مجلة الدراسات المستدامة
P-ISSN(Print) : 2663-2284
E-ISSN(online): 2663-7413
السنة (٨) المجلد (٨) العدد (٤) تشرين الأول . لسنة ٢٠٢٦م – ١٤٤٨ هـ

Politeness and Face Management in Institutional Discourse

Assistant Instructor. Faten Waleed Jawad
Al-Iraqia University, College Education for Women
Department of English Language
Faten.W.Jawad@aliraqia.edu.iq

ABSTRACT

Politeness plays a central role in institutional discourse, where language is shaped by hierarchy, authority, and role-based interaction. This study examines how politeness strategies and face management operate in institutional contexts such as political interviews, courtroom exchanges, and administrative communication. Drawing primarily on Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory, supported by Goffman's concept of face and Speech Act Theory, the paper adopts a qualitative pragmatic approach to analyze naturally occurring institutional data. The analysis reveals that institutional speakers strategically employ both positive and negative politeness to maintain authority, mitigate face threats, and manage social distance. The findings demonstrate that politeness in institutional discourse is not merely a matter of courtesy but a pragmatic resource for exercising power, negotiating accountability, and sustaining institutional order.

Keywords: politeness, face management, institutional discourse, pragmatics).

التهذيب اللغوي وادارة الوجه في الخطاب المؤسسي

م.م. فاتن وليد جواد
الجامعة العراقية / كلية التربية للبنات / قسم اللغة الانجليزية
Faten.W.Jawad@aliraqia.edu.iq

الملخص

يلعب التهذيب اللغوي دوراً محورياً في الخطاب المؤسسي، حيث تتشكل اللغة بفعل التراتبية التنظيمية والسلطة والتفاعل القائم على الأدوار. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى فحص كيفية عمل استراتيجيات التهذيب وإدارة الوجه داخل السياقات المؤسسية مثل المقابلات السياسية، وتبادلات الخطاب في المحاكم، والتواصل الإداري.

مجلة الدراسات المستدامة
P-ISSN(Print) : 2663-2284
E-ISSN(online): 2663-7413
السنة (٨) المجلد (٨) العدد (٤) تشرين الأول . لسنة ٢٠٢٦م - ١٤٤٨ هـ

وتعتمد الدراسة أساسًا على نظرية التهذيب الموضوعة من قبل (Brown and Levinson) ، مدعومةً بمفهوم الوجه لدى(Goffman) ونظرية أفعال الكلام (Searle) ويتبع البحث منهجًا تداوليًا نوعيًا لتحليل بيانات مؤسسية.

تكشف نتائج التحليل أن المتحدثين داخل المؤسسات يوظفون بصورة استراتيجية كلًّا من استراتيجيات التهذيب الإيجابي والتهذيب السلبي من أجل الحفاظ على السلطة، والتخفيف من تهديدات الوجه، وإدارة المسافة الاجتماعية بين أطراف التفاعل. وتشير النتائج إلى أن التهذيب في الخطاب المؤسسي لا يقتصر على كونه مجرد مظهر من مظاهر المجاملة، بل يمثل موردًا تداوليًا يُستخدم لممارسة السلطة، والتفاوض حول المساءلة، والحفاظ على النظام المؤسسي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: (التهذيب اللغوي، ادارة الوجه، الخطاب المؤسسي، التداولية والقوة).

1. Introduction

Institutional communication is essentially a multi-layered process that involves conveying information as just one of its components. The power structures, social status, and the expectations that surround the communication process are always at work influencing the choice of words used by the speakers and the meaning of those words. In such institutions as courts, the government, universities, and the political arena, language has been the main tool for establishing and enforcing power and maintaining social relations. In these situations, politeness is not just a matter of appropriate manners but a very practical necessity that enables the communication to continue without a direct conflict or the loss of social legitimacy.

Politeness is the number one concern in institutional discourse, as the speakers tend to take the risk of their speaking being perceived as more or less threatening to their face. The actions of requesting, ordering, judging, and saying no are frequently performed in institutional communication, but each of them carries the risk of hurting the public image of the other party. Brown and Levinson put forward the argument that face is an individual's claim for respect and autonomy,

and that the communicative interaction is one that requires constant attention to the protection of such claims. In institutional settings where the power relations are unmistakably laid out and the roles are unequal, the issue of face becomes not only more intricate but also more important.

The notion of face in social interaction was earlier pointed out by Goffman, who regarded interaction as a joint effort in which the parties involved are trying to maintain each other's social position. However, in institutional contexts this cooperation is often restricted by official differences and unequal power relations. The professionals may be put in a position where they have to oppose, teach, or correct others during the course of their job. Therefore, rather than simply to create consensus, the speakers employ politeness strategies to communicate the institutional power that exists at the same time and to ensure stability in personal interactions.

Courtroom interactions, political interviews, and administrative communication are some of the situations that clearly depict this dynamic. Interviewers, who may be public figures, question the public but still try not to lose the perception of neutrality. Judges may deliver orders that are direct at the same time while preserving the dignity of the legal proceedings. Decisions are communicated through written means, since they can be pervasive in nature while minimizing confrontation. In all these situations, politeness acts as a practical resource that empowers the speakers to reach the institutional objectives and, at the same time, to be in control of the possible social costs of their actions.

This research investigates the use of politeness and face management in institutional discourse by analyzing different institutional settings where such practices happen. This paper is based on Brown and Levinson's model of politeness, Goffman's concept of face, and speech act theory, and it intends to prove that linguistic choices mirror the social structures within the community. The work illustrates the instances of institutional interaction in real-time, and through this, it can be concluded that politeness is not something that is sidelined in institutional communication, but rather it is a part and parcel of the communication process, being the effective and legitimate part of it.

2. Literature Review

Politeness and face have been considered the main topics in pragmatic and discourse-analytic studies for a long time. They were especially connected with different interactions where power and social ranking were the main factors. The early sociological studies gave stronger support to the later linguistic ones by stressing the social aspect of communication. Goffman's face concept is one of the most renowned theories in this area. He identifies face as the positive social value claim that a person makes for himself/herself during interaction and contends that the partners are equally responsible for its maintenance through what he calls "face-work" (Goffman, 1967). Thus, the perspective emphasizes that interaction always involves cooperation among the parties, even if one of them is correcting or arguing.

Drawing upon this sociological background, Brown and Levinson came up with a systematic pragmatic model of politeness that has become the

cornerstone of linguistic research. They classify politeness as a collection of tactics aimed at reducing the impact of certain speech acts that may be offensive to a person's face (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The authors' division between positive face and negative face has not only been theoretically important but has also proven very fruitful in the analysis of institutional discourse. In the context of institutions, many communicative actions, such as giving directions or appraising one's work, always pose the real danger to either of the faces or both. As Brown and Levinson declare, the speakers have no choice but to select the pros and cons strategies that are both efficient and socially attentive.

The subsequent advancement in research has affirmed that politeness theory is relevant to various institutional contexts. For instance, the research into the interaction in courts has revealed the ways the legal professionals face the challenges to their images while following the norms of the procedure and the authority surrounding them. According to Atkinson and Drew (1979), the judges might be frequently issuing direct and unmitigated commands, but in most cases, these are done under the patronage of ritualized forms that protect the dignity of the court during the course of the action. Hence, politeness in these contexts is not eliminated but rather modified to fit the needs of institutions.

Politeness researchers have come to political discourse as a significant area of research. Clayman and Heritage (2002) assert that a struggle between confrontational questioning and maintaining the public's good manners characterizes political interviews. The interviewers typically resort to indirectness, mitigation, or diplomatically phrased critiques to avoid appearing openly hostile, while the interviewees employ politeness techniques to protect their public reputation. Thus, these

findings serve to strengthen the argument that politeness is an integral aspect of institutional discourse and that it is tightly connected to accountability and the design of the audience.

Administrative and bureaucratic communication is one more example where the use of politeness is strategically implemented. Sarangi and Roberts (1999) claim that institutional talk is influenced by professional roles that limit the ways in which the speaker can exhibit either power or bonding. The use of polite formulations in administrative texts softens the directness of orders and validates decisions without allowing for discussion. According to Yule, such strategies can be regarded as reflecting his description of the pragmatics of the area of study that deals with meaning creation in context, particularly in terms of speaker intent and listener interpretation (Yule, 1996).

Additionally, Speech Act Theory offers a unique theoretical viewpoint for the understanding of politeness in official communications. The claim of Austin that utterances perform acts implies that politeness is a must for such acts when they entail responsibility or authority (Austin, 1962). Searle extends his view by subdividing speech acts according to their illocutionary force and thereby bringing to light that in institutional settings, the power of the speaker to perform acts that would otherwise be socially frowned upon is frequently still in place (Searle, 1969). Politeness strategies thus serve to build a bridge between institutional power and social standards.

Institutional discourse must be polite to manage face and relationship norms (Watts, 2003). The context includes more than simply politeness, which might signal that the speaker is weak or merely attempting to be kind (Holmes, 2000). Exploring how individuals interact teaches how politeness or impoliteness confers power or

friendship (Terkourafi, 2008). The identity of institutional participants, along with their cultural norms when respect or disdain is shown, creates the same picture. Therefore, controlling one's temper in a business talk necessitates understanding the different strategies to realize both political and personal aims at the same time, and the result is a kind of game (Spencer Oatey, 2005).

When the above-mentioned studies are considered collectively, it becomes apparent that politeness and face management are not only the supporting elements of institutional discourse but also the core around which institutional interaction is organized. Earlier research focused exclusively on politeness as a characteristic of casual conversations; however, it is increasingly recognized that formal, structured, goal-directed contexts also require consideration of politeness. Such a foundation of works is already strong for the current study, which is going to analyze the politeness strategies across different institutional settings and hence build on the existing insights.

3. Theoretical Framework

The present study employs three theoretical perspectives that are interrelated in such a manner as to deliver a comprehensive insight into politeness and face management in institutional discourse. Politeness Theory provides a pragmatic explanation of the ways through which speakers lessen the impact of face-threatening acts, Face Theory illuminates the social value of face in the interaction, and Speech Act Theory describes the function of institutional utterances as actions. The frameworks, when taken together, provide a detailed analysis of how linguistic choices mirror power, authority, and social responsibility in the institutions.

3.1 Politeness Theory

Politeness Theory, which has been formulated by Brown and Levinson, is still considered as one of the most important approaches for the comprehension and analysis of the interpersonal aspect of language. According to them, politeness is the defense mechanism that every speaker chooses to use to deal with the communicative act's face threats. Brown and Levinson (1987) declare that "certain kinds of acts intrinsically threaten face" (p. 65), especially those that demand a lot from the listener and at the same time denigrate his or her status in the community. Institutional discourse, being very much dependent on the acts that do threaten face, makes the subject of politeness one of the main pragmatic concerns.

Brown and Levinson (1987) make a distinction between positive and negative faces. The former refers to a person's desire to be liked and approved, and the latter to the desire for no interference and no imposition. Institutional speakers do not only threaten negative face but also positive face when giving orders, making judgments, or announcing decisions. Consequently, speakers resort to politeness strategies to make these hard acts more bearable for the listeners while keeping the institutional power still in place. The authors note that politeness strategy is determined by the power relationship, speaker proximity, and the extent of the imposition, all of which are very pronounced in institutional settings.

The application of Politeness Theory in institutional discourse is justified by its capability to reveal the non-aggressive nature of the language used to exercise authority. Even in places where power imbalance is a fact, such as courts or administrative offices, the speakers are still using mitigation to keep their professional and institutional prestige. In this way, politeness becomes a weapon-like

resource through which linguistic behavior is made to comply with the institution's norms.

3.2 Face Theory

The definition of face is rooted in Goffman's sociological studies (1967), which determine it as “the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact” (p. 5). He sees a lot of cooperation in every interaction since the parties involved are indirectly supporting the face of one another. He calls it "face-work," the whole process that includes not only avoiding those things that can negatively impact one's face but also applying fixing measures when such things happen.

Face-work in institutional discourse is influenced by role-based interaction and power relations. Goffman points out the mutual responsibility for face maintenance in his theory; however, in institutions, some participants are allowed to threaten face as part of their role in the professional setting. Judges, interviewers, and administrators may be the ones who possess such rights. They may challenge, correct, or evaluate others legitimately. Regardless of the circumstances, the face continues to play a key role in communication. The speakers have to be extremely cautious while dealing with the threats they face so that they do not get labeled as rude, prejudiced, or unprofessional.

The Face Theory is considered the most significant framework for understanding the role of politeness in the power-laden institutional discourse. The institutional face maintained reinforces the stability and trustworthiness of the institutions. The higher the institutional representatives' disregard for the face issues, the greater the risk of losing the public's confidence and collaboration. Consequently, face management becomes not just a matter of interpersonal relationships

but also has wide-ranging implications for the whole institutional context.

3.3 Speech Act Theory

Speech Act Theory is another viewpoint that allows the interpretation of politeness in the language of institutions through the lens of an action. Austin (1962) very famously noted that "the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action" (p. 6), thereby revealing that speech is not merely a means of reflecting the world but rather an active factor in its forming. This remark is especially important regarding the scenario of institutions, as communication, for instance, can result in the granting of rights or obligations or taking legal and administrative actions.

Searle goes further than Austin, and he classifies speech acts in terms of their illocutionary force and also points out social conventions as the main factor in the determination of a speech act's effectiveness. He asserts that speech acts operate within systems of rules that determine the right of the speaker to perform an act and also the conditions under which the act can be performed (Searle, 1969). The rules in institutional discourse are very strict; they assign certain roles to people who are authorized to give orders, make decisions, or provide judgments.

Politeness is closely linked to speech acts, and here it acts as a modifier of their force. Although a person in an official capacity may directly perform a face-threatening act, he/she usually opts for a less aggressive way of communicating to retain the spirit of cooperation during the interaction. A request can be suggested, an order can be made less forceful by using indirectness, and an evaluation can be expressed in a neutral or impersonal way. From the perspective of speech acts,

politeness does not change the institutional weight of an utterance but rather alters the way that power is received socially.

4. Data and Methodology

The study employs a qualitative pragmatic approach, focusing on the institutional discourse that is naturally generated. The data is composed of the most significant excerpts from the political interviews, court hearings, and an exchange of official administrative letters. The reason for choosing these kinds of communication is that they show different institutional environments, which are marked by the presence of power relations and strict regulations. The analysis includes the identification of face-threatening acts and the examination of politeness strategies applied to mitigate their effects. Each extract is scrutinized in the light of the speaker's positions, the institutional objectives, and the limitations of the context, in line with the interpretive method proposed by Levinson (1983), who understands pragmatics as "the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language" (p. 9).

5. Analysis and Discussion

The investigation of the institutional discourse showed that linguistically, politeness and face management were the main points of the practices that enabled the institutions to impose their power. In other words, politeness allowed the speakers to carry out actions that are typically perceived as face-threatening while still preserving the flow of the conversation. In the different institutional contexts, there were speakers who were fully aware of the social identity of the others that their utterances might affect and who were willing to change their language accordingly.

5.1 Politeness in Political Interviews

Political interviews are the most delicate institutional discourses where inquisition is mostly adversarial. Interviewers are expected to act as watchdogs for public figures, but the interviewees' positive image may be jeopardized if their directness is perceived as bias or hostility. Therefore, interviewers often employ indirectness and mitigation strategies to maintain institutional neutrality. Phrases such as "Would you care to explain…" are examples of negative politeness strategies because they reduce the burden of the imposition and allow the listener to participate in the response. According to Brown and Levinson, negative politeness is primarily about giving the listener control of the situation, especially when there is a power imbalance or when the communication is under public observation (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

On the other hand, politicians typically utilize positive politeness strategies when they confront face-threatening inquiries. Politicians are using these methods, namely, to put forth shared objectives, to bring out similarities, and to show understanding of the audience's worries. The politicians, through such a stance, aimed not only to fortify the tie but also to maintain their persona in the public eye. The communicative style involved here indicates that the matter of politeness is not only concerned with the individuals involved but also with the public portrayal, where the maintenance of faces is closely connected to the trustworthiness and political authority of the parties concerned.

5.2 Face Management in Courtroom Discourse

A court discourse is, by all means, a widely recognized example of an interaction that is contextually based on institutions and is greatly characterized by the power inequality existing between the parties. The judges hold the institutional power to confront the other side's

arguments by giving orders. Direct commands like "Answer the question" reflect this power and show the judges' determination to carry on the trial rather than settle the dispute with the other party. These cases demonstrate that the power of dialogue control is so crucial in the legal field that the imposition of such acts on other parties becomes almost inevitable.

Nevertheless, courtroom interaction also suggests that politeness, although very slight, is still there even in the most powerful situations. Judges' behavior may be less forceful if they are looking for partnership rather than compliance, particularly with witnesses and jurors. The limited use of politeness in this situation suggests that the management of faces is a tactical act rather than a universal one. As Atkinson and Drew argue, courtroom communication is arranged in such a way that it keeps the institutional authority strong but at the same time is flexible enough to let face concerns come up when necessary (Atkinson and Drew, 1979). This arrangement makes it possible for the entire legal process to proceed without questioning the fairness and legitimacy of the judicial norms.

5.3 Politeness in Administrative Communication

Politeness in communication through administrative and bureaucratic channels is frequently done with a language that is very conventionalized. Normally, written correspondence includes such elements as directives, requests, or decisions that restrict the recipient's options and thus endanger his or her negative face. To counter this threat, institutional writers often resort to the use of such expressions as “We kindly request…” These expressions may appear to be very ordinary, but they actually serve an important role in the

communication process by making the request less demanding and still preserving the power of the institution.

From the pragmatic perspective, the strength of these formulas is not their creativity but their familiarity. Yule (1996) points out that pragmatics deals with "meaning as communicated by a speaker and interpreted by a listener" (p. 3). In the communication between the administration and the public, both sides are aware of the institutional implications of such phrases, although the markers of politeness indicate that the speaker respects the listener's autonomy. The use of such strategies enables the institutions to impose their decisions while keeping the communication cooperative and professional, thus facilitating the flow of interaction and compliance.

6. Findings

The research results lead to the conclusion that institutional communication politeness mainly depends on power relations, the expectations of the roles to be played, and the aims of the institution. The selection of words and other language manners is determined by the individual's position in the institution's ranking. Those who have power can even threaten others' face more directly than the others and often do so with little mitigation. On the other hand, the less powerful observer faces concerns more carefully, and hence they use polite strategies for softening their requests, replies, and evaluations.

The use of both positive and negative politeness strategies is seen as the main way to reduce interactional tension. Positive politeness is often used to create a bond, shorten the social distance, and project a spirit of cooperation, especially in cases where public accountability is concerned. Negative politeness, conversely, is used to affirm the interlocutor's free will and to make the imposition less severe that comes with directives and institutional decisions. The manner in which

speakers strategically utilized these tactics was indicative of their grasp of the context's and institutional norms' limitations, not of their sticking to unchanging politeness rules.

These results are significant when one considers that politeness in an institutional setting is a major factor in the use of language. It is not simply the other way around; on the contrary, it is a pragmatic resource that allows the continuation of institutional interactions, even in cases where face-threatening is strongly rooted. Politeness, by reducing possible conflicts and providing social legitimacy, not only plays a role in the institutions' being controlled and socially approved but also in the exercising of power being less and more acceptable at the same time.

7. Conclusion

The primary research objective of this study was to examine the changes in politeness and face management in institutional communication, particularly in those interactions where hierarchy, authority, and the role of the participants are the main features. The paper has provided evidence that institutional language in political interviews, courtroom discussions, and administrative communications is not only determined by the strict following of rules but also by the constant consideration of social acceptance and the need for a proper speaker-hearer relationship. Politeness was found to be a central pragmatic tool in all the contexts that were investigated, through which speakers managed to balance the accomplishment of institutional tasks with the social consequences of their utterances.

The application of Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory reinforced by Goffman's notion of face and the perspective of Speech Act Theory has shown that the use of politeness strategies is not random but rather systematic. The speakers choose their linguistic forms based on the

power dynamics, institutional roles, and the resulting perceived impact on the others. Positive politeness is commonly used in public or audience-oriented situations to create friendly relations and lessen social distance, while negative politeness is used to acknowledge the Other's freedom of choice and to lessen imposition in directives or decisions. The stated patterns are an illustration of the shift in politeness strategies that happened within the limits of the institution.

The research outcomes point out that the management of face still plays a role even in proper environments where power is established. It is a common practice for the actors of public institutions to make face-threatening acts at their own risk, but they still get engaged in the mitigation process very often just to keep up the standards of the operation concerning professionalism, cooperation, and the credit of the institution. Thus, it seems that face is not an individual issue only; rather, it is part of interactions and institutions. Politeness does not diminish authority; instead, it enhances its proper use by making it non-confrontational and ensuring that the fairness of practices is perceived by the institutions.

Being one of the contributors to pragmatic research, the current study emphasizes the necessity of analyzing politeness in particular institutional settings instead of regarding it as a universal or a single phenomenon. By showing how face management works under the circumstances of power imbalance and constraint, the paper actually takes the theories of politeness and discourse analysis into structured, goal-oriented environments.

References

1. Atkinson, J. M., & Drew, P. (1979). Order in court. Macmillan.

2. Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words. Oxford University Press.

3. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge University Press.

4. Clayman, S., & Heritage, J. (2002). The news interview. Cambridge University Press.

5. Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction ritual. Anchor Books.

6. Holmes, J. (2000). Politeness, power and provocation: How humour functions in the workplace. Discourse Studies, 2(2), 159–185.

7. Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.

8. Sarangi, S., & Roberts, C. (1999). Talk, work and institutional order. Mouton de Gruyter.

9. Spencer-Oatey, H. (2005). (Im)politeness, face and perceptions of rapport: Unpackaging their bases and interrelationships. Journal of Pragmatics, 37(12), 1643–1664.

10. Terkourafi, M. (2008). Toward a unified theory of politeness, impoliteness, and rudeness. In D. Bousfield & M. Locher (Eds.), Impoliteness in language: Studies on its interplay with power in theory and practice (pp. 45–74). Mouton de Gruyter.

11. Watts, R. J. (2003). Politeness. Cambridge University Press.

12. Yule, G. (1996). Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.