



Politeness as Performance – The Functions of *Mbôk* and *Áák* in Ibibio

Juliet Charles Udoudom

English Department, University of Uyo, Nigeria

E-mail: drjulietudoudom@yahoo.com.

07029600758

ABSTRACT

Linguistic politeness as enunciated within the framework of Brown and Levinson's (1978, 1987) work proposes that utterances are either polite or impolite, and that linguistic resources serve to "encode" politeness. This paper adopts the Rational Actor model of politeness which focuses on participants' goals and motivation during interactions. It examines the functions of two Ibibio politeness forms, **mbôk** and **áák** in ten naturally occurring interactive sessions. This is with a view to demonstrating that in some social and cultural contexts politeness may encompass dimensions which extend beyond positive or negative face threats. The findings indicate that in Ibibio society the politeness form **mbôk** tends to be employed in informal contexts, while the form **áák** described by Essien (1990, p.174) as a form of polite request appears to be used strategically, deployed for the preferred outcome which it can secure. The paper concludes that the choice of certain politeness forms in some socio-cultural contexts may be strategically determined by the outcome which such choice are anticipated to secure for the individual interactant.

INTRODUCTION

The past twenty years have witnessed a large body of politeness research which has focused on Brown and Levinson's (1978, 1987) politeness theory. While some of this research has tended to follow Brown and Levinson's (1978, 1987) classification of politeness into two neat dichotomies of polite and impolite, some of the work in politeness research has sought to extend the theoretical frontiers and understanding of politeness as a linguistic performance. Thus, more recent and broader theoretical frames have evolved

Politeness As Performance – the Functions of Mbôk And Áák in Ibibio

(like the rational actor model, the social constructionist theory, the speech act theory, etc), which have examined linguistic politeness as a sociolinguistic construct and a culturally specific phenomenon, which varies across cultures and varies from one social context to another.

The rational actor model (the model adopted in this paper) proposes that interactants are sentient language users (henceforth LU); therefore, rather than passively observe existing social norms, they strategically select from a set of linguistic options (a form or combination of forms)/ linguistic resources in order to secure a desired outcome (Cook 2006, Schegloff 1991, Ochs 1993). In this view speech-shifts are permissible and are determined in large part by the desired goals of the speaker. Although every society has pre-prescribed norms governing social interactions and relationships, and speakers possess tacit knowledge of these social norms, however, they also possess both ability and agency to choose which form is appropriate for which context. In the process of executing a desired outcome, language is viewed and employed as a tool available to members of a particular society for eliciting preferred outcomes and controlling the actions of others. (See Searle, 1969).

A cover linguistic label which encodes politeness in all social contexts is rare, and different socio-cultural contexts have different politeness forms and strategies which are determined by the operative culture in the society in question. In some society, politeness forms and strategies are linguistic, in some others, for example, Yoruba society in Nigeria, they are both linguistic and non linguistic (gestural). Take the linguistic form “please” that indexes politeness in English, for example; this may be used in various contexts generally without strategic politeness implications. The pragmatic functions of the word “please” as a politeness marker may constitute plain polite behaviour together with other dimensions of social and cultural contexts (House, 1989), but it may also index superior authority without any politeness implications as when it is used sentence finally in issuing directives to subordinate officers by superior officers in work places. In other words, since speakers have tacit knowledge regarding how utterances are interpreted in given socio-cultural contexts, they choose specific politeness form(s) – linguistic and/or nonlinguistic – to accomplish communicative goals.

In what follows, I examine speech – style shifts in oral discourse/interaction among LUs in formal and informal sociolinguistic contexts in Ibibio society. In this way, I attempt to demonstrate that politeness may not always be demarcated into the neat dichotomy of polite and impolite but that there are gradations existing within each type. I also attempt to demonstrate that the dichotomy between the two types of politeness – discernment and volition – often associated with Japanese and Western societies respectively may not always obtain in Ibibio society. The analysis and the discussion of data show that interactants rationally select and utilize linguistic forms as resources for securing desired outcomes. The social contexts of formal and informal sequential/organizational talk is appropriate

for this study because they typify the social contexts in which the different gradations of politeness may be demonstrated. I will illustrate that polite behaviour in some social contexts is a well-calculated set of acts and activities performed to accomplish preferred outcomes.

Linguistic Politeness as Performance

In linguistic circles, it is a generally acceptable fact that language is constituted in two dimensions namely, *Competence* and *performance: knowledge* and *use*. In this view, a language does not comprise only in its sound system, vocabulary, its rhythms in speech and writing but pragmatically in “the attitudes it inspires” in the users and sociolinguistically, in the communicative goals it is deployed to achieve Ikiddeh (2005, p. 393). Chomsky (1965, p.4) considers linguistic performance to be “the actual use of language in concrete situations”. Linguistic performance may, therefore be thought of as the selection and utilization of relevant structural aspects of a language in executing communication and discourse events. Ikiddeh (2005, p. 393) asserts that “language may be basically biological, but its major modes of operation are functionally social” (p 393).

Performance as construed in this paper describes the types of “action” which a speaker /LU does in appropriate contexts using language. Language users may use utterances to perform the following linguistic “action”: requesting, commanding, questioning or informing. In the relevant literature, the term “speech act” is regularly used to describe those actions which are capable of being performed within the proximity of language. Of the four broad speech act types mentioned above, politeness may be located within “requesting”. Linguistic politeness is a type of “action” which requires the use of language for a successful execution of a discourse event given that certain linguistic devices encode politeness even though indexing polite behaviour is determined by socially definable variables like age, status, power and gender.

Ideas about what constitutes the appropriate markers of politeness differ substantially from one culture to another, as there is no one-to-one correspondence between a linguistic form and social meaning. In this regard, Yule (2007) draws attention to cultural determinants of how linguistic forms could be interpreted. According to Yule, some cultures value indirectness and avoidance of imposition. In such cultures, linguistic forms as “Are you using this”, “will you stay for dinner?” are considered polite utterances, while in other cultures that are more oriented to directness as an acceptable way of showing solidarity utterances such as “Give me that chair” or “stay for dinner!” constitute polite behaviour. Also politeness in East Asian languages show differences in culturally determined social meaning. For example, Ide (1989), Ide and Yoshida (1999), Mao (1994) and Matsumoto (1988, 1989) differentiate between two broad types of politeness – discernment and volition. In their view, discernment and volition characterize polite behaviour in East Asian (Japanese) and Western societies respectively. According to

Politeness As Performance – the Functions of Mbòk And Áák in Ibibio

Ide and Yoshida (1999) in Japanese society, politeness through discernment is essential whereas in Western society the volitional use of politeness (strategic politeness based on face needs) is predominant. Indeed, there is no direct correspondence between a linguistic form and social meaning.

Cook (2006, p. 270) argues that “most linguistic forms have a broad indexical scope”. This point may be illustrated with linguistic forms generally considered to be markers of the female gender. Tag questions, for example, are widely believed to index the female gender but they are known to be used also by men. In Yoruba society (Nigeria) polite behaviour is marked both linguistically and non- linguistically by use of addressee honorifics as well as gestures. Yoruba addressee honorifics is indicated by affixing /e-/ to the relevant base, for example, *é-jòò/jòò* “please” (where the first form “*é-jòò*” is directed at an older/higher status interactant). But by contrast, interactants in Ibibio society express politeness only linguistically, however, without the use of morphologically marked honorifics. Ibibio politeness forms are *mbòk*: “please” and *áák*, “I entreat you” and they constitute gradations within the politeness system of Ibibio society with which interactants perform specific acts on the basis of the personal assessment of context variables relative to the act in question.

Data

The data analyzed and discussed in this study came from naturally occurring interactions (NOIs) obtained during speech events in rural Ibibio society in the South-South geo-political zone of Nigeria. Ibibio society covers fourteen Local Government Areas in Akwa Ibom State where Ibibio language is spoken. Ten sessions of different speech events were recorded and classified into two broad categories of language use – Formal and informal speech events.

In the context of this study, formal speech events are those in which the social boundaries definable by status, age, power and gender are somewhat rigid and non- permeable. The traditional court sessions, sessions where land disputes are resolved and sessions involving the resolution of family crises (between spouses or siblings, etc), constitute formal social speech events. Also classed among formal speech events are marriage ceremonies, village meetings, family meetings and social gatherings. Informal speech events, on the other hand, comprise filial talk, that is, conversation among siblings, members of a family or requests made by members of a family to older/younger siblings and to neighbours. The duration of each session varied from session to session, and the entire sessions were audio-recorded and later transcribed. To preserve the naturalness of the interactions, the recordings were done without the interactants being aware.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

The data reveal that among the many politeness forms which exist in Ibibio society, the form *mbòk*: “please” is considered informal and *áák*, “please” is considered to be a more formal index of politeness. The form *mbòk*: “please” has a more frequency of occurrence than *áák*; however, the data further reveal that *áák* “please” is multifunctional, indexing different social identities and expectations or norms of appropriateness.

Naturally Occurring Interactions A: Filial Talk

1. (a) Bèn àfòń mími nsòk
Bring me my cloth
- (b) Bro; mbòk sè ànyè mi
Brother, please here it is
2. (a) Bro, mbòk kú-frè à-di –ńnò akak úfòk ñwèd-ò
Bro, please don't forget to give me school fees
- (b) mbòk kú-m-fínà mìn
Please, stop bothering me

Naturally Occurring Interactions B: Interaction between two neighbours – A and B.

3. (a) NA: Mmà mbòk nò àyín mífò itèm
Mother, please counsel your child
- (b) NB: áák, Brò; mbòk kú-ùyád ésíd
I entreat you, Bro, please do not be angry.

Naturally Occurring Interactions C: Interaction between husband and wife.

4. (a) Ímá, mbòk yèm mkpò nnò n-díà
My love, please find me something to eat
- (b) Èbé áák ùdíá íbíódtó díòn
My husband, I entreat you, the food is not yet ready

Naturally Occurring Interactions D: Formal Speech Events – Interaction between alleged offenders and members of a traditional jury.

5. (a) JS: Àtáá ákpàn ndùdùè ádó mì, à-yáá á-kpé ísóp
This is a very serious offence, you will be penalized.
- (b) Áák, mímè dúè, mbòk ikí-mbọọ ísóp
I entreat you, I am guilty, please do not exact a penalty
6. (a) Áák, Oboon m-mí, n-túa mìn mbom
I entreat you, my lord, please have mercy on me

Politeness As Performance – the Functions of Mbôk And Áák in Ibibio

7. (a). Dà ówò, òták àfò à-síkké ádáńá íkòd à-dò-ó?
Young man, why did you adjust the boundary of that land?
(b). Ñkí-síkké ádáńá íkòd, áák mmè ètè mmì
I did not adjust the boundary, áák: I entreat you, my fathers.
8. (a). Àfò à kè bó díé mímá á-mì?
What did you say to this woman?
(b). Ñkè bò yàk ànyè ákpémè ìkpàd ísàń ámò
I told her to be mindful/careful of her footsteps.
(c). Àfò à ké kòdò ànyè àkpàrà, à mmèdíòñò ké à-yáá àyéd ànyé ídém?
You called her a prostitute, are you aware that you will be asked to cleanse her?
(d). Áák, mmè mbòñ idlń ñnyin mbòk ì-féén ì-nnò ké mmé dúè, Ñ-yáá kpé ènyé úbòk.
I entreat you, our village leaders, please forgive me, I've wronged her. I shall apologize to her.

Naturally Occurring Interactions E: Interaction between spokespersons at a traditional marriage ceremony.

- 9 (a). Mbòn Ikòt Àkàn, èdí sóó kè àtlń ámì?
People from Ikot Àkàn what do you want in this compound?
SS: Mmè úkòd ñyín, íyèm ídí ídò úyàiyà àyin òwòńwààn mífò kèèd kè úfòk mífò.
Our in-laws, we have come to marry one of your beautiful daughters.
BS: Ùsòñ-ènyèn! Ànié ádó úkòd yè mbùfò?
Insult! Who are your in-laws?
(b). Ákè àyin ñnyín kè mbúfò èdò?
Which of our daughters have you married?
SS: (Sensing that he has stepped out of turn in his utterance) responds
(e). Áák, mbón Ikot Ibanga, úbòk kè ísòñ-ó, mbòk, ìkíyád ésít; mímé dúè íkò
People from Ikot Ibanga, I entreat you, (my) hands are on the ground, (gesturing appropriately) do not be angry, I have erred in my speech.

Naturally Occurring Interactions F: Interaction between attendees at a village meeting.

- 10 (a). 1st Speaker: Ikò Ikot Effiong ádò àkpènà ñyín íkí nèèńé ádáńá

- About Effiong's piece of land is that we should set the boundaries.
- (b). 2nd Speaker: *Áák yàk é-ké nèèñé éno-ò mbòk*
Áák: "I entreat you" let the boundaries be set, please.

DISCUSSION

An analysis of the Naturally Occurring Interactions (NOIs) data indicates that *mbòk* has a more frequency of occurrence than *áák*: "I entreat you"; however, it would be observed that the *áák* form is multifunctional, indexing different social identities and expectations or norms of appropriateness.

The Functions of *mbòk* and *áák* in Informal Speech Events

The data in (Ib), (2a) (4a) and (5a) conform to the notion of social norm or what Cook (2006, p. 276) described as 'discernment'. The exchanges in these data sets are carried out in reciprocal *mbòk* form between higher status/older interactants (UTT(0)) and the lower status/younger interactants (UTT(Y)). The exchanges here may be classified as informal speech event performed in informal talk sessions where the use of *mbòk* does not only index the speaker's hierarchical relationship to the addressee, but also indicates the acknowledgement of his/her sense of place toward the addressee/referent, who in each case cited above is older or of a higher status than the speaker.

In (Ia) an older sibling asks a younger sibling to get him his cloth. In line (2), the younger sibling complies with the order by performing two kinds of action: the physical act of bringing the cloth and the linguistic act of signaling his compliance by using the plain/informal politeness form, *mbòk*. It would be observed from the exchanges that while the older sibling can use a direct speech act to talk to the younger sibling, the addressee does not reciprocate by saying "*sè ányè mí*: "Here it is". Rather, as a rational actor who has tacit understanding of the meaning of social acts in the culture in which he performs and who acknowledges his socially lower status in relation to the older sibling, the younger sibling injects *mbòk* into his utterance to show politeness to the older sibling. This contrasts with what obtains in western society where the direct speech act indexes solidarity between interactants (Yule 2007). In Ibibio socio-cultural context, the use of the direct speech in line (1) by the older sibling (a higher status addressee) is not intended to show solidarity, it is to be interpreted as an order issued to a lower status addressee/referent. Moreover, in line (2) the younger sibling's utterance contains a form of addressee honorific in sentence initial position. Thus, the form "Bró." (short for brother) is the honorific which linguistically marks both a filial and a hierarchical relationship.

Politeness As Performance – the Functions of Mbôk And Áák in Ibibio

In the case of (b), the older sibling's utterance "mbôk", kû-mfina mièn: "please, stop bothering me" contains the Ibibio informal politeness form, mbôk. The initial segment of this utterance overlaps with the younger sibling's utterance "Brò, mbôk kú-ùfrè à-dí ñno àkàk úfok-ñwèd - o". This shift in speech style contradicts the predictions made about the concept of mbôk in Ibibio society. Here, the elder sibling's use of mbôk does not index politeness to the younger sibling, who is socially lower in status, but is rather a resource for indicating avoidance of commitment or for shunning himself from the speaker. It may also serve to express what Maynard (1989, p. 179) refers to as "internal thought self-reflection", somewhat like talking to oneself.

In example (3), both neighbours A and B use the informal *mbôk* form in lines (3a) and (3b). In line (3a) neighbour A's use of *mbôk* indexes polite/appropriate performance in the social act being performed because he is the lower status/younger interactant; thus, even though he is the offended seeking redress he rationally selects *mbôk* as an appropriate resource to linguistically mark a hierarchical relationship. Moreover, the syntactic realization of neighbour A's request move is performed using the imperative mould. Imperatives are generally considered to constitute less polite/mitigated linguistic resource for expressing a polite request. As a rational actor the requester's (neighbour A's) use of *mbôk* is a resource to index his stance and social relationship toward the addressee/referent (neighbour B, who is older).

In line (3b) the addressee/referent reciprocates NA's plain/polite form, *mbôk*, but uses the formal polite form *áák* in sentence initial position as a mitigator and as a linguistic resource to a face-threatening act (FTA). The older interactant may shift to the formal polite form but such a shift does not mean that the older interactant is avoiding a hierarchical relationship. The use of the formal *áák* form by the older interactant in this exchange illustrates that there are multiple functions associated with it in Ibibio society.

In this interaction line (3a) contains the younger interactant's complaint. In line (3c) he expands his complaint by stating the offence committed against him, and threatens some action against the offender. The older interactant's use of the formal *áák* form in sentence initial position in line (3b) does not index politeness to a younger or lower status addressee. It is to be interpreted as an active and rational choice made to forestall the outcome of the younger interactant's threatened action against her child. Even though this speech event may be classified as informal, however, the use of the formal *áák* form alongside the *mbôk* form in the same utterance by the same speaker demonstrates the gradations which exist within the Ibibio politeness system. The use of *áák* illustrates the multifunctions associated with the politeness form and demonstrates that politeness in Ibibio society may be viewed as a social act which results from an actor's personal assessment of context variables in relation to the social act s/he plans to perform.

The exchange in (4) is also classified under informal speech event. In (4a) the husband requests his wife to serve him food. The use of the plain

mbòk from neither marks politeness since in Ibibio society (as in most African societies) the husband is generally older considered more powerful and of a higher status than the wife, nor does it show the husband's solidarity with the wife. The husband's use of *mbòk* may be interpreted as a strategy for urging the addressee/referent to carry out a request. In Ibibio society one gradation of polite behaviour is urging, expressible using the plain polite form, *mbòk*, but sometimes also *áák*. In (4b) using the *áák* form the wife states a negative proposition indicating that her husband's request was not likely to be granted (at least, not immediately). It would be observed that as a rational actor, the speaker positions the politeness form *áák* sentence initially. Essien (1990) describes Ibibio as an SVO language which sentences have (pro) nominal elements occurring regularly in sentence – initial position in the canonical word order. But as is apparent, *áák* is not a (pro) nominal element, therefore it cannot function as the subject of the verb in the utterance under analysis. The speaker's decision to place it sentence initially is not only grammatically regular but also expected in terms of discourse organization (i.e. in terms of foregrounding and backgrounding information (see Cook, 2006). Thus, in (4b) the wife foregrounds her pleas by prefacing her explanation with *áák* as a display of strategic politeness to her husband.

The Functions of *mbòk* and *áák* in Formal Speech Events

Natural Occurring Interactions in this segment are classified as Formal speech events discussed in (1)-(4) where more speech – style shifts occurred in interactants' use of the plain *mbòk* and the formal *áák* forms. By contrast in (5) – (10) we find that interactants' choices in the selection and use of politeness forms are not as fluid as they were in informal speech contexts. In (5), (6), (8), (9) and (10), the utterances of the lower status interactants have a similar syntactic structure whereby *áák* prefaces the sentences. This feature in the data sets under discussion is analyzable in terms of syntactic structure and in terms of discourse organization.

In (5a), the utterance is the verdict of the traditional village jury pronounced by the spokesperson in which he states, àtàà àkpàh ñdúduè a dom mí à-yàà-kpè ísóp: "This is a very serious offence, you will pay a penalty". The speaker uses a direct speech act to define the relationship between the traditional jury which he represents and the addressee unlike what obtains in Western society where this resource would indicate solidarity between the interactants, in Ibibio society – where this study is based – members of a traditional jury are mostly elderly men and are considered higher status interactional partners. The relationship between them and those brought before them is a hierarchical one.

The addressee's turn in (5b) reflects both the formal context of language use as well as institutional hierarchy. His status is singly indexed by his use of the *áák* form which he employs as a rational actor not only to accomplish a communicative goal, but to secure a preferred outcome in the discourse event. This is achieved by his adoption of the *áák* form and by positioning it where

Politeness As Performance – the Functions of Mbôk And Áák in Ibibio

it receives primary attention. Even though he admits his fault, this information is put in the background relative to the plea for mercy hence: *Áák mmé-dúè; mbôk ì-kí-ìmbó ísóp*: “*áák*, I entreat you, I have faulted *mbôk* (please) don’t demand a penalty”.

In (6), *Áák*, *Ọbọñ mmì ntúá míèn mbòm*: “I entreat you my Lord, have mercy on me”, has similar grammatical structure and discourse organization with (5), (8d) and (10). In each of these data sets *áák* is positioned sentence – initially as a resource for foregrounding the information on the plea for mercy. These are demonstrable evidences that interactants in Ibibio society are actors with agency, consequently, they do not passively implement a priori given sociolinguistic norms but strategically employ both linguistic and non- linguistic resources like sentence structure, the principles of discourse organization...and so on in performing linguistic politeness and in constructing desired outcomes.

The data in (9e) is particularly illustrative of the agency with which interactional partners in Ibibio society are endowed. The constellation of politeness forms in SS’s response, *Áák mbôn Ikot Ibanga, úbók kè ísòñ - o, mbôk ì-kí-yád ésí; mmé-dúè íkọ*. “*Áák* people from Ikot Ibanga, I entreat you, (my) hands are on the ground...please, don’t be angry, I have erred in my speech” shows that the speaker knows what strategies of politeness to employ and knows how to organize them to achieve the desired outcome (Wardough 2006). The politeness strategies in SS’s utterance are both linguistic and non- linguistic – *áák* and *mbôk* are linguistic while the act of placing one’s hands on the ground or floor is non- linguistic. The constellation of politeness forms in a single utterance singly indexes a steep institutional hierarchy between a prospective son-in-law and his prospective father-in-law, a relationship that is regarded very highly in Ibibio society.

CONCLUSION

Overall, this paper examines how interactants in Ibibio society achieve preferred outcomes in different social contexts and the resources they employ in achieving these communicative goals. In this discussion we showed that interactants are rational actors in the social situations in which they are participants and they adopt politeness forms which are best suited not only to the social situation at hand but which are best suited to securing desired communicative goals.

By carefully examining naturally occurring data in different social contexts in Ibibio society, this paper re-analyses the use of *áák* as the speaker’s active rational choice and shows a variety of social situations in which this politeness form may be used. The paper has demonstrated that Brown and Levinson’s (1978) neat dichotomy of polite and impolite behaviour does not always obtain. For example, the paper has shown that

interatants do not always passively observe pre-prescribed rules of social interaction; rather, they make their choices in order to achieve intended communicative goals.

Abbreviations

NOI	-	Naturally Occurring Interaction
UTT (O)	-	Older Speaker's Utterance
UTT (Y)	-	Younger Speaker's Utterance
JS	-	Jury Spokesperson
NA	-	Neighbour A
NB	-	Neighbour B
SS	-	Suitor's Spokesperson
BS	-	Bride's Spokesperson
LU(s)	-	Language User(s)

REFERENCES

- Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson (1978). "Politeness: some universals in language usage". In Goody, E. (Ed.), *Questions and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 56 – 289.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen Levinson (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cook, Haruko (2006). "Japanese politeness as an interactional achievement: Academic Consultation sessions in Japanese Universities". In Richard J. Watts (Ed.) *Multilingua: Journal of cross-cultural and interlanguage communication*. Vol. 25 – 3; 269 – 291.
- Essien, Okon (1990). *A grammar of the Ibibio language*. Ibadan: University Press Ltd.
- House, Juliane (1989). "Politeness in English and German: the functions of please and bitte". In Shoshana Blum-Kulka, Juliane House, and Gabriele Kasper (Eds.), *Cross cultural Pragmatic: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex 1989. International English Language Testing System. At <http://www.ielts.org> Accessed October 13, 2009 at 11.08 am.
- Hudson, Rod, A. (1996). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: University Press.

Politeness As Performance – the Functions of Mbôk And Áák in Ibibio

- Ide, Sachiko (1989). “Formal forms and discernment: two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness”. *Multilingua*: 8 (2/3), 223 – 248.
- Ide, Sachiko and Megumi Yoshida (1999). “Sociolinguistics: Honorifics and gender differences”. In Natsuko Tsujimura (Ed.) *The handbook of Japanese linguistics*. Malden: Blackwell. 444- 480.
- Ikiddeh, Ime (2005). *Historic essays on African literature, language and culture*. Uyo: Robertminder International Ltd.
- Mao, LuMing (1994). Beyond politeness theory: ‘face’ revisited and renewed. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21, 451-486.
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko (1988). “Re-examination of the universality of face: politeness phenomena in Japanese”. *Journal of pragmatics* 12, 403-426.
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko (1989). “Politeness and conversational universals – observations from Japanese”. *Multilingua*, 8 (2/3), 207-221.
- Maynard, Senko (1989). “Pragmatics of discourse modality: A case of da and desul Masu forms in Japanese”. *Journal of pragmatics* 15, 551-582.
- Ochs, Elinor (1993). *Constructing social identity: A language socialization perspective*. *Research on language and social interaction*. 26(3), 287-306.
- Schegloff, Emmanuel (1991). “Reflections on talk and social Structure”. In Deirdre Boden and Don E. Zimmerman (Eds) *Talk and social structure: Studies in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 33-70.
- Searle, John R. (1975). *Indirect Speech Acts*. In Peter Cole and Jerry Morgan (Eds.) *Syntax and semantics: speech acts*. Vol. 3. New York: Academic Press, 59-82.
- Wardhaugh, R.(2006). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Yule, George (2007). *The study of language*. Cambridge: University Press.