

Chapter five: Discussion and conclusions

1.1 Introduction

The present chapter intends, at first, to provide a detailed morphological and pragmatic analysis of the results put forth in the previous chapter. Thus, section 5.2 includes the explanation of both analyses and it is followed by a description of the limitations that the researcher noticed and faced while the present study was being carried out. In section 5.4 the answers to the research questions are presented in a more explicit and summarized manner together with the implications of the results obtained from both the quantitative and qualitative analyses. Finally, the author of the paper provides some suggestions and considerations for further research.

1.2 Discussion

1.2.1 Morphological analysis. Morphemes are considered the basic unit of analysis, as they combine with one another to form words which in turn combine to form sentences (Cressey, 1978). It must be recalled that according to Moreno (1986), morphemes are meaning units or meaning carriers that cannot be further subdivided. Yet, Aronoff (1983, as cited in Lang, 1990) holds that the meaning they carry is not always constant because it is the linguistic context in which newly formed words appear what determines meaning. As a result, meaning cannot always be deduced from morphemes alone (Aronoff, 1983, as cited in Lang, 1990). Thus, the word might also be considered the unit of analysis (Moreno, 1986) as was done in the present study.

It must be kept in mind that word formation aims at “analyzing and understanding the processes through which the lexis is created or renewed” (Lang, 1990:3). Although purists and lexicographers might consider the creation of new terms as irrelevant and unnecessary, for the users of a language lexical innovation and creativity allow more expressiveness when speaking and/or writing. As was already pointed out in tables 5 and 6 in the previous chapter, the word formation processes that were identified in the present study were compounding, borrowing,

blending, and acronym. It will be noticed, from the results put forth in table 5, that compounding was the word formation process that was identified in the majority of the lemmas (17 out of 22) in the AMLO corpus, whereas in the EPN corpus the most recurrent word formation process was blending (4 out of 6 lemmas).

Let us recall that compounding occurs when an independent lexeme or free morpheme combines with another to form more complex morphological structures (Lang, 1990). In the AMLO corpus, the word *peje* was the independent morpheme that was compounded the most (12 out of 22 lemmas). According to Rodríguez (2011), *peje* is the way in which enemies and detractors of Andrés Manuel López Obrador pejoratively refer to him because it is a synonym of fish (peje, 2001). In the AMLO corpus, it was observed that the word *peje* was syntagmatically compounded, i.e. without orthographic fusion, with the nouns *fan* (appears pluralized in the corpus), *perro* (appears both in singular and plural in the corpus), *joto*, *lacra*, *mártir* (pluralized in the corpus), *psicópata*, and *terrorista* (pluralized in the corpus); with the adjectives *imbécil* (misspelled in the corpus), *seguidor* (pluralized in the corpus), and *tarado* (pluralized in the corpus); with the acronym NINI (pluralized and in lower case letters); and with the adjective *zombie* borrowed from the English language and that in the corpus appears both in singular and plural forms, and in some cases it is misspelled¹. The word was also compounded with the noun *lieber* borrowed from the German, and which appears pluralized in the corpus. Accordingly, the formulas that represent the compounding formation process that the word *peje* underwent are:

PEJE + NOUN

PEJE + ADJECTIVE

PEJE + ACRONYM

Table 7 shows a detailed description of each of the words with which the word *peje* was compounded. Since there were no orthographic changes, it could be said that the words listed in

¹ Misspellings could be due to stylistic reasons or to typos, as well ignorance regarding the orthography of the word. Nonetheless, neither of these reasons is certain.

table 7 were simply attached to the independent lexeme *peje*, and thus they are referred to in such way. In addition, a general and rough definition of the resulting structure of the compounding process is also put forth in table 7. Such a definition is driven by considering the definition of *peje* and the definition of each independent word that was attached to it. It will be noticed that in some cases there is more than one definition provided. The reason is that it is hard to tell, from the resulting structure alone, whether it is used to refer to Andrés Manuel López Obrador or to his advocates. This disjunctive will be solved in the section that follows as a result of the pragmatic analysis, which considers the linguistic context where each word formation process took place.

Table 7

Description of the words with which the word peje compounded

Attached word	Word class	Independent word definition	Origin of the word	Definition of the resulting structure
<i>fan</i>	Noun	Someone's follower or admirer	English	A fan of AMLO.
<i>imbécil</i>	Adj.	Foolish, stupid	Latin	1. Andrés Manuel López Obrador is a fool. 2. A follower of AMLO is a fool.
<i>Joto</i>	noun	Homosexual man	Unknown	1. AMLO is a homosexual man 2. A follower of AMLO is a homosexual man.
<i>lacra</i>	noun	Physical or moral defect	Unknown	1. AMLO is physically or morally faulty. 2. A follower of AMLO is physically or morally faulty.
<i>mártir</i>	noun	Someone who sacrifices in	Latin	1. AMLO is a martyr.

		name of his/her beliefs		2. A follower of AMLO is a martyr.
<i>perro</i>	noun	Despicable person	Spanish	1. AMLO is a despicable person. 2. A follower of AMLO is a despicable person.
<i>psicópata</i>	noun	Someone who shows an amoral and antisocial behavior, and who cannot learn from experience.	Greek	1. AMLO is a psychopath. 2. A follower of AMLO is a psychopath.
<i>seguidor</i>	Adj.	Supporter, follower, partisan	Latin	Simply a follower of AMLO.
<i>tarado</i>	Adj.	Stupid, foolish	Unknown	A follower of AMLO is stupid.
<i>terrorista</i>	noun	Someone who uses or advocates terrorism	Latin	1. AMLO is a terrorist. 2. A follower of AMLO is a terrorist.
<i>zombi</i>	Adj.	Absent-minded, foolish	African	1. AMLO is a zombie. 2. A follower of AMLO is a zombie.

Note: The definitions provided in the third column were consulted in the Diccionario de la Real Academia Española.

The acronym NINI stands for those who neither work nor study, in Spanish: “**NI** estudian, **NI** trabajan” (“Entérate, ¿qué es un nini?”, 2009). However, since it does not yet appear in the dictionary, it was not included in the above descriptive list (table 7). In contrast, although zombie is a borrowed word, it does appear in the *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española*, yet the spelling in Spanish is different: *zombi*. As can be seen in table 5, the compounding process with the “correct” Spanish language occurred three times in singular, i.e. *pejezombi*, and 14 times in plural, i.e. *pejezombis*. Regardless, it must be said that the resulting structure of the compounding between the word *peje* and the English word zombie (*pejezombie*) is the lemma

that had the highest frequency of occurrence in the AMLO corpus, including all its tokens, some of which were different because they were misspelled, e.g. *pejezombiez*. The high frequency of a borrowed word, i.e. *zombie*, is congruent with what Lang (1990) said in relation to the commonality of borrowing, as a word formation process, in Mexican Spanish. Thus, in the case of the lemmas *pejezombie* and *peñazombie*, two word formation processes took place: borrowing and compounding. Although *zombie* has already been accepted as a Spanish word, as it is included in the dictionary, it is argued that borrowing took place because in the majority of the cases, i.e. tokens (9 out of 16), the word is spelled in the English way.

It was hypothesized that the word *peje* might have been left intact in most of the cases in order to emphasize the discontent against Andrés Manuel López Obrador, because it must be recalled that it is a pejorative in which people refer to him. However, since most of the linguistic units that resulted from compounding *peje* with either a noun, an adjective, or an acronym are in plural, it is concluded that hatred towards AMLO's followers and their "disruptive"² actions, e.g. repeated demonstrations that blocked the traffic, is also being expressed. However, in order to determine this latter with certainty a different study is required.

In terms of acronym, NINI was not the only acronym that was found to be part of a word formation process. AMLO and EPN also gave way to newer words by means of blending, which involves putting words together regardless of their morphemic structure (Lang, 1990). As can be noticed from the results obtained from both corpora and that are presented in tables 5 and 6, the acronym AMLO, which stands for Andrés Manuel López Obrador, blended with two nouns borrowed from the English language, i.e. *love* and *loser*, and with a single Spanish adjective, i.e. *loco*. From the blended structure AMLO*ve* derived AMLO*vers*, another linguistic unit under analysis. This latter unit is thought to be a synonym of yet another morphological structure found in the AMLO corpus: AM*liebers*.

² Some people might be in favor, because it is constitutionally stated that any Mexican can organize or be a part of demonstrations, others may be against them.

In the linguistic unit *AMLove*, the acronym blended with the noun *love*, borrowed from English. Thus, in this lemma three word formation processes can be identified: first, acronym, then borrowing, and finally blending. It must be mentioned that this structure appears in both corpora, in the AMLO corpus it was the lemma that had the third highest frequency of occurrence, while in the EPN corpus it appeared only twice. However, it was also noticed that the acronym blended with the noun *lovers*, which is also borrowed from the English language, and with *liebers*, which has a German origin, i.e. *love* is translated as *liebe* in German (*liebe*, 2013). Both nouns –*lovers* and *liebers*– derive morphologically and semantically from the root word “*love*”, and therefore they are considered tokens of the lemma *AMLove*. Consequently, it is argued that they underwent the same word formation processes: acronym, borrowing, and blending in the case of the token *AMLovers*, but in the case of the structure *Amloliebers* compounding took place instead of blending, because, as can be seen, no orthographic modification occurred in neither the root morpheme, i.e. the acronym, nor in the attached word, i.e. *liebers*³.

Further, In the AMLO corpus, this acronym, after which the corpus is named, was also found to be blended with another English noun: *loser*, and with the Spanish adjective *loco*, which means crazy or mad. The blending between the acronym and the Spanish adjective was the lemma with the fourth highest frequency of occurrence in the corpus, and it was in fact followed by the blending between the acronym and the word *loser*. In the latter case the word formation processes were the same as those identified in the case of the lemma *AMLove* and its token *AMLovers*. However, in the former case, i.e. *AMLOCO*, only blending and acronym can be identified. In turn, this linguistic unit has its own tokens, which are a diminutive, i.e. *loquitos*, and

³ Although it was mentioned that the word *liebers* is thought to have a German origin, it could also be hypothesized that it comes from another morphological structure that appeared in a different context: *BELIEBERS*. This term resulted from the blending of a singer’s last name (*Bieber*) and the English verb *to believe*. This word, *beliebers*, is used to refer to Justin Bieber’s fans (Legge, 2013). Nonetheless, it is hard to tell when exactly did this word appear, and it is even harder to know how often it is actually used in Mexico. Consequently, a clear connection between the words *beliebers* and *amloliebers* cannot be fully determined.

a feminine, pluralized form, i.e. *locas*. Nonetheless, the word formation processes remain the same. It remains to determine the reason behind the use of each.

Further in terms of acronym, that which stands for the initials of the current president (EPN) was observed to have been blended twice in the AMLO corpus. The first linguistic unit, which happens to be a token of *peñazombies*, is *zombieEPNdejos*. It was already determined that the word *zombie* is a borrowing because of its Anglophone spelling. Thus, this time, four word formation processes can be identified: first, borrowing (*zombie*), followed by acronym (EPN), these two are compounded. They would have been blended if the /E/ had been deleted from the acronym. This deletion might not have happened precisely to keep the acronym intact, and thus make the referent completely explicit to the interlocutor or whomever came across the linguistic unit. Further, once compounding took place, it was followed by blending. This last word formation process seems to be phonetically justified, in the sense that the letters /PN/ from the acronym will no longer be pronounced separately, but together as if there were an /e/ in between them. As a result, the word *pendejo* is perfectly understood, as is the referent, i.e. Enrique Peña Nieto. The second case in which the acronym EPN was used to create a new linguistic unit was *EPNdejos*, which needs no further explanation as it is the second part of the token *zombieEPNdejos*, which was recently explained. Since both units are pluralized, it is hypothesized that they were used to refer to Enrique Peña Nieto's followers.

Going back to blending, the lemma *peñejo* occurred once in the AMLO corpus and four times in the EPN corpus, and it results from the orthographic merging, i.e. blending, between the word *Peña*, which is the current president's last name, and the adjective *pendejo*, which is one of the strongest insults there are in Mexican Spanish (del Río, 2001; *pendejo*, 2001; *pendejo*, 2013). The same process was identified in the lemma *pejendejo*, which appears 13 times in its singular form and 7 times in its plural form, thus the lemma with the second highest frequency of occurrence in the AMLO corpus. It must be noted that the three words (*Peña*, *peje*, and *pendejo*) start with the syllable /pe/, which is probably one of the reasons why it was easy for users of the

language to make each blending. Nonetheless, this assertion can only be confirmed with a different study. In addition, the reader must be made aware of the fact that both resulting structures of the blending word formation process (*peñejo* and *pejendejo*) keep the ending /-ejo/ of the word *pendejo*, which together with the beginning already given syllable /pe/, makes it easier for the native speaker to grasp both the meaning and the origin of the resulting structure.

The word *pendejo* was also blended with the root word *copete* in both corpora. In the AMLO corpus the token *pencopete* was found, while in the EPN corpus the token found was *copendejo*. In the latter case, the orthographic blending makes a lot more sense. The word *copete*⁴, apart from the token recently mentioned, underwent no further word formation process. However, in the section that follows, reasons as of why it is considered an insult are provided. Finally, blending was also identified in the lemma *apejejado*, found in the AMLO corpus. It is thought that this linguistic unit might have been inspired by the adjective *apendejado*, which derives from *pendejo* and in general terms it means to be or act stupidly (pendejo, 2001; pendejo, 2013). The /n/ and /d/ in the original word are substituted by the syllable /je/, which is part of the word *peje*, which we have discussed earlier already.

To conclude, it must be kept in mind that the appearance of the linguistic units described throughout this section occurred because according to post-generative theorists, users of a language have a lexical competence which allows them to construct and understand new words in the same way that they produce and understand new sentences. In this sense, word formation processes are thought to be analogous to sentence formation processes and lexical morphology is considered a component of grammar. Thus, both morphemes and words have a syntactic structure (Cressey, 1978; Lang, 1990; Moreno, 1986), which in most cases might be triggered by pragmatic intentions.

⁴ Roll of hair over the forehead.

1.3 Pragmatic analysis. Verschueren (1999) sustains that meaning depends on the intentions of language users, which are in turn determined by the context in which any given interaction takes place. Hence, meaning is rarely stable. In this context, pragmatics examines, describes, and attempts to understand linguistic phenomena, especially *meaning*, in relation to the social, situational, textual, and background knowledge contexts in which a person speaks or writes (Huang, 2007; Paltridge, 2006; and Verschueren, 1999). Thus, pragmatics is especially interested in the relationship that exists between a linguistic form and the communicative function it serves in relation to the context (Paltridge, 2006:3).

To illustrate, towards the end of utterance (1) its producer makes a general description of the use given to online social networking sites during the 2012 electoral process, and puts forth the intentions of the users of one of the Facebook pages under study, him or her amongst them, when commenting pictures and other postings: “to speak ill of [Andrés Manuel López Obrador]” (author’s translation). As was mentioned in chapter three, considering the names of each of the pages, it is assumed that the four of them are intended to do as the utterer of (1) says. Further, with her comment, this person highlights the relevance of communities of practice, which gather together because they have things in common. In this case, users of pages AMLO1 and AMLO2 are against the candidate of the PRD, while those who visit pages EPN1 and EPN2 reject who now is the current president of Mexico. From the latter, it is concluded that most words, being new or old, are intended to show discontent against either of the two candidates mentioned.

Before moving on, the reader must be prevented that in the utterances provided below s/he will find abbreviations that are commonly used in text messaging. Table 8 shows those abbreviations and includes the actual word they stand for, its word class, and an equivalent in the English language.

Table 8

Abbreviations found in the utterances provided

Abbreviation	Actual word	Word class	English equivalent
x	<i>por</i>	preposition	So, because of
xq	<i>porque</i>	conjunction	because
Q, q	<i>que</i>	adverb	That, what, so
Ke, k	<i>que</i>	conjunction	That, what, so

(1) *Seguidores*⁵ de AMLO son gente violenta sin educación, que* no saben respetar un punto de vista diferente al suyo sin dejar de recurrir a insultos y etiquetas* a los [que] pensamos diferente, como JorGe Acostta [the utterer is addressing another user]. La verdad yo respeto la decisión* que* él**⁶ tomó** para apoyar al señor AMLO, pero no x eso lo voy a insultar como él** a los demás** solo por poner cosas en su contra y tampoco voy a empezar a llamarlo “pejzombie“. La verdad a todos los seguidores* de AMLO les pido educadamente que* si son viscerales* no entren a páginas como esta, ya que aquí se habla mal de este señor y si aun así entran y ven el contenido de esta, discutan pero civilizadamente xq de lo contrario demuestran una gran falta de educación y respeto.*

Undoubtedly then, the physical, social, linguistic, and psychological contexts of any interaction are crucial factors that influence meaning production and interpretation. The linguistic context, particularly, refers to surrounding utterances, namely what has already been said and what remains to be said in consequence. This is the context that has been further analyzed, after the morphological construction of the new linguistic units identified in the corpora, in order to get a better understanding of their meaning and pragmatic function. Nonetheless, since

⁵ Words with an (*) next to them were misspelled in the original. They have been corrected to facilitate the reader's understanding of the text.

⁶ Two (**) indicate that the word next to them was missing an accent in the original text. These too have been corrected to make reading easier.

comments on Facebook pictures are not really conversations, i.e. a comment may remain isolated and have no further response to it, only the utterance where the linguistic units appeared where considered for the pragmatic analysis.

Regardless, the physical context cannot be overseen. This type of context refers to the spatio-temporal location where an utterance is produced. Language users hold a conception of such a context. In this case, as was already mentioned in chapter two, and as can be inferred from utterance (1), online social networking site users are aware of the anonymity that these virtual spaces offer them, and thus, they feel free to write and share all sorts of information, even if it is intended at discrediting or insulting a political candidate and/or his advocates or any other person, for that matter. This latter is also encapsulated in the psychological context, also called general knowledge context (Huang, 2007) or sociocultural context (Bravo, 2003, as cited in Bernal, 2008), and which includes what language users know about each other, about the world in general, and about what is expected and assumed in a particular communicative situation depending on the discourse community (Huang, 2007; Johnstone, 2002; Paltridge, 2006). In this sense, it must be recalled that communication on Facebook takes place by written postings and shared pictures and hyperlinks. Photos in particular, encourage communication and discussion. Nonetheless, commenting on a picture is not a must, neither is answering back to an already made comment. In this sense, it is hypothesized that most users might feel free to make a comment regardless of whether or not they will receive an answer. Furthermore, since comments were made on pictures shared by the pages' administrators, not by individual users, those who make comments in most cases do not know each other at all and thus will have no further interaction after they make a comment on a particular picture or in response to another comment.

Hence, influenced by the context where they are at and the cultural background that they hold, language users are constantly and continuously negotiating their relationships while interacting, and make linguistic choices accordingly (Johnstone, 2002; Verschueren, 1999). In

this sense, producers of an utterance make production choices, whereas addressees make interpretation choices by way of conscious or unconscious strategies that vary in order to satisfy communicative needs. Among such needs we can mention speakers' need to take into account their addressee's as well as their own negative and positive faces. Let us recall that face is constructed based on who we are and who we are interacting with, depending on the communicative situation. Face, therefore, is the public self-image that both the hearer and the speaker seek to maintain while interacting (Allan and Burridge, 2006; Martínez-Lara, 2009; Mills, 2002). Brown and Levinson's face saving model (1987, as cited in Bernal, 2008, Huang, 2007, Johnstone, 2002, Mills, 2002, and Martínez-Lara, 2009) focuses on how the speaker's linguistic and non-linguistic choices reflect his/her intentions to protect or threaten the addressee's face-wants (Holmes, 1995; Huang, 2007; Mills, 2002).

Considering that expressions of disapproval, criticism, accusations, and insults threaten a person's positive face (Holmes, 1995; Huang, 2007), it is concluded that the content shared and posted on the Facebook pages under study were precisely intended at compromising the candidates' and their advocates' positive face. Such conclusion is based on the type of utterances found, even if they had no newer morphological structure, e.g. *pejezombie*, in them. In utterance (2), as can be seen, its producer expresses his or her disapproval of demonstrations, i.e. *marchas*, by accusing those who get involved in them of being unproductive, of disrupting those who actually work, and of having no shame. In addition, this person also compromises AMLO's advocates' negative face by ordering them to get to work. As will be seen later in this section, utterances like (2) were common practice.

(2) *los del SME* [Sindicato Mexicano de Electricistas; Mexican Electricians' Union: author's translation] *no tienen vergüenza**, *tantos años que ya llevan sin trabajar, esperando como todos los pejezombies que les regalen las cosas, dejen de molestar a la gente*

productiva de este país, sólo han servido para hacer marchas y perseguir el hueso. [...]

Pónganse a trabajar carajo!!!!!!

In this context, it is said that language allows its users to perform acts or actions (Grundy, 2008; Johnstone, 2002; Paltridge, 2006). This brings us back to Austin's speech act theory, which, as the reader may recall, looks at language as a form of action and suggests three facets of a speech act: the locutionary, which basically is the production of the utterance; the illocutionary, which is the intention behind an utterance; and the perlocutionary, which is the actual effect that the utterance has on the addressee (Grundy, 2008; Huang, 2007; Paltridge, 2006; Verschueren, 1999). Thus, any person carrying out a speech act must have an intention in mind, yet s/he must be recognized by the discourse community as having the authority to perform it at the right time and place (Huang, 2007; Grundy, 2008; Johnstone, 2002; Paltridge, 2006). Further, it must be kept in mind that the addressee's actual reaction is by no means in the hands of the utterer because there are no specific perlocutionary acts linked to particular locutionary acts (Huang, 2007; Johnstone, 2002). Nonetheless, the same locutionary act can have different illocutionary forces (Huang, 2007). Some examples of illocutionary acts are promising, congratulating, joking, apologizing, and insulting.

Insulting, as was mentioned earlier, is a face threatening speech act that involves the use of words that offend, wound, provoke, denigrate, or reject someone (Allan and Burrige, 2006). In both corpora, some of the linguistic structures under analysis were intended at insulting either the candidates or their followers. To illustrate the first use, i.e. insulting candidates, the producer of utterance (3) refers to Andrés Manuel López Obrador as *pendejo*, as *pejeperro*, and as *burro ignorante*. Denigration can be fully detected by noticing that the candidate is being compared to a dog and to a donkey. Dogs are commonly known as loyal friends; nonetheless, as can be seen in table 7, the noun *perro* is also used to refer to a despicable person. In addition, the word donkey in Spanish is also used as a synonym of stupid. Thus, the newly formed structure is also

intended to show rejection. Therefore it is considered an insult against Andrés Manuel López Obrador, mainly because it includes the word *peje*, and we have already mentioned that such word is used to refer to the already mentioned candidate in a pejorative way, and because the producer of utterance (3) encourages his readers NOT to vote for the *pejeeperro*.

(3) [...] *qué les puede prometer este pendejo solo su locura y terquedad solo eso NI UN VOTO AL PEJEPERRO Ni UN VOTO AL MESEANICO NI UN VOTO A ESTE BURRO IGNORANTE.*

Utterance (4) also shows rejection towards the PRD candidate. The entire utterance appears to have a sarcastic intention. The producer is making fun of the advocates of Andrés Manuel López Obrador, because s/he argues that the candidate will not win and this fact will make his followers cry. Thus, the utterance could be aimed at provoking those in favor of AMLO, not only by making fun of them, but also by directly insulting the candidate. S/he calls him *pinche pejejoto*. According to del Río (2001), in Mexico there is an enormous rejection towards homosexual men. Hence, the utterer is showing his rejection by calling AMLO thus, i.e. *joto* (see table 7). He also refers to him as *peje*, and precedes the resulting morphological structure of the latter insults put together (*pejejoto*) by the word *pinche*, which in Mexico is used to insultingly refer to someone because that person might be seen as despicable (pinche, 2013).

(4) *Q pinche hueva ! Quieren llorar xq no ganará* ese pinche pejejoto hahaha*

The lemma *pejelacra* is also directed to AMLO as can be seen in (5). In this utterance, the producer first refers indirectly to the PRD candidate by way of mentioning and making fun of his stubbornness to occupy the presidential seat. It is therefore concluded that stubbornness might be socially considered a moral defect. Further, the producer addresses the candidate directly,

although it is not certain whether or not the candidate will see the comment, and refers to him as *pejerata*. This latter is a new morphological structure that had not been previously identified. Yet, with it, the candidate is once again compared to an animal; hence he is denigrated and offended. In addition, Mexicans colloquially use the word *rata* as a synonym of thief. In conclusion, both morphological structures, i.e. *pejelacra* and *pejerata*, are used to denigrate and offend Andrés Manuel López Obrador. Thus, they are both insults.

- (5) *que para dentro de seis años cuando la pejelacra quiera ser por milésima** vez prejidente [stands for presidente, it is written this way to make fun of AMLO's seaside town accent] no olvidemos estas imágenes** para volverlo a mandar al demonio.*
HAGAS LO QUE HAGAS JUNTO CON TUS PEJEBASURAS MALDITA
PEEEJJEERRATA NUNCA SERAS PREJJIDENTE

Yet another newer morphological structure found in the corpus that is used against Andrés Manuel López Obrador is the lemma *pejendejo*. Its use is exemplified in (6), (7), and (8).

- (6) *Miren nada más lo que me encontré**! Y quieren tener a este tipo como presidente de México*? Es un tarado! Jajajajajaja, me da risa este wey! Pero con lo que acabo de ver me doy cuenta y confirmo al 100% de que es un pejendejo! Esto dice más** que mil palabras! Sobre todo por lo preparado que está para gobernar a nuestro país*! Jajajajajaja...!!!*

- (7) *Yo no me APENDEJO y NO voy con el PEJENDEJO.*

- (8) *los seguidores del pejendejo ese no dan muestras de respeto así q no hay x q respetarlos ya q son igual de pejendejos*

In (6), AMLO is first called *tarado*, which is a synonym for stupid (table 7). We know that the utterer is referring to him because it is an excerpt from the AMLO corpus, because s/he mentions the presidential seat, and later uses the word *peje* compounded with the word *pendejo*, which is the strongest of insults in Mexican Spanish to refer to a stupid person (del Río, 2001; *pendejo*, 2001; *pendejo*, 2013). In this case, the producer is highlighting AMLO's inadequacy to rule precisely because of his foolishness and stupidity, which he argues to have completely confirmed: "*me doy cuenta y confirmo al 100%*". Thus, in this case, the intention is to offend AMLO by calling him stupid, and as a result denigrate him by arguing that he is not fit to rule a country. In (7), the utterer is also making reference to AMLO's stupidity by declaring that casting a vote in favor of him would be a stupid thing to do. Finally, in (8) the *pejendejo* morphological structure is further used to refer not only to the PRD candidate, but also to his followers. In this sense, the producer is implying that since AMLO is already stupid, those who follow him are stupid as well. Thus, (8) is in a way similar to (7). As a result, since it can be seen that the structure *pejendejo* has been used to offend and denigrate AMLO and his followers, it is also catalogued as an insult.

In contrast, not many utterances containing new morphological structures against Enrique Peña Nieto were found. However, four examples are now put forth in order to explain, as was already done in the case of the new morphological structures against AMLO, the pragmatic function of those found against EPN, although they were fewer in number. Utterance (9) includes none of the linguistic units under analysis. Nonetheless, it was included because it provides the background, i.e. social and psychological context, for the use of the word *copete* which appears on its own or blended with the word *pendejo* as in (12). Either way it is a linguistic unit under analysis. In (9) the word *copete* is not used to refer to EPN, rather it is part of the noun phrase that is actually used for that purpose: *burro con copete*, which could be translated as "donkey with pompadour". In this sense, as happened with AMLO, he is being compared to

an animal. Nonetheless, the producer of this utterance is making clear such comparison by adding the *copete* or pompadour in English, which is something that came to characterize EPN during the electoral process. In fact, AMLO mentioned several times that EPN was more worried about his appearance than about ruling a country (“Llama AMLO a desmitificar”, 2012).

(9) *algo es muy cierto, la democracia arcaica que tiene el país nos obliga a votar entre 4, así* que no elegimos* al que queremos, sino al menos peor.... sin embargo en esta elección nos vemos en la necesidad de votar por quien puede ganarle al peor, para que ese peor no llegue. Prefiero un demagogo utópico que un burro con copete*

The producer of (10) is supporting AMLO by arguing that EPN, referred to as *copetes*, promises things that make no sense and since his followers believe him, they too are stupid. In addition, s/he offends and denigrates EPN’s advocates by calling them “*priístas pendejos*”. With this expression, the producer of this utterance is implying that being an advocate of the PRI is something stupid, and thus since s/he is in favor of AMLO, he is superior. Finally, this person is disapproving of the PRI and of its advocates.

(10) *NO CABE DUDA QUE LOS PENDEJOS PRIISTAS SIGUEN SOÑANDO YA
NADIE LOS QUIERE TODOS LOS ODIAN HASTA SUS SIMPATIZANTES
DEJAN AL COPETES A MEDIO DISCURSO Y SE VAN POR QUE PROMETE
PURA PENDEJADA*

By the same token, the producer of (11) calls EPN’s followers ignorant and stupid, and compares them to their leader by calling them “*copetones*”, thus making reference to EPN’s appearance and implying once again that it is more important than his intellect and preparation. This person threatens EPN’s advocates’ negative face by demanding them to read and to avoid

being just like their leader. With the latter, the producer is implying that worrying about one's appearance is unimportant, while being an educated person that reads is important. In addition, s/he implies that by reading people will not become as stupid as EPN is.

- (11) *pura gente ignorante gente lean. no sean copetones estúpidos** que la palabra democracia se la pasan por el culo como nos pasaran antes de llevarnos* a la chingada más jodidos porque no creo que alguien está cagando dinero*

Finally, in (12) the person is threatening the general public with a civil war in case Enrique Peña Nieto, referred to as *copendejo*, wins the elections. As was described in the morphological analysis, this morphological structure is made up of the word *copete*, which was already described in the previous examples and the word *pendejo*, which surely the reader has not forgotten that it is the most aggressive insult to refer to a person who is considered dumb (del Río, 2001; pendejo, 2001; pendejo, 2013). Therefore, in this last example, the utterer shows his psychological and social knowledge by blending an already established insult, i.e. *pendejo*, with one that had been recently introduced to refer to EPN in a pejorative way pretty much in the same way that *peje* is used to refer to AMLO. Therefore, is a single word and considering the context where it appears, i.e. a threat, it is concluded that the producer of (12) is implying that EPN is not fit for governing because of his stupidity. The reader may recall that the same was done for AMLO.

- (12) *guerra civil si gana el copendejo*

By considering the examples set forth in (10) through (12), it is concluded that when analyzing insults, one gets an insight to a culture's social values and expectations from an individual (Martínez-Lara, 2009), especially from whom intends to govern. Further examples of

society's values and expectations encapsulated in other newer morphological structures are presented. First, from (13) through (30) the values of those against AMLO and his followers are presented. In the excerpts that follow, (31) through (39), statements in favor of AMLO and in response to those against him are included. It is argued that such values are encapsulated in the newer morphological structures detected.

- (13) *estos pseudo* estudiantes, de veras están** súper pejetarados, ya que se pongan a trabajar en algo productivo o de plano que [se] peguen un tiro. bola de parásitos. no sirven para nada.*
- (14) *.. Un verdadero ESTUDIANTE no lo encuentras en una "marcha o mitin" lo encuentras en un salón de clases, en una obra d teatro, en una biblioteca, en fin... Seran pejendejos o no pero no creen que para protestar en contra de algo hay que actuar de manera distinta, ayudando y no perjudicando? Que opinan?*
- (15) *jajaja le dicen ignorante a EPN y su peje que duró 14 años en la uni x eso le decían el abuelo jajajaja x favor tienen bien lavado el cerebro estos pejezombies*
- (16) *pero hay todavía pejezombies que creen ciegamente en él** yo ya decidí dejarlos en paz porque en su estupidez nunca van a cambiar*
- (17) *mmm no creo que sean lo mismo al menos yo no he visto a antipejes entrar a paginas pro-AMLO-Co a decirles vendidos muertos de hambre incultos y cuanto insulto se les ocurra, en fin, cada cabeza es un mundo, pero los pejefans son lo más intolerante que he visto.*
- (18) *tolerancia es una palabra que los pejezombies no conocen! Apenas y dices algo en contra de amlo y te dicen demasiadas groserías! Y así hablan d 'tolerancia' cuando se plantan y hacen marchas insultando a otros candidatos déjame informarte, eso no es tolerancia!*
- (19) *los pejezombies descerebrados e intolerantes le llaman conformistas a los que no piensan como ellos*

- (20) *Por favor ya dejen a México, porque los pejezombies no respetan nuestro voto haya sido PAN o PRI no entienden que para nosotros es mejor cualquier otro menos el Pejechavez [Another linguistic unit used to negatively compare AMLO to the former president of Venezuela, Hugo Chávez, who was actually a dictator]. Exigimos respeto de mayoría por los que no votamos por ese individuo*
- (21) *[...] Los porros [a stupid and stubborn person], borregos o pejezombies como les quieran llamar ya están** aprovechándose** de la libertad de expresión** para cometer actos de vandalismo, después no se quejen cuando se use la fuerza pública, el que se lleva se aguanta.*
- (22) *amlo, que bueno , que como MEXICO no hay dos, porque nuestro planeta no soportaría a otra gran nube de pendejos, con una basta y sobra. Pejezombies ya dejen de molestar, ya gocen* de sus vacaciones, y dejen de seguir a un POLITOLOGO ambicioso de poder.*
- (23) *[...] con sus marchas de repudio a candidatos que no quieren...? si no quieren a esos candidatos que no voten por ellos pero que no dividan ni sean violentos... violentos los pejezombies...*
- (24) *Ke se puede hacer antes unos inadaptados borregos y sin cerebros pejezombies... Es vandalismo y luego dicen k son muestras pacificas.... Y luego pretenden hacerse victimas...*
- (25) *La frustración devora a los pejezombies por dentro. Su amloco les envenenó la mente con mentiras y ahora ese veneno se los carcome. Pensar que se pasarán así 6 años AL MENOS. Pobres ridículos.*
- (26) *No se puede hacer nada por ellos, pruebas han tenido de sobra y aún así siguen con el cerebro vacío, incapaces de formarse un criterio propio y peor aún creyendo cada palabra que sale de la boca del orate redentor de las masas, su apostolado y sus respectivas biblias, tales como PROCESO, EL5ANTUARIO [this is how the word*

appears in the corpus, the 5 stands for an s], etc, etc. *Pejezombies... Pejezombies everywhere.*

(27) *No bueno, pero eso si prefiero a EPN a JVM que al psicópata de AMLOVE, quien dejó mal a su "mejor amigo" a los 8 años de un batazo en el cerebro y mató a su hermano a los 10 años de un balazo, ahora imaginarme que si a los 10 años mató a su propio hermano, que no hará 50 años después..... PIEDAD.....!*

(28) *jajaja no se peleen todos los candidatos tienen sus cosas, pero si AMLOVE pierde podemos esperar un plantón nacional y en todo México va a ver gente que en lugar de hacer algo productivo y trabajar se va a quedar días sin hacer nada, porque ellos querían su puta pensión y dinero gratis que el gobierno no tiene.*

(29) *Se ve los amlovers son intolerantes a la gente que piensa diferente. Y creen k todo el mundo lo quiere. Y Lo respetan. Jajaja. Respeto es lo que no tiene el por la gente k lo sigue*

(30) *Lo que pasa es que sabe cómo manejar su imagen. Y la gente se muere por empatizar con un "héroe de la comunidad" pero es sólo un hombre FALSO manejando una izquierda resentida y a una borregada de gente que no tiene memoria. Pejezombies y amlovers "ofendidos" en 3 2 1 ...*

The reader may recall from chapter two that during the 2012 Mexican electoral process, it was the youth that got the most involved in political matters both online and offline. In this sense, as an example one could also think of Peña Nieto's visit to one of the most important universities in Mexico and the rejection that the students showed to him. From that moment on, the youth in general organized demonstrations mainly against EPN. For many, among them producers of (13) and (14) these demonstrations are not something a student should be doing. Thus, it is concluded that society dictates that students should be in a classroom or in a library doing something productive. In this sense, for some members of society, demonstrations are disruptive

and serve for nothing. Further, the utterers of (13) and (14) argue that these pseudo students get involved in such activities because they are *pejetarados* and *pejendejos*. If we recall from the morphological analysis section, *tarado* and *pendejo* are synonyms, though the latter is stronger than the former. Hence, in these two utterances, AMLO's advocates are catalogued as stupid precisely because they follow that particular candidate and because they get involved in demonstrations instead of working or studying.

In the utterances that are now indicated, AMLO's followers are described as intolerant ((18), (19), (29)), brainwashed ((15)), brainless ((19), (24)), ignorant ((17)), blind ((16)), stupid ((16), (22)), uneducated ((17)), disrespectful of other people's political stand and vote ((20)), vandals ((21), (24)), violent ((23)), poisoned by their leader ((25)), and unable to form their own opinion yet they do nothing but insult those who do not think the way they do ((26), (30), (18), (19)). Considering these general descriptions, it is concluded that the morphological structures *pejefans* ((17)), *amlovers* ((29), (30)), and *pejzombies* (the rest of the utterances) are used to pejoratively refer to AMLO's followers implying that they do so blindly and violently. In this sense, utterers refer to insults as a tabooed behavior that is avoided because a person's integrity is at stake. Thus, since these utterers argue that *pejzombies*, *pejefans*, and *amlovers* go against this social rule, then they deserve no respect whatsoever especially keeping in mind that they too are disrespectful because with their demonstrations they show no respect towards the advocates of other candidates. In addition, from these comments it is also concluded that AMLO's followers are considered to be blindly following their leader because they have had enough proof of the faultiness, falsity, and craziness of the candidate, yet they refuse to become aware of them because they have no brain that might help them understand. Therefore, in these utterances, the advocates of AMLO are offended and denigrated because of their political stand which leads them to acts of vandalism, which are further disapproved of by the utterers and by society in general.

Once again, AMLO is referred to as a mental and lying person in (25). Thus, it is inferred that for society a mental person is not someone to be trusted, and that a crazy person might contaminate others, in this case AMLO's advocates who have been poisoned by him. Then, AMLO is seen as having a tremendous power over the minds of millions of people who favor him. In this sense, it is ironical how those against AMLO mention that their political stand is not being respected by those who favor him, however they are committing the same mistake by arguing that following AMLO implies madness and having no brain.

Besides being referred to as *amloco* ((25)), those against AMLO also call him AMLOVE in utterances (27) and (28). In the first case, the morphological structure under study is preceded by the noun psychopath, which implies that AMLO is (once again) a mental person. Such an assertion is supported by the producer of utterance (27) by mentioning that he killed his brother when he was ten and he severely injured a friend when he was eight. Thus, the producer concludes that he is even more dangerous now that he is even older and has gained more power. To refer to such power, producer of (28) mentions that if he were to lose there would surely be massive demonstrations integrated by people who have nothing better to do and that are only looking for easy money from the government. Once again, these utterances are intended at offending and disapproving of AMLO because of his past and future actions which are based on violence.

Although it was mentioned earlier that a comment made on a Facebook page not always receives an actual response, it was found that some of the morphological structures under analysis were used by AMLO's followers not against themselves though, rather to question and even make fun of those who use them as can be seen in utterances (31) through (39).

(31) *Por favor! Cada gente pendeja e ignorante! No mamen, ya no mas PRI, ya no mas PAN, mas AMLOVE. Mejor infórmense para que vean un poco más claro la realidad.*

- (32) *y qué les garantiza que sean "pejezombies"? En todas las ciudades hay vandalismo, gente desinformada que lo único que quieres es ser parte de una manifestación sin siquiera saber su propósito, en este caso se está tomando como si fuera parte de aquellos grupos, y si así fuera, el daño es mínimo con lo que provocará Peña Nieto*
- (33) *Orgullosamente pejezombie, si eso significa no querer más de los últimos 82 años y quiere un cambio verdadero, pues si, soy un orgulloso pejezombie*
- (34) *Siguen ladrando los perros!! Priistas de mierda y acarreados limosneros x ustedes el pais esta como esta.... Yo puro AMLOVE!!!*
- (35) *dirían eres un pobre vendido, de perdís que te dieran la Monex [a Mexican finance company that was accused of having bought votes in favor of the PRI during the Election Day] para que valga la pena sino eres un pobre Peñazombie lamecu...*
- (36) *Que tonto el que escribió esta publicación seguro debe ser del pri ya que escribió mal las siglas de Andrés Manuel López Obrador es AMLO y el peñejo que posteo puso MALO así que entonces ahora sería Manuel Andrés López Obrador*
- (37) *pero bueno no hay peor ciego que el que no quiere ver, y eso de las medidas de tráfico no te preocupes porque en el DF el 70% del electorado esta con AMLO, ahí no hay pierde y de recomendaciones no hace falta decirte que youtube está abarrotado de las estupideces del burro de Peña, tan solo pon Peña y te sale una infinidad de negativos, pero bueno se feliz que el cambio viene con AMLOVE*
- (38) *[...] pero el pueblo??? la gente que vive y sufre problemas de desempleo, inseguridad, los millones que fuimos timados con estas elecciones??? porque apoyan a los que se hacen millonarios a nuestras costillas???? neta no entiendo... nosotros los "pejezombies" simplemente deseamos un México más equitativo, que haya democracia, que deje de haber corrupción.*

- (39) *AMLO tiene mi voto, tuve la oportunidad de verlo y nada que ver con el copete. aquí en donde vivo el pri dejó una deuda de 660 millones de pesos a la próxima administración, y ahora todas las calles están cubiertas con propagandas del PRI. puros políticos corruptos.*

In (31) for instance, the utterer too calls those against AMLO stupid and ignorant precisely because they are not in favor of him. S/he argues that society is tired of the major parties, the PRI and the PAN, and thus the change that everyone is looking for will only come with AMLO, to whom s/he refers as AMLOVE, hence implying that this candidate is the only one that actually cares about his people and his country. To further contextualize the use and appearance of this morphological structure, i.e. AMLOVE, it must be mentioned that during Felipe Calderón's administration, AMLO was considered by many as a stubborn extremist that refused to accept that he had lost the presidential elections. The reason is that he and his followers took one of Mexico City's most important avenues (Paseo de la Reforma) and established what *they* called "the legitimate and rightful government" (Huxley, 2011). Apparently, in an attempt at redeeming himself and guaranteeing the vote of those against Calderón's Drug War, in his 2012 campaign AMLO presented himself under a different and more pacific scope. He proposed the "*República Amorosa*" (Loving Republic, author's translation), which he assured before the media that he would establish once he was elected president, and which consisted of enforcing moral, spiritual, and cultural values that would lead to a less individualistic lifestyle, and thus more peace and love and therefore no hatred whatsoever. Since this political face shown by the candidate was completely different from what is usually expected from political candidates, many voters began to see AMLO as Mexico's savior (Montalvo, 2012; Huxley, 2011).

Hence, in line with what was said in regards to AMLO being considered a political Messiah, the producer of utterance (34) also declares him or herself in favor of AMLO by once

again referring to the candidate as AMLOVE, implying that s/he is a faithful follower. Further, s/he offends and denigrates those in favor of the PRI by calling them dogs and “*prístas de mierda*”, which is also a great insult. Once again, we detect aggressiveness derived from difference in political standings. Further, in (33) an advocate of AMLO openly declares to be so by saying that he is proud of being in favor of such candidate. S/he says: “*orgullosamente pejezombie*”, thus implying that s/he cares not about what others call him or her due to his or her political thoughts. In addition, s/he argues that despite of what is said about AMLO’s followers, aka *pejezombies*, they are the ones who truly want a different Mexico in social, economic, and political matters. This latter is also argued by the producer of (38) who speaks on behalf of the lower social classes, and by the utterer of (37) who makes references to EPN’s mistakes, which are found all over the internet and are therefore proof of his inability to govern a country, whereas AMLO, once again referred to as AMLOVE, will be the one to bring a rightful change. It is thus concluded that the linguistic unit AMLOVE not only implies that AMLO loves his people, but also that people love him.

In the same way that AMLO’s followers are called *pejezombies*, those in favor of EPN are called *peñazombies* as in (35). The utterance that triggered (35) was not actually found, yet from what its producer says it can be inferred that being in favor of EPN means doing so because the candidate pays people to follow him, or because, as in the case of AMLO’s followers, brainless people are in favor of a candidate that is worth nothing. The unit *peñazombie* is followed by another incomplete insult: *lameculos*, which was probably left incomplete because it is a swear word that refers to body parts, and is thus a tabooed word despite of the anonymity and impunity that online social networking sites provide. In addition, those in favor of Peña Nieto are also called foolish in (36), although the producer is referring to a single person, i.e. “*el que escribió esto*”, yet later he mentions that following the PRI implies being a stupid person, even more so if they support Enrique Peña Nieto, who has previously been referred to as stupid. In this sense,

once again the PRI candidate is referred to as *copete* in (39), which highlights that to him a person's appearance are more important than her intellect.

Although some Facebook users implied that Enrique Peña Nieto is a stupid person, others focused on expressing their disapproval of AMLO's followers' actions by emphasizing that EPN was going to be or that already was the elected president. To illustrate, the utterer of (40) openly declares him or herself in favor of Enrique Peña Nieto by declaring him the president of Mexico. Since AMLO's followers are also Mexican, Peña Nieto's victory implies that he is their president too. Thus, driven by his or her anger due to the actions taken by the PRD, i.e. promoting hatred, and because the country spends loads of money in the campaign of AMLO, who s/he does not consider fit for ruling, the producer of utterance (40) threatened AMLO's followers', whom s/he calls *pejezombies*, freedom of action, and thus their negative face (Bernal, 2008; Grundy, 2008; Holmes, 1995; Huang, 2007; Johnstone, 2002; Martínez-Lara, 2009; Paltridge, 2006; Mills, 2002; Verschueren, 1999) by verbally imposing Peña Nieto as president of Mexico. We say imposing because the Election Day had not taken place yet. Similarly, in (41), the producer of the utterance indirectly orders *pejezombies* to stop their disruptive practices because they must accept that Peña Nieto is their president. In this context, it is inferred that by the time when the utterance was written, Peña Nieto had already been declared the elected president.

(40) *El PRD es el partido q fomenta el odio. Si hay q darle chance a la izquierda pero si estuviera un candidato modelo no el pendejo loco y decerebrado del MALO lastima gastar tanto dinero x esta porqueria de candidato. PEÑA PRESIDENTE DE MEXICO y de los pejezombies*

- (41) *Son unos inches vándalos mugrusos muertos de hambre ke se jodan estos pendejos su nuevo presidente es epn [EPN] asi ke se me joden inches⁷ pejezombis*

However, although many of the utterances are intended at discrediting, denigrating, offending, and disapproving of AMLO and his followers, it does not mean that the producers of such utterances are in favor of EPN as can be seen in utterances (42) and (43):

- (42) *De hecho la inflación* comenzó* a bajar des de q estuvo salinas heee infórmense después Cedillo, luego Fox y hasta ahora se a mantenido en 4 % investiguen* bien y q q quede claro yo no estoy de acuerdo con ninguno de los candidatos así como digo de lopez Obrador puedo decir del copetes o de la chepina [vocative used to refer to the 2012 PAN candidate, Josefina Vázquez Mota]*
- (43) *Yo festejaré el triunfo de Josefina y la derrota del copetes y el menso del peje*

In most cases, AMLO's followers were labeled as *pejezombies*, and are described as intolerant, unproductive, blind, stupid, brainless, disrespectful, brainwashed, violent, poisoned, ridiculous, frustrated, incapable of forming their own opinion because they believe everything that AMLO says. Considering these words, which are part of the linguistic context where the word *pejezombie* was found, together with the individual meaning of the words *peje* and *zombie*, it is concluded that this morphological structure implies "blindly and thoughtlessly following someone". Ironically, however, many Facebook users who made comments on the pictures also used foul language and insults to refer to AMLO's followers and to express their disapproval in regards to their actions. An example of such verbal aggressiveness is utterance (44) where the utterer uses *pinches* and *pendejos*, both of which have already been identified as

⁷ Mexicans shorten the word *pinche* by omitting the /p/ to lessen the effect of the word, i.e. euphemistic expression

strong insults in Mexican Spanish (del Río, 2001; pendejo, 2001; pendejo, 2013; pinche, 2013), before the word *pejezombies*; thus implying that AMLO's followers are stupid and worthless. Furthermore, it must be noted that very few Facebook users encouraged serious debating and political discussion, the majority were apparently entertained by the political information and other types of political content, i.e. pictures and videos shared and posted on the Facebook pages under study. Utterance (45) illustrates the invitation to serious political discussion and disapproves of disinformation and gossip, which are common practice in online social networking sites as was already mentioned in the second chapter of this paper.

(44) *Estos PINCHES PENDEJOS DE PEJEZOMBIES, CREEN QUE NO SOMOS UNIVERSITARIOS, NOSOTROS YA SOMOS GENTE RESUELTA, YA SABEMOS POR QUIEN VOTAMOS Y POR QUIEN LO HACEMOS, SU PENDEJO DEMAGOGO DEL PEJE HOY, HOY!!!, SE VA A IR A LA CHINGADA, VOTEMOS INTELIGENTE POR PRI, PAN O ALIANZA!!!, PERO NO POR UN PINCHÉ PENDEJO DEMAGOGO MANIPULADOR DE MASAS IMBERBES Y MENTALMENTE INESTABLES, NO SE APENDEJE!, NO VOTE POR EL PEJE!!!!*

(45) *yaaaaa!!!! ahora para ser lider de opinión basta agarrar una revista vieja, renovar las fotos y...a volar!!! ya chole, vemos fotos de chepina abrazando a la maistra [vocative used to refer to Elba Esther Gordillo, the former president of the teacher's unión], al copetes abrazando a salinas y a amlo abrazando a bartlett...¿¿¿y qué???...¿¿es éso suficiente para cambiar la preferencia del voto???...vamos!!! hay que ser más inteligentes...las fotos NUNCA dicen la mitad de lo que realmemnte ocurre, vamos a dejar a un lado las cortinas de humo y vamos a comentar seriamente las posibilidades de cada candidote...el tiempo se agota*

Last but not least, though, it must be noted that some of the lemmas did not occur in an actual linguistic context. That is to say, since comments made on Facebook are not precisely conversations, some comments remain with no answer or consist of a single word as occurred in the case of the lemmas *pejeterroristas* (APPENDIX D), *pejemartires* (APPENDIX C), *pejeninis* (APPENDIX E), *pejeliebers* (APPENDIX E), *AMLOliebers* (APPENDIX E), *pejeimbasil* (APPENDIX F), *AMLOSER* (APPENDIX C), and *Peñejo* (APPENDIX G). In these cases, it is inferred that the comment is directly addressing and referring to what appears on the picture, which is why the appendix was indicated next to each morphological unit, so that the reader can observe the picture and conclude the pragmatic meaning of the linguistic units enlisted above.

From the latter excerpts, it is concluded that although insults tend to be avoided because they are a face-threatening act, they were widely used on Facebook during the 2012 electoral process. It can be further seen that insults are dysphemistic in nature. Dysphemisms are further used to express fear, frustration, distaste, hatred, and disapproval, also to humiliate or degrade (Allan and Burrige, 2006). Consequently, insults reflect the attitudes, beliefs, and qualities that are appreciated and rejected in a given society or in a given community of practice and are most of the times used to damage the addressee's face (Bernal, 2008). As a result, insults are a form of authentic impoliteness, which is characterized by verbal or physical aggressions consciously done, and which therefore have a negative interpersonal effect as there is conscious verbal or physical aggression intended to damage. Nonetheless, the degree of offensiveness of an utterance, however, is only determined by the hearer, whose perception and interpretation are influenced by the sociocultural context (Bravo, 2003, as cited in Bernal, 2008), which refers to the knowledge a person has about the way interpersonal interactions and relations should take place. In this respect, the responses given to the utterances that included new morphological structures intended to insult were not considered for the present study on the one hand because, as was mentioned earlier, answering back is not a must in online social networking sites, therefore the comments under study could not be treated as actual conversations. On the

other hand, including responses would have resulted in a different study or would have elongated this one, which was not at all possible due to time issues.

Regardless, considering that “politics cannot be conducted without language” and that political discourse analysis aims at investigating how are strategic functions, i.e. resistance, opposition, protest, and delegitimization, expressed through pragmatic, semantic, and syntactic choices (Chilton and Schäffner, 1997:206), in the last part of the present study the linguistic units detected in both corpora were analyzed in terms of the linguistic context in which they appeared as well as the meaning encapsulated in each of the words that underwent a word formation process and thus gave way to new politically-related insults. It was determined that the main strategic functions, i.e. pragmatic functions, that the linguistic units under study were used for were resistance, opposition, protest, and delegitimization. Let us recall that the latter strategic function refers to political actions that involve blaming, accusing, and insulting a political actor (Chilton and Schäffner, 1997). Consequently, since it was observed that most morphological structures were either preceded or followed by already existing insults, i.e. *pendejo*, *pinche*, or by negative adjectives, e.g. *intolerante*, *irrespetuoso*, it is concluded that the meaning enclosed in the linguistic choices made by users of a language and political actors is consistent with their political background knowledge and values. That being said, we now proceed to the limitations of the study section, which is in turn followed by the overall conclusions of the study, and a final section where the researcher makes important suggestions for follow up studies on this matter.

1.4 Limitations of the study

The size of the corpora was definitely a limiting factor, if not the biggest and perhaps the only limiting factor. Nonetheless, as was already explained in chapter three, the comments that were used as data were randomly selected. In addition, the size of the corpora had not been previously determined. Thus, the resulting size in both cases was indeed surprising. In this

sense, it is hypothesized that if the EPN corpus had been larger, perhaps more newly formed words would have been identified in it.

It must be taken into account that the number of comments made to each picture varied depending mainly on the picture itself, i.e. not all of them were controversial enough. Hence, there were pictures that had at least 20 comments made to them because that was the parameter in order to consider them as part of the study, and others had more than 500 comments. This happened especially in the case of the AMLO2 page, where there were only 19 pictures shared throughout the year, yet most of them had over 1000 comments. In addition, the difference in size might also be due to the fact that the EPN1 page ended up sharing and uploading pictures that were not at all related with the electoral process and its aftermath. In conclusion, it might be best to do a follow up study were more pages are considered as data sources.

1.5 Conclusions

Voters look for information that will allow them to cast a well-reasoned vote. In this sense, it was mentioned before that political information is mainly transmitted by means of social interaction. Since people join online social networking sites mainly driven by socializing needs, i.e. keeping in touch with offline acquaintances and/or friends, making new friends, learning about social events, “looking cool”, seeking self-status (Park et al., 2009; Bonds-Raacke and Raacke, 2010), among others, it is not surprising that online social networking sites have become an important source of political information and a space for political expression and discussion.

In this context, online social networking sites allow voters to rapidly find and share information; to meet others who think the way they do, which in turn enhances a sense of group belonging and collective problem solving practices; to gather support and mobilize large numbers of people; and to speak or write about or with candidates themselves (Weiwu et al.,

2010; Garret and Danziger, 2011; Contreras, 2012b; Leighninger, 2011). The latter serve as infrastructure for public engagement and democracy (Leighninger, 2011; Islas, 2012; “Preparan inédita declaración”, 2012). In this sense, the impact and influence that information and communication technologies have had on people’s behavior is evident, especially when it comes to politics and democracy (Del Rey Morató, 2008; McGrath, 2011; and Morozov, 2009; Contreras, 2012a).

As a result, the Internet is considered to be bringing forth new forms of political participation (“Redes sociales, internet y elecciones”, 2012), and thus it is now thought of as a human right because it is said to promote freedom of speech (Garret and Danziger, 2011). However, the Internet’s impact, and especially that of online social networks remains to be further analyzed, because most Internet users tend to visit mainly, if not exclusively, sites whose content coincides with their points of view, and generally avoid those with which they disagree (Garret and Danziger, 2011). In addition, political websites are only attractive to those who already are politically active offline (Weiwu, et al., 2010). Furthermore, the political information that can be found on the internet can be so vast that users might feel overwhelmed and as a result they might lose interest or develop negative attitudes towards the electoral process or the actors involved in it. Finally, individuals might be merely interested in being entertained by political information, which is known as infotainment (Garret and Danziger, 2011).

It must be noted that online information is seldom reliable not only because it is hard to verify (Del Rey Morató, 2008; Morozov, 2009), but also because the opinions of experts are considered irrelevant (Enríquez, 2011). In addition, it is most of the times biased since it is directed to a specific audience (Garret and Danziger, 2011). In this sense, Chilton and Schäffner (1997) sustain that most politicians and political institutions use language in persuasive and manipulative ways that the general public might not be able to detect. In Mexico, for instance, voters are deprived from the access to relevant political information which could help them to cast more conscious votes, and some of them have even decided to abstain from participating in

the electoral process as a result of the television spot bombardment. In this sense, Rohini (2007 as cited in Luna, 2011) highlights that misinformed societies will undoubtedly elect corrupted politicians. Thus, although there is apparently more access to information of all kinds because of communication technologies, such information must be interpreted and analyzed carefully and critically (Chilton and Schäffner, 1997).

In Mexico, however, since political parties and candidates were given access to the media, i.e. 1970s (Paoli, 2011), they have never encouraged public debate or critical thinking because instead, they have invested time and money on discrediting and insulting their adversaries (Luna, 2011; Orozco, 2011). The 2007 constitutional amendment prohibits politicians and political parties from insulting or denigrating one another. Nonetheless, civilians are not forbidden to do so. In addition, the amendment provides a legal framework for the use of advertising spaces on the radio and on television. However, it disregards other media, including online social networking sites (Orozco, 2011). Hence, during the 2012 electoral process, online social networking sites became society's voice (Mejía, 2012).

It has been noticed that social networking sites have become the main source of information for most internet users in Mexico (Islas, 2012). Thus, online social networking sites, especially Facebook, were indeed an ideal way for Mexican politicians to come closer to citizens and rightfully gain their vote during the 2012 electoral process (Mejía, 2012). Notwithstanding, although Mexican politicians intended to mimic Barak Obama's campaign ("Las redes le ponen picante", 2012; Islas, 2012), they failed at using online social networking sites in positive and productive ways, as president Obama did. Instead, they applied old practices on modern scenarios, like the use of bots and trolls and the creation of fake accounts to appear more popular than they really were (Mejía, 2012; "Las redes sociales le ponen picante", 2012; Seco, 2012; "Redes sociales: el otro escenario", 2012; Islas, 2012), to mention but a few. The reader may recall from chapter two that bots and trolls were used for political cyberbullying (Poy Solano, 2012). In other words, people were payed to create fake accounts in the most popular

online social networking sites in Mexico which they used to linguistically attack a candidate by way of insults, rumors and lies that lead to distrust, disinformation, and intolerance (Poy Solano, 2012; “Las redes sociales le ponen picante”, 2012; “Las redes sociales, el otro escenario”, 2012).

Once again, therefore, Mexican propagandistic and political practices focused on discrediting and insulting candidates and their followers (Islas, 2012; Pérez, 2012; “Redes sociales, el otro escenario”, 2012) by means of violent and aggressive language against them, as well as the creation of rumors and lies that lead to distrust, paranoia, disinformation, and intolerance (“Redes sociales, el otro escenario”, 2012; Poy Solano, 2012; “Las redes sociales le ponen picante”, 2012; “Las redes sociales, el otro escenario”, 2012).). As a consequence, many SNS users felt intimidated and decided not to express their political opinion and ideas in online social networking sites because they were afraid to be victims of political cyberbullying, which was previously defined as the use of violent and aggressive language to insult or make fun of a candidate and/or his followers (Poy Solano, 2012).

It is thus concluded that Mexican political actors refuse to use the Internet, and especially online social networking sites, as a tool to improve their communicative practices with citizens, especially because they seem reluctant to accept and profit from the horizontal organization of online social networking sites, where no user is more important than the rest (Aguilar, 2011). Regardless of politicians’ misuse of online social networking sites during the 2012 elections, citizens acknowledged the freedom and impunity provided by their anonymity in online social networks (Torres Nabel, 2009), and thus they used them widely to share and spread their feelings and opinions about the political parties, the candidates, and the electoral process itself, and to organize both online and offline demonstrations and protests, i.e. cyberprotesting and cyberactivism (Lozano, 2010; Torres Nabel, 2009; Mejía, 2012; “La explosion de las redes sociales”, 2012). Therefore, in general, during the 2012 electoral process not only were political parties aggressive and violent in their use of online social networking sites, but also regular

users who also discredit and insult political actors and their followers, i.e. cyberbullying (“El IFE sin facultades”, 2012).

In this respect, society’s increasing, decentralized, and uncontrollable power could be seen as dangerous mainly because extremists and anarchists are now able to spread their thoughts and ideas to larger groups (Del Rey Morató, 2008; Morozov, 2009), which might include violent and antidemocratic goals (Lozano, 2010). Keeping in mind that in Mexico there is no legal framework that regulates the political use of online social networking sites (Ramírez, 2012; “Preparan inédita declaración”, 2012; Contreras, 2012b), and considering that during the 2012 electoral process both politicians and regular users of the online social networking sites behaved violently to one another, it could be argued that online freedom of speech is but a theoretical concept (Del Rey Morató, 2008; Morozov, 2009). Nonetheless, it might also be argued that such a “negative” use, i.e. insulting, is a way of expressing oneself and one’s opinion regarding political matters (Orozco, 2011). In this context, the present study aimed at identifying and explaining some of these online linguistic practices, i.e. insulting and discrediting, expressed mainly in the appearance of new morphological units loaded with pragmatic meaning.

Let us recall that the research questions that drove the present study were: 1) What are the most common politically-related insults used on Facebook during the 2012 Mexican electoral process?, 2) Which are the morphological processes that gave way to such insults?, and 3) What are the pragmatic implications of such insults? In response to question number one, the most common politically-related insults used on the two Facebook pages under study were *pejzombies*, *pejendejo*, *copete*, and *AMLOCO*, i.e. these were the ones with the highest frequency of occurrence in both corpora, however, there are more. As can be seen, most are intended at insulting and making fun of, i.e. cyberbullying, Andrés Manuel López Obrador. Nonetheless, this does not mean that the users of these newly created words are in favor of Enrique Peña Nieto. In addition, it must be kept in mind that not as many newly formed structures were found in the EPN corpus probably because it was smaller with respect to the

AMLO corpus. In the section that follows it is suggested that the comments made to all pictures gathered be included in a follow up study so that the corpora are bigger in size, and thus conclusions can be more easily generalized. Nonetheless, in response to research question number two, it was rather easy to detect the word formation processes that gave way to the insults under study. These were syntagmatic compounding, blending, borrowing, and acronym. They are listed in a hierarchic way, considering which occurred most often. However, they also occurred simultaneously, and even one before the other. Borrowing for instance, was not as frequent as compounding, yet it must have occurred before so that words could be actually compounded.

Finally, based on the analysis of the linguistic context where each of the newly formed structures were, as well as the individual meaning of the words that were compounded, blended, or borrowed, as an answer to research question number three it is concluded that the linguistic units under study are proof of the ongoing linguistic violence that took place in online social networking sites before, during, and after the 2012 presidential elections. Thus, it is concluded that in a context where political matters have been carried out in a rather aggressive and violent way, it is not surprising that users of online networking sites, aware of the anonymity and impunity, and profiting from the lexical competence came about with newer linguistic ways to express their discontent towards the current political situation. The latter is especially true when considering that Octavio Paz indicates that words can be used to alleviate a strong emotion, to strengthen an argument, to insult the interlocutor (Raisin and van der Heijden, 2005), among others. In addition, Lang (1990) asserts that lexical and grammatical changes are in many cases triggered by social, political, economic, technological, and cultural changes. In terms of political circumstances, Moreno (1986) mentions that linguistic changes happen as a result of the consolidation of democracy.

1.1 Considerations for further research

As it was mentioned in the Limitations of the study section, it would be interesting to further develop the present study by including all the comments made to every single picture gathered so that there is more linguistic data under analysis, and thus the conclusions can be more easily generalized. In addition, it is suggested that a follow up study be aimed at determining whether or not these insults have come to stay. This would result in a diachronic study of not only the use of these insults both on Facebook and probably in offline environments, but also the reactions to them and to those who use them. A research such as these would also provide relevant data to determine the degree to which online social networking sites influence offline behavior and interpersonal interaction on political matters. In addition, it would also be interesting to extend the study in order to include other Facebook pages so that the data under analysis is even more representative.