

**How to Cite:**

Borris, D., & Zecho, C. (2018). The linguistic politeness having seen on the current study issue. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 2(1), 32-44.  
<https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v2n1.10>

## The linguistic politeness having seen on the current study issue

**Decca Borris**

Canada Institute of Linguistics, Langley Township, Canada

**Charles Zecho**

Canada Institute of Linguistics, Langley Township, Canada

**Abstract**--The current issue is overviewed in this paper about the linguistics politeness. Positive politeness strategies seek to minimize the threat to the hearer's positive face. These strategies are used to make the hearer feel good about themselves, their interests or possessions, and are most usually used in situations where the audience knows each other fairly well. In sociolinguistics and conversation analysis (CA), politeness strategies are speech acts that express concern for others and minimize threats to self-esteem ("face") in particular social contexts. Being polite means being aware of and respecting the feelings of other people. Politeness can and will improve your relationships with others, help to build respect and rapport, boost your self-esteem and confidence, and improve your communication skills. Importance of Politeness in Life. Politeness is a great virtue. But a polite person will always please others with his polite behavior and good manners. Politeness means consideration for the feelings of others. Politeness is one of the central features of human communication. It is a human phenomenon, yet expressed differently in different cultures. Positive politeness refers to an atmosphere of inclusion and mutuality created by linguistic means such as compliments, encouragement, joking, even the use of "white lies."

**Keywords**--communication, context, human, linguistics, politeness.

**Introduction**

Hill, Ide, Ikuta, Kawasaki & Ogino (1986), politeness is generally related to the relationship between two participants which can be referred to as 'oneself' and 'others'. The view of politeness in pragmatic studies is described by several experts. Among them are Leech, Robin Lakoff, Bowl & Levinson. Pan & Kadar (2011), the principle of politeness has several maxims, namely the maxim of wisdom (tact maxim), the generosity maxim (generosity maxim), the maxim of acceptance (approbation maxim), the modesty maxim (modesty maxim), the maxim of compatibility (agreement maxim), and the sympathy maxim (sympathy maxim). The principle of politeness is related to two conversation participants, namely oneself (self) and others (other). The self is a speaker, and the other person is the opposite of the speaker.

Lo & Howard (2009), maxims is a language principle in lingual interaction; the rules governing his actions, the use of his language, and his interpretations of the actions and

---

Linguistics and Culture Review © 2018.

**Corresponding author:** Zecho, C. [zecho.c@canil.ca](mailto:zecho.c@canil.ca)

Received 09 February 2018/ Accepted 18 April 2018 / Published 27 June 2018

speech of the interlocutor. In addition, the maxim is also called a pragmatic form based on the principle of cooperation and the principle of politeness. The maxims advocate politely expressing beliefs and avoiding polite speech.

[Davies, Haugh & Merrison \(2011\)](#), the basic idea of wisdom maxim in politeness principle is that speech participants should hold to the principle of always reducing their own profits and maximizing the profits of others in speaking activities. People who hold and carry out the wisdom maxim will be said to be polite. Leech says that the longer a person's speech is, the greater the person's desire to be polite to the interlocutor. Likewise, speech that is spoken indirectly is usually more polite than speech that is spoken directly.

With a maxim of generosity or maxim of generosity, participants in speech are expected to respect others. Respect for others will occur if people can reduce profits for themselves and maximize profits for other parties.

[Clark & Schunk \(1980\)](#), in the maxim of appreciation, explained that someone will be considered polite if in speaking always try to give appreciation to other parties. With this maxim, it is hoped that the participants of the speech will not mock one another, berate each other, or demean each other. Speech participants who often mock other speech participants in speaking activities will be said to be rude. It is said so because the act of mocking is an act of disrespect for others.

[Fukada & Asato \(2004\)](#), in the maxim of simplicity or maxim of humility, the speech participant is expected to be humble by reducing praise to himself. People will be said to be arrogant and proud if in speaking activities always praise and favor themselves. Maximum consensus/match. In this maxim, it is hoped that the speech participants can foster mutual compatibility or agreement in speaking activities. If there is agreement or compatibility between the speaker and the speech partner in the speaking activity, each of them can be said to be polite ([Gagné, 2010](#)).

Prosperous Max. This maxim is expressed by assertive and expressive utterances. In the maxim of sympathy, it is expected that the speech participants can maximize the attitude of sympathy between one party with another party. If the interlocutor gets success or happiness, the speaker is obliged to give his congratulations. If the interlocutor finds it difficult, or the speaker is worthy of grieving or expresses condolences as a sign of sympathy. An attitude of antipathy towards one of the speech participants will be considered an impolite act.

In daily social interactions, people generally behave as if the expectations of their public self-image will be appreciated by others. [Spencer-Oatey \(2002\)](#), if a speaker says something that is a threat to the expectations of others about their self-image, the action is said to be the Face Threatening Act (FTA). As an alternative, one can say something that has a smaller chance of threat. This is referred to as the Face Saving Act (FSA).

A neighbor is playing music very loudly and a married couple is trying to sleep. The husband can do the FTA: "I'll tell him to turn off the noisy music right now!" Or the wife can do the FSA: "Maybe we can ask him to stop playing the music because it's getting late and we need to sleep".

According to Brown and Levinson, negative faces are the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, and rights to non-distraction and positive faces are the positive and consistent image people have of themselves and their desire for approval. In other words, the negative face is the need to be independent and positive face is the need to be connected (in a relationship) ([Mboudjeke, 2010](#)). In connection with the negative and positive faces, it can be concluded that the FSA is oriented to the negative face and is concerned with the interests of others, even including apologies for the disturbances created. FSA like this is

called negative politeness. Whereas FSA which is oriented towards one's positive face will tend to show solidarity and emphasize that both parties (speaker and speech partner) want the same thing and the same goal. FSA in this form is called positive politeness (Upadhyay, 2003).

Negative politeness pays attention to negative faces, by applying the distance between the speaker and the speech partner and does not interfere with each other's territory. Speakers use it to avoid coercion and provide the choice of speech partners. Speakers can avoid the impression of coercion by emphasizing the interests of others by using apologies, or by asking questions that give the possibility to answer "no". For example, in a student center building, you ask for help to mention the site address that you need by saying to David.

"Sorry, I didn't mean to bother, but maybe you could tell me the address of the site the lecturer was talking about this morning?" Another example, "Sorry to bother, can I borrow five hundred thousand, hmm, if you don't need it now? The presence of choices has an effect on politeness. The more likely the answer to "no" is given, the more polite the speech is.

Terkourafi (2015), positive politeness aims to save by applying closeness and solidarity, usually in friendship or friendship, making others feel comfortable and emphasizing that both parties (speaker and speech partner) have the same goal. Suppose you are still in the student center and still need help, this time you ask for help from your close friend, Rudi.

"Rudi, you have a good and cool memory, it would be cool if you tell me the address of the site Mr. Handano referred to this morning." Super strategies in Politeness. In every speech act, we always have many expressions of speech. Brown & Levinson (1987) suggest several super strategies for language users to be able to communicate in a polite manner (quoted from Yule, 1996). "The following example will give an explanation of super strategies. For example, you are taking an exam. You then realize that you don't have a pen. You are sure your classmates will help. In this case, you must first make a decision whether to say something or not.

- *Not say anything*  
You can immediately search in the bag without saying anything waiting for your friend to ask or offer help. The 'not saying anything' approach might work or not work. It depends on how other people interpret your actions.
- *Say something: off the record*  
If you decide to say something, you can say: "Oh dear. I Forgot my pen ". Similar to the approach 'not say something', say something: this off record also has the possibility of success or failure. There is no guarantee that others will understand what you mean.
- *Say something: on record*  
Contrary to off-record statements, you can express your needs by talking directly to someone. The most explicit way to express your needs is firmly on the record. You can directly ask for help by saying: "Give me a pen!" A strict request, following Grice's maxim, is truly direct and concise. However, this has the potential to threaten the face of the speech partner if this request is considered an order. To avoid this, you must do face-saving acts that use positive and negative politeness strategies to reduce threats.

Félix-Brasdefer (2006), there are at least three types of politeness ranking measuring scales which to date have been widely used as a reference in politeness research.

### Leech politeness scale

In the Leech politeness model, each interpersonal maxim can be utilized to determine the politeness rating of a speech. The following scale Leech politeness in full.

- **Cost-benefit scale:** Representing the cost or benefit of an act to the speaker and hearer.  
Pointing to the size of the losses and gains caused by a speech act on a speech. The more the speech is detrimental to the speaker, the more polite the speech will be considered. And vice versa, the more the speech benefits the speaker, the less polite the speech is. If this is seen from the perspective of the speech partner, it can be said that the more beneficial the speech partner is, the less it will be seen as unattractive.
- **Optimality scale:** Indicating the degree of choice permitted to speaker and/or hearer by a specific linguistic act.  
Pointing to the many or at least choices that the speaker delivers to the speech partner in the speaking activity. The more the speech allows the speaker or speech partner to make a large and flexible choice, the more polite the speech will be.
- **Indirectness scale:** indicates the amount of inferencing required of the hearer in order to establish the intended speaker's meaning.  
Referring to the ranking directly or indirectly the purpose of a speech. The more the speech is straightforward it will be considered the less polite the speech is.
- **Authority scale:** represents the relationship status between speaker and hearer.  
Referring to the relationship of social status between speakers and speech partners involved in speech. The farther the distance between the speakers' social rank and the speech partner, the speech used will tend to be more polite.
- **Social distance scale:** Indicating the degree of familiarity between speaker and hearer.  
Pointing to the ranking of social relationships between speakers and speech partners involved in a speech. There is a tendency that the closer the social rank between the two, the less polite the speech becomes.

Meier (1995), a positive politeness strategy is oriented towards efforts to improve the listener's positive face threat. When you use positive politeness, try to imagine that the listener has the same basis or even has a friendship with you. Using the language of identity in a group, you can say: ("How about letting me use your pen?") The let form indicates a sense of solidarity between the speaker and the listener. However, this strategy still has the risk of being rejected if the listener has a different social level from you. In this case, the opposite politeness strategy might be more appropriate to use.

Locher, (2015), a negative politeness strategy doesn't always mean bad. In fact, this strategy intends to correct negative facts that threaten the listener. You can ask for help indirectly by asking "Could you lend me a pen?" Or "Sorry to bother you, but may I borrow your pen?" These questions are preceded by an expression of apology for loading which shows your concern about loss for listeners. In addition, asking for permission to ask more polite questions.

### Brown-Levinson politeness scale

- The scale of social distance ranking between speakers and speech partners  
Much is determined by the parameters of differences in age, sex, and sociocultural background.
- The scale of social status ranking between speakers and speech partners  
Based on the asymmetric position between the speaker and the speech partner or can be said to be based on the speaker and hearer relative power (power rating).

- The scale of speech acts or so-called rank ratings or the complete degree of imposition associated with the required expenditure of goods or services is based on the relative position of one speech act with other speech acts.

### **Robin Lakoff's politeness scale**

Robin Lakoff stated that there are three provisions for politeness in speaking activities.

- The first scale or formality scale  
It was stated that in order for the speech participants to feel comfortable and at ease in speaking activities, the speech used should not have the tone of force and should not have the impression of being arrogant.
- The second scale or the scale of indecision/choice scale  
Demonstrate that for speakers and speech partners to feel comfortable in speaking activities, choices in speaking must be given by both parties. Not allowed to be too tense or rigid.
- The third scale or ranking of severity or similarity  
Demonstrate that in order to be polite, one must be friendly and always maintain friendships between one party and another. In order to achieve this, the speaker must be able to regard the speech partner as a friend. By considering one party as a friend to the other party, a sense of solidarity and alignment as one of the prerequisites of politeness will be achieved.

### **Coordination and context**

Politeness is a pragmatic phenomenon. Politeness lies not in form and words, but in the function and social meaning referred to. If the speaker says the form is more polite than the context required, the speech partner will suspect that there is a special purpose hidden.

Pilegaard (1997), politeness is not the same as respect which uses a formal form that expresses distance and respect for people of higher status, and usually includes elements of choice. Respect is already in languages, such as Korean or Japanese, and can be seen in people's pronouns in several languages in Europe (French: tu/vous). However, it is very rarely found grammatically similar things in English, although there can still be found forms of respect such as the use of "Sir" and "Madam". It is possible to practice respect without having to be polite (Brown, 2015).

- Situation context  
Because politeness is a pragmatic phenomenon, it is influenced by context. There are two contexts in a situation that affect the way we make requests. First, the level of coercion and the rule is "the higher the level of loading contained in an utterance, the more indirect an expression is". For example, when we want to borrow money, we tend to say: "Can I borrow five hundred thousand, if you don't need it now?" If the money borrowed is in smaller nominal terms, "Can I borrow five thousand rupiahs to pay for photocopies?" The second context is a formality. The more formal a situation is, the more indirect a speech is produced. For example, when we are in a seminar and we are involved in a debate, we will say, "Can I continue what I said before ..." However, when debate occurs between close friends, we will say, "Wait, I'm not done talking yet ..."
- Social context  
The choice of politeness formulation depends on social distance and power between the two parties. If there is social distance, politeness is coded and there is a lot of speech discontent. When social distance decreases, negative politeness and sustainability also decrease. The variables that determine social distance are the

level of familiarity, differences in status, roles, age, gender, education, class, occupation, and ethnicity.

- Cultural context

However, the relationship between unsustainability and social variables is not that simple. Overall, it can be said that politeness and language are bound by local culture.

For example, in Cuba, for example, there shouldn't be any distance between friends, so when a friend says 'thank you' when served a cup of coffee can cause misunderstandings and create a barrier between the two people.

[De Ayala \(2001\)](#), there are some people who in certain situations are more concerned with the principle of politeness than the principle of cooperation, or prioritizing the maxim of the principle of modesty than one another. In this case, it must be acknowledged that the position of the principle of cooperation is very weak if exceptional cases are not explained satisfactorily. To be able to provide a satisfying explanation we need the principle of politeness. Therefore, the principle of politeness should not be considered as a principle that is merely added to the principle of cooperation, but the principle of politeness is a necessary complement.

[Matsumoto \(1988\)](#), general social functions carried out by the principle of cooperation and the principle of politeness must not go unnoticed, and the 'bargaining' relationship that exists between the two principles. The principle of cooperation allows a conversation participant to communicate assuming that the other participants are willing to work together. In this case, the principle of cooperation functions to regulate what is said by the participants of the conversation so that speech can contribute to the purpose of illocution or the purpose of discourse. However, it can be said that in terms of organizing the participants' speeches, the principle of politeness plays a role in maintaining social balance and friendly relations, because only with such relationships can we expect that other participants will work together. In certain situations, the principle of politeness takes second place. This happens in a cooperative activity in the form of exchanging information that is needed by both parties ([Ji, \(2000\)](#)).

From the description above we can know that the principle of cooperation with the principle of politeness is always incompatible. This is in accordance with the statement of Grice in Leech which states that if we want to be polite we are often faced with the clash between the principle of cooperation with the principle of politeness so we must decide the extent to which we will bargain between the principle of cooperation with the principle of politeness.

[Leech \(1993\)](#) explained that the principle of cooperation is needed to make it easier to explain the relationship between meaning and power; such an explanation is very adequate, especially to solve problems that arise in semantics using a truth-based approach. But the principle of cooperation itself cannot explain why people often use indirect means to convey what they mean; and what is the relationship between meaning and power in types of sentences that are not declarative (non-declarative) sentences. So, this is where the role of politeness becomes important.

Politeness is one of the studies of pragmatics. This statement is reinforced that politeness is a new horizon in language and has not been studied in the linguistic constellation, except in pragmatic studies. The define politeness or etiquette as procedures, customs, or customs that apply in society ([Kasper, 1990](#)). Politeness is a rule of behavior that is determined and agreed upon by a particular community so politeness is at the same time a prerequisite agreed upon by politeness social behavior, hereinafter referred to as manners. Muslich holds that politeness contains three elements, namely politeness in dress, action and language. Courtesy dress with regard to the procedure for dressing politely and neatly

in public places according to circumstances. Politeness is concerned with the way to act or gestures when facing something or in certain situations (Nwoye, 1992). The politeness of the language regarding procedures for communicating through verbal or language signs.

Fraser (1990), sociolinguistics exists as a combination of two scientific disciplines, namely sociology and linguistics. Sociology as a science of society joins linguistics about the science of language. The relationship between sociolinguistics with politeness lies in politeness in the language (Jary, 1998). The politeness of language is essentially the speech agreed upon by the speaker and the speech partner for the purpose of the conversation. Therefore, the author wants to compile a paper titled Politeness Politeness as a Sociolinguistic Phenomenon to enrich and deepen the reader's knowledge.

The politeness of language as a sociolinguistic phenomenon is closely related to language in society. Politeness is one form of language behavior agreed upon by the community of users of certain languages in the context of mutual respect and respect for one another. The purpose of learning politeness in the language is to understand, appreciate, and implement a form of communication that respects the relationship between speakers and speech partners so that the use of communication strategies is known by the community as a power of speakers (Chen, 1993).

Various opinions emerged, responding to the relationship between sex and language politeness. Labov, Trudgill, and Lakoff agree that women's language is more polite than men. Brown and Sachiko Ide, et al understand that women's language reflects their social position. It can be concluded from research in Japan, where speakers determine choices in a language not because of gender differences, but based on the function of linguistic expressions. Differently, in Indonesia between men and women have the same level of politeness.

Gu (1990), the politeness aspect varies based on three things. First, based on the age that can be seen between the two parents and children, teachers and students, and brothers and sisters. Second, based on the socioeconomic level that can be seen between servants and employers, courtiers with the king or the nobility, and superiors with subordinates. Third, based on relationships between friends who are already familiar. The phenomenon of politeness in the language is expressed in speech level. The choice of polite speech in Indonesian should pay attention to two things, including the choice of greetings and sentences. Politeness can be formed due to three things, among others: the application of the principle of politeness, avoiding the use of the word taboo, and the use of honorific or euphoric words.

### **Brown and Levinson's universal politeness theory**

Brown & Levinson (1987) argue that every member of a society has face, which is defined as one's public self-image, and when the speaker decides to commit an act which potentially causes the hearer (or the speaker) to lose face, the speaker will tend to use a politeness strategy in order to minimize the risk. Sifianou (2012), there are two types of face. One is a negative face, which is related to the claim to one's territory, personal preserves, and rights to non-distraction, such as freedom of action and freedom from imposition. The other is a positive face, which is related to the desire to be appreciated or approved by other members of society. Brown and Levinson claim that the notion of the face and one's social interaction oriented to it are universal.

In their universal politeness theory, Brown & Levinson (1987) suggest five possible strategies to alleviate a face-threatening act, henceforth called FTA: (1) without redressive action, baldly; (2) by positive politeness; (3) by negative politeness; (4) by going off record; and (5) by not doing the FTA. The riskier the speaker perceives the FTA to be, the higher the number of the strategy he/she will want to choose. Each of the above strategies

consists of several subordinate strategies; in particular, the use of honorifics is categorized as a negative politeness strategy.

The theory also offers a formula that is claimed to be used in computing the seriousness of an FTA. According to [Brown & Levinson \(1987\)](#), the speaker evaluates the weightiness or seriousness of an FTA (x) on the basis of the following three factors; the social distance between the speaker (S), and the hearer (H), a measure of the power that the hearer has over the speaker, and the absolute ranking of impositions in the particular culture.

Research on politeness has been a set topic within pragmatics ever since [Lakoff \(1973\)](#), [Brown & Levinson \(1978/1987\)](#) and [Leech \(1983\)](#), as the most influential early scholars, put the topic firmly on the linguistic agenda. In an endeavor to explain pragmatic variation in naturally-occurring data on the one hand (as part of the pragmatic turn) and still working within a mindset that proposed ‘rules’ and universals on the other, their thinking has influenced all following scholars within this field of interest. Roughly from the 1990s onwards, however, the scope of analysis has been widened from face-maintaining and face-enhancing data to instances of conflictual and face-aggravating behavior ([Yeung, 1997](#)).

We have also witnessed an increase in discussions about appropriate methodological and theoretical approaches to politeness and a tendency to creatively draw on approaches from other fields (such as identity construction research). These trends have made the field an especially vibrant one that is currently witnessing a struggle to (re)define its focus.

Culpeper’s (1996, 2005, 2010, 2011) work on his own and with colleagues has shaped these discussions considerably since he was among the first to broaden the scope of interest to include impoliteness phenomena (e.g. [Culpeper et al., 2003](#); [Bousfield & Culpeper, 2008](#)), to also work with fictional and historical data (e.g. [Culpeper & Kádár, 2010](#); [Culpeper & Demmen, 2011](#)) and to ceaselessly question and discuss current wisdom within the research community (e.g. [Culpeper & Haugh, 2014](#); or the current extensive project on The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (I’m)Politeness, [Culpeper, Haugh & Kádár](#)). In what follows, I want to offer some thoughts on two connected issues that are currently being discussed and that bear further thinking: the scope of our research questions and efforts of developing an interdisciplinary approach within interpersonal pragmatics.

### **Goffman vs Brown and Levinson**

Subsequent research on ‘face’ and ‘politeness’ has often been more intent on quoting Goffman selectively than on examining critically the potential of his analytical constructs and original observations. The first edition of Brown and Levinson’s work appeared twenty years after Goffman’s and has been enormously influential, generating a huge amount of literature. Critics, not surprisingly, are mainly nonAnglophone researchers who find Brown and Levinson’s particular concept of ‘face’ difficult to apply in their own cultures and, consequently, have argued with the universality of their definition of ‘polite behavior’. Rather than retracing the lines of criticism, a task beyond the scope of this article, I shall attempt to illustrate the ways in which Brown and Levinson’s understanding of ‘face’ and ‘politeness’ falls short of Goffman’s original ideas.

At the beginning of their 1987 revised essay, *Politeness*. Some universals in language use, [Brown & Levinson \(1987\)](#) point out that their notion of face is “highly abstracted and subject to cultural elaboration”. It is their dualistic notion of ‘face’, or public self-image, with matching positive and negative politeness behaviors, that is at the heart of their model and that departs most radically from both Goffman’s elaboration of ‘face’ (and “face-work”) and Durkheim’s “positive and negative rituals”.

“Avoidance rituals” have found extensive application in Brown and Levinson’s elaboration of “negative politeness”, from which a notion of ‘negative face’ emerges that does not find



correspondence in Goffman's or Durkheim's work. Brown and Levinson's cognitive concept of 'face' and the rational actor does not fit into Goffman's study of interaction, which he understood to be about "not the individual and his psychology, but rather the syntactical relations among the acts of different persons mutually present to one another". It was the search for the "general properties" that individuals share in social interaction, i.e. their social psychology, that led Goffman to analyze "not [...] men and their moments. Rather moments and their men" (Goffman, 1967).

In particular, it is "negative face" and, consequently, negative politeness, that has generated the most criticism, usually on cultural relativistic grounds. Whereas Goffman views 'avoidance' as a process whereby individuals avoid face-threatening situations, this is not reduced to a clear-cut distinction between "freedom of action and freedom from imposition" that characterizes Brown and Levinson's negative face (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The two types of 'face' and the notion of 'imposition', criticized by many as culture-bound, are not the only difficulties.

The negativity that connotes one side of 'face' and a type of 'politeness', could not have been derived from Durkheim, although Brown and Levinson's debt to the French sociologist is signaled at least six times in the re-issue of their essay. Brown and Levinson state: "That there must be simple and direct links [between interpersonal politeness and formal rites] we dimly saw when we borrowed the distinction between negative and positive politeness from Durkheim's distinction between negative and positive rites". In his *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, Durkheim points out that "negative cult" is "one means in view of an end: it is a condition of access to the positive cult". (Durkheim, 1915).

A little further on, Durkheim (1915) states more unequivocally that "normally, the negative cult serves only as an introduction and preparation for the positive one". 'Negativity' is, in fact, a positive and necessary contribution to an overall worthy endeavor from which both the individual and society ultimately benefit. This is hardly in line with Brown and Levinson's (1987) elaborate description of 'Face Threatening Acts' (FTAs) as a major concern of 'polite behavior'. 'Giving', enhancing or maintaining face are less important objectives of interactional practices than protecting one's own and the other's face.

It appears that in Brown and Levinson's treatment of 'face', Goffman's tendentially individualistic treatment of the 'sacred self' becomes an obsessive attempt by an ideal rational actor to mark and protect the personal territory from potentially harmful interpersonal contact. Emotions may indeed be present in Brown & Levinson's (1987) model but they appear to be mostly concerned with defensiveness and protectiveness.

Brown & Levinson (1987) proposed a universal model of linguistic politeness and claimed that politeness is realized linguistically by means of various strategies across cultures. Central to this model of politeness is the concept of 'face', derived from Goffman (1967), which Brown & Levinson (1987) define as "the public self-image that every member [of a society] wants to claim for himself", and the authors recognize that everyone has similar face wants. The authors distinguish between two aspects of the face that they claim to be universal: positive and negative. While positive face refers to the hearer's desire to be appreciated or approved of (e.g., by seeking agreement, solidarity, reciprocity), negative face "represents the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction, i.e., freedom of action and freedom from imposition" (Brown & Levinson (1987) (e.g., by being indirect, giving deference, being apologetic). According to Brown and Levinson, the face is invested; it is something that can be lost, and it must be constantly attended to in interaction.

Further, Brown & Levinson (1987) argue that during social interaction a speaker must rationally assess the nature of a face-threatening act (FTA) (e.g., a refusal). This assessment of the seriousness of the act involves three independent and culture-sensitive

factors: the social distance (D) and social power (P) between a speaker and a hearer, and the absolute ranking (R) of imposition in a particular culture. Although D and P are universal, Brown and Levinson acknowledge the fact that diverse cultures will interpret them differently; as to R, it is culture-specific since the imposition of the act may vary according to the culture.

Cook (2011), once the degree of the FTA has been assessed, the speaker must select from a set of five strategies that allow him/her to avoid or to minimize an FTA (1987:69). These strategies are based on a hierarchy of binary choices and are ordered with respect to the degree of politeness or face-work involved: first, the speaker has to decide whether to do or not to do the FTA; if he decides to do it, then he must decide to do it either on record or off record (e.g., by using irony, understatement, rhetorical questions). If the decision is to go on record, the speaker must perform the act with or without redressive action (e.g., ‘turn off the light, please’ versus ‘turn off the light’).

Finally, if the speaker chooses to perform an FTA with redressive action, he/she must do it using positive or negative politeness strategies (e.g., ‘Nicky, honey, turn off the light’ versus ‘Could you please turn off the light?’). Overall, Brown and Levinson view linguistic politeness as a means of conflict avoidance; in their framework, the emphasis is placed on the speaker, not on the hearer, as an independent member of society (by negative politeness).

In order to avoid the confusion that might result from the use of the terms ‘positive’ and ‘negative’, the notions of the positive and negative face were examined by Scollon & Scollon (2001), taking into account individual and group needs. These authors used the term involvement as a way of reminding us that the emphasis is on the common ground and highlights the “person’s right and need to be considered a normal, contributing, or supporting member of society”.

Bargiela-Chiappini (2003), involvement is realized by such discourse strategies as paying attention to others, claiming in-group membership, using first names, or to show that the speaker is closely connected to the hearer. On the other hand, they use the term independence to emphasize the individuality of the participants. Independence is shown by such discourse strategies as making minimal assumptions, using formal names and titles, or by giving options to the interlocutor. As observed by these authors, the original meaning of the terms ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ “can easily be forgotten and readers can too easily begin to think of ‘positive politeness’ as good and ‘negative politeness’ as bad”.

Based on these observations, Scollon & Scollon (2001), classified face relationships into three politeness (or face) systems. According to this model of politeness, in a deference politeness system, the interlocutors see themselves at the same social level with no interlocutor exerting power over the other (Power), but with a distant relationship (+Distance). As a result, both interlocutors use independence strategies, including expressions that minimize the threat to avoid the risk of losing face. In a solidarity politeness system, interlocutors see themselves as being of equal social position (Power) and with a close relationship (Distance); in this system, the interlocutors use involvement strategies to assume or express reciprocity or to claim a common point of view. Finally, in a hierarchical politeness system, one participant is in a superordinate position (+Power) and the other is in a subordinate position (Power) (Chen, 2001).

## **Conclusion**

Politeness is the practical application of good manners or etiquette. It is a culturally defined phenomenon, and therefore what is considered polite in one culture can sometimes be quite rude or simply eccentric in another cultural context. Manners are something used every day to make a good impression on others and to feel good about oneself. No matter

where you are - at home, work, or with friends - practicing good manners is important. Good manners are more than opening doors and writing thank you notes. An important concept in the linguistic study of interaction is that of 'face' However, the nature of interaction means that — intentionally or unintentionally — speakers often find themselves producing utterances that threaten one or both types of face: what Brown and Levinson called 'face-threatening acts' (FTAs). Speech Acts. Speech acts represent a key concept in the field of pragmatics which can be broadly defined as language use in context taking into account the speaker's and the addressee's verbal and non-verbal contributions to the negotiation of meaning in interaction. Pragmatics is a subfield of linguistics and semiotics that studies the ways in which context contributes to meaning. Pragmatics encompasses speech act theory, conversational implicature, talk in interaction and other approaches to language behavior in philosophy, sociology, linguistics, and anthropology.

## References

- Bargiela-Chiappini, F. (2003). Face and politeness: new (insights) for old (concepts). *Journal of pragmatics*, 35(10-11), 1453-1469. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00173-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00173-X)
- Brown, P. (2015). Politeness and language. In *The International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences (IESBS)*, (2nd ed.) (pp. 326-330). Elsevier.
- Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.
- Chen, R. (1993). Responding to compliments A contrastive study of politeness strategies between American English and Chinese speakers. *Journal of pragmatics*, 20(1), 49-75. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(93\)90106-Y](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(93)90106-Y)
- Chen, R. (2001). Self-politeness: A proposal. *Journal of pragmatics*, 33(1), 87-106. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00124-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00124-1)
- Clark, H. H., & Schunk, D. H. (1980). Polite responses to polite requests. *Cognition*, 8(2), 111-143. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(80\)90009-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(80)90009-8)
- Cook, H. M. (2011). Are honorifics polite? Uses of referent honorifics in a Japanese committee meeting. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(15), 3655-3672. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.08.008>
- Culpeper, J. (2008). Reflections on impoliteness, relational work and power. *Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice*, 21, 17.
- Culpeper, J. (2010). Conventionalised impoliteness formulae. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(12), 3232-3245. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.05.007>
- Culpeper, J., & Demmen, J. (2011). Nineteenth-century English politeness: Negative politeness, conventional indirect requests and the rise of the individual self. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*, 12(1), 49-81. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.12.1-2.03cul>
- Culpeper, J., & Haugh, M. (2014). *Pragmatics and the English language*. Macmillan International Higher Education.
- Culpeper, J., & Kádár, D. Z. (Eds.). (2010). *Historical (im) politeness* (Vol. 65). Peter Lang.
- Culpeper, J., Haugh, M., & Kádár, D. Z. (Eds.). (2017). *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im) politeness*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Davies, B. L., Haugh, M., & Merrison, A. J. (Eds.). (2011). *Situated politeness*. A&C Black.
- De Ayala, S. P. (2001). FTAs and Erskine May: Conflicting needs?—Politeness in question time. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33(2), 143-169. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(00\)00002-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(00)00002-3)
- Durkheim, E. (1915). The elementary forms of the religious life, trans. *Joseph Ward Swain* (New York, 1915). See also *Edward Shils, Center and Periphery: Essays in Macrosociology* (Chicago, 1975).
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2006). Linguistic politeness in Mexico: Refusal strategies among male speakers of Mexican Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(12), 2158-2187. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.05.004>
- Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of pragmatics*, 14(2), 219-236. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90081-N](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90081-N)

- Fukada, A., & Asato, N. (2004). Universal politeness theory: application to the use of Japanese honorifics. *Journal of pragmatics*, 36(11), 1991-2002. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2003.11.006>
- Gagné, N. O. (2010). Reexamining the notion of negative face in the Japanese Socio linguistic politeness of request. *Language & Communication*, 30(2), 123-138. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2009.12.001>
- Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction ritual: essays on face-to-face interaction.
- Goffman, E. (1967). On face-work. *Interaction ritual*, 5-45.
- Goffman, W., & Newill, V. A. (1967). Communication and epidemic processes. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 298(1454), 316-334.
- Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of pragmatics*, 14(2), 237-257. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90082-O](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90082-O)
- Hill, B., Ide, S., Ikuta, S., Kawasaki, A., & Ogino, T. (1986). Universals of linguistic politeness: Quantitative evidence from Japanese and American English. *Journal of pragmatics*, 10(3), 347-371. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(86\)90006-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(86)90006-8)
- Jary, M. (1998). Relevance theory and the communication of politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30(1), 1-19. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(98\)80005-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)80005-2)
- Ji, S. (2000). 'Face' and polite verbal behaviors in Chinese culture. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 32(7), 1059-1062. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(99\)00068-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00068-5)
- Kasper, G. (1990). Linguistic politeness: Current research issues. *Journal of pragmatics*, 14(2), 193-218. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90080-W](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90080-W)
- Lakoff, R. T. (1973). *The logic of politeness: Minding your p's and q's*.
- Leech, G. (1993). Corpus annotation schemes. *Literary and linguistic computing*, 8(4), 275-281. <https://doi.org/10.1093/lc/8.4.275>
- Levinson, S. C. (1987). Pragmatics and the grammar of anaphora: A partial pragmatic reduction of binding and control phenomena. *Journal of linguistics*, 23(2), 379-434. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226700011324>
- Lo, A., & Howard, K. M. (2009). Mobilizing respect and politeness in classrooms. *Linguistics and Education*, 20(3), 211-216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2009.07.001>
- Locher, M. A. (2015). Interpersonal pragmatics and its link to (im) politeness research. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 86, 5-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.05.010>
- Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of pragmatics*, 12(4), 403-426. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(88\)90003-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(88)90003-3)
- Mboudjeke, J. G. (2010). Linguistic politeness in job applications in Cameroon. *Journal of pragmatics*, 42(9), 2519-2530. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.02.010>
- Meier, A. J. (1995). Passages of politeness. *Journal of pragmatics*, 24(4), 381-392. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(94\)00053-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(94)00053-H)
- Nwoye, O. G. (1992). Linguistic politeness and socio-cultural variations of the notion of face. *Journal of pragmatics*, 18(4), 309-328. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(92\)90092-P](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(92)90092-P)
- Pan, Y., & Kadar, D. Z. (2011). Historical vs. contemporary Chinese linguistic politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(6), 1525-1539. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.10.018>
- Pilegaard, M. (1997). Politeness in written business discourse: A textlinguistic perspective on requests. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 28(2), 223-244. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(96\)00084-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(96)00084-7)
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2001). 27 Discourse and Intercultural Communication. *The handbook of discourse analysis*, 538.
- Sifianou, M. (2012). Disagreements, face and politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(12), 1554-1564. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.03.009>
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2002). Managing rapport in talk: Using rapport sensitive incidents to explore the motivational concerns underlying the management of relations. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(5), 529-545. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(01\)00039-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(01)00039-X)

- Terkourafi, M. (2015). Conventionalization: A new agenda for im/politeness research. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 86, 11-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.06.004>
- Upadhyay, S. R. (2003). Nepali requestive acts: Linguistic indirectness and politeness reconsidered. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(10-11), 1651-1677. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(03\)00076-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(03)00076-6)
- Yeung, L. N. (1997). Polite requests in English and Chinese business correspondence in Hong Kong. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 27(4), 505-522. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00050-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00050-X)
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York.