



People's Democratic Republic of Algeria  
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research  
Ibn khaldoun University of Tiaret  
Faculty of Letters and Languages  
Department of Foreign Languages  
English Section



**Politeness Strategies Employed in Student-Teacher Facebook Interaction.  
The case of Master Two Students of English at the University of Ibn Khaldoun,  
Tiaret.**

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for a Master's  
Degree in Linguistics

**Presented by:**

- Lakhdar Khaoui
- Mehdi Maroufi
- Walid Gana

**Supervised by:**

Dr. Ahmed Mehdaoui

**Board of Examiners**

|            |                    |                      |
|------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Chairwoman | Dr. Louiza Belaid  | University of Tiaret |
| Supervisor | Dr. Ahmed Mehdaoui | University of Tiaret |
| Examiner   | Mr. Ammar Benabed  | University of Tiaret |

Academic year: 2021/202

## Dedication

We dedicate this work to our parents who sacrificed their time and efforts to make us who we are today.

## **Acknowledgements**

We would like to express our gratitude to our supervisor Dr. Ahmed Mehdaoui for his guidance and support.

We would like to express our appreciation to the members of the jury, Dr. Louiza Belaid and Mr. Ammar Benabed, who we were most delighted to be their students.

## **Abstract**

A plethora of studies revealed the fact that there must be an appropriate manner in student-teacher interaction. The research in hand sheds light on a different type of interaction, which is “student-teacher Facebook interaction”, and demonstrates the appropriate politeness strategies in order to achieve a successful interaction. To fulfill the objectives of the study which was conducted in the English department of Ibn Khaldoun University, Tiaret, we adopted a qualitative research method in which sixteen (16) data were collected from Master two EFL students as a case study. In order to investigate the existence of the politeness strategies in students’ and teachers’ Facebook texts (messages and comments), a text corpus analysis was employed. The results revealed that the majority of students use Bald-on record politeness strategy when addressing their teachers. Similarly, most teachers use the same strategy because it helps in guiding students and keeping distance with them. Therefore, Face Threatening Acts occurred more than Face Saving Acts.

**Keywords:** politeness, student-teacher, interaction, Facebook.

## List of Content

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>Dedication.....</b>                         | <b>I</b>   |
| <b>Acknowledgements.....</b>                   | <b>II</b>  |
| <b>Abstract.....</b>                           | <b>III</b> |
| <b>List of Content.....</b>                    | <b>IV</b>  |
| <b>List of Abbreviations and Acronyms.....</b> | <b>VI</b>  |
| <b>General Introduction.....</b>               | <b>1</b>   |

### Chapter ONE: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1.1 Introduction.....                             | 5  |
| 1.2 Social Interaction Theory.....                | 5  |
| 1.2.1 Social Interaction Requirements.....        | 6  |
| 1.2.1.1 Social Contact.....                       | 6  |
| 1.2.1.2 Communication.....                        | 6  |
| 1.3 Computer Mediated Communication.....          | 7  |
| 1.4 Facebook Communication.....                   | 7  |
| 1.5 Facebook as an Educational Environment.....   | 9  |
| 1.6 Student Teacher Interaction on Facebook.....  | 10 |
| 1.7 Facebook Politeness.....                      | 10 |
| 1.8 Politeness.....                               | 11 |
| 1.9 Face and Politeness.....                      | 12 |
| 1.9.1 Positive Face.....                          | 12 |
| 1.9.2 Negative Face.....                          | 13 |
| 1.10 Face Threatening Acts.....                   | 13 |
| 1.11 Face Saving Acts.....                        | 13 |
| 1.12 Politeness Theories.....                     | 14 |
| 1.12.1 Grice's Cooperative Principle.....         | 14 |
| 1.12.2 Geoffrey Leech's Theory of Politeness..... | 15 |
| 1.12.2.1 Tact Maxim.....                          | 16 |
| 1.12.2.2 Generosity Maxim.....                    | 16 |
| 1.12.2.3 Approbation Maxim.....                   | 16 |
| 1.12.2.4 Modesty Maxim.....                       | 16 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1.12.2.5 Agreement Maxim.....                       | 17 |
| 1.12.2.6 Sympathy Maxim.....                        | 17 |
| 1.12.3. Brown and Levinson’s Politeness Theory..... | 18 |
| 1.12.3.1. Bold on-Record.....                       | 19 |
| 1.12.3.1.1. Sub- Strategies.....                    | 20 |
| 1.12.3.2. Positive Politeness.....                  | 20 |
| 1.12.3.3. Negative Politeness.....                  | 24 |
| 1.12.3.4. Off-Record.....                           | 27 |
| 1.12.3.5. Do not Do the FTA.....                    | 31 |
| 1.13. Conclusion.....                               | 31 |

## **CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 2.1 Introduction.....                               | 33 |
| 2.2 Research Aim.....                               | 33 |
| 2.3 Methodological Approach.....                    | 33 |
| 2.4 Case Study as a Qualitative Research.....       | 34 |
| 2.5 Population and Sampling.....                    | 34 |
| 2.6 Facebook Comments and messages.....             | 34 |
| 2.7 Data Collection Tool.....                       | 35 |
| 2.7.1 Text Corpus Analysis.....                     | 35 |
| 2.7.6.1 Definition of Text Corpus Analysis.....     | 35 |
| 2.7.1.2 Aims of Text Corpus Analysis.....           | 35 |
| 2.7.1.3 Administration of Text Corpus Analysis..... | 36 |
| 2.8. Conclusion.....                                | 36 |

## **CHAPTER THREE: DATA ANALYSIS**

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 3.1. Introduction.....                 | 38 |
| 3.2. Positive Politeness Strategy..... | 38 |
| 3.3. Negtaive Politeness.....          | 40 |
| 3.4. Bald on-Record.....               | 42 |
| 3.5. Off-Record.....                   | 45 |
| 3.6. Results and Discussion.....       | 45 |
| 3.7. Conclusion.....                   | 46 |

|                   |    |
|-------------------|----|
| General           |    |
| Conclusion.....   | 48 |
| Bibliography..... | 50 |

## List of Abbreviations

- **CMC:** Computer Mediated Communication.
- **CP:** Cooperative principale.
- **EFL:** English as a Foreign Language.
- **FTA:** Face Threatening Acts

# **GENERAL INTRODUCTION**



In Algeria, Facebook is used as a social media communication platform in the educational context. In many Algerian universities, Facebook is used to share information about university activities, discuss various topics as well as research collaboration projects among students.

Difficulties in using appropriate language tend to be more apparent in student-teacher Facebook communication, where students often struggle in conveying their intentions to their teachers. One of the outstanding examples of the appropriate language use is linguistic politeness. Khusnia (2017, p.32) sees politeness as ‘‘a common social phenomenon, and is regarded as a moral code in human communication and social activities’’. Politeness, in this sense, is a major aspect of student-teacher interaction when students inevitably use some utterances that, by their nature, necessitate the use of some politeness strategies as the case with Facebook platform. Thus, knowing what constitutes polite linguistic behavior in student-teacher interaction and which politeness strategies students use when addressing their teachers is necessary.

The present dissertation investigates politeness strategies employed in student-teacher Facebook interaction at Ibn Khaldoun University of Tiaret using Brown and Levinson’s politeness model. It examines both, Master Two EFL students’ and teachers’ use of politeness strategies during their interaction on Facebook.

To achieve such aims, these questions have been raised

1. What are the politeness strategies employed in student-teacher Facebook interaction?
2. Do Face Threatening Acts occur more than Face Saving Acts in student-teacher Facebook interaction?

To answer these questions, we hypothesize that students employ various politeness strategies to address their teachers on Facebook. However, employing certain strategies may cause Face Threatening Acts to occur more than Face saving Acts.

To meet our objectives, the current study adopts a qualitative approach to gather in-depth information about the theme under investigation. On this basis, a text corpus

analysis is adopted to examine the students' and teachers' Facebook messages and comments and to investigate the nature of politeness strategies used.

This dissertation is divided into three chapters. The first chapter is devoted to the theoretical background; it covers an inclusive overview of Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies, in addition to Facebook interaction notion. The second chapter deals with the methodology used in data collection and analysis. While the third chapter accounts for exploring the use of politeness strategies in student-teacher Facebook interaction via a text corpus analysis of messages and comments. The reported data and findings will be discussed.

# **CHAPTER ONE :**

## **THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

## **1.1. Introduction**

This chapter reviews a theoretical framework concerning politeness strategies employed in student-teacher interaction on Facebook. First, it sheds light on the social interaction notion. Then it introduces Facebook as an interaction means in the educational environment. Finally, it covers the politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987).

## **1.2. Social Interaction Theory**

Social interaction theory is concerned with the ways that people engage with each other. Those patterns that may be observed in such interactions are of interest to scholars from many disciplines, including anthropology, sociology, psychology, and linguistics. Ferrante-Wallace (1992, p.162) sees that “social interaction is events involving at least two people in whom they communicate through language and symbolic gestures to affect one another’s behavior and thinking”. Meanwhile, Schaefer (2003, p.109) explains that “the term social interaction refers to ways in which people respond to one another, whether face to face or over the telephone or on the computer”. In other words, it is a mutual relationship in which individuals or groups respond to and influence one another’s behavior verbally, physically, or emotionally through media or face-to-face.

Social interaction has a strong impact on the social relationships that exist among individuals. Mueller et al (2003, p.01) stated that “social interaction is of the utmost importance for the well-being of individuals as well as society as a whole”. Thus, it establishes mental relations among persons. It is the reciprocal influence mutually exerted by human beings through their stimulation and mutual response.

In general, social interaction is composed of a set of roles and identities that are associated with the individual’s social status. Thus, it plays an important role in achieving individual perfection in society, as well as revealing one’s social status.

## **1.2.1. Social Interaction Requirements**

In his book, *Sosiologi Suatu Pengantar* (Introduction to Sociology), Soekanto (1982, p.58) mentions that social interaction occurs when there are social contact and communication.

### **1.2.1.1. Social Contact**

It is a set of social actions that have no further consequence. i.e., it is unlikely to happen again. It is sometimes referred to as an accidental social interaction. For instance, asking a stranger for directions.

As a social phenomenon, “Social contact does not occur simply because of physical touch, but also people can make contact with another person without touching each other” (Soekanto, 1982, p.58). Thus, it does not necessarily mean “physical contact”, such as shaking hands, fighting, wrestling, or hugging. Rather, it can occur either with or without physical contact. On the one hand, an example of social contact in the form of physical relationships would be two people who meet and greet each other and shake hands. On the other hand, social contact in the form of no physical connection would be two people communicating via Facebook.

### **1.2.1.2. Communication**

Sociologically, communication is defined as the process of transmitting thoughts, ideas, or desires from one person to another to reach a common understanding (Giffin & Pattern, 1976, p.56). Thus, communication is the delivery of messages between two parties which causes them to obtain relatively the same understanding of something.

Communication is mandatory for social interaction (Goodman, 1992, p.95) because it determines the emergence of relationships between individuals and individuals, between individuals and groups, or between groups and groups in community life. Communication is a complementary element for social interactions. Without it, contact will not lead to social interaction. Two people can make contact, but if they both do not complete with communication, there will be no interaction. For example, an Algerian student greets and shakes hands with a Chinese student, then speaks in Arabic, even

though the Chinese student does not understand Arabic. As a result, he is unable to comprehend the Algerian student's communications (feelings, thoughts, or information). In this case, contact (as the first condition for interaction) has occurred, but no communication takes place because one of the parties does not comprehend the other's tongue, and therefore no social interaction occurs.

### **1.3. Computer Mediated Communication**

Romiszowski and Mason (1996, p.398) defined Computer-mediated communication (hence forth CMC) as “the process by which people create, Exchange, and perceive information using networked Telecommunications systems that facilitate encoding, transmitting, and decoding messages”. Therefore, CMC has changed the way people communicate throughout the world Because it challenges and shifts away from the traditional modes of human communication. Today, a growing number of people use social media to share and exchange information and ideas in virtual networks.

The attitudes of students towards using CMC in EFL learning have a high impact on their linguistic outcomes. According to Aykaç (2005, pp.36-37), those attitudes about educational innovation, such as CMC, might allow students' success or failure in EFL classrooms to be displayed. Knowing students' perspectives is important while transitioning from old modes of contact to new technologies. Aykaç went on to say that most studies on students' opinions toward CMC, particularly asynchronous tools, found that they were generally positive. Therefore, according to students, CMC has a favourable impact on their performance.

### **1.4. Facebook Communication**

The Internet's early years were characterised by non-synchronous and unidirectional communication (e.g., reading web pages or sending emails). Online communication, on the other hand, is now highly multidirectional and synchronous. People can interact in real-time with several people in different parts of the world at the same time. In this sense, Meredith & Potter (2013, p.374) argue that “electronic discourse should be seen as electronic interaction”.

A well-known example of a social networking service is Facebook. It is defined as follows by Ghaleb (2013, p.05):

The name of the social networking site stems from the colloquial name for face and book. Face means what you first see of the body in front of you. It is also the clearest part of the body that gives you an indication of what is the person in front of you like which is related to the social field. While the word book is related to the academic field. So the word face has social roots and the word book has academic roots.

According to Boyd & Ellison (2007), this program enables people to act together and cooperate within its space and enables them to form an open or closed group to join and share their ideas with others.

People use Facebook to keep in touch with friends and family, to stay informed and entertained in their social circle, and to share photos and videos, and to discuss what is important to them. In February 2004, Harvard University students Chris Hughes, Andrew McCollum, Dustin Moskovitz, Eduardo Saverin, and Mark Zuckerberg founded Facebook. It was created as a way for university students to connect and share information online. It began as a Harvard-only social network (Baker, 1999, cited in Muñoz & Towner, 2009, pp.4-5), but over time, it extended to include any university. It subsequently evolved into a global social network. (Raymond, Lu, 2011, p.03). states that Facebook “is pervasive, entering homes, businesses, and organizations worldwide, and reaching widespread demographic groups”(p. 03). It became the largest social network in the world, with nearly three billion users as of 2021.

Thanks to Facebook, the world has become a global village. Horváth (2014, p. 86) supports this viewpoint, stating that Facebook:

Strengthened the world’s global village character. Geographical distances play none ever-increasing role in our lives given the possibility of being in the same cyberspace, whatever our geographical location might be. Maintaining contact does not depend on geographical proximity anymore, what does count, though, is internet availability.

## **1.5. Facebook as an educational environment**

Although Facebook is largely used for online socializing, it has also evolved into a significant e-learning platform (Irwin, Desbow, and Leveritt, 2010). Several studies have shown that students enjoy incorporating Facebook into their academic learning process since it increases student communication, provides access to course resources, and optimizes course logistics. Facebook may help with course administration, providing information and tools to students, and encouraging them to communicate and work with each other.

According to relevant literature, Facebook has an impact on all levels of academia (Bugeja, 2006) and academic contexts (Villano, 2007); it has the potential to be used for educational applications by opening up new and fascinating worlds of learning for both educators and students (Couros, 2008). Facebook can also be a useful tool for students' educational communications and collaborations with faculty (Roblyer et al., 2010) since it offers a distinct example of how online platforms might be used in educational settings (Downes, 2007). Furthermore, Blankenship (2011) discusses how social media affects higher education through the lens of five interrelated "literacies" including attention, engagement, collaboration, network awareness, and critical consumption.

Finally, Schroeder and Greenbowe (2009) discovered that students at a public university used Facebook groups more dynamically than they used discussion forums on an online community for Organic Chemistry after comparing students' use of Facebook groups with that of educational discussion forums.

## **1.6. Student-Teacher Interaction on Facebook**

During the lifetime of a course, Facebook offers an excellent tool for the interaction between students and teachers. Facebook appears to be the preferred social media platform among university students (Ellison, 2008; Milshtein, 2007).

According to some recent studies, teachers' Facebook interactions with their students can boost learning, motivation, and educational performance. Çoklar (2012) believes



that teachers' Facebook interactions with their students can provide teacher supervision, which could be advantageous to the learning experience.

Berg, Berquam, and Christoph (2007) discovered that Facebook could help students and teachers form stronger relationships, students use Facebook to befriend teachers in order to obtain a better knowledge of who they are outside of the classroom. Many students want to have more personal contact with their instructors on social media, but they also want to maintain a professional relationship (DiVerniero&Hosek, 2011).

### **1.7. Facebook Politeness**

Facebook is one of the most widely used online social media networks, where users manage their interaction with a wide range of contacts or "friends" ranging from family members and classmates to teachers. Therefore, it can be considered as an essential component of people's online presence.

In the educational context, students can text the teachers instead of meeting them in person to discuss or ask a question. However, Politeness is one of the most crucial factors in ensuring that a Facebook conversation runs well.

According to Leech (1983), politeness is the foundation of social Interaction. It implies that politeness has a part in people's social interactions and lives. Yule (1996) defines politeness as the ability to recognize the face of another person. Respect and politeness are portrayed as understanding and recognizing people's faces in both, media and face to face. Socially close people are perceived as kind, loyal, and solid when they understand and recognize one another's Faces. Being linguistically courteous includes communicating with people appropriately in light of their relationship with you (Holmes,2013, p.285).

### **1.8. Politeness**

Politeness is defined by the Oxford Dictionary as showing good manners and respect for the feelings of others. However, explaining what politeness means is difficult, and there is still no universal definition because politeness varies from one culture to another, and there is great confusion about its universality and linguistic specificity. This

linguistic phenomenon is described by held (1992, p. 31) as a “definitionally fuzzy and empirically difficult area”. Therefore, there is a major disagreement among scholars considering the complicated nature of politeness and the range of ways in which the term has been treated, there is such a major disagreement among scholars.

However, in linguistics, the term politeness is much more complex. It is the expression of the speakers’ intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face threatening acts towards another (Mills, 2003).

Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory (1987) is the most influential study in the field of linguistics (1987). Their theory is based on Gollman’s (1967) concept of face and the English folk notion of face, which is linked to notions of being embarrassed, humiliated, or losing face.

According to Yule (1996), politeness is the consciousness of another person’s face (the public self-image of a person), i.e., the methods employed to reveal awareness of another person’s face. Lakoff (1975, p. 64) on the other hand, believes that politeness is those forms of behaviour which have been “developed in societies in order to reduce friction in personal interaction”. Similarly, Leech (1983, p. 104) views politeness as a behaviour pattern designed to establish and maintain comity, i.e., the ability of participants to interact in a pleasant and harmonious setting. He believes that some verbal acts are essentially impolite, while others are fundamentally polite. As a result, politeness includes minimizing the impact of impolite acts while increasing the impact of polite ones. It is asserted that the shortcoming in these pragmatic models is their extreme reliance on utterance-level.

The majority of scholars agree that politeness is a contract done by individuals in order to sustain and retain a positive social interaction. If one participant attempts to break such a contract, he or she is likely to be impolite.

For Brown and Levinson, politeness also utilizes communicative methods to maintain social harmony. As they stated, “...politeness, like formal diplomatic protocol (for which it must surely be the model), presupposes that potential for aggression as it

seeks to disarm it, and makes possible communication between potentially aggressive parties.” (1987, p. 1).

Richard Watts explains politeness as a thing that people do, not born with. It is something people have to learn and socialized into, and no generation has been of short teachers and handbooks on etiquette and correct behavior to help people acquire politeness skills. (2003, p. 10).

## **1.9. Face and Politeness**

The concept of face is central to politeness theory. In politeness theory, the term “Face” does not refer to a physical feature; rather, it refers to an individual’s respect for himself or herself and retaining that “self-esteem” in public and private contexts (Bussman, 2006). As previously mentioned, the purpose of politeness in language is to demonstrate regard and respect for the recipient or to save his or her face. For Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 66) Face is “the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself”. They assume that every individual has two types of face or want:

### **1.9.1. Positive Face**

Positive face is defined as “the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others” and “the positive consistent self-image or personality (crucially including the desire that this self-image he appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants” (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 62). i.e., the need to be accepted, even liked by others, to be treated as a part of the same group, and to know that others share his or her desires.

### **1.9.2. Negative Face**

Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 62) defined Negative Face as “the want of every component adult member (of a society) that his actions be unimpeded by others”, or “the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction, i.e., the freedom of action and freedom from imposition”. Thus, it means the need to be independent, to have freedom of action, and freedom from imposition.

## **1.10. Face Threatening Acts**

Face threatening Acts (henceforth FTA) are the acts that threaten to damage others' self-image expectations. By acting in opposition to the wants and desires of the hearer/speaker. For Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 65), they are "those acts that by their very nature run contrary to the wants of the addressee and/or speaker". The majority of these acts are verbal, but they can also take the shape of non-verbal communication such as tone or inflections. At least one face-threatening act must follow each utterance. Sometimes more than one of these acts can be found in a single utterance (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Interlocutors must be careful while using them if they want to protect both, the addressee's face and their face.

## **1.11. Face Saving Acts**

During a discussion or conversation, Face Saving Act (henceforth FSA) is an act taken to avoid embarrassment to a person (Folger, Poole & Stutman, 2008). Face saving is always oriented toward preserving the dignity, self-respect, personality, or good reputation of the people involved in the conversation. It expresses the speaker's intention to be perceived in a specific way by the hearer, and to avoid insulting or annoying others to maintain a positive self-image.

## **1.12. Politeness Theories**

### **1.12.1. Grice's Cooperative Principle**

Human beings are expected to follow a certain manner of interaction in order to communicate effectively. As a result, Herbert Paul Grice, a linguist, created the Cooperative Principle (henceforth CP) and its maxims based on ordinary language philosophy as a mode of interaction for successful communication. For its impact on the area of pragmatics, the CP has been cited in several pragmatics works, such as Yule (1996) and Grundy (2000). Every interlocutor in every interaction must follow basic conversational principles in order to communicate effectively. Grice designed the CP in response to this situation. According to Grice (1975, p.45), the Cooperative Principle is as follows:

Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.

He classifies maxims into the following (1975, pp. 45–46)

**1. Maxim of Quality**

- Try to make your contribution one that is true.
- Do not say what you believe to be false.
- Do not say that, for which you lack adequate evidence. .

**2. Maxim of Quantity**

- Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).
- Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

**3. Maxim of Relation**

- Be relevant.

**4. Maxim of Manner**

- Be perspicuous.
- Avoid obscurity of expression.
- Avoid ambiguity.
- Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
- Be orderly.

Grice (1978, pp. 113–114) states:

I have suggested a Cooperative Principle and some subordinate maxims, with regard to which I have suggested : (i) that they are standard (though not invariably) observed by participants in a talk exchange ; and (ii) that the assumptions required in order to either at the level of what is said or failing that, at the level of what I implicated are maintain the supposition that they are being observed (or so far as is possibly observed) in systematic correspondence with nonconventional implicate of the conversational type.

This indicates that the successful exchange of information via maxims is the primary goal of the conversation. Grice's maxims are extremely important when it comes to forming polite language and behaviour.

### **1.12.2. Geoffrey Leech's Theory of Politeness**

Leech explains the important function of politeness in linguistic communication in his book *Principle of Pragmatics* (1983) and sees the politeness principle and the cooperative principle provided by H.P. Grice as the two essential principles on which communication should be built. The politeness principle is initially introduced by Leech as an essential addition to Grice's cooperative principle. He considers "politeness principles" to be one of the most basic pragmatic principles that one should consider when communicating in Language. The *Principals of Pragmatics* includes six maxims.

#### **1.12.2.1. Tact Maxim**

Minimizes cost to others; (maximize the benefit to others). The first portion of this maxim is consistent with Brown and Levinson's negative politeness strategy of minimizing imposition. The second portion illustrates the positive politeness strategy of paying attention to the listener's needs and desires.

Example 01: If I could just answer this call.

Example 02: عذرا هل يمكنني مقاطعة حديثك لدقيقة .

#### **1.12.2.2. Generosity Maxim**

Minimizes benefit to self; [maximize cost to self], the maxim of Generosity focuses on the speaker, he or she minimizes the benefit to self correspondingly maximizes the cost to self.

Example 01: Relax I'm doing the chores.

Example 02: أنا سأنتهي العمل، يمكنك أخذ قسط من الراحة.

#### **1.12.2.3. Approbation Maxim**

The speaker minimizes dispraise to self and correspondingly maximizes praise to other, the first part of the maxim aims to avoid disagreement, and the second portion aims to make others feel good by demonstrating solidarity.

Example 01: I saw the picture you took, it was different.

Example 02: سمعتك تغني، بدا الأمر مختلفا.

#### 1.12.2.4. Modesty Maxim

Minimizes the expression of praise of self; maximizes the expression of dispraise of self.

Example 01: Oh! I'm so stupid; I forgot to bring the project, did you?

Example 02: يا الهي كم أنا أحمق، لقد نسيت احضار مفاتيحي، هل أحضرتهم؟

#### 1.12.2.5. Agreement maxim

The speaker minimizes disagreement and correspondingly maximizes agreement between himself and the listener. It follows Brown and Levinson's positive politeness strategy that seek agreement and prevent disagreement.

Example 01:

A: No! It's not the colour I have chosen.

B: Yes sir, but I think we have discussed that before.

Example 02:

أ: لا ليس هذا ما طلبت منك احضاره.

ب: نعم، لكن أظن أنني شرحت لك الأمر من قبل.

#### 1.12.2.6. Sympathymaxim

Minimizes antipathy and correspondingly, maximizes sympathy between self and other.

Example 01: I was sorry when I heard about your accident.

Example 02: اسف لما حدث مع والدك.

Leech goes on to say that there are three levels of delicacy on which each of the Politeness Principal's maxims must be implemented: cost/benefit, optionality, and indirectness. Cost/Benefit scale refers to the weightiness with which a speaker must balance the cost to herself/him and the benefit her/his utterance will bring to the listener. The Optionality scale measures the degree to which the speaker's illocutions give the recipient a degree of option. The Indirectness scale assesses the degree of effort required by the listener to interpret the speaker's speech acts.

### **1.12.3. Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory**

Brown Levinson's politeness theory was initially published in 1978. It is unquestionably the most influential and outstanding theory since it has received several reactions, applications, critiques, adjustments, and revisions. Brown and Levinson's names have nearly become synonymous with the word politeness; it is hard to discuss politeness without mentioning them. It is an attempt to develop a theory of how humans produce linguistic politeness for Watts (2003).

Every conversation contributor has a Face, and it is everyone's function in a conversation to keep and maintain their Face among the interactants. However, Face can be threatened in specific situations and such threats are called Face Threatening Acts. In order to reduce the threat, procedures must be done to counter-balance the profound impacts of the FTA. This is known as a politeness strategy. Politeness strategy is the study of the manners people employ language during interaction or communication. It teaches how to utilize the language and make a conversation flow smoothly. However, when it comes to communicating, everyone wants to be understood and not be annoyed by others; furthermore, no one wants to lose face while doing so. Losing face conveys feelings of embarrassment, humiliation, or disappointment. That is why, in an interaction, the face is something that is emotionally attached, maintained, developed, and frequently attended in an interaction.

To protect the Face, an interactant must first assess the risk of potential Face damage before deciding whether to completely avoid it or reduce it by employing a suitable



politeness strategy. Brown and Levinson (1987) suggested five different strategies that the speaker would need: (1) Bald on-Record; (2) positive politeness, (3) Negative Politeness, (4) Off Record and (5) No FTA strategy.

The choice of which strategy to employ at any given time depends on different FTA-related sociological factors. There are three sociological factors that could influence the decision of which Brown and Levinson's strategy to use: relative power, social distance, and rank of imposition. (1987, p. 74).

### **A. Relative power (P)**

It relates to the speakers' relative influence in society. In most communities, power is available and innate. The hierarchy system in society is also linked to power. A president has more power than a vice president; teachers have more power than learners. i.e., the control that the speaker has towards the hearer.

### **B. Social distance (D)**

The social bond between two speakers is referred to as distance. We are closer to a neighbour than a stranger we encounter on the bus. However, social bonding is more than just the proximity of space between speakers, which brings them together in familiarity. Instead of meeting frequency, spatial proximity, or familiarity, distance is more associated with interpersonal intimacy.

### **C. Ranking of imposition (R)**

It is the weight of the stake or request in the conversation. This factor is interlinked with the other two mentioned factors. The greater the request is the more respectful one must be, because it may be inconvenient for the hearer.

To sum up, the stronger the person, the shorter the distance between the speakers, and the less rank of the stake, the more direct strategies are considered by the speaker.

Below are the explanations of the strategies:

#### **1.12.3.1. Bald on-record**

Brown and Levinson (1987) investigated this method in depth. Face threatening act is conducted in the most direct, clear, unambiguous, and brief manner possible under this strategy (Brown and Levinson, cited in Bousfield, 2008). To do so “baldly” means expressing it clearly and honestly, with no attempt to lighten the face threatening act. Bald on-record strategy does nothing to reduce the threats to the listener's face. For instance, speakers make requests such as "Do x!" (p. 69). Because the X in the previous example refers to an act, doing it baldly or truthfully necessitates a direct address to the listener.

This strategy focuses on the act's performance rather than on how the hearer's feelings and self-image should be saved. This strategy entails that the speaker communicates his or her perspective honestly, for instance, s/he may say “your performance is unacceptable” (Rudick, 2010, p. 5).

Brown and Levinson (1987) considered Bald on-record strategy as the most direct and least polite. Being the least polite is prioritizing face protection and avoiding FTAs on the hearer's face. This sort of strategy is widespread among individuals who know each other well and are relaxed in their settings, such as close friends or family members. There are several bald on-record strategies, which are illustrated in the following examples:

#### **1.12.3.1.1. Sub-strategies**

- a. Showing disagreement: “I do not like your haircut”.
- b. Giving suggestion: “give it a shot!”
- c. Requesting: “take your shoes off!”
- d. Warning: “I will talk to your father!”
- e. Using the imperative form: “Get back!”
- f. Offering: “leave them; I will clean the dishes right away!”
- j. Task-oriented: “pass me the bottle!”

#### **1.12.3.2. Positive Politeness**

Positive face means the primary need for every individual's public self-image is to be shown involvement, ratification, and consideration from others—the want to be

wanted Brown and Levinson (1987). The FTA is carried out by implementing strategies that address the hearer's positive face threat (Bousfield, 2008). The speaker recognizes the listener's need to be respected through positive politeness. It expresses group cooperation and ensures that the relationship is pleasant. This type of strategy is most frequent among circles of friends or in social situations where people are close enough to each other.

Here, the threat of being confronted is low. It usually attempts to bridge the gap between them by expressing friendly words and showing deep interest in the desires of the listener. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), positive politeness includes fifteen positive politeness sub-strategies.

#### **A. Notice: Attend to Hearer**

This means that the listener wants the speaker to notice, approve, and acknowledge noticeable changes in his or her physical appearance or attitude.

Example: “You must be hungry; it is a long time since breakfast. How about some lunch” (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 103).

#### **B. Exaggerate**

This sub-strategy means that the speaker expresses his attention, approval, and compassion to the speaker by using an exaggerated tone.

Example: “what a fantastic garden you have!” (p. 105).

#### **C. Intensify Interests to Hearer**

The speaker intensifies the listener's interest and draws him or her into the conversation. As in tag questions, the speaker employs expressions in which the listener participates in the conversation.

Example: “I come down the stairs, and what do you think I see?” (p. 106).

#### **D. Use in-group Identity markers**

Using a variety of methods to communicate with group membership. This strategy focuses on the use of address forms, in-group language or dialect, jargon or slang.

Example: “dear, cutie, sweetheart, honey, blondie, Luv” (p. 107).

### **E. Seek Agreement**

In this strategy, the speaker emphasizes agreement with the listener by choosing safe subjects to fulfill the listener's desire to be right or to share his perspective and repeating part from previous speaker's speech.

Example:

“A: John went to London this weekend!

B: To London!” (p. 112).

### **F. Avoid Disagreement**

This method is used when the speaker conceals his disagreement. This method can be implemented in three ways:

- a. Token agreement occurs when a speaker twists their words to appear to agree or to hide disagreement.

Example:

“(A): What is she, small?

(B): Yes, yes, she's small, smallish, um, not really small but certainly not very big” (pp. 113-114).

- b. White lies: speaker may do white lies to hide his disagreement to save the

Example: “Yes, I do like your new hat!” (p. 115).

- c. Hedging opinions are used to soften the FTA of recommending, critiquing, or complaining.

Example, “sort of, kind of” (p. 116).

### **G. Presuppose / Raise / Assert Common Ground**

Any statements that can develop a friendly relationship. This strategy includes talking for a long time about unrelated things, such as asking for gossip or small talk.

Example: “well I was watching High Life last night and...” (p.117).

#### **H. Joke**

Jokes are used to stress the shared background knowledge or the shared values between the speakers and the hearer and enable put the hearer at ease.

Example: “Ok if I tackle those cookies now?”. (p. 125).

#### **I. Assert or presuppose the speaker’s knowledge and concern for the hearer’s wants**

One way of indicating that the speaker and the hearer are cooperators and thus potentially putting pressure on the hearer to cooperate with the speaker is to presuppose that the speaker’s knowledge has a connection with the hearer’s desires.

Example: “I know you love roses but the florist didn’t have any more, so I brought you geraniums instead” (p.126).

#### **J. Offer and promise**

The speaker can employ this strategy by making offers and promises to the listener to preserve a positive face.

Example: “I’ll drop by sometime next week” (p. 125).

#### **K. Be optimistic**

This strategy relates to the desire to demonstrate that the speaker and the hearer are both actively participating in the action.

Example: “Look, I’m sure you won’t mind if I borrow your typewriter” (p. 126).

#### **L. Inclusion of speaker and Hearer in the activity**

Using (we) and (let's) instead of (you) and (me) are examples of this strategy, in which the speaker includes herself or himself in the conversation can shorten the distance.

Example: “let’s stop for a bite”. I.e. I want a bite, so let’s stop (p. 127).

#### **K. Give (or Ask for) Reasons**

This strategy refers to the reflexivity of the listener. The speaker explains why he wants what he wants and involves the hearer in his reasoning and postulating reflexivity.

Example: “why don’t I help you with that suitcase?” (p. 128).

#### **L. Assume or Assert Reciprocity**

By agreeing on what the speaker and hearer should do to demonstrate collaboration.

Example: “I’ll do X for you if you do Y for me” (p.129).

#### **M. Give Gifts to Hearer (Goods, Sympathy, Understanding, and Cooperation)**

This strategy entails showing the hearer that you care, understand, admire, and listen to them. The Speaker may show that his desires and those of the listener are similar to some extent. The speaker may give material or moral gifts to the listener as part of positive politeness behaviour. (p. 129).

To conclude, these strategies make the hearer feel valued by the speaker, which can convey unity and familiarity between people.

#### **1.12.3.3. Negative Politeness**

According to Brown and Levinson’s (1987) work, the hearer’s face is also recognized by the negative politeness. It also confesses that the speaker is imposing on the listener in some way. By conveying distance and wariness, negative polite structures contain negative face. The negative face indicates the urge of any activity to achieve freedom from imposition. Brown and Levinson (1987, p. 70) state:

Negative politeness, on the other hand, is oriented mainly towards partially satisfying (redressing) H's negative face, his basic wants to maintain

claims of territory and self-determination. Negative politeness, thus, is essentially avoidance-based and realizations of negative-politeness strategies consist of assurances that the speaker recognizes and respects the addressee's negative-face wants and will not (or will only minimally) interfere with the addressee's freedom of action.

Negative politeness strategies aim to reduce the imposition by diminishing it. Negative politeness has several sub-strategies; being Indirect, not presuming/assuming, not coercing H, communicating S's want to not impinge on H, and redressing other wants of H (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Ten negative output politeness strategies have been developed from those strategies.

**A. Be conventionally indirect**

The speaker employs a comprehensible indirect speech act, such as the use of phrases and sentences with unambiguous contextual meanings that vary from their literal meanings.

Example: "can you do advanced calculus? (when a speaker is/isn't doing a homework assignment)". (Brown and Levinson, 1987, p. 134)

**B. Question/Hedges**

Speakers prefer to use a hedge imposition, which results in less direct utterances. A hedge is a word or phrase that, in most situations, alters the degree of membership of a predicate or noun phrase by making it partial, making a statement less powerful or assertive.

Example: "Bill is a regular fish "(p.145)

**C. Be Pessimistic**

The speaker can redress the hearer's negative face by directly expressing uncertainty. Pessimism comes in many forms, one of which is negative (p.173).

Example: "You don't have any Manila envelopes, do you by any chance?" (p.175)

**D. Minimize the Imposition**

The speaker requests assistance without making an imposition statement, allowing the listener to decide whether or not to pay attention and do what the speaker requests.

Example: “I just want to ask you if I can borrow a single sheet of paper “(p. 177)

#### **E. Give Deference**

The speaker has two options for expressing reverence. First, the speaker debases or humbles himself. Second, the speaker considers the listener to be superior. The hearer is conveyed as having a higher social rank than the speaker in both circumstances. As a result, the speaker can utilize phrases like sir, president, officer, or other expressions that are very context-dependent (p.178).

Example: “We look forward very much to dining with you” (p. 181)

#### **F. Apologize**

By apologizing for doing FTAS, the speaker shows his reluctance to encroach on the hearer's negative face.

Example: “I’m sure you must be very busy, but... “(p. 188)

#### **G. Impersonalizing Speaker and Hearer**

The speaker avoids using the words you and I, indicating that he or she does not wish to impose on the hearer.

Example: “I ask you to do this for me. “(p. 190)

#### **H. State the FTA as a General Rule**

The speaker uses pronoun avoidance in this strategy to describe FTAs as an example of a general social norm, regulation, or obligation.

Example: The expression “(A) Passengers will please refrain from flushing toilets on the train” is used by the speaker instead of “(B) You will please refrain from flushing toilets on the train” (p. 206).

#### **I. Nominalize**



Negative politeness is correlated with degrees of nouniness or the use of nouns.

Example: “(1) You performed well on the examinations and we were favourably impressed”, the speaker can say instead “(2) Your performing well on the examinations impressed us favourably” (3) Your good performance on the examinations impressed us favourably. (p. 207).

#### **J. Go on Record as Incurring a Debt or as Not Indebting Hearer**

This strategy uses a kind expression to encourage the speaker to accomplish what they desire. The speaker uses a kind gesture, statement, and expression to avoid feeling disappointed.

Example: “(1) I’d be eternally grateful if you would...”. presents a request, “(2) I could easily do it for you...,” shows an offer (p. 210).

#### **1.12.3.4. Off Record**

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), an off-record or indirect method is used to allow the speaker to express a communicative goal that is uncertain. It implies that speakers can use this strategy and let the addressees understand the intended message if they want to avoid having to execute FTAs. Language use necessitates off-record expressions. In this situation, the hearer will have to infer something to figure out what was meant. Off record strategy include.

##### **A. Give Hints**

Speaker may say anything that isn’t expressly relevant; he allowed Hearer to infer the potential significance.

Example: “This soup’s a bit bland” the speaker gives a hint to say pass the salt (p. 215).

##### **B. Give Association Clues**

A related type of implicating produced by relevance violation is given by mentioning something related to the act needed of Hearer, either by precedent in Speaker.

Example: “are you going to market tomorrow? ... There’s a market tomorrow, I suppose”. The speaker here wants to say give me a ride there. (p. 216)

### **C. Presuppose**

By implying something, the speaker states something that makes the listener look up for a presumed preceding action.

Example: “I washed the car again today”. In this example, the speaker presupposes he has already washed the car. The word again encourages the listener to look for a previous incident (p. 217).

### **D. Understate**

By speaking less than is required, understatement is one method to generate implicates. It is then regarded as an off-record politeness strategy.

Example: “Nothing wrong with her”. (It means: I don't think she’s very good) (p. 218).

### **E. Overstate**

The speaker may exaggerate or choose a scale point that is higher than reality. The implications are frequently far greater than what is expressed.

Example,” There were a million people in The Co-op tonight!” may convey an excuse for being late (p. 219).

### **F. Use Tautologies**

Another way is to use tautologies, which go against the quantity maxim conveyed by the speaker in a non-informative statement and force the listener to represent an informational interpretation. It can be criticism by repeating the same speech.

Example:” Your clothes belong where your clothes belong, my clothes belong where my clothes belong. Look upstairs!” (p. 220).

### **G. Use Contradictions**

The Speaker makes it appear like he cannot be talking the truth by saying two things that contradict one another. As a result, he invites the hearer to find an interpretation that reconciles the two opposing assertions.

Example, ‘‘Are you upset about that?’’. This indicates that the speaker makes it appear that the listener is unable to communicate his or her feelings (p. 221).

### **H. Be Ironic**

Ironic expressions may be used by the speaker to communicate indirect, opposing meanings (p.221).

Example: s/he may ironically say ‘‘John’s a real genius’’ (p. 222). The example above shows that John’s actually not a genius. He has just done twenty stupid things in a row.

### **I. Use Metaphor**

Metaphors fall into a different category of quality violations since they are actually wrong. Although the use of metaphor is frequently on record, the precise meanings that the metaphor intends may be off-record.

Example:’’ Harry’s a real fish’’, this example means that Harry swims like fish (p. 222).

### **J. Use Rhetorical questions**

The speaker asks a question without expecting an answer, but rather to convey specific information.

Example:’’ How many times do I have to tell you?’’. This indicates that the speaker does not need an answer from the hearer (p. 223).

### **K. K. Be Ambiguous**

A metaphor is a type of expression that conveys ambiguity.

Example: “John’s pretty smooth cookie” (p. 225). This example demonstrates that the speaker's meaning is ambiguous; it could be a compliment or an insult directed towards John's cookies.

#### **L. Be Vague**

Participants may go off the record with the FTA by being unclear about the FTA's purpose.

Example: “Perhaps someone did something naughty” (p.225). The word “someone” is an illustration that the speaker is imprecise about the object of FTA.

#### **M. Overgeneralize**

The speaker states a broad rule, and the listener decides whether or not the rule applies to him. The object of the FTA may be left off-record during rule instantiation.

Example: “mature people sometimes help do the dishes”. The hearer has the choice to decide if this general rule applies to him or not (p. 226).

#### **N. DisplaceHearer**

Speaker may go off-record as to whom his FTA is targeted at, or he may pretend to address the FTA to someone who would not be threatened by it and hope that the true target notices the FTA is directed at him.

Example:

A. Someone has to be responsible with this mess.

B. You know who was having time with his freinds. (p. 226).

#### **M. Be Incomplete and Use Ellipsis**

Speaker can leave the implicate floating in the air by leaving an FTA half undone.

Example: “well, I didn't see you...” (P.227).

#### **1.12.3.5. Do not Do the FTA**

Because the FTA is seen as too threatening to the targeted recipients, it is not carried out for the sake of social harmony (Bousfield, 2008). The speakers here completely

avoid executing the FTA, perfectly avoiding the threat to another's face. Someone, for example, wishes to borrow a lawnmower from his neighbour. If he doesn't know his neighbour, he may choose the negative pole of the rational option (not doing the FTA at all), which would therefore result in him never borrowing the lawnmower. It is thought to be more polite. Brown and Levinson (1987) paid attention to several types of politeness, and they espied the speaker may avoid offending the listener with this FTA. It is used when a speaker fails to fulfil his or her desired communication goals. Yet, there is little research on this strategy, which is why it is neglected in Brown and Levinson's discussion (p.72).

Finally, Brown and Levinson (1987) have been criticized for a variety of reasons. According to Leech (2014), this is a sort of respect for them. It could not be criticized as easily if they did not have the virtue of presenting a rather explicit and precise description of linguistic politeness. One line of criticism has been pointed at their politeness theory's "universal" assertion, which is stressed in their subtitle (Some Universal in Language Usage). It has been addressed Brown and Levinson's model has a western bias and hence cannot claim to be a universal theory applicable to all languages and cultures. Brown and Levinson (1987) also emphasize the participant. Although it is appropriate for the west, it is not appropriate for eastern civilizations such as China and Japan's collectivism or group orientation (Gu. 1990; Mao, 1994; Ide, 1993; Matsumoto, 1988). Despite the widespread criticism, Brown and Levinson's politeness theory (1987) remains the most widely discussed account of language and politeness (Leech. 2014).

### **1.13. Conclusion**

This chapter included a literature study in which we defined politeness, discourse, interaction, and the Facebook platform. The review also emphasized the concept of face-threatening behaviours, as well as the many politeness strategies used, such as positive politeness, negative politeness, bold on record, off record, and do not do the FTA politeness strategies established by Brown and Levinson (1987).

# **CHAPTER TWO:** ***METHODOLOGY***

## **2.1. Introduction**

This chapter discusses the methodology employed to test the research hypotheses, in which data is collected utilizing qualitative procedures that allow valid results to be extracted and research questions to be answered. These tools allow gaining insight into the student-teacher use of politeness strategies when addressing each other on Facebook. Thus, this chapter provides a detailed overview of data gathering devices that entail a text corpus analysis of messages from students and teachers. The gathered data is reported and analyzed to have a better understanding of the student-teacher interaction in Facebook messages and comments.

## **2.2. Research Aim**

The present dissertation Investigates politeness strategies employed in student-teacher Facebook interaction. It examines both, Master 2 EFL students' and teachers' use of politeness strategies during their interaction on Facebook (messages, comments), as well as the occurrence of both face saving and face threatening acts

## **2.3. Methodological Approach**

The study of students' politeness strategies when addressing their teachers on Facebook requires the use of a qualitative approach that includes a text corpus analysis.

The qualitative design can be characterized as a method of conducting a systematic empirical investigation into a particular meaning (Shank, 2002, p. 5). In this context, systematic indicates that it is well-planned and organized according to specific rules and standards, and empirical denotes that it allows researchers to derive a specific meaning from their findings due to its experimental nature. Similarly, Denzin and Lincoln (2005) reported that qualitative research is a real-world activity that immerses the observer in a tangible environment. Thus, this design comprises activities that make the world visible through various representations including interviews, conversations, recordings, etc. This approach analyzes variables in their natural settings to make sense of the examined phenomenon from people's perspectives and affords the investigator to infer explicit results.

## **2.4. Case Study as a Qualitative Research**

The qualitative research approach is commonly used to answer questions regarding the nature of phenomena to describe and understand them from the perspective of the participants. By using a qualitative research methodology, researchers want to collect more data and acquire a better understanding of cases, issues, or events. (Arora and Stoner 2009).

Case studies are a type of qualitative study that is characterized by the interest in individual cases than the methods of inquiry used. They draw attention to the topic of what may be learned specifically from the cases. The case study method may be used to investigate almost any phenomenon. Some researchers focus their efforts on a single case because of its unique features. Other researchers look at multiple cases to compare, build theories, and make generalizations.

## **2.5 Population and Sampling**

A sample of Facebook messages was collected from the population of 12 Master Two students 04 teachers. The participants were chosen for text corpus research because they are considered to have advanced language abilities that enable them to engage in the communicative process more easily than their peers at other levels. The students ranged in age from 22 to 28 years old and included males and females, while the teachers' age is between 30 to 55 years old.

## **2.6 Facebook Comments and messages**

A corpus of 16 messages and comments was collected from the participants. The messages and comments written by the students were obtained after asking for their permission via Facebook. they copied their messages and sent them via social media to the researchers.

## **2.7 Data Collection Tool**

### **2.7.1 Text Corpus Analysis**



The implementation of text corpus analysis in the discipline of linguistics is widely used for performing investigations on language features. Sinclair (2005, p. 16) defined corpus as “a collection of pieces of language text in electronic form, selected according to external criteria to represent, as far as possible, a language or language variety as a source of data for linguistic research”. Thus, the current research looks at a collection of messages from students to their teachers, which will be examined using Brown and Levinson’s (1987) Politeness model criteria. As a result, the current research focuses on a collection of messages from students to their teachers, which will be analyzed employing Brown and Levinson’s (1987) Politeness model criteria.

### **2.7.1.1 Definition of Text Corpus Analysis**

Text Corpus is a collection of linguistic data collected in written texts to analyze and characterize language features. Text corpus analysis is used to investigate the variations in the use of specific words and sounds (Crystal, 1992, p. 73), or to infer the presence or absence of specific linguistic elements in written or recorded texts. According to McEnery and Wilson (1996, p. 21), sampling, representativeness, finite size, machine readable form, and standard references are all required features that distinguish a corpus from other forms of text collections.

### **2.7.1.2 Aims of Text Corpus Analysis**

The current study used a text corpus analysis approach to determine the extent to which students and teachers adopt politeness strategies when interacting on Facebook. The two goals of text corpus analysis are as follows:

1. To identify and demonstrate the many politeness strategies used.
2. To investigate the occurrence of FTA and FSA

### **2.7.1.3 Administration of Text Corpus Analysis**

The ongoing study includes a corpus of 16 written messages and comments collected from students. The text corpus research was conducted during the first semester at the Department of English, University of Ibn Khaldoun, Tiaret. Students were asked to copy their messages and comments when addressing their teachers. To preserve greater

confidentiality, the teachers' and students' personal information, including their Facebook identities, has been deleted.

## **2.8. Conclusion**

This chapter included the main steps and elements that were part of the study in hand. Every detail about the process of the study was provided, including context, participants involved and data collection tools. Moreover, we describe and explain the objectives behind choosing the data. The data analysis' methods were described to unfold the process of finding the results.

# **CHAPTER THREE:**

# **DATA ANALYSIS**

### 3.1. Introduction

This chapter is devoted to the analysis of the politeness strategies employed by the students when messaging and commenting to their teachers and vice versa, through a text corpus analysis where a set of samples is under investigation. The process goes through the use of the four different politeness strategies suggested by Brown and Levinson (1987).

### 3.2. Positive Politeness Strategy

Most of the students stated greetings when they texted the teachers. The greeting varied from formal to informal. Some of them are still considered formal greetings, such as "Salam, "Dear Miss", "good morning", "good evening". and some like: "Hi", which seem to be impolite and informal to be said to someone with a higher status than the speaker. The data below show the students' messages and comments to their teachers that contain positive politeness strategy.

#### Sample 1: (student, message)

Hi, Miss. I want to ask something, can I conduct a study aboutan American influencer named Mr. X, I'll examine the use of modal verbs in his speech and I've already got a title for my study, "An analysis of modal verbs Mr. X's online video's".

According to the student's message, she said an informal greeting to her supervisor. She said "Hi" which is typically said to someone close by and of equal power to the speaker. In this case, the speaker has already caused damage to the listener's face. Based on the speaker's request "Can I conduct a study on an American influencer named Mr.Xonline video's?", it can be said that she applied positive politeness. The speaker, however, threatened the hearer's positive face by saying, "I already have a topic for my study.". The sentence demonstrates that the speaker chose what she wanted to research on her own. However, based on the message, it appears that she was still deciding on a topic for her research and that she required the teacher's approval whether the topic was right or not. FTA occurred here.

**Sample 2: (student, message)**

Good evening. Miss, sorry for Texting you at this time. Can I perform my project presentation on Monday Miss? Thank you.

As demonstrated by the data above, the speaker applied a positive politeness strategy because she was messaging the teacher at a late time. She was actually doing FTA. However, she expressed regret for her actions. The speaker sought an agreement by saying “Can I perform my project presentation on Monday, miss?”. This statement implies the speaker’s offer to seek agreement Brown and Levinson (1987). Although she employed positive politeness to minimize the threat, the speaker threatened the listener’s positive face.

**Sample 3: (student, comment)**

Hello, Miss. I am Khaled from Group 02... Can I perhaps present my project next Wednesday, Miss?

The speaker utilizes a positive politeness strategy in the excerpt above, in which he attempts to reach an agreement with the teacher. “Can I perhaps” he said, minimizing the damage to the hearer’s face. Actually, it could be negative politeness, but the speaker indicated the time for consultation, which could threaten the listener’s positive face. “Can I perhaps present my project next Wednesday, Miss?”, he asked. This question can damage the hearer’s face because the hearer has more power than the speaker in this situation. FTA is influenced by social distance, relative power, and rank of imposition, according to Brown and Levinson (1987, p.74).

The data above show that students greeted their teachers in both formal and informal ways. Thus, the speakers subconsciously threaten the listener’s face by doing FTA’s. This happened because some students were unaware that the hearer had a higher power.

### 3.3. Negative Politeness

The following data show how the speakers used negative politeness strategy to address the listener in their messages. Questioning, being pessimistic, apologizing, and giving deference were the sub-strategies used.

**Sample 6: (student, message)**

Good afternoon, Miss. I apologize to you. I am Sara from Group3, I am afraid of not being able to attend the final examination because the exam schedule is colliding with my departure from January 15th to 30th. Is there a makeup examination? Thank you.

According to the data presented above, the speaker messaged the teacher using a negative politeness strategy. Question is used when she wanted to know when the makeup exam was and what action she should take. She also told the teacher that she would be scared and afraid if the exams and her schedule collided, her words revealed that a pessimistic strategy was employed. The speaker was treated with deference as she apologized for interrupting the teacher at the beginning and end of the message. She also requested the teacher's solution, implying that she trusted and appreciated him. By saying "thank you" at the end of the conversation, she saved the teacher's face. The theory of Holmes (2013, p. 285) that "politeness involves contributing to social harmony and avoiding social conflict" is reflected in this speaker's message. The speaker maintained her politeness and was aware of her position. She avoided conflict by involving the instructor in the problem-solving process.

**Sample 7: (student, message)**

Good evening Miss. I am Salma from group 1. I apologize. I was misinformed about the exam schedule, I just found out that the exam has already been done. I apologize for my carelessness as a student, Miss. Please forgive me, miss

Because she was misinformed, the speaker had trouble with the examination timetable. According to the data, she attempted to reduce the threat she caused to the hearer's face by greeting the hearer, revealing her situation, apologizing and giving deference. The speaker in this case employs negative politeness strategy. Her statement,

in which she apologized and admitted her irresponsibility, reflected her belief that the hearer possessed greater power and position. "Miss. Please forgive me. Miss" she said, emphasizing it, and it clearly saves the hearer's face. According to the data above, the speaker understands how to message her teacher politely.

**Sample 8: (student, comment)**

good morning, Miss, I am Mohamed from group 4, I want to send my Project.  
May I ask for your email address? I am sorry, Miss.

According to the data above, the student used negative politeness when commenting on the teacher's Facebook post. He greeted the teacher, announced his name and class, and expressed his intention. "May I ask for your email address", he continued, implying that he wanted the teacher's email address. "I am sorry, Miss." This shows that he respected the hearer and did not ask for the hearer's email address explicitly. Additionally, he expressed regret for commenting to the teacher.

**Sample 9: (teacher, message)**

Ok, Ahmed. Can you correct this?

The teacher requested the student to correct her answer indirectly, as indicated by the utterance. Because the teacher did not tell the student to do what she wanted. As a result, the instruction is considered polite. She did it indirectly instead of explicitly since she did not want to put any pressure on the student.

### **3.4 Bald on-Record**

Students employed this strategy the most when messaging their teachers. The damage to the hearer's face cannot be avoided once this strategy has been implemented. This action might be considered impolite.

**Sample 10: (Student, message)**

Miss, today is the presentation deadline, right? I want to do my presentation next session.... all the mistakes are fixed.

According to the data provided above, the student engaged in FTA and threatened the teacher's face. She did not greet the teacher and instead exclaimed, "Miss, today is the presentation deadline, right?". She did not attempt to reduce the FTA. She stated her intention clearly without regard for the position of the hearer. "All the mistakes are fixed" she said, damaging the hearer's position.

**Sample 11: (student, message)**

Sir! Wait I am on my way to the class.

The data reveals that the student used bald on-record and damaged the hearer's face. This message comes across as aggressive and impolite. For the student being late is disrespectful and inappropriate. "Sir! Wait, I'm on my way to the class" can be regarded as impolite. Inappropriate verbal choices, according to Brown and Levinson(1987), might be considered rude.

**Sample 12: (student, message)**

Sir, I am not attending the session today, so it will be tomorrow, Sir. Okay

According to the data. the students's session with her teacher was cancelled, he was disrespectful and rude in the delivery of his statement. "Sir, I am not attending the session today, so it will be tomorrow". By saing "Okay, Sir", he made the decision on his own to reschedule the lecture. Because it is not suitable to make this statement to someone with higher status and power, her message and choice of words can be considered impolite.

**Sample 13: (student, message)**

Good morning, Sir. I want to meet you. Are you at the university?

The student's message above demonstrates that the student directly messaged the teacher. He did not attempt to soften the speech, and the message was read as a command. This last may be considered as annoying and impolite to the teacher who reads it. The statement "I want to meet you" was considered direct, while "Are you at the university?" was regarded as disrespectful. The student's direct statement, "I want



to meet you,” was impolite, and the student did not apologize for interrupting the teacher’s time. However, the speaker did not ask about the teacher’s place, which might be irritating for some teachers because the student appeared to be unaware about his attitude. Because the speaker did not attempt to satisfy the listener’s face, the bald-on-record was utilized. The speaker preferred accomplishing FTA to satisfy the listener’s face (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 95). Face is ignored. The student unintentionally gave the teacher orders “Sir I want to meet you. Are you at university?” which threatens the teacher’s face.

**Sample 14: (teacher, message)**

A supervision meeting is scheduled this Wednesday you and your partner must be there. Remember to bring your laptop including your research.

Here the teacher expresses a direct, clear and honest instruction “you and your partner must be there” in an imperative form, with no attempt to soften the face-threatening act. The bald on-record does nothing to reduce the threats to the listener’s face.

**Sample 15: (teacher, message)**

Meeting tomorrow Wednesday at 9. You must come.

The data above demonstrates a direct and honest order that was given to the student without minimizing the face-threatening act “You must come”.

**Sample 16: (teacher, message)**

You will be excluded if you don’t bring me a justification.

The utterance above “You will be excluded” indicates a warning in a clear manner, without any attempt to reduce the student’s FTA.

### **3.5 Off-Record Strategy**

This strategy was found in some messages. The sub-strategy used was giving hints.

**Sample 17: (student, comment)**

Good evening, Miss. I have sent a paper that I have revised.

According to the data above, the student employed off-record strategy to address his teacher. He hinted that he had already revised the paper and he expected the teacher to review it again and provide feedback. One of the off-record sub-strategies is to give hints.

**Sample 18: (student, message)**

Salam Miss, I went to university because you said that the consultation was on the 13th. However, there was nobody in the department, it was really quiet.

Here, the student applied the third sub-strategy through the presupposing way. In this case, he delivered his idea related to the consultation. In fact, the consultation was not held.

### **3.6 Results and Discussion**

Following an analysis of the 16 data about students' and teachers' messages and comments when addressing each other. It was discovered that the majority of the data dealt with the students' questions about different academic issues.

Brown and Levinson's politeness theory (1987) is utilized to categorize the data. They were divided into three (03) positive politeness strategy data, four (04) negative politeness strategy data, seven (07) bald on-record data and two (02) off record data. However, no Do not Do the FTA strategy was found. The findings of this study reveal that the students used practically the four politeness strategies of Brown and Levinson (1987) (Positive, negative, bald on-record, off-record) while addressing their teachers. However, the most used strategy in teacher messages and comments is the Bald On-Record strategy by giving direct and honest orders without slighting the threat to the student's face since they are aware of their higher status and social distance.

According to the research, some students are unaware that sending a message containing FaceThreatening Acts could damage the teacher's face (FTA). FTA occurred because the speakers are unaware of their own and the hearer's respective positions and status.

Based on the results, the majority of the Face Threatening Acts happened when students and teachers used Bald On-Record strategy to interact with each other. The students' most common strategy was bald on-record, which implied that FTA had occurred. However, they employed off-record strategy the least. Thus, the teacher's face was unintentionally threatened by the students. Greetings such as Salam, good morning, good afternoon, and good evening were used by the majority of the students. Few students did not greet the teacher and instead stated their intentions directly. FTA's often occurred and students frequently threatened the teacher's face.

The student's choice of words impacted the teachers' feelings and sounded informal. When students interacted with their teachers on Facebook, they appear to be unaware of social distance, roles and status, and power relations. Some students treated the teachers as if they were on an equal level, which came across as disrespectful. Face Saving Acts occurred when students select suitable terms to address their teachers when employing off-record (giving hints and presupposing) and negative politeness strategies.

### **3.7.Conclusion**

This chapter was mainly about the practical side of which is the core of this study, in which we have analyzed the data collected from Matser Two students of English department at the University of Ibn khaldoun, Tiaret, throughout the use of text corpus analysis. In an attempt to investigate the use of politeness strategies suggested by Brown and Levinson (1987) in student-teacher Facebook interaction and to which extent they employ FTA's and FSA's. The aim is to test our research hypothesis and to answer our research questions. In this part, we have presented 16 samples of messages and comments. To sum up, we have found that students used practically the four of Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness strategies (Positive, Negative, Bald-on-Record, and

Off-Record) while addressing their teachers. However, teachers used only Bald-on-Record strategy.

# **GENERAL CONCLUSION**

This study aims to examine the student-teacher politeness strategies employed when interacting via Facebook. In order to analyze the data (messages and comments), Brown and Levinson's (1987) framework is used as a criterion.

This research was divided into three chapters. The first chapter represents the theoretical background of social interaction theory, Facebook communication. In addition to Brown and Levinson's politeness theory in detail. The second chapter is devoted to the research methodology and the practical framework in collecting data and analyzing them using a text corpus analysis. The research is held with Master Two students of English department at Ibn Khaldoun University, Tiaret. However, the third chapter deals with the analysis of data and findings' discussion to meet our research objectives.

The study reveals that most of the students employ Bald On-Record politeness strategy when addressing their teachers on Facebook. Similarly, the majority of teachers used Bald On-Record strategy since it is considered effective in instructing and guiding students.

Our study confirms the first research hypothesis. It is asserted that students employ different politeness strategies to address their teachers on Facebook. The second research hypothesis is also confirmed because both, Face Saving Acts and Face Threatening Acts occurs during student-teacher Facebook interaction. However, depending on the strategy employed, Face Threatening Acts tend to occur more than Face Saving Acts since Bald on-record strategy was the most dominant among teachers and student messages and comments.

# **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Adel, S.R & Ramezanzadeh, A (2016). A qualitative study of politeness strategies used by Iranian EFL learners in a class blog. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*.4(1), .47–62.
- Aykaç, M. (2005). *Students' and teachers' attitudes towards the use of computer-Mediated communication voice & text chat as an instructional resource to improve speaking skill* [ Unpublished Master's Dissertation, University of Bilkent, Ankara].
- Boon, S. & C, Sinclair. (2009). *A World I Don't Inhabit: Disquiet and Identity in Second Life and Facebook*. *Educational Media International*.46(2).
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Cambridge University Press: New York.
- Bugeja, M. J. (2006). Facing the Facebook. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52(21), C1 .Bussman, Hadumon (ed.). *Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics*. Routledge: New York.
- Chen, C.E. (2001). *Making email requests to professors: Taiwanese Vs. American Students*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, St, Louis, Ms.
- Coklar, A.N. (2012). Evaluation of students on Facebook as an educational environment. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 3(2), pp.49-51.
- Couros, A. (2008). Safety and social networking: How can we maximize the learning power of par-ticipatory web sites while ensuring students are pro-ected and behave responsibly? *Technology and Learning*.28(7).20.
- DiVerniero, R. A., Hosek, A. M. (2011). *Students' perceptions and communicative management of instructors' online self-disclosure*. *Communication Quarterly*. (59). 428–449.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01463373.2011.597275>.
- Ellison, N. B. (2008). Introduction: *Reshaping campus communication and community through social network sites*. In G. Salaway, J. B. Caruso & M. R. Nelson (Eds.), *The ECAR Study of Undergraduate Students and Information Technology*. pp. 19–32. Educause Center for Applied Research: Boulder.
- Emmer, E & Sabornie. E. J. (2014). *Handbook of Classroom Management*. . (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). Routledge: New York.
- Facebook: A beginner's guide. (n.d). American Majority. Retrieved 02/02/2022  
[www.Americanmajority.org](http://www.Americanmajority.org)
- Felix, B & Cesar. J. (2003). Declining an invitation: A cross-cultural study of pragmatic strategies in Latin American Spanish and American English. *Multilingua* (22). pp. 225–255.
- Ferrante, W.J. (1992). *Sociology: A Global Perspective*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.



- Ghaleb, I. M. (2013). The Effect of Using Facebook on Improving Students' Writing Skills in English. [Online master thesis, Faculty of Graduate Studies, An-Najah National University, Nablus, Palestine].
- Goffman, E (1967). *Interaction ritual*. Aldine Publishing Company: Chicago.
- Goodman, N. (1992). *Introduction to Sociology*. Harpercollins Publishers, Inc., New York.
- Grice, H.P. (1975). Logic and conversation In Cole, P. & Morgan, J. (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics*, (3). Academic Press.: New York. 41–58.
- Grice, H.P. (1978). Further notes on logic and conversation In Cole, P. (ed) *Syntax and Semantics*, (9). New York: Academic Press: New York. 113–127.
- Held, G. (1992). Politeness in linguistic research. Watts, R. S. and Ehlich, K. (eds.), *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice*. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin.
- Holmes. J. (2013). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, (4<sup>th</sup>ed.). Pearson: London.
- Homans, G. C. (1961). *Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms*. Harcourt, Brace: New York
- Horváth, G. (2014). *From Museum Walls to Facebook Walls*. In. GizelaHorváth, RozáliaKláraBakó and ÉvaBiró- Kaszás (Eds). *The Third Argumentor Conference. Ten Years of Facebook*. Partium Press and Debrecen University Press: Oradea, Romania.
- Irwin. C., Ball. L., Desbrow. B. &Leveritt. M. (2012). Students'perceptions of using Facebook as an interactive learning resource at university. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 28 (7).
- Khusnia, A. N. (2017). Politeness Strategies in EFL Classroom: Building Positive Values towards Students (Vol. 109). Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto. Indonesia.
- Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and Woman's Place*. Harper and Row: New York
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman: London.
- Meredith, J. & Potter, J. (2013). Conversation Analysis and Electronic Interactions: Methodological, Analytic and Technological Considerations. IGI Global. Pennsylvania. p. 374
- Merrill, E & Wentworth, H. E. (1955). *Culture and society, an introduction to sociology*.17(1). Prentice-Hall: New Jersey.
- Mueller, F., Agamanolis, S & Picard, R. (2003). *Exertion Interface: Sports Over a Distance for Social Bonding and Fun*. In SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. p. 01. ACM: Florida.
- Munoz, C. & Towner, T. (2009). *Opening Facebook: How to Use Facebook in the College Classroom*. In I. Gibson et Al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Society for*

- Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference. pp. 4–5. Charleston Sc.
- Politeness. (n.d). In Oxford learners Dictionary. Retrieved 03/03/2022 from <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/politeness>.
  - Riley, P. (2010). *Attachment Theory and the Teacher-Student Relationship: A Practical Guide for Teachers, Teacher Educators and School Leaders*. Routledge:New York
  - Romiszowski, A. J., & Mason, R. (1996). Handbook of Research for educational communications and technology (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). D. Jonassen (Ed.) *Computer-mediated communication*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: New Jersey.
  - Sara, M (2003). Gender and politeness. *Cambridge University Press*: Cambridge.
  - Shaefer, R.T. (2003). *Sociology* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). McGraw-Hill: New York.
  - Sifianou, M (1992). Politeness Phenomena in England and Greece: A Cross-Cultural Perspective. *Oxford University Press*: London.
  - Soekanto, S. (1988). *Sosiologi Suatu Pengantar*. PT. Raja Grafindo Persada: Jakarta.
  - Villano, M. (2007). Social revolution. *Campus Technology*, 20(5), 40–45.
  - Watts, R.J. (2003). Politeness: Key Topics in Sociolinguistics. *Cambridge University Press*: Cambridge
  - Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. *Oxford University Press*: London

## Summary:

The study in hand seeks to investigate the use of politeness strategies in student-teacher Facebook interaction and to reveal the most used strategies in their interaction and the reason behind using them, to achieve this aim, a study was conducted in the English department, Ibn khaldoun University with master two linguistics students. It adopted the qualitative method of research. 16 data were taken and analyzed. The study revealed that the majority of students use the Bald on-record politeness strategy in interacting with lecturers due to their unawareness of the appropriate strategy that should be used, while most teachers employed the same strategy purposely because it is helpful in guiding and keeping distance with students.

**Keywords:** Politeness, Facebook Interaction, Teachers, Students.

## ملخص:

سعت الدراسة قيد البحث إلى التحقق من وجود مفاهيم نظرية التأدب في التواصل بين الطالب والأستاذ عبر الفيسبوك، ولتحقيق هذا الهدف أجريت دراسة على طلبة السنة الثانية ماستر كلية الآداب واللغات، فرع اللغة الإنجليزية، تخصص لسانيات، جامعة ابن خلدون، تيارت. تم تبني منهج البحث النوعي الذي استخدم أداة تحليل البيانات بعد جمعها من 16 متطوع منهم 4 أساتذة. كما شملت العملية رسائل وتعليقات عكست التواصل بين الطلبة والأساتذة، كشفت نتائج البحث أن معظم الطلبة يستخدمون الجانب الأخف من نظرية التأدب تلك أنهم غير مدركين للجانب الملائم للتواصل عبر موقع فيسبوك مع الأساتذة. فيما أوضحت الدراسة أن اغلب الأساتذة يستخدمون نفس الجانب من نظرية التأدب لأنه يساعدهم على توجيه الطلبة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التأدب، التفاعل عبر الفيسبوك، الأساتذة، الطلبة.