

Face-Threatening Acts of Teachers: A Discourse Analysis of Politeness in the Workplace 189

Aporbo, Russel

russel_aporbo@umindanao.edu.ph

Faculty-University of Mindanao Tagum College, Tagum City, Davao del Norte, 8100, Philippines

Abstract

This politeness study aimed to investigate the face-threatening acts of interactants in their casual conversations in terms of positive and negative wants and to determine how interactants exhibit face-saving acts in conversations. The study made use of discourse analysis as a method of analysing the recorded and transcribed conversations with FGD and in-depth interviews to ensure the validity of data source. The researcher classified, analyzed and interpreted the gathered data from the casual conversations among the faculty of Compostela Valley State College. The results showed that face-threatening acts which cause damages on the hearer's positive face are insults, complaints, disapproval, rejections, bringing of bad news, boasting, inattentions, non-cooperation, unleashing of negative emotions and challenges. Comments and criticisms generally exist but these are commonly in the form of humour which made the conversation among the faculty of the college sparky and engaging. Face-threatening acts which cause damages on the speaker's positive face are self-humiliation, acceptance of compliments and confessions. In terms of the face-threatening acts which cause damages on the hearer's negative face, the common FTAs are suggestions, promises, requests, threats, challenges, dares, reminders, compliments, offers, and suggestions. Requests as FTAs are the most commonly exhibited while interactants engaged themselves in casual conversations. Showing extravagant paralinguistic codes while engaging in casual conversations is also demonstrated by interactants as FTA. While the negative FTAs on speaker's face are expression of negative emotions, accepting compliments, and succumbing to the power of the hearer

Keywords: Face-threatening acts, face saving acts, discourse analysis, and politeness

1. Introduction

As pervasive role of language in human endeavors is evident, understanding the centrality of face concerns and face-negotiation processes is fundamental to achieve efficient communication and to develop relational competence. Observing politeness in a conversation serves some important functions such as avoiding conflict, ensuring cooperative interaction, managing impressions, establishing power, ensuring compliance, showing deference, and being nice to other interlocutors. These functions could be viewed best as goals to be achieved in order to show the other person the respect which is likely to lessen any feelings of hostility or even annoyance. Politeness also helps to create a more positive atmosphere which helps minimize the feelings of conflict and opposition while engaging in the course of conversation.

Researchers about politeness have emphasized the empirical and theoretical importance of seeing politeness and impoliteness as acts which involve consideration of the addressee's wants and desires as well as the speaker's own, and acts that involve consideration of the demands of a larger social group (Meyerhoff, 2006).

In the course of conversation, interlocutors may encounter assessable matters about which they may express a viewpoint, an interpretation or a perspective. But rather than straightforwardly commit themselves to a perspective, interlocutors may choose to be more cautious or circumspect; for example, by systematically delaying their assertions or producing them as comparatively modest statements of experience rather than

strong declarations of fact, speakers could exercise varying of interactional caution when expressing their views. In the process, they could achieve a variety of practical ends such as minimizing interpersonal disagreement while maximizing agreement and mitigating critical, accusatory, and other sensitive actions (Pomerantz, 1984). According to Goffman (1967), whatever the context in which communication occurs, and whatever the relationship shared by the interlocutors, it is assumed that each person's face is supported and maintained during interactions.

Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory attempted to delineate speakers' motives to diminish face threats inherent to certain face threatening acts. Face management theory is useful for illuminating how relational partners with high investment in the relationship cope with problematic interaction episodes (Cupach & Metts, 1994). Cross-cultural work and empirical work in wide range of specific languages and cultures have, however, highlighted the socio-cultural variations in the interpretation of these kinds of terms.

Different cultures have different ways of showing politeness, but everyone regards it as an acceptable behavior. In the Philippines, politeness is considered a Filipino value and being polite is an expected behavior by people all communicative settings. Filipino interactants seem to ascribe meaning to others in order to aid social coordination such as (1) the relationship between the individual and the group and (2) the establishment and maintenance of hierarchies.

In the workplace, every member of the workforce – from the top administration down to the lowest rank – is expected to behave in a manner that avoids collision or “reduces friction”, which means every member must observe politeness. Lakoff defined politeness as “a device used in order to reduce friction in personal interaction” (Lakoff, 1979). How people in the workplace show this is a concern to note; who shows “more or greater politeness” to whom seems predictable and how these interlocutors exhibit politeness are interesting area to study.

Reducing friction in interaction especially in casual conversation does not only mark a person's proficiency in a language, but is also a “device” used in order to expedite operational processes in the workplace. Politeness serves as a driver to move people in a harmonious working relationship and operation whether or not they are truly in good terms or not with one another. Yule (1996) pointed out that much of what people say and communicate is determined by their social relationships; hence, in the workplace, the operational procedures serve as legitimate reasons to make people communicate whether they maintain close or distant social relationship.

On the other hand, teachers are of crucial importance, not only for the organization of the classroom, but also for the process of acquisition. Politeness is a common social phenomenon, and is regarded as a moral code in human communication and social activities. Knowingly, a positive learning atmosphere could encourage both teachers and students to communicate smoothly. It is of much importance to know about the extent in which how teachers apply politeness strategy to their casual conversation. Teachers' choice of words and language selections are critical to the self-esteem, the academic success, and the healthy mental and emotional development of any students. There is an undeniable link between the words that a teacher speaks and the attitudes and outcomes students create in their lives. By selecting words and phrases intentionally, altering the present language, and adding to or talking away from common utterances a teacher could empower and enhance students' learning (Moorman & Weber, 1989).

The study of Ellis (1998) which focuses on teachers' common confirmation and disconfirmation behaviors points out its vital importance for learners, as language learning is generally recognized as an especially anxiety-prone activity and to establish learners' willingness to communicate. Thus, it is for this reason that the researcher pursued this study in order to know how teachers contribute and commit face-threatening acts while engaging in casual conversations based on the notion that teachers' language shapes the success of students' academic endeavors.

1.1 Literature Review

To frame this study into a wide array of pragmatic discipline, the researcher presented theories and related empirical studies that support the existence of Face Threatening and Face-Saving Acts of interactants across cultures.

The most renowned framework of politeness, which this framework best applies to this study, comes from Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness (1978). Their concept of politeness has been considered the most influential and comprehensive work in pragmatics. They claimed two types of saving face: negative face, which the speaker attempts to minimize the imposition of the hearer; and the positive face, which gives a free reign connection between the speaker and the hearer. The proponents emphasized that the principle behind the politeness strategies is to avoid damaging the listener's and hearer's faces.

In order to save the acts that inherently damage the face of the addressee or the speaker by acting in opposition to the wants and desires of the other, Brown and Levinson (1987) emphasized the use of the four strategies: bald-on strategy, which seeks to minimize the threat to the hearer's face; positive strategy, which attempts to reduce the threat to the hearer's positive face and to ensure that the hearer is comfortable; negative strategy, which assumes imposition on the hearer and intrusion on other's face; and indirect strategy, which uses connotations instead of direct requests.

1.2. Research Questions

Generally, the purpose of this study was to describe the interactants' contribution in showing the positive and negative faces in their conversation.

Specifically, the study answered the following questions:

1. What are the positive face-threatening acts committed by teachers in their casual conversations?
2. What are the negative face-threatening acts committed while engaging in conversation?

2. Method

2.1 Research Design

This is a qualitative study employing discourse analysis to describe and analyze the face-threatening acts and face-saving acts of the faculty of Compostela Valley State College New Bataan Campus. The present study which explored the face threatening and saving acts of the faculty of Compostela Valley State College is an example of how language is used in a specific context of human interaction. The collected data of this

study were analyzed based on the Politeness Theory of Brown and Levinson (1978). It intends to elucidate the intricacies of the utterance in a recorded conversation occurred in different communicative settings

Discourse analysis seeks to understand how such language is used in human communication to produce a meaning the speaker intends and the listener would understand given their knowledge of the social and situational context of the speech-act. DA further recognizes that the intended meaning is not always the one that is received by the listener, and is interested in the way of multiple interpretations. This is to understand that language has a couple of functions in human interaction: transactional or interactional. In transactional language, the primary purpose of the speaker is the “efficient transference of information.” Interactional language is used to maintain social interactions, negotiate role-relationships, for peer-solidarity, or the saving of face. It could even include the taking of turns in speaking. While this is only a basic examination, it should serve as sufficient illustration of the focus DA places on the human nature as it pertains to the structure of the communicative act.

Essentially, the focus of DA on the human element of communication is an attempt to identify “how a language is used to create cohesive and coherent communication.” This focuses on the context in which words and phrases are used, because the manner and method of communication could change based on the environment in and purpose for which it is uttered.

2.2 Sample/ Participants

The data of the study included the recorded conversation from natural settings and communicative events elicited from the focus group discussion and in depth interview of the research participants. The recordings were done naturally and spontaneous data were elicited from different communicative events in the span of two weeks as advised by the members of the thesis committee.

This study was delimited on describing and analyzing only interactants’ contribution as they show positive and negative faces in casual conversation in their break time. The informants of the study were the faculty of Compostela Valley State College New Bataan campus.

This setting and participants of conversation were good research locale and participants as subjects of the study on the discourse analysis of face-threatening and face-saving acts since these were authentic manifestations about the significance of relational and conversational competence in the workplace.

2.3 Data Collection Procedure

The researcher sought the permission of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences in USEP and the Dean for Instruction in CVSC to allow him to conduct this study. He also asked the permission of the research participants to allow him record the actual flow of the conversation and to conduct the focus group discussion and in-depth interviews as data sources of the study.

Triangulation of data was followed by the researcher to obtain the sources of the study. Triangulation means using more than one method to collect data on the same topic. Triangulation is used in order to map out and describe more concisely the intensity and complication of the problem. According to Raagas (2010), this method is the combination of methods used to produce more empirical materials for a more precise, thorough and objective representation of the study.

Silverman (2007) added that the written document observed by the informants and the responses of interviews could be triangulated. Denzin (1970) who is known as the advocate of triangulation emphasized that triangulation could overcome partial views and present something like a complete picture.

Specifically, this study utilized *Data triangulation*, which entails gathering data through several sampling strategies so that slices of data at different times and in different social situations, as well as on a variety of people, are gathered.

- a) *Auditory recording and transcription.* The researcher recorded and transcribed the actual conversation while interactants engage and attend to each other's face while the conversation is going on. Rapley (2007) elaborated that the actual process of making detailed transcripts enables one to become familiar with what is being observed. The recording needs to be watched/listened repeatedly. Through this process one may begin to notice the interesting and often subtle ways that people interact. These are the taken-for-granted features of people's talk and interaction that without recordings one would routinely fail to notice, fail to remember, or be unable to record in sufficient detail by taking hand-written notes as it happened.
- b) *Conducting Focus Group Discussion (FGD).* Seeking to come up with inter-subjective and reliable justifications and reasons of interactants' portrayal of positive face and negative face in a conversation across pragmatic cultures in the locality, Focus Group Discussion (FGD) was facilitated by the researcher to delve deeper about the responses of the interactants and their contribution in the recorded conversation. Focus groups are used for generating information on collective views, and the meanings that lie behind those views. They are also useful in generating a rich understanding of participants' experiences and beliefs. Suggested criteria for using focus groups include: a standalone method, for research relating to group norms, meanings and processes in a multi-method design, to explore a topic or collect group language or narratives to be used in later stages, to clarify, extend, qualify or challenge data collected through other methods, and to feedback results to research participants (Gill et al., 2008).
- c) *In-depth Interviews:* In this study, in-depth interview was conducted to gain quality, reliable, and unbiased information. Raagas (2010) emphasized that through in-depth interview, there would be more in-depth, representation, efficacy, efficiency, and value. In this study, the nondirective in-depth interview was employed so that the informants were given maximum freedom to respond within the limits of the topic.

2.3 Data Analysis

The data collected were analyzed utilizing the Politeness Theory of Brown and Levinson (1978). The researcher focused on the face-threatening and face-saving acts committed by the interactants while engaging in the conversation. After which, few examples were selected for further elucidation. The researcher deemed it crucial to examine the participants' discernment on the necessity of interpersonal competence as they are situated in the same speech community, to discover and explore the different types of 'face' in different settings, ends of the communication, the key or the manner and tone of communication as well as the norms which include the conventions of the communicative event, and the genre of the communication process.

The data gathered were tabulated and analyzed using the Discourse Analysis anchored on Politeness Theory of Brown and Levinson which served as bases to answer the objectives of this study. The results were validated with the help of the thesis adviser. . Also, the assistance of the panel as experts in the field of sociolinguistic researches were sought in order to provide empirical and intersubjective answer to the questions of the study.

The results were stated in order to answer the question of the study. Generated explanations in the selected examples in the conversation were provided in order to find out the positive and negative faces shown by the interactants and how they show their face-threatening and face-saving acts while engaging in the conversation.

3. Results

Face-threatening Acts on Casual Conversations

The following are the face-threatening acts of the interactants which cause damages on hearer’s and speaker’s positive face exhibited in the recorded casual conversations. *TC* as coding of presenting data indicates Transcribed Conversation and *S* means segment of the conversation in order to explicitly discuss the flow of the talk. The researcher divided some of the TCs into segments in which shifts of the topic are prevalent while engaging in the conversation. This is to give a detailed analysis of the FTAs committed by the interactants.

Table 1: Face-threatening Acts of Teachers in Casual Conversations

Positive Face-Threatening Acts

- Damages on the Hearer
 - Insult
 - Complaint
 - Disapproval
 - Criticism
 - Bringing Bad News
 - Boasting
 - Non-cooperation
 - Unleashed Negative Emotions

Negative Face-Threatening Acts

- Damages on the Hearer
 - Self-humiliation
 - Request
 - Succumbing to the power of the hearer
 - Dares
 - Reminders
 - Acceptance of Compliments
 - Giving offers
 - Suggestions
 - Showing extravagant paralinguistic codes

4. Discussion

a.) Positive Face- Damages on the Hearer

The transcribed conversations provide some useful means of illustrating a very direct and explicit exercise of power and authority, and an apparent disregard of the norms of conventional politeness. These demonstrate the kinds of things people achieve with words at work: giving instructions, disagreeing with and challenging each other, avoiding miscommunication, amusing their colleagues, maintaining good collegial relations, and so on.

Positive face is threatened when the speaker or hearer does not care about their interactor's feelings, wants, or does not want what the other wants (Brown & Levinson, 1987). These are the acts that express the speaker's negative assessment of the hearer's positive face or an element of his/her positive face.

The following are the face threatening acts exhibited by the interactants which cause damages on hearer's positive face:

Insult

It is one of the FTAs which cause damage on the hearer's positive face. The term "insult" shares the feature of "offence" of a remark, for example, "an offensive remark or action". Only focusing on verbal insults, the present study considers insult as an offensive or contemptuous remark.

Context: Talking about the proposed uniform of the CVSC faculty

- | | | |
|---|--------|---|
| 1 | Niel: | Mag uniform ta ba? |
| 2 | Peter: | Individual sir? |
| 3 | Niel: | Hahaha... oo oie.. lain pud share ta nga uniform mana. hahaha |
| 4 | Joel: | Ayaw mo ug saba kai natulog si sir |
| 5 | Peter: | Cge sir, cge sir mag kuan ta. White lng gud |

(Excerpt from TC1 S1)

In this segment of the conversation, the interlocutors are discussing the proposed uniform for the faculty of CVSC for SY 2015-2016. The interlocutors have been talking for several weeks and have developed a very good rapport regarding this matter. In this first segment of conversation, Niel is the campus director of CVSC New Bataan Campus and other participants are members of the teaching force of the institution. Niel being the campus director has a discretionary power to suggest and to implement what is the best for the institution.

A great deal of workplace talk is firmly embedded in its social and organizational context as depicted in this conversation. Co-workers typically share common assumptions, a common reference system, and use the same jargon or system of verbal shortcuts. They often share extensive background knowledge and experiences and may have similar values and attitudes towards work and the objectives of their organization. Together these constitute a common workplace culture (Holmes & Stubbe, 2003). The community of practice is a concept which illuminates a number of aspects of workplace interaction. Segment 1 is also a very clear instance of 'doing power' at work which constitutes damaging the positive face of the members of the same speech community.

In this segment of casual conversation, the tone is less serious and does not require a great effort in work relations, but even in this mood of conversation, there are positive face-threatening acts exhibited by the interactants. The manner of Niel in suggesting reflects his uncompromising and explicit status in the organizational hierarchy. Peter, one of the instructors, positively responds to the invitation of the previous speaker with his utterance “*Individual sir?*”, but the response *Hahaha... oo oie.. lain pud share ta nga uniform mana? Hahaha* [Hahaha. Obviously, that’s our uniform! Are we going to share that? hahaha] is an indication that Niel damages the positive face of his interlocutor, Peter, as expression of insult in the form of humor. As what Brown and Levinson claimed, this type of approach in damaging the hearer’s positive face is an expression of disapproval by stating or implying that the hearer is wrong, irrational or misguided.

As an offensive or contemptuous remark, insult is an FTA as this speech act shows that speaker has a negative evaluation of some aspect of hearer’s positive face. However, insults may not always hurt people’s feelings, as the same utterance may achieve different effects for different addressees. One particular insult may be insulting for one particular addressee while it may not be insulting for others. On the contrary, it is possible for unintentional insult to occur. An addressee may feel deeply offended by an utterance which is meant as a statement or an expression of surprise. Basing on the speaker’s attitude, an insult may be seen as ludic or aggressive.

Ludic insults could be seen as the insults expressed in playful manner without causing impoliteness effects. Banter as a form of playful insults between intimates is a widespread form of ludic insults. Aggressive insult could be seen as verbal provocations between hostile speakers which may lead to verbal or even physical aggression. Evaluating if these expressions cause impoliteness affects the bases of the receiver’s interpretation as insulting or the receiver’s reactions. From this definition of insult, it could be deduced that line 3 (*Hahaha... oo oie.. lain pud share ta nga uniform mana. Hahaha*) is a way of reinforcing in-group solidarity as a way of being polite based on the claim of Leech. Bernal (1999) found that some expressions commonly used for insulting or mocking could, in certain contexts, produce an affiliated social effect, strengthening feelings of solidarity within a group and of closeness between interlocutors.

Based on the focus group discussion conducted, interactants asserted that establishing rapport in a conversation is very important since they are working in one organization, and that even banter in a form of jokes among them are essential in building solidarity as members of the workforce of the college. Niel, as campus director, when asked how important is establishing rapport towards another interactants in a conversation said: “*Being in an organization like this, it is very important to have a good rapport to your colleagues because you will be working with one another inside the organization and in achieving the goals of this organization, so it’s better that you’ll have a good rapport with one another.*”

As exhibited in the conversation, though insult is considered as positive FTA with the consideration of the degree of familiarity and social distance among interactants, this could be a way of establishing rapport among interactants situated in a community of practice.

Complaint

When making complaint, the speaker (the complainer) expresses his/her disapproval, negative feelings towards the state of affairs described on the propositions (complainable) he/she holds the complantee (hearer) responsible either directly or indirectly. In Leech terminology, complaint is a representative of the conflictive function which includes acts of threatening, accusing, cursing and reprimanding. These acts are

their very nature to cause offence, and they are therefore highly threatening to the social relationship between the hearer and the speaker.

Context: Talking about the proposed uniform of the CVSC Faculty

- 21 Lalay: Hala wala na gyud ko ninyu gi huna2 ba.. Wala na gyud ko ninyu gi apil ba, sa bawat move.. sa bawat
- 22 Niel: Dili man gud kung apilan ka dili palang nimu bayaran.
- 23 Lalay: Hahahahahaha
- 24 Niel: Naunsa dwai ka? Maayu unta ug naa lng ka dre kai pwedi ra man kaltasan sa imung payroll
- 25 Lalay: Apili sab ko ana oie.

(Excerpt from TC1 S1)

Lalay is a former full time instructor but now is part time instructor of the academe for she is currently connected with the Department of Education. With this background, it is easier to delve the referential content of this conversation. Line 21 exhibited by Lalay in this segment of conversation is also a positive face threatening act which causes damages on all the hearers' positive face specifically those instructors whom she worked with before. *Hala wala na gyud ko ninyu gi huna2 ba.. Wala na gyud ko ninyu gi apil ba, sa bawat move.. sa bawat...*[Oh, you never think of me, you never include me in very move, in every..] This is an expression of complaint from Lalay being a former full time faculty of the college before and now a part time instructor. This could be interpreted as an expression of negative emotions on her part being one of the pioneering instructors of the institution.

Context: Talking about the delayed salary of the faculty

- 12 Glendelle: Naa naman daw..
- 13 Russel: Ang sweldo?
- 14 Glendelle: O...
- 15 Russel: Mali man dwai ning information gi pangpakalat ni sir nillo drea!
- 16 Glendelle: Dili ang akua ba.. hahahahaha
- 17 Glendelle: Sugnod! Hahaha ning text ko kang mam ging...
- 18 Michael: Ok na daw?
- 19 Glendelle: Naa naman daw... ipaklaru lng daw nko sa HR. sa HR ang Problema ani..kung ok na ang tanan nako'ng gipasa...
- 20 Michael: Para ma release na?
- 21 Glendelle: Ohmmm..

(Excerpt from TC6 S3)

This conversation illustrates one common assumptions that existed in the community of practice. Delayed salary among the faculty is the problem they faced in the institution. Michael, being assigned to make all the payrolls for contractual of service instructors, is held responsible for whatever news the faculty may get regarding their salary. Glendelle as one of the intructors of the college has asked Michael to have some updates of his salary. As referential content of conversation, Michael happened to mention that the Administration has processed Glendelle's salary, yet he could not give the fix date about its release. In this segment of the conversation, lines 12 and 15 committed by Russel and Glendelle as interactants are clear

indications of damaging the positive face want of Michael as responsible of the proposition which is the delay of the salary.

A complaint is a “face-threatening act” (Brown & Levinson, 1978). As formulated by Place (1986) “the act of moral censure or blame” is an act of social rejection, which is an act whereby an accuser breaks ties of an affection, mutual support and cooperation.

In the complaint committed in this segment of conversation, line 12 exhibited by Glendelle is an indirect way of complaining the proposition raised by Michael. This utterance indirectly expresses complainer’s ill feeling towards the complainee in which Glendelle performs the inference process to establish a link between what is said and what is really intended on the basis of the situational context. On the other hand, the utterance *Mali man dwai ning information gi pangpakalat ni sir nillo drea!* [*The information being disseminated is wrong!*] is a straightforward accusation or the moral judgment which causes a severe challenge on Michael’s positive want by explicitly declaring the that the complainee is incompetent and irresponsible as a social member of the conversation.

As supported by Edmundson-House (1981), “In making a complaint, the speaker potentially disputes, challenges or bluntly denies the social competence of the complainee”. They point out that the speaker flouts the hearer’s supportive maxim, but the complaint is justified in so far as the complainee has already committed this maxim, a social offence which constitutes grounds for complaint. Therefore, the complainee must also accept that he/she in his/her behavior has damaged or denied the social standing of the complainer. A likely outcome is a heated exchange in which both participants are fighting to regain their social standing. However, in the segment provided, the complainee indirectly accepted the complaint of Russel and Glendelle in his utterance *Ok na daw?* [So is it okay?] as shown in the conversation.

When Glendelle was asked in an in-depth interview conducted: “*What are your considerations when you make complaints towards your colleagues?*”, Glendelle replied: *Ay usually mao na akong sakit or problema kung mag complain kay kuan dili kaayu ko naga kanang kuan vocal.* [Usually, that is really my problem if I have to make complaints because I am not that vocal]. His response means that as interactant, making complaint towards his colleague is essentially a problem for he does not know how to state his side in doing so. It could be deduced from his response that he has to observe politeness strategies in order to mitigate the FTA he supposed to commit while engaging the casual conversation.

Disapproval

In the commission of disapproval as FTA, interactant has to believe in the proposition that someone or something is bad or wrong. This FTA prevalently damages the hearer’s positive face wants since it debunks the principle of the universal face want to be appreciated, to be liked and to be connected with competent adult members of the social group, hence devaluing hearer’s self and public image.

Context: Proposing the school uniform

- | | | |
|----|--------|--|
| 22 | Niel: | Dili man gud kung apilan ka dili palang nimu bayaran. |
| 23 | Lalay: | Hahahahahaha |
| 24 | Niel: | Naunsa dwai ka? Maayu unta ug naa lang ka dre kai pwedi ra man kaltasan sa imung payroll |
| 25 | Lalay: | Apili sab ko ana oie. |

(Excerpt from TC1 S1)

Context: Talking the delayed salary

- 36 Vic: Sir Nillo, wa pakai sweldo? Ako nalang magpahiram nimu...
 37 Russel: Da...
 38 Michael: Hala kwartahan gyud ni si mam ba..
 39 Peter: Hala ang ako mam?
 40 Vic: Wala kai labut oie..
 41 Peter: Ahh .. laina ana oie..aw ana.. kanya2 na dwai ni di-aie?

(Excerpt from TC5 S2)

Lines *Dili man gud kung apilan ka dili palang nimu bayaran* [If we will include you, what if you'll not pay.] and *Naunsa dwai ka? Maayu unta ug naa lang ka dire kai pwedi ra man kaltasan sa imung payroll* [It would be better if you are full time here because we can easily deduct it with your salary.] performed by Niel in this segment are acts that manifest his negative assessment of the hearer's positive face or an element of his positive face. The speaker displays his disapproval by directly indicating that he dislikes some aspects of the hearer's desires of having the proposed uniform for CVSC faculty. These expressions of negative assessment regarding what the other interlocutor wants cause damage to the positive face value of Lalay as one of the members of this communicative event.

In the second example of this FTA, utterance *Wala kai labut oie* committed by Vic clearly manifests disapproval on the proposition which is the money needed for allowance. This utterance damages Peter's positive face being rejected and disapproved with regard to his wants.

Criticism

When interactant committed this FTA, he/she expresses his/her dissatisfaction or negative comment on a hearer's state of affairs (Hyland, 2000). This excerpt of the conversation provides a useful information of exhibiting comments and criticisms as FTAs on the hearer's positive face.

Context: Talking about the new haircut of the other instructor

- 1 Peter: Ang amu man gung buhok ni sir Nillo sir, bastus kaayu. Kung matagak sa tiles, dili ma kuan, abi ug bungut
 2 All: Hahahahahahahahahaha
 3 Russel: Bastus kaayu si sir Nillo, dala-dalag kuan .. hahahaha
 4 Peter: Lukdo ug bungut ba. Hahaha
 5 Peter: Sir unsa ni sir?
 6 All: Hahaha
 7 Peter: Itlog! Hahahaha
 8 All: Hahahaha [everyone is laughing]
 9 Peter: Sir. Hahahahahahaha
 10 Russel: Psssst... ma offend gani na si sir Nillo..hahahha
 11 Peter: Parehas man mi. hahahaa

(Excerpt from TC5 S1)

This conversation happens when two other instructors notice the new haircut of Michael Nillo, General Education instructor of the institution. The expression of criticism in line 1 in the cited conversation delineates the positive face threatening act on the part of the hearer. *Ang amu man gung buhok ni sir Nillo sir,*

bastus kaayu. Kung matagak sa tiles, dili ma kuan, abi ug bungut [The kind of hair that we have sir, is so absurd, if it falls on the floor, it cannot be recognized, it's like a beard] . This line significantly threatens the positive face wants of Michael as participant of this communicative event since this is an act that expresses Peter's negative assessment of the hearer's positive face or an element of his positive face. The utterance is an expressive speech act which accounted as the manifestation of speaker's psychological attitude to a state of affairs. It could be noted that when other instructor boisterously laughed with the previous utterance, this offensively damages the positive face wants of Michael.

As Russel commented on Michael's hair *Bastus kaayu si sir Nillo, dala-dalag kuan .. hahahaha*, [SirNillo's hair is so ridiculous, bringing the... hahaha] this causes more damages on his positive face wants as two other participants mockingly commented on his haircut. The response of Peter from the previous utterance, *Lukdo ug bungut ba. Hahaha*, [Carrying a beard. Hahaha] ultimately indicates that upon the commission of this act, the speaker is willing to disregard the emotional well-being of the hearer. As they continue teasing, this could certainly be noted that no response at all is made on the part of the hearer. Another example in which criticisms were exhibited is evident in this segment of conversation.

Context: Proposing school uniform

27 Niel:	Unsa gani size nimu gani? Murag parehas mo ug size ni Matet.
28 Peter:	Medium
29 All:	hahahahahaha...
30 Peter:	Medium man ka lai.

35Lalay:	Aie parehas ra mi ug size ni Mimi.
36 Niel:	Hala... hahaha... Hoi mas daku ka ug lawas oie..
37 Peter:	Hoi medium ka oie. Parehas ra ta ug size..
38 Niel:	Hala.. ayaw pud pag assume oie nga gamay ka ug lawas... haha

(Excerpt from TC1 S1)

Lines 27-29 is talking about the body size of Miss Carolina. These lines are explicit manifestations of positive face threatening acts which cause damages on the hearer's positive face. Giving criticisms as mentioned by Brown and Levinson could make damages on the hearer's positive face while the interactant is engaging in the conversation. Line 27, though indirectly asking Miss Carolina's body size, Niel presupposes that Lalay has a bigger body size being compared to Matet, the college registrar of CVSC. Ratified by the other interlocutor, Peter causes more damages to the hearer's positive face. Line 35 of Lalay signifies that she wanted to be accepted in the conversation when it comes to her personal attributes. But lines 36-38 committed by Peter and Niel cause a heavy damage on Lalay's positive face. The utterance *Hala.. ayaw pud pag assume oie nga gamay ka ug lawas... haha* [oh, don't assume that you have a fit body] extravagantly damages the hearer's positive face.

Lines 5 to 11 from TC5 S1 and lines 27-29 from TC1 S1 ostensibly show the dominance of the participants as they mocked the element of the hearer's positive face in this segment. This could certainly be attributed primarily to the degree of familiarity they share working in the same institution. This is supported with the claim of Brown and Levinson that politeness is "socially controlled". In other words, it is a factor of the participants and the contexts of the conversation. They listed three 'sociological variables' that speakers employ in choosing the degree of politeness to use and in calculating the amount of threat to their own face: the social distance of the speaker and hearer; the relative 'power' of the speaker over the hearer; and the

absolute ranking of impositions in the particular culture.

Social distance is a measure of the social similarity between participants. This factor is also determined by the particular structure of the society. Relative power is also socially determined by the ability of the participants to impose their will over the other. Factors contributing to power could be institutional such as employer-employees or larger social traditions such as gender. Rank of imposition is culturally determined by the particular norms and sensitivities of a culture (Gray, 2009).

From the mentioned facts, it could be deduced that these sample segments of casual conversation adhere to the notion that the lesser the social distance between the interlocutors (e.g., if they know each other very much), the less politeness is generally expected. The lesser the (perceived) relative power of hearer over speaker, the lesser politeness is recommended. Peter and Niel have been working with Michael and Lalay since last year and the degree of familiarity is much shared as they take along their contributions in casual conversations.

Bringing Bad News

One of the FTAs which cause damages on the hearer's positive face is bringing bad news regarding the state of affairs of hearer's concerns and wants. This FTA certainly denies what the hearer wanted to gain while engaging in the course of conversation. When bad news is introduced on interlocutor's face, this indicates that the other participants of the conversation is willing to cause redress to hearer or does not care what the hearer may feel in the process of interaction.

Context: Asking the salary

- | | | |
|----|----------|--|
| 21 | Honey: | Daghan na kaayu nangita sa imung beauty sir .. |
| 22 | Peter: | Nganong nangita man sila nga wa pa may time? |
| 23 | Honey: | Mao gani... |
| 24 | Peter: | Laparuhun ko na silag wala-tuo.. |
| 25 | Michael: | Isog na si sir kai dili inspired.. |
| 26 | Peter: | Wala pa gihapon sir... |
| 27 | All: | Hahaha...[everyone is laughing] |
| 28 | Michael: | Wala pa gyud... |
| 29 | Honey: | Mao gyud na ang pangutana nga sila mismo dili ka tubag.. |

(Excerpt from TC9 S1)

This communicative setting illustrates how bad news is being brought on the hearer's positive face. Line 21 is an utterance of informing Peter about his students' concerns. When Mr. Michael inserted the conversation reminding him the delayed disbursement of salary, he quickly asked about it, "*Wala pa gihapon sir?* [Don't we have a salary sir?]. This concern of Peter led other interlocutors to give their responses *Wala pa gyud* [None at all], *Mao gyud na ang pangutana nga sila mismo dili ka tubag* [That's the question the administration cannot answer too.] which cause damages on Peter's positive face.

Context: Taking about the hair cut

- 10 Peter: Hahaha ako pa nimu sir.. imu nlng na gidayun.. ipa-opaw nlng na..
 11 Russel: Ahhh.. mao lagi na...
 12 All: Ahhahaha..
 13 Peter: Murag kaaraang choi ba. Ahaha
 14 Peter: Murag manrugbihai didtua o..
 15 Peter: Unya kung milakaw pa gyud si sir russel kai mura gyud choi,, ana Kaayu mulakaw o..
 16 All: Ahhh.. hahaha
 17 Russel: Hambungiro
 18 Joel: Hahaha.. sir ayaw kalia ha..
 19 Russel: Hambungiro murag dakung tawu..
 20 Peter: Ana o.. hahaha
 21 Joel: Naa bya nangutana ,Kinsa manang ..Maestro diha sa CVSC..Kinsa Mana siya..
 22 Michael: Patay,, kuyawa mangutana kya oie.
 23 Joel: Maestro mana boss. Diha sa cvsc..kuwaya bag nilaktan
 24 Michael: Hala ka sir... hahahaha
 25 All: Hala...
 26 Joel: Taga sawata man gud na boss..
 27 Peter: Sawata ...hahaha
 28 Joel: Na .. bugoy pud na sawata...
 29 Joel: Mao nga ayaw gyud pag kompyansa sir russel..
 30 Joel: Kanang maestro nga choi kaayu mulakaw... kuyaw kaayu na sa sawata..
 31 Russel: Daaahhh... nagsalig si sir nillo kai bag-ong gupit.

(Excerpt from TC 14 S1)

This sample conversation explicitly shows how bad news could cause damages on the hearer's positive face. The conversation started when instructors mockingly described the new hair cut of Russel as Peter commented *Hahaha ako pa nimu sir.. imu nalang na gidayun.. ipa-opaw nalang na* [Hahaha, If I were you sir, you just have to make it flat top] which invites all other participants to discuss how Russel's hair cut affects his image. In the next utterance, bringing bad news is clearly committed by Joel as he uttered *Hahaha.. sir ayaw kalia ha..* [Hahaha, sir don't be mad...] and *Naa bya nangutana, kinsa manang ..maestro diha sa CVSC..Kinsa mana siya?* [Someone has asked about you, that instructor in CVSC, who is he?] These utterances cause damages on the hearer's positive face giving him threats out of what people observed the way he carried himself. Utterances *Mao nga ayaw gyud pag kompyansa sir russel..* [That's why, be observant] and *Kanang maestro nga choi kaayu mulakaw... kuyaw kaayu na sa Sawata* [That instructor who confidently walks...] cause more damages on Russel's positive face in this segment of transcribed conversation.

According to Brown and Levinson (1978), this kind of utterance is an FTA which causes damages on the hearer's positive face since his/her state of affairs is not connected and reciprocated by another interactant as a member of the same speech community. Supported by Stubbe and Holmes (2000), that it is inevitable to

commit this FTA in the workplace as people share a community of practice relating to common notions and perspectives.

Boasting

The commission of boasting as face threatening act indicates that one expresses too much pride of himself or in something he has, has done, or are connected to in some way, a reason to be proud, and something impressive that someone or something has or has done.

Context: Asking for Cash Advance

- 13 Michael: Mu C. A nlng ta... pwedi mi mu C.A mam n?
 14 Peter: Mu C.A ta ta..
 15 Michael: Kai wa koi kwarta bai...
 16 Peter: Tara sir mu C.A. ta sir.. wa man di-ay kai kwarta.
 17 Michael: Tara ba...Hambugiru-a ning tawhana oie...

(Excerpt from TC5 S2)

This segment of conversation among faculty is a clear indication that in the community of practice when people in the workplace share a common degree of interest and share a degree of familiarity, interactants may use of boast as a way of making a sparky way of communication. The concern of these two interactants is to ask for cash advance since their salary is yet to be disbursed. Line 13 when Michael suggested that their best option is to ask for cash advance, this leads Peter to boast in the next utterance. *Tara sir mu C.A. ta sir.. wa man di-ay kai kwarta* [Okay sir, let's go. Let's ask for cash advance since you don't have money] significantly damages the hearer's positive face as this utterance essentially suggesting that he does not need money and that emphasizing hearer's need for money. Presumably, this leads Michael to commit the utterance *Tara ba...Hambugiru-a ning tawhana oie* [Hey, let's go. You're so boastful!] However, it is evident that upon the commission of these utterances, interactants smoothly committed the FTAs or expressed it in the form of humor, thus making it less threatening on the hearer's positive face wants.

Context: Asking assistance in making payroll

- 20 Peter: Sir Nillo, di ka kabalo mubuhat ana?
 21 Michael: Unsaun di-ay ni?
 22 Peter: Dili ka kabalo nga kasayun ra man tawn ana?
 23 Peter: My God, dili ka kabalo ana?
 24 Russel: Tudlu-i na, unsa mana oie, dili functional literate, incompetent.
 25 Michael: Ka hambugiro na lang gyud nimu dagul, dili bi aka kabalo mag excel ha.
 26 Russel: Agay ka, maninuod man dayun.
 27 All: hahahahahaaha...

(Excerpt from TC12 S1)

Another example of boasting as FTA in indicated in this transcribed conversation in which interactants unconsciously committed the threatening act. The commission of utterances *Dili ka kabalo nga kasayun ra man tawn ana?* [Don't you know how to do it, that so simple] and *My God, dili ka kabalo ana?* [My God, don't you know that?] by Peter causes damages on Michael's positive face suggesting his incompetence in the use of computer. This FTA is also reinforced by another interactant Russel when he

uttered *Tudlu-i na, unsa mana oie, dili functional literate, incompetent* [Then teach him how to do it, not a functional literate, incompetent] which causes more damages on the hearer's positive face.

The response of Michael *Ka hambugiro na lang gyud nimu dagul, dili bia ka kabalo mag excel* [You are so boastful Dagul, you even don't how to use excel] lessen the gravity of the FTA committed as interactants make use of humorous banter while engaging in the conversation.

This is reinforced in the FGD conducted with the interactants that humors or jokes could really be a good way of building solidarity among workers within the organization. All interactants asserted that jokes and humors are ways to socialize and know each other's attitude as part of the organization. Brown and Levinson (1987) asserted that humors are positive politeness strategies which minimize the threat to ones positive face by minimizing social distance. It brings people together with shared knowledge and references. This also links between humor and etiquette in the workplace which talks freedom and constricting rules that each competent adult members should adhere. The procedure of jokes telling often abolishes the hierarchical pecking order that existed in the community of practice.

Non-cooperation

As stated in Politeness Theory, non-cooperation to interlocutor's wants damages the positive face of the hearer himself. The positive face wants to be connected and to be agreed by any competent adult member of the speech event is invaded when other participants of the conversation ignore the speaker. This utterance means that another interactant fails or refuses to cooperate with what other interactant desires within the range of interaction.

Context: Asking a favor

- | | | |
|----|----------|--------------------------------------|
| 32 | Michael: | Sir Dagul? |
| 33 | Peter: | Unya rako hilabti sir. |
| 34 | Michael: | Isuksuk ra nako ning papel ba.. |
| 35 | Peter: | Ah cge-cge sir.. |
| 36 | Michael: | Imuha bia na... |
| 37 | Peter: | Sus.. samuka gyud ana... |
| 38 | Michael: | Kanang? |
| 39 | Peter: | Di ko ganahan anang hilabtan ko ba.. |

(Excerpt from TC11 S1)

This segment of conversation explicates that non-cooperation among participants who have shared a culture of practice still committed this FTA. Lines 32-34 committed by Michael essentially require Peter to attend to his interactant's wants, but Peter did not respond and did not even care to attend to Michael's request. This is also evident when Michael asked for favor towards Peter regarding the documents he needs to process the salary of the instructors. *Sir Dagul?* is an utterance requesting him to interrupt from what he is doing in order to prepare the needed documents, but the response *Unya rako hilabti sir* [Just approach me later on] evidently indicates the commission of positive FTA on the part of Michael's desires. This FTA is reinforced by another utterance in lines *Sus.. samuka gyud ana* [You are so annoying] and *Di ko ganahan anang hilabtan ko ba* [I really don't want to be disturbed.]

Context: Asking for favor

- 41 Rosello: Hala nakalimut bia ko sa akoang cedula number sir.
 42 Michael:Hala problema gyud na nimu sir ay..
 43 Honey: Kintahay imung students kay 50..
 44 Russel: Di ba naa man to ghapon diba? Unsa mana siya oie..
 45 Rosello: Pwedi ma open tong computer didtua?
 46 Michael:Di gyud Puydi..
 47 Rosello: Gara-gara sir oy.. cge ako sang tan-awun

(Excerpt from TC10 S1)

This segment also shows non-cooperation of one participant to what other interactant wanted to accomplish. Line 42 classified as an indirect illocutionary act has an illocutionary force of request to Michael as responsible of what he wanted to accomplish. This is in line with the necessary documents they need to prepare for their salary. However, the commission of utterance *Hala problema gyud na nimu sir ay*. [Oh, that is really your problem sir] is uncooperative to the positive face want of Rosello which is the community tax number.

Utterance committed by Rosello *Pwedi ma open tong computer didtua?* [Can I open the computer at another office?] is reinforcing what he requested from Michael, but his response *Di gyud puydi* [No, you cant!] essentially suggests that he is unwilling to cooperate what the other participant wanted and thus committed the positive FTA on Rosello's face wants. These utterances are manifestations that among interactants who have a high degree of familiarity unreluctantly expressed utterances that negate what another participant wanted.

Unleashed negative emotions

When interactants unleash their negative emotions, this suggests that they are expressing their anger or negative emotions, or in a word, *release*. This FTA acts as a self-protective mechanism against repressed expression, where mounting pressure from frustrations and minor offences build to the point that it only takes a slight annoyance to set-off a chain reaction. This type of FTA commonly regarded as utterance that heavily and extremely damages the hearer's positive face. However, in this segment of the recorded casual conversation, this expression of negative emotions is smoothly and humorously delivered by the participant thus, creating a less serious effect on the part of the hearer.

Context: Talking about the hair cut

- 1 Peter: Abi.. hala nay wak-wak. Hahahaha
 2 All: hahaha
 3 Peter: Hahaa.. ani na ang ma-abtan..
 4 Michael: Ay dili na lahi na gyud ni..
 5 Michael: Lahi na gyud na sir.. ahahaha..
 6 Michael: Ay lahi na gyud akong na sense ani ba...
 7 Russel: Hala gitira na gyud..hahaha
 8 Michael: Dili na gyud maayu akong na sense ani ay..
 9 All: Hahaha...

(Excerpt from TC11 S1)

This segment explicates the commission of unleashing negative emotions in the course of casual conversation. Line 1 committed by Peter making fun of Michael’s new haircut is an example of FTA which causes damage on the positive face want of the other interactants. Comparing him to a “wak-wak” [witch] leads him to react negatively. Mocking his new look is ostensibly a criticism of his positive face’s state of affair to be liked and to be appreciated as member of the speech event. His utterances committed in lines 5, 6 and 8 manifested his negative emotions regarding what Peter has commented on his look. These utterances, on the other hand, cause damages on the hearer’s positive face. These could be interpreted as negative reactions for what other participant has committed in the previous lines of the conversation. However, it could be noticed significantly that the way these participants mock each other impolitely is in the form of humor which makes a sparky style of expression. This could be considered as mutual respect in each others’ face wants and needs as these utterances license them of modifying the blatant impositions on one’s wishes and desires (Goffman, 1967).

This is supported in an in-depth interview conducted with Peter that humors or banter could be a good way of establishing rapport among people in the workplace. He asserted that jokes are really one of the factors that build camaraderie among interactants situated in one organization. He also added that one has to consider first the background of the person, the mood or the personality in order not to create a commotion in the workplace.

(b) Damages on Negative Face

In the different segments of conversation, only few FTAs are committed by interactants which on the same way cause damages on their (speaker’s) negative face wants.

Self-humiliation

The act of self-humiliation as FTA suggests that the speaker reduces her self-image before other knowledgeable adult interactants within the speech event. This FTA is considered blatantly self-contradicting depending on the context of the speech event.

Context: Copying movies		
1	Lalay:	Sir russel, kanang kuan... kanang wa na ka’y klase?
2	Russel:	Unya pang mga 6..
3	Lalay:	Aw ok lang, wa kaayu ka na harsh?
4	Russel:	OK ra man...
5	Both:	Hahahahahaha [both are laughing]
6	Russel:	Ahh .. nanguha man pud kog mga movies nimu..
7	Lalay:	Hoi... naa bayay X dra.
8	Russel:	Ok ra oie..
9	All:	Hahahahaha
10	Glendelle:	Wala gyud dwai ka nachange di-aie lai?
11	All:	Hahahaha..
(Excerpt from TC4 S2)		

This segment delineates how the interactant blatantly damages her own face before other interlocutors. This conversation happens while Russel is copying some movies he has to Lalay's flash disk. Prior to this segment, she requested Russel to copy some of the movies he has to her flash drive. The utterance *Sir Russel, kanang kuan... kanang wa nkai klase?* [Sir Russel, don't you have your class?] is an utterance indirectly asking Russel to continue what he is doing. Though, they both do not share a strong degree of familiarity, these interactants able to manage a sparky and engaging way of conversation as evidently shown in lines 3, 4, 5 of this segment. On the commission of Russel of the utterance *Ahh .. nanguha man pud kog mga movies nimu.* [It's okay, I also copy your movies.] tremendously surprises Carolina since Russel has to scan her flash disk and could see all the files she has stored in it, thus, committed the FTA which damages her own face. Line *Hoi... naa bayay X dra* [Hey, there are porn movies in it] is a clear manifestation that she humiliated her own self-image and lowered her self-value by stating that there are pornographic movies stored in her flash disk. This could certainly be attributed to her degree of familiarity towards Russel who has just started working in the college for quite some time and that they do not share common culture practice.

Utterance *OK ra man* [It's okay] committed by Russel in this segment seems to save Lalay's face value regarding the stored pornographic films in her flash disk. Reinforced by Glendelle, *Wala gyud dwai ka nachange di-ai-e lai?* [So, you really don't change yourself Lay], more damages are put into her positive face.

Context: Looking the pictures of other instructor

- | | | |
|---|----------|---|
| 1 | Peter: | Ka igat ni sir Nillo drea oie..hahaha |
| 2 | Russel: | Ambi daw... |
| 3 | Peter: | Tan-awa o, kuan kaayu ... |
| 4 | Russel: | Hala, aw o... demure kaayu oie... hahaha |
| 5 | Michael: | Hoi, ayaw ko ninyu ug kabu-angi ba.. |
| 6 | Peter: | Hala naa pa gyud... hahahaha |
| 7 | Michael: | Ayaw ba kai Makita ninyu akong scandal diha. Hahahaha |
| 8 | Peter: | Ang imung kadulog? |
| 9 | All: | Hahahaha |

(Excerpt from TC 15)

In this conversation, self-humiliation is also exhibited when Peter commented on Michael's picture while operating on hearer's personal belonging. The utterance *Ka igat ni sir Nillo drea oie..* [Sir Nillo is so seductive here..hahaha] invites another interactant to make comments on the picture being described and as Russel committed the utterance *Ambi daw...* [Can I see it?] puts more pressure on the person being talked to by other participants of the communicative event. When these interactants give more comments, the hearer, Michael committed an utterance *Hoi, ayaw ko ninyu ug kabu-angi ba..* [Hey, don't mock my photos] which indicates the threatening acts committed by the other participants and *Ayaw ba kai, ambi na akong cellphone bi. Makita ninyu akong scandal diha. Hahahaha* [No, give that phone to me, you can see my scandal.. hahaha] which also causes more damages on him as speaker of the utterance.

Though these utterances are expressed in the forms of jokes and humors, these could still cause damages on both hearer's and speaker's positive face wants and needs. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), when taboo topics such as issues of sex, and race or topic which is inappropriate of the context raised in the conversation, the likelihood of exhibiting FTAs are increased.

On the other hand, the following are negative face-threatening acts exhibited in the recorded conversation which cause damages on hearer's face.

Request

The commission of this FTA indicates that the speaker (requester) conveys to the hearer (requestee) that he/she wants the requestee to perform an act which is for the benefit of the speaker. The act may be a request for non-verbal goods and services i.e. request for an object, request of an action and some kind of service or it could be a request for verbal good i.e request for information.

It is an impositive act in which the speaker who makes the request attempts to exercise the power or direct control over the intentional behavior of the hearer and in doing so threatens the requestee's negative face which is his/her wants to be unimpeded by indicating that he/she does not want to refrain from impeding requestee's freedom of action. The requester also runs the risks of losing face himself/herself, as the requestee may choose to refuse to comply with his/her wishes. (Trosborg, *Interlanguage Pragmatics*)

Threats

This FTA may center on the importance of what is requested by the requester towards the requestee which is the request of object or action. If the hearer perceives either to have interference of self-determination or lack of approval, then a threat or intrusion is felt on the part of the requester and thus, more power is to be exerted in order to make the request successful.

Succumbing to the power of the hearer

When interactants committed this type of FTA in the course of casual conversation, the hearer yields to superior strength or force or overpowering appeal or desire of the speaker. This could be attributed ostensibly with the social distance (D) between the hearer and the speaker, the measure of power (P) that the hearer has over the speaker and the cost of the action (C), and the degree to which the act is considered as an imposition in the culture that the speaker and the hearer belong to.

Context: Asking for favor

- | | |
|----------|--|
| 1 Joel: | Sir, Dad.a nang laptop unyang gabie. |
| 2 Niel: | Iya manang ibilin Dili mana siya ka dili.. hahaha |
| 3 Lalay: | No!! I can say No! |
| 4 Niel: | Sure? Sure? haha.. Pila gani ka ka units karun? Haha |
| 5 Lalay: | Aie Yes. Hahahah [everyone is laughing] |
| 6 All: | Hahahahaha |
| 7 Niel: | 9 bia ka karun hahahaha |

(Excerpt from TC1 S1)

This segment of the casual conversation explicitly shows that several FTAs could be committed by interactants while engaging in casual conversations. This also delineates that even among workers who already established a sparky way of communicating to each other, still they may be able to damage each other's negative face while engaging in any work related talk. A negative face need is the desire to act freely, to become independent of actions and not to be imposed upon by others (Brown & Levinson, 1987). In the cited segment, Niel tries to make an indirect request to Lalay to lend her laptop for just one week. Line 1 *Sir, Dad-a nang laptop unyang gabie* exhibited by Joel ostensibly creates a pressure on the part of the hearer to

either perform or not perform the act requested by the participant. This turn in the conversation causes damage on the part of Lalay for she has to lend her laptop for one week.

Line 2 signifies an indirect request from Niel but significantly affirms the future act of the hearer reiterating what Joel has mentioned in line 1. The utterance *Iya manang ibilin. dili mana siya ka dili. hahaha.* [She has to lend me that, she cannot say “no” hahaha] though, an indirect request of her laptop, is a threat to her face knowing that the person whom she is interacting with is the campus director of CVSC New Bataan Campus. This is a clear imperative statement which has an indirect illocutionary force of directive demanding the hearer to lend her laptop for work-related matters of the speaker. This utterance, though in the form of humor certainly damages the negative face of Miss Lalay for she has to perform the request of her campus director. The counter statement of the hearer, *No!! I can say No!*, is a phenomenon in which the request is not reciprocated by the hearer herself and a clear indication that her negative face is being threatened upon the commission of this utterance. Also, as illustrated in this line, the response of the hearer is an act which indicates that she does not really want to lend her laptop for she has to use it in the school where she is teaching; thus, the requester face is also threatened.

Consequently, the utterance of Mr. Niel *Sure? Sure? haha.. Pila gani ka ka units karun? Haha* [Are you sure? Hahaha how many teaching loads do you have now?] illustrates his power being in the higher organizational hierarchy of the workplace. Though this utterance is in the form of *wh*-interrogative question but its indirect illocutionary force is directive in the form of warning or threat on the part of the hearer.

This also significantly threatens the negative face of the hearer for she has to succumb to the power of her director, thus the response, *Aie Yes. Hahahaha* manifested that she does not really have the option to deny what her director requested from her. Lalay, being the speaker, commits herself to something she does not want to do succumbing to the power of the hearer or other interlocutor being in the top of the organizational hierarchy of the workplace. This is a negative face threatening act which causes damage to her face as speaker of this utterance. Though this is humorously stated, still negative face is threatened.

Brown and Levinson stated that negative face is threatened when an individual does not avoid or intend to avoid the obstruction of their interlocutor's freedom of action. It could cause damage to either the speaker or the hearer, and makes one of the interlocutors submit their will to other. Freedom of choice and action is impeded when negative face is threatened (1987). This exchange of dialogues manifests that language is clearly a crucial means of enacting power, and equally a very important component in the construction of social reality. Based on the social constructionist approach, the segment given explicitly supports the notion that every interaction which involve people enacting, reproducing and sometimes resisting institutional power relationships in their use of discourse by means of a range of coercive and collaborative strategies e.g. Crawford, 1995; Davies, 1991; Dwyer, 1993; Fairclough, 1989; Ianello, 1992).

Power in the workplace may be manifested in a number of ways. In this segment, Niel's authoritative position enabled him to define the rules a way that preserves good working relations. His negative face threatening acts towards the hearer is expressed through the humor of his indirect request of Lalay's laptop is an indication that though he is in the highest rank of the organizational hierarchy of the workplace, still he managed to make use of humor as a way of making request to his subordinate. His response in line 4 *Sure? Sure? haha.. Pila gani ka ka units karun? Haha* is deliberately humorous which leads Lalay to restate her position quite explicitly *Aie Yes. Hahahaha*. The commission of the utterances is in a form of humor and this could be associated to their relative degree of social distance since both already have years of experience working together as instructors of CVSC New Bataan Campus.

Dares

The commission of dares as FTAs restricts the hearer's personal freedom which includes acts that predicate a future act of the hearer. Dares are challenges on the part of the hearer to do something demanded by the speaker. These challenges require the hearer to perform an action especially as a proof of courage.

Context: Talking about college days

- 22 Glendelle: lagi... naa biay dance troupe..
 23 Gabrele: Da kana kuan rana akua oie.. da char2 ra.. hahaha [challenging
 Lalay while he performs in front other interlocutors]
 24 Lalay: Unsa di-ay imung gusto? [grooving her body towards Gabrele]
 25 Gabrele: Latin, Cha-cha (2) ...[giving a sample dance no] ahahahaha
 26 Glendelle: Agay wana lai... gibikil ka ba...

(Excerpt from TC2 S1)

While having an engaging talk, Glendelle inserted the conversation regarding the dance troupe of the college, this changes the segment into another topic of the conversation. Relating to the past experiences of Gabrele and Lalay as members of the dance troupe in their college days, Gabrele performs in front of other interactants challenging Lalay to do the same. This utterance is an explicit challenge towards other participants to do the same, and that Lalay's negative face is threatened as dare is exhibited in the paralinguistic codes manifested by Gabrele. Lalay's response, *Unsa di-ay imung gusto?* [What do you want?], is an utterance that also damages her negative face accepting the dare and shows that she is succumbing to the power of the hearer as she performs in front of them. Consequently, line 25 *Latin, Cha-cha...* while Gabrele shows extravagant paralinguistic codes performing Cha-cha invades hearer's negative face. This is an indication of more dare on the part of the hearer to outsmart what the previous speaker did.

Reminders

Giving reminders on other participants of the conversation, essentially suggests that the utterance of FTAs are purposively committed in order to make someone think about something again or to cause someone to remember something, and in doing so threaten the negative face want of a competent adult member by predicating his future action as significantly caused by the speaker to obstruct the freedom of action of another interactant.

Context: Talking about the Instructor's personality

- 27 Joel: Hahaha,, samuka ani oie.. mao mani ang magdala ug samuk drea
 28 Peter: Lagi... kanang ingnun gud drea sa una lay nga ... kanang Joke State...
 29 All: Ahahahaha
 30 Glendelle: Agay,
 31 Russel: Agaaaaaaaaay... gibikil...
 32 Niel: Hahaha... hahaha.. ingna lai, kinsa gani nagdala nimu gani dre?
 33 Lalay: Ay,psssttt. dali ra kaayu na...mangwenta... utang bi bayad!
 34 All: Hahahahahahha
 35 Lalay: hahaha...
 36 Lalay: Utang nimu one, one.
 37 All: Ahahaahaha...

(Excerpt from TC2 S1)

In this segment of the conversation when Peter commented as reflected in line 28 regarding what Joel uttered, *Lagi... kanang ingnun gud drea sa una lay nga ... kanang Joke State...* [Yes, you know what, we've known before as Joke State ...] indicates the sudden change of talk which provokes the hearer to invade the negative face wants of Peter. Line 33 *Ay, psssstt. dali ra kaayu na... mangwenta... utang bi bayad!* as response to Peter's comment in line 28 explicitly damages the negative face of the hearer. This utterance is a reminder of the hearer to pay his debts way back their college days. This act committed puts pressure on the part of the hearer to either perform or not perform the act demanded by another speaker. This utterance is exhibited with an intention to obstruct her interlocutor's freedom of action. It could be noticed that the line *Utang nimu one, one.* [Your debt, 1,100] specifying the amount of his debt causes more damage to Peter's negative face.

Acceptance of Compliments

In acceptance of compliments as FTA, speaker may feel constrained to denigrate of the object of hearer's prior compliment, thus damaging his own face or may feel constrained to compliment hearer in return.

Compliments are speech acts that are primarily aimed at maintaining, improving, or supporting the addressee's face. Newton and Burgoon (1990) define compliments as "statements that are intended to make the other feel good about himself/herself". Holmes (1986) has defined a compliment as a "a speech act which explicitly or implicitly attributes credit to someone other than the speaker, usually the person addressed, for some good (possession, characteristic, skill, etc.) which is positively valued by the speaker and the hearer". Generally, a compliment means that one is giving a positive evaluation about the addressee's appearance, behaviour, manner, skill, etc.

Compliments could be considered as a type of speech acts through which a speaker expresses positive attitudes towards another speaker. Within the same culture, compliments have different types according to the ways of using them and their roles in context. The main target of using a compliment is not to lose one's face which is likely to be lost if a compliment is misused in a context.

Performing a successful compliment requires the following conditions: a) Hearer (complimentee) has a certain quality; b) Speaker (complimenter) believes that the quality is admirable; c) Speaker wants Hearer to know/believe that Speaker admires the quality.

Context: Talking about loan

- | | | |
|----|---------|--|
| 1 | Peter: | Nakuan na ninyu inyung kuan mam? |
| 2 | Vic: | Hmmm? |
| 3 | Peter: | Inyung loan? |
| 4 | Vic: | Wala man ko naglaon....Ay, asa nga loan? |
| 5 | Peter: | Kadtong sa CVSC kadtong.. |
| 6 | Vic: | Wala oie,, wala ko nagloan.. |
| 7 | Peter: | Aie wala di-aie ka ni avail ato mam? |
| 8 | Russel: | Unsay pagtoo ni mam? Kadaghan ug kwarta ana...Maglibog man Gani unsaun pag gastu ang kwarta? |
| 9 | Vic: | Gul, |
| 10 | Peter: | Ayyyy? |
| 11 | Vic: | Mas maayu paning magpait ta kai di ta ka huna-huna ug utang.. |
| 12 | Peter: | May paka mam.. |

(Excerpt from TC5 S2)

This segment is an example of the commission of FTA when interactant accepted the compliment of another participant in the conversation. The first one committed by Peter is an initiation of the topic about the loan which leads another interactant to give his compliment towards Vic's state of being. When asked by Peter *Inyung loan?*, she directly replied that she's not able to avail the loan offered. Russel in his utterance *Unsay pagtoo ni mam? Kadaghan ug kwarta ana...Maglibog man gani unsaun pag gastu ang kwarta?* [What do you think? She has a lot of money, she even doesn't know how to spend her money?] is a compliment about her state of being. This utterance as stipulated in Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory is a face-threatening act on Vic's negative face for this restrain her freedom of action to accept or reject the compliments given to her by another interactant. A clear manifestation that she somehow poses in her line *Gul* is a sign to think what to say of the previous utterance about her. Her response in line the next utterance, *Mas maayu paning magpait ta kai di ta ka huna-huna ug utang* [It is even better to have few money because you cannot think of debts] is an indirect way of accepting the compliment given by Russel.

Context: Appreciating colleague

- | | | |
|----|----------|---|
| 1 | Peter: | Ka organized gyud ni mam ocon oy. |
| 2 | Russel: | Grabi gyud na si mam ocon oy, organize kaayu bai. |
| 3 | Peter: | Ganahan pud ko sa iyang buhok. |
| 4 | Honey: | Thanks.... |
| 5 | All: | Aahhh. Hehehehe |
| 6 | Peter: | Parehas ka sir nillo. |
| 7 | All: | Ahahhaahha |
| 8 | Peter: | Si sir russel gyud ang pinakanindut ug tupi sa tanan.. |
| 9 | Michael: | Lagi oie. Ahahahahha |
| 10 | Peter: | Hahaha ako pa nimu sir.. imu nlng na gidayun.. ipa-opaw nlng na.. |
| 11 | Russel: | Ahhh.. mao lagi na... |

(Excerpt from TC14 S1)

As reinforced by the study of Coates (1998), giving compliments could be a negative face-threatening act that creates what may be unwelcome attention on either the hearer or the hearer's possessions. Paying a compliment to someone 'may or may not function to increase solidarity between the interactants, to create or strengthen ties of liking or affection or affiliation'. Indeed, it varies situationally since it all depends on whether the compliment is appropriate or not. The context may not be suited to an evaluative move of this type. Kerbrat-Orecchioni (1987) describes a compliment as 'un cadeau verbal' and this characterization of the compliment as a verbal gift implies that the addressee is, in a way, put in the complimenter's debt (Petit, 2006).

Holmes (1988) also showed that addressees could perceive compliments as a face-threatening act because 'they imply the complimenter envies the addressee in some way or would like something belonging to the addressee'.

Giving Offers

When interactant gives his/her offers to other participants of the conversation, the speaker states a future action and at the same time also presupposes that the hearer should be involved. Offers are potentially face-threatening to both the hearer and the listener (but less so than requests, rejections, etc). The hearer could be offended if the thing offered is too much or too little or because of the risk of losing face by being offered

something in the first place. The speaker risks losing face if the offer is rejected or accepted with reluctance. It could be further suggested that offering help to another person is not an FTA but the fact is though that when someone offers anything, in this situation at least, he has the abilities that are superior to the other persons and their acceptance of this offer could signal their acknowledgement of their 'inferiority'. What may seem to another participant is to be a benign act could in fact be perceived as very hostile.

Context: Talking the delayed salary

- | | | |
|----|-------------------|--|
| 28 | Michael: | Sakita na sa akong ngipon oie... |
| 29 | Russel: | Hahahahaha... daghan na kaayu ug sakit ba... |
| 30 | Peter: | Hahahahha.. laina ana oie...gi sakitan ug ulo, gi kalintura.. wa mai sweldo..ana mana sir.. |
| 31 | Michael:
aning | Sakita sa akong ngipon oie.. magpa ibut dwai ko inig sweldo..Laguta pud wai sweldo oie...lain man kaayu magsakit na sab ni akong ulo unya ba.. hahaa |
| 32 | Russel: | So basta gani'y sweldo musakit ng ulo? |
| 33 | Michael: | Tara sir dagul ba.. |
| 34 | Peter: | Tara... |
| 35 | Michael: | Tara, cge ra man kag atubang sa imung ... |
| 36 | Vic: | Sir Nillo, wa pakai sweldo? Ako nalang magpahiram nimu... |
| 37 | Russel: | Da... |
| 38 | Michael: | Hala kwartahan gyud ni si mam ba.. |

(Excerpt from TC5 S2)

This exchange of utterances exemplifies how interactants offer some help to other people in the workplace. The commission of these utterances could primarily be attributed to the problem of the participants regarding the delay of the salary. As line 28 initiated by Michael expressing his state of affairs lead another interactant to give his comment *Hahahahaha... daghan na kaayu ug sakit ba...*[*Hahaha...too many ills..*] and line *Hahahahha.. laina ana oie...gi sakitan ug ulo, gi kalintura.. wa mai sweldo..ana mana sir..*[*Hahaha.. it's ridiculous.. headache, fever, just because we don't have the salary*] performed by Peter elaborated the problem experienced by other participant which is due to the problem of money. Vic in her utterance *Sir Nillo, wa pakai sweldo? Ako nlng magpahiram nimu.* [Sir Nillo, you still don't have your salary? I will just let you lend my money] is now an indication that she offers some help regarding Michael's state of being. This indicates that the speaker states a future action which also presupposes that the hearer should be involved in the commission of the act. From Brown and Levinson's perspective, this act causes damages on the negative face of the hearer since this may indicate that his future action or freedom of choice is impeded. However, in this context, it could also be inferred that offering some help for a workmate is an act which establishes solidarity to other participant.

In an in-depth interview conducted, Michael stated that he would be grateful if his colleagues offer some help when it comes to his work-related and personal matters. Though, Politeness Theory of Brown and Levinson claim that this pragmatic phenomenon is an FTA, in this context, it is considered as a way of building connections with other people in the workplace.

Suggestions

The commission of suggestions in the course of conversation potentially challenges the future act of the hearer. By doing so, negative face wants of the hearer which is the desire not to be impeded and impinged by other interactants are threatened. These acts significantly affect the choice and freedom of action as the speaker wants to get the hearer to act as he is expected to conform to the speaker's wishes.

Context: Talking about the test questionnaire

- 88 Peter: Tama naman ning ingun ani nga questionnaires..
 89 Russel: Butangi pud ug kuan face-validity.. pa nindut-ninduti pud.. butangi lagi ug logo lagi..
 90 Michael: Aha man ana?
 91 Russel: Para ganahan mo answer ba kai nay logo..hahahaha..
 92 Michael: Ahh naay logo... ganahan ko mu answer, ana?
 93 All; Hahahaha
 94 Michael: Laina sab nimu sir oy. Lain kaayu kag taras ba. Ahaha
 95 Russel: Hahaha.. para nay view ba, ikaw no?
 96 Russel: Pero ok ra man na..

(Excerpt from TC13 S1)

This segment illustrates that among people in the workplace, suggestions regarding work related matters could be considered FTA as stipulated in the Politeness Theory of Brown and Levinson. This conversation has something to do when one faculty asked his colleagues the quality of his test questions constructed in his subjects. The utterance *Tama naman ning ingun ani nga questionnaire* [Is it okay to have a questionnaire like this?] as an initiation of the talk which requires other participants to affirm or comment what he has shown to them, but the response of Russel *Butangi pud ug kuan face-validity.. pa nindut-ninduti pud.. butangi lagi ug logo lagi* [Just add face validity on it,make it attractive, just add logo on it] has an illocutionary force of suggesting, demanding the hearer to make some changes on the test paper he has constructed. The suggestion has something to do with the face validity of the test paper and thus in the commission of this act, Peter's negative face is invaded. This suggestion explicitly impedes the hearer's freedom of action as the speaker gives his observations and his advice based on what he has observed on the hearer's state of affairs. However, lines 95-96 also indicate that what the hearer has done about his test questionnaire could be considered good and this somehow mitigate the the face threat on the hearer's negative face.

Context: Asking for favor

- 1 Michael: Haaaaa... kwartahan kaayu si madam ba..
 2 Peter: Kanus.a na nimu I remit ma'am?
 3 Michael: Ikuan gud na mam bi., basig naa kai dili tag 500-500
 4 Peter: Hoi kanang mas dali mana mawala mam kanang tag 100.
 5 Peter: 0..may pag imuha ng ihatag sa amua ng ...
 6 Vic: 150 ra man pud na..unsa man kambyu ta sa 500?
 7 Michael: Ay, ayaw na lang ma'am oie..
 8 Vic: Ana ba... hahahahahaha
 9 Russel: Da, ka ingun man lagi kag ayaw..

10	Both:	Hahahahaha
11	Michael:	Alangan, ipa kambyu man pud niya...
12	Russel:	Da talaw man lagi.. hahahaha
13	Vic:	Ana sya nga dali rad aw mawala ang tinag 100, unya ingun Kog 150 ra man pud na.. unsa imung gusto kambyu ta sa 500? Hahaha.. imuha naming 150 ...da....

(Excerpt from TC6 S2)

Another example of suggestions which causes damages on the hearer's negative face is exhibited in this transcribed conversation. Michael in his utterance invited other participants to give their comments regarding the delayed salary and their need to look for their allowance. Peter, on the other hand, asked Vic regarding the money she has collected. The commission of utterance *0..may pag imuha ng ihatag sa amua ng...* [Why don't you give that money to both of us ma'am?] by Peter towards Vic causes a damage towards her negative face wants in this conversation. However, in the following utterance, as Vic responded *150 ra man pud na..unsa man kambyu ta sa 500?* [It is only 150, do you want to exchange this to your 500?] causes more damages to both Michael and Peter as clearly manifested by Michael's utterance *Ay, ayaw na lang ma'am oie* [No, thanks Ma'am].

According to Banerjee and Carell (1998), suggestions are directive acts in the interest of the hearer. On the other hand, Hindelang (2000) classifies such act as advice and defines suggestions as directives in the interest of both participants.

Showing Extravagant Paralinguistic Codes

This FTA is not included in the Politeness Theory of Brown and Levinson; however, the researcher found it significant while conducting his analysis. Beyond what has been stipulated in the theory of politeness, showing extravagant paralinguistic codes depending on the nature of conversation, significantly causes damages on the hearer's negative face. This is explicitly manifested in this sample of the transcribed conversation.

Context: Talking about college days

22	Glendelle:	lagi... naa biay dance troupe..
23	Gabrele:	Da kana kuan rana akua oie.. da char2 ra.. hahaha [challenging Lalay while he performs in front other interlocutors]
24	Lalay:	Unsa di-ay imung gusto? [grooving her body towards Gabrele]
25	Gabrele:	Latin, Cha-cha (2) ...[giving a sample dance no.] ahaha
26	Glendelle:	Agay wana lai... gibikil ka ba...
27	Lalay:	Just like this [showing more extravagant paralinguistic codes]
28	All:	Hahahahaha

(Excerpt from TC2 S1)

While engaging in a dynamic conversation, the situation leads the participants to talk about their involvement in the campus dance troupe during their college days. As Glendelle committed his utterance, this invited Gabrele to show his moves in front of other participants. This showcase of his moves causes a gravity of damage on the part of the hearers especially in the case of Lalay as member of the same dance troupe. In her utterance, *Unsa di-ay imung gusto?* [So, what do you want?] while grooving her body towards Gabrele,

she challenges the hearer's negative face. Due to this act, Gabrelle committed and performed *Latin, and Cha-cha-cha* approaching towards Lalay. The next utterance committed by Glendelle put more pressure on Lalay's negative face as her desire not to be impeded and impinged upon is ostensibly disregarded.

Showing extravagant paralinguistic codes while engaging in casual talks is a negative face threatening act which requires the relative degree of solidarity and familiarity among members of the speech community. Only interactants who have a closer degree of familiarity are capable of showing this FTA since this could be offensive on the part of the hearer.

References

- Aloia, Lindsey S. (2009). I'm sorry about your face: A study of face, politeness, and investment in the context of apology. ProQuest LLC 789 East Eisenhower Parkway P.O. Box 1346 Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.)(1989). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E. Goody (Ed.), Questions and politeness: Strategies in social interaction (pp. 56-310). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). Politeness: Some language universals in language use. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cupach, W. R., & Imahori, T. T. (1993). Managing social predicaments created by others: A comparison of Japanese and American facework. *Western Journal of Communication*, 57, 431-444.
- Cupach, W. R., & Metts, S. (1994). Facework. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fraser, B.1978. "Acquiring Social Competence in a Second Language". *RELC Journal* 9 (2). pp.1-21.
- Fraser, B., & Nolan, W. (1981). The association of deference with linguistic form. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 27, 93-109.
- García, C. (1989). Apologizing in English: Politeness strategies used by native and non native speakers. *Multilingua*, 11, 387-406.
- Goffman, E. (1972). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. In J. Laver & S. Hutcheson (Eds.), *Communication in face-to-face interaction* (pp. 179-196). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face interaction*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order*. New York: Basic.
- Gil, Maria. (2012). Face-Threatening Speech Acts and Face-Invading Speech Acts: An Interpretation of Politeness Phenomena. *International Journal of Linguistics*. Vol. No. 2. 2012
- Gray, Katherine-Matsumoto. (2012). Politeness in increasing degrees of imposition: A sociolinguistic study of politeness in political conversations. The University of Utah. Hayashi, Makoto and Junko Mori. 1998. Co-construction in Japanese revisited: We do 'finish each other's sentences'. *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 7, ed. by Shoichi Iwasaki. Stanford: SLA.
- Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, men and politeness*. New York: Longman.

- 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, 347-371.
- Hughes, G.H. (1984). An argument for culture analysis in the second language classroom. In J.M.Valdes, (Ed.). *Culture bound: Bridging the cultural gap in language teaching* (pp. 162-170). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ide, Sachiko. 1989. Formal forms and discernment: two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua* 8-2/3: 223-248.
- Karafoti, Eleni. 2007. Politeness, Gender and the Face of the Speaker. *CamLing 2007*: 120-126
- Kasper, G. (1990). Linguistic politeness: Current research issues. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(2). p. 193 – pp. 218
- Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 13(02). p. 215 – pp. 247
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (2002). *Pragmatic Development in a Second Language*. Oxford Blackwell.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). “The Logic of Politeness, or Minding Your P’s and Q’s” in *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society pp.236-87.
- Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and Women’s Place*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Lakoff, R. (1990). *Talking Power: The Politics of Language*. New York: Basic Books
- Leech, G.N. (1980). *Explorations in Semantics and Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. New York: Longman.
- Lin, H.H. (2005). *Contextualizing linguistic politeness in Chinese –A socio-pragmatic approach with examples from persuasive sales talk in Taiwan Mandarin*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University- Ohio
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 1988. Reexamination of the universality of face: politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12: 403-426.
- Matsumoto, Y.1989.”Politeness and Conversational Universals Observations from Japanese”. *Multilingual* (2/3) pp.207-21.
- Maynard, Senko. 1989. *Japanese conversation: Self-contextulization through structure And interactional management*. Norwood: NJ: Ablex.

- Nall, Sh. P. (2004). An analysis of the face threatening act strategies used in international trade email correspondence. National Symposium on Teaching English for Business Purposes HKU Proceedings, 78-100.
- Navari, Safoora & Pishghadam Reza. (2012). A Study into Politeness Strategies and Politeness Markers in Advertisements as Persuasive Tools. Vol.3. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, ISSN2039-2117
- Palmer, F.R. 1981. Semantics. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pomerantz, A. (1978). 'Compliment responses: Notes on the cooperation of multiple constraints'. In J. Schenkein (ed.), Studies in the organization of conversational interaction. New York: Academic Press, 79-112.
- Searle, John (1969). Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Scollon, Ron and Suzanne B. K. Scollon. 1981. Narrative, literacy and face in interethnic communication. Norwood: NJ: Ablex.
- Spencer-Oatey, H.D.M. 1992. "Cross-cultural Politeness: British and Chinese Conceptions of the Tutor-Student Relationship". Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Lancaster University.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1984. Conversation style: Analyzing talk among friends. Norwood: NJ: USA.
- Thomas, J. 1995. Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics. London and New York: Longman.
- Tracy, K. (1990). The many faces of facework. In H. Giles & W. P. Robinson (Eds.), Handbook of language and social psychology (pp. 209-226). New York: John Wiley.
- Walters, J. 1979. "The Perception of Politeness in English and Spanish". TESOL '79. pp. 289-96.
- Wagner Lisa C. (2008) Positive- and Negative-Politeness Strategies: Apologizing in the Speech Community of Cuernavaca. University of Louisville. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Watts, R. (1989). 'Relevance and relational work: Linguistic politeness as linguistic behaviour'. Multilingual, 8/2-3: 131-166.
- Watts, R. (1991). Power in family discourse. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Watts, R. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, S. R., & Kunkel, A. W. (2000). Identity implications of influence goals: Similarities in perceived face threats and facework across sex and close relationships. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 19, 195-221.
- Wilson, S. R., Aleman, C. G., & Leatham, G. B. (1998). Identity implications of influence goals: A revised analysis of face-threatening acts and application to seeking compliance with same-sex friends. *Human Communication Research*, 25, 64-96.
- Wilson, S. R., Kim, M. S., & Meischke, H. (1991/1992). Evaluating Brown and Levinson's politeness theory: A revised analysis of directives and face. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 25, 215-252.
- Yule, G. 1996a. *The Study of Language*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: CUP.
- Yule, G. 1996b. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.