

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 different politeness strategies or face-saving acts of teachers as they engaged in casual conversations. This study utilized discourse analysis as research method in identifying the face-savings acts exhibited from the samples of teachers' conversations. The researcher analysed the linguistic corpora using Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory. Data showed that teachers as interactants observed the use of positive politeness strategies such as: By intensifying interest to the Hearer, By joking, By seeking agreement, By giving offers and promises, By asserting a common ground, By concerning a Hearer's wants, By attending to the Hearer, By including both speaker and hearer in the activity and, By using honorifics "Sir and Ma'am. The negative politeness strategies used by teachers in their actual conversations are: By questioning, By stating FTA as a general rule and By minimizing impositions. Teachers, as they engage in their casual talks, used various politeness strategies to mitigate the threatening acts that may cause damages to the hearers' positive and negative face wants. Discourse, as it is, necessitates both hearer and speaker to contribute evenly and observe politeness to successfully convey the message may it be formal or informal setting.

Keywords: Face-wants, casual talks, discourse analysis

1. Introduction

Good communication necessitates not only good language but also a good act. To be pragmatically competent, every person as participant of the conversation must be tactful, modest and nice to others (Yule, 2013; Prifante, 2016). Politeness strategies create a more positive atmosphere which ostensibly minimize conflict and hostility while engaging in casual talks (Aporbo, 2022).

Yule (as cited in Attamimi, 2011) argued that face-saving acts are committed when speakers make counter utterances that may cause damages or threaten another person's face. Utterances in different contexts may carry more than one meaning to the hearer which may damage the desire to be like, to be appreciated or to be unimpeded upon by another participant. Face saving is something that involves not only one individual, but it also involves multiple people who depend on each other for face support (Cupach & Cunary, as cited in Forsberg, 2014). Face-saving acts are very crucial in maintaining one's face, to avoid conflict, to ensure cooperative interaction, manage impressions and maintain a socially caring atmosphere as interlocutors.

As teachers, the use of language is believed to give impact for the success of language learners in one way or another. As some teachers' speech included managing classroom, giving instructions, and providing feedbacks, it is inevitable that a teacher would use the power and make the students uncomfortable (Agustina, 2021). For educators, a good interaction enables them to build a positive relationship with their students so that the gap between them can be bridged by good communication skills. This is the reason why carrying out effective communication in the classroom is very important and cannot be underestimated. A study by Mantasiah and Yusri (2018) proved that teacher's language politeness has a pivotal role in improving students' academic motivation (Agustina, 2021).

With the crucial role of teachers in the language classroom, it is important to explore how teachers communicate in casual conversations since this persona can also be reflected in their actual academic discourse with students. It is in this premise that the researcher wants to investigate how teachers mitigate face-threatening acts for both positive face and negative face wants of their colleagues while engaging in casual conversations.

1.1 Literature Review

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-savings acts committed by teachers in their casual conversations?
2. How do teachers save their interactants' face wants ?

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.

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.

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.

Data Analysis

The data collected were analyzed utilizing the Politeness Theory of Brown and Levinson (1978). The researcher focused on 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-saving Acts of Teachers in Casual Conversations

Positive Face-Savings Acts	By intensifying interest to the Hearer By Joking By Seeking Agreement By giving offers and promises By asserting a common ground By concerning of Hearer's wants By noticing, attending to the hearer By including both Speaker and Hearer in the Activity By sing honorifics "Sir and Ma'am"
Negative Face-Saving Acts	By questioning, hedging By stating FTA as a general rule By minimizing the impositions

4. Discussion

Face-saving Acts of the Interactants in Conversations

Face-saving is the need to signal respect for the other person's need for freedom, space, and dissociation. A face saving act is an utterance or action which avoids a potential threat to a person's self-image. Incorporating the centrality of face into the explanation of the politeness types, Yule (1996) offers an attractive summary that stated face-saving act which is oriented to the person's negative face would tend to show deference, emphasize the importance of the other's time and concerns, and even include an apology for the imposition or interruption (negative politeness). A face saving act would tend to show solidarity, emphasize that both speakers want the same thing, and they have a common goal (positive politeness).

The following are ways which show how interactants exhibit their face-saving acts in order to lessen the damages of face wants to other participants of the conversation.

Positive Politeness Strategies

According to Wardaugh (2006), positive politeness leads to achieve solidarity through offers of friendship, the use of compliments, and informal language use. He further stated that people treat others as friends and allies, do not impose on them, and never threaten their face. This strategy attempts to minimize the distance between a group of people by expressing friendliness and solid interest to the hearer's need to be respected. This strategy is commonly used by people who have already known each other fairly well like members of the same group or community. Thus, positive politeness is used in order to keep relationship between the Speaker and Hearer because it indicates solidarity.

By Intensifying Interest to the Hearer

This strategy draws the hearer into the narration, for example by using the 'vivid present' which is, according to Brown and Levinson, commonly utilized in positive-politeness conversations. Speaker wants to share his interest to Hearer as a form of Speaker's contribution into the conversation. Therefore, Speaker exaggerates facts as well as he makes good story to draw Hearer as a participant into the conversation, and Hearer also usually uses tag questions like 'uhuh', 'what do you think?', etc. Sometimes, this could involve switching back between past and present tenses.

Another way for Speaker to communicate to Hearer that he shares some of his wants is to intensify his own (Speaker's) contributions to the conversation, by 'making a good story'. This strategy shows that Speaker includes Hearer into the middle of the events being discussed. This is exemplified in the following transcribed conversation.

Context: Talking the test

- | | | |
|---|----------|---|
| 1 | Peter: | Why sex is an integral part of marriage? |
| 2 | Rosello: | Oo, bitaw dugay pud sila manirado inig ka gabie. |
| 3 | Russel: | Hahaha.. tama bitaw.. |
| 4 | Michael: | Hahahaa.. |
| 5 | Peter: | Tama na oie.. |
| 6 | Russel: | Hahaha tama bitaw.. sex is an ingtegral part man gyud.. |

- 7 Rosello: Why sex? Unsa .. why sex is an important part of..? married life?
 8 Peter: Ngano man daw?
 9 Russel: Alangan! Walay kuan...
 10 Peter: That is necessity!
 11 Michael: Dili gyud na sya wants...
 12 Peter: Need gyud sya..
 13 Michael: Need gyud!
 14 Peter: Di gyud mo magmalipayun kung wa' na.
 15 Peter: Ikaw daw mangasawa unya way sex... cge ramu ug istorya ug
 gira...human pangako sayo...
 16 Rosello: Alangan man ug mag tinutukay ramu.
 17 Russel: Pait kaayu ng ingun-ana no?
 18 Russel: Ang kuan gyud kung dili ka anak ang isa ba.. baug!
 19 Rosello: Mangita gyud pud cguro ang isa kung dili ka anak.
 20 Peter: O..
 21 Russel: Mag-adopt lain pud kaayu oie..
 22 Russel: Kung mag adapt..
 23 Michael: Daghana ug questions ni sir oie..

(Excerpt from TC13 S1)

This sample exchange of utterances exemplifies how interactants exhibit their face-saving acts in order to lessen the threat on other interlocutor's positive and negative faces. It could be noticed in the sample segment that Peter initiated the conversation by reading one of his test questions for essay in his Social Science subject. Lines 3 and 4 committed by other participants indicate that they intensify interest towards what Peter has uttered in the previous line. The commission of the utterance, *Hahaha tama bitaw.. sex is an integral part man gyud* [Hahaha, yes that's right, sex is indeed an integral part!] performed by Russel affirming the notion of Peter exemplifies more interest on his part discussing the test question given. This could also be observed when another participant joined the conversation, *Why sex? Unsa .. why sex is an important part of..? married life?* asking for the repetition of what Peter has uttered. Affirming Peter's contribution, Michael also significantly intensifies his interest by stating, *Dili gyud na sya wants* [That is not a want!] and *Need gyud* [It's really a need]. Peter's contribution *Ikaw daw mangasawa unya way sex... cge ramu ug istorya ug gira* [If you were in that case, no sex at all, then you'll just be talking some sort of stuffs] is also affirmed by Rosello when he uttered line 18 *Alangan man ug mag tinutukay ramu?* [And are you just staring each other?]. Making a vivid story, repeating and affirming the notions of the speaker are ways in which interactants intensify interest from what the other interactant has uttered. These utterances are important in establishing rapport and solidarity among people in the workplace.

Based on in an in-depth interview conducted, when Michael was asked "How important is establishing rapport to to your fellow instructors in casual conversation?", he answered, *Ahh..important sya sir in a sense nga first, ang purpose kai maka-socialize and then, another way is maka lingaw-lingaw pud ta* [It is important in sense that , first, the purpose is to socialize and another way is to have just fun in the workplace]. He also added that it could be a way of establishing connection and making friendship with other interactants who belong to one organization.

By Joking

Since jokes are based on mutual shared background knowledge and values, joke may be used to stress the shared background or values. Joking is a basic positive politeness technique, for putting Hearer 'at ease' and minimizing an FTA of requesting.

This strategy of joking may be useful in diminishing the social distance between Speaker and Hearer and at the same way, minimizing the relative power associated in the organizational hierarchy, and enhancing the connections among interactants or degree of familiarity among members who shared the common notions of culture. Thus, strengthening the shared understanding, values, knowledge, and solidarity between the hearer and the speaker or among competent adult members of the workplace and even establishing common perspectives towards attaining the goal of the speech community which shared the community of practice. This is indicated in the following transcribed conversation.

Context: Talking about the salary

- 1 Glendelle: Naa naman daw..
- 2 Russel: Ang sweldo?
- 3 Glendelle: O...
- 4 Russel: Mali man dwai ning information gi pangpakalat ni sir nillo drea!
- 5 Glendelle: Dili ang akua ba.. hahahahaha
- 6 Glendelle: Sugnod! Hahaha ning text ko kang mam ging...
- 7 Michael: Ok na daw?
- 8 Glendelle: Naa naman daw...ipaklaru lng daw nko sa HR. sa HR ang Problema ani..kung ok na ang tanan nkong gipasa...
- 9 Michael: Para ma release na?
- 10 Glendelle: Ohmmm..
- 11 Michael: Ana si mam ging naa na gyud daw no?
- 12 Glendelle: O.
- 13 Michael: Nakadungog man gud ko sa iyaha... basta ni ingun man to Siya nga aha man ang requirement ani ni... sir babag o..
- 14 Russel: A, daghan kaayu ug kwarta si sir Glendelle dwai.
- 15 Peter: Pahirma name sir ha...
- 16 Glendelle: Pila? Da... hahaha dyesmeil? Di ko gusto magpahiram ug baba sa dyesmil. Hahaaha..
- 17 Peter: Kuan lng gud sir..
- 18 Glendelle: Hahahahaha...pero kuan.. 10% ang akong interest
- 19 Peter: Cge-cge.. sugot mi sir... sugut man pud kaha ka ug ingun ani ka daku imung bukol...
- 20 Glendelle: Hahha.. 10% akong interest... pero dili sya per month ang interest...
- 21 Russel: Per day?
- 22 Glendelle: Per day. Hahahahaha.. grabi sab cancer natu ana oie..
- 23 All: Hahahahaha
- 24 Michael: Hahaha., maputol na gyud na sir[referring to his hand]
- 25 Russel: Ha.. Maputol na gyud na hahaha
- 26 Peter: Maski piang rana ... maputol na gyud sya.. hahahaha

27	Glendelle:	Simbako intawn .. hahahaha [everyone is laughing]
28	Peter:	Hala di bya na pwedi kai .. plastic...

(Excerpt from TC6 S3)

This conversation shows the different face-threatening acts committed by the interactants while engaging in the conversation but minimize the face threats by making use of jokes. This exchange of utterances has something to do with the problem of the instructors related to their salary. Glenn, who initiated the conversation telling about his salary, is supported when Russel contributed his utterances *Ang sweldo?* [Your salary?] and *Mali man dwai ning information gi pangpakalat ni sir nillo drea!* [So, the information being disseminated is wrong!] making Michael as responsible of spreading bad news about the salary in the form of humorous banter. Russel's comments are face-threatening acts damaging the positive face of Michael but lessen its effect as it is being delivered; it could not be detected as a threatening act since it is supported by Glendelle's utterance *Sugnod! Hahaha ning text ko kang mam Ging* [Provoke me! Hahahaha.. I have texted ma'am Ging earlier].

Russel's utterances *A, daghan kaayu ug kwarta si sir Glendelle dwai* [So, you really have a lot of money sir] initiated the next flow of the talk which is the request from Peter *Pahirma name sir ha* [Sir, lend us your money sir]. This utterance is obviously a negative face threatening act as it has illocutionary force of request. The following utterance committed by Glendelle, *Pila? Da... hahaha dyesmeil? Di ko gusto magpahiram ug baba sa dyesmil. Hahaaha* [How much do you want? Ten thousand? I don't want to lend lower than ten thousand pesos. Hahaha] indicates his rejection of Peter's request in the form of jokes. This somehow saves the threat he has performed towards Peter's request. As supported by another humorous line, *Hahahahaha....pero kuan.. 10% ang akong interest* [Hahaha, but the interest is 10%], the rejection of other's request has a lesser negative effect on the part of the requester. The exchange of banter between the requester and the requestee is evidently depicted in this conversation as Peter performed the utterance *Cge-cge.. sugot mi sir, sugot man pud kaha ka ug ingun ani ka daku imung bukol* [Okay sir, that would be okay. Do you also want me to punch this fist to you?] showing his fist towards Glendelle. Even in lines 31-39, it is shown that they both committed the threatening acts towards each others' face but since this exchange of humorous banter is exhibited by the participants, they both saved each other's face wants and desires as participants of the conversation.

This phenomenon in the workplace is supported in the observation of many anthropologists about the widespread existence of "joking relationships" even in illiterate societies, in which individuals in certain social relationships were expected to interact with humor, such as joking, teasing, banter, ridicule, and practical jokes (Apte, 1985).

Humor is also a gentle approach because it is ambiguous, and statement may be passed off as "just joking" if it seems to give offense, particularly when rejection of the statement would cause result in punishment (challenging the status of a superior) or cause an individual to lose face (rebuff of a sexual overture). This enables a person to deny the seriousness of their intent to others in order to protect their esteem; it also enables them to deny its seriousness even to themselves to protect their self-esteem. And all this consideration of saving face presumes that the remark would not be well-received and must be withdrawn, but few individuals would make a proposal at all if they are certain it would be rejected. Their hope is likely that their proposal would be accepted, and the conversation could transcend from joking to serious when their initial "test" meets with acceptance (Jim Shamlin, *The Psychology of Humor*, 2001).

When both Peter and Glendelle were interviewed, “Do you think humors or jokes can be a good way of establishing rapport towards your workmates?” Peter answered: “Yes sir, one way ni siya nga maka build ug closeness ug maging comfortable naka sa pakig istorya.” [Yes sir, this is really one of the ways to build closeness and to become comfortable when we engage in conversations].

Glendelle also asserted what Peter has responded. He said that it makes the workplace at ease and relieves the pressure of the work. However, both interactants agreed that sometimes jokes could hurt other participants’ feelings, thus one has to observe limitations and boundaries when doing so in the conversation. They also said that one has to know first the personality, the attitude and the mood of the interactants before throwing banter towards another participants of the conversation in order not to be offensive.

The purpose of humor, then and even now, is to establish group identity and norms, identify insiders and candidates while excluding outsiders, and sort out the hierarchy within a group. Similar functions are served when humor is used between individuals: it is about distance, identity, and status.

By Seeking Agreement

One way of claiming common ground with Hearer is to seek ways in which it is possible to agree with another participant. The raising of ‘safe topics’ allows Speaker to stress his agreement with Hearer and therefore to satisfy Hearer’s desire to be ‘right’, or to be corroborated in his opinions towards the topic raised in the conversation.

Agreement may also be stressed by Speaker repeating part or all of what the preceding Speaker has said in a conversation and by using particles that function to indicate emphatic agreement (yes, uhuh, really, etc.) whenever someone is telling the story. Seeking a common ground upon which the speaker could agree with the hearer could also be indicated by asking questions or any related talk that make a sparkly and engaging conversation. See transcription that follows.

Context: Talking about Instructors of College days

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| 21 Michael: | Hatang sukoa bitaw niya... unsaun naman tawn ni nako... wana gyud koi I-klase sa kong mga bata... nahurot na nako ug char-char tanan hahahaha. |
| 22 Michael: | Naunsa na gyud to siya.. |
| 23 Peter: | Wala rana sa among maestro sa una nga mag story telling ra sa Iyang kaagi..class kami sa una .. ingun ani... |
| 24 Peter: | Mao na... |
| 25 Peter: | Kadto bitaw sa una si sir Talikdan sa una sir... |
| 26 Michael: | Isa nana ka oras sir? |
| 27 Peter: | Naka agi mu ana sa iyaha sir? Kang sir talikdan? |
| 28 Glendelle: | Ay kaisa.. |
| 29 Peter: | Tong kuan ba.. mag lesson siya.. kung unsa ang nakasulat sa board.. mao ra sab iyang i-klase..iyang i-explain.. |
| 30 Russel: | Maski dili iyaha? |
| 31 Peter: | O, haha... ok class.. oy mao ni inyang topic? Aw. Wala bamu kabalo ani class nga kini siya... ok class. Among klase likoy lagi kaayu.. |

- 32 Michael: Let's go na oie...
- 33 Peter: *Kini siya.. gi explain ni maayu sa inyung maestra? Ingun sya.. hahaha layu ra kaayu... iyang klase kai layu ra kaayu..*
- 34 Russel: *Unya sir ang ending ana kai ang isa ka maestra di kabalo mutudlo.*

(Excerpt from TC7 S1)

This segment of conversation shows the commission of seeking agreement as face-saving acts while interactants engage themselves in casual conversations. This happens when Michael initiated the talk regarding the book which an English instructor from CVSC Maragusan Campus requested him to borrow from Russel. The shift of the talk happened when Michael mentioned that other instructor badly needs the reference for Literary Criticism and Structure of English subjects, making him accountable of the request. The utterance *Hastang sukoa bitaw niya... unsaun naman tawn ni nako... wana gyud koi i-klase sa kong mga bata... nahurot na nako ug char-char tanan hahahaha*. [She's really mad at me and said "How would I teach my students now, it's really difficult to make some sort of stuffs just to keep the class going" ...hahaha] started the shift of the topic as Peter joined in the conversation recalling his experiences with his former instructor who also does the same thing in class. His contribution in the conversation, *Wala rana sa among maestra sa una nga mag story telling ra sa iyang kaagi.. class kami sa una, ingun ani...* [But we also have an instructor like that, he would just say "class, you know what, before its like this.."] is supported by other interactant when Michael committed the face-saving act by seeking an agreement in the line *Isa nana ka oras sir?* [*Is that good for one hour session sir?*]. Peter is also supported by another interactant Russel when he committed the utterance *Tong kuan ba.. mag lesson siya.. kung unsa ang nakasulat sa board.. mao ra sab iyang i-klase.. iyang i-explain*. Russel's utterance asking him *Maski dili iyaha?* [Even if it's not his subject?] is a face saving act finding ways to make some agreement of the previous interactant. This FSA satisfies the need of the interactant to be liked, accepted and corroborated while engaging the casual talk in the workplace.

Seeking agreement as face-saving act can certainly make a good rapport and connection towards any member of the organization as each interactant is supported and agreed by any competent adult member of the workplace.

By Giving Offers and Promises

Speaker and Hearer are good co-operators that they share some goals or Speaker is willing to help to achieve those goals. Promise or offer demonstrates Speaker's good attention in satisfying Hearer's positive-face wants, even if they are false.

In order to "distract" the hearer from potential face threats, the speaker may stress cooperation or future cooperation in various areas to demonstrate good will that would assure beneficiality towards the speaker's wants and needs as competent member of the speech community. This could take the form of offers, promises, or suggestions, often with little sincerity of intended fulfillment. See transcription below for sample.

Context: Processing the salary

- 30 Michael: Hoy mga teachers, ibtun sa nako ang kuan ha..
- 31 Honey: Hoy, tagai pud ko ninyu ug sweldo bi arun ma inspired pud ko..
- 32 ichael: Cge na bi arun magbuhat ta ninyu'g kuan...
- 33 Michael: Hoy magbuhat na pud bia ta ninyu ug payroll ay..
- 34 Honey: Hoy, pa apila ko ninyu..

- 34 Honey: Agay ka...Pa apilon man ko ni sir Nillo pero dili man niya ipasa..
35 Michael: Ma'am, dili man nako makuan mam oie...
36 Peter: Part time?
37 Michael: Pero karun mam, akoo na gyud ng buhaton mam
38 Honey: Yes....

(Excerpt from TC9 S1)

This segment of the conversation delineates how interactant minimizes the face threat by giving offers and promises on the part of the hearer. When Michael asked for permission in plugging out the extension wire from the main source so he could work the payroll, this also leads Honey to give her utterance *Hoy, tagai pud ko ninyu ug sweldo bi arun ma inspired pud ko* [Hey, count me in for that salary so I will be inspired]. Lines *Hoy, pa apila ko ninyu..* [Count me in] and *Agay ka...Pa apilon man ko ni sir Nillo pero dili man niya ipasa* [Oh my, Sir Nillo wants to include but he doesn't hand me that..] are manifestations of request from Honey to include her payroll in the process. Utterances *Ma'am, dili man nko makuan mam oie* [Ma'am, I really can't make it now] and *Pero karun mam, akoo na gyud ng buhaton mam* [But I assure you I will really make it now ma'am] are ways of mitigating the face threat on Honey's positive face as Michael gives an assurance that her payroll would be included in the process, distracting the hearer from potential face threats as his utterances stress cooperation regarding the concern of the other participant. This sample of work related talk develops solidarity among interactants in the workplace as they share a community of practice (Stubbe & Holmes, 2000).

When Honey was interviewed, "*How do you feel when your workmates offer you some help when it comes to personal and work-related matters?*" Honey asserted, "*I feel ... happy and.. grateful.*" She also added that when her workmates ignore her when she needs something related to work or personal matters, she understands them anyway.

Michael, on the other hand, when asked "*How do you manage to respond when your workmates demand you to do something but you still have other important stuffs, things to do such as personal and work-related matters?*" responded that he is really willing to help his colleagues as situated in the workplace but he still has to consider first the necessity or emergent response of the request.

By Asserting a Common Ground

The value of Speaker's spending time and effort on being with the Hearer, as a mark of friendship or interest in him, gives rise to the strategy of redressing an FTA by talking for a while about unrelated topics. Speaker talks with Hearer for a while about any other sort as ways to support the hearer and to show that Speaker is interested in the Hearer.

Gossip or small talk. Speaker is talking about unrelated topics to show that Speaker is interested in Hearer as the mark of friendship and does not come only to impose him.

Point-of-view operations. Speaker may claim common ground by using cooperation point of view. (S speaks as if H were S, or H's knowledge were equal to S's knowledge).

Presupposition manipulations. Speaker presupposes something when he presumes that it is mutually taken for granted.

This is exemplified in the following example.

Context: Talking about the TV set

- 1 Niel: Naunsa dwai ka? Naayu na imung TV?
- 2 Joel: External naman na iyang gamiton mam, aie sir kai ibilin man niya Iyang laptop.
- 3 Lalay: Pero kaun.. unsay tawag ana .. ni ingun rag ihatud lang drea,
- 4 Niel: *Lain ug tubag oie... haha.. Ihatud lang dre ma'am.. haha. Ihatud nimu lai? Kadaku sab ato oie.*
- 5 Lalay: Gani daku kaayu...
- 6 Niel: *Daku kaayu iyang TV tas ihatud pa niya sa Nabunturan... hahaha*
- 7 Lalay: Hoi kanang nay plano dra. Nga mupalit ug TV, i- discourage gyud ta mo nga dili mupalit ug Tv nga daku kai kung maguba, ipahatud.
- 8 All: Hahaha... Hahaha..
- 9 Joel: *Problemado na hinuoon kaayu..*
- 10 Lalay: Kana rang gamay nga TV inyung paliton oie..
- 11 Niel: *Hahaha... ilang TV daku kaayu.. Ana akong pag-umangkon ba.. kuya. Kuya.. daku kaayu si Sponge Bob.*
- 12 All: Ahhhahahaha...
- 13 Niel: Kai akong pag umangkon sa una.. daku kaayu ilang Tv nya.. 48 Inches..Daku kaayu mao to ilang gibutang sa kwarto tas duol kaayu sa iyaha... ni ingun gud ug Oie.. ang laki ni Sponge Bob.
- 14 All: Hahahaha
- 15 Joel: *Mura naman ug sinihan kai daku man kaayu ug TV...*
- 16 Niel: Hahaha..
- 17 Joel: *Mao bitaw problema aning daku nga TV no? kai kung padulong sa imung balay, ihatud man... pag madaut, ikaw gyud intawn anmag baguod ana!*

(Excerpt from TC1 S3)

In this segment of the recorded conversation, point of view operations are exhibited by the interactants in order to save face. Talking about the TV set of Lalay as initiated by Niel is one way of mitigating the potential face threat and establishing rapport towards the other participant. This conversation happened when Lalay was about to leave the office in order to get her external drive as she requested Russel to transfer and copy all the movies he has in his laptop. Raisng unrelated talk, Niel asked her about her TV set. The utterance *Naunsa dwai ka? Naayu na imung TV?* [What happen to you? Have you fixed your TV?] is a face saving act showing interest to Lalay's possession. Niel in his utterances *Lain ug tubag oie... haha.. Ihatud lang dre ma'am.. haha. Ihatud nimu lai? Kadaku sab ato oie* [What kind of answer is that? Just bring it here ma'am... so are you going to bring that ? That's too bulky to carry] and *Daku kaayu iyang TV tas ihatud pa niya sa Nabunturan hahaha* [That's too big and you still have to bring that to Nabunturan] puts himself to Lalay's point of view having trouble with her TV set.

It is also evident that in the provided utterances in this segment, interactants also presuppose when taken for granted by another participant in order to make a sparky way of communication. Joel also asserted his experience of having a bulky TV set, *Mao bitaw problema aning daku nga TV no? kai kung padulong sa imung balay, ihatud man... pag madaut, ikaw gyud intawn ang mag baguod ana!* [What's the problem of having that TV set, when you buy that, nothing to worry because they really have to bring it to you, but if there's something to fix on it, that's a dilemma because you really have to bring it back to them] as a way of asserting a common ground.

This FSA shows that interactants supported each other's need to be connected and to appreciated as they share equal opportunities being members of the communicative event.

By Concerning for Hearer's Wants

One way of indicating that Speaker and Hearer are cooperators, and thus potentially to put pressure on Hearer to cooperate with Speaker, is to assert or imply knowledge of Hearer's wants and willingness to fit one's own wants with them. It means Speaker knows Hearer's wants.

Context: Problem of the delayed salary

- 45 Joel: Ma return about lagi to ni sir niel.. mu apiki lagi to...
impas to...gubut pa
Sa lukot ning trabahu-a run...
- 46 Michael: Unsa iyang ingun kuya about sa among sweldo?
- 47 Peter: Pait na kaayu ba...
- 48 Joel: Susss... nangambut naman ang taga pinanser kung kanus-a ang
sweldo..kung kanus.a mapirmahan..
- 49 Michael: Mao gani...
- 50 Peter: Sa una man gani nga giadto mana ug Panabo..
- 51 Peter: Mao gani..
- 52 Russel: Unya nagnong dili naman ingun ana?
- 53 Michael: Mao gani ingun ni mam vic kya...nganong dili ma nila
mapirmahan.. nga Kung mu adto sila sa Panabo mag T.O man
- 54 Joel: O.. mag T.O mana sila.. ma reimburse ra man na ilang pamilite..
- 55 Russel: Gikapoi sila, Gikapoy sila.. Gikapoi ug lihok
- 56 Honey: Basig naa nay mga hidden agenda..

(Excerpt from TC9 S1)

Interactants situated in the community of practice do share a common goal as prevalently exercise in the workplace. In the provided exchange of utterances, it could be noticed that interactants show concerns towards another's wants regarding the problem of his salary. Peter complaining the delay of disbursement of their salary gains the concern of his colleagues who also experience the same thing. Joel, Peter, Honey and Russel stipulated this face-saving act by giving their concerns and making comments on the accounting office. This implies that interactants are knowledgeable enough as they asserted one another and show concerns to the face need of the other participant.

The utterance committed by Joel *Ma return about lagi to ni sir niel.. mu apiki lagi to... impass to...gubut pa Sa lukot ning trabahu-a run* [If sir Niel will be back, and found it disgusting, it would even be tougher] and Michael's affirmation, *Mao gani* [Yeah, that's right] and *Mao gani ingun ni mam vic kya...nganong dili ma nila mapirmahan.. nga Kung mu adto sila sa Panabo mag T.O man* [That's what ma'am Vic has told has Kya, why can't they make it signed by the President in Panabo where in fact, they can simply have the Travel Order] are face saving acts manifested by the interactants showing their concerns about what Peter has experienced. These utterances assert and imply that other participants do have knowledge and are aware of the Hearer's wants and and show their willingness to fit one's own wants with the concern of other interactants.

By Noticing, attending to the Hearer

It means Speaker should take notice of Hearer's condition such as noticeable changes, remarkable possessions, anything which looks as though Hearer would want Speaker to notice and approve of it. This may also include attending what other interactant's wishes or desires or wants from the hearer. See example below.

Context: Attending interlocutor's request

- 1 Rosello: sir naa kai copy sa 1C?
- 2 Michael: 1c o, naa.
- 3 Rosello: Pila sila? Pakitan.aw daw sir pila ka student
- 4 Michael: Pila imuha di-aie?
- 5 Rosello: Wala pa man gud ko nakakuha gud.. aie kuan
- 6 Michael: Bidaw 1c...
- 7 Rosello: Kanang kuan ..Gamay pa man gud nagpasa ug Index card...
- 8 Michael: Bidaw, 9 magsugod..hangtud... 1C mn kaha?
- 9 Rosello: O, 1C
- 10 Michael: 9, magsugod...
- 11 Rosello: Entrep 1C..
- 12 Michael: Singkwenta..
- 13 Honey: Naa man guy uban nga naa sila ana nga subject unya ang uban wala.
- 14 Michael: O, wala..
- 15 Honey: wala ana nga subject..
- 16 Rosello: Pero sila gyud.
- 17 Michael: Kani.. mao gyud ni sila ang naa sa akoang subject sa Filipino.. sa English nila kai naa may nadungag...
- 18 Rosello: Sengkwenta?
- 19 Michael: O, 59 mani ang naa drea unya 9 man pud nagsugod so 50 ra sila.
- 20 Rosello: Ahhh.

(Excerpt from TC9 S1)

This conversation among instructors is a segment in which mitigating the face-threatening acts is prevalent as interactant attends and notices the wants of another interactants. This happens when Rosello wanted to have a complete list of the students enrolled in his subject. His utterance *Sir naa kai copy sa 1C?* [*Sir, do you have the copy for 1C ?*] is an utterance in the form of question which has an illocutionary force of indirect request towards Michael who also handles the same section. Michael's response *1C, o naa* [*1C, yes I have*] is an indication that he attended and noticed the want and desire of the other interactant. The positive face want of Rosello is being addressed by attending to his concern regarding the complete list of the students enrolled in his subject when Michael committed this utterance *Singkwenta* [*There are fifty students*] stating the exact number of students he has in is subject. Honey's response *Naa man guy uban nga naa sila ana nga subject unya ang uban wala* [*There are cases, that some students are enrolled in this subject but are not enrolled with another*] is also a face saving act attending to the concern raised by Rosello. Speaker's desire is reciprocated when other participants notice what he has requested.

Noticing and attending the speaker's wants is a face-saving act that addressed the face want of another interactant which is to be liked and to be connected as member of the same organization.

By Including Both Speaker and Hearer in the Activity

Speaker uses an inclusive ‘we’ form when Speaker actually means ‘you’ or ‘me’, and could call upon the cooperative assumptions and thereby redress FTAs. It is also an attempt to involve Hearer and Speaker into the activity. ‘Let’s’ is an inclusive ‘we’ form. Here, S manipulates the subject of an activity and is done together. S uses an inclusive ‘we’ when S actually means ‘you’ or ‘me’. An example is given in the following,

Context: Requesting the faculty to join the program

- | | | |
|---|----------|--|
| 1 | Honey: | Hala oie.. na unsa naman ni akong trabahu oie... |
| 2 | Niel: | Taaaa |
| 3 | Russel: | Tara adtu nata... |
| 4 | Russel: | Bye, |
| 5 | Rosello: | Kaw mam drea raka mam? |

(Excerpt from TC11 S1)

The given segment of conversation explicitly shows how interactants exhibit their face-saving acts at the same time mitigating the threat on hearer’s face wants. This conversation is basically a request on the part of the faculty to attend the program as initiated by Russel and Niel. The use of “Taaaa”[*Let’s go*] and “Tara adtu nata”[*Let’s go now*] minimizes the face-threats on the part of the hearer as speakers are also part of the activity. The illocutionary force of these utterances is request which is negative face-threatening act, but this is lessened when both speakers include themselves in the activity. *By Giving Gifts or Sympathy*

It means Speaker may choose to stress his cooperation with Hearer by claiming that whatever Hearer wants, Speaker wants for him and will help to obtain. Offers and promises are the natural outcome of choosing this strategy. See example given.

Context: Making offers

- | | | |
|----|----------|---|
| 44 | Michael: | Sakita sa akong ngipon oie.. magpa ibut dwai ko inig
sweldo..Laguta gyud aning wai sweldo oie...lain man kaayu
magsakit na sab ni akong ulo unya ba.. hahaa |
| 45 | Russel: | So basta gani’y sweldo musakit ng ulo? |
| 46 | Michael: | Tara sir dagul ba.. |
| 47 | Peter: | Tara... |
| 48 | Michael: | Tara, cge ra man kag atubang sa imung ... |
| 49 | Vic: | Sir Nillo, wa pakai sweldo? Ako nlng magpahiram nimu... |
| 50 | Russel: | Da... |

(Excerpt from TC5 S2)

This conversation happens when two instructors discussed their problem regarding the delay of their salary. Face wants are addressed when Ms. Vic offers Michael money for him to borrow. In this utterance, the speaker satisfies Hearer’s positive face want by giving gift, not only tangible gifts, but human relation wants which are the wants to be liked, admired, cared about, understood, listened to. This means that this strategy is usually used for the benefit of the Hearer. Even if they are false, they demonstrate Speaker’s good intentions in satisfying Hearer’s positive face wants.

In an in-depth interview conducted, Michael asserted that he would be grateful when his colleagues offer some help in the workplace. This also shows that his wants to be connected with other participants are addressed and compensated.

By Using Honorifics 'Sir' and Ma'am

This positive politeness strategy is no longer part of Brown and Levinson's theory; however scrutinizing details in the transcribed conversations, the researcher found it useful and significant in discussing the mitigation of the face threatening acts committed by the interactants.

The use of honorifics *Sir* and *Ma'am* is unique to Filipino culture as sign of respect to those who are in a position or to those who are worthy of respect. Several instances are recorded and observed by the researcher which alleviate the gravity of the FTAs.

Context: Asking for favors

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| 24 Vic: | Aha sir russel? Wala nya na on iyang wifi? |
| 25 Peter: | Mu print sa kog time and location bi para sure.. |
| 26 Michael: | Dalia imung time and location.. |
| 27 Michael: | Kini long bani sir? |
| 28 Peter: | Dili na mao sir? |
| 29 Michael: | Kalian oie... |
| 30 Michael: | Ngano mani? Ay short ni? |
| 31 Michael: | Long na sir.. |
| 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 Peter: | Kanang? |
| 39 Peter: | Di ko ganahan anang hilabtan ko ba.. |
| 40 Russel: | Kai mawala iyang focus.. |
| 41 Michael: | Asa dapit si focus? |
| 42 Peter: | Drea ra gud na sir bi... |
| 43 Russel: | Libre sir nillo bi.. |

This strategy lessens the several FTAs committed in this segment of conversation. The use of honorifics '*Sir*' even in the commission of positive face threatening acts in this segment mitigates the supposed gravity of the offense committed. The commission of the utterance *Kini long bani sir?* by Michael in this segment is a threatening act that impedes the freedom not to be impinged upon of Peter as participant of the conversation. Peter's response *Dili na mao sir?*, indicating his attention towards Michael's positive wants fulfills the hearer's need to be connected. However, in the next utterance as Michael continues to ask *Long na sir...?* [Sir, is it long bond paper?] and *Sir Dagul?* impeded the face wants of Peter, giving his response *Unya rako hilabti sir.* [Do not disturb me sir].

The commission of these utterances may offensively cause gravity of face damages, but only alleviated by the use of honorifics 'Sir'. The failure to adhere to the seemingly rigid morphosyntactic rule of polite expressions may be considered an act of rudeness or impoliteness in communication.

The use of expressions "Sir or Ma'am" addressed to those people worthy of respect could be equated to one's ability to communicate respectful attitude towards others. However, scholars have observed that communication style may shift, from unmark to mark or vice versa, depending on social relationships of interlocutors while the essence of politeness in the interaction is kept intact, that is to safeguard a deferential relationship with each other.

Negative Politeness Strategies

According Brown and Levinson (1987), negative politeness redressive action addressed to the addressee's negative face: his want to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded. It uses in order to show that Speaker cares and respects H's negative face in the social distance. This strategy orients toward satisfying the H's negative face and emphasizes avoidance of imposition on the Hearer.

By Questioning, hedging

Questions are often used to give options to the addressee to say 'no'. Imperative impositions are coercive. In interrogative impositions, as Allan (1980) remarks, the speaker asks the addressee to do something for him while pretending to give the latter the option to accept or reject the responsibility. The hearer is left to infer that the speaker wants him to carry out an act. Thus, imperative forms are generally replaced by less assertive forms such as questions.

A similar strategy designed to win acceptance is that of hedging, which expresses hesitancy. But this does not mean that hedges always imply hesitancy. Hedges are generally used to produce the effect of interposing the speaker's opinion between the propositional content and the addressee's assessment (Thorat, 2000).

Lakoff (1977) classifies hedges into two groups: lexical hedges and sentential hedges. An important point about hedging is that the more elaborate the hedging and the more hesitant the delivery of the utterance, the politer it will seem. This is indicated in the following example.

Context: Requesting other faculty

- 1 Rosello: sir naa kai copy sa 1C?
- 2 Michael: 1c o, naa.
- 3 Rosello: Pila sila? Pakitan.aw daw sir pila ka student
- 4 Michael: Pila imuha di-aie?
- 5 Rosello: Wala pa man gud ko nakakuha gud.. aie kuan
- 6 Michael: Bidaw 1c...
- 7 Rosello: Kanang kuan ..Gamay pa man gud nagpasa ug Index card
- 8 Michael: Bidaw, 9 magsugod..hangtud... 1C mn kaha?
- 9 Rosello: O, 1C
- 10 Michael: 9, magsugod...
- 11 Rosello: Entrep 1C..

12 Michael: Singkwenta..

(Excerpt from TC9 S1)

This segment of conversation deliberately shows how interactants mitigate the threatening acts they have committed by observing hedges and questions when making request towards other interactants. The utterance *Sir naa kai copy sa 1C?* [Sir, do you have the complete of 1C?] committed by Rosello is a concrete example of question as way of asking request from another participant. This form of speech act which has an illocutionary force of request mitigates that imposition given by the speaker since it is in the form of question. This lessens the degree of imposition as speaker gives the hearer a freedom to accept or reject the imposition given. The utterance *Pila sila? Pakitan.aw daw sir pila ka student* [How many are they? Kindly look how many are they in your list sir?] also combines both question and hedge as way of softening the FTA. The word *pakitan-aw* [kindly look] is a lexical hedge modifying the whole utterance of request. Lines 5 and 7 giving reasons of not knowing the exact number of students he has in his subject clearly lessen the imposition of request he has given towards the hearer. These utterances also indicate the sincerity of his request towards the other participant of the conversation.

Lakoff (1972) analyzed hedges as “words whose meaning implicitly involves fuzziness-words whose job is to make things fuzzier or less fuzzy”, and he discussed words and phrases manifesting hedging power (like rather, very, in a manner of speaking) setting some boundaries on how to interpret linguistic items as hedges. Lakoff also discussed the fact that hedges “interact with felicity conditions for utterances and with rules of conversation”, thus setting the coordinates for interpreting hedges as manifestations conditioned by pragmatic factors.

Context: Making an indirect request

- 29 Michael: *Gipaphotocopy gud na nako imung libro sir... ibilin ra man na nimu sir no?*
- 30 Russel: O..
- 31 Michael: *Hinay-hinayan ra nko nag suong dihaa.*
- 32 Russel: Bitaw kaysa magpalit... ako kay kinahanglan man gud..kay kuan..
- 33 Michael: Taga didtua man gud ka.
- 34 Michael: *Sa USEP gyud di-ay ni nga skwelahan nimu gipalit sir?*
- 35 Russel: Ommm.
- 36 Russel: Akong mga kuan .. mga maestra gud sa masteral kai sila ang mga authors ana..

(Excerpt from TC13 S1)

This sample conversation also makes use of hedges and questions as a tool of mitigating the FTA. This segment essentially talks about an indirect request of another participant's possession which is the reference being used in English 101. Line 29 exhibited by Michael, *Giphotocopy gud na nko imung libro sir...*

ibilin ra man na nimu sir no? [Sir I already reproduced your book sir, you'll just it here sir, right?] is a form of sentential hedges as the whole sentence modifies the utterance. This has something to do with the previous pragmatic factors when Michael asked Russel to photocopy his reference in English 1 subject, but he was not able to ask permission to do so. The utterance in the form of question essentially mitigates the imposition which is in the form of request. The commission of the utterance, *Hinay-hinayan ra nako nag suong diha-a* [I'll just reproduced it little by little] also softens the FTA making it politer on the part of the hearer.

Many speech acts contain the speaker's opinions and assumptions. Some of these are potentially FTAs, particularly assumptions about the hearer's beliefs, wants, and abilities. So as not to impose his views on the hearer, the speaker may qualify his statements either as (1) to their veracity or (2) to the degree of the speaker's commitment to the view. Hedges could be used to soften performatives, and thus the stronger the face threat, the more hedging used.

Brown and Levinson (1987) start with the definition of 'hedge' as a particle, word, or phrase that modifies the degree of membership of a predicate or noun phrase in a set. This definition includes both detensifiers and intensifiers. However, the term 'hedge' is in many other theories reduced to the former one.

Caffi (2007) classifies mitigating mechanisms according to which components of the utterance they affect: 'bushes' concern the proposition, 'hedges' concern the illocution and 'shields' concern the utterance source.

By Stating the FTA as a General rule

It means Speaker indicates that he does not intend to impinge by stating the FTA as an instance of some general social rule, regulation, or obligation. It uses in order to dissociating Speaker and Hearer from the particular imposition in the FTA and Speaker does not want to impinge but is merely forced to by circumstances. So, the pronoun use is avoided.

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.. ahahha.. |
| 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)

The segment of conversation shows that stating FTA as general rule is one way of mitigating the face threatening acts. As observed in this conversation, making comments on the part of the hearer's state of being is performed by Peter in his utterance *Abi.. hala nay wak-wak. Hahahaha* [Oh, witch? hahaha] making fun of Michael's new hair cut. Michael being jokingly mocked of these banters from his colleagues generally

states the social obligation of each participants as part of the speech community. In lines 4-5, he clearly states this rule not to insult or mock other colleague as member of the college belonging to the community of practice. The utterance *Dili na gyud maayu akong na sense ani ay* [What I sense is really obnoxious] is also an FTA on the part of the hearer's positive face, but as part of the work force generally forced him to state that making bad comments or making fun of other people is not accepted.

It is also observed that how he stated this FTA rule is also in the form of humors or jokes which also modify and soften the whole utterance of giving warning on other participants.

By Minimizing the Impositions

It means Speaker redresses the seriousness of the FTA to pay Hearer deference. It usually uses expressions like a tiny little bit, a sip, a taste, a little, a bit, etc. This strategy is based on utilizing expressions that are to minimize the size of the FTA. An example is provided.

Context: Asking for favor

- | | | |
|----|----------|--|
| 1 | Peter: | Ma'am Vic, pautanga mi ug 500 |
| 2 | Michael: | Pautanga mi bi..sinsilyu-I mam bi.. |
| 3 | Vic: | Ako manang ibayad sa kuan.. |
| 4 | Michael: | Haaaaa... kwartahan kaayu si madam ba.. |
| 5 | Peter: | Kanus.a na nimu I remit ma'am? |
| 6 | Michael: | Ikuan gud na mam bi., basig naa kai dili tag 500-500 |
| 7 | Peter: | Hoi kanang mas dali mana mawala mam kanang tag 100. |
| 8 | Peter: | 0..may pag imuha ng ihatag sa amua ng ... |
| 9 | Vic: | 150 ra man pud na..unsa man kambyu ta sa 500? |
| 10 | Michael: | Ay, ayaw na lang ma'am oie.. |

This segment shows minimizing imposition as a tool of mitigating the face-threatening acts towards other interactants. The expression used in the cited transcription essentially lessens and mitigates the act of imposing request towards another participants of the conversation. The utterance exhibited by Michael *Haaaaa... kwartahan kaayu si madam ba* [Haaaa.. Ma'am Vic has a lot of money now] mitigates the act of imposing performative towards Vic as requestee of the conversation. The commission of the utterance, *Kanus.a na nimu I remit ma'am?* [When are you going to remit that ma'am?] also lessens the FTA on Vic's negative face as Michael imposed towards another participant of the conversation.

5. Conclusion

The faculty of Compostela Valley State College (CVSC) observed and exhibited the complex and fascinating relationship between power and politeness in the workplace. Face threatening acts are performed, but face saving acts are also observed as they engage themselves in casual talks.

The concept and relative definition of power license the nature of interaction in the workplace. Most of the workplace interactions as exhibited by the interactants provide evidence of mutual respect and concern for the feelings or face needs of others, that is observing politeness. Interactants exhibit more of positive politeness strategies than negative politeness strategies in order to mitigate the FTAs they have committed in casual conversations.

Since both positive and negative FTAs are committed by faculty members regardless of discipline taught, administrators should conduct an orientation reminding all academic personnel of the importance of observing decorum in the academe to building rapport and solidarity among people in the workplace. Teachers of Linguistic subjects could introduce to their classes the different theories in conversational analysis and discourse analysis in order to give meaningful analysis of the different utterances occurred in verbal interaction.

The study could be a basis for another research endeavor delving on power and politeness that existed in the workplace. Further studies on discourse and conversational analysis may be conducted to know the different meaning of utterances and understand the complexities of language in a verbal interaction situated in different contexts.

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-contextualization through structure And interactional management. Norwood: NJ: Ablex.
- Murphy, M & Levy, M. (2006). Politeness in intercultural email communication: Australian and Korean perspectives. *Journal of Intercultural Communication* (12).
- 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. (1992). 'Linguistic politeness and politic verbal behaviour: Reconsidering claims for universality'.
- In R. Watts, S. Ide, K. Ehlich (eds), Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory and practice. Berlin: 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