



A Comparative Analysis of Politeness Strategies in the Genderlect of Americans and Pakistanis in English TV talk Shows

Tahir Shah^{a*}, Irfan Ullah^b, Haleema^c, Khalid^d

^{a,c}MPhil Scholar, Department of English, Abdul Wali Khan University, Mardan, Pakistan. ^bAssistant Professor. Department of English, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan, Pakistan. ^dLecturer, Department of English, University of Swabi, Pakistan.

*Email: tahir4ici@gmail.com

Abstract: The research aims to explore the differences in politeness strategies between Pakistani males and females, using English as their second language, and Native American males and females using English as their first language, specifically in the context of TV talk shows. The study investigates how politeness strategies vary based on gender, language proficiency, and cultural background, with a focus on positive and negative face-saving acts. The research methodology includes a quantitative analysis of twenty English-language TV talk shows from American and Pakistani channels, examining the politeness strategies used by hosts and guests of different genders. Findings of this study suggest that Pakistani speakers, especially males, tend to use more positive face-saving acts in interactions with females, while American speakers exhibit similar patterns but with variations based on cultural norms and language skills. Both cultures establish a preference for maintaining positive face and avoiding negative face-threatening acts, especially in cross gender interactions. The research study adds to what we already know about how language and gender are connected. It gives us new information about how people use politeness when they communicate with each other across different cultures. It also shows us how a person's language skills, their culture, and their gender all affect how they communicate with others. The results have implications for how we can make better communication between people from different languages and cultures.

Keywords: Politeness, Native & Second language, Culture, Face-saving, face-threatening

1. Introduction

It is important for a person to preserve both his or her own face and the faces of others with whom he or she is conversing. The face-work concept is that she or he attempts to avoid making face-threatening gestures (Goffman 1967). A Goffmanian view was used by Brown and Levinson, (1987) to argue that language use derives from facial assumptions, which are evident in the use of three types of politeness strategies: "positive modesty (the expression of solidarity), negative modesty (reserve), and off-record modesty (avoidance of unequivocal impositions) as well as claiming that the effectiveness of any method is dependent on social variables (1987). It indicates that the speaker's interest in the listeners dictates the usage of each tactic. It focuses on the speaker's expectations for the

responses of the people he or she is speaking with. To demonstrate respect for the addressee, the speaker prefers to express conduct that displays positive care for the addressee and retains his desire for independence, according to Locher (2004) this kind of conduct (utterance) may be considered courteous if the recipient understands the speaker's purpose. To the recipient's benefit, the speaker's desired action will be seen as courteous on their part. This shows that "no faceless communication" is possible.

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), there are four main strategy categories for face-threatening acts: bald on record, politeness methods (positive and negative), and off-record strategies. As the saying goes, "bald-on-record" just states the obvious. Respecting the listener's wishes and enjoying the speaker's message are examples of positive politeness (e.g., the expression of friendliness towards others). When practicing negative politeness, the speaker avoids insulting the other person by expressing respect (e.g., interrupting less, being less direct and using more hedges). Off-the-record tactics are employed when the speaker is evasive and does not want to be seen as a bully. Brown and Levinson (1987, 79) claim that three social factors, namely D, P, and R, impact the likelihood of losing one's face and the method chosen. P represents speaker power over listener, D represents social distance between speakers and listeners, and R represents the absolute value of imposition in a given culture. One of the most well-known and broadly accepted language theories is Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson's Politeness Theory. Face, "the public self-image that every member of a community seeks to claim for himself," is at the heart of the researchers' thesis, which was developed from Goffman's work and the English folk word "face" (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), who disagree with Goffman's definition of face, "every member knows every other member wishes, and it is generally in the interests of every member to partly fulfill" these fundamental wants, rather than a physical appearance (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Among the parts of face, Brown and Levinson (1987) note that "positive face the need of each and every part that his needs be attractive to at any rate some others, by sure face they figure out the positive steady mental self-portrait or 'character,' (essentially including the craving that this mental self-view be preferred, appreciated, thought often about, saw Good respectfulness, then again, is revolved around H's positive mental self-portrait and the positive face he depicts. In contrast to positive politeness, negative politeness is primarily geared on fulfilling (redressing) H's negative face, his core need to retain claims to territory and self-determination." This is based on the work of Brown and Levinson in 1987 on page 62.

Face-threatening actions (FTAs) are common, despite the fact that maintaining eye contact is an important part of any social engagement. It is a face-threatening conduct when the speaker or the addressee's face is damaged as a result of their actions being in contradiction to their own wishes and goals. Both vocal and nonverbal actions are possible in these situations. Furthermore, a single speech may be connected with many FTAs. You might lose both your good and bad aspects. Brown and Levinson defined four sorts of politeness strategies: plain on-record, negative politeness, positive politeness, and off-record politeness (indirect). Communicational conduct is a broad term that includes both good and negative aspects of a speaker's actions. As a result, the goal of this article is to examine Piers Morgan's communication style using Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness while analyzing Piers Morgan Live interviews. For this reason, we'll examine how the interviewer, Piers Morgan, implements politeness strategies on a linguistic and cognitive level. While the examples in the preceding paragraphs illustrate well Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness, we'll go over the theory in great detail this time around, including all of its key features and major implications.

1.1 Statement of the Research Problem

The research at hand titled as "A Comparative Analysis of Politeness Strategies in the genderlect of Americans and Pakistanis in English TV talk shows" aims to investigate the differences in politeness strategies of Pakistani males and females, with English as their second language and similarly to explore the differences in politeness strategies between Native American males and females in their use of English language. And also to find out the differences and similarities in the genderlect of the two cultures; Pakistanis and Americans, based on the research findings of Q1 and Q2

1.2 Objectives of the Study

Research objectives are as given below:

- a) To investigate the differences in politeness strategies of Pakistani males and females, with English as their second language
- b) To explore the differences in politeness strategies between Native American males and females in their English language use
- c) To find out the differences and similarities in the genderlect of the two cultures; Pakistanis and Americans, based on the research findings of Q1 and Q2

1.3 Research Questions

- a) In what ways are the politeness strategies of Pakistani males different from Pakistani females, using English as their second language?
- b) How is the language of the Native American male different from the Native American female?
- c) What are the differences and similarities in the genderlect of the two cultures; Pakistanis and Americans, based on the research findings of Q1 and Q2?

1.4 Significance of the Study

The most striking significance of this research at hand is that it showed how both genders use politeness strategies and how they take turns in English as L1 by Americans and as L2 by Pakistanis in Talk shows. It was a kind of awareness for the people in each society that how they should talk to each other and in what ways one should talk to the opposite gender avoiding negative face and other kinds of impoliteness. The study was meant to add new ideas to the research about how men and women use polite language differently in English. It was supposed to help both researchers and people in the real world understand this better. Also, the study's results can help Pakistani English speakers understand how gender affects the way people speak. They can learn how Native American English speakers use language differently based on gender, compared to native English speakers.

2. Literature Review

Cultural concerns and the construction of public life today cannot be understood without the use of modern media (Navarro-Beltrá & Llaguno, 2012). Media forms play a critical role in these endeavours. The portrayal of societies is one of these cultural forms. Observing and recording social and cultural norms and incorporating them into television programmes like comedies or discussion shows is a part of representing cultures (Bignell, 2014). Gender is a social characteristic, and the study of how it is represented is aimed to promote and reassure particular social behaviour and attitudes as well as to reflect and chronicle cultures.

According to George Gerbner's cultivation theory, which was designed to explain how television use affects society's perceptions, attitudes, and moral ideals, the latter remark may be better understood (Ahmad, 2002; Gerbner et al., 1986). For example, Albert Bandura's social learning theory says that people may learn certain behaviors by watching television and other media, and that this behavior serves as a model for future plausible situations they could encounter in real life. This perspective is strengthened by this theory (Bandura, 1977; Ahmad, 2002). Gender is one of the most noticeable qualities of television and media characters or players, and it is via media productions that certain particular representations may establish into society (Barner, 1999).

This inquiry is concerned with the societal impact and influence that media forms, like television, have on the general population. Consequently, some authors and organizations feel that the media may be used to promote gender equality in a positive and constructive manner (Turley, 2006; Lowe Morna, 2002; Padovani, 2018; Popa & Gavrilu, 2015). Feminist and gender media studies are a branch of study dedicated to investigating how media portrays gender. Gender studies share research areas (representation as well as role of genders) and a shared history (Mendes, though distinctions have been made between the two fields, with gender studies favoring an individual perspective and feminist studies emphasising a political agenda). This investigation's starting point is set inside both views while admitting their contrasts and similarities (Carter et al., 2008).

The second wave of feminism in Europe and the United States sparked the emergence of this discipline in the 1970s, coinciding with a rise in political interest in gender equality. By making women's difficulties seem insignificant or making their bodies objectified, mass media goods were seen as a way to discriminate against women in this setting (Mendes & Carter, 2008; Kramarae & Spender, 2004; Capecchi, 2014). Media images that

incite hate or inequity have sparked feminist media studies, which emerged as a response to this need (Popa & Gavrilu, 2015). Studying how media portrays women's lives and experiences in connection to their cultural portrayal is at the heart of this field's work (Cragin, 2010).

This study topic began with a focus on how women were portrayed in the media, particularly on television, since experts felt that they were underrepresented in a medium deemed more feminine because of its presence in the house (Summergrad, 2016). Television commercials were one of the first types of media material to be analyzed, contrasting the depiction of women with the portrayal of men and the standing of women in social reality (Capecci, 2014). In commercials based on stereotypes, sex submission, and sexist humour, stereotypical and even degrading depictions of women were (and sometimes still are) frequently depicted (Wood, 1994; Fallis, 2013; Ogletree et al., 1990) whereas the current trend is more aligned with depicting women as empowered subjects (Alkan, 2016). Men are more likely than women to advertise products that are considered gender-neutral because women would not hesitate to buy them if they are associated with femininity, but men would hesitate more if the product were associated with masculinity, according to studies of advertisements (Holladay, 2010). In spite of the aforementioned tendency, gender stereotypes are still conveyed in this media form throughout the globe, which is a paradox that eventually causes a problematic interpretation of the image of women (Matthes et al., 2016). Older males have long been considered more acceptable on-screen than women of the same age, and this has been a constant theme in television studies since its inception (Vernon et al., 1991). Even as women become older, they tend to 'disappear from the public realm and basically become invisible (Prieler et al., 2011).

3. Methodology

3.1 Population and Sampling Procedure

Twenty (20) complete talk shows were purposively selected from YouTube which are broadcast by different American and Pakistani channels which were in English language where numerous kinds of programmes are telecasted in which TV Talk shows were selected on YouTube. The participants in the aforementioned programs were purposively selected in order to make sure the representation of both the genders; males as well as females, for the purpose to sort out the gender differences of the host and the guests' politeness strategies utilized. All the data were taken from American and Pakistani TV talk shows in English language official websites and channels.

By utilizing statistics, the researchers sought to examine the data and uncover results that could be applicable to a wider demographic. The methodology employed in this study mirrored the way Sacks, Jefferson, and Schegloff (1974) analyzed conversations. The conversation analysis approach looks at how people talk to each other and how they use language to communicate. The researcher studied recorded conversations to find patterns in how people interact with each other. The researcher found patterns and rules to describe these patterns based on their analysis using the conversational analysis method.

The researchers used AntConc to study a large amount of data because this study is based on analyzing a large collection of texts. This way, the researchers can make sure they do not miss anything important. Corpus analysis is a way to study and compare lots of different written materials at once. It's sometimes called "distant reading". It allows us to notice things in the talk shows that the researcher might miss if they were just reading the transcripts.

3.2 Data analysis Procedure

The researcher investigated the politeness strategies of both the male and female host and guest in talk shows applying Politeness theory of Brown and Levinson's (1987), as it is the most influential and comprehensive model of politeness. Special attention was given to the choice between positive and negative strategies.

4. Analysis and Discussion

4.1 Politeness in Genderlect of Pakistanis

Parts one and two of Brown and Levinson's work are distinct. For starters, they explain how they define "politeness" and how it manifests itself in social situations. Examples of 'politeness' tactics are included in the second section. In the area of politeness, Brown and Levinson's theory from 1987 is well-known. The theory says that being polite is about being aware of and considerate towards the other person's feelings. Brown and Levinson (1987: 61) say that face is the image of ourselves that we want other people to see. The idea of "face" has two parts:

positive and negative.

The positive face is when people want others to think highly of them, admire them, respect them, and see them as a good person. On the other hand, the negative face is about people wanting to be free from any kind of trouble or responsibility. Face-saving acts protect both our desire to be liked and our desire to be respected. When someone tries to avoid hurting another person's feelings, they are doing a positive face-saving act. Otherwise, trying to save face in a bad situation is just a way to make the embarrassment or shame a little less. While observing the politeness in the genderlect of Pakistani males and females, it was revealed that male and female in talk shows generally tend to manage more positive face-saving acts.

However, it showed that positive face-saving utterances were generated more by male speakers than female when interacting with males. While Positive face saving utterance were used more by female speakers than males when interacting with males. Positive face saving utterances were found more frequent in the opposite gender groups than the same gender groups. It also indicated that male speakers used more negative face-saving utterances in male to male interaction. And female speakers produced more negative face-saving utterances in female to female interaction. It was concluded that Pakistani speakers of the same gender groups were dominant in negotiating positive face-saving acts as compared to opposite gender groups which justified that Pakistani opposite gender groups are more polite than the same gender groups. Brown and Levinson's list of 'politeness' strategies, despite the theoretical potential of their work, only covers a very specific type of inter-personal interaction. A majority of the examples they provide involve single utterances with clear communicative objectives, such as a request to borrow a book or an offer of advice. Most single utterances are really part of a wider conversation between two or more people, and Brown and Levinson tend to overlook this reality when they write about the human language. Their primary failing is a failure to take into account phenomena that occur throughout a speech, such as back-channeling or even the general order in which words are said.

The followings example from the data related to Brown and Levinson theory of politeness in Pakistan talk shows.

Male: most welcome the honor and pleasure is entirely mine right um our show of your caliber it is an honor

Female: thank you so much that that's uh very kind of you so let's begin now sir with um your background mean you've grown up in Karachi a very regular sort of life and then you went to Rawalpindi medical college and then from there sort of things just took off where you pioneered all these things in healthcare in Pakistan so uh tell us a little bit about your life your family what kind of hums an environment did you grow up in Karachi.

In the example the speaker tries to show a politeness to the listeners that are female by exemplifying with honor and pleasure. He gave solid examples in order to bring coherence and clarify the theory of politeness.

While listening, the listener inserts short responses that are more rhythmical, indicating her more active involvement rather than passive attention. This is referred to as "positive politeness." Repeated nods of agreement show that the listener is satisfied with the speaker's "positive face." The 'positive politeness' of the listener may be seen in the major speaker's quicker tempo and longer turns. At this stage, the speaker's style may be compared to Tannen's 'high participation style' (1984). When compared to Tannen's discussion of specific individuals, this is seen here as a feature of the negotiation and establishment process in this segment of a specific conversation.

4.2 Politeness in the Genderlect of American Talk Shows

By not intruding on one another, the interactants fulfill each other's "negative face" in addition to the "positive politeness" they show. That is to say, the speaker asks for the listener's permission to continue speaking, and the listener responds softly and minimally with only intermittent interruptions of her interlocutor's discourse. While listening, the listener inserts brief comments that are more rhythmical, indicating her more active engagement rather than passive attention. This is referred to as "positive politeness." Repeated nods of agreement show that the listener is satisfied with the speaker's "positive face." The 'positive politeness' of the listener may be seen in the major speaker's quicker tempo and longer turns. At this stage, the speaker's style may be compared to Tannen's 'high participation style' (1984). When compared to Tannen's discussion of specific individuals, this is seen here as a feature of the negotiating and establishing process in this portion of a specific dialogue.

It was discovered that American males and females often manage more positive face-saving acts on talk shows while observing the politeness in genderlect. It did, however, demonstrate that when speaking to females, male speakers produced more positive face-saving utterances than did female speakers. However, when speaking to men,

female speakers employed positive face-saving expressions more frequently than male speakers. The opposite gender groups exhibited positive face-saving utterances more frequently than the same gender groups did.

It showed that in male to male interactions, male speakers tended to use more negative face-saving utterances. Furthermore, female to female interactions featured more negative face-saving utterances from female speakers. The findings supported the notion that American opposite gender groups are more polite than the same gender groups because American speakers of the same gender groups were more successful in negotiating positive face-saving acts than opposite gender groups.

The following example showed politeness in American talk shows:

Ellen: - I am happy to see you congratulation. Since I saw you to own the championship and you were now ranging kind of everything I mean what a so 200 no 200 million dollar.

Steph: yeah I know.

Ellen: they offer you 200 million you sad nope.

Ellen: no no.

Steph: non starter.

Ellen: I need\$ 201 million dollar so much do you have on you right now.

First and foremost, the listener begins to participate more actively than she has in any previous level. It's also possible to see a "positive politeness" occurrence here when the speaker firmly agrees with the listener's description of her own discussion. The 'politeness' theory of Brown and Levinson may be a useful tool for analysing 'politeness' phenomena in both goal-oriented and non-goal-oriented interactions like these. Brown and Levinson's list of "politeness" methods, such as emphasising the style and sequencing of a prolonged contact, might need some improvement, though.

4.3 Politeness by American and Pakistani Genderlect

It was very astonishing while observing the politeness in the Pakistani and American genderlect of males and females; it was revealed that male and female in talk shows generally tend to manage more positive face-saving acts. Nevertheless, it was discovered that while speaking to females, male speakers produced more positive face-saving utterances than female speakers, but when speaking to males, female speakers used more positive face-saving utterances than male speakers. The opposite gender groups indicated positive face-saving utterances more frequently than the same gender groups did. Additionally, it showed that in male to male interactions, male speakers tended to utilize more negative face-saving remarks. Additionally, female to female interactions featured more negative face-saving statements from female to male interactions. It was determined that American and Pakistani speakers of the opposite gender were more competent at negotiating successful face-saving measures than speakers of the same gender, which supported the claim that Americans and Pakistanis of the opposite gender are more polite than speakers of the same gender.

5. Conclusion

The researcher considered politeness strategies of linguistics for analyzing similarities and differences in the genderlect of Pakistanis and Americans to achieve the above three objectives, by using genderlect theory and difference approach by Deborah Tannen (1990). As the researcher was to cover politeness strategies, he only discussed certain subdomains of the areas which were mostly related to the genderlect theory and difference approach. In a nutshell, the conclusions drawn from the analysis can be discussed as below;

According to Tannen (1990), men speak more in public than women. This relates to their primary communicational motive, which was mentioned earlier: status. When men speak in public, they usually compete for dominance. Men's speaking, in contrast to women's, is direct, comprehensive, and instructive, loaded with arguments and defensive implicit and explicit remarks. Women's conversational speech, on the other hand, is imbued with connectional strategies that help to build a symmetrical connection between them and their interlocutors. They are well-known for deploying "question tags" and "hedging devices" in discussion. All of this serves to keep the conversation continuing and to alert the interlocutor that they, as women, identify with the substance of his talk and want to learn more about it. In the conversations, females conducted more turns and overlaps than males. Observing the analysis of females, the researcher noticed that female took a great number of turns and overlaps in

conversations with males which proved the very first point of the theory that female tries to discuss more than male and male tries to take time for taking turns. Therefore, it is inaccurate and misleading to suggest that women speak less at meetings or they are given the floor less frequently and are interrupted more frequently when they talk. The research on politeness in communication between men and women in Pakistan and America yielded some intriguing findings. In TV talk shows, both genders frequently engage in behaviors to present themselves in a favorable light. Men tend to use more polite language when speaking to women in order to avoid causing offense. On the other hand, when women talk to men, they use more compliments or polite remarks to avoid hurting their feelings, compared to men. This trend shows that opposite gender groups are better at using positive ways to save face than same gender groups. Men often use more negative comments to save face when talking to other men, while women tend to do the same when talking to other women. In both cultures, people felt more comfortable and polite when avoiding embarrassment while talking to someone of the opposite gender. This was especially true for Americans and Pakistanis.

References

- Ahmad, Azza M. (2002). *Gender Roles: A Content Analysis of Egyptian Television Commercials*. Oklahoma State University.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge university press.
- Cragin, Becca. (2010). Beyond the Feminine: Intersectionality and Hybridity in Talk Shows. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 33(2), 154–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07491409.2010.507585>
- Carretero, M. (2016). Cutting, J.(2015). *Pragmatics: A resource book for students*. <https://doi.org/10.1075/resla.29.2.10car>
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., & Signorielli, N. (1986). Living with television: The dynamics of the cultivation process. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.), *Perspectives on media effects* (pp. 17-40). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Anchor Books.
- Kramarae, C., & Spender, D. (2004). *Routledge International Encyclopedia of Women: Global Women's Issues and Knowledge*. Taylor & Francis.
- Locher, M. A. (2004). *Power and politeness in action: Disagreements in oral communication*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Lowe Morna, Colleen. (2002). Promoting Gender Equality in and through the Media: A Southern African Case Study. *EGM/MEDIA/2002/EP.5*, November.
- Mendes, Kaitlynn, & Carter, Cynthia. (2008). Feminist and Gender Media Studies: A Critical Overview. *Sociology Compass*, 2(6), 1701–1718. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2008.00158.x>
- Navarro-Beltrá, Marián, & Llaguno, Marta Martín. (2012). A systematic review of gender and advertising studies. *Catalan Journal of Communication & Cultural Studies*, 4(2), 171–183. https://doi.org/10.1386/cjcs.4.2.171_1
- Ortells Badenes, Sara. (2011). Información política e infoentretenimiento en televisión: visiones contrapuestas de un problema complejo. *Padovani, Claudia*. (2018). Media gender equality regimes.
- Popa, Dorin, & Gavriliu, Delia. (2015). Gender Representations and Digital Media. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 180, 1199–1206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.244>
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1978). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking for conversation. In *Studies in the organization of conversational interaction* (pp. 7–55). Academic Press.
- Priest, Patricia Joyner. (1995). *Public Intimacies: Talk Show Participants and Tell-All TV*. Hampton Press.
- Turley, Anna. (2006). Who makes the news? Promoting gender equality in and through news media. *Pacific Journalism Review*, 12(1), 10–14.
- Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. William Morrow and Company.