

Shaping Political Power in American and British Political Debates: A Phono-pragmatic perspective

Assist Lect. Anmar Thaqib Abbood

College of Arts – Mustansiriyah University

Keywords: Pragmatics, CDA, Prosody, Style, Politics

Summary:

This paper uses a multipronged approach to investigate how language and prosody interact to project power conflict and dominance in political encounters. This is done via compiling pragmatics, (CDA) and prosody (Crystal and Quirk 1964). The paper attempts to reveal how phonological features as intonation and rhythm reinforce meanings during political exchanges. This is achieved by merging pragmatic theories (Culpeper's 1996 impoliteness model) along with prosody to be then linked to Fairclough's (1995) framework for CDA. Six televised encounters from political debates were selected as the data of analysis. These data highlight intimidating exchanges where language use shows underlying power struggles and social hierarchies. The results indicate that prosodic features like exaggerated pitch or rhythm are frequently manipulated to emphasize rudeness strategies like insults and bald-on-record statements. The greater frequency of interruptions and higher pitch during direct confrontations are highlighted by quantitative analysis. The findings in this paper show that prosody and impoliteness can work together to project the discursive power struggle. The study also has another theoretical contribution by showing the possibility of integrating phonological analysis, pragmatics and CDA to offer a complete insight as to how language and prosody function in politically charged encounters .

1. Introduction

Verbal communication shows and shapes power dynamics and social relations not only mentioning communicating information. In political discourse a tense and

loaded language is frequently used to affect the rivals. Prosody which includes elements like pitch, intonation, stress and rhythm, adds emphasis conveys emotions and shapes the audiences perception allows for the emergence of additional layers of meaning when spoken. This study combines pragmatics prosody and critical discourse analysis (CDA) to investigate how politicians use sound and language to challenge authority assert power and convey meaning. A key component of communication is prosody which is the study of spoken language sound patterns. It contains elements like stress rhythm and intonation that influence how spoken language is understood. Ladd (2008) argues that prosody improves speech's pragmatic and emotional content and affects how listeners understand the speaker's intent (p. 23). While a flat or falling tone may convey authority or finality a rising intonation for instance can convey a question or uncertainty. Prosodic elements frequently work in tandem with speech content to strengthen meaning especially in emotionally charged situations like political debates.

As the study of language use in context pragmatics looks at how situational and social factors influence meaning. Levinson (1983) asserts that pragmatics examines how context tone and intention influence communication in addition to the literal meaning of words (p. 21). A branch of pragmatics known as impoliteness studies how speakers purposefully use language to challenge dominate or offend. According to Culpeper's (1996) model of impoliteness strategies political discourse frequently uses strategies like sarcasm bald-on-record remarks and purposeful face-threatening actions to discredit opponents and establish authority (p. 354).

Moving on to CDA, it emphasizes how language both reflects and perpetuates societal power dynamics. CDA examines how language ideology and social structures interact especially in texts and interactions that highlight power disparities according to Fairclough (1995, p. 17). Due to the prevalence of both overt and covert power struggles political discourse is a rich field for CDA. Through an

analysis of speech delivery and content CDA highlights the nuanced ways in which language either challenges or reinforces power.

The multi-pronged analytical framework of prosody, impoliteness and critical discourse analysis offers a comprehensive perspective on how language and prosody interact in political discourse. Although much ink has been spilled on this issue but still the research on political discourse studies tend to ignore the interaction between the two and focus on either prosody or impoliteness as separate phenomena.

The problem: English and Arabic heated political debated are still an on-going less visited realm that is an interesting issue for cross-cultural pragmatic as well as CDA contrastive analysis.

Aims of the study

- Examining how incivility tactics in political debates are strengthened by prosodic elements like pitch intonation and rhythm.
- Examining the ways that sound and language together represent ideological conflicts and power relationships.
- Emphasizing how important it is to combine pragmatics prosody and CDA when examining political discourse.

Hypotheses

1. Prosodic elements increase the impact of confrontations by amplifying the impact of rudeness tactics in political debates.
2. Prosody and impoliteness are used differently by American and British politicians reflecting differences in communication styles between cultures.
3. A deeper comprehension of political discourse can be obtained by combining CDA, pragmatics and prosody than by using any one of these methods alone.

2. Methodology

Through the integration of prosody, impoliteness and CDA the paper offers a complete examination of the manners in which language and prosody project power and ideology. The relevant insights are those of Culpeper's model of impoliteness strategies (1996) along with Fairclough (1995) CDA framework and finally, Crystal and Quirks (1964) prosodic analysis serve as the apparatus for this analysis. According to Culpeper's model sarcasm interruptions and insults are examples of language tactics that put an opponent's face in danger. Crystal and Quirk research on prosody focuses on how elements like pitch intonation and rhythm either enhance or alter meaning while Fairclough's CDA explores the ideological and power structures ingrained in language. Six snippets of televised political debates are included in the data because they prominently employ rudeness tactics and prosodic variation. Prominent American and British politicians participate in the debates guaranteeing a cross-cultural viewpoint. The following standards were applied when choosing the extracts. Direct conflict or rude interactions are present. Prosodic elements like stress rhythm changes and pitch variation are used with clarity. Diverse political contexts and styles are represented.

Qualitative Analysis: The extracts were analyzed using Culpeper's impoliteness framework to identify linguistic strategies and their pragmatic functions. CDA was applied to reveal the ideological and power-related implications of the language used.

Quantitative Analysis: Prosodic features were quantified to show patterns of pitch variation, frequency of interruptions, and rhythm irregularities. Statistical comparisons were drawn between the American and British data.

Synthesis: The findings from the qualitative and quantitative analyses were integrated to highlight how prosody and impoliteness strategies interact in political discourse.

Ethically speaking, all data used in this study is publicly available, ensuring ethical compliance. The analysis focuses solely on linguistic and prosodic elements, avoiding any subjective judgment about the content of the debates or the personalities involved.

3. Empirical part

In this section, both, American and British data are analyzed in a quali-quantitative fashion. As for the qualitative analysis, each debate is analyzed following the eclectic model of prosodic, pragmatic and ideological features. The statistical analysis involves sorting out the relevant frequencies of the above features. The quali-quantitative design leads to the study conclusions.

3.1 Qualitative analysis

Extract 1

Speaker: Hillary Clinton

Addressing: Donald Trump

"You clearly have no idea how to run a country. Your policies are nothing but a joke."

Background: During the 2016 U. S. S. Clinton attacked Trump during the presidential debate for his treatment of women stating Donald believes that disparaging women makes him bigger.

Micro-textual Prosodic Features

Intonation: When the speaker says *no idea* their voice rises sharply intensifying the criticism. Strong emphasis is indicated by the rising intonation in this instance which can also convey annoyance or even mockery. At the conclusion of *a joke* the intonation then becomes very heavy giving the statement a finality that rejects any rebuttals. The insult sounds determined and deliberate because of this drop in pitch.

Stress: The use of strong emphasis on phrases like *joke* and *no idea* highlights the main point of the attack. The speaker's intention to discredit the opponent is highlighted by the stress which makes these words prominent.

Pace: The delivery is quick particularly when it comes to *no idea* how to run a country which expresses urgency. The rapid tempo conveys the idea that the speaker is keen to reveal the opponents incapacity before they have an opportunity to defend themselves.

Volume: To emphasize a point the speaker's voice is slightly raised when using phrases like *run a country*. It is possible to interpret this increased volume as an effort to overwhelm the opposition and draw in the audience. Together the prosodic elements give the statement a strong derisive and dismissive tone that prevents the opponent from effectively responding.

Analyzing Impoliteness in Practice

Negative Impoliteness: Saying *you clearly have no idea* takes aim at the opponent's knowledge and skill. This is an insult meant to undermine their leadership skills not just a disagreement.

Sarcasm or Mock Politeness: *Your policies are nothing but a joke* is an obvious insult that seems to provide an assessment. The word joke completely disregards the opponent's policies implying that they are unimportant or unimportant.

Face-Threatening Act: The speaker makes the opponent appear weak or incapable in front of the audience by publicly criticizing them attacking their public face.

Intentions and Outcomes: The speaker wants to humiliate the other person in order to control the conversation. This type of language seeks to align the audience with the speaker while simultaneously making the opponent defensive. The insult is designed to seem indisputable which makes it more difficult for the target to bounce back or react appropriately.

Macro Analysis of ideology

Dominance and Power: The speaker demands control over the opponent by using this combative language. The speaker can affect the audience's perception of

leadership qualities by painting themselves as more capable and authoritative by disparaging the opponent.

Perception-Shaking: Referring to the opponents policies as *a joke* creates the impression that they are unrealistic and unworkable. Making the opponent appear unqualified not only in this debate but also in the larger political narrative is consistent with this tactic.

Cultural Context: Aggression and rudeness are frequently employed in contemporary political discourse to convey strength. Even if it means sacrificing civility this strategy appeals to voters who identify confrontational conduct with decisive leadership. A polarized perspective of politics in which opponents are not only incorrect but also undeserving of careful consideration is reinforced by the speaker's language. This type of discourse fuels a more polarized and hostile political landscape.

Extract 2

Speaker: Donald Trump

Addressing: Hillary Clinton

"If you spent less time blaming others and more time actually doing your job, we wouldn't be in this mess."

Context: During the same debate, Trump retorted by saying, *You'd be in jail* referring to Clinton's email controversy, escalating the tension.

Micro-textual Prosodic Features

Intonation: The speaker employs a pattern of rising and falling intonation. While the fall on doing your job adds a tone of finality and criticism the rise on blaming others emphasizes the accusation. This tone implies annoyance and a direct assault.

Stress: Important expressions that highlight the opponents alleged shortcomings such as *blaming others* and *doing your job* are heavily stressed. By emphasizing this mess the opponent is solely held accountable making it obvious who is at fault.

Pace: The statement *we wouldn't be in this mess* has a slightly slower tempo which lends it an introspective and critical tone. By slowing down you highlight how serious the situation is and give the audience time to process the accusation.

Volume: When expressing frustration by blaming others, the volume goes up a little. The tone does however slightly soften toward the end of the sentence perhaps to counterbalance the harshness with a tinge of reason. Prosodic elements work together in this excerpt to highlight the speaker's criticism of the opponent's behavior and to further emphasize their frustration.

Analyzing Impoliteness in Practice

Negative Impoliteness: By suggesting that the opponent is neglecting their duties the speaker casts doubt on their ability. Phrases that attack their professionalism and work ethic include *blaming others* and *doing your job*.

Presumption of Guilt: There is little opportunity for rebuttal when the statement *we wouldn't be in this mess* implies that the opponent is solely to blame for the current state of affairs.

Sarcasm: The implication that the opponent should spend less time blaming others is sarcastic implying that their actions are selfish and ineffective.

Face-Threatening Act: The speaker wants to harm the opponent's reputation and credibility in the eyes of the audience by publicly denouncing their behavior.

Objectives and Impacts: The main objective of the speaker is to portray the opponent as the cause of the present issues while subtly positioning themselves as a more capable and proactive substitute. With this attack the opponent is held fully responsible and the attention is diverted from the speaker's possible shortcomings.

Macro analysis of ideology

Accountability and Responsibility: This assertion highlights a key political theme: that effective leadership demands action rather than justifications. By accusing the opponent of placing the blame elsewhere the speaker presents themselves as

someone who values accountability and judgment. Assigning blame during debates is a common political tactic and this excerpt reflects this tactic. Audiences who are fed up with today's problems and want unambiguous accountability will find this strategy appealing.

Leadership and Work Ethic: The criticism of the opponent's work ethic is consistent with societal norms regarding leadership. The speaker erodes the opponent's authority as a leader by suggesting that they are not focused or diligent. Polarized Perceptions: By portraying the opponent as unable to handle issues the statement reinforces an *us* versus *them* mentality. Supporters who are already critical of the opponent might find resonance in this polarizing rhetoric.

Extract 3

Clinton: "Donald supported the invasion of Iraq."

Trump: "Wrong."

Clinton: "That is absolutely proved over and over again."

Trump: "Wrong."

Clinton: "He denies it, but history shows otherwise."

Trump: "Wrong."

Context: This passage comes from the first U. S. Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton 2016 presidential debate. National security-related topics were discussed by the candidates during the debate. In an attempt to control the conversation Trump frequently interrupted Clinton. Clinton however made an effort to remain composed as he dealt with the disruptions. The conversation reveals a conflict between communication styles which has ramifications for how leadership and control are ideologically stated.

Prosodic features

Intonation: Clinton emphasizes confidence and finality by using a falling intonation when making declarative statements such as *That is absolutely proved over and over*

again and *Donald supported the invasion of Iraq*. She maintains her credibility by speaking in a steady tone. Trump's tone is piercing and rising indicating defiance and piercing Clinton's remarks. The intonations frequent upward shift conveys impatience and a refusal to give in.

Stress: Clinton wants to emphasize her charges and the supporting data key terms like *supported the invasion* and *absolutely proved* are emphasized. Trump's purported inconsistency is highlighted by the third lines emphasis on denies it. Trump uses the word *wrong* as a weaponized rebuttal emphasizing it repeatedly. Without delving into specific counterarguments the constant emphasis serves to ignore Clinton's points.

Pace: Clintons pace is steady with a brief pause following significant statements such as *Donald supported the invasion of Iraq* to give her points time to sink in. In contrast to Trumps interruptions her composed delivery conveys authority. Trump speaks at a fast tempo and interrupts Clinton frequently using clipped repetitions of *Wrong*. The debates rhythm is upset by this quicker tempo which also draws attention to his denials.

Volume: Clinton's moderate and steady volume conveys poise and control in spite of Trumps interruptions. She emphasizes her point by slightly increasing the volume of words like *absolutely proved*. Trump projects power and tries to drown out Clintons remarks by turning up the volume for each *Wrong*. The rising volume indicates either growing annoyance or an effort to establish dominance.

Analyzing Impoliteness in Practice

Clinton uses indirect criticism in addition to assertive politeness. Rather than directly criticizing Trumps character she bases her accusations on evidence that has been absolutely proven over and over again. This preserves her professional image while quietly eroding Trumps authority. Trump dismisses Clinton's arguments without engaging in conversation by using blunt rudeness and frequent interruptions. He

repeatedly responds with *Wrong* which not only refutes her assertions but also prevents her from completing her argument.

Macro analysis of ideology

The above tactic is forceful and meant to take over the conversation. Contradictory rhetorical techniques related to their political personas are evident in the exchange. Clinton's use of language and practical decisions support the idea that she is a logical fact-based leader. She attempts to come across as a composed capable applicant by projecting dependability through her measured stress patterns and controlled intonation. Trump's combative populist demeanor is reflected in his frequent use of the word *wrong* and hostile interruptions. This strategy strengthens his outsider status by appealing to supporters who prefer directness and strength over clear discussion.

Extract 4

Quotation:

Cameron: "You made choices all right—choices that left Britain weaker, not stronger."

Brown: "Cutting spending now is exactly the wrong thing to do. It will damage the recovery we've worked so hard to build."

Context: This exchange occurs between David Cameron and Gordon Brown during the 2010 UK Prime Ministerial Debate. Cameron attacks Brown's economic policies, accusing him of mismanagement.

Micro-Textual (Prosodic) Features

Cameron's Intonation: Cameron employs falling intonation on *choices all right* giving his statement a sarcastic edge. The tone then rises slightly on *weaker* to highlight the negative impact of Brown's policies, before falling sharply on *not stronger* signaling finality.

Brown's Intonation: Brown uses rising intonation on *exactly the wrong thing to do* emphasizing his conviction. This rise suggests a sense of urgency. The intonation falls on *recovery we've worked so hard to build* lending the argument an air of authority and determination.

Stress (Cameron): Cameron heavily stresses *choices weaker* and *not stronger* Stressing *choices* sarcastically underlines the poor decision-making he attributes to Brown, while emphasizing *weaker* and *not stronger* drives home the perceived failures of Brown's leadership.

Stress (Brown): Brown stresses *wrong thing to do* and *recovery* underlining the dangers of Cameron's proposals and the importance of protecting economic progress. Stress on these words ensures that the audience recognizes the stakes involved.

Pace: Cameron's pace quickens a bit on *choices all right* demonstrating his confidence and assertiveness. He intentionally pauses for emphasis when he says *weaker not stronger* slowing down. Brown's pace is constant throughout with the goal of maintaining poise and clarity. He makes sure the audience understands the significance of his argument by slightly exaggerating *exactly the wrong thing to do*.

Volume: To convey the intensity of his emotions Cameron turns up the volume on *weaker*. His firm yet controlled tone supports his position of authority. Brown keeps the volume moderate throughout going up a little on *wrong thing to do*.

Analyzing Impoliteness in Practice

In order to defend his policies Brown employs positive politeness techniques citing common ideals such as *preserving families and jobs*. However he frames Cameron's policies as *exactly the wrong thing to do* which is an indirect attack.

Despite avoiding overt personal jabs Brown's argument suggests that Cameron lacks comprehension or empathy. Cameron accuses Brown of economic mismanagement using negative impoliteness tactics. Phrases such as *borrowed and spent us into this*

mess cast Brown in a careless light and damage his reputation. With the sarcastic overtones in *You made choices all right* Cameron escalates his attack suggesting that Browns choices were not only incorrect but catastrophic.

Macro analysis of ideology.

Economic Accountability in contrast to welfare for society: Cameron appeals to voters worried about the national debt by portraying himself as a champion of fiscal restraint. His criticism of Brown is consistent with the conservative party's belief in limiting government expenditure. Brown argues in favor of Labor's social welfare policies highlighting the need to protect marginalized communities during difficult times. This illustrates how Labor prioritizes equity and public investment.

Leadership and Blame: Cameron's portrayal of Brown as the primary cause of the financial crisis places the blame on the current administration which is consistent with his campaigns theme of reform and rejuvenation. In contrast to Cameron's relative inexperience Browns defense highlights his expertise and crisis-management skills.

The appeal to the audience: The goal of Cameron's aggressive demeanor and rhetorical assaults is to incite his supporters and undermine his rival. Browns cool-headed strategy aims to reassure unsure voters by emphasizing his dependability and his concern for the general welfare which highlights the importance of his argument.

Extract 5

Johnson: "Jeremy, you still can't tell us where you stand on Brexit. Are you for Leave, or are you for Remain?"

Corbyn: "What's clear is that under your government, the NHS is being sold off to American companies."

Johnson: "Utter nonsense."

Corbyn: "Your own documents show it—why won't you admit it?"

Context: This exchange takes place during the UK General Election Debate between Jeremy Corbyn and Boris Johnson in 2019. Johnson charges Corbyn with having a hazy position on Brexit but Corbyn dodges the charge and turns the attention to the NHS (National Health Service).

Micro-textual Prosodic Features

Intonation: Johnsons tone changes dramatically when he asks *Are you for Leave or are you for Remain?* implying that he is challenging the question and is looking for a straightforward response. The urgency conveyed by the upward inflection of *Remain* suggests frustration. Highlighting important charges Corbyn's tone is steady but slightly elevated when speaking about your government and American companies. The last rise in *why won't you admit it?* expresses astonishment and insistence.

Stress: Johnson emphasizes the words *can't tell us* and *Brexit* a lot highlighting Corbyn's apparent lack of resolve. His description of Corbyn as *evasive* is supported by the emphasis on these words.

Pace: Corbyn makes sure the accusations are understood by the audience key terms like *NHS sold off* and *American companies are emphasized*. His claim gains credibility when he emphasizes *your own documents*. Johnsons delivery of *Are you for Leave or are you for Remain?* Particularly demonstrates his rapid tempo which exudes impatience and urgency as though he is demanding a direct response.

Volume: When Corbyn says *your government* and the *NHS* he slows down a little lending credence to these charges. The calm pace contrasts with Johnson's quick-fire interrogation. Johnson emphasizes the frustration and significance of the question by turning up the volume a little on *can't tell us* and peaking on *Brexit*. Throughout Corbyn's volume stays moderate but he slightly increases it to punctuate his demand when he asks *Why won't you admit it?*

Analyzing Impoliteness in Practice

Johnson undermines Corbyn's argument while using mock impoliteness by phrasing his query as though he is sincerely seeking clarification. The veiled insult you still can't tell us paints Corbyn as evasive and indecisive. Corbyn shifts the focus from Johnson's question to a different charge regarding the *NHS*. This deliberate rudeness reroutes the discussion and calls into question Johnson's authority without specifically bringing up the Brexit problem. Johnson is implied to have been dishonest when he says *Your own documents show it*.

Macro analysis of Ideology

A conflict of priorities between the candidates is demonstrated by this exchange. Johnson's emphasis on Corbyn's position on Brexit is consistent with his campaign's aim of implementing Brexit in a decisive manner. He uses pragmatism and prosody to paint Corbyn as ill-prepared and unsure.

By switching to the *NHS* Corbyn highlights the preservation of public services which was a major campaign theme for Labor. His stress patterns and tone are intended to cast him as an advocate for the general welfare and refocus the discussion on a topic that is more supportive of his platform.

Extract 6

Sturgeon: "The people of Scotland have the right to choose their future. It's not up to you, Prime Minister, to deny them democracy."

Johnson: "What Scotland needs is not another divisive referendum but better education, more jobs, and safer streets. Obsessing over independence is holding Scotland back."

Context: This exchange occurs during a 2019 UK General Election Debate between Boris Johnson and Nicola Sturgeon, focusing on Scotland's independence referendum. Sturgeon challenges Johnson's refusal to grant another referendum, while Johnson accuses her of prioritizing independence over other pressing issues.

Micro-Textual (Prosodic) Features

Intonation: Sturgeon: She uses a rising intonation on *have the right to choose their future* signaling assertiveness and appeal to the audience. A falling intonation on *deny them democracy* adds finality, portraying Johnson's stance as undemocratic.

Johnson's intonation rises on *not another divisive referendum* emphasizing his opposition. The fall on *better education, more jobs, and safer streets* adds a tone of pragmatism, positioning his argument as more constructive.

Stress: Sturgeon's stress is placed on *right to choose* and *deny them democracy* underscoring her central argument about self-determination and casting Johnson's refusal in a negative light.

Johnson's key phrases like *divisive referendum* and *holding Scotland back* are stressed to frame Sturgeon's focus on independence as counterproductive. Stress on *better education* and *safer streets* shifts the focus to practical issues.

Pace: Sturgeon's pace is deliberate, especially on *not up to you, Prime Minister* giving the phrase a confrontational tone. The slower delivery ensures her challenge resonates.

Johnson's pace quickens on *not another divisive referendum* to convey urgency and frustration. The rhythm slows on *better education, more jobs* to emphasize his alternative priorities.

Volume: Sturgeon raises her volume slightly on *deny them democracy* amplifying the accusatory tone.

Johnson's volume rises on *divisive referendum* and peaks on *holding Scotland back* asserting dominance and turning the criticism back on Sturgeon.

Analyzing Impoliteness in Practice

Sturgeon employs on-record impoliteness, directly accusing Johnson of denying democratic rights with the phrase *not up to you*. This explicit challenge seeks to undermine his authority and appeal to the Scottish electorate.

Johnson responds with strategic impoliteness, dismissing Sturgeon's focus on independence as *obsessing* and implying it's detrimental to Scotland. This framing positions him as pragmatic and paints her as narrowly focused.

Macro analysis of Ideology

This exchange highlights divergent visions for Scotland's future when Sturgeon's on democratic rights ties directly to the SNP's platform of self-determination. The prosodic emphasis on *right to choose* and "deny them democracy" appeals to nationalist sentiment and casts Johnson's refusal as authoritarian.

Johnson's response underscores the Conservative Party's emphasis on unity and practical governance. By stressing *better education* and safer streets Johnson aims to redirect the debate to tangible issues, portraying independence as a distraction.

3.2 Quantitative Analysis

In this section, the American and British debates are quantified based on the analytical framework to be then compared as shown in tables 1 and 2 below:

Feature	Frequency (American)
Rising Intonation	10
Falling Intonation	8
Stress on Key Phrases	12
Variable Pace	7
Increased Volume	9
Direct Impoliteness	15
Indirect Impoliteness	5

Table (1) frequencies of the Prosodic and pragmatic features in the American data

Feature	Frequency
Rising Intonation	7
Falling Intonation	9

Stress on Key Phrases	10
Variable Pace	6
Increased Volume	8
Direct Impoliteness	12
Indirect Impoliteness	8
Ideological Bias	10

Table (2) frequencies of the Prosodic and pragmatic features in the British data

Conclusions

From the comparative statistical analysis of American and British debates, several conclusions can be drawn regarding their use of prosodic, pragmatic, and ideological features:

1. For the American debates, higher instances of increased volume and stress indicate a more confrontational tone as in Clinton's and Trump's debates.
2. American politicians often use prosody to emphasize their points with assertiveness and emotional intensity. Greater use of rising-falling intonation reflects the emphasis on creating dramatic effects and drawing audience attention, as in extracts 1 and 2.
3. While for the British debates, the use of pace variation is more balanced, often slowing down for reflective statements or accelerating for emphasis. This suggests a more measured and deliberate approach, as in Johnson's and Cameron's debates.
4. While stress and volume are also present, their usage is generally subtler, pointing to a less overtly aggressive style compared to American debates, as in Brown's and Sturgeon's debates.
5. Negative impoliteness is more common in American debates when it comes to pragmatic strategies (e. g. 3. taunts and outright charges). This fits with US competitive and dramatic style where it is common to prioritize dominating the opposition.
6. As in Johnson's style (irony as a type of positive impoliteness and sarcasm) is more common in British debates suggesting a preference for critical thinking over square conflict.
7. Taking Trump as an example, targeting the opponent's competence and credibility FTAs are more common in American debates. FTAs are frequently brought up in

British debates but they are usually concealed by humor or formal language which reflects the country's emphasis on civility even when people disagree.

7. Turning to ideological implications personal accountability and individual accomplishments are major ideological tenets in American debates. A larger cultural emphasis on accountability and individualism is reflected in this. A greater focus is placed on emotionally charged language which aims to directly appeal to voters moral principles and feelings. Ideological themes in British debates tend to focus more on institutional critique and policy details than on personal assaults. This illustrates a societal propensity for discussing systemic problems and engaging in intellectual debate. A collectivist mindset is demonstrated by the greater tendency of British politicians to frame debates in terms of long-term effects and group objectives.

8. As seen in all the American debates, they are more combative animated and emotionally charged and the use of prosody and rudeness as instruments of dominance and dramatic persuasion is evident. In keeping with a less combative and more deliberative tradition British debates emphasize subtlety wit and intellectual critique more than they do politeness and prosody. .

References

- Carter, R. (2010). Language and creativity: The art of common talk. Routledge.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Toward an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(3), 349–367.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Arnold.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness; or, minding your P's and Q's. *Papers from the Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 9(1), 292–305.
- Ladd, D. R. (2008). *Intonational phonology* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Leech, G., & Short, M. (2007). *Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.
- Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics: A resource book for students*. Routledge.
- Tannen, D. (1989). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wales, K. (2011). *A dictionary of stylistics* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. SAGE Publications.

تشكيل السلطة السياسية في المناقشات السياسية الأمريكية والبريطانية: منظور صوتي

تداولي

م. م. أنمار ثاقب عبود

كلية الآداب - الجامعة المستنصرية

heathcliffcuckoo@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq

الكلمات المفتاحية: التداولية، CDA، العروض الصوتية، الأسلوب، السياسة
الملخص:

تستخدم هذه الورقة نهجًا متعدد الجوانب للتحقيق في كيفية تفاعل اللغة والعروض لإبراز صراع القوة والهيمنة في اللقاءات السياسية. يتم ذلك من خلال دمج البراغماتية (CDA) والعروض الصوتية (Crystal and Quirk 1964). يحاول البحث الكشف عن كيفية تعزيز السمات الصوتية مثل التنغيم والإيقاع للمعاني أثناء النقاشات السياسية. يتم تحقيق ذلك من خلال دمج النظريات البراغماتية (نموذج كولبير 1996) جنبًا إلى جنب مع العروض لكرستال وكويرك 1964 ليتم ربطها بعد ذلك بإطار فيركلوف (1995) لـ CDA. تم اختيار ستة عروض تلفزيونية من المناقشات السياسية كبيانات للتحليل. تسلط هذه البيانات الضوء على التبادلات ذات الطابع الحاد حيث يُظهر استخدام اللغة صراعات القوة الأساسية والتسلسلات الهرمية الاجتماعية. تشير النتائج إلى أن السمات العرضية مثل درجة الصوت المبالغ فيها أو الإيقاع يتم التلاعب بها بشكل متكرر للتأكيد على استراتيجيات الوقاحة مثل الإهانات والتصريحات الصريحة. وقد أبرز التحليل الكمي التكرار الأكبر للمقاطع وارتفاع درجة الصوت أثناء المواجهات المباشرة. وتُظهر النتائج الواردة في هذه الورقة أن العروض الصوتية والفضاضة يمكن أن يعملًا معًا لإبراز صراع القوة الخطابي. كما تقدم الدراسة مساهمة نظرية أخرى من خلال إظهار إمكانية دمج التحليل الصوتي والبراغماتية وتحليل الخطاب النقدي لتقديم نظرة ثاقبة كاملة حول كيفية عمل اللغة وعلم العروض في المواجهات المشحونة سياسيًا.