره بهدوء).

٢ فيصل القاسم [مقاطع]: أدخل لي بالموضوع، ما فيش مقاطعة، الوقت يداهنا.

٣ محمد العربي: الشعوب، هذه الشعوب هو يقول محرقة، هي في المحرقة هي في الكارثة..

٤ [المتحدث يرفع من نبرة الصوت تعجباً].

٥ برهان بسيس: كيف؟ [يقاطع متحدياً].

⁽¹⁾The SL extract has been taken from a debate entitled "Revolution of the Arab peoples". It was live broadcast on January 11, 2011 as the Tunisian "revolution" was still on.

(IE) refers to the interviewer Faisal Al-Qasim, (IE1) to the first interviewee Mohammed Al-Arabi, and (IE2) to the second interviewee Burhan Basis.

٦ فيصل القاسم: بس دقيقة.

٧ محمد العربي: تحكمها عصابات بكل ما أوتيت، هؤلاء حلفاؤهم الأمريكيون يقولون في

٨ ويكيليكس إن هناك عصابة تحكم في تونس.. [المتحدث يجيب بنبرة مرتفعة].

٩ برهان بسيس: أصبحت ويكيليكس هي المرجع، ويكيليكس هي المرجع للمعارضة السياسية

!!! [المتحدث يسأل بنبرة تعجب].

١٠ محمد العربي: رجاء لا تقاطعني.. [المتحدث يطلب بلهجة تهديد].

١١ فيصل القاسم: بس بدون مقاطعة. تفضل.

١٢ محمد العربي: هذه الشعوب تعيش المحرقة الآن، لا تخسر شيئا.. [المتحدث يرفع من

نبر الصوت مع التلويح بورقة].

١٣ فيصل القاسم: عصابة؟

١٤ محمد العربي: عصابات تحكمها مش عصابة تحالف عصابات مع أجهزة الأمن

لحمايتها.

١٥ وتحالفت مع عدوها، تقول لي إسرائيل وأمريكا؟ أمريكا متواجدة في كل مكان في أرضينا

١٦ بقواعدها بمخابراتها بسفاراتها بكل ما أوتيت.. [المتحدث يرفع من نبرة الصوت].

١٧ برهان بسيس: قليل من المسؤولية.

١٨ محمد العربي: رجاء بدون مقاطعة.. لا تقاطعني وإلا سأبقى أتحدث عن الطرابلسية

[المتحدث يهدد خصمه عبر مستوى الصوت].

١٩ فيصل القاسم: إيه تفضل أكمل، بدون مقاطعة.

٢٠ برهان بسيس: لا، لا، احترام احترام نحن في منبر، نحن في منبر.. [المتحدث يطلب

بنبرة صوت معتدلة].

٢١ محمد العربي: إذا أرفع المستوى، إحنا في منبر إذا لا تقاطعني.

[المتحدث يوجه يده نحو المتحدث الآخر ويطلب منه عدم المقاطعة بنبرة صوت مرتفعة].

٢٢ برهان بسيس: إحنا في منبر راق أرجوك أرجوك...

The Extract starts with Interviewee 1(IE1) as the Interviewer (IR) gives him the floor to reply to the allegations of Interviewee 2(IE2). However, he asks the IR in a polite way using a formal honorific expression) لايحتكر الكلمة (sayyidi, Lit. Sir) as he is the man of power and control in the debate not to be interrupted by IE2 so as to have a harmonious and intelligible interaction. His request, though, carries further nuances than it seems on the surface. He uses when one looks deeper the third person pronoun to belittle his opponent and ignore his presence. This is carried out through using لايحتكر الكلمة (layahtakirul-kalima, Lit. monopolize the floor) in line1 instead of addressing IE2 directly لايحتكر الكلمة (latahtakirul-kalima, Lit. don't monopolize the floor). This threat is a clear violation to the tact maxim as more imposition is weighed on IE2 and disrespect is marked. This imposition by threat to face may hold a presupposition that IE2 is to show disagreement by interrupting him and gain the floor back.

On his part, line2, IR abruptly interrupts IE1 demanding him to ادخل لي بالموضوع ('udkhul li bilmawdhu, Lit. get to the point) to save time and avoid wasting it. This interruption by IR as he is the man of control authorizes him to correct and avoid any irrelevant material. This case represents a face attack since IR presupposes by saying الوقت يداهمنا ('alwaqtuyudahimuna, Lit. time is running out) that IE1 is being irrelevant to say so and hence he must be relevant. IE1 in his turn

complies with the IR request and beats this time right in the bush. He shows total disagreement to the statement of IE2 and counterclaims his allegations of having a comfortable life in Tunisia. His disagreement here is designed to be a strategic choice. He first uses the third person pronoun هو (huwa, Lit. him) to ignore the speaker and downsize his status. The use of this pronoun is a clear adherence to one of the most clear impoliteness strategies as it is not used in the appropriate situation. Then, in line3, he describes the massacres in Tunisia as similar to what was told to happen to the Jews محرقة (mihraqa, Lit for holocaust) as a sort of refuting the claim of IE2. IE1 makes both verbal and non-verbal communication go together in this instance. His aggressive words are accompanied by high voice quality and exclamatory tone to mock the allegations of IE2. It could be hypothesized building on the previous instances that nonverbal communication goes hand in hand with the verbal one to enhance the force of the message.

As response to the counterclaim, IE2 makes an abrupt interruption to challenge IE1. His question came in a challenging tone asking IE1 to substantiate his view with proofs when wondering by the interrogative particle كيف (kayf, Lit. How?), a question particle for "how?". IR again tries to keep the debate under control. This time he asks IE2 to stop interrupting by saying بس دقيقه (bas daqiqqa, Lit. Just a moment) to regain the floor and give it back to IE1 to finish his turn. Being challenged, IE1 seems to be aroused by the question of IE2. Hence, he restarts his attack on the Tunisian regime stating that the Tunisian people is governed by عصابات (iSaabaat, Lit. gangs). He further escalates the situation by referring حلفاءهم الامريكيون

(Hulafa'ahumul-amrikyyuun, Lit. their American allies) to show that the Tunisian regime is collaborating with the US against his people. Saying so, IE1 intention is to dismantle the regime from its patriotic nature. The next axis of attack is that IE1 substantiates his accusation with the Wiki Leaks documents which prove his view of the "gangs ruling Tunisia". His attack is also boosted by high voice tone as this level is strategically employed to aggravate face of opponent. The tact maxim in this line is blatantly violated as IE1 breaks the social structure and accuses the Tunisian government of being a group of "gangs" which are subduing the Tunisian people. This aggressive stance is achieved through lowering the high status of statesmen and viewing them as mere gang members.

On the other extreme, IE2 also prefers to reply in an offensive way too to refute and mock the Arab opposition role in the Tunisian revolution. He interrupted IE1 to resume his attack by ironically wondering about the creditability of the Wiki Leaks website whose job is to declassify top secret documents online. In line9, He goes more specific when wondering again but this time is about the Arab opposition members by saying *مرجع للمعارضة العربية* (marjiuunlilmuaradhatul-arabiyya, Lit. authority for Arab opposition) from which we can infer that IE2 intends to accuse the Arab opposition of depending on unauthenticated Western resources to conspire against their homelands. Therefore, if we restrict our attention to the surface, the statement of IE2 may look an informative one as the structure does not tell the whole story; however, when one scrutinizes some factors such as ideology, precedent dialogue, and above all the tone of IE2, wondering ironically would be the intended meaning. The sarcasm of

belittling others is a pure violation to the agreement and hence the tact maxim.

IE2 on his defense gains his turn back by replying with a threatening statement with somehow euphemized form. Although he uses a polite request form رجاء (rajaa'an, Lit. please) the tone IE1 uses is a sort of threat to IE2 so as not to keep interrupting him in the debate and as a result he should respect the turn taking convention. One can be sure about this inference if s\he goes further in the dialogue in which IE1 uses the same form with somehow more aggressive and hence impolite intention. IR practices his power over both IEs and demands them both to stop interrupting each other. His request takes the form of بس رجاء (bas rajaa'nbiduunmuqataa, Lit. please, without مقاطعة). However, as IR is the man of power in the debate, his message could be an order as the more powerful has the right of using more direct and off-record strategies to those who are lower than him.

In the following turn, line12, IE1 reaffirms his stance and disagreement with IE2 when he says that the Arab peoples تعيش المحرقة (taiishulmihraqa, Lit. living the holocaust). The difference this time takes a more aggressive form for various reasons. First, it is not arbitrary a speaker repeating something especially in political interactions as each and every word is loaded with many implications. It must stem from a deeply rooted ideology and stance toward a cause. Second, the tone of IE2 is sharper and his voice goes higher than the first time which shows more aggressive stance than the first one. This stance is further enhanced with the hand move as he picks and brandishes a cheap blank paper especially when saying لاتخسر شيئاً (latakhsarushay'an, Lit. Lose nothing) showing that the Arab peoples

will lose nothing when standing against the regimes. The agreement maxim is violated in the two cases. However, it is violated in a more straightforward way in the second emphatic case.

In line 13, IR questions IE1 about what he means by the *عصابه* (isaaba, Lit. gang) which is ruling Tunisia. His question is to be and make the wide Arab audience sure about his intended meaning. IE1 replies positively saying that it is not only *عصابه* (isaaba, Lit. one gang) but *تحالف عصابات* (tahalufisaabaat, Lit. alliance of gangs) to show his emphatic stance and double the aggravation of IE2 face. He also accuses this alliance of gangs to collaborate with *اجهزة الامن لحمايتها* ('ajhizatul-'amniliHimaayatiha, Lit security forces to protect those regimes). The attack here takes as far as meaning is concerned the reverse and negative function of security forces. While they are supposed to protect the Arab peoples, they turned against them to protect the gangs of Tunisian and other Arab regimes. IE1 continues his attack and this time states that this alliance is not restricted to internal forces, but rather with foreign apparatus too. He mentions that Arab regimes allied with the enemies of their peoples by saying *تحالفت مع امريكا واسرائيل* (taHalafatma'aamrikawa'isra'iil, Lit. allied with the US and Israel) to weaken the position of IE2 and his supporters. This foreign existence on the Arab soil is represented by the US *قواعد* (qawaa'idwamukhabaratwasafaaraat, Lit military bases, embassies, and intelligence). The inference one can make from the previous statement is that the US and all its apparatus are supporting the Arab dictatorships to subdue their peoples. IE1 seems to whole

heartedly stand for this meaning as his ideology motivates him to explicate all he knows about the rival party. IE1 attack is once more enhanced by shouts and hand moves which are directed toward IE2. The tendency of IE1 to use shouts is to express his anger and dominate the session. Referring to IE by hand moves could be considered a sort of accusation of being a pro-Arab regime and hence be labeled as one of them.

IE2 on his turn seems to be aroused by what he thinks to be false and unacceptable statement. His offensive choice is ready as the debate reached to the climax in this part. He implicates a very offensive message as he demands his rival to have a small portion of responsibility when mentioning information about the Arab regimes. His statement قليل من المسؤولية (qaliilunminalmasuuliya, Lit. small portion of responsibility) is a direct accusation to IE1 of having not the least degree of responsibility toward others.

IE1 blows the scene in line18 and threatens IE2 by asking him not to interrupt. The threat came as IE1 threatens to offend one of the symbols IE2 stands for, Layla Trabolsiya, Tunisia's first lady. His threat is accompanied with doing the FTA in a serious way as he breaks the social structure and directs his words and threat to a very high position official. This break is aimed at weakening the polite belief toward others. The threat is also employed in the nonverbal way. IE1 uses a threatening tone to enhance his verbal attack and make it clearer even when looking directly into his rival.

IE2 interrupts this time trying to keep IE1 from saying more about the first lady of Tunisia. He stresses his stance by repeating لا، لا (laa, laa, Lit. no, no) احترام احترام ('ihtiram, 'ihtiram, Lit. show respect show respect), and نحن في منبر نحن في منبر (nahnufi minbar, nahnu fi minbar,

Lit we are in a respectable place, we are in a respectable place). This triple successive emphasis is considered a clear intention of disagreeing with IE1 to make him stop talking about LaylaTrabolsia. It also presupposes that IE1 has broken the conventions of such adorable places. However, IE1 claims that his rival must lift the level of debating up اذا ارفع المستوى (ithanirfaailmustawa, Lit. then raise the level up). This reply has a conditional link with the previous one of IE2 telling him if you want to have a clean debate, he, i.e., must level the debate up. He further asks him to respect the place where they are debating نحن في منبر so you must stop interrupting.

In the last line of the extract, IE2 repeats his request to IE1 to stop talking and have limits. He repeats that نحن في منبر راق (nahnu fi minbarinraqi, Lit. we are in an honorable place) accompanied with ارجوك ارجوك (arjuk, arjuk, Lit. please, please) which is a very polite formula when requesting. The context in this case tells far from the linguistic form as the use of نحن في منبر راق implicates that IE1 words are not morally appropriate to a live TV debate. IE2 conveyed his impolite message indirectly trying to avoid more face aggravation.

Finally, this extract could be considered the outcome of the previous part of the debate as the two IEs manifested all their intentions and aggressions directly. It is therefore noticed that the debate has reached a very heated level.

5.2 TL Analysis

The following translation is a neutral literal translation for the ST given herefor convenience:

Mohammed Al-Arabi: First I would like him not to take the floor only for himself to speak to avoid any interruption.

Faisal Al-Qasim: Get to the point, there is no interruption. We are running out of time.

Mohammed Al-Arabi: He says it is a holocaust. These peoples are facing a holocaust; a disaster.

Burhan Bsis: How?

Faisal Al-Qasim: Just a minute.

Mohammed Al-Arabi: they are extremely controlled by gangs. Those are allies with the American government. Wikileaks says that there is a gang governing Tunisia.

BurhanBsis: has Wikileaks become a reference? a reference for the political opposition.

Mohammed Al-Arabi: Please do not interrupt.

Faisal Al-Qasim: Please do not interrupt. Go on.

Mohammed Al-Arabi: these peoples are facing a holocaust, losing nothing.

Faisal Al-Qasim: A gang.

Mohammed Al-Arabi: not only one gang but many gangs control them which are allies with the security forces to protect them. They are allies with their enemies. America and Israel? America is here and there in our lands; its bases, intelligence, embassies and so on.

Burhan Bsis: be responsible...

Faisal Al-Qasim: and Israel...

Mohammed Al-Arabi: please do not interrupt.

Faisal Al-Qasim: ok go on, no interruption.

Mohammed Al-Arabi: stop interrupting me or else I will keep talking about Tripoli approach.

Burhan Bsis: no no. Be respectful, be respectful we are in a forum, we are in a forum.

Mohammed Al-Arabi: then behave, we are in a forum so do not interrupt me.

Burhan Bsis: we are in a respectful forum please, please...

Translators 1, 2, 3, and 4 (henceforth T1, T2, T3, and T4) seem to have somehow common conceptual, cognitive, and ideological environment with the text producer, IE1 in our case. This alignment is reflected through keeping on the same sympathetic and emotive stance similar to that of the text producer. This means that there is no conflict between the two worlds of the text producer and that of the four translators. Their choice could also be justified if we take the overall solidarity which the Arab peoples showed toward the "Tunisian revolution" by the outset of 2011. The four translators could be considered, to a large extent, "pro-revolution mass" as they made no effort to avoid sympathizing with the "noble fighters, opposition leaders" and so on. In this case, the four translators variably adhere to the sympathy maxim to accurately convey the message of IE1; however, some of them could not be accurate enough especially when selecting a stronger or milder vocabulary.

The extract concentrates on a direct face-to-face interaction as the disagreement value reaches a high level. In line (1) for instance, IE1 starts his turn with a high offensive style as requesting no interruption by ignoring his opponent's presence. This irrespective utterance violates at least the tact maxim of politeness:

..ياسيدي اولاً اتمنى الا يحتكر الكلمة حتى لا ندخل في مقاطعه

Yasiidi 'awalan 'atamannaallayaHtakirul-
kalimaHattalanadkhulufiimuqaaTa<a...

This turn is perceived by the four translators as follows:

- First, I would like him not to take the floor only for himself to speak to avoid any interruption... (T1)

- Oh sir, first I hope that he will not monopolize the speech so that we will not be involved in interruption... (T2)
- Sir, I hope he does not take over the talk so that we do not have to interrupt... (T3)
- Sir, I don't want Mr. Bsis to keep talking so as not to resort to interruption... (T4)

At the surface, one may not grasp that much difference; but even the tiniest details may change the whole meaning of the utterance. This could be marked as T1 deleted the honorific expression directed to the IR of the debate session as a sort of being even more direct toward the presenter of it. However, T1 worked on keeping on the same aggressive tone to convey the "ignoring IE2 presence" by using the third person pronoun "him, himself". T2 is even more direct than T1 as he overtly convey the accusation of "monopolize" added to the desire of "ignoring IE2 presence" which is also performed in his rendering by sticking "he" rather than directly addressing his opponent instead.

Similarly, T3 keeps on the offensive style as the "ignoring presence" incidence is preserved by using "he" to overtly convey the insult and detach himself from the argumentative circle and take a quite "peaceful" standpoint. As the previous three translators employed, to some extent, an overt translation strategy to show how the insult is conveyed, the conflict avoidance translation strategy is not appropriate for this kind of line. Therefore, the tact maxim is fully violated in the same or close to that of the SL.

T4 in his part followed a quite different strategy so as to avoid conflict and attenuate, if not deleting, the insulting style in an attempt to adhere to his line of thinking and involve it in the TL text. This could be marked as T4 deleted the "ignoring the presence" of IE2 by replacing "him" by the real name of his opponent "Mr. Bsis". Another point in T4's rendering is that of deleting the negative concept of

monopoly". The FTA in this case is carried on in a milder way compared to that of the previous three translations. All these cases indicate that T4 is involved in the text as he preferred to inject it with ideological concepts that go straight with the desired meaning in his mind.

As response to IE1 start, the IR practices his power in line 2 so as to save time and prevent IE1 from wasting it. IRs in such cases have a variety of strategies to pick. However, the IR, Faisal Al-Qasim, preferred a highly threatening style to lay more imposition on IE1 as mentioned below:

ادخل لي بالموضوع، ما في مقاطعه، الوقت يداهمنا...

‘udkhullibilmawdhuu<mafiishmuqaaTa<a ‘alwaqtuyudaahimuna.

The aggressiveness of this turn lies in implicating that IE1 intends to waste time and expatriate over that issue. The four translators perceived this interruption as follows:

- Get to the point, there is no interruption. We are running out of time... (T1)
- Cut to the chaste, no interruption, we're running out of time ... (T2)
- Start the subject. There is no interruption. Time is passing... (T3)
- Get to the point. There will be no interruptions. We are running out of time... (T4)

As the IR is the man of power and control in TV debates, the four translators did not pay much attention to the volume of directness. T1 sticks to the word order, degree of imposition, and the imperative order to beat in the bush. They use some imperative verbs such as "cut to the chaste, start, get to the point". All these direct imperative choices are

found in these renderings to serve as overt TL matches to that of the SL one.

In line 3, IE1 complies with the call of the IR and gets directly to the point. The offence is even repeated again to disagree with what IE2 calls the situation in Tunisia. The offence lies in reusing the impolite strategy "ignoring the presence" of his counterpart to belittle his counterpart. This disrespect violates at least the agreement and tact maxims as the expression of impolite belief is enhanced in this case:

الشعوب، هذه الشعوب هو يقول محرقة، هي في المحرقة هي في الكارثة...

Ash-shu<uub, haaThihi-shu<uubhuwayaquullumiHraqa, hiyafilmiHraqa, hiyafilkaaritha.

- he says it is a holocaust. These peoples are facing a holocaust, a disaster... (T1)
- peoples, he says these peoples are holocaust. They are in the holocaust indeed, in the disaster... (T2)
- nations, these nations are a holocaust. They are in a holocaust; they are in a disaster... (T3)
- He is referring to the revolting people as being a cause of a holocaust! They are not. In fact, they are being suffered in the holocaust and by the tragedy... (T4)

T1, T2, and T3 stick to the word order and the style of the SL. This could be clearly marked as in T2 and T3 renderings "they are holocaust" which is not an appropriate choice as the word "holocaust" is a noun that does not go straight with the subject. T1 in his turn may be marked as linguistically competent translator as he ordered the utterance components in an acceptable order "he says it is a holocaust". The three translators attempt to keep on the same accusative tone and directness of the SL message. This could be motivated by the desire to show the "ignoring presence" strategy by rendering هو يقول into "he

says". The previous three failures denote that politeness represented by conflict avoidance does not appear as they stick to the SL details.

T4 on the other hand is different as far as translation is concerned. One can note that he prefers paraphrasing strategy to extract some implied nuances and show them to the surface. Conflict avoidance is present in this rendering as T4 made some changes to quench his thirst for modification. First, he deletes the pronoun "he" and replaces it with a direct address one "Mr. Bsis" with an honorific expression to show some respect and make a redressive form to disagreement. Second, he redistributes the elements in the utterance as he deletes "peoples" which is used at the beginning as a sort of challenging to the claim of his opponent. Then, he chunks the one part Arabic style into three independent parts to make some explanation and adhere to the TL conventions. Furthermore, T4 shows over sympathy as he inserts "being suffered" into the TL which he deduced from the hypertext of the debate as no such component is found in the SL version of the debate.

Another point is that of adding the adjective "revolting" into "peoples" to enhance his sympathy with the Tunisian people. All these instances refer to one fact: the translator is clearly involved as no one-to-one correspondence between the SL and TL is found when making a comparison. Conflict avoidance strategy worked this time as a euphemistic choice by adding, deleting, and substituting some elements in the SL text.

After a series of interruptions and challenges by IE2, IE1 regains the floor to blatantly violate the approbation maxim as he directly attack the Arab regimes and unambiguously dispraise them. This offence is taking a more serious level as he accuses them of being stooges to the Western countries as in line7:

تحكمها عصابات بكل ما أوتيت، هؤلاء حلفاؤهم الأميركيون يقولون في ويكيليكس إن هناك عصابة تحكم في تونس...

**taHkimuha<iSaabaatbikulimaauutiyat,
haaula'aiHulafaahumulamriikiyuunyaquuluunfiiWikileaksannah
unaaka<iSabatuntaHkumufiiTuunis**

- they are extremely controlled by gangs. They are allies with the American government. Wikileaks says that there is a gang governing Tunisia... (T1).
- they are totally ruled by gangs. Their American allies say in Wikileaks that there is a gang ruling in Tunisia... (T2).
- gangs with all that they have, rule them. Those, whose allies are the Americans, say through Wikileaks that Tunisia's gangs, there are gangs, there are gangs ruling them... (T3)
- these people are being manipulated by a mafia. Their American allies say in Wikileaks that there is a mafia ruling Tunisia... (T4).

One may note that the four translators intend to convey the offence as it is. However, linguistic competence has the upper hand as choosing the (in)appropriate linguistic item may spoil the degree of offence. This case is clear noted in the first three renderings as they translate عصابات (<iSaabaat) into "gangs". This misunderstanding is usually caused by the interplay of some uses of words. The word "gang" is usually used with small and limited criminal groups which goes against the wide scale organized groups of the government. Mafia may fit better in this situation to convey the exact intended meaning. T4 is aware of this point as he strategically prefers "mafia" which better fits into this situation. In this case, the four translators prefer the overt translation as they are ideologically motivated to show how the Tunisian regime is behaving with his people. However, the linguistic

and pragmatic competence is a judge in such cases as mistakenly choosing a word may not convey the degree of aggressiveness in the SL.

IE2 in line 9 challenges the pervious statement of his opponent and interrupts him in an ironic way. The agreement maxim is violated in this direct and ironically structured style. The utterance at the surface may seem a mere straight statement; however, the tone and the wider context tell the opposite as in the following line:

أصبحت ويكيليكس هي المرجع، ويكيليكس هي المرجع للمعارضة السياسية

aSbaHatWikileakshiyalmarji>u lilmu>aaradhatis-siyaasiyya

The four translator's renderings appeared the following way:

- has Wikileaks become a reference? A reference for the Arab opposition... (T1).
- Wikileaks has been the source, the source of the political opposition... (T2)
- Wikileaks has become the source; the source for the political opposition!!!.... (T3)
- I see Wikileaks is now becoming the reference!!! It is becoming the main reference for the political opposition! ... (T4)

If one checks the four renderings, s\he will find that a great misunderstanding happens. This failure is due to the deception of the formally structured statement whereas irony is there instead. T1 for instance has translated it into a question "has Wikileaks become a reference?" this question has abolished the ironic use of words, and hence mistranslating happens. T2 has caused a more problematic spot as he prefers a more continuous style "Wikileaks has been the source" which does not precisely convey the ironic intended meaning of IE2. Similarly, T3 is even more insistent on this fallacy as he sticks to form

and renders it into "Wikileaks has been the source". One can mark in the previous three translations that sticking to form and ignoring other contextual variables is to reverse the intended meaning of IE2. Furthermore, taking one side of the utterance causes a serious problem as impoliteness represented by irony is not achieved; rather, a more euphemistic style, unfamiliar version with that of the TL, appears.

T4 could be the only one to better understand the SL and reflect the intended meaning in the TL version. The irony is clearly perceived and hence appropriately rendered into Arabic. T4 adds some elements so as to express the ironic sense such as "I see now" accompanied by the exclamation mark. However, the conflict avoidance is not found in the four renderings as they all, one way or another, worked to variable degree on showing the ironic style of IE2.

After many interruptions, challenges, and accusations, IE2 replies with a short and accusative tone to the "irresponsible" behavior of his opponent. In line 17, IE2 demands his opponent to be responsible for what he states on air as in *قليل من المسؤولية* (qaliilunminalmasuuliya). The offence here is implied as IE2 intends to say that IE1 is irresponsibly behaving. It is variably perceived by the four translators who followed gradable styles when rendering it into the TL:

- be responsible... (T1)
- be a man of responsibility, please... (T2)
- some responsibility, please... (T3)
- would you please be responsible for your words...?

T1 and T2 have the most direct and aggressive styles in their endeavor to explicate the SL message and show the real meaning of the utterance. The aggressiveness is even clear as they both use the imperative style "be responsible, be a man of responsibility" to overtly convey the implied layer of meaning. This trend in translation could be

substantiated as some translators consider translation as an interpretation process; so, they have the right to tell the untold and say the unsaid.

The gradability is clearer when tackling T3 who attempts to keep the unsaid part of the offence and render it into "some responsibility, please" as a sort of conflict avoidance to covertly convey the implied meaning of the SL.

T4 could be the one who has a full understanding of this point as he makes a polite request starting from the formal style "would you please" to manage the situation and make it less direct toward IE1. Moreover, T4 adds an element to the TL that does not exist at least at the surface in the SL. This is marked when explicating "your words" so as to attenuate the sharpness of the message. In the whole, the first two renderings represent a conflict escalation trend as the two translators attempt to explicate the implied message of the SL; while T3 and T4 approach the case from conflict avoidance strategy as they both engage to attenuate the force of some direct words. As result, tact maxim is more preserved in T3 and T4 renderings, while it is blatantly violated in both T1 and T2 renderings as the style is more direct and hence offensive.

In line 18, IE1 seems to have been aroused by the statement of his opponent. The reply comes as he interrupts him and shows disrespect and dispraise. The tact and modesty maxims are both violated as a greater imposition is intended to threaten the face of his opponent as in:

بدون مقاطعة.. لا تقاطعني وإلا سأبقى أتحدث عن الطرابلسية

BiduunmuqaTa<a..laatuqaTi<niiwa'illasa'abqaataHadathu<anil-Traabulsiyya

This part of the debate may be considered the most problematic one as it put the four translators into a serious test. This serious test stems from the fact that they must exert double effort and resort to background knowledge to grasp the point.

- stop interrupting me or else or I will keep talking about Tripoli approach... (T1)
- don't interrupt me or I will keep talking about Trablus... (T2)
- please do not interrupt or else I would talk about Tabulsis... (T3)
- don't interrupt me or I will keep talking about Trablus... (T4)

The four translators fail in this instance to decode the intended meaning of الطرابلسية and hence the result is quite ambiguous renderings.

At first sight, one might be deceived about the way the four translators start their jobs. They insist on keeping on the threatening level by using a warning and imperative style " don't, or else" to carry the SL flavor of the offence. However, this does not make their translations appropriate or even acceptable. The offence intended in this case is Tunisia's first lady, Layla Trablusia, which the four translators mistakenly perceived as the Libyan capital, Tripoli. This mistaken perception created a sort of ambiguity and hence distorted the abusive offence against a high rank official. A proposed rendering for this could be better as follows:

- don't interrupt me or else I will degrade your president's wife!!!

Furthermore, conflict avoidance could be resorted to in such cases by deleting the part related to the president's wife and restrict the utterance to a request of non-interruption interaction

Proposed rendering: No interruption, please

The IR attempts to cool down the heated atmosphere promising that each will have his turn without interruption. However, IE2 breaks the power barrier to keep interrupting and defending his party. This time,

his interruption is employed to curb his opponent and prevent him from insulting others as in line 20:

لا، لا، احترام نحن في منبر، نحن في منبر

Laa, laa, iHtiraamiHtiraam, naHnufiimibar, nahnufiimibar

IE2 prefers in this part of the debate to blame his opponent in such an implied way and even moderate tone. When repeating "no, no" it is intended to show maximum disagreement and then repeats "show respect, show respect" to imply that his opponent is disrespectfully behaving. The four translations come as follows:

- no no, be respectful, be respectful, we are in a forum, we are in a forum... (T1)
- no, no please, we are on line, we are on line... (T2)
- no, no, respect, respect! we are in a pulpit... (T3)
- hell no. I ask for respect in this adorable place!... (T4)

One can note that T1 commits his rendering to the SL style and nature. This linguistic incompetence is evident especially when he sticks to the formal structure and even get subdued to the repetition which may not fit well in to English language. Therefore, T1 is the most overt rendering as one can find a one to one correspondence between the SL and TL utterances. T2 is somehow different from T1 in that he deletes the احترام احترام (iHtiraam, iHtiraam) part and adds a euphemistic term "please" to cool the situation down as sort of attenuating the force of IE2 statement. This choice by the T1 may make his rendering seem a more normal and natural English style. T3 is much similar to T1 as far as sticking to the formal style of the utterance. In his rendering one can almost find the match of every single SL utterance such as "no, respect". Another point is the misuse

of" pulpit" which is of religious use. These two failures could be attributed to the overexposure to overt translation which is problematic in this case as the peculiarities of the SL and TL are not taken into account. As a result, the degree of aggressiveness is not precisely conveyed as the norms of the TL are not respected.

T4 could be the only one to have gone deep enough in the text to understand its hidden part. It seems apparent that he perceives repetition as a sort of emphasizing the message. His choice then is resorted to delete the repeated parts of IE2 statement such as "no, respect, adorable place" to cope with the TL conventions. However, T4 adds, on the other hand, some items so as to keep on the aggressive intention of the speaker. He adds, for instance, "hell" to compensate for the deletion of denial at the outset of IE2 turn. Another point is that when T4 seeks power in his rendering when seeking "respect" from the other party. All in all, T4 is seen to have the closest meaning to the SL as he employs addition and deletion so as to make his TL looks like an original version, not a translated one.

In line 21, IE1 replies with the same style as he directly demands his opponent to show respect to the place they are debating in:

إذا أرفع المستوى، إحنا في منبر إذا لا تقاطعني

‘iThan‘irfa<ilmustawa, ‘iHnafiiminbariniThanlaatuqaTi<nii

In this case, the modesty maxim is violated too as the request is made with such an aggressive and accusative way. This violation is perceived as follows:

- then behave, we are in a forum so do not interrupt me... (T1)
- respect then, we are online, don't interrupt then
- then raise the standards, we are at a pulpit so do not interrupt me.... (T3)

- then you need to speak more decently. We are on air; therefore you need not to interrupt me.

The four translations are variably performed according to the way each translator looks at the text. T1 extremely sticks to the SL structure in his endeavor to overtly convey the message. This problematic choice makes his translation even unfamiliar to the TL reader. Some may argue that T1 uses direct and imperative verbs which match the SL one; still, the ordering of these components is not logically distributed. He isolates the verb "behave" without giving more details such as "behave well, get well-behaved...". Hence, T1 failed at least to create an acceptable English style and achieve conflict avoidance. T2 on his part succeeded to a large extent to create an acceptable English style. Moreover, he kept on the aggressive and imperative attitude of IE1. This is evident especially when he uses "respect then, don't interrupt" in which the tact maxim is overtly violated. The degree of inappropriateness is somehow high in T3 rendering. This opinion could be argued for as T3 prefers the literal tendency especially when translating منبر into "pulpit" which is a purely religious entity that does not fit into this context. He keeps on the imperative and offensive flavor which denotes the fact that he would stand for the overt translation in which no involvement is marked.

Finally, T4 attempts to extract some of the hidden implied meaning as he paraphrases the statement of IE1 and make it directly addressed to IE2 especially when he twice adds the verb "need" to force IE2 to be "decent". In such cases, T4 insists on violating the tact maxim as his rendering seems more offensive than that of the SL version. Conflict escalation is evident in this rendering as more direct

style is employed especially when extracting the unsaid part of IE1 statement.

6. Findings and Conclusions

The Extract is considered to be the most heated part in the whole debate as it is a continuous turn break dialogue. Each party tries to prove his view to be the best no matter how many times to interrupt and what strategy to use. This dialogue witnesses many interruptions through which IEs (interviewees) try to show maximum disagreement and total face aggravation. Politeness in this extract is at risk as we have noticed as one interruption leads into another and the result is a completely non-harmonious and non-cooperative environment. Agreement maxim in particular was the most violated maxim. IEs expressed most of their ideas in the most unambiguous ways which may not be understood as seeking clarity, but to achieve the maximum amount of face aggravation. The study concludes the following:

1. The Tact maxim is the super politeness maxim. It is adhered to or breached whenever any other of the five maxims is either achieved or ignored.
2. Politeness maxims are sensitive in conflictive non-harmonious discourses especially Arab televised debates as they are usually associated with political correctness, ideology, and attitudinal standpoints.
3. Building on conceptual mapping, Translators are not expected to fully adhere to politeness maxims as what is polite for one translator could be impolite for another. Conflict avoidance translation strategy could be a good choice to maneuver as the translator is armed with addition, deletion, substitution to manage the undesired (im)polite meaning.

4. Conflict avoidance could be best achieved by resorting to covert translation as it takes the social and political contexts into account rather than overt translation which binds the translators to the formal context of the utterance.
5. Translators are expected to work within a set of moral ethics according to which they integrate the (im)polite assumptions in processing an SL text and hence build a TL one.
6. Translation is a moral activity. It sometimes requires the translators to adapt the SL message to meet the TL reader's moral expectations.
7. Politeness is a delicate aspect in political interactive debates as both IEs are after political correctness. This gives them the right to say whatever insults no matter how rude as they consider it politically correct.
8. Over reliance on literal rendering causes much harm to politeness in translation as the "absolutely" polite form may have quite relative impolite content.
9. Unawareness of the force gradability of SL expressions turns the TT more or less polite than the SL ones and consequently presents inaccurate points in conveying the intended meaning.
10. The rendering of (im)polite utterances is affected by the individual conceptualization of the utterance as meaning is usually of a subjective entity through which we are expected to look differently at the world.
11. Background knowledge is essential in translating televised interactions since having no mental frame for the ongoing events the translators will most probably mistranslate the intended (im)polite meaning.

References

- ❖ Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1987). **Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ❖ Clayman, S. and Heritage, J. (2002). **The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air**. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- ❖ Farghal, M. and Shunnaq, A. (1999). **Translation with Reference to English and Arabic: A Practical Guide**. Irbid, Dar Al-Hilal for Translation.
- ❖ Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. **Journal of Pragmatics**, Vol.14, pp.219-236.
- ❖ Fraser, B. and Nolen, W. (1981). The association of Deference with Linguistic form. **International Journal of the Sociology of Language**, Vol.27, pp.93-111.
- ❖ Grice, H. (1975). Logic and Conversation. In Cole, P. and Morgan, J. (eds.), **Syntax and Semantics 3. Speech Acts**, New York: Academic Press, pp.41-58.
- ❖ Hatim, B. Mason, I. (1997b). **The Translator as Communicator**. London, Routledge.
- ❖ House, J (1999) (1998). Politeness and Translation. In **The Pragmatics of Translation** by Leo Hickey. Clivedon: Avon, pp.54-71.
- ❖ House, J (2002). Universality Versus Culture Specificity in Translation. In
- ❖ **Translation Studies: Perspectives on an Emerging Discipline** (Ed) Alessandra Riccardi, pp.92-111. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- ❖ Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness; or minding your p's and q's', **Chicago Linguistics Society**, Vol.8, pp.292-305.

- ❖ Leech, G. (1983). **Principles of Pragmatics**. London: Longman Publishing.
- ❖ Martínez, M^a. (2000). **Political Interviews, Talk Show Interviews, and Debates on British TV: A Contrastive A Study of the Interactional Organization of Three Broadcast Genres**. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Santiago Compostella.
- ❖ Van Emmeren, F. Houtlosser, P. and Hankemans, F. (2007) (Eds).
- ❖ **Argumentation Indicators: A Pragma-Dialectical Study**. Dordrecht, the Netherlands, Springer Publishing.