Discourse strategies: politeness
Role of social relationships: linguistic interaction = social interaction
interaction parameters:
  a.) interaction-external parameters: relative status of participants,
age, power relationship etc.)
b.) interaction-internal parameters: amount of imposition, degree of
friendliness (cf. distance-change in address)
Politeness: possible to treat it as fixed concept + general principles
  • more narrow definition: politeness in discourse, \( \Rightarrow \) “face”
Face: public self-image of a person, emotional and social sense
of self
  • socially distant awareness: respect, deference, acknowledging that
other person is independent
  • socially close awareness: friendliness, solidarity
Example: asking either a teacher or a friend if he/she has time

Discourse strategies: face
Face wants:
  • face threatening act: violates expectations regarding self-image
  • face saving act: action to diminish threat
Negative and positive face:
  • negative face = the need to be independent
  • positive face = the need to have freedom of action
Negative politeness:
  • face-saving act towards the negative face
  \( \Rightarrow \) usually an apology or sign of respect
Positive politeness:
  • face-saving of positive face (= showing solidarity)
  \( \Rightarrow \) recognizing other’s needs when they appear to have a problem

Discourse strategies: floor and turns
Floor: “the right to speak”, who controls the floor has the turn
  • turn-taking \( \Rightarrow \) attempts to switch control
  • change-of-turn points in discourse: Transition Relevance Place
TRP features: speakers
  1. cooperate or
  2. fight for floor
Pauses:
  • enable elegant transition of turns
  • long pauses: 1st speaker hands over turn, 2nd speaker: silent
  • short pauses
  \( \Rightarrow \) overlaps
Overlaps:
  • occur often initially (both speakers start
  • shared rhythm mismatch: repeated start-overlap-stop pattern
  • younger speakers: permanent overlap signals closeness
A: \<rummages in bag>\nB: Here, take my pencil!

Discourse strategies: conversational style
Two major types of conversational style:
1. high involvement style: active talk, almost no breaks, some overlap
2. high considerateness style: slower rate, longer pauses, no overlap,
   no interruption
Adjacency pairs: idiomatized structure patterns in discourse
A: How are you?  B: Fine!
  • always have first and second part;
  • first part always creates expectation of second part
  • missing second part: is therefore meaningful
Adjacency pair examples: A: Can you help?
B: Sure!

Adjacency pairs: preference
Preference structure: acceptance as second adjacency part is
more likely than refusal \( \Rightarrow \) therefore “preference”
• pattern is socially determined (cf. Levinson)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st part</th>
<th>2nd part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>preferred</td>
<td>dispreferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invitation</td>
<td>accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offer</td>
<td>agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proposal</td>
<td>accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>request</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Function of silence: speaker A can revise 1st part or disagree
A: I really liked her latest novel!
B: \<silence>\nA: Well, some parts were a bit contrived, though

Adjacency pairs: dispreference
Refusal: dispreferred, can be expressed without saying no
A: Come over!  B: I’d love to but...
  \( \Rightarrow \) shows appreciation of the first part

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dispreference types (cf. Yule)</th>
<th>forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>delay</td>
<td>&lt;pause&gt;, ahem…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preface</td>
<td>well, oh…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doubt</td>
<td>I'm not sure…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>token you</td>
<td>I'd love to but…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apology</td>
<td>I'm sorry…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other obligation</td>
<td>I actually have to do X you see…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appeal for understanding</td>
<td>everybody else…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make it non-personal</td>
<td>too much work, no time…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give account</td>
<td>really, really, sort of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mitigators</td>
<td>I guess not…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \Rightarrow \) more time/language used for dispreference than for preference
• preference expresses proximity
• dispreference expresses distance, therefore it is more negotiated