The Analysis of Relationship Between Politeness and Face Theory

CrossMark
click for updates

Komang Trisna Dewi [a]
Ketut Artawa [b]
Putu Sutama [c]
Ni Ketut Ratna Erawati [d]

Article history:	**Abstract**
	This study aims to analyze the relationship between politeness and face theory. This type of research is qualitative research with a descriptive method to explain the relationship between politeness and face theory. The theory of Brown and Levinson is used to describe and explain face theory while Leech's Politeness Principle is used for politeness theory. The results of this study showed that politeness is very important, theory and concepts have been broadly developed by experts, especially on how to be polite as well as to show solidarity to other people. Face theory suggests that to be polite, people need to recognize each others' faces, where face itself means public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself. These theories and concepts give great impacts on society because politeness is one of the important factors to keep harmony between people. The application of these theories and concepts are also significantly needed in society so that harmonious relationship between people can be maintained.
	International journal of linguistics, literature and culture © 2021. *This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license* *(https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).*

Corresponding author:
Komang Trisna Dewi,
Hindu State University I Gusti Bagus Sugriwa Denpasar, UHN I.G.B.S Denpasar, Indonesia
Email address: trisnadewi053@gmail.com

---

[a] Hindu State University I Gusti Bagus Sugriwa Denpasar, UHN I.G.B.S Denpasar, Indonesia

[b] Udayana University, Denpasar, Indonesia

[c] Udayana University, Denpasar, Indonesia

[d] Udayana University, Denpasar, Indonesia

1 Introduction

Politeness is an aspect of pragmatics that its use in language is determined by an external context. Politeness is a system used by the speaker to keep up to the addressee's expectations. According to Yule (Winerta & Hamzah, 2012), politeness is showing awareness of another person's face; it is related to social2 distance or closeness. Politeness refers to the emotional and social sense of self that everyone else to recognizes. In this case, to build a good relationship among people and to have a good social interaction, politeness is needed. In other words, politeness was the expression of the speakers' intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face-threatening acts toward another.

There are so many different things to put into consideration when people communicate with each other, most importantly about what to say and how to say it. They affect the selection of words, specific sentence types, and the best sounds to relate what people want to say to each other and how they want to say it. For example, in French, there is a distinction between the pronoun tu and vous (meaning 'you'), and they are very significant to indicate address terms, naming, and politeness markers. They also indicate the social relationship between the speakers. In Indonesian, there is also a distinction in addressing 'you' depending on the closeness of relationship among communication participants and situation. When both speaker and hearer share a close relationship, kamu is used as a second-person pronoun instead of anda, which sounds very formal. Anda is used when people are engaged in a formal situation, e.g. in a lecture or job interview. Therefore, French and Indonesian speakers need to consider and choose the right pronoun to address their interlocutors to maintain positive communication (Fita, 2014; Mao, 1994).

In society, it is easy to observe politeness by giving examples of behavior that is considered polite. For example, people behave politely when they show respect to their superiors. Furthermore, polite language may be characterized by the use of respectful address terms, such as Sir, Madam, or the use of polite utterances, such as excuse me, sorry, thank you, etc. Similarly, the social distance between speakers has a tremendous impact on how they speak to each other. People are generally more polite to those whom they don't know very well, and they generally feel that they can be more abrupt with people who are close friends (Fraser, 1990; Meier, 1995).

When people are doing communicating, it is very important to save the interlocutor's 'face'. This factor has a solidarity function. Sometimes, solidarity is considered more important in conversation. For example, by changing asymmetrical use of second-person pronouns to symmetrical use of the pronouns. By doing this switch, people show their solidarity without any fear of being impolite to others. Therefore, solidarity is sometimes considered in communication to maintain the positive relationship among people.

In addition, Leech 1983 in (Watts et al., 2005) defines politeness as a type of behavior that allows the participants to engage in social interaction in an atmosphere of relative harmony. He then comes with a term called Politeness Principle (PP) which is mainly concerned with six maxims, namely tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim, and sympathy maxim. These maxims concerns minimizing the cost and maximizing the benefit to the speaker/hearer. These maxims can be used in social interaction to establish and maintain feelings of comity within a social group. This paper will mainly discuss the relationship between politeness and face theory, as well as observing Leech's Politeness Principle and its maxims. Examples are provided to make the explanation clearer. To support our understanding of Leech's Politeness Principle and its maxims, research on the issue will also be provided in this paper.

2 Results and Discussions

Face theory

Wardhaugh (2006) stated that the concept of politeness is closely related to Erving Goffman's work on the notion of 'face'. Goffman used the term 'face' to discuss some of the constraints on social interaction. In Goffman's work, 'face' was a personal feature that people protect or enhance. People are more likely to protect their faces and the faces of others to the extent that each time they interact with others, they play out a kind of mini-drama, a kind of ritual in which each party is required to recognize the identity that the other claims for himself or herself. By this explanation, therefore, the face has a social identity function.

Moreover, Brown & Levinson (1987) define the face as 'the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself.' They also distinguish between positive face and negative face. The definitions of both positive and negative face according to Brown and Levinson are as follows:

- Positive face: the positive consistent self-image or personality (crucially including the desire that this self-image is appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants.
- Negative face: the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction – i.e freedom of action and freedom of imposition.

Therefore, a positive face looks for solidarity, and a negative face, however, is more problematic for it requires interactants to recognize each other's negative face, i.e., the need to act without giving offense (Wardhaugh, 2006). These two kinds of 'faces' need to be aware when having interaction in society. Regarding these two kinds of faces, therefore, there are two choices of politeness, namely positive politeness, and negative politeness. Wardhaugh (2006) stated that positive politeness 'leads to moves to achieve solidarity through offers of friendship, the use of compliments, and informal language use: we treat others as friends and allies, do not impose on them, and never threaten their face.' On the other hand, negative politeness 'leads to deference, apologizing, indirectness, and formality in language use: we adopt a variety of strategies to avoid any threats to the face others are presenting to us.'

Another important element in understanding how face and politeness are connected involves what Brown and Levinson call a face-threatening act (FTA). This occurs in social interactions which intrinsically threaten the face of the speaker (S) or hearer (H), such as when one makes a request, disagrees, gives advice, etc. Brown & Levinson (1987) defined politeness as redressive action taken to counter-balance the disruptive effect of face-threatening acts (FTAs). In their theory, communication is seen as potentially dangerous and antagonistic. Brown and Levinson also argue that in human communication, either spoken or written, people tend to maintain one another's face continuously. In everyday conversation, people adapt utterances to different situations. Among friends, people take freedom or say things that would be likely impolite among strangers. In both situations, people try to avoid making the hearer embarrassed or uncomfortable. Thus, situation and context play an important role in performing politeness as well as saving both speakers' and hearers' faces. Face-threatening acts (FTAs) are acts that infringe on the hearers' need to maintain his/her self-esteem and be respected. Politeness strategies are developed for the main purpose of dealing with these FTAs. There are four strategies in Brown and Levinson's Face Threatening Acts (FTAs), namely bald on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off record. The next section will give a brief explanation of each strategy (Kasper, 1990; Jary, 1998).

Bald-on record

The bald on-record strategy does nothing to minimize threats to the hearer's "face". Brown & Levinson (1987) state that doing an act baldly, without redress, involves doing it in the most direct, clear, unambiguous, and concise way possible. Normally, an FTA will be done this way if both the speaker and the hearer agree that face demands may be suspended in the interests of urgency or efficiency. It will also be done in requests, offers, suggestions, that are clearly in hearer's interest, and when the speaker is superior to the hearer. The example can be observed in a conversation between a manager and an employee as follows:

(1)   Manager   :   *Anda dipecat.*
                    You are fired.
       Employee   :   *Ini gak adil. Saya sudah bekerja di perusahaan ini lebih dari 10 tahun!*
                    This is unfair. I've been working in this company for more than 10 years!

In the conversation above, it is very clear that the manager does nothing to minimize the hearer's face. The manager acted baldly, said the utterance most concisely and directly to say his/her intention. When the employee's face is not saved, it gives an offensive sense to the employee that in some way, the employee felt an unfair situation in the utterance. The degree of superiority is also seen in the conversation, where the manager is superior to the employee.

Positive politeness

The positive politeness strategy shows speakers recognize that hearer has a desire to be respected. It also confirms that the relationship is friendly and expresses group reciprocity (Mandala, 2018). The potential of face threat in an

act is minimized here. In addition, a positive politeness strategy is done when the speaker considers the hearer to be in important respects. The example of positive politeness can be observed in the following conversation:

> (2) A : *Jam kuliahnya sejam lagi. Aku laper nih. Aku mau makan. Kamu ga laper? Mai makan yuk. Kau pasti laper dah.*
> The lecture is in one hour. I am hungry. I want to eat. Aren't you hungry? Let's eat. You must be hungry.
>
> B : *Oh ya dah. Entar dah. Duluan aja. Makasi dah ngajakin.*
> Oh okay. Later. You go. Thanks for asking.

In the above conversation, by observing the underlined utterance, it can be concluded that A is being considerate to B in a friendly manner without being ignorant to B's face. This can be considered as positive politeness since it gives solidarity function. Furthermore, by observing A's utterance, it does not possess any indication to give a threat to B's 'face'.

Negative politeness

The negative politeness strategy also recognizes the hearer's face. But it also recognizes that the speaker is in some way imposing on them. Wardhaugh (2006) states that negative politeness 'leads to deference, apologizing, indirectness, and formality in language use: we adopt a variety of strategies to avoid any threats to the face others are presenting to us.' Some other examples would be to say, "I don't want to bother you but..." or "I was wondering if..." The example of negative politeness can be observed in the following conversation.

> (3) A : *Bisa gak jadwal kuliahnya itu dipindah jamnya jadi pagi? Biar kita gak pulang kemaleman.*
> Can we move the schedule to morning? So that we don't go home late.
>
> B : *Oh iya. Pagi lebih baik.*
> Oh yes. Morning is better.

The underlined utterance is an example of negative politeness found in an informal discussion between the students. It indicates that A wants the schedule to be moved, but A does not want to give any threats to the 'face' others possess. In other words, A is imposing B to move the schedule without ignoring B's 'face'.

Off-record

Off-record indirect strategies include metaphor and irony, rhetorical questions, understatement, tautologies, all kinds of hints as to what a speaker wants or means to communicate, without doing so directly so that the meaning in some degree is negotiable (Brown & Levinson, 1987). An example of an off-record strategy can be observed in the following conversation.

> (4) *Susi* : *Ya ampun. Dompetku ketinggalan di rumah lho.*
> Oh my. I left my wallet at home.
>
> *Yoga* : *Ya udah, gapapa. Aku pinjemin duit dulu ya.*
> Well. It's okay. I'll lend you some money.

In the example above, it is clear that Susi gives hint to Yoga to lend her some money. In this case, giving hint is an indication of an off-record strategy. Without saying what she means, Susi's intention is recognized by Yoga. By giving hints to Yoga, Susi is trying to avoid the direct FTA. It is in contrast when Susi says, "Lend me some money" which gives a threat to Yoga's face.

Leech's politeness principle

Leech 1983, in Watts et al. (2005) defines politeness as a form of behavior that establishes and maintains comity. He also stated that the politeness principle is a series of maxims, which Geoffrey Leech has proposed as a way of

explaining how politeness operates in conversational exchanges. First, one has to know what being "polite" means. Leech has this to say on the subject: some illocutions (e.g. orders) are inherently impolite, and others (e.g. offers) are inherently impolite. The point of politeness as a principle is to minimize the effects of impolite statements and to maximize the politeness of polite illocutions. This point is very important while having a conversation with others because politeness may lead you to a harmonious relationship with society. Hence, it can be said that people need to have and understand the politeness principle that could help them in maintaining the comity to others. Here is an example provided by Leech:

> Parent : Someone's eaten the icing off the cake.
> Child : It wasn't ME!

Leech's point, in providing this example, is that this parent's particular way of implying a possible misdemeanor committed by the child is considered more polite than something like this: 'you have eaten the icing off the cake!' By saying the utterance like what has been stated in the example, a parent could avoid the impolite behavior to directly accuse their child of eating the cake (Sifianou, 2012; Blum-Kulka, 1987). Therefore, it can be seen that parents want to minimize impolite behavior. By looking at those explanations before, it might be understood that politeness principles by Geoffrey Leech concern with minimizing the expression of impolite beliefs and maximizing corresponding positive version (maximizing the expression of polite beliefs). Politeness principles propose how to produce and understand language based on politeness. The purpose is to establish a good feeling of community and social relationship. Thus, politeness principles focus on the process of interpretation that the center of the study is on the effect of the hearer rather than the speaker. Moreover, it accounts for the regulation of familiarity and allows speakers to believe that their contributions to the conversation are constructive and accepted. If this acceptance happens in the conversation, it means that the purpose of conducting politeness principles can be reached. The speakers can maintain a good feeling of the social relationship and decrease the impolite behavior in the society. There are six maxims proposed by Leech, namely the tact maxim, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and maxim of sympathy. The following is the description of each maxim.

- Tact maxim
  The tact maxim is an important kind of politeness in English speaking society. It is because the tact maxim increases respect for other people and avoid irritated feelings. Tact maxim according to Leech, involves minimizing the cost to others and maximizing the benefit to others. In this maxim, the addressee gets to benefit from the speaker which can make the addressee minimizing the cost to self. In the other words, this maxim is more focused on the addressee.
  Example:

  (5) *Ani   : Ada yang bisa aku bantu?*
           Can I help you?
        Budi : Syukur ada kamu. Tolong jelasin Take Home Testnya dong.
           Thank God, I have you. Please tell me about the take-home test

  The tact maxim is adhered to by the speaker to minimize the cost and maximize the benefit to the addressee. In this conversation, it can be seen that the speaker wants to show her solidarity by offering help to the addressee. It means that the speaker, Ani, offers something politely to make her friend has a good feeling and feels impressed. If Ani's intention is accepted clearly by the hearer, the benefit will be felt by the addressee. Therefore, when the benefit is felt and the cost is lost, it can be said that tact maxim is applied in this conversation (Bargiela-Chiappini, 2003).

- Generosity maxim
  The generosity maxim states minimizing benefit to self and maximizing cost to self. Like the tact maxim, the generosity maxim occurs in commissives and directives/ impositives. This maxim is centered on self, while the tact maxim is on others. The example will be illustrated as follows:

  (6) *Rudi   : Kamu kok ga nulis? Lupa bawa pulpen? Nih pake pulpenku aja. Aku udah selesai.*
           Why don't you write anything? Do you forget to bring a pen? You can use my pen. I have
           finished using it.
        Rina   : Iya. Makasi ya.

Yes. Thank you.

In this case, the speaker implies that the cost of the utterance is to himself. Meanwhile, the utterance implies that the benefit is for the hearer. It also can be said that the speaker implies the cost for him and gives benefits for the addressee. It is conducted by offering help to the addressee. It commonly happens in our society as a reflection of solidarity and cooperation.

- Approbation maxim
  The criteria of approbation maxim are to minimize dispraise of other and maximize praise of other. It is so close to the politeness strategy of avoiding disagreement. In this maxim, it is also accepted that people should not mock and disrespect others to avoid impolite behavior. This impolite behavior should be avoided in our social interactions.
  Example:

  (7)   *Adi   : Eh, barusan aku nyiptain lagu baru lho.*
                 Hi, I have just made a new song.
         Bowo : Oh pantes tadi aku denger kamu nyanyiin lagu yang bagus banget.
                 Oh, that's why I heard you sang a great song.

In the example, it can be found that Bowo gives a good comment about Adi's new song. He talks the pleasant thing about other. He gives compliments to Adi. This expression is an utterance that maximizes the praise of others. Thus, this utterance is included the approbation maxim.

- Modesty maxim
  In the modesty maxim, people need to minimize praise of self and maximize dispraise of self. The modesty maxim concerns the degree of good or bad evaluation of others or self that is uttered by the speaker. The approbation maxim is exampled by courtesy of congratulation. On other hand, the modesty maxim usually occurs in apologies. The sample of the modesty maxim is below.
  Example:

  (8)   *Riri   : Ini aku bawakan oleh-oleh. Maaf kalo harganya ga seberapa.*
                 I bring you this souvenir. Sorry if the price is not expensive.
         Tia   : Terima kasih banyak ya. Ini bagus sekali.
                 Thanks a lot. This is so good.

In this case, the utterance above is categorized as the modesty maxim because the speaker maximizes dispraise of himself. The speaker shows her dispraise by saying "*Maaf kalo harganya ga seberapa*" She does not want to maximize her praise to be polite to others. If she maximizes her praise to others, she will look like an arrogant person and people will disrespect her. Due to those reasons, she says an utterance that minimizes the praise of self.

- Agreement maxim
  The criteria of agreement maxim are to minimize disagreement between self and other and maximize agreement between self and other. The disagreement, in this maxim, usually is expressed by regret or partial agreement. An example will be illustrated below.
  Example:

  (9)   *Doni   :Matematika ni kok susah ya?*
                 Why Mathematics is so difficult?
         Dini   : Iya sih susah. Tapi syukurnya aku ngerti materi logaritma.
                 Yes. It's difficult. But, fortunately, I understand about logarithm.

According to this conversation, it can be seen that Dini adheres to the agreement maxim. Dini's statement is partial agreement because Dini does not completely agree with Doni's argument. After all, her second sentence is in contrast with her first sentence. It means that she expresses her partial agreement to maximize the agreement between herself and Doni.

- Sympathy maxim
The sympathy maxim involves minimizing antipathy and maximizing sympathy between self and others. This includes a small group of speech acts such as congratulation, commiseration, and expressing condolences - all of which are by Brown and Levinson's positive politeness strategy of attending to the hearer's interests, wants, and needs.
Example:

(10) *Sonia : Ndre, kakekku meninggal tadi pagi. Tolong kasih surat ijin ini ke guru kita ya.*
        Ndre, my grandfather passed away this morning. Please give this permission letter to our teacher.
  Andre : <u>Ya tuhan. Aku turut berduka ya.</u>
        Oh my God. My deepest condolence goes to you.

This statement is to give condolence about misfortune. By saying this expression, we are maximizing sympathy to other people. This expression shows the solidarity between the speaker and the hearer. Therefore, it can be concluded that this conversation adheres to the sympathy maxim.

3 Conclusion

Since politeness is very important, theory and concepts have been broadly developed by experts, especially on how to be polite as well as to show solidarity to other people. Face theory suggests that to be polite, people need to recognize each others' faces, where face itself means a public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself (Brown & Levinson, 1987). On the notion of face, Brown, and Levinson distinguish face into two different kinds, namely positive face, and negative face. A positive face refers to the positive consistent self-image or personality, meanwhile, a negative face refers to the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction – i.e freedom of action and freedom of imposition.

Furthermore, based on face theory, Brown and Levinson developed Face-Threatening Acts, which are closely related to face and politeness. Face-Threatening Acts views that in a conversation, either spoken or written, people tend to maintain one another's face continuously. Moreover, Brown and Levinson suggested four politeness strategies to be used in society, namely bald-on record, negative politeness, positive politeness, and off-record. On the other hand, still on politeness strategy, Leech also suggested six maxims to establish a feeling of community and social relationship between people. They are tact maxim, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy maxim. Therefore, it can be concluded that these theories and concepts give great impacts on society because politeness is one of the important factors to keep harmony between people. The application of these theories and concepts are also significantly needed in society so that harmonious relationship between people can be maintained (Chen, 2001; Sorlin, 2017).

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

Blum-Kulka, S. (1987). Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different?. *Journal of pragmatics*, *11*(2), 131-146. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(87)90192-5

Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.

Chen, R. (2001). Self-politeness: A proposal. *Journal of pragmatics*, *33*(1), 87-106. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00124-1

Fita, M. N. (2014). Politeness Maxim Used in the Novel "Hamster".

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of pragmatics*, *14*(2), 219-236. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90081-N

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

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

Mandala, H. (2018). Divergent Principles of Politeness in Verbal and Non-Verbal Directive Speech Act. *International research journal of engineering, IT & scientific research*, *4*(2), 41-51.

Mao, L. R. (1994). Beyond politeness theory:'Face'revisited and renewed. *Journal of pragmatics*, *21*(5), 451-486. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(94)90025-6

Meier, A. J. (1995). Passages of politeness. *Journal of pragmatics*, *24*(4), 381-392. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(94)00053-H

Sifianou, M. (2012). Disagreements, face and politeness. *Journal of pragmatics*, *44*(12), 1554-1564. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.03.009

Sorlin, S. (2017). The pragmatics of manipulation: Exploiting im/politeness theories. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *121*, 132-146. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.10.002

Wardhaugh, R. (2006). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics: Solidarity and Politeness. *Australia: Blackwell Publishing Ltd*.

Watts, R. J., Ide, S., & Ehlich, K. (2005). *Politeness in language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Winerta, V., & Hamzah, R. A. S. (2012). An Analysis of Politeness Strategies in Requesting Used in Real Human and Non-Human Conversation on "Avatar" Movie. *English Language and Literature*, *1*(1).