Aristotelian ethos or credibility is reflected through the use of language. We examine the language of face-saving in parliamentary arguments. In oral question period in a Westminster-style parliamentary system, the opposition asks confrontational questions, which require a defensive face-saving response, whereas government backbenchers ask friendly and promotional questions, for which a response need not be defensive. Can we distinguish the two kinds of response?

Novel dataset for analyzing reputation defence:
Question and answer pairs during the oral question period of the Canadian parliamentary proceedings (Hansard) from 1994 to 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governing party</th>
<th>Threatening</th>
<th>Non-threatening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal and Conservative</td>
<td>4,524</td>
<td>4,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>11,090</td>
<td>1,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>11,504</td>
<td>2,004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five-fold cross-validation
Canada 1994–2014; Threatening: 4,524; Non-threatening: 4,524

Cross-parliament setting
Train on Liberals and test on Conservatives
Train on Conservatives and test on Liberals

Cross-parliament setting with balanced data (1,700 each class)
Train on Liberals and test on Conservatives
Train on Conservatives and test on Liberals

Our approach:
– Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN)
– Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM)
– Gated Recurrent Units (GRU)
– SVM classifier trained with all possible combinations of words extracted from cross-product of questions and answers

– Reputation defence language can be detected with high accuracy regardless of differences in ideologies.
– Bigrams, NRC emotions (anger+pos+neg), and vagueness cues can help distinguish the language of face-saving.