

دراسة في التهذيب وعدم التهذيب في نصوص مختارة

اعداد:

م.م زهراء خالد رحيم

كلية التربية - جامعة ميسان

البريد الإلكتروني Email : zahraakhaleed@uomisan.edu.iq

الكلمات المفتاحية: الأدب، مفهوم الوجه، الفعل الذي يهدد الوجه، الفعل الذي يحافظ على الوجه، استراتيجيات قلة الأدب .

كيفية اقتباس البحث

رحيم، زهراء خالد ، دراسة في التهذيب وعدم التهذيب في نصوص مختارة،مجلة مركز بابل للدراسات الانسانية، نيسان 2026، المجلد:16، العدد:4 .

هذا البحث من نوع الوصول المفتوح مرخص بموجب رخصة المشاع الإبداعي لحقوق التأليف والنشر (Creative Commons Attribution) تتيح فقط للآخرين تحميل البحث ومشاركته مع الآخرين بشرط نسب العمل الأصلي للمؤلف، ودون القيام بأي تعديل أو استخدامه لأغراض تجارية.

Registered في مسجلة في

ROAD

Indexed في مفهرسة في

IASJ



A Study of Politeness and Impoliteness in Some Selected Texts

Prepared by

Asst. Lecturer Zahraa Khalid Raheem

University of Misan/ College of Education/ English Department

Keywords : Politeness, The notion of face, face-threatening act, face-saving act, Strategies of Impoliteness.

How To Cite This Article

Raheem, Zahraa Khalid , A Study of Politeness and Impoliteness in Some Selected Texts ,Journal Of Babylon Center For Humanities Studies, April 2026, Volume:16,Issue 4.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

[This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

المخلص

يُعدّ مفهومًا التهذيب وعدم التهذيب من المفاهيم المتداخلة ضمن حقل التداولية، إذ يعكسان طبيعة العلاقة التفاعلية بين المتحدث والمتلقي في سياقات تواصلية محددة. ويرتبط مفهوم التهذيب ارتباطاً وثيقاً بعلمي اللغة الاجتماعي والتداولية، لما له من دور في تنظيم السلوك اللغوي وتوجيهه داخل المجتمع. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تحليل مظاهر التهذيب وعدم التهذيب في الخطاب، مع التركيز على التعليقات السياسية المتداولة عبر وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي، ولا سيما منصة Facebook.

تنقسم الدراسة إلى ثلاثة محاور رئيسة. يتناول المحور الأول الإطار التمهيدي للدراسة، متضمناً مشكلة البحث، وأهدافه، وإطاره النظري، والمنهجية المعتمدة، إضافة إلى الجوانب ذات الصلة. أما المحور الثاني فيركّز على الأسس النظرية لمفهوم التهذيب بوصفه موضوع الدراسة الرئيس.

أما القسم الأخير، فيناقش كيفية عمل التهذيب وعدم التهذيب في الحياة الواقعية، وذلك من خلال تحليل أمثلة من المجال السياسي على وسائل التواصل الاجتماعي، وبشكل أساسي من منصة فيسبوك. وتختتم الدراسة بخلاصة تلخص أهم المحاور التي تناولها البحث، مع إبراز الفروق بين التهذيب والفظاظة في تحليل الخطاب.

ABSTRACT

Generally speaking, the concepts of "politeness" and "impoliteness" are interrelated subjects within the realm of pragmatics, illustrating the rapport between the speaker and the listener in a certain context. Politeness is closely related to sociolinguistics and pragmatics. This research examines politeness and impoliteness in speech analysis, specifically among political Facebook comments. This research is divided into three sections. The first section serves as an introduction, addressing the issue statement, objectives, theoretical framework, methodologies, and other relevant aspects. The second part focuses on the primary subject of this study, which is kindness.

The final part discusses the functioning of politeness and impoliteness in actual life. It does this by using instances from the political domain of social media, mostly from Facebook. The conclusion summarizes the main topics discussed in the research on the distinctions between politeness and rudeness in speech analysis.

1.Introduction

People think of politeness as the rules of how to talk to people in a social way, including things like kindness, connection, respect, and space. In addition, it means having a humble and positive attitude toward other people or their faces.

Next, the problem with this study is that some strategies of being polite, being rude, and facial expressions can be misunderstood on modern social media sites like Facebook, where the conversation between two people doesn't include sounds, emotions, or facial expressions.

The point of this paper is to look into the theory of politeness and impoliteness and how it works in English through the lens of some chosen talks. The main ideas of this theory will be looked at and talked about in detail by using cases and going into more detail.

The focus of this study is only on looking at techniques for being polite and rude in a small sample of political Facebook comments taken from multiple social media pages.



It is hypothesized that the tactics for being polite and rude in speaking can be found in social media, especially on "Facebook." Also, to a certain point, native speakers are more likely to use one approach than the other.

2. The Concept of Politeness

In sociolinguistics and pragmatics, "politeness" denotes the manner in which language influences social norms, including the expression of respect, kindness, relationships, and personal boundaries. Some of them use specific quotation marks (such as "please"), the appropriate tone of voice, and the correct method of addressing someone, including the selection between first and last names or between intimate and distant terms (Crystal, 2008: 373).

"Face" is what Brown and Levinson (1987: 61) call "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself." Also, they can tell the difference between good and negative faces.

Holmes (1995: 296-297) says that being nice is "the ability to make others feel comfortable and relaxed." This means caring about other people's feelings, treating them the way they want, and not getting in their way.

Meyerhoff (2011: 312) says that being polite is "what competent speakers do in a community to deal with possible social or interpersonal disturbance."

Politeness shows that the speaker doesn't want to make face threats by doing certain actions that make the listener feel threatened. (Mills, 2003:8).

There are many types and methods of being nice, and they are all based on the idea that everyone wants two things:

1. Positive wants are the hopes that at least some other people will want the same things that you do.
2. Negative wants: every responsible adult in a community wants to be able to do what they want without anyone getting in the way.

3. The Notion of 'Face'

Brown and Levinson present their theory in the form of an abstract model of interaction. They introduce a Model Person (MP), whose two fundamental features are rationality and face (1987: 58). Thus, rationality is seen as a means-end reasoning that does not really come within the

realm of linguistic studies since it gives rise to language strategies on the basis of their being means, satisfying thereby the subject matter of linguistic politeness.

According to Yule (2010:135), the concept “face” is the most relevant one. In pragmatics, your face is your public self-image. And this is the emotional and social self that every person possesses and assumes everybody else recognizes. You could do that, but if you say something that threatens someone’s self-image, then that’s a face-threatening act. For example, you use a direct speech act to get someone to do something (Give me that paper!), you are acting as if you have more social power than the other person. If you don’t really possess that social power (e.g. you’re not a military officer or prison warden), then what you are doing is performing a **face-threatening act**. An indirect speech act, in the shape of a question form: Could you pass me that paper? un, sets aside the presumption of social authority. You are only asking if it is possible. It makes your request less of a face threat to the other person. When you say something that diminishes the potential threat to another’s face, this can be considered face-saving.

4. Politeness Strategies

Politeness strategies are used to write words that help people keep a good mood when they need to or want to do something that might hurt their image. The four main ways that Brown and Levinson say people can be polite are bald on-record politeness, negative politeness, positive politeness, and off-record (indirect) politeness. They also say that the act of threatening should never be used.

4.1 Bald on-record

Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson propose that bald on-record is the most direct politeness strategy. It occurs when a speaker performs a Face-Threatening Act (FTA) in a clear, unambiguous, and concise manner without attempting to minimize the threat to the hearer’s positive or negative face (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 94–95).

Most of the time, bald on-record strategies don't try to lessen the danger to the hearer's face by using positive or negative politeness strategies. The approach is most often utilized in situations where the speaker has a close relationship with the audience, such as family or close friends and





in some other cases
(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politeness_theory#Bald_on-record).

Brown and Levinson identify several contexts in which bald on-record strategy is typically used:

1. Urgency or Emergency

The speaker must communicate rapidly to prevent danger or harm, leaving no time for politeness strategies. Example: “Watch out!”

In such situations, clarity and speed outweigh face considerations (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 96).

2. Task-Oriented Communication

Efficiency becomes more important than politeness during cooperative activities where participants share common goals. Example: “Pass me the hammer” (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 97–98).

3. Close Social Relationships

Among family members or intimate friends where social distance is minimal and politeness markers are unnecessary. Example: “Give me the phone.”

Shared familiarity allows speakers to use direct forms without threatening interpersonal harmony (ibid: 101–103).

4. Power Differences

A speaker with higher institutional or social power may use direct forms without being considered impolite. Example: A teacher saying, “Open your books.” Role-based authority often legitimizes bald directives (ibid: 74–76).

5. Conventionalized Expressions

Certain offers, invitations, greetings, and formulaic expressions are naturally direct because they function as social routines rather than genuine impositions. Examples: “Come in.” / “Sit down.” / “Enjoy.”

Such expressions are interpreted as conventional politeness rather than face-threatening acts (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 100).

4.2 Positive Politeness Strategy

Strategies of positive politeness are designed to minimize the redress that follows by emphasizing closeness. Such strategies include pairing criticism with praise, seeking common ground and humor, nicknames, honorifics, tag questions, special discourse markers (please), in-group

jargon and slang (<http://grammar.about.com/od/pq/g/Politeness-Strategies.htm>).

Positive politeness serves several important interpersonal functions:

- Expressing solidarity and group membership — Speakers highlight common ground, shared values, or mutual experiences to strengthen social bonds.
- Showing approval and admiration — Compliments and expressions of interest make the hearer feel appreciated and respected (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 103-104).
- Reducing social distance — Informal language, nicknames, and friendly markers signal familiarity and closeness (Holmes, 2013: 274- 276).
- Maintaining harmonious interaction — Speakers avoid conflict by emphasizing cooperation and mutual understanding (Thomas, 2013: 171-173).

4.3 Negative Politeness Strategies

Negative politeness is typically associated with formal communication and situations where social distance or power differences exist. The speaker avoids presuming familiarity and instead uses linguistic strategies that convey respect for the hearer's personal space and autonomy (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 131-132).

Negative politeness strategies are oriented toward the negative face of the addressee; their primary aim is to avoid impinging on the hearer. Examples include a polite salutation (Dr. Sir), an apology (Pardon me, I'm sorry) and/or at least one attempt to minimize the ask (only, one second). These are negative politeness strategies since they meet up with the addressee's negative face wants— that is, his/her desire to be able to go about their own action or passion without interference. Example: Excuse me, Dr. Michaels. Sorry, but can I just cut in on you for a second?

The speaker here indicates that he cares more about his interlocutor's time and social status than what he is saying (the phrase "I'm sorry" in context means that other people would judge what he's doing negatively).

Negative politeness serves several interpersonal purposes:

- Minimizing imposition — Speakers reduce the burden of requests by making them less direct (ibid: 129).
- Showing deference — Language reflects respect for status, authority, or unfamiliarity (Watts, 2003: 88- 89).





- Maintaining social distance — Formal expressions prevent unwanted intimacy (Holmes, 2013: 276- 278).
- Avoiding coercion — The hearer is given options and freedom to refuse (Thomas, 2013: 173-174).

4.4 Off-record (indirect)

This approach uses indirect language and lets the speaker off the hook. A speaker can also imply the request indirectly, as in "It's getting cold in here," expecting the listener to autonomously increase the temperature (they could do that without being prompted directly). Therefore, if a speaker is willing to perform a face-threatening act but wants to escape accountability for it, they will do so indirectly by making an unspecified or irrelevant statement, permitting the addressee to determine its meaning (Brown and Levinson 1987: 211).

This is an ambiguous technique, as it communicates several intentions without any of them being a threat. It reflects how the speaker can avoid responsibility, by arguing that the hearer's understanding of the comment as a face-threatening act is incorrect (Erbert & Floyd, 2004: 324). The common types of off-record strategies are:

1. Giving hints

The speaker implies a need or desire without making a direct request. Example: "It's very hot in here." (Implied request: Open the window) This indirect hint allows the hearer to interpret the intended meaning voluntarily.

2. Giving association clues

The speaker makes some reference to the intended act. For example "I have an exam tomorrow. Find something else to do with your hands. (Implied request: Please lower voice / stop noise.) Because of the connection between exams and quietness, this carries an indirect implication about what exactly the speaker means.

3. Being vague

The speaker intentionally omits detail to make the request go down smoothly. For example: "Maybe someone can help with this. Since the hearer cannot be held accountable directly, vagueness is a plus.

4. Using rhetorical questions

Questions are asked not to be answered but to suggest blame or demands. Example: "Why do you play the music so loud?" By not stating it down

the line, this means a complaint and request: can you make sure to lower the volume.

5. Using understatement

They minimize the degree of a situation in order to make even more impact. For example: “The report is still a work in progress.” This could mean a lot of rewriting is necessary.

6. Using overstatement

The speaker exaggerates sarcastically, another way to see it is while implying criticism or evaluation. For example: “This bag is so heavy!” (Which, to be fair, is really a request for help carrying it.) Exaggeration indirectly conveys the speaker’s trouble.

7. Using metaphor or figurative language

Figurative expressions convey meaning indirectly. Example: “He’s a walking encyclopedia.” This metaphor is at once an indirect compliment to the person’s knowledge.

8. Being ironic

The speaker states the contrary of what they mean. Example: “What a beautiful day!” Ironically, that allows the speaker to express dissatisfaction indirectly (during a storm).

9. Using tautologies

Repetition conveys hidden meanings. Example: “Boys will be boys.” This means some behavior is inherent, so should be accepted.

10. Being ambiguous

This speaker deliberately manipulates polysemous phrases. For example: “I saw someone steal your book.” The interlocutor does not take a direct swipe at one person (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 214- 222).

Speakers prefer off-record strategies when:

- The imposition is high
- Social distance exists
- The speaker doesn't want to be directly responsible
- Socially-preferred modes are polite and subtle.

This strategy allows the addressee leeway to work out what utterance can mean, with the option to follow suit (Brown & Levinson, 1987: 211-214).





5. Cultural Differences and Politeness

Understanding Languages with different cultures other societies for Politeness. Gestures or phrases that are polite in one culture may be impolite or rude in another. For example, the value placed on direct communication in Western cultures such as the United States, which tends to appreciate clarity and efficiency, contrasts with indirectness preferred in many Asian cultures that tend to seek harmony and avoid threatening the “face” of hearers. Another example of this kind of culture and politeness strategy that refutes the theory that politeness is exhibited in threatening situations are those systems found within the Japanese honorific system (which even occurs under non-threatening circumstances). They claim that in other types of societies (e.g. Japanese society) these socialization mechanisms are learnt to the extreme cases and as a consequence, people can be considered face threatening if they deviate from their forms (Fukada, 2002: 11) this implies that these forms will have an effect on mitigating such acts.

It's a universal concept, politeness strategies- Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson (1987: 60–62) claimed that they are manifested differently based on cultural norms, social distance between interlocutors and their respective power relations. Almost identically, Geoffrey Leech (1983: 104) asserts that politeness is defined by cultural values which govern the strategies that speakers use to minimize conflict and maximize social harmony. By appreciating cultural differences, one can decode each other's intentions for effective interaction and avoid communication barriers caused by exposure to culture.

6. Gender and Politeness

A plethora of studies on language and gender have been focusing for decades on identifying, and also trying to explain, differences in the speech styles between men and women one of the most significant disparities has appeared in the field of linguistic politeness. In what is probably the most thoroughgoing of the bodies of the evidence to date, Holmes characterizes women’s speech as more polite than men’s, whereby women are more epistemically than males in positively politeness and to utilize mitigating motives so that they do not at all or minimize threatening their interlocutors’ face. For instance, women interrupt less when speaking to one another and “are more likely to be a

teacher listener, concerned to make sure that others have an opportunity to speak” than men. They even deconstruct and use certain speech acts differently to men. For example, not only do women use more apologies than men but women’s apologies are also more frequently than men’s “used as remedies for space and talk offences – areas of interaction in which women have particularly vulnerable positions and where they might have developed to a higher degree a greater sensitivity” (Holmes, 1995: 185).

7. Impoliteness

Antipathy refers to a negative attitude against particular behaviors exhibited in some contexts. It is sustained by projections, fantasies, and/or beliefs about social structure—in particular how an individual’s or group’s identities are shaped by others in the course of interactions. Contextual actions are frowned upon when they deviate from what was expected, desired or perceived as normal. Such activities always possess or are assumed to possess emotional repercussions for at least one person, namely, they induce or are considered to induce offense. Multiple variables might intensify the perceived offensiveness of impolite conduct, such as the extent to which one perceives the action as very purposeful. According to Culpeper (2005: 38), impoliteness occurs when: (1) the speaker intentionally expresses a face-attack, or (2) the hearer interprets and regards it as purposefully face-attacking, or both of these apply.

Culpeper also looked at another form of impoliteness: the use of face-attack for entertainment of a third party. Culpeper argued this phenomenon resulted from a combination of psychological principles such as the acknowledgment made by philosophers of what are known as 'Superiority' theories of humor (Bergson, 1911; Hobbes, 1640) explain how people find pleasure in others misfortune and exploration into how impoliteness can be performed through sarcasm, mimicry or implicature. Using the British daytime TV show *The Weakest Link*. His research suggested that the brusqueness exhibited by the show’s host, Anne Robinson, could not simply be explained in terms of business lexical and grammatical choices, however; it was also a function of contextual factors and above all her prosody. Prosody is a key exponent for interpersonal orientation and should not be underestimated.





8. Strategies of Impoliteness

1. Bald on record impoliteness: However, this way is applied in the cases when important face is involved and also once a speaker intends to damage hearer's face; thus, it would lead to a blunt and overt impolite discourse (Bousfield, 2008: 92). Culpeper used the concept of face-attack-act (FAA) to be differentiated from a face-threatening act (FTA), which delineated cases of face assault by their being speaker intentionality (Mullany and Stockwell, 2010: 71).

2. Positive impoliteness: In this approach, the positive face desire (need to be accepted) of listener is attacked with the intension of breaking the social norms as described by Bousfield and Locher, (2008: 134). For example, in his 2005 version of the model, Culpeper lists sub-strategies for positive impoliteness which entail (cited in Mullany and Stockwell, 2010: 72):

- ignoring or ignoring the interlocutor
- denying shared knowledge with speaker-listener,
- introducing a face threat topic or unwelcome topics
- using inappropriate identity markers
- using indifference and insignificance toward speaker listener
- like seeking disagreement points, ambiguous words usage as well as specific phrases during conversation
- breaking taboos.

3. Negative impoliteness: Negative impoliteness refers to communicative strategies that are designed to damage or threaten the hearer's negative face, that is, their desire for autonomy, freedom of action, and freedom from imposition. According to Jonathan Culpeper (1996: 357), negative impoliteness includes behaviors such as frightening, condescending, ridiculing, invading the other's space, or explicitly associating the hearer with negative aspects. These strategies intentionally impose on the listener and restrict their sense of independence, often creating discomfort or offense. This is designed to attack the hearer negative face want, the want not to be imposed upon (Thielemann and Trudgill, 2013: 239).

9. Data Analysis

This part gives the selected data or conversation for analysis about politeness and impoliteness. The examples have been selected from various contexts and dialogues between two individuals on social media,

namely inside political comments on Facebook. Each discourse is presented in bold, followed by its analysis based on the theoretical frameworks proposed by Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson (1987) and the impoliteness model developed by Jonathan Culpeper (1996).

Text No.1

A-Let criminals out. Let illegals in. If boys go where girls piss. Condemn police officers. Persecute Christians. To stomp and burn the American flag. Condone barbarism in Islam's name. Overtax the hard-working Americans. Coddle the lazy. And spew hate. That's the liberal way. Thank God Trump won. If he does, maybe he'll step in and put an end to this madness.

B- I'm completely with you.

The interaction between speakers A and B demonstrates a predominance of impoliteness strategies with very limited politeness features. This exchange has the concept of Face which is the public self-image that everyone tries to maintain as mentioned in previous section. The speech employs a bald on-the-record strategy, presenting accusations and criticisms raw with no attempts to sugarcoat them. In addition, these comments attack the positive face of a social group ("liberals") through strong disapproval and contempt while also potentially threatening negative face by imposing the speaker's perspective forcefully. There are no politeness strategies be they hedging, indirectness or solidarity markers that indicate the intention to maximise clarity and impact over social nicety.

There was also a quick the o ak o cente, and an incorporation of tere not ce into english in contra s to t e act of ac if two t ese previous modalities you are more simply a target. By using language that insults, excludes, and associates the target group with negative attributes (e.g., criminality, immorality, "madness") that damage their social identity (i.e., positive impoliteness). Elements of negative impoliteness can also be observed in the imposition of harsh judgments and the dismissal of opposing viewpoints. In these utterances, we can observe that in this conversation there is an acceptance from the hearer towards the speaker as in the speaker mentions he agrees with what was commented by "A". Text B ("I'm completely with you") functions as an alignment move, reinforcing





A Study of Politeness and Impoliteness in Some Selected Texts

the stance of Text A and showing in-group solidarity, which further legitimizes and amplifies the impolite stance within that interaction.

Text No.2

But on the one hand we have an investigation ongoing at the moment about who was responsible for that fraudulent use of British passports because in fact over a dozen British passports appear to 've been used in flagrant contravention against, you know, the way we operate our passport system and that's very serious matter as is the question of stability in the Middle East.

B - Just on that point you met with your Israeli counterpart, Avigdor Lieberman, not long ago in Brussels. He had nothing to tell you, Mr. Lieberman I believe told you. Is that acceptable.

Here, one is using minimize of the imposition: That means that it is not so great. Hence indirectly this can add respect to the interviewee. From the perspective of Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson (1987), this exchange reflects a more institutional and controlled use of language, yet still involves subtle face management and potential face threat.

Speaker A uses aspects of negative politeness, attempting to relatably inform without directly imposing. This is evident in the use of hedging expressions like "you know" and indirect phrasing, both of which soften the delivery and frame it as a serious issue without explicitly blaming anyone. The speaker reduces threats to both the hearer's negative face (freedom from imposition) and positive face (desire for approval) by observing formalities while honoring institutional roles.

In contrast, Speaker B's question introduces a face-threatening act (FTA). By directly questioning whether the response from Avigdor Lieberman is "acceptable," the speaker challenges the adequacy of diplomatic communication. Although framed as a question (which can function as a mitigating strategy), it still places pressure on Speaker A to justify or defend their position. This reflects a mix of bald on-record and negative politeness, since the question is direct but still maintains a formal tone.

Text No.3

A- I think we now have to get into the debate about how does the police service use the lethal force, if it has to. Because there are a number of occasions. It's not just about suicide bombers. It's about explosive entries to premises; it's about live kidnaps. There's a whole



series events for which the police HAVE to develop tactics. In fact, let me just make one point, it is this, if we hadn't had that tactic to do with suicide bombers and we'd 've then faced with a prospect, unique in the world, of four failed would- be suicide bombers on the list and that would have been a scandal. This is a tragedy.

B. But I now think we actually do have to have that debate. I don't quite know how we are going to have it, but we need to have it.

From the perspective of Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson (1987), Speaker A employs negative politeness strategies, particularly through hedging and modal expressions such as “I think,” “if it has to,” and “let me just make one point.” These forms lessen the strength of the statements and display respect for audience’s negative face by not imposing. The structured and rational explanation contributes to the positive face by showing the speaker as looking reasonable and cooperative. Speaker B also employs hedging (“I think,” “I don’t quite know”), as well as inclusive language (“we need to have it”), which is a hallmark of positive politeness, where people emphasize shared responsibility and common ground.

This text detection finds little evidence of overt impoliteness according to the impoliteness model of Jonathan Culpeper (1996). The exchange steers clear of direct face assault and respectfully scrapes the voice mark. If anything, Speaker B’s repetition (“we do have to... we need to have it”) might be interpreted as a weak type of bald on-record strategy, signaling urgency but not face threatening. Differs, but this exchange is mostly cooperative and institutionally appropriate, with slight impoliteness.

Text No.4

Let us set that particular point of yours the correct way- about what is described as military..h Can we erase you saying in the past "shoot to kill policy" (The Home Secretary Charles Clarck has explicitly stated he does not think that "shoot to kill" even in order to protect is an appropriate form of words.) Are you saying there is a shoot –to-kill policy?

This excerpt demonstrates a semi-confrontational institutional encounter, where politeness remains on the surface but face threat is clear. The speaker uses multiple face-threatening acts (FTAs). The directive “Let’s move on...” operates as a bald on-record strategy since it asserts power





over the conversation and risks threatening the hearer's freedom of action (negative face). Additionally, the phrase "the basic confusion you have" also directly undermines the hearer's competence and threatens their positive face. However, there is a degree of mitigation present in the inclusive language ("Let's") and the question format of the final point, which introduces a form of negative politeness by downplaying imposition and encouraging a response rather than delivering outright condemnation.

Based on Jonathan Culpeper's (1996) model of impoliteness, the following analysis will identify instances of positive impoliteness within the text, particularly focusing on explicit mention of the hearer's "confusion" as a potential target for reproach or condescension. However, the institutional context (e.g., political interview) renders such confrontations relatively mundane and lowers their impression as deliberate rudeness.

Text No.5

A- I'm telling him to cut his disgusting replies against the President.

B- Couldn't you just ask him if he's going to quit that soon.

In this exchange we have a Taxonomic label of FTA, the action Speaker THREATENING FACE and predicting self image on behalf of someone else by T-discourses. Face Saving Act = something the speaker says to neutralize an imminent threat or protect a positive self — image.

According to Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson (1987), Speaker A employs a bald on-record strategy via the direct declarative "I'm going to tell him to stop," which imposes a great deal upon the third party, while it conveys strong certainty and authority. The evaluative adjective "awful" also endangers the positive face of the person being criticized by communicating their disapproval clearly to others. By the same token, Speaker B avoids using negative politeness strategies such as hedging and indirectness in "Perhaps you could just ask him..."

Following Jonathan Culpeper's impoliteness model of 1996, Speaker A's utterance can be construed as a relatively mild instance of bald on-record impoliteness in that it features criticism expressed directly and without mitigation.

Text No.6

A. Can you please send the link?

B. Excuse me for interrupting you, but can I have a link?

It can be observed that NEGATIVE POLITENES. The so-called FSA, highly popular is using the negative politeness strategy. Usually, it uses a modal verb. This interaction shows varying levels of politeness when making a request. According to Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson (1987), from a face perspective, both speakers' speech acts are face-threatening because all requests impose on the negative face of the hearer (the freedom from being imposed upon). Speaker A, however, employs a fairly direct conventionally indirect way ("Could you give me the link?"), which is an example of a rather low-degree of negative speech politeness (but with little mitigation). By contrast, Speaker B uses more robust negative politeness strategies: in addition to an apology ("I'm sorry to bother you"), there's also further hedging with "can I ask you..." These approaches minimize the imposition and show greater respect for the hearer's right to make their own decisions about how they use their time. Under the impoliteness model of Jonathan Culpeper (1996), neither utterance represents impoliteness. However the request of Speaker A is somewhat less mitigated, though still acceptable and polite in most contexts. Speaker B, by contrast, does his best to be polite and obviously avoids all risk of being interpreted as impolite by carefully softening the request.

Text No.7

A -Did you ever consider it?

B -exactly one, in that regard in this someone tells you yeah makes those comments you know you're not just going to brush it aside, you're gonna sit and thinking. But no I just feel like the right thing for the organization and for the country of for the city of London is to not do that.

From the text above we can see that here is one of the politeness strategies implemented in a conversation. They plans to use Positive Politeness Strategies in own talk. This exchange is an example of nuanced face management in a conversation with the possible plans.

Speaker A's "Did you ever consider it?" is an indirect FTA. The indirectness mitigates the imposition. Speaker B responds with positive





politeness strategies, using inclusive language (“you are not just going to brush it off you sit there and think”) in showing thoughtfulness and responsibility as a means of preserving their positive face which signals rational consideration. The hedging (“I don’t think ...is the right choice for the organization or the country”) further dilutes the response, illustrating what sociolinguists call negative politeness — a way of avoiding too direct or confrontational an assertion of rejection.

The context of this exchange is one where, supposedly hierarchically, both partners are above. If we apply the impoliteness model from Jonathan Culpeper (1996) - then a minimal amount of impolite behavior occurs since there is no face attacking present. Speaker A’s question could be taken as a very mild challenge, but the indirect form and the careful, mitigated response of Speaker B avoid any sense of rudeness or aggression.

10. Conclusions

This study has reached the following conclusions:

1. Language serves as a fundamental instrument in all society interactions, including cross-gender dialogues and many contexts of social communication. It is used by individuals to fulfill their socializing requirements and is influenced by the situation.
2. Consequently, gendered speech varies as one of several factors influencing language use. The use of politeness methods based on gender is influenced by sociocultural and linguistic aspects within the specific environment.
3. "Norms for courteous conduct vary across different speech communities." Linguistic politeness and impoliteness are contingent upon cultural factors. The conventions for expressing politeness vary significantly between cultures.
4. If you've been brought up in a culture where directness is considered a way to show group loyalty, then using actions of direct speech (For example: "Give me that chair!") towards people whose cultures value indirectness and avoidance of imposition would be considered disrespectful. You could find individuals ambiguous and wishy-washy as to what they truly want, or simply asking if you're using this chair (you are?).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bousfield, Derek (2008) 'Impoliteness, preference organization and conducivity'. *Multilingua* 26 (1-2):1-33.
- Crystal, D. (2008): A Dictionary of Phonetics and Linguistics. 6th ed. Oxford: Blackwell Press.
- Culpeper, Jonathan (1996) 'Towards an anatomy of impoliteness'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(3), 349–367.
- (1998) '(Im) politeness in drama'. In: Jonathan Culpeper, Mick Short and Peter Verdonk (eds.) Studying Drama: From Text to Context. Routledge: London.
- (2005) Language and Characterization: People in Plays and Other Texts. Longman: London.
- Erbert, L. and, K. Floyd (2004). "Affectionate expressions as face-threatening acts: Receiver assessments, *Communication Studies*.
- Fukada, Atsushi (2002). "Universal Politeness Theory: Application to the Use of Japanese Honorifics". *Journal of Pragmatics* (36.11).
- Holmes, J (1995) An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. 3rd ed. London: Edinburgh Gate.
- (2013). An introduction to sociolinguistics (4th ed.). UK: Routledge.
- Leech, G. (1983). Principles of pragmatics. London: Longman.
- Mills, Sara. 2003. Gender and Politeness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Miriam Meyerhoff (2011). Introducing Sociolinguistics. UK: Routledge Press.
- Mullany, L., & Stockwell, P. (2010). Introducing English Language: A Resource Book for Students. London: Routledge.
- Watts, R. J. (2003). Politeness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G (2010) The Study of Language. 4th ed. New York: Cambridge University Press.





A Study of Politeness and Impoliteness in Some Selected Texts

INTERNET REFERENCES

- <http://grammar.about.com/od/pq/g/Politeness-Strategies.htm>.
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politeness_theory#Bald_on-record.

