

**Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research**

**University of Abdelhamid Ibn Badis- Mostaganem**

**Faculty of foreign languages**

**English Department**



*Politeness strategies in Relizane  
spoken Arabic*

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of foreign Languages in candidacy for the  
Degree of master in English language and linguistics

**Presented by Under the Supervision of**

Academic year: 2015-2016

## **Acknowledgments**

First, I would like to thank Allah for having blessed me, and giving me the courage and the ability to finish this work against all the odds.

I would also thank my supervisor MS Benyoucef for her guidance, and especially her patience.

My special gratitude also goes to the jury members, the president MRS Hairech, and the examiner MR Moulaiyacene.

I would also thank my family and my friends for their encouragement.

Finally, and most importantly, I would to thank my husband for his support and encouragement.

I

**Dedication**

I dedicate this work to:

The memory of my father Mohammed

My mother Badra

My sisters

My brothers

II

**Abstract**

The focal point of the present research work is to study linguistic politeness, taking a variety of Algerian Arabic, namely Relizane spoken Arabic as a case of study. The first chapter of this work provides some basic definitions that are related to the current topic. The second chapter mentions several studies that have been conducted by other researchers about linguistic politeness, but the third one is concerned the methodology and data analysis. This work attempts to discover some of the politeness strategies that are adopted by speakers of Relizane speech community. Observation is used as a tool in order to collect an appropriate data. Analysis of the data showed that, there is a high applicability between politeness strategies used in Relizane speech community and politeness strategies as proposed by Brown and Levinson 1987.

**Key words:** linguistic politeness, Relizane spoken Arabic, Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies.

### III

Dedications.....	I
Acknowledgements.....	II

Abstract.....	III
Table of contents.....	IV
Abbreviations.....	VI
Phonetic symbols.....	VII
General introduction.....	1
Chapter one: Theoretical background	
1.1. Introduction.....	2
1.2. Language and communication.....	2
1.3. Basic definitions.....	3
1.3.1. Pragmatics.....	3
1.3.2. Speech act theory.....	4
1.3.3. The speech community.....	6
1.4. Linguistic politeness.....	7
1.4.1. Approaches to politeness.....	9
1.4.2. Grice's theory of conversation.....	9
1.4.3. Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness.....	10
1.4.4. Politeness strategies.....	12
1.4.4.1. Bald-on record.....	12
1.4.4.2. Positive politeness.....	13
1.4.4.3. Negative politeness.....	13
1.4.4.4. Off-record.....	13
1.4.4.5. Do not do the FTA.....	14
1.4.5. Variables determining politeness strategies.....	14
1.4.6. Conclusion.....	14

#### IV

#### Chapter two: Literature review

2.1. Introduction.....	15
2.2. Politeness strategies in Arabic dialects.....	15
2.3. Politeness strategies in other languages.....	17
2.4. Comparison studies between other languages.....	18
2.5. Conclusion.....	19

## Chapter three: Data analysis and methodology

3.1. Introduction.....	20
3.2. Methodology.....	20
3.3. Sample.....	20
3.4. Data collection.....	20
3.5. Analysis of the data collection.....	22
3.6. Interpretation of the data.....	23
3.7. Limitations of the study.....	24
3.8. Recommendations and suggestions.....	24
3.9. Conclusion.....	24
General conclusion.....	25
References.....	26

### **Abbreviations**

**AA:** Algerian Arabic

**CP:** The Cooperative Principle.

**PP:** positive politeness

**NP:** negative politeness

**MP:** model person.

**S:** speaker.

**H:** hearer.

**FTA:** face-threatening act.

**D:** social distance.

**P:** power.

**R:** ranking of imposition.

**RA:** Relizane Arabic

## VI

### **Phonetic symbols**

The following system of phonetic symbols has been adopted in this study

#### **\*consonants:**

Arabic letter	transliteration key
ب	b
ت	t
ج	dj
د	d
ر	r
ز	z
س	s

ش	sh
ف	f
ق	q
ك	k
ل	l
م	m
ن	n
و	w
ه	h
ي	j
ط	t'
ح	h'
خ	kh
ع	3

**\*vowels:**

-Short vowels are: **a**, **o**, and **i**.

-long vowels are: **a:** /**o:** / and **i:**.

## **General introduction:**

Pragmatics is considered as a branch of linguistics, it is concerned with the study of the use of language in context, and how people produce and understand meanings through their use of language. Pragmatics as a linguistic field takes into account the study of linguistic politeness and how people use their utterances to show respect to the others during their interactions.

This dissertation is based on Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies, according to B&L there are five strategies which are bald- on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, off-record and do not do the FTA.

The spoken language investigated here is that of Relizane, Relizane is a region situated in the west of Algeria. This study will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. Do Relizane Arabic speakers adopt the same types of politeness strategies as proposed by Brown and Levinson 1987?
2. Do the sex and the age of the hearer affect the choice of strategies?
3. What are the other factors that affect politeness in Relizane?

It is hypothesized that in Relizane, may be speakers of RA adopt all the politeness strategies as proposed by Brown and Levinson 1987. It is also hypothesized that gender and age may have a great impact on the choice of politeness strategy.

The present work consists of three chapters. The first chapter gives definitions to some relevant concepts to the theme. The second chapter presents a review of some previous studies to give the reader the opportunity to make a comparison between the use of politeness strategies in his or her own culture and in other cultures. The last chapter is the practical part; it includes the analysis of the data obtained through the observation in order to answer the research questions.

### **1.1. Introduction:**

The notion of “linguistic politeness” is very broad and complicated, and because there are different languages with different cultures in the world, the form of politeness differs from one culture to another and also from one language to another. So, the first chapter of this study has to provide different notions that are related to politeness phenomenon, such as, human communication, pragmatics, speech act theory, and speech community.

## **1.2. Language and communication:**

Generally speaking, language is a means of communication, and communication always takes place in social context. That is why effective communication needs an understanding between language and people who use this language.

According to linguists, in order to realize an effective communication people need a communicative competence, and pragmatic competence, the notion of communicative competence was first proposed by Hymes in 1966 (Belaskri, 2012, p. 12).

Canale and Swain (1980) stated that communicative competence consists of three components. First, grammatical competence, it refers to the knowledge of language (syntax, morphology, semantics, and phonology). Second, sociolinguistic competence, it consists of two sets of rules, namely sociocultural rules of use and rules of discourse, linguists believe that the knowledge of these rules is very important to understand the speaker’s intended social meaning. Third, discourse competence, it refers to the ability of making a meaningful discourse (Belaskri, 2012, p. 14-15).

On the other hand, Thomas (1983) defined pragmatic competence as the ability to use language effectively to reach a specific communicative goal by adding knowledge beyond the level of grammar (Belaskri, 2012, p. 17). According to Saville and Troike “pragmatic competence involves knowing not only the language code but also what to say to whom, and how to say it appropriately in any given situation” (as cited in Eshreteh, 2013, p. 2013). To explain more, pragmatic competence involves the cultural rule that help the speaker to use and interpret linguistic forms.

## **1.3. Basic definitions:**

First, it is important to provide definitions of some concepts that are related to the theme of this research, that is to say, to linguistic politeness, so, these definitions will help the reader to relate things in order to get better understanding.

### **1.3.1. Pragmatics:**

According to Leech and Thomas Pragmatics is considered as a branch of linguistics, it is concerned with the study of the use of language in context, and how people produce and understand meanings through their use of language. The term 'pragmatics' was appeared first in the 1930's, but pragmatics as a subfield of linguistics was developed in the late 1970's (Eshreteh, 2013, p.23).

To begin with, George Yule in his major work "pragmatics" makes a distinction between three branches of linguistics, namely, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. First, syntax has to do with the rules that govern the way words are combined together to form phrases and sentences. Second, semantics is the study of the relationship between linguistic forms (words) and objects. Third, Yule defines pragmatics by saying, pragmatics is the study of "invisible" meaning, or how we recognize what is meant even when it isn't actually said or written (1996, p.128).

Yule 1996 provided four areas that pragmatics is concerned with, meaning that, in order to understand the meaning of an utterance we have to take into consideration, the speaker's meaning, the contextual meaning, the hearer's meaning (what he recognized from what is said), and the meanings of expressions of relative distance. from a pragmatic point of view, words and sentences are often produced with many different interpretation, this production depends on what the speaker wants to convey by producing an act (the speaker meaning).another important thing is that the context in which the language is used always influences what is said, however speakers should gave a regard to as Yule states "wat they want to say in accordance with who they are talking to, where, when, and under what circumstances"(1996, p. 3). Pragmatics also helps us to comprehend that how listeners realize the speaker intended meaning. Meanings and expressions of relative distance, here pragmatics looks to the relationship between what is said and what is meant, however this relation is due to the notion of distance as Yule said "closeness, whether it is physical, social, or conceptual, implies shared experience. On the assumption of how close or distant the listener is, the speaker determines how much needs to be said" (1996, p. 3).

To conclude with, the main interest of pragmatics is the study of the speaker's meaning in a particular context not what the words mean according to a dictionary.

### **1.3.2. Speech act theory:**

The study of politeness is usually accompaniment with speech act theory. So, in this work it is useful to mention some concepts that are related to speech acts.

Linguistics and the philosophy of language are two broad disciplines; they give importance to the study of language and its use. Philosophers like Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) have introduced the idea that people produce actions when they speak, this idea constitutes what is called the speech act theory, this theory helps us to examine utterances from the perspective of their functions, and not their forms (Eshreth, 2013, p.36).

What is a speech act? Searle considers a speech acts as “the basic or minimal units of all linguistic communication” (as cited in Eshreth, 2014, p.36). Yule defined speech act as “the action performed by a speaker with an utterance” (1996, p.133). And consequently, the term speech act describes actions such as requesting, commanding, requesting...etc. If someone says “I will be there at six”, he is not just speaking, but he also produces the speech act of promising.

Speech act theory is based on the idea that a speech act has three levels, Widdowson stated that these levels are aspects of pragmatic meaning (1996, p.62-63):

\*locutionary act: the production of an utterance, “it is an act of saying something” (Pandey, 2008, p. 115). For instance ‘give me the pen, please’.

\*Illocutionary act: it is what the speaker wants to achieve by producing an action, “it is an act of in saying something” (Pandey, 2008, p. 115). For instance “request”.

\*Perlocutionary act: it is the result. “It is an act of by saying something” (Pandey, 2008, p.115), for example, the hearer can react by giving the pen to the speaker.

According to the speech act theory in order to make a successful speech acts people need a number of conditions, these conditions called “felicity conditions”. Organized felicity conditions into five classes are as follows:

\*general conditions: these conditions deal with knowing the knowledge of the language, meaning that the participants can understand the language used.

\*content condition: these conditions deal with the appropriate content of an utterance, that is to say, the utterance has to do with a future event, however, the future event of the speech act of promise should be the act of the speaker in the future, for example, “I promise you to be here at five o’clock”, here the future event occurs when the speaker come on time.

\*preparatory conditions: these conditions deal with differences of various illocutionary acts (promises, warnings), to explain more, concerning the promise there are two preparatory conditions, first, the event of the promise will happen by the speaker, second, the event will have a beneficial effect.

\*sincerity conditions: these conditions deal with the issue that the speaker has to fulfill the future event of the of the promise, and for the warning the speaker has to believe that the future event will not have a beneficial effect

\*essential conditions: these conditions deal with what should be in the content of the utterance, it means the utterance of the speaker should contain what he intends to achieve, for example, obligation, and fulfill a promise (1996, p. 50-51).

According to Yule there are two types of speech acts, namely the direct and the indirect one (1996, p.134). For example, when we don't know something and we ask in order to get information, we actually produce a direct speech act of request such as 'can you speak English?' But, in the case of 'can you open the door?' The speaker is not asking, but he used the structure of the question in order to perform the speech act of request.

According to linguists, the main reason behind the use of indirect speech acts is that, indirect speech acts are considered to be more polite and gentle in all languages. Scholars such as Austin, Searle, Brown, and Levinson argued that politeness has been sometimes equated to indirectness (as cited in Al-Qahtani, 2009, p.36).

Finally, it is clear that the appearance of the speech act theory makes a great change in the study of language use. Consequently, many linguists at that time (1962) were curious to understand and comprehend the principles of this theory.

### **1.3.3. The speech community:**

Generally, sociolinguistics as a broad discipline concerns with the study of language use within a group of speakers, this group is named by sociolinguist as "speech community". So, what is a speech community?

Concerning the definition of the speech community many linguists give different explanations. Bloomfield said that, "a speech community is a group of people who interact by means of speech" (as cited in Elhadj-Said, 2011, p. 18).

From his part Charles Hockett in defining a speech community argued that "each language defines a speech community: the whole set of people who communicate with each other, either directly or indirectly; via the common language" (as cited in Fizzioui, 2011, p. 24).

Labov stated that "the speech community is defined by...participation in a set of shared norms...which may be observed in overt types of evaluative behavior, and in the uniformity of abstract patterns of variation" (as cited in Elhadj-Said,2011, p. 19).

According to Romaine the speech community is “a group of people who do not necessarily share the same language, but share a set of norms and rules for the use of language” (as cited in Fizzioui, 2011, p. 24).

Although the above definitions are very complicated, but all of them can be considered as correct, because they provide us with definitions to groups of people who have something in common. To conclude with, a group of people who speaks the same language is considered as the simplest definition of the speech community among all the others.

In this work, the focus is on an Algerian speech community, namely Relizane speech community; people of this community speak a variety of Algerian Arabic (AA), which is Relizane Arabic (RA). In this research, the aim is to investigate politeness as linguistic phenomenon in an Algerian society (Relizane society).

#### **1.4. Linguistic politeness**

What is politeness? It is not easy for anyone to provide an answer for this question. However, being polite is an important condition for all human beings to communicate with others. Generally, politeness refers to the idea of being modest, nice, and respectful.

In the communication process between individuals, politeness takes into consideration the polite behavior and the polite language usage as Watts said “politeness should not focus only on polite behaviors, but also should include all forms of polite language usage” (2003, p. XI).

This research is concerned with politeness and the use of language. However, linguistically speaking politeness is the use of language in a good and polite way to communicate with other people in order to make them feel comfortable during the interaction.

Indeed, the study of linguistic politeness has increased in recent years because several disciplines take the study of politeness into consideration, among these disciplines linguistic pragmatics and sociolinguistics. Watts described politeness phenomenon as “not only that it occupies a central place in the social study of language, but also that it has been the subject of intensive debate in linguistic pragmatics, sociolinguistics and, to a lesser extent, social theory for several years now”(2003, p. 10. concerning this issue Brown and Levinson state that “in the case of linguistic pragmatics a great deal of the mismatch between what is ‘said’ and what is ‘implicated ‘can be attributed to politeness” (1987, p. 2).

Linguistic politeness, in pragmatic linguistics is defined as the use of the right language. As an illustration for this idea, asking indirect question, and using respectful forms

of address such as ‘sir’ all these are aspects of polite language usage (Watts, 2003, p. 1). For many linguists, the reason why people use polite language between each other is to avoid conflict, facilitate interaction, or to show respect for others.

Watts in his book “politeness” mentions that polite behavior, including polite language; has to be acquired, that is to say, politeness is not something we are born with, but something we have to learn from our society (2003, p. 9).

A lot of research works have shown that the means to express politeness is different from one culture to another. Every culture and every language has its ways of showing respect, thanking, or greeting. However, what is considered polite in one culture might be considered as impolite in another.

One of the central claims made in Brown and Levinson is that politeness is a universal feature of language usage. In other words, all of the world’s languages possess the means to express politeness. Their claim for universality, however, is made in relation to their conceptualization of an idealized concept of politeness not in relation to the ways in which groups of participants struggle over politeness. (Watts, 2003, p. 12)

The quote above means that politeness as a concept is observed in all of the world’s languages, but what is not universal is that every language has specific means to express politeness.

To end with, we can say that the notion of “politeness” is broad and very complicated, and large part of studies in pragmatics give a great deal to this notion, these studies showed that, if rules of politeness are not observed in a given society, people cannot live with each other and communicate together.

### **1.4.1. Approaches to politeness:**

The late of 1970's witnessed the appearance of several politeness theories in pragmatics to explain how people use their language, among these, the Grice's theory of conversation, and Brown and Levinson's model of politeness.

### **1.4.2. Grice's theory of conversation:**

The philosopher Paul Grice (1975) has proposed the theory of conversation; it is considered the most significant work in linguistic pragmatics. However, many studies about linguistic politeness were based on the theory of Paul Grice among these works are: Leech in 1983 and Brown and Levinson in 1987. The theory of Grice based on the idea that when people involved in a conversation they will cooperate with each other which he called the cooperative principles (CP). Grice stated that cooperation involves four maxims (Al-Qahtani, 2009, p. 37).

The philosopher Paul Grice mentions that as human beings in our daily conversation, speakers and hearers share the cooperative principle which describes how people interact with one another, these principles are four maxims:

\*Maxim of Quantity: this maxim says the following:

- Make your contribution as informative as necessary as is required, but not more, or less, than is required.

\*Maxim of Quality: it says the following:

- Do not say what you believe to be false, or for which you lack adequate evidence.

\*Maxim of Relevance: it says the following:

- Be relevant (i.e., say things related to the current topic of the conversation).

\*Maxim of Manner: it says the following:

- Be brief, clear, and orderly. (Yule, 1996, p. 144)

Conversational implicature is an important concept in Grice's theory of conversation. However, speakers may choose to violate or flout one of the four maxims, and as speakers of a language, we are able to make inferences about what is meant and not what is actually said. Information conveyed in this way is what Paul Grice calls "conversational implicature". (Widdowson, 2007, p. 58).

Brown and Levinson supported Grice's maxims; they said "Grice's theory of conversational implicature and the framework of maxims that give rise to such implicatures is essentially correct" (1987, p. 5).

Linguists stated that, people in their daily interaction flout or violate Grice's maxims, and one of the reasons to flout those maxims is to try to be polite (Elsoufi, 2014, p. 19).

Màrquez stated "the off record strategy, also called hints or non-conventional indirectness, is thus related to the flouting of Grice's maxims in which meaning is to some degree negotiable by means of conversational implicature"(as cited in Elsoufi, 2014, p. 19).

### **1.4.3. Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness:**

One of the famous models of politeness proposed by Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson this model is known as the MP model.

According to Brown and Levinson the MP model explains how and why individuals try to protect or save their face especially when they face a difficult situation. It also explains how we protect our and others' identities through interactions, in particular through the use of politeness strategies (Watts, 2003, p.85). The creation of this model was based on the study of three different languages, namely, English, Tamil, and, Tzeltal. Consequently, Brown and Levinson observed that the same politeness strategies used by speakers of these three languages, this is what led them to create their MP model and assume the universality of politeness (Elhadj-Said, 2011, p. 33).

Linguists claim that, during the communication process every individual (speaker or hearer) has face-wants. Brown and Levinson define face as "the public self -image that every member wants to claim for himself" (1987, p.61). The notion of face is belonged Goffman "our notion of 'face' is derived from that of Goffman (1967)" (1987:61). But later Brown and Levinson proposed two kinds of face which are the positive face and the negative one.

Central to our model is a highly abstract notion of 'face' which consists of two specific kinds of desires ('face-wants') attributed by interactants to one another: the desire to be unimpeded in one's actions (negative face), and the desire (in some

respect) to be approved of (positive face). This is the bare bones of a notion of face which (we argue) is universal, but which in any particular society we would expect to be the subject of much cultural elaboration. (1987, p. 13)

Every individual in the communication process has face, this face has two kinds or aspects, the positive face is every one of us wants to be accepted by others, and the negative face is every one of us has the desire to be free in order to act or behave without being imposed. And also we can understand from the quotation above that face-wants are universal.

From the notion of face we move to another notion which is the Face Threatening Act (FTA). However, Brown and Levinson (1987) argued that there are some speech acts or more specific illocutionary acts performed by S (speaker) threat H's (hearer) face. According to Brown and Levinson there are speech acts threat the positive face and acts threat the negative face:

Those acts that threaten the H's negative-face want, by indicating that the speaker does not intend to avoid impeding H's freedom of action, include:

- \*Acts that predicate some future act of H, such as, orders and requests.

- \*Acts that predicate some positive feature act of S toward H, and the H here has the right to accept or reject, such as, promise.

- \*Acts that predicate some desire of S toward H or H's goods, such as, compliments. Or, expressions of negative emotions like hatred, anger toward H.

Those acts that threaten the positive-face want, by indicating that the speaker does not care about the address's feelings, wants, include:

- \*Acts that show that show that S has a negative evaluation of some aspect of H's positive face, such as, contradictions or disagreements, challenges.

- \*Acts that show that S does not care about H's positive face, such as, expressions of violent emotions, mention of taboo topics, including those that are inappropriate in the context.

- \*There some acts threaten both the negative and the positive face such as, complaints, interruptions, threats, strong expressions of emotion, and requests for personal information.

The list of acts above is when S threatens the H's face, but there are also cases in which H Threats S's face.

\* Acts that offend S's negative face such as, expressing thanks, acceptance of offers.

\* Acts that damage S's positive face such as apologies (1987, p. 65 - 68).

#### **1.4.4. Politeness strategies**

Politeness strategies are speech strategies that the speakers use during their interaction with others; these strategies help the speaker to reduce the impact of FTA's such as requests and apologies. Brown and Levinson 1987 suggested five possible strategies are as follows: Bald on Record, Negative Politeness, Positive Politeness, Off Record-indirect strategy, and "Do not do the FTA" strategy.

##### **1.4.4.1. Bald on record:**

Bald on record strategy considered as the most direct one. It occurs when the expression of an act is in the direct way. However, this strategy does not require efforts from the speaker to reduce the impact of the FTA's. To explain more, bald on record strategy usually uses the imperative form without any redress, when speakers use this strategy they make the hearer feel uncomfortable. Bald on record strategy is commonly used with people who know each other very well, such as close friends and family members such as sisters and brothers (B&L, 1987, p. 94-95).

People also do the act with redressive action in order to reduce the face threat, redressive action is "some action which is designed to correct a wrong done to another person" (Watts, 2003, p. 277). In this case people use modifications and additions for example the insertion of the word "please". The use of redressive action divided into two types which are positive politeness and negative politeness.

##### **1.4.4.2. Positive politeness:**

Positive politeness has to do with the positive face of the hearer, persons use this strategy to protect the positive face of their interlocutors and to show solidarity, this strategy used between friend and between people who know each other, and also we can notice in this strategy the use of address terms such as sister, brother (Yule, 1996:62). According to Brown and Levinson PP includes many sub strategies are: notice attends to H, exaggerate, joke, promise, include both S and H in the activity, seeking agreement, avoid disagreement, use of in-group identify markers (1987, p. 103-129).

##### **1.4.4.3. Negative politeness:**

Unlike positive politeness, negative politeness has to do with the negative face of the hearer, the speaker use this strategy in order to protect and respects the negative face of the addressee (Yule,1996:62). Based on this strategy there are sub strategies that speakers use in order to protect the negative face of the hearer: be conventionally indirect, the use of hedges, be pessimistic, minimize the imposition, give deference, apologize, and nominalize (B&L, 1987, p.172-207). The use of this strategy needs a lot of politeness markers like question hedges (could you please, would you please), redress terms such as sir and madam.

#### **1.4.4.4. Off-record:**

If the speakers choose to go off-record strategy is when a certain act can be performed in an unclear and indirect way, off-record strategies allow the act to have more than one interpretation, and it is up to the hearer in this case to interpret the implicated meaning. This strategy includes the use of metaphor, irony, rhetorical questions, understatement, tautologies, and all kinds of hints. For example, when you give hints you can say “it’s cold in here”, and the hearer can understand the implicated meaning which is “to close the window” (B & L, 1987, p. 211-226).

#### **1.4.4.5. Do not do the FTA:**

The fifth strategy of Brown and Levinson is “do not do the FTA”. However, in this strategy nothing is said, it is to remain silent and without doing any speech act. “The payoff for the fifth strategic choice, ‘do not do the FTA’, is simply that S avoids offending H at all with this particular FTA” (B&L, 1987, p. 72).

#### **1.4.5. Variables determining politeness strategies:**

Brown and Levinson stated that there are social variables that determine the kind of politeness strategies used by participants during the interaction. First, social distance (SD), it refers to the relationship between the interlocutors. If two people are very close they would have a low degree of SD, but two strangers would have a high degree of SD. Second, power(P), refers to the power relationship between two interlocutors, a person will find himself in three types of power relationship, namely equal power with the other interlocutor, more power, or less power. Third, rank of imposition (R), it refers to the importance and a difficulty of situation such as orders, and asking for a big favor (B&L, 1987, p.74). In addition there are other social variables such as age and gender that affect the selection of the appropriate politeness strategy.

### **1.4.6. Conclusion:**

As a conclusion, we can say that Brown and Levinson's model is considered as a major contribution on politeness research. So, in this chapter we have dealt with the theoretical part of the present research "politeness strategies in Relizane spoken Arabic", and in chapter two we will attempt to present a review of some previous studies that examine the notion of politeness in different languages.

### **2.1. Introduction:**

The major concern of this chapter is to mention other studies that have been conducted by other researchers. However, these studies tackle the linguistic politeness in several languages and even varieties of languages. This chapter is very important since it will help the reader to make a comparison between the use of politeness strategies in his/her culture and other cultures.

### **2.2. Politeness strategies in Arabic dialects:**

Many studies have been conducted to explore politeness phenomenon in Arabic dialects, Bouchara 2002, A-I Marrany 2010, Elhadjsaid 2011, Al- Hrahsheh 2012, and Bituna 2012, these are among many others were curious to shed light on linguistic politeness as used by Arabic people.

Al-Marrani (2010) conducted a study in order to investigate the various politeness strategies that native speakers of Yemeni Arabic use in making requests. After the analysis of the data the findings proved that: first, speakers of Yemeni Arabic in male-male interaction use direct strategy of request and this is due to the closeness between the people involved in the interaction. Second, speakers of Yemeni Arabic in male- female interaction use indirect strategies when make their requests and this is due to culture and religious values. Third, male speakers of Yemeni Arabic use direct strategies of request when address people having a lower position and this considered an example of positive politeness strategy. to sum up, this study proves that strategies of polite request differ from one culture to another, native

speakers of Yemeni Arabic use direct ways of request with softeners to mitigate or to make their request easy, and also this study proves that imperative form of request is not impolite in Yemeni Arabic as it is in English or in any other language.

The study of Bouchara (2002) aimed at the investigation of the reasons behind the use of Qur'anic verses and religious words by Moroccans in particular and Arabs in general in producing their speech acts. The researcher in this study took the speech act of greeting as a case study. However, the analysis of the data proved that: first, Moroccan people in particular and Arabs in general, greet each other in a polite way by the use of religious vocabulary. Second, the use of religious vocabulary as politeness strategy is a means to protect the self-image of both the speaker and the hearer in Moroccan culture. Third, Islam has a great influence on the way Moroccans and Arabs people communicate with each other, for instance, in most of Moroccan or Arab greetings one can find Qur'anic words and expressions such as [salamu 'aleik-um] which means in English "peace be upon you". Fourth, greeting among many other speech acts serves to establish relationships between individuals. Fifth, in intercultural communication the misuse of greeting expressions may create misunderstandings between people involved in the interaction. To conclude, this analysis namely the analysis of Moroccan greeting as a speech act gives the reader some information about the cultural values of Moroccan society.

Elhadj- said in (2011) in her magister theses investigated politeness strategies in requests in Elfhouli Speech Community which is an Algerian speech community. The researcher prepared five different situations and asked sixty participants to write down what they would say in each situation in their own dialect, at the end of this study Elhadj-said proved that people of Elfhouli speech community use indirect strategies and negative politeness when the social distance and the social power between the speaker and the hearer are very high, but when there is no social distance or power Elfhouli people use direct strategies and positive politeness.

Al-harashsh (2012) studied silence and politeness in Jordanian society, participants of this study were 24 university students (12 males and 12 females), he found out that Jordanian people use silence as a positive politeness strategy in order to show respect and to protect the face of the others during the interaction.

Bituna (2012) presented a paper which attempted to investigate politeness in the spoken Arabic of Baghdad. In order to collect an appropriate data Bituna gathered oral texts in spoken Arabic of Baghdad through various methods such as audio recordings of spontaneous conversations and hidden microphone, after collecting data the researcher

analyzed them by focusing just on two strategies which were PP and NP. The finding revealed that the speakers of Baghdad spoken Arabic used the plural instead of the singular for the first person in order to express positive politeness. Besides, people of Baghdad in their everyday interaction they give much more importance to the negative face of the speaker rather than to the positive face. At the end Baghdadi people prefer to use NP more than PP.

### **2.3. Politeness strategies in other languages:**

Not only in Arabic, but linguistic research also shed light on other languages in order to give a general idea to the reader about linguistic politeness.

Dogancay-Aktuna and Kamisli (1996) in their study “linguistic of power and politeness in Turkish: revelations from speech acts” investigated the production of the speech act of correction and disagreement in the classroom and in the work place. As a result, these two researchers found that Turkish people give more importance to the negative face of the hearer rather than to the positive one, and the context has a great influence on the way people choose their politeness strategies in Turkish society.

Esther Ofosua Totimeh and Lawrence Bosiwah (2015) conducted a study in order to investigate how native speakers of the Akyme Twi dialect of the Akan language of Ghana make polite request, and how social variables such as age and gender influence their way in making request. At the end the findings prove that the speakers of the Akyme prefer the indirect strategies of request, in addition age and gender have a great influence on the way speakers of the Akyme perform their polite request.

Félix-Brasdefer (2005) studied the notion of indirectness and politeness in Mexican requests, his findings proved that unlike Brown and Levenson’s claim (1987) indirectness in Mexican requests increases the degree of politeness and solidarity during the interaction between interlocutors

## **2.4. Comparison studies between other languages:**

There are a huge number of researchers who tried to conduct comparison studies about linguistic politeness, so it is important to mention few of them in this research.

Elsoufi Hamed (2014) studied the use of politeness and impoliteness strategies by British and Egyptian participants in sport talk shows. The data analyzed according to Brown and Levinson politeness theory. According to the analysis of the data both groups preferred to use positive politeness strategies and the two groups used few impoliteness strategies. Although there are similarities the two groups were quite different, Egyptian participants used more positive politeness strategies than British participants. The result showed that there is a high applicability of Brown and Levinson model to the Egyptians context of sports talk shows and the difference between the two groups in the use of PP and NP is due to cultural differences between the British and the Egyptians.

Al-Qahnani (2009) presented a study which aimed to investigate the difference in the female use of politeness strategies between spoken Saudi Arabic and spoken British English in the speech act of offering, at the same time, the researcher tested the applicability of Brown and Levinson's model of politeness to spoken Saudi Arabic. Al-Qahtani prepared 15 different situations to collect offers. The findings of this study revealed that speakers of Saudi Arabic adopt all the five politeness strategies of Brown and Levinson in their interaction. Unlike the power of the hearer, the social distance between the interlocutors had a great influence on the choice of politeness strategies in both groups. In addition, the gender of the speaker showed a significant impact on the use of politeness strategies in realizing offers in the Saudi female group but not in the British one. As a conclusion, this research manifested that there are significant differences between the Saudi Arabic and the British female speakers in the use of politeness strategies in expressing offers.

Salvesen(year) analyzed the various politeness strategies in requests made by Norwegian speakers and native speakers of English, in addition this study looked at whether the Norwegian learners of English transfer the politeness strategies from their first language to their second language. The findings confirmed that the native speakers of English used more indirect strategies of request than the Norwegian speakers, and according to Brown and Levinson the indirect form of request reduces the face threat and it is the most polite one

among the other strategies. Besides, the researcher found that the Norwegian speakers of English not all but in some situations of requests they transferred politeness strategies from their first language to English. Finally, according to this study it is clear that people can transfer politeness strategies from their first language to another language.

Sing Ting Cheung (2009) aimed to investigate the notion of politeness in two cultures, Chinese and American, these two cultures are very different as the researcher said, the Chinese culture is very conservative and the American one is very open. The Chinese use silence when they disagree with the others and this considered as an example of do not do the FTA strategy, the Chinese also damage their own faces in order to express politeness. American people use bald on record strategies without redressive actions in order to seek agreement with the others. The researcher observed that misunderstandings occurred when people from the two cultures communicated with each other and according to his analysis this was due to the difference in the cultural values and in the attitudes towards face.

## **2.5. Conclusion:**

To conclude with, all the above studies showed that the notion of linguistic politeness is very broad and complicated, and the way of showing politeness during the interaction between interlocutors differs from one society to another and also from one language to another.

## **3.1. Introduction:**

The third chapter of this research includes the analysis of the data obtained by the researcher, and the interpretation of the result. The case study is a variety of Algerian Arabic (AA), namely Relizane spoken Arabic (RA). However, the data was analyzed according to the model of Brown and Levinson of linguistic politeness.

### **3.2. Methodology:**

In this study observation is used as a tool of collecting research data. However, the researcher observed the linguistic behavior of Relizane speech community and he recorded the result of those observations.

Observation method is very helpful since it helps the researcher to gather appropriate data about spoken languages.

The observation process takes one month, the researcher guided his observations by the research question that is why he organized and planned his observations in a good way.

Data for this study was analyzed by using qualitative data analysis methods since the major aim of this research is to describe politeness phenomenon in an Algerian society, namely Relizane society.

### **3.3. The sample:**

In Algeria there are different regions speak different varieties of the same language which is (A A). the sample of this study consists of people who speak Relizane dialect which is a variety of Algerian dialect. Relizane is an Algerian province (Wilaya) which is located in the west of Algeria.

### **3.4. Data collection:**

In this chapter we collect examples and we intend to categorize the range of politeness strategies (bald-on record, positive politeness, negative politeness, off-record politeness) used by speakers of Relizane Spoken Arabic in certain situations, relying on the model proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) as a basis.

#### **\*Bald- on record:**

1-[Mohammed, ro:h' lalh'ano:t shri lh'li:b] محمد روح للحنوت شري الحليب

-mohammed, go to grocery and buy milk.

2-[madi:l: kas h'li:b ] مديلي كاس حليب

- give me a cup of milk.

3- [ salafli: lot'o:k rani: masth'aqha ] سلفلي لوطوك راني مستحقها

-lend me your car, I need it.

**\* Positive politeness:**

1-[ raki: dajra kalwarda ] راكي دايرة كالوردة

-you are like a flower.

2-[3andak alsah' lmra lazam takhdam fi had alwaqt] عندك الصح المرا لازم تخدم في هاد الوقت

-you are right, working is necessary for women nowadays.

3-[roptak shaba baza:f] روبيتك شاب بزاف

-your dress is so beautiful.

**\*Negative politeness:**

1-[ra:h' al h'a:l, khalina nro:h'o] راح الحال خلينا نرحو

-the time is up, let's go.

2-[ma3li:sh tkhabrini: shh'al rahi al sa3a] معليش تخبريني شحال راهي الساعة

-Could you tell me the time?

3-[ smah'li, ida qalaqtak, ma3lish th'al altaqa ] سمحلي ادا قلتك معليش تحل التافة

-I'm sorry to bother you, could you open the window?

**\*Off record politeness:**

1-[dari: mahish b3i: da] داري مهيش بعيدة

-My house is not very far.

2-[ja rabi : nsi:t drahmi, ma3andi:sh bash nkhalas] يا ربي نسيت دراهي ما عنديش باش نخلص

-Oh my God, I forgot my money; I do not have enough to pay.

### **3.5. Analysis of the data collection:**

People of Relizane try to:

Adopt bald on record strategy in the following cases: first, when they address young people, the example of a woman asking a boy in order to buy milk, second, a brother to his sister asking her for giving a cup of milk.

Show a great importance to H's wants, desires, and goods, for instance, a girl to her friend 'your dress is so beautiful', here the girl shows an interest to the appearance of her friend.

Exaggerate in describing others. However, people try to exaggerate what is new and nice for them, for example, a woman to her daughter 'you are like a flower'.

To seek agreements when they communicate with others by raising safe topics, safe topics give the opportunity to H in order to agree with the other interlocutor, as an illustration, 'you are right, working is necessary for women nowadays'.

Protect the negative face of H by including both Sand H in the activity, for example, two strangers have the same direction, waiting for the bus, one of them said 'the time is up, let's go'.

Adopt another strategy in order to maintain the negative face of their interlocutors, which is apologizing. Apologize allows the speaker to have the impression that he is treated in a polite way, for instance, a woman to a strange man sitting in the bus, she said 'I am sorry to bother you, could you open the window?'

Another strategy of doing negative politeness is by using questions and hedge, hedge is "a linguistic expression that enables the speaker to avoid being too direct in her/his utterance" (Watts, 2003, p.274). For example, the use of question as an indirect request 'could you tell me the time?'

Another politeness strategy in Relizane speech community is off record politeness, people choose to go off record indirectly by using hints in their speech, "hint is to say something that is not explicitly relevant, it invites H to search for an interpretation of the possible relevance" (B&L. 1987, P. 213). The observed situation consists of two women, they went together in order to buy goods, one of them forgot her money she said 'oh my God, I

forgot my money, I do not have enough to pay', in this case the women preferred to speak indirectly by giving hints.

There is also another strategy to speak off record indirectly, which is giving association clues, this strategy is realized by mentioning something associated with the act, for instance, a girl to her classmate in the high school, she said 'my house is not very far' instead of saying 'you can visit me', in this situation off record is adopted, since the social distance between classmates is not close with comparison between friends.

### **3.6. Interpretation of the result:**

The findings of this study analyzed according to Brown and Levinson's politeness theory. However, the result showed that:

Age is considered as a crucial social variable in the realization of politeness strategies among members of Relizane speech community; a person age may be an important factor which affects the selection of the appropriate politeness strategy.

People of Relizane show a great importance and respect to the positive face of their interlocutor, so that; they adopt a lot of PP strategies in their interactions.

In Relizane society, speakers also try to protect the negative face of H, that is why they use NP strategies in order to make H feel comfortable and without being imposed.

Bald on record strategies used between close friends and family members such as sisters and brothers.

In the social culture of Relizane, asking someone for money is considered as a difficult situation, for this reason the speaker has to adopt the appropriate politeness strategy.

In Relizane traditions, speakers have to be more polite in male-female, or female-male interactions.

### **3.7. Limitation of the study:**

Although this study provides useful findings about politeness strategies used in Relizane speech community, some limitations exist. However, several researchers noticed that there are some limitations correlate with the use of observation as a tool of collecting data. First, the age and the gender may affect the researcher wants to observe. Second, many events are not open to observation.

### **3.8. Recommendations and suggestions:**

In the light of this study and its significance, the following is recommended for future research in linguistic politeness in general:

\*although the topic of linguistic politeness is widely studied nowadays, there are many other issues related to it that have not been studied yet

\*Tools used in gathering the data are very important in any study, especially when the topic is related to language use. That is why; researchers in this field should always choose the appropriate tool that helps them to collect data in a good way. I would like to recommend all researchers who study topics related to language use to focus on observation as a tool of collecting data.

### **3.8. Conclusion:**

In this chapter, the notion of linguistic politeness among speakers of Relizane speech community was examined. This chapter is based on Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies. It was found that speakers of Relizane Arabic adopt all the five politeness strategies as proposed by Brown and Levinson 1987.

### **General conclusion**

This study examines the notion of politeness strategies among Algerian speakers, in particular speakers of Relizane speech community, in this study three questions are raised but at the end the result answers all the three questions.

According to the findings of this study, as an answer to the first question, one can find several similarities between Brown and Levinson work and politeness strategies adopted in the Algerian context or in specific in Relizane speech community.

Age and gender also play important roles in the performance of requests. Indirectness is used to address old people due to the respect, and directness is used by old people to interact with the young ones.

To end with, this study remains incomplete and limited since the data obtained are very few, but this study will make the reader eager to conduct another research in order to investigate the way speakers of Relizane dialect use their language to show respect to the others.

## References:

### Books:

Brown, P, & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. New York .Oxford University press.

Pandey, R. (2008).*speech act and linguistic communication*. New Delhi. Ashok Kumar mittal.

Watts, J. (2003).*politeness: key topics in sociolinguistics*. Cambridge. Cambridge University press.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. New York. Oxford University press.

Widdowson, H. G. (2007). *Discourse analysis*. New York. Oxford university press.

### Theses:

Al-Qahtani, H. (2009). *Female use of politeness strategies in the speech act of offering: Aconstrastive study between spoken Saudi Arabic and spoken British English* (Magister's theses,king saudi university). Retrieved

from

[repository.ksu.edu.sa/jspui/.../Female%20Use%20of%20Politeness%20Strategies.pdf](http://repository.ksu.edu.sa/jspui/.../Female%20Use%20of%20Politeness%20Strategies.pdf)

*Belaskri, K. (2012). Asociolinguistic study of communication and language barriers in Algeria health care settings (Magister's these university of Mascara)*  
retrieved from

<http://dspace.univ-tlemcen.dz/handle/112/3540>

*Elhadj-Said, N. (2011). Politeness strategies in requests: the case of Elfhoul speech community (Master's theses. University of Telemcen).* Retrieved from

<http://dspace.univ-tlemcen.dz/handle/112/3637>

*Eshreteh, K. (2013). Across- cultural sociopragmatic study of invitation in Palastinian Arabic and American English (Master's theses Madrid university)* retrived from

[www1.cs.columbia.edu/nlp/papers/2008/fadi\\_al\\_08b.pdf](http://www1.cs.columbia.edu/nlp/papers/2008/fadi_al_08b.pdf)

*Fizzioui, F.(2013). Sociolinguistic variation in the speech community of Béchar(Magister's thesis. University of Oran )* retrieved from

[theses.univ-oran1.dz/document/TH4250.pdf](http://theses.univ-oran1.dz/document/TH4250.pdf)

*Journals and articles:*

*Aktuna, D&K, S. (1996). Linguistic of power and politeness in Turkish: revelations from speech acts. Educational research and improvement.* Retrieved from

[files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED402732.pdf](http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED402732.pdf)

*Al-Harahsheh, A, M. (2012). Silence and politeness in Jordanian society. Arab world English journal, 3(3), 246-269.* Retrieved from

[www. Awej.org](http://www.Awej.org)

*Al-Marrani, Y, A. (2010). Polite request by male speakers of Yemeni Arabic in male-male interaction and male –female interaction. The international journal of language society and culture,/(30) 63-80.* Retrieved from

[www.educ.utas.edu.au/users/tle/JOURNAL/](http://www.educ.utas.edu.au/users/tle/JOURNAL/)

*Bouchara, A. (2002). The role of religion in shaping politeness in Moroccan Arabic: the case of the speech act of greeting and its place in intercultural understanding and*

misunderstanding. *Journal of politeness research*, 11(1) 11-27.

Retrieved from

[Www.gigapaper.ir/.../the%20role%20of%20religion%20in%20sha](http://www.gigapaper.ir/.../the%20role%20of%20religion%20in%20sha). Pdf

*Brasdefer, F. (2005). Indirectness and politeness in Mexican request. cascadilla Proceedings Project.7, 66-78.*

Retrieved from

[www.lingref.com/cpp/hls/7/paper1087.pdf](http://www.lingref.com/cpp/hls/7/paper1087.pdf)

Salvesen, K. E. (2015). Politeness strategies in requests by Norwegian learners of English in comparison with native speakers of English. *Hawaii Pacific University TESOL Working Paper Series* 13, 53-69. Retrieved from

<http://www.hpu.edu>