

A pragma-structural analysis of Egyptians' Disagreement strategies in computer-mediated communication^(*)

Dr. Hala Rashed

Department of English Language and Literature

Faculty of Arts, Fayoum University

Abstract

The speech act of disagreement, though sometimes inevitable, is a relatively complex act. It has traditionally been considered a dispreferred response. Recent research, however, has shown that disagreement should no longer be perceived as a negatively marked act, but rather as a normal phenomenon in human interaction. This paper aims to investigate the strategies used by Egyptians to express the speech act of disagreement in Arabic. To pursue this end, the study employed a corpus of 30,757 words collected from Arabic Facebook pages and groups from two topic areas: society and economy. The data were classified according to a new taxonomy built upon the taxonomies of Muntigl & Turbull (1998) and Harb (2016). The results of the study showed that Egyptian speakers used 11 strategies to express disagreement with different frequencies. Anatomization of these strategies revealed varying structural and pragmatic characteristics. It, also, highlighted the importance of culture to understand Egyptians' disagreement strategies in Computer Mediated-Communication (CMC)

Key words:

Disagreement strategies, Egyptian Arabic, computer-mediated communication.

^(*) Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts Volume 85 July 2025

مستخلص

تعتبر أساليب الرفض، بالرغم من أنها تمثل جزءاً أساسياً وجانباً لا يمكن الاستغناء عنه في أحاديثنا اليومية، أحد أفعال الكلام المعقدة نسبياً وغالباً ما يصنف الرفض كرد غير مرغوب فيه، إلا أن بعض الدراسات الحديثة أوضحت أن أساليب الرفض لا تعتبر رداً غير مرغوب فيه وأنه يجب اعتبارها رد طبيعي في التفاعل بين البشر. لذلك يهدف هذا البحث إلى دراسة الأساليب والاستراتيجيات التي يستخدمها المصريون للتعبير عن عدم الموافقة (الرفض) باللغة العربية، ولتحقيق هذا الهدف استخدمت الدراسة عينة بحثية تتكون مما يقارب إحدى وثلاثون ألف كلمة تم جمعها من صفحات موقع التواصل الاجتماعي (فيس بوك) واقتصرت عينة البحث المختارة على الموضوعات الاجتماعية والاقتصادية، وقامت الدراسة باستخدام تصنيف جديد لاستراتيجيات الرفض مبني على تصنيفات سابقة منها مانجل وتيرنبول (١٩٩٨) وحرب (٢٠١٦) وأوضحت نتائج الدراسة استخدام المصريون لإحدى عشر استراتيجية مختلفة للتعبير عن الرفض بنسب متفاوتة، أما عن تحليل هذه الاستراتيجيات فأوضح أن هناك الكثير من الخصائص السياقية والدلالية لهذه الاستراتيجيات، كما بينت الدراسة أيضاً أهمية فهم ثقافة المجتمع المصري حتى يتسنى فهم أساليب واستراتيجيات الرفض لديه عبر منصات التواصل الاجتماعي.

1. Introduction

The last two decades have witnessed a drastic change in communication styles. The burgeoning use of different forms of communication via the internet such as e-mails, face book, X (Twitter) and weblogs, has cut down the distances and opened new ways for faceless computer-mediated communication (CMC). CMC is defined as “text-based interactive communication via the Internet websites, and other multimodal formats, and mobile communication” (Herring, Stein & Virtanen, 2013, “back cover, para 1”). It has become an indispensable

part of human communication. McQuail (2005) classifies CMC as synchronous and asynchronous. Synchronous communication enables people to interact at the same time but in different places as in video conferences or chat rooms. Asynchronous communication, on the other hand, enables people to communicate in different times and different places as in emails or in interactions through social media websites (Facebook, Twitter...). Both modes of communication proved to be of great value for language research as they represent a rich raw data stock, especially in pragmatics. In the near past, researchers had to depend on data coming from questionnaires and/or role plays to obtain the required amount of data for analysis. Today CMC gave us more authentic conversational data to analyze. These asynchronous conversations usually cover different topics and reflect the viewpoints and cultural traits of the participants.

Of central importance in this data are the instances in which conversational arguing (especially disagreement) takes place. This is simply because the acts that have the most critical impact on conversation structure, according to Labov and Fanshel, (1977) “are not such speech acts as requests and assertions, but rather challenges, defense, and retreats, which have to do with the status of the participants, their rights and obligations, and their changing relationships in terms of social organization” (pp.58-59). These activities actually involve identity claims about self, other as well as the relationship between the self and the other. (Goffman, 1972).

Research on disagreement strategies has been mainly inspired by Muntigl and Turnbull (1996) and its modified version Muntigl and Turnbull (1998). They studied disagreement from the perspective of social psychological pragmatics and proposed a meticulous analytical scheme for classifying disagreement on a structural as well as a pragmatic basis. They state that in conversational arguing a speaker (A) makes a claim. Speaker (B) disagrees with A's claim. Speaker A usually produces counter disagreement until the arguing might be resolved. This process of disagreeing with claims and producing counter claims usually results in producing the speech act of disagreement (Muntigl & Turnbull, 1998); the act which is referred to elsewhere as disputing (Kotthoff, 1993), conflict talk (Grimshaw, 1990) or oppositional argument (Schiffrin, 1984).

This paper aims to explore the different forms of disagreement strategies used by Egyptians through asynchronous computer-mediated online communication in their native language. More specifically, it shows how arguing is accomplished and how face concerns may (or may not) affect expressing disagreement in faceless CMC on Facebook Pages and Groups in the area topics of economy, and society. To pursue this aim the study builds on previous research to analyze a corpus of naturally occurring disagreement exchanges taking place on face book pages in Arabic.

1.2. Statement of the problem

Despite the fact that several speech acts have been investigated in the Arabic language in general e.g., apology (Al-Hami, 1993; Bataineh, 2004; Nureddeen, 2008), refusals (Al-Shalawi, 1997), expressing gratitude (e.g., Al-Khawaldeh, 2014), swearing (Abdel-Jawad, 2000), compliments (Farghal & Haggan, 2006; Migdadi, 2003; Nelson, Al-Batal & Echols, 1996) and refusals (e.g., Al-Eryani, 2007; Al-Issa, 1998; Nelson, Carson, Al Batal, & El Bakary, 2002; Stevens, 1993), and in Egyptian Arabic in particular e.g. thanking (Gabr, 1991), complimenting (Mazid, 1995; Morsy, 1992), complaining (Salah El-Din, 2000) and advice giving (Rashed, 2008), the speech act of disagreement has received little attention, particularly in relation to CMC (Fernandez, 2013; Harb, 2016).

Most previous studies on disagreement show that it has traditionally been considered a dispreferred response or face-threatening act, which interlocutors should try to avoid or at least mitigate as it destroys social solidarity (Fraser, 1990; Georgakopoulou, 2001; Heritage, 1984; Levinson, 1983; Netz, 2014; Pomerantz, 1984). Leech (1983), for example, argues that disagreement has always been considered as a sign of impoliteness and that “partial disagreement is often preferable to complete disagreement” (p.38). He further states that “there is a tendency to exaggerate agreement with other people, and to mitigate disagreement by expressing regret, partial agreement etc.” (p.138).

In the studies of conversation analysis, on the other hand, the speech act of disagreement has been regarded as ‘dispreferred’ next

actions especially when compared to its correspondent, that of agreement that has always been regarded as a preferred response and that interlocutors should orient towards it (Pomerantz, 1984;). Similarly, Brown and Levinson (1987) considered it as a face-threatening act that should be avoided or at least prefaced or mitigated to save the interlocutor's face. Waldron and Applegate (1994), for example, have regarded it as a form of conflict. Likewise, it has been regarded as a "kind of failure between interactants" (Sifianou, 2012, p. 1555). Thus, in most of the studies dealing with disagreement, one can easily notice that the act of disagreement has been traditionally considered as an act that undermines solidarity among interlocutors. It had even been given a 'bad reputation' (Harb, 2016; Myers, 2004).

Unlike some other speech acts, disagreement is a reactive speech act. That is, it requires a prior utterance from an interlocutor (Sornig, 1977:367). So, it is important to study the context of the situation and to take into consideration the cultural-specific practices of different countries. That is, despite the fact that many of the previously mentioned linguists considered it as an act that undermines solidarity, other linguists (e.g. Kakavá, 2002; Schiffrin, 1984; Sifianou, 2012; and Tannen & Kavaka, 1992) considered it as an act that enhances solidarity and group belonging.

The current researcher agrees with many recent studies which proved that this idea should be changed and that disagreement should no longer be perceived as a negatively marked act, but rather as a common phenomenon in human interaction (Bargiela-Chiappini and Harris, 1997; Xu, 2017). This is simply because even if people prefer to be co-operative and polite when communicating with others, they have different experiences and different viewpoints on the same thing; which means that disagreement is inevitable. Moreover, it should not be always regarded as a dispreferred response, especially in CMC as it is the place where people express their ideas and viewpoints freely. So, in CMC "disagreement is both likely and expected to happen" (Shum & Lee, 2013, P.55). That is to say, it can be a preferred response in argumentations where opponents are expected to defend their viewpoints. Consequently, it should not be examined in isolation, but rather it must be examined in relation to other factors such as culture

(Georgakopoulou, 2001) and context (Netz, 2014) as well as the topic of interaction (Harb, 2016).

These views have given rise to the introduction of new theories of politeness such as Watts (2003) and Locher & Watts, (2005). Watts (2003) referred to appropriate/polite behavior as politic. He defined politic behavior as “that behavior, linguistic or non-linguistic, which the participants construct as being appropriate to the ongoing social interaction” (p. 144). Accordingly, the traditional views of the classical theories of politeness (e.g., Lakoff, 1973; Leech, 1983; Brown and Levinson, 1987) which classify certain acts as intrinsically polite (e.g., complimenting) and other as intrinsically impolite (e.g., complaining) are no longer dominating (Watts, 2003; Culpeper, 2011). They should be (or might have already been) replaced by more dynamic views of interaction in which the participants decide on the appropriateness of their linguistic behavior. Shum and Lee (2013) argue that there seems to be apparent change in attitudes towards politeness. That is to say that direct and unmitigated disagreement seem to be generally considered as politic/appropriate. In fact, many recent studies have shown the non-inherent negativity of disagreement (e.g., Angouri & Locher, 2012, p.1549; Zhu, 2014, p. 87). By contrast, it is sometimes considered to be a preferred response or even the norm in some special contexts.

Harb (2016) seems to be in favour of the statement which says, ‘*Arabs have agreed to disagree.*’ He further explains that this statement is so deeply rooted in the minds of the speakers of the Arabic language. Although many Arab people may easily and strongly confirm this statement, I find my mind totally refusing it. One reason could be the fact that there are many other factors that should be taken into consideration, such as peoples’ interests, level of education, context and even personal traits, before confirming/denying such cultural sweeping generalizations. Another reason is that many studies should be conducted to build such conventions on scientific basis. He further stated that, the Arabic speakers express their disagreement “in manners that may be considered inappropriate, or perhaps too direct, if examined by an outside observer or through the lens of Western theories of politeness such as Brown and Levinson (1987). Such arguments highlight the urgent need of studying the act of disagreement in Arabic on a wider scale to discover the different variables that may govern how

disagreement acts are formed. Moreover, as far as the researcher knows, no attempts have been made to analyze the way Egyptians perform the act disagreement strategies in CMC. Therefore, this study aims to explore the structure as well as the pragmatic functions of the disagreement strategies used by Egyptians in CMC and also to examine the effect of the variable of topic on the choice of online disagreement strategies.

1.3 Research Questions

The current study will address the following questions:

1. How do Egyptian speakers express their disagreement in Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC), more specifically on Facebook, in their native language?
 - 1.1. What are the most commonly used disagreement strategies among Egyptian speakers?
 - 1.2. How are lexical choices and sentence structure made when expressing disagreement?
3. Does the topic affect the speakers' choices of disagreement strategies?

2. Theoretical framework

2.1. Towards a definition of disagreement:

Various definitions have been proposed for the speech act of disagreement. The first of these comes from Wierzbicka (1987) who defines it as an act in which the second speaker doesn't think the same as the earlier speaker'. Another definition comes from Kavaka (2002:1538), who claims that disagreement is "the negation of a stated or implied proposition". A relatively similar definition comes from Edstrom (2004), who states that disagreement is "the communication of an opinion or belief contrary to the view expressed by the previous speaker" (p. 1505). Another recent definition, which will be used in this study, is that of Harb (2016) who defines disagreement as "*the negated expression of a stated or implied proposition either partially or fully in oral or written communication.*" (p. 29). Though the current study employed Harb's (2016) definition, it should be stated that most of the previously mentioned definitions delve into the concept of expressing a viewpoint that is different from what the speaker in (Turn 1) T1 has already mentioned.

2.2. Data collection and corpus construction

The corpus of the study is extracted from the social networking site Facebook (<https://www.facebook.com>). Facebook was particularly chosen for the following reasons: (1) it is one of the most widely used social networking sites in Egypt, (2) it allows users to post, comment and reply to prior comments, (3) Facebook is accessible through mobile phones, which increases the possibility of collecting data coming from a wide array of people.

The data was basically taken from public pages or groups in which the researcher is a member. For ethical purposes only public pages or groups were used to collect the data. Also, care was taken to choose data from pages and groups that are visible to everyone on the internet. Different discussion topics were selected for identifying disagreement instances. The corpus is not an extensive one, but it allows insight into how Egyptians express their disagreement in their mother tongue.

The selection of posts was determined by two major features: (1) The nature of the topic. Care was taken to choose two types of topics. That is, either social topics that reflect the opinion of the poster or economic topics that have do with the prices of different products/services. (2) The number of replies and comments accumulated. Only posts that attracted over a hundred responses were selected. To collect the required amount of data, the researcher frequently browsed many public groups/pages during the period of 2020 to 2021, read through the postings, and chose the postings that triggered a greater number disagreeing comments.

After excluding many posts because they didn't trigger the required number of responses, the decision was taken to include responses coming from only four posts; two social posts and two economic ones. For ease of reference each post of the four posts was given a number and a short title. (For a complete list of the posts (T1s) and samples the disagreeing comments (T2s), see appendices 1, & 2)

It should be mentioned here that the researcher did not post or comment on any of these pages/groups. Next, the responses were tagged for name of the writer (only for ease of reference). The posts and all the comments on them were then moved to a Microsoft word document.

2.3. Procedures of analysis

After obtaining the data, the researcher excluded irrelevant/unneeded data. That is, all names, comments that showed agreement or the ones that were written in different dialects (Syrian etc) as well as the irrelevant T2 responses were deleted. Emojis were also eliminated from the analysis. Only disagreement responses coming from Egyptian posters were included. To guarantee that the poster is Egyptian (If the country of the poster/ commenter is not publicly indicated on his page) several clues were used. Among them are the following: (1) The location of the Facebook page/group. (2) The poster's page info such education, job, place of living, place of studying, list of friends and the like. (3) The dialect of the poster's reply (T2). (4) The researcher's intuition as a native speaker of Egyptian Arabic. Instances in which the clues indicated a different nationality or where no clues could have been identified were excluded from the analysis. After that, posters' responses were coded, categorized, and disagreement strategies were identified according to the taxonomy used in this study. The obtained instances of disagreement were analyzed qualitatively, supported by descriptive statistical analysis.

2.4 Identification of disagreement strategies

This study builds on previous research (e.g. Harb, 2016; Muntigl & Turnbull, 1998; Schiffrin, 1984; Shum & Lee, 2013) which showed that disagreement - or the so-called arguing exchanges- consist of a minimum of three turns. That is speaker A making a claim in Turn 1(T1). This claim is opposed by speaker B in Turn 2(T2), then in T3, speaker A mostly disagrees with speaker B T2 either by asserting T1 or by disputing T2. The analysis of the study focused on T2 as it contains the act of disagreement. In this study, T1 was always the original post. The comments received from other members constituted T2. Due to the fact that the poster, in some cases, did not produce a T3 response (T3s were relatively few) or that they kept arguing for several Turns, the researcher decided to exclude all T3 examples from the study. Thus, only T2 utterances were analyzed in this study. Moreover, T2 is usually considered the most significant part as it is the part that represents acts of disagreement (Harb, 2016; Muntigl & Turnbull, 1998).

In order to classify disagreement strategies, the researcher reviewed the available disagreement strategies classifications (e.g. Goodwin, 1983; Harb, 2016; Locher, 2004; Muntigl & Turnbull, 1998;

Rees-Miller, 2000; Shum & Lee, 2013). Of these, both classifications of Muntigl and Turnbull (1998) and Harb (2016) were chosen as a basis for a new taxonomy that is used in this study. These two taxonomies were particularly selected for several reasons. Firstly, the taxonomy of Muntigl and Turnbull (1998) can be considered the most elaborate analytical scheme for analyzing disagreement (Harb, 2016). Secondly and more importantly, these taxonomies suit the nature of the study as this taxonomy examined the structural and pragmatic characteristics of disagreement which is the aim of the current study. Thirdly, unlike other taxonomies (e.g., Shum & Lee 2013) overlaps are not found among most of the strategies used in these two taxonomies. In other words, disagreement strategies in the chosen taxonomies were clearly identified by the authors.

To facilitate the identification process and due to the fact that the researcher found new strategies that did not exist in previous taxonomies, a list of disagreement strategies relevant to CMC was proposed based on previous taxonomies. The strategies that were selected for data analysis as well as the corresponding description are summarized below:

(1) Irrelevancy Claim (IC): IC means that the claim is not valid or is sometimes irrelevant to the discussion at hand.

E.g. T1 C: Yes, it should be such a big deal because I'm moving in this week

T2 D: so what? (Muntigl & Turnbull, 1998, p.229)

(2) Challenge (CH): In challenge, the speaker questions the addressee's claim and demands that the addressee provides evidence for his/her claim(s). The challenge is mostly in the fact that the addressee cannot provide evidence for his/her claim. Challenges typically appear in an interrogative form with question particles such as 'when, where, and who'.

E.g., T2: Ah wait, ah, when was that?

(Muntigl & Turnbull, 1998, 230).

(3) Contradiction (CT): It means negating the proposition expressed by the previous claim. CTs are mostly expressed with particles such as no or not. The main idea here is stating the opposite

claim using different forms like “No”, or “What you say is totally wrong”.

E.g., T1: It is not necessary to go out at the weekend.

T2: No, it is necessary.

In Arabic, the CT were expressed by words such as “لا”, “كلام خطأ”, “كلام غير صحيح”-

(4) Counter Claim (CC): The speaker disagrees by providing an alternative claim that does not necessarily contradict or challenge the proposition expressed by previous speaker. That is to say that a CC does not have to be only the opposite of T1, but it could be a new suggestion or treating the issue from a different angle. It is sometimes a polite innovative idea. (Muntigl & Turnbull, 1998, 231-132).

E.g. T1 الوفا فالزمن هذا حكي فاضي

‘Loyalty these days is pointless.’

T2: الوفا قل بهذا الزمن لان المادة طغت علينا ولكنه موجود أخالفك الرأي

‘Loyalty has decreased these days because materialism [money] has overwhelmed us, but it [loyalty] still exists [-] I disagree with you.’

(Harb, 172)

(5) Verbal Attack (AV): VA refers to using taboo words or abusive language as the main utterance where no other strategy is selected.

E.g. T1 الإعجاز العلمي في القرآن كلام فارغ

‘The scientific miracles in the Qur’an are empty talk.’

T2: فعلاً انك يهودي صهيوني خنزير

‘Truly you are a Zionist, a Jew, and a pig.’

(Harb, 174).

(6) Verbal Irony (VI): It can be described as an expression of sarcasm, ironic statement or criticism. When using this strategy, the speaker in T2 sometimes gives a masquerading agreement, yet people can easily understand that he is implying the opposite of agreement.

e.g. T1 لا يوجد معتقلون أو تعذيب في السجون

‘There are no prisoners or torture in prisons.’

T2: أصلاً احنا البلد الوحيدة اللي مش فيها سجون

‘Indeed, we are the only country that does not have prisons.’

(Harb, 2016, p.177)

(7) Religious Expressions (REs): This is a culture-specific strategy in which disagreement is articulated through the use of all kinds of religious words that indicate disapproval of the proposition in T1 such as referring to Hadith, verses from the Holy Quran to prove the falsity of T1. Supplications against the writer of T1 were also classified under this category. It should be noted that a relatively similar strategy was used in (Harb, 2016), termed as supplications. However, the current researcher found expressions other than supplications. For this reason and due to the existence of different forms of religious expressions in the data, it was decided to use the term religious expressions as it is considered to be an umbrella term that can be used to cover a wide array of expressions. Following are some examples of REs:

حسبي الله ونعم الوكيل-

'Allah is Sufficient, and He is the best dependable'.

لا حول ولا قوة إلا بالله

'There is no power or might except in Allah'.

ربنا ينتقم منك

'May Allah take revenge on you'.

(8) Exclamation: In exclamations speakers express their surprise or astonishment to a prior statement to cast doubts on the truth value of T1 claim.

E.g. T1: 'Cases of harassment in the Arabic countries are on the rise.'

T2: 'من أغرب ما سمعت!'

'This is the strangest I have ever heard.'

(Harb, 186).

(9) Threat (Th): This strategy was not mentioned in any of the previous taxonomies. It appeared only in the economic posts and revolves around showing disagreement through using a warning or, more specifically, a threat to indicate that certain bad consequences or determined actions will be the result of T1's post.

E.g. T1: The government is going to raise the price of bread.

T2: إياكم و ثورة الجوع

'Be aware of hunger protests'.

(Current study)

(10) Mild Scolding (MS): In mild scolding speakers express the faultiness or erroneousness of T1 proposition through using words that show that the prior statement is a violation of the socially or religiously agreed-upon rules. It is mostly manifested in using words such as “shame” or “عيب. حرام” in Arabic. (Harb, 2016, 189)

(11) Argument Avoidance (AA): In argument avoidance speakers in T2 openly indicate that they will deliberately refrain from commenting. It “encodes dissatisfaction with a prior claim” such as ‘لا تعليق’, ‘No comment’. (Harb, 2016, 191)

(12) Act Combination: As the name denotes the speaker disagrees by producing more than one of the previously mentioned strategies. (Muntigl & Turnbull, 1998, p.233-234).

3. Findings

This section presents a quantitative and a qualitative analysis of the data collected for the study. It starts with Table 1 that shows the total frequency and percentage of each strategy in each of the topic under investigation as well as the sum and percentage of each strategy in the two topics. After that, each strategy is explained in detail and examples are given.

Table 1 Distribution of pragmatic strategies of disagreement

	disagreement strategies	Social topic		Economic topic		Total	
		Number of acts	Percentage ^a	Number of acts	Percentage ^a	Number of acts	Percentage ^a
1	Counterclaim (CC)	101	19.7%	33	6.4%	134	26.2%
2	Religious expression (RE)	4	0.8%	70	13.6%	74	14.4%
3	Contradiction (CT)	15	3.0%	38	7.4%	53	10.3%
4	Verbal Attack (VA)	14	2.7%	25	4.9%	39	7.6%
5	Challenge (CH)	4	0.8%	34	6.6%	38	7.4%
6	Verbal Irony (VI)	12	2.3%	24	4.7%	36	7.01%
7	Irrelevancy Claim (IC)	15	3.0%	1	0.2%	16	3.1%
8	Exclamation (EX)	9	1.7%	2	0.4%	11	2.1%
9	Mild Scolding (MS)	·		9	1.75%	9	1.75%
10	Threat (TH)	0		7	1.4%	7	1.4%
11	Argument Avoidance (AA)	2	0.4%	2	0.4%	4	0.8%
12	Act Combination (AC)	80	15.6%	12	2.3%	92	18.0%
	Total	256	50%	257	50%	513	100%

^aPercentage is to the total number of disagreements acts.

Egyptians used various strategies to express disagreement. A total number of 513 responses (excluding agreeing comments) were analyzed. These responses were collected from four posts: two social posts and two economic posts. Interestingly enough, the two social posts had almost the same number of responses (256) as those of the economic posts (257). The responses were classified according to the 12 types of disagreement strategies indicated in section (4.3). The results show that while counterclaims were the most frequent strategy in the social topics, religious expressions were the most recurrent in the economic topics. This is evident in Table 1 which seems to suggest that the topic of the post might probably be an important variable in choosing the disagreement strategy.

It is also noted that the 12 types of disagreement strategies were framed in different ways and characterized by the use of different linguistic devices or sometimes associated with the Egyptian cultural norms. Following is a detailed description of each strategy supported by illustrative examples from the data. The strategies are presented according to their frequency of occurrences (in each topic) from highest

to lowest, except for act combination as this category/ strategy will be discussed at the end of each section.

3.1 Counterclaim (CC)

This strategy means that the speaker in T2 suggests another claim, not necessarily the opposite of the one suggested in T1, but it is usually a rather different claim. Unlike Harb (2016), who stated that CT is the most frequently used strategy of disagreement among Arabic speakers, this study found out that the frequency of strategies varied according to the **topic** among Egyptian speakers. In other words, the results of the current study showed the "topic" of the post is the main variable that controls the frequency of occurrence of each disagreement strategy. In social topics, for example, it was found that the most frequently used strategy of disagreement is that of counterclaim (CC).

Table 2: Frequency and Distribution of CCs in the two corpora

Topic	Frequency	Percentage
Social	101	19.7%
Economic	33	6.4%
Total	134	26.2%

As Table 2 suggests CCs had an overall frequency of 134, representing 26.2% of the data. However, it was much more frequent in the social topics (101) than in the economic ones (33). The reason for the high frequency of using CC could be the fact that social topics usually reflect the viewpoint of the sender and those who disagree try to prove the falsity of such viewpoints by providing another claim, that they believe to be true, to change the mindset of the speaker or refute it. That is to say that CCs, unlike CTs, are mostly meant to reject the content and attack the rationality of the claim which could probably be an affective disagreement strategy in social topics. The economic posts, on the other hand, didn't necessarily reflect the sender's viewpoint but mostly stated facts or things happening like an increase in prices. Consequently,

providing another claim might not probably be the most successful disagreement strategy in this case. That could be the reason for using CC less frequently in the economic data than in the social data. Following are the examples.

Example (1) Social post No.1: Fulltime-Kindergarten (appendix 1a)

T2(1)	<p>كفاية اقتصار حب الأم والأب على قبلات وأحضان ، تحقيق الأمور المادية في حد ذاته حب</p> <p>Stop limiting Parent's love to kissing and hugging. Gaining money (for children) is itself a kind of love.</p>
T2(٢)	<p>طب وايه المشكلة ان ابني يوديني دار مسنين ده هيبقى أحسن لي كمان عشان اشوف ناس واتكلم مع ناس من سني وببشاركوني نفس الاهتمامات ولا ايه؟</p> <p>What's the problem if my son sends me to an elderly house? I think it is better. There, I can see and talk with people who have same interests as me.</p>
T2(3)	<p>بس المشكلة ان جيل الأمهات اللي بنشوفهم في دار المسنين حالياً، كلهم كانوا سنات بيوت</p> <p>The problem is that the mothers who are in old people's homes these days were all housewives.</p>

Example (2) Economic post No.1: Bread Price (appendix 2a)

T2(1)	<p>شيل الدعم خالص وصلح المرتبات.</p> <p>Remove the subsidy and give us fair salaries.</p>
T2(٢)	<p>لماذا لا يتم استبعاد أصحاب الدخول العالية من الدعم مثل العاملين في البنوك والكهرباء والبترول والرتب العليا في الجيش والشرطة وهذا سيوفر على الدولة مبالغ مالية طائلة وشكراً؟</p> <p>Why don't you exclude those who receive high income from the subsidy such as those who work in banks, electricity or petrol companies as well as those who have high positions in the army and police? This will save a lot of money to our country, thanks.</p>

T2(3)	<p>احنا نشتغل بدون مرتبات بس الحكومة تتكفل بأكلنا وشرابنا وكهربتنا وكل حاجه ومش عاوزين فلوس.</p> <p>We can work without salaries, but the government take the responsibilities of food, water, electricity and everything.</p>
-------	---

In examples (1) & (2) above, care was taken to choose T2s that used different structures. More specifically, T2 (1), T2 (2) and T2 (3) occurred in imperative, interrogative and declarative structures in the two examples respectively. Such variations in sentences structures lend support to previous studies (Harb, 2016; Sadock & Zwicky, 1985; Searle, 1979) that there is no one to one correspondence between form and function and that the context plays a very important role in stating the pragmatic meaning of any utterance.

One more thing that was noticed during the analysis of CCs is that most of T2s in the social posts were relatively longer than their counterparts in the economic posts and usually take several turns. A plausible explanation could be the fact that in social posts the speaker tries to change the mindset of the sender, which not an easy task. It requires arguing to convince the listener with the speaker's viewpoint; unlike the economic posts which has to do with economic decisions and probably has nothing to do with changing the mindset of the speaker. Moreover, the current study agrees with (Harb, 2016) that CCs are generally "expansive". That is, they allow for further negotiation/explanation of the claims introduced in T1. This is logical as CCs sometimes introduce different ideas and consequently, they need room to discuss such diversity of opinions.

3.2 Religious Expressions (RE)

Table 3: Frequency and distribution of REs in the two corpora

Topic	Frequency	Percentage
Social	4	0.8%
Economic	70	13.6%
Total	74	14.4%

As Table 3 shows, religious expressions were the second most frequent strategy employed by Egyptian speakers. Interestingly enough, they were much more frequent in the economic data (70) than in the social data (4 successively). Religious expressions refer to using certain expressions to show disapproval or dissatisfaction with T1's claim. In this strategy Egyptians basically used expressions known as "Hawqala", "Hasbana" or "supplications against T1 post". Hawqala is an acronym for the statement "لا حول ولا قوة إلا بالله" which literally means there is no power or might except in Allah. As for Hasbana, it is an acronym for another statement which is "حسبي الله ونعم الوكيل" in Arabic. The Hasbana can be, roughly, translated as "Allah is sufficient, and he is the best dependable. Following are examples of REs.

Example (3) Social Post No. 2: Two types of women (appendix 1b)

T2(1)	حسبنا الله ونعم الوكيل. دا خراب بيوت مش بوست هزار Allah is sufficient, and he is the best dependable. What you say ruins homes not a joking post.
T2(٢)	ربنا يطف بالعباد May Allah be kind to people
T2(3)	اللهم إني أعوذ بك من العجز والكسل الحركة بركه واليد البطالة نجسة May Allah protect us from inability and laziness. Movement is a blessing, and an idle hand is impure
T2(4)	ربنا يخرّب بيتك May Allah ruin your house

Example (4) Economic post No.1: Electricity consumption (appendix 2b)

T2(1)	قوة إلا بالله العلي العظيم لا حول ولا There is no power or might except in Allah.
T2(٢)	يا رب كل اللي يشوف البوست ده ومايقولش الحق ربنا يجحمه . May Allah torture anyone who sees this post and doesn't say the truth.
T2(3)	ربنا يتولانا برحمته May Allah have mercy on us.
T2(4)	ولا تسلط علينا من لا يخافك ولا يخشاك ولا يرحمنا. استغفر الله O, Allah please do not impose over us someone who neither fears nor dreads you, or who does not have mercy on us. I ask your forgiveness.

It should be noted here that use of religious expressions to imply disagreement revolves around the use of expressions that show disapproval. Previous studies have shown that religious expression is a culturally specific strategy that could be used to perform different pragmatic functions in the Egyptian society such as thanking (Gabr, 1991), advice (Hosni, 2021) and also complimenting (Mazid, 1995). Moreover, it is deeply rooted in the minds of many Egyptians and probably in the minds of most Muslims that one way to change things they refuse is to supplicate to Allah. This belief could have probably led them to use such religious expressions. Another reason could probably be that they feel helpless to stop the rise in prices, so they resort to Allah. Finding out the reasons for which Egyptians use religious expressions to perform the act of disagreement or probably any other act is a huge task beyond the scope of this study. It requires a separate study as there might be a lot of cultural/ social reasons. However, the fact that remains is that cultural identity of the speakers is projected through their responses.

3.3. Contradiction (CT)

Table 4: Frequency and distribution of CTs in the two corpora

Topic	Frequency	Percentage
Social	15	3.0%
Economic	38	7.4%
Total	53	103%

Contradiction is mostly achieved through negating T1 proposition. CTs are considered to be highly confrontational (Harb, 2016; Muntigl & Turnbull, 1998), as they cause face loss to the sender and imply superiority over T1 post. CT came third in terms of frequency of occurrence of disagreement strategies. Like REs, CTs were highly more frequent in the economic corpus (38) than in the social one (15). Similar to Harb (2016), the current study found that CTs were not only realized through negating T1's proposition but rather through several forms or sub-strategies including but not limited to the following:

- (1) The flat "no": E.g. (لا).
- (2) Negated statement: E.g. "ليس صحيح"، "غير صحيح"، "ما ينفعش" roughly translated as (not correct).
- (3) Negative evaluative adjectives: E.g. "كلام فارغ"، "كلام غير"، "موزون"، "كلام سخيف" roughly translated as "nonsense".

Example (5) Social Post No. 2: Two types of women (appendix 2b)

T2(1)	كلام غير موزونBiased speech.
T2(٢)	لا طبعا كلام غير صحيح.No, of course that is not true.
T2(3)	كلام غلط ١٠٠%What you say is wrong 100%.
T2(4)	مش من حقا تقول كلام زي دهYou don't have the right to say words as such.

Example (6) Economic post No.1: Bread Price (appendix 2a)

T2(1)	ماينفعش طبعا نزيل الدعمOf course, we can't remove the (financial) support.
-------	--

T2(٢)	لا مساس برغيف العيش Bread price shouldn't be touched(changed)
-------	--

The fact that CTs were much more frequent in the economic posts than in the social ones could be relegated to the nature of the posts which, the researcher believes, is the main force in determining the strategies used to show disagreement. To illustrate, it should be noted that while most T2 responses in social posts oriented towards convincing the poster of T2 opinion, CTs, on the other hand, are oriented towards closing the discussion rather than convincing others, which could probably be more suitable to the nature of economic posts. This finding agrees with Harb (2016) that "CTs are contractive, for they directly deny a prior claim and fail to provide alternatives in the context of established disagreement" p. 169. Giving CTs, unlike CC, is a matter of just rejecting the content without attacking the rationality of the topic under discussion.

It should be noted here that there is inherent face damage in the CT acts. They are highly confrontational and imply the speaker superiority over T1 post. That is, not only do they reject the value of T1 post, but they also attack the poster as being unable to think properly and to make a sound claim. They might probably be interpreted by some people as containing a kind of indirect insult to the poster's mentality and way of thinking.

3.4. Verbal Attack:

Table 3: Frequency and distribution of VAs in the two corpora

Topic	Frequency	Percentage
Social	14	2.7%
Economic	25	4.9%
Total	39	7.6%

The fifth strategy is that of verbal attack. All the T2 acts that caused face damage, i.e those that damage either positive face wants or negative face wants, were considered VAs. VA was counted only if the entire post consisted of obnoxious language or taboo words. Otherwise,

If VA was used as a supportive move that complements the head act, it was considered to be part of act combination; that will be discussed later (see section 5.12). VA had a frequency of 39 occurrences, constituting about 7.6% of the data. Most of the VA category occurred in the economic posts than in the social ones (4.9% to 2.7% respectively). This lends some support to Harb (2016), who stated that the social topics had the lowest number of VAs. The findings of the current study also agree with previous studies (e.g. Angouri & Tseliga, 2010; Harb, 2016; Locher, 2004; Shum & lee 2013) that the anonymity of CMC is probably the major reason for using such impolite expressions. It should be noted that this study, unlike that of Mutingl and Turnbull (1997) which considered IC to be the most aggravating strategy, agrees with Harb 2016 in describing AV as the most aggravating strategy. Following are examples extracted from the data.

Example (7) Social post No.1: Fulltime-Kindergarten (appendix 1a)

T2(1)	عين الجهل والغباء والعقوق Real ignorance, stupidity, and impiety.
T2(٢)	وادي إنسانة سفيهة مريضة عقلياً This is an impertinent and mentally ill person.

Example (8) Economic post No.1: Bread Price (appendix 2a)

T2(1)	شوية حرامية A group of thieves
T2(٢)	إدارة فاشلة Failure in management

The responses in Examples (7) and (8) above only consist of offensive language. It describes the poster as a stupid impertinent person or as a mentally ill person (Example (7) T2 (1) & T2 (2) respectively. As for Example (8), T2 (1) accuses the people who are in charge to be a group of thieves and T2 (2) describes administration as a failure.

3.5. Challenge

Table 6: Frequency and distribution of CH in the two corpora

Topic	Frequency	Percentage
Social	4	0.8%
Economic	34	6.6%
Total	48	7.4%

Challenge was the fifth most frequently occurring disagreement strategy that Egyptians used in voicing their online disagreement. It is often realized through the use of interrogatives that challenge the original claim in T1. It is mostly used to cast doubts about T1 or prove the falsity of T1's claim through asking questions that show how erroneous the claim is. The results of the study show that it is highly more frequent as a disagreement strategy in the economic posts (6.6%) than in the social ones (0.8%).

Example (9) Social post No.1: Fulltime-Kindergarten (appendix 1a)

T2(1)	<p>هو ايه هو ايه المشكلة اننا لما نكبر نروح طوعا لدار مسنين يعني؟ ايه العيب في دار المسنين أصلا؟ Why don't we go to elderly houses willingly when we become aged? What's the problem with that?</p>
T2(٢)	<p>ومين قال ان لما تتفرغ تماماً ليه مش هيكبر ويوديها دار مسنين؟ What if she gave him all her time and then when he grows up he sends her to an elderly house?</p>

As we can see in example (9) above, the speaker in T2 (1) tries to show the T1's claim is erroneous and that there is no problem in joining elderly houses willingly. Another poster in T2(2) challenges T1's claim showing that even if the mother dedicated all her time to her kids there is no guarantee that s/he won't send her to an elderly house.

Example (10) Economic post No.1: Bread Price (appendix 2a)

T2(1)	<p>ازاي تكلفته ٦٥ قرش والافضل منه بيتباع برا ب ٥٠ قرش؟ How come that it costs 65 piasters and a better one is sold for 50 piasters in other stores?</p>
-------	---

T2(2)	يعني الرغيف الي بيتباع فالافران الخاصة بـ ٥ قرش ده اصحاب الافران بيخسرو فيه؟ Does this mean that the owners of other bakeries stores lose money?
T2(3)	مش من حقتك تقول كلام زي ده You don't have the right to say things like that.

The same applies to T 2 (1) in example (10) above as the poster here tries to challenge T1's claim by stating that a better kind of bread is sold for less. T2 (2) also challenges T1 by asking whether those who sell bread for less lose money.

The challenge sometimes came in the form of a rhetorical question that doesn't need an answer but shows the invalidity T1 claim. Rhetorical questions are considered separate strategies in some studies (e.g. Shum and Lee, 2013) but they are considered a subcategory of challenge in this study for two reasons. First, because they were not frequent in the data of the current study. The second reason is that they are not real questions. They are meant to challenge T1's post. Thus, the current researcher believes that, on the functional level, they act as challenge.

Although challenge is considered by Muntigl and Turnbull (1997) as one of the most aggravating disagreement strategies in face-to-face communication, it is doesn't seem to be equally aggravating in CMC. Harb (2016), for example, states that it is "culturally appropriate to voice disagreement via the use of CHs, as a high value is placed upon the act of questioning for it creates a sense of involvement" p. 182. Arabs, in this respect, might probably seem to be similar to Jewish speakers (Schiffrin, 1984) or Greek speakers (Tannen & Kavaka, 1992) in that they may tend to voice their disagreements through confrontational ways including questioning.

3.6. Verbal Irony

Table 7: Frequency and distribution of VI in the two coropra

Topic	Frequency	Percentage
Social	12	2.3%
Economic	24	4.7%
Total	36	7.01%

The sixth most used strategy by Egyptian speakers was invested in the use of verbal irony. Following Harb (2016), verbal irony in the current study included sarcasm, criticism, humorous notes as well as sarcastic agreement. No attempts were made to distinguish between them as it is a task beyond the scope of this study. VI was more frequent (almost double) in the economic than in the social topics. Following are some examples.

Example (11) Social post No.1: Fulltime-Kindergarten (appendix 1a)

T2(1)	هي مخدنتش بالها و قعدت ع الكيبورد تقريبا. It seems that she sat on the keyboard by mistake.
T2(٢)	مين اللي سمحك تطرطشي القرف ده ع الفيسبوك... ما فيه حمامات للبي بي؟ Who gave you permission to put this shit on Facebook? Are there no bathrooms for this?
T2(3)	متشتغلوش يا بنات، خليك ف بيتكم بين اربع حيطان اكنسوا وامسحوا ونضيفوا وارمي نفسك ونفسيك علي جنب عشان الاطفال متروحش حضانه. Don't have a career, girls. Stay at home just sweep, mop, clean up and throw yourself and your feelings away just because you shouldn't send your kids to kindergartens.

As the above examples show VI, or what could be more specifically called humorous notes, mostly emanates from flouting the Grecian maxims. The speaker in T2 (1) implicates that post is nonsense. Humor here emanates from flouting the maxim of relevance as the answer doesn't seem relevant to T1. It requires working out to understand the meaning. As for T2 (2) humor emanates from using dysphemism. That is, the poster here used derogatory or unpleasant terms. He likens what is written to peeing. The poster here uses metaphor as a vehicle of humour. He likens what the poster has written in T1 to peeing that should be done in bathrooms only not on Facebook. The point of similarity or the ground here is that both are dirty. It also seems to flout the maxims of quality and probably that of relevance to generate the implicature that what is written in T1's post is rubbish. In T2 (3) humour is generated through violating the maxim of quality as the speaker's intended meaning is the exact opposite of what was explicitly stated. It is also important to note here that

example 11 above lends support to the fact that there is no one to one correspondence between form and function. Though the three T2 responses above differ in form (the first is declarative, the second is interrogative and the third is imperative, respectively) all of them perform the function of disagreement. It also highlights the importance of understanding the context to reach the pragmatic meaning.

**Example (12) Economic post No.1: Electricity consumption
(appendix 2b)**

T2(1)	اهم شيء تكون هذه الزيادة تصب في مصلحة المواطن The most important thing is that this increase is for the citizen's benefit.
T2(٢)	اداره رائعة للازمة Wonderful crisis management
T2(3)	حقك زود اللي انت عاوزة وحاسينا على الاكسجين اللي بنتنفسه كمان It's your right, raise the prices of whatever you want, including even the oxygen we breathe.

Similarly, example (12) above shows that VI in T2 (1) emanates from flouting the maxim of quality as the speaker knows that this increase is not in the benefit of citizens. Actually, raising prices of amenities is, definitely, an extra burden, so it is not in the benefit of citizens. However, s/he sarcastically claims that the most important point is the fact that this increase is for the benefit of citizens. The speaker intentionally flouts the maxim of quality so that the reader generates an implicature of the exact opposite of T2 (1)'s post. The same applies to T2 (2) and T2 (3) above as both posts flout the maxim of quality to implicate meaning that is contrary to their direct meaning. In T2 (2) the poster claims that it is "wonderful crisis management", but s/he means that it is failure in crisis management. VI here also emanates from exaggeration which is meant to create a negative meaning, which is, the opposite of the literally stated meaning. The poster in T2(3) even goes to the extreme by giving people in authority the right to raise prices of whatever they want. The poster also adds that citizens should also

pay for the oxygen they breathe. This statement cannot be taken as true because people do not pay for the oxygen they breathe in any country. Sarcastically, s/he means that citizens already pay a lot and it is not fair to add extra burdens.

3.7. Irrelevancy claim

Table 8: Frequency and distribution of IC in the two corpora

Topic	Frequency	Percentage
Social	15	3.0%
Economic	1	0.2%
Total	16	3.1%

IC came seventh in terms of frequency of occurrence of disagreement strategies. As seen in Table 8 above, they are more frequent in the social topics (15) than in the economic ones. IC occurs when T2 posters disagree by dismissing or rejecting T1 proposition. It is usually manifested in disdaining the importance of T1's claim. It is mostly manifested in the data of this study through using declarative sentences; usually starting with expressions such as المهم (what is important is ...), مش مهم (It is not important...), أهم شيء (The most important thing is).

Example (13) Social Post No. 2: Two types of women (appendix 1b)

T2(1)	المهم عندي مش كلمة شاطره المهم اني عطيت وقتي لأولادي وبיתי What is important for me isn't the word clever. What is important for me is that I gave my time to my kids and my house
T2(2)	المهم ان الواحد يعامل ربنا صح وميكنش مقصر في حاجه What is important is that I treat Allah and that I do my best.

The speakers in all T2 examples above disdain T1's claim by showing that what is important is doing things in the right way not having titles such as "clever or not clever". This way the speaker in T2 dismisses or reduces the importance of T1's claim and invites the original poster to rethink about his/her proposition and may be to adopt another perspective. Having only one response using IC in

economic posts (as indicated in table 8) could be due to the fact that when it comes to economic topics especially the topics discussed here (prices) very few people consider it to be something irrelevant or unimportant.

Though ICs were considered by some linguists as the most aggravating disagreement strategy (Muntigl & Turnbull 1998; Langlotz & Locher, 2012), the current researcher believes that this could be the case in face-to-face communication and between people who know each other, as it boldly threatens negative face wants leaving the speaker feeling that his contribution might be trivial or not important. However, when it comes to CMC, ICs are not considered highly aggravating as they are in face-to-face communication. They are rather considered as a suggestion or invitation to rethink about the proposition by providing an alternative perspective to the issue at hand.

3.8. Exclamation

Table 9: Frequency and distribution of EX in the two corpora

Topic	Frequency	Percentage
Social	9	1.7%
Economic	2	0.4%
Total	11	2.1%

The eighth most common strategy in performing disagreement is that of exclamation. It constituted only 2.1% with 11 occurrences. Exs were more frequent in the social (9) than in the economic topic (2). Exclamation seldom occurred as the main act. They were usually part of act combination. In exclamations, the speakers usually express their astonishment as a way of showing the irrationality of T1. Exclamation in this study were written in colloquial Arabic. It was identified according to the use of appropriate punctuation marks (exclamation marks) as well as the meaning.

(Example (14) Social post No.1: Fulltime-Kindergarten (appendix 1a)

T2(1)	في ١٦ ألف بني ادم عاجبهم الكلام دا!!! معقول!!! 16000 human being liked this post!! is this reasonable!!
-------	--

Example (15) Economic post No.1: Bread Price (appendix 2a)

T2(1)	حتى اللؤمه هيحسبوها علينا!!! They will even count the piece of bread we eat!!!
-------	---

In example (14) the speaker says “16000 human beings like this post!” The speaker tries to show his\her astonishment because there are many people (16000) who liked T1’s post. As for example (15), the speaker is showing his\her exclamation that the government wants to raise the prices of the bread saying that “even the bread” implicating that the prices of almost everything are getting higher and showing astonishment they should-at least- leave the bread price as is.

3.9. Mild Scolding

Table 10: Frequency and distribution of MS in the two corpora

Topic	Frequency	Percentage
Social	0	0%
Economic	9	1.8%
Total	9	1.8%

Mild scolding came ninth in terms of frequency of occurrences, constituting only 1.8% of the data. Interestingly enough, it appeared only in the economic topics. Mild scolding was first used by Harb (2016) to refer to what he termed “politic” ways to express disagreement. According to Harb such expressions “do not constitute serious infringement to Arabic speakers” (p. 187). They include Arabic words like عيب “shame” or حرام “roughly translated as unethical or prohibited”. These words are usually used to show disagreement but in a rather polite way. They are usually accepted by Egyptians and mostly considered slightly face threatening acts.

Example (16) Economic post No.1: Bread Price (appendix 2a)

T2(1)	هذا حرام، حرام والـف مليون حرام This is Haraam, Haraam and thousand millions Haraam.
T2(٢)	عيب واللهى علينا لما نتكلم في زياده رغيـف العيش اللى مبيكلوهشى الا الغلبان والبسيط دا لو طاله Shame on us, I swear, we talk about bread which is usually eaten by poor people if they could obtain it.

The speaker in T2 (1) above expresses disagreement using the word "حرام" which means prohibited by God and repeats it several times to show emphasis. As for T2 (2), the speaker uses the word "عيب" which is very common word in colloquial Arabic meaning shame. It can be safely said that both words are culturally specific as they only appeared in studies investigating disagreement in Arabic (e.g. Harb, 2016) and were not used in studies that investigate disagreement in other languages.

3.10. Threat

Table 12: Frequency and distribution of TH in the two corpora

Topic	Frequency	Percentage
Social	0	0%
Economic	7	1.4
Total	7	1.4

A rather less frequent strategy that appeared in the economic topics only is that of using threat to voice disagreement. It was the tenth commonly used strategy with an overall frequency of only 7 occurrences, constituting 1.4% of all strategies employed in the study. This strategy, as far as the researcher knows, was not cataloged in any of the previous disagreement taxonomies. The poster in this strategy usually expresses disagreement through indicating certain bad consequences or determined actions that might be the result of T1's post. Following are the examples:

Example (17) Economic post No.1: Bread Price (appendix 2a)

T2(1)	كله إلا رغيف العيش هتتطريق على دماغ الكل Bread is a red line; the consequences will be catastrophic.
T2(٢)	إذا قربتوا من رغيف العيش هتزعلوا من رد فعل الشعب الغلابة If you raise the bread price, the reaction of poor people will be disastrous

The speaker in T2 (1) threatens the poster, or probably the government, stating that bread is a red line for Egyptians. So, if they increase its price the consequences will be catastrophic for everybody.

Example (18) Economic post No.1: Electricity consumption (appendix 2b)

T2(1)	إذا استمر الغلا بالشكل دة الناس هتسرق الكهرباء If prices continue to raise this way, people will steal electricity.
-------	--

Similarly, the speaker in example 19 above threatens the government of the bad consequences that might happen if they raise the prices of electricity. S/he claims that if the government continues to raise the prices people will get electricity through illegal ways.

3.11. Argument Avoidance (AA)

Table 11: Frequency and distribution of AA in the two corpora

Topic	Frequency	Percentage
Social	2	0.4%
Economic	2	0.4%
Total	4	0.8%

The least frequent strategy that Egyptians used to voice disagreement is that of AA. AAs had an overall frequency of 4 occurrences, constituting only 0.8% of the all identified disagreement strategies (513). In this strategy, posters expressed their disagreements using expressions like “لا تعليق” “No comments” or “nothing to say”. They deliberately indicate that they choose to refrain from commenting.

Example (19) Economic post No.1: Electricity consumption (appendix 2b)

T2(1)	مش لاقى كلام اقوله Can't find words
T2(٢)	لا تعليق No comment

In example (19) above, the poster in T2 (1) directly states that s/he ‘can’t find words’ to show dissatisfaction and disagreement with the T1’s post regarding increasing the prices of electricity. Similarly, the poster in T2 (2) replies by sharing the statement “No comment”. Argument avoidance or message abandonment or the elsewhere described as silence could be used to perform different types of illocutionary acts such as questioning, disagreeing, promising, denying, warning, threatening, insulting as well as other types of illocutionary forces depending on the context (Saville-Troike, 1985; Al-harabsheh, 2013). AAs, also provide a means to avoid confrontation and/or to express meaning that the speaker cannot or, probably, does not want to express in words (Al-harabsheh, 2013). Consequently, the current researcher believes that, AAs can be considered appropriate off-record disagreement strategies that do not constitute face threat for participants.

3.12. Act combination

Act combination refers to the use of two or more disagreement strategies. The total number of act combinations in all posts was 112 T2 posts. Most of these consisted of double acts 82% and only 18% consisted of triple acts.

3.12.1 Double acts

The findings of the study showed partial similarity to previous research (e.g., Harb 2016; Muntigl & Turnbull, 1998) which showed that the double act combinations of (CT + CC) were the most frequent act combinations constituting almost half of the data 48.9%. The next most frequently occurring double act strategy was (CT+CH) representing 16.3% of the data. The third recurring double act strategy was that of (CC+ VA) constituting almost 13%. Finally, the remaining instances (almost 20%) consisted of a variety of combinations such as Verbal Irony followed by Verbal Attack (7.6%); or Religious expression followed by counter claim (7.6%) or some other different combinations (6.5). Table (13) below shows the most salient forms of act combination that were used in the data.

Table 13: Double act strategies in the data obtained

Double act strategies	Frequency	Percent
CT + CC	45	48.9%
CT+ CH	15	16.3%
Cc+ VA	12	13%
VI +VA	7	7.6%
RE+ CC	7	7.6%
Other combinations	6	6.5%
Total	92	100%

Percent is to the total number of double acts

Example (20) Social Post No. 2: Two types of women (appendix 1b)

T2(1)	<p>لا الست الشاطرة بتكون الحظن والدفا لأولادها وزوجها وبتضيف جو سعادة علي البيت</p> <p>No, a clever woman represents the hug and warmth for her children and her husband. She always adds an atmosphere of happiness in the house.</p>
-------	--

Example 20, above, represents the most frequently used double act strategy that of CT+ CC. It constituted almost half of double act strategies (48.9%). In this example the poster in T2(1) disagrees with T1 by directly using flat "No" which is classified as a CT followed by another strategy which is CC, in which the poster provides an alternative account, not necessarily the opposite of T (1)'s post, to T(1)'s claim. The poster here states that the clever woman is not less intelligent as stated in the post but she represents wormth and gives an atmosphere of happiness in the house.

Example (21) Social post No.1: Fulltime-Kindergarten (appendix 1a)

T2(1)	<p>وجهه نظرك غلط تماما وأيه اللي يضمن انه لما يكبر ميوديهاش دار مسنين؟</p> <p>Your viewpoint is totally wrong. What is the guarantee that he won't send her to an elderly house when he grows up?</p>
-------	---

Another recurrent combination of double acts is that of using CT+ CH constituting 16.3% of the total number of double acts. In example 21 above the speaker first directly contradicts T1 through indicating that the speaker viewpoint is totally wrong. Then s/he challenges T1's post by showing there is no guarantee that s/he will not send her to an elderly house even if the mother didn't send him to a kindergarten.

Example (22) Economic post No.1: Bread Price (appendix 2a)

T2(1)	<p>رغيف ايه الي بي ٦٥ قرش تكلفت الرغيف ٢٥ قرش ده انتو شويت حرميا</p> <p>How come that a loaf of bread is sold for 65 piasters. The loaf of bread coasts 25 piasters. You are a group of thieves.</p>
-------	---

Another, though less frequent (13%) form of double acts is that of counterclaim CC followed by VA as in 22 above. In 22 above the commenter in T2 provides a CC stating that the coast of a loaf of bread is not as stated in the post and that its cost is much less. Then, s/he insults the poster(s) of T1.

Example (23) Social Post No. 2: Two types of women (appendix 1b)

T2(1)	<p>خليكم كدة يا بنات ماتعملوش حاجة علشان تبقي انثى ذكية زي المعفنه اللي كتبت البوست دة بالضبط</p> <p>Don't do anything girls, just to be clever exactly like the filthy one who wrote this post.</p>
-------	---

In 23 above the speaker voices disagreement through using VI+ VA. This strategy combination was not frequent in that data. It constituted 7.6% of all double acts. The VI in the above example emanates from flouting the maxim of quality by saying “Don’t do anything girls, just to be clever “because the commenter knows that the contribution is not true. S/he begins with showing agreement with the poster’s claim; yet it is understood that s/he is communicating the opposite meaning. The intended sarcastic meaning lies in showing sarcastic agreement with the poster. It is clear that the speaker has intentionally violated the maxim of quality to create a negative pragmatic meaning through the use of sarcasm. Sarcasm becomes clearer when the commenter uses VI to, openly, insult the poster through describing her as a filthy girl.

Example (24) Economic post No.1: Electricity consumption (appendix 2b)

T2(1)	<p>حسبنا الله ونعم الوكيل ارفع الدعم خالص بس ادينا مرتبات زي الناس</p> <p>Allah is sufficient, and he is the best dependable. Take the subsidy and give us good salaries.</p>
-------	--

In 24 above, the speaker uses RE+ CC. This strategy constituted 7.6% of the data. The poster starts with a religious expression which is “hasbana” followed by a CC. The CC here provides an alternative,

probably logical, account to the claim made in T1. The commenter, here, states that the government can take the subsidy but it should give people fair salaries first.

Example (25) Economic post No.1: Electricity consumption (appendix 2b)

T2(1)	<p>حسبنا الله ونعم الوكيل سرقتو قوت الغلbian</p> <p>Allah is sufficient, and he is the best dependable. You stole the money of poor people.</p>
T2(2)	<p>حسبنا الله ونعم الوكيل يعني لما تتشيل الدعم من الغلbian كده ازمة البلد هتتحل؟</p> <p>Allah is sufficient, and he is the best dependable. Does this mean that when you remove the subsidy you will solve the crisis?</p>

In 25 above, there are some examples of act combinations that were performed via a variety of acts. The strategies used in T2 (1) & (2) above are RE+ VA and RE+CH, respectively. In T2 (1), the commenter first uses RE, which is 'hasbana', followed by a VA in which the commenter accuses the poster of stealing the food of the poor. In T2 (2), on the other hand, the commenter also begins with 'hasbana' then it is followed by a CH in which s/he challenges the commenter by posing the question of whether removing subsidy would solve the crisis.

It was difficult to specify other salient forms of the act combination strategies as they occurred in different combinations. Besides, the current researcher believes that though the previously mentioned salient combinations appeared in the data, other variables may affect the formation of act combination such as the character of the commenter, his/her the level of education, social class, gender and even way of thinking.

3.12.2. Triple acts

Not only were double act strategies that attested in the data, but three act strategies were observed as well. A total of 20 instances were obtained. Table (14) below shows numbers and percentages of the different triple act combinations that were used in the data.

Table 14: Triple act strategies in the data obtained

Triple acts strategies		Percentage
CT (Flat no)+ CT+ CC	9	47%
EX+VA+ CH	6	31%
Other	4	21%
Total	19	100%

Percent is to the total number of triple acts strategy

The current study agrees with Harb (2016) that most prominent combinations of triple acts were CT (flat no) + another CT+ CC, which constituted 9 out of 19 occurrences. The second most prominent form of triple acts was EX+VA+ CC, constituting 6 out of 19 occurrences. Other different combinations were also used but were rather few, constituting almost 4 occurrences. Following are examples of triple acts.

Example (26) Social Post No. 2: Two types of women (appendix 1b)

T2(1)	لا مش صحيح كثير كسلانين ولا مهتمين بشكلهم ولا حاجة No, that is not true. Many girls are lazy and they don't care about their appearance.
-------	--

In example (26) above the speaker in T2 disagrees through using CT which is the flat NO followed by another CT, the negated adjective (not true). Then the poster provides a CC stating that 'Many girls are lazy and they don't care about their appearance' to prove the falsity of T1's post. This triple act strategy was the most recurrent one; constituting 9 out of 19 instances.

Example (27) Social post No.1: Fulltime-Kindergarten (appendix 1a)

T2(1)	فير!!، هي الناس اتهطلت ولا ايه؟ هي على أي أساس حكمت وعمت القاعدة بتاعتها؟ Fair!! Are people fool or what? On which basis did she make judgments and generalizations like these?
-------	---

Another triple act strategy that appeared in the data was of using EX followed by VA and CH. In (27) above the writer of T2 post shows disagreement through using exclamation (Fair!!), followed by VA (Are people Fool or what?), then the speaker challenges T1's post (On which basis did she make judgments and

generalizations like these?).

Example (28) Economic post No.1: Electricity consumption (appendix 2b)

T2(1)

لا مش صحيح أزاي واللي أحسن منه بيتباع بسعر أقل من كدة؟

No, not true. How come that a better one is sold for less?

The remaining triple act strategies were manifested through using different combinations. Following is one of these combinations. In (28) above for example, the poster in T2 uses CT (flat No) followed by the negated adjective (not true) and a CH (How come that a better one is sold for less?).

4. Conclusion

The analysis carried out in this study has sought to provide a detailed description of the speech act of disagreement as employed in colloquial Arabic by Egyptian speakers on the social networking site Facebook. The study focused on posts belonging to two the topics of economy and society. The study basically focused on lexical, syntactic and pragmatic devices used to perform the act of disagreement online. The results of the study revealed that several strategies were used by Egyptian speakers. Syntactically, it was found out that disagreement could be performed through various types of sentence structure. More specifically, it was found out that declarative, imperative, interrogative and exclamatory sentences were used by Egyptian speakers to voice their disagreement. Pragmatically, the data showed that Egyptians basically used eleven strategies with different frequencies. The findings lend support to previous research (e.g. Harb, 2016; Sifianou, 2012) that prove the complexity of the act of disagreement. It also agrees with Harb (2016) that the use of the strategies of “mild scolding” and “religious expressions” is fathomable to Arabic speakers and consequently to Egyptian speakers. The study also found out that using religious expressions is a cultural-specific strategy that needs further investigation as culture appears to be of primary influence on the performance of different speech acts.

In conclusion, the study recommends that the act of disagreement still needs to be studied from different perspectives such as response or reaction of conflict talk in the discourses or texts of training courses, academic meetings, commercial communications, literary works, family communications, political debates as well as the several forms of computer mediated communication. The use of emoji's to express disagreement and the combination of words and emoji's are important aspects that are still understudied. Moreover, the use of mitigators and/or aggravators when expressing disagreement and the variables governing the use of such discourse tools still needs further investigations.

Works cited

- Abdel-Jawad, H. (2000). A linguistic and socio-pragmatic and cultural study of swearing in Arabic. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 13(2), 217-240.
- Al-Eryani, A. (2007). Refusal strategies by Yemeni EFL learners. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 9(2), 19-34.
- Al-Hami, F. (1993). *Forms of apology used by Jordanian speakers of EFL: A cross cultural study* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). University of Jordan, Jordan.
- Al-Harashseh, A. M. (2013). A Study of Pragmatic Functions of Silence in Colloquial Jordanian Arabic. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 39 (1), 5-49.
- Al-Issa, A. (1998). *Sociopragmatic transfer in the performance of refusals by Jordanian EFL learners: Evidence and motivating factors* (Doctoral dissertation). Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania, USA.
<https://books.google.com.sa/books?id=6qGzPwAACAAJ>
- Al-Khawaldeh, N. (2014). *Politeness orientation in the linguistic expression of gratitude in Jordan and England: A comparative cross-cultural study* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Bedfordshire, Bedfordshire, United Kingdom.
<http://hdl.handle.net/10547/344604>
- Al-Shalawi, H. G. (1997). *Refusal Strategies in Saudi and American cultures* (Master's thesis). Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.
<https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:153039896>
- Angouri, J. & Tseliga, T. (2010). "You have no idea what you are talking about": From e-disagreement to e-impoliteness in two online fora. *Journal of Politeness Research* 6(1), 57-82.
- Angouri, J., & Locher, M. A. (2012). Theorising disagreement. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(12), 1549-1553.
- Bargiela-Chiappini, F., & Harris, S. (1997). *Managing language: The discourse of corporate meetings*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bataineh, R. (2004). *A cross-cultural study of the speech act of apology in American English and Jordanian Arabic* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University of Pennsylvania, USA.

- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, J. (2011). Politeness and impoliteness. In: K. Aijmer and G. Andersen (Eds.), *Pragmatics of Society* (pp.391-436). *Handbooks of Pragmatics Series: Vol.5*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Edstrom, A. (2004). Expressions of disagreement by Venezuelans in conversation: Reconsidering the influence of culture. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36, 1499-1518.
- Farghal, M. & Haggan, M. (2006). Compliment behavior in bilingual Kuwaiti college students. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 9(1), 94-118.
- Fernandez, S. (2013). The linguistic realization of disagreements by EFL Egyptian speakers (Unpublished MA thesis, Universidad Complutense, Madrid, Spain).
- http://eprints.ucm.es/23287/1/Sonia_Shabaka_Fern%C3%A1ndez.pdf
- Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(2), 219- 236.
- Gabr, A. (1991). *Thanking in American English and Egyptian Arabic: A cross-linguistic cross-cultural study*. (Unpublished M. A. Thesis). The American University in Cairo.
- Georgakopoulou, A. (2001). Arguing about the future: On indirect disagreements in conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33 (12), 1881-1900.
- Goodwin, M. H. (1983). Aggravated correction and disagreement in children's conversations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 7(6), 657-677.
- Grimshaw, Allen, D. (1990). *Conflict talk: Sociolinguistic investigations of arguments in conversations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harb, M. (2016). *Attending to face in faceless computer-mediated communication: (in) politeness in online disagreements among Arabic speaker* (Doctoral dissertation). Ball State University, Indiana, United states. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Hosni, H. (2020). Advice giving in Egyptian Arabic and American English: A cross-linguistic, cross-cultural study. *Journal of Pragmatics* 155 (1), 193–212.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.11.001>

- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Herring, S., Stein, D. & Virtanen, T. (2013). *Pragmatics of Computer-Mediated Communication*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Kakavá, C. (2002). Opposition in Modern Greek discourse: Cultural and contextual constraints. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34 (10), 1537–1568.
- Kotthoff, H. (1993). Disagreement and Concession in Disputes: On the context sensitivity of preference structures. *Language in Society*, 22, 193–216.
- Labov, W., & Fanshel, D. (1977). *Therapeutic Discourse*, New York: Academic Press.
- Lakoff, R. T. (1973). The logic of politeness, or minding your p's and q's. *Chicago Linguistics Society*, 9, 292–305.
- Langlotz, A., & Locher, M. A. (2012). Ways of communicating emotional stance in online disagreements. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(12), 1591-1606.
- Leech, G. (1983) Principles of pragmatics. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Locher, M. & Watts, R. (2005). Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture*, 1(1), 9-33.
- Locher, M. (2004). *Power and politeness in action: Disagreements in oral communication* (Vol.12). Walter de Gruyter.
- Mazid, B. (1995). *Complimenting behavior among upper Egyptian university learners of English*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Cairo University.
- McQuail, D. (2005). *Mcquail's Mass Communication Theory* (5th Ed). London: SAGE Publications.
- Migdadi, F. (2003). *Complimenting in Jordanian Arabic: A socio-pragmatic analysis* (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Ball State University, USA.
- Morsy, E. A. (1992). *Sex differences in complimenting behavior: A contrastive analysis between Egyptian Arabic and American English*. (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). The American University in Cairo.
- Muntigl, P. and Turnbull, W. (1996). *Argument structure in conversation*. Proceedings of the 10th Northwest Linguistics

- Conference, edited by Wayne Oliver & Nathalie Schapansky, 103-110. Burnaby, British Columbia: Simon Fraser University Press.
- Muntigl, P., & Turnbull, W. (1998). Conversational structure and facework in arguing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 29 (3), 225-256.
- Myers, G. (2004). *Matters of opinion: Talking about public issues* (Vol. 19). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nelson, G. L., Carson, J., Al Batal, M., & El Bakary, W. (2002). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Strategy use in Egyptian Arabic and American English refusals. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(2), 163-189.
- Nelson, G., Al-Batal, M., & Echols, E. (1996). Arabic and English compliment responses: Potential for pragmatic failure. *Applied linguistics*, 17(4), 411-432.
- Netz, H. (2014). Disagreement patterns in gifted classes. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 61, 142-160.
- Nureddeen, F. (2008). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Apology strategies in Sudanese Arabic. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(2), 279-306.
- Pomerantz, A. (1984). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In: Atkinson, M. Heritage, J. (eds.), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, (pp. 57-103). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rashed, H. (2008). *Advice giving in Egyptian Arabic and American English: A cross-linguistic, cross-cultural study*. (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Cairo University.
- Sadock, J. M., & Zwicky, A. M. (1985). Speech act distinctions in syntax. *Language typology and syntactic description*, 1, 155-196.
- Salah El-Din, Y. (2000). *Complaints in Egyptian Arabic and American English: A cross-linguistic cross-cultural study*. (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis). Cairo University.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1985). The Place of Silence in an Integrated Theory of Communication. In D. T. a. M. Saville-Troike (Ed.), *Perspectives on Silence* (pp. 3-18). Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Schiffrin, D. (1984). Jewish argument as sociability. *Language in society*, 13(03), 311-335.

- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shum, W., & Lee, C. (2013). (Im) politeness and disagreement in two Hong Kong Internet discussion forums. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 50(1), 52-83.
- Sifianou, M. (2012). *Disagreements, face and politeness*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(12), 1554-1564.**
- Sornig, K. (1977). Disagreement and contradiction as communicative acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1(4), 347-373.
- Stevens, P. (1993). The pragmatics of "No!": Some strategies in English and Arabic. *IDEAL*, 6, 87-110.
- Tannen, D., & Kakavá, C. (1992). Power and solidarity in Modern Greek conversation: Disagreeing to agree. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 10(1), 11-34.
- Waldron, V. R., & Applegate, J. L. (1994). Interpersonal construct differentiation and conversational planning an examination of two cognitive accounts for the production of competent verbal disagreement tactics. *Human Communication Research*, 21(1), 3-35.
- Watts, R. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1987). *English speech act verbs: A semantic dictionary*. New York: Academic.
- Xu, L. (2017). Disagreement Studies Reviewed and My Coy Disagreements. *Studies in English Language Teaching*, 5(4), 679- 694.
- Zhu, W. (2014). Managing relationships in everyday practice: The case of strong disagreement in mandarin. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 64, 85-87.

Appendices

Appendix 1: samples of the social topics

Appendix 1a Post No.1

Light shading= Original post (T1)

No shading = responses/ disagreeing comments (T2)

T (1) Social post No.1: Fulltime-Kindergarten
<p>وهو عمره شهور (full time) طالما انتي بتدفعي فلوس علشان تودي ابنك حضانة علشان انتي مشغولة وبتبتي ذاتك برة البيت فحق الولد لما انتي تكبري يدفع فلوس علشان كمان، فيرو الله. يوديكي دار مسنين علشان هو مشغول يثبت ذاته هو</p> <p>Since you pay money to leave your baby in a full-time kindergarten when he is just a few months old, because you are busy building your career, he has the right to pay money to leave you in elderly house because he is also busy building his career. It is fair; I swear.</p>
<p>عين الجهل والغباء والعقوق. قياس فاسق وفاجر</p> <p>Real ignorance, stupidity and disobedience. Immoral and unfair comparison.</p>
<p>كلام رجعي متخلف الناس بتشيريه</p> <p>People share regressive stupid things.</p>
<p>بس المشكلة ان جيل الأمهات اللي بنشوفهم في دار المسنين حالياً، كلهم كانوا ستات بيوت ومشتغلوش</p> <p>But the problem is that the generation of mothers we see in nursing homes currently were housewives and weren't employed</p>
<p>مفيش أم بتسيب ابنها علشان تنفسح ولا تلعب ولا تروح لا مش فيبر خالص على فكره النادي مع أصحابها</p> <p>No, it's not fair at all, by the way, no mother leaves her son to have fun nor play or to go to the club with her friends.</p>

Appendix 1b Post No.2

Social Post No. 2: Two types of women

T (1)

المرأة نوعان ... كسلانه - شاطرة
(فلانة شاطره ...) هي أنثى ذكية فضلت راحتها و نفسها على كلمة:تعريف الكسلانه
: فحصلت على العديد من المزايا
والكثير الكثير من المزايا التي على شغالة وزوج يلاحق ولاده لأنه مينفعش يتكل عليها
لا تعرفها الا الكسولات
... أما الشاطرة
(وهي كلمة لا تسمن ولا تغني شاطره)،فضلت الحصول على لقب فهي أنثى أقل ذكاء
يغضب لو تأخرت في أي (وزوج اتكالي كسول تعب ٢٤ ساعه... من جوع فحصلت على
طلب حتى وإن كانت متعبه صحيا وأولاد معتمدين عليها في كل حاجة حتى في حاجتهم
وتلاقيها طبخة.. خياطة .. سباكة ... كهربائية... صبي البقالة ... حتى عبدو .. الشخصية
... سعيد عامل الورشة تاخذ دور هوفي الآخر
كسلانه) ويتجوز عليها بوحدة(ويجدد جوزها كل خدماتها وتضحياتها تتدهور صحياً
لأنها تفرغت له ويحلف أنه مادي طعم السعادة ولا عاشها إلا أما إتجوز الكسلانه ده
... وانت ياشاطره خلي اللقب ينفعك وهي بكامل صحتها وزينتها وطاقتها الإيجابية.

There are two types of women: Lazy and clever.

Definition of the lazy woman: She is an intelligent female. She prefers herself, her comfort over being called a 'clever woman.' By doing this she got a lot of merits. She got a servant and a husband who looks after his kids most of the time because he can't depend on her and many other advantages that only lazy women know.

Regarding the clever woman...

She is a less intelligent one, she preferred having the title "clever woman," which is a useless one. She is tired 24 hours a day; she got a lazy husband who depends on her most of the time and gets angry with her if she is late in doing anything even if she is tired or not in a good health. She has got children who depend on her in everything even in their personal needs. You find her a cook, a seamstress, a plumber, an electrician, a grocery boy... She even takes the role of Abdu Saeed, the workshop worker.

Her health usually gets deteriorated, her husband denies all her services and sacrifices. He marries another one (usually a lazy one). Then, he swears that he has never been happy except when he married that lazy woman because she has given him all her time,

health, beauty and positive energy. As for you “clever woman”, just be happy with the title!
والله كلام في منتهي القذارة وبيع عمل فتنه في البيوت سببوا كل واحد يمشي حياته زي ماهو شاييف
I swear this really dirty talk. It creates conflicts at homes Let everyone live his life as he sees it.
كلام غير منطقي خالص Completely illogical talk
لا خالص الست الشاطرة بتكون الحزن والدفا لأولادها وزوجها وبتضيف جو سعادة علي البيت
No, at all. A clever woman will give warmth to her children and her husband. She adds an atmosphere of happiness to the house.
والله شاطرة أحسن من كسلانة
The clever is better than the lazy I swear.

Appendix 2: The Economic Posts

Appendix 2a: Post No.1

Economic post No.1: Bread Price T (1)
الرئيس السيسي يعلن زيادة سعر رغيف الخبز المدعم يجب ان يتوقف بيع الرغيف بخمس قروش
President Sisi declares: Increase in the price of bread Buying bread for five piasters should be stopped.
حسبي الله ونعم الوكيل
Allah is sufficient, and he is the best dependable
معلومات غير دقيقة ومغلوطه
Inaccurate and false information
يا سياده الرئيس شيل غير المستحق اللي دخله فوق عشرون الف جنيه
Mr. President, remove the those who do not deserve support whose income exceeds twenty thousand pounds.
رغيف العيش خط أحمر
Bread is a red line

Appendix 2b: Post No.2

Economic post No. 2 Electricity Consumption T (1)
الكهرباء تجاوز المستهلك ل ٦٥٠ كيلو وات يعد خروجاً من الدعم Ministry of electricity: If the consumer/ customer exceeds 650 Kilo watt, he will not deserve the government's (financial) support.
أنا نفسي أعرف بس الشريحة الأولى ٦٥٠ ك دي تكفي ايه؟؟ I really want to know the first strip (650 k.w)is sufficient for what?
نظام الشرايح ده ظلم وسرقة كمان This electricity strip system is not fair and a theft as well
هو فين الدعم كفاية ظلم Where is the subsidy? stop being unfair