

Acting the Intangible: Hints of Politeness in Non-Verbal Form

Jumanto Jumanto¹, Sarif Syamsu Rizal¹ & Raden Arief Nugroho¹

¹ Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Dian Nuswantoro, Semarang, Jawa Tengah, Indonesia

Correspondence: Jumanto Jumanto, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Dian Nuswantoro, Semarang, Jawa Tengah, Indonesia. Tel: 62-812-878-2484. E-mail: ilhamj@dsn.dinus.ac.id

Received: September 16, 2017 Accepted: October 10, 2017 Online Published: October 12, 2017

doi: 10.5539/elt.v10n11p111

URL: <http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n11p111>

Abstract

This review paper has explored politeness in non-verbal form to come to hints for indicating the ideology. Politeness in non-verbal form is researched by reviewing verbal politeness theories through interpretive techniques, and then the data in form of interpreted hints based on the reviews are analyzed by employing a coding technique. The six non-verbal hints of politeness found out based on the theoretical reviews are silence for politeness, gestures for politeness, gifts for politeness, observance of norms, rules, and regulations for politeness, adjusted behavior for politeness, and performance for politeness. The hints expectedly provide a sufficient account for non-verbal politeness in interactions or communication between a speaker and a hearer. The findings also encourage promoting harmony among speakers of languages in non-verbal interactions or communication, especially in formal situations or in the general public. The hints are hopefully also worth considering in the context of English language teaching and learning across languages and cultures in the world.

Keywords: verbal/linguistic politeness, non-verbal politeness, interpersonal face, social face, hint

1. Introduction

Language use is a matter of probabilities (Jumanto, 2014), either verbal language or non-verbal language. Conveying messages, therefore, is a matter of choices whether a speaker is using verbal language or verbal form or utterances, or they are using non-verbal language or non-verbal form or, merely called *acting* in this paper. The word acting refers to the art or practice of representing a character on a stage or before cameras (Note 1), analogically used here as acting before a particular hearer or in the general public. This acting may be in form of facial expressions or gestures, or else indicating non-verbal responses for communicating messages.

One of the messages conveyed by a speaker to a hearer is an ideology called politeness. Politeness is a message having to do with the want or the will of a particular hearer to be appreciated by a speaker of language. This concept is termed *face* by Erving Goffman (1959). Along with the development of face theory, there has been interpersonal face or social face. The former is managed together by a speaker and a hearer in a *vis-a-vis* communication, while the latter is protected together by a particular social group in interactions or communication. Interpersonal face or social face needs to be considered as well as maintained for the sake of interpersonal harmony or social harmony.

Theories of politeness on interpersonal face or social face are important for interpersonal interactions or social interactions. These interactions may be vehicled by verbal form or non-verbal form. As in the case of politeness ideology, that verbal form or utterances should be elaborated in such a way that it is perceived as conveying politeness, and so is the case of non-verbal form or actings.

This review paper on acting the intangible, i.e. hints of politeness in non-verbal form has made use of theories of verbal politeness, in which hints are interpreted through a coding technique upon the interpretive techniques applied in the verbal politeness theory reviews. The term intangible here is used to give an emphasis on the fact that politeness is a variant of meaning, thus concerning what behind the form perceived by our visual senses. Upon the hints interpreted, actings for politeness are presented, taken from real-life everyday practices in the Indonesian context within empirically logical assumption as well as experience of the researchers.

2. Method

This qualitative research is a literature review. A literature review requires different kinds of activities and ways of thinking (Baker, 2000). An effective review creates a firm foundation for advancing knowledge, facilitates

theory development, closes areas where a plethora of research exists, and uncovers areas where research is needed (Webster & Watson, 2002). In this review, new ideas from others' work are extracted by synthesizing and summarizing previous sources so that new theories and directions for future research can be built and suggested based on the evidence (Bolderston, 2008). The literature review in this research is done through interpretive techniques; therefore, interpreting is the main way of thinking in this research. In this research, foundation for advancing knowledge and developing theory is created from interpreting and reviewing established theories of verbal politeness to come to hints of non-verbal politeness. The hints function to limit areas for further research, i.e. non-verbal politeness. Other ways of thinking involved in this research are synthesizing and summarizing of the hints, and then elaboration of the hints into practices (actings) is made to confirm that the hints are applicable in probable real-life situations of speech communities.

Through the interpretive techniques, the researchers examine the data and interpret them through forming an impression and reporting it in a structured form. The data in form of theory reviews upon the interpretive techniques are then further analyzed through a coding technique, which consists of three steps: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Holloway, 1997; Bohm, 2004; Saldana, 2012).

In the open coding, the data in form of theory reviews are separated and conceptualized. The separated data are then reunited in the axial coding to come to major categories. The selective coding then discovers the main phenomena, i.e. a story line built by relating the major categories from the axial coding. The main non-verbal hints are then applied to practices of politeness in everyday life.

The definition of politeness as the guideline for the reviews of politeness theories in this research is the one proposed by Jumanto (2014), i.e. "Politeness is everything good that has been uttered as well as acted by the speaker to the hearer within a particular context, to maintain their interpersonal face as well as their social face". The verb *uttered* in the definition refers to verbal politeness, while the verb *acted* to non-verbal politeness. Based on the definition, the researchers examine and interpret interpersonal face and social face and their connection with verbal politeness theories to come to the non-verbal hints. It is the non-verbal hints of politeness which are to be found out in this research.

3. Results

3.1 Review of Verbal Politeness Theories and Non-Verbal Hints Interpreted

The data in form of theory reviews here are interpreted from verbal politeness theories of Fraser & Nolen (1981), Leech (1983), Arndt & Janney (1985), Brown & Levinson (1987), Ide (1989), Watts (1989), Gu (1990), Lakoff (1990), Blum-Kulka (1992), Spencer-Oatey (1992), and Thomas' Pollyanna Hypothesis (1996). Each of the theories is reviewed and interpreted for the non-verbal hints below. A hint here is referred to as a slight indication of the existence, approach, or nature of something (Note 2) or a piece of advice that helps us to do something (Note 3).

3.1.1 Fraser and Nolen (1981)

Fraser & Nolen (1981) propose a different view on politeness. They suggest that the freedom of others in interactions, also in conversations, should be adjusted to a conversational contract. The contract includes observance of norms and also rights and obligations in the interactions with others. The norms proposed by them are based on four dimensions: conventional, institutional, situational, and historical. Conventional dimensions include common rules in interactions, e.g. turns in conversation and softness or loudness of voice. Institutional dimensions include rights and obligations as ruled by a social institution, e.g. the right to speak in court and attentive silence in the church. Situational dimensions include factors in relation to roles, status, and relative power between a speaker and a hearer. Historical dimensions refer to previous interactions between a speaker and a hearer. The four dimensions vary in the applications. Politeness refers to observance to the conversational contract, while impoliteness happens due to violation of the contract. Normal interactions, i.e. interactions based on norms, thus politeness, are usually not seen, while impoliteness is usually noticed. In the eye of Fraser and Nolen, politeness is not in form of strategic interaction nor making a hearer feel comfortable, but it is merely doing the obligations acceptable to terms and conditions in the conversational contract.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from Fraser and Nolen's theory are probably (1) that observing the norms in society or rules in institutions is polite, instead of violating them, and (2) that keeping silent is polite, as it is a contract to observe when the situation calls.

3.1.2 Leech (1983)

Leech (1983) studies politeness in the light of harmony and smooth social interaction, so potential face-threatening acts should be avoided. Leech has proposed 7 maxims for social harmony, i.e. maxims of (1)

tact, (2) generosity, (3) approbation, (4) modesty, (5) agreement, (6) sympathy, and (7) consideration. These maxims should be elaborated in such a way that they give benefits more to others than to one's self. Leech has formulated things a speaker should avoid doing to others (the don'ts), i.e. don't tell others what to do, don't say bad things of others, don't express happiness when others are not happy, don't attack others' view or ideas, and don't praise yourself or show off your wealth or strength.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from Leech's principles of politeness are probably (1) that making others happy, for example by giving things they would like to expect or to have is polite, and (2) that saying nothing or keeping silent when it makes others happy is probably polite.

3.1.3 Arndt and Janney (1985)

Arndt & Janney (1985) propose the appropriacy-based approach to politeness. This theory asserts that politeness concerns appropriate expressions in appropriate context, based on appropriate conventional rules. Arndt and Janney's theory is an interpersonal framework stressing on people as the main factor as well as the center of politeness. This theory centers on emotive communication, instead of emotional communication. The former refers to strategic modification of affective signals to influence others, determined by social sanctions, interaction norms, and civilized expectations, which enables a speaker to control their natural impulses. The latter refers to spontaneous, uncontrolled expressions of emotion. Emotive communication within this theory involves not only utterances but also para- and non-linguistic signals under three dimensions: confidence, positive and negative affections, and intensity, through verbal forms, vocal, and kinesics, termed as cross-modal emotive cues.

This theory elaborates interpersonal supportiveness. Being polite here is not to do with social expectations, but is more to avoid interpersonal conflicts. Interpersonal supportiveness is used to convey message. The main idea is that there are supportive ways and non-supportive ways to express positive and negative feelings. An effective speaker tries to minimize emotional uncertainty of the hearer by behaving as supportively as possible. This interpersonal supportiveness refers to interpersonal politeness (or tact), which differs from social politeness. Social politeness consists of linguistic forms of high convention, like traffic regulations as a set of conventional rules, which are socially appropriate. Interpersonal politeness is conciliative, while social politeness is regulative.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this Arndt and Janney's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs or cross-modal emotive cues in interaction with a hearer is polite, and (2) that observing social symbols or signs of regulations in social context is polite.

3.1.4 Brown and Levinson (1987)

Brown & Levinson studies politeness in line with face management, engineering the theory of face, i.e. the want of everyone by Erving Goffman (1959). In the face theory, everyone has positive face and negative. Positive face refers to the want or the will to be appreciated by others, while negative face refers to the want or the will not be deappreciated (Brown & Levinson, 1987). They have then divided utterances or verbal acts into two, i.e. face-threatening acts (FTA) and face-saving acts (FSA), and also proposed politeness and negative politeness strategies. In brief, the politeness strategies of Brown & Levinson are of 5 categories: (1) bald on records, (2) positive politeness, (3) negative politeness, (4) off the records, (5) do not do the FTA.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from the theory are probably (1) that giving something better or best to others, whether we are close to them (positive politeness) or we are not (negative politeness) is polite, and (2) that keeping silent (not doing the FTA) is polite.

3.1.5 Ide (1989)

Ide's theory (1989) is based on Japanese politeness. The theory highlights discernment as the main aspect of politeness, i.e. honorific forms or chosen verbal utterances demanded by the society. There are no socially neutral utterances in Japanese, but honorific and non-honorific ones. A speaker should choose either one to give information on their interpersonal relationship, even in their most banal factual statement. Use of honorific forms is a must so as to reflect a socio-pragmatic equivalence to grammatical concord. This Japanese politeness called *wakimae* is based on social conventions. Within this Ide's theory, there are four conventional rules to observe: being polite to people with higher social status, being polite to people with more power, being polite to older people, being polite in the formal situations: to the participants, the occasions, or the topic.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this Ide's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs of discernment to others with higher social status or with more power, and older people, is polite, and (2) that observing the formal situation and its participants, occasions, and topic is polite.

3.1.6 Watts (1989)

Watts' theory of politeness (1989) refers to emotive communication as politic behavior, i.e. sociocultural behaviors directed to instill or maintain an equilibrium of interpersonal relationship of individuals in a social group. The equilibrium does not refer to social equality, but more to maintenance of social status-quo. Politeness is a particular case of politic behavior.

Important aspects of Watts' theory are restrictive codes and elaborative codes (Bernstein, 1971; Atkinson, 1985). Restrictive codes refer to closed communicative system, while elaborative codes to open communication system. The former system is practiced by closed-groups, while the latter is practiced by open-groups. Closed social groups with closed communicative system place the group's interest above the individual's, while the open social groups with open communicative system enjoy the individual's interest above the group's. This distinction has to do with Ide's notions of volition and discernment. Discernment is practiced by a closed society, for example, Japanese, which basically has a closed communicative system. A society with volition orientation usually has open communicative system, which practices volition, i.e. conscious selection of language by a speaker. Discernment strategies demand that an individual adjust their roles within a group, while volition strategies enable an individual to be prominent beyond a social group.

In Watts' theory, a non-politic behavior is the negative deviation of politic behavior, while politeness is the positive deviation. Politeness consists of behaviors which are more than merely politic or more than merely appropriate. Politeness is a strategic conscious behavior which aims to positively influence the opinion of a hearer upon a speaker's self.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from Watts' theory are probably (1) that performing more or better than the group's interest in an open society is positive or polite, and (2) that observing and adjusting to the group's interest in a closed society is polite.

3.1.7 Gu (1990)

Gu (1990) views politeness from the concept of Chinese politeness. Gu explicitly links politeness to social morals and ethics, thus managing social face for politeness, instead of interpersonal face. Gu's theory is prescriptive in the concept of Chinese *limao* (politeness), and is attached to moral sanctions from the society. Politeness is not instrumental but normative. Face is not threatened when individual want is not satisfied, but it is when an individual does not observe the standards or expectations of the society. Within the Chinese concept, politeness holds the principle that individual's behaviors should be adjusted to social expectations on respectfulness, modesty, and warmth and refinement. Gu proposes four maxims of politeness, i.e. self-denigration, address, tact, and generosity.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from Gu's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs of respect, modesty, warmth, or refinement to others is polite, and (2) that giving things to others as a sign of generosity is polite.

3.1.8 Lakoff (1990)

Lakoff (1990) asserts that politeness has fallen into imperative rules, i.e. (1) *Don't impose*, (2) *Give options*, and (3) *Make A feel good, be friendly* (Lakoff, 1990). In the first rule, Lakoff suggests that an utterance or verbal form should not contain imposition or arrogance from the side of a speaker. Different cultures apply the three rules differently, and hence culture consequently affects social distance in the first rule, deference in the second, and camaraderie or friendship in the third. Social distance suggests strategies of impersonality, deference does those of respect, and camaraderie does those of informality. Furthermore, Lakoff sees roughly that European cultures stress more on distancing strategies, Asian cultures more on deferential strategies, and modern American cultures on camaraderie.

The non-verbal hints for politeness interpreted from this theory are (1) that keeping the considerate silence instead of making any imposition even the lightest one is polite, and (2) that producing any non-verbal signs of being friendly or making a hearer feel good is polite.

3.1.9 Blum-Kulka (1992)

Blum-Kulka (1992) studies politeness in the context of Israel-Jewish. This theory borrows elements of other politeness theories and interprets them in a culture-relativistic concept. The term cultural norms or cultural scripts are central in this theory. This theory embraces the concept of face-wants but the wants are culturally determined. It also admits obligatory and strategic use of language, but the scope and depth are interculturally different. Obligatory use of language in this theory is termed cultural conventions. Politeness in Blum-Kulka's

theory is about appropriate social behaviors, determined by cultural expectations or cultural norms. This theory of politeness involves cultural interpretations on interactions of four parameters: social motivations, expressive modes, social differentials, and social meaning. Social motivations refer to reasons for someone's being polite, expressive modes to linguistic forms for politeness, social differentials to situational conditions for politeness (e.g. power, distance, relationship), and social meaning of linguistic expressions in particular context.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this Blum Kulka's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs of appreciation or any conventional symbols is polite, and (2) that behaving non-verbally adjusted to particular context is polite.

3.1.10 Spencer-Oatey (1992)

Spencer-Oatey (1992) studies politeness in cross-cultural context, viewing that what is respected in a particular culture is probably not so in another, e.g. the autonomy principle, which is applicable to Western cultures, but is not so in Eastern cultures. Spencer-Oatey (1992) proposes a set of dimensions called Spencer-Oatey's pragmatic scale, which comprises three needs: autonomy, approbation, and relational identity. Autonomy is preferred to imposition, approbation is preferred to criticism, and inclusion and equality are preferred to exclusion and subordination.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this pragmatic scale theory are probably (1) that keeping silent on what others are doing is more polite than commenting or saying something about it, (2) that giving any signs of agreement or acceptance is more polite than saying something contrary or criticising, and (3) that joining a group or gathering in some situation is more polite than being alone or in exclusion within that situation.

3.1.11 Thomas' Pollyanna Hypothesis (1996)

Pollyanna is a little girl in the novel Eleanor H. Porter. The girl has such interesting attitudes that she likes to see things from the bright side of life, as described by Thomas (1996). The Pollyanna principle thus suggests one to find best ways to say something. This principle also applies in why people tend to talk about interesting things than dull ones, or the bright side of life than the dark side. In verbal form, for example, the utterance *something too short* is mitigated into *something a bit short*, or the utterance *I wish you good luck* (a wish for success) is accepted, but not *I wish you bad luck* (an expression for sympathy or commiseration).

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this theory are probably (1) that giving or allowing something better or best of ours to others is polite, and (2) that making others happy or pleased with something we do is polite.

3.2 Hints of Politeness: From Verbal to Non-Verbal Form

Now we are coming to hints of politeness, from verbal to non-verbal form. The non-verbal hints here have been interpreted from theories of verbal politeness from Fraser and Nolen (1981), Leech (1983), Arndt and Janney (1985), Brown and Levinson (1987), Ide (1989), Watts (1989), Gu (1990), Lakoff (1990), Blum-Kulka (1992), Spencer-Oatey (1992), and Thomas' Pollyanna Hypothesis (1996). The interpretation has resulted in six hints, each of which will be accounted for in the next section.

3.2.1 Silence for Politeness

The first non-verbal hint is Silence for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Fraser & Nolen (1981), Leech (1983), Brown & Levinson (1987), Lakoff (1990), and Spencer-Oatey (1992).

This hint has been referred to as a contract to observe when the situation calls for (Fraser & Nolen, 1981), as making others happy (Leech, 1983), as not doing the face-threatening act (Brown & Levinson, 1987), as not making any imposition (Lakoff, 1990), and as not commenting or saying something about what others are doing (Spencer-Oatey, 1992).

3.2.2 Gestures for Politeness

The second non-verbal hint is Gestures for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Arndt and Janney (1985), Ide (1989), Gu (1990), Lakoff (1990), Blum-Kulka (1992), and Spencer-Oatey (1992).

This hint has been referred to as giving any signs or cross-modal emotive cues in interaction with a hearer (Arndt & Janney, 1985), as giving any signs of discernment to others with higher social status or with more power, and older people (Ide, 1989), as giving any signs of respect, modesty, warmth, or refinement to others (Gu, 1990), as producing any non-verbal signs of being friendly or making a hearer feel good (Lakoff, 1990), as giving any signs of appreciation or any conventional symbols (Blum-Kulka, 1992), and as giving any signs of agreement or acceptance, not of something contrary or criticising (Spencer-Oatey, 1992).

3.2.3 Gifts for Politeness

The third non-verbal hint is Gifts for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Leech (1983), Brown and Levinson (1987), Gu (1990), and Thomas (1996).

This hint has been referred to as making others happy, for example by giving things they would like to expect or to have (Leech, 1983), as giving something better or best to others, whether we are close to them (positive politeness) or we are not (negative politeness) (Brown & Levinson, 1987), as giving things to others as a sign of generosity (Gu, 1990), and as giving or allowing something better or best of ours to others (Thomas, 1996).

3.2.4 Observance of Norms, Rules, and Regulations for Politeness

The fourth non-verbal hint is Observance of Norms, Rules, and Regulations for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Fraser & Nolen (1981), Arndt & Janney (1985), and Ide (1989).

This hint has been referred to as observing the norms in society or rules in institutions, not violating them (Fraser & Nolen, 1981), as observing social symbols or signs of regulations in social context (Arndt & Janney, 1985), and as observing the formal situation and its participants, occasions, and topic (Ide, 1989).

3.2.5 Adjusted Behavior for Politeness

The fifth non-verbal hint is Adjusted Behavior for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Watts (1989), Blum-Kulka (1992), Spencer-Oatey (1992).

This hint has been referred to as observing and adjusting to the group's interest (Watts, 1989), as behaving non-verbally adjusted to particular context (Blum-Kulka, 1992), and as joining a group or gathering in some situation, instead of being alone or in exclusion within that situation (Spencer-Oatey, 1992).

3.2.6 Performance for Politeness

The sixth non-verbal hint is Performance for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Watts (1989) and Thomas (1996).

This hint has been referred to as performing more or better than the group's interest in an open society (Watts, 1989) and as making others happy or pleased with something we do (Thomas, 1996).

4. Discussion

Based on the results of the analysis, acting the intangible or actings for politeness in the Indonesian context can be identified by hints of politeness in non-verbal form. There are, therefore, 6 (six) hints with appropriate actings as discussed here. The six hints are (a) silence for politeness, (b) gestures for politeness, (c) gifts for politeness, (d) observance to norms, rules, and regulations for politeness, (e) adjusted behavior for politeness, and (f) performance for politeness.

Silence is part of politeness in non-verbal form. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint are those concerning silence, e.g. attention, empathy, or impartiality, for example (a) keeping silent when attentive to a hearer speaking, (b) keeping silent when showing empathy to a hearer expressing sadness or misery, (c) keeping silent when angry to an annoying hearer, (d) keeping silent for showing impartiality on two or more hearers in a severe argument, and (e) keeping silent in a highly formal situation.

Gestures are also part of politeness in non-verbal form. Gestures concern facial expressions or other bodily movements and are part of non-verbal politeness. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint are, for example (a) smiling as a sign of friendliness, (b) noticing a hearer coming and approaching, (c) nodding the head as a sign of paying attention to a hearer saying a point, (d) waving the hand as a sign of acknowledging a hearer within sighting distance, and (e) bending the body when meeting a respected hearer.

Gifts are also part of politeness in non-verbal form. Gifts or things given to a hearer are part of non-verbal politeness. Better-quality gifts show more politeness than less-quality ones. This situation is the opposite of the one when a speaker empty-handed is visiting a hearer. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint in everyday life are, for example (a) giving something after a trip (trip-gift) to a hearer, (b) sending a self-cooked meal or purchased one to a neighbor hearer, (c) allowing a sum of money or valuables to a partying hearer, (d) allowing a sum of money for a hearer in bereaved situation, and (e) giving a hand to a hearer busy with loaded stuff.

Observance of norms, rules, and regulations is part of politeness in non-verbal form. Norms or rules or regulations in social life are usually passed for particular sanctions. Observance of them is part of politeness, and is regarded as normal. Meanwhile, violation of them is regarded as not polite. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint in everyday life are, for example (a) listening solemnly to an elder hearer talking, (b)

obeying what is told by a parent hearer, (c) giving something with the right hand to a hearer, (d) observing the traffic regulations, e.g. turning right or left with a lighted sign, and (e) not violating the law.

Adjusted behavior is part of politeness. Adjusting a speaker's behavior to a particular context is part of politeness in non-verbal form. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint in everyday life are, for example (a) accepting and not underestimating the group's interest, (b) joining and sitting at the group's gathering, (c) coming to an invitation by the group, (d) pretending to be happy on the group's interest, and (e) keeping and taking care of gifts from the group.

Performance in a particular manner is part of politeness in non-verbal form. Performance or body movement involves a speaker's motions or movements directed to a particular hearer within the acting distance. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint are, for example (a) giving way to a hearer walking in a hurry, (b) beseeching or fetching a seat for a hearer, (c) escorting a hearer to a particular room for a meeting, (d) giving a ride or a lift to a needy hearer, (e) dressing-up best and properly for a formal situation, (f) helping an aged hearer to cross the street, and (g) traveling farther and purchasing something for the group which is better, more interesting, or more expensive than the group's interest or expectation.

To bring this discussion to an end, we can present here as the findings of the research that the hints of politeness in non-verbal form in the Indonesian context are (a) silence for politeness, (b) gestures for politeness, (c) gifts for politeness, (d) observance of norms, rules, and regulations for politeness, (e) adjusted behavior for politeness, and (f) performance for politeness. The hints of non-verbal politeness above are applicable in interactions or communication by Indonesian speakers in the real-life everyday practices. Acting the intangible or actings for politeness are probably partly or wholly also applicable to the practices of languages and culture in the world, including, the authors believe, English languages and cultures. The non-verbal forms or actings shown as exemplary practices in this research are just part of potential others in the human non-verbal interactions or communication.

The hints of non-verbal politeness in this research should be best considered by a speaker when interacting or communicating with a particular hearer especially in the formal context or situation, or in the general public. The hints should also be best considered by teachers and learners of language to encourage harmonious interactions or communication, including the contexts of English language teaching and learning. However, the authors also believe that there are shortcomings of this research, as not all variables have been controlled, e.g. speakers of different ages and or speakers of different languages or speech communities. It is a collegial suggestion that other researchers conduct a further research based on the findings of this research or other researches concerning other ideologies within non-verbal interactions or communication.

The actings derived from the hints of non-verbal politeness in this research are open to elaboration by different languages or speech communities in the world, despite presumably universal aspects of languages. Further researches on these actings are encouraged to verify or to develop the findings in this research or to find out other hints of non-verbal politeness which probably exist in particular languages or speech communities.

References

- Arndt, H., & Janney, R. W. (1985). Politeness revisited: cross-modal supportive strategies. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 23(4), 281-300. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1985.23.1-4.281>
- Atkinson, P. (1985). *Language, structure and reproduction: An introduction to the sociology of Basil Bernstein*. London: Methuen. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203463239>
- Bernstein, B. (1971). *Class, code and control, Volume 1: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language*. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203014035>
- Baker, M. J. (2000). Writing a Literature Review. *The Marketing Review*, 1(2), 219-247. <https://doi.org/10.1362/1469347002529189>
- Bohm, A. (2004). Theoretical coding: text analysis in grounded theory'. In U. Flick, E. Kardorff, & I. Steinke (Eds.), *A Companion to Qualitative Research* (pp. 270-275). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Bolderston, A. (2008). Writing an Effective Literature Review. *Journal of Medical Imaging and Radiation Sciences*, 39, 86-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmir.2008.04.009>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1992). The metapragmatics of Politeness in Israeli Society. In Richard Watts, S. Ide, K. Ehlich (eds.) *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory, and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Fraser, B., & Nolen, W. (1981). The association of deference with linguistic form. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 93-109. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1981.27.93>
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness Phenomena in Modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatic*, 14, 237-257. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90082-O](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90082-O)
- Holloway, I. (1997). *Basic concepts for qualitative research*. Oxford: Blackwell Science Ltd.
- Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua*, 8(2/3), 223-248. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.1989.8.2-3.223>
- Jumanto, J. (2014). Politeness and camaraderie: how types of form matter in Indonesian context. Proceeding: *The Second International Conference on Education and Language (2nd ICEL)*. Bandar Lampung University (UBL), Indonesia.
- Lakoff, R. T. (1990). *Talking power: the politics of language in our lives*. Glasgow: Harper Collins.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Limited.
- Saldana, Johnny. (2012). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. D. M. (1992). Cross-cultural politeness: British and Chinese conceptions of the tutor-student relationship (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Lancaster: Lancaster University.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques*. California: Sage Publications.
- Thomas, J. (1996). *Meaning in interaction: an introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Watts, R. (1989). Relevance and relational work: linguistic politeness as politic behavior. *Multilingua*, 8(2-3), 131-166. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.1989.8.2-3.131>
- Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: writing a literature review. *MIS Quarterly*, 26(2), xiii-xxiii.

Notes

1. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/acting>
2. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hint>
3. <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/hint>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Result of Review

Title: Acting the Intangible: Hints of Politeness in Non-Verbal Form

Author(s): Jumanto, Sarif Syamsu Rizal, Raden Arief Nugroho

Decision of Paper Selection

- A. Accept submission, no revisions required.
- B. Revisions required; please revise the paper according to comments.
- C. Decline submission; you may revise and resubmit for review.
- D. Decline submission.

What should you do next? (Only for accepted papers, A & B)

- ✓ Revise the paper according to the comments (if applicable).
- ✓ All authors must agree on the publication; please inform us of agreement by e-mail.
- ✓ Pay a publication fee of **400.00USD** for the paper.
 - ✧ Please find payment information at: <http://payment.ccsenet.org>
 - ✧ Please notify the editorial assistant when payment has been made

Proposed Schedule for Publication (Only for accepted papers, A & B)

- ✓ Vol. 10, No. 11, 2017, if you meet above requirements **within 10 days**.
- ✓ e-Version First: the online version may be published soon after the final draft is completed.
- ✓ You may also ask to publish the paper later, if you need more time for revision or payment.

Additional Information (Only for accepted papers, A & B)

- ✓ You will receive two copies (per paper) of the printed journal, *free of charge*
- ✓ If you want to buy more printed journals, please contact the editorial assistant
- ✓ You may download the e-journal in PDF free of charge at: <http://elt.ccsenet.org>
- ✓ Other questions please contact the editorial assistant at: elt@ccsenet.org

Comments from Editor

Evaluation	Grade
	Please give a grade of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 (high to low)
Overall evaluation of the paper	2.5
Contribution to existing knowledge	2
Organization and readability	2.5
Soundness of methodology	2
Evidence supports conclusion	2.5
Adequacy of literature review	2.5
Comments and Suggestions	
<p>(*) Revise the paper according to <i>Paper Submission Guide</i>: http://submission.ccsenet.org</p> <p>(*) Add DOI persistent links to those references that have DOIs, please see <i>Paper Submission Guide</i>.</p> <p>(*) Improve your paper according to the reviewer's comments.</p>	

Note: revise your paper according to the items with “(*)”

Comments from Reviewer A

❖ Evaluation (Please evaluate the manuscript by grade 1-5)	
5=Excellent 4=Good 3=Average 2=Below Average 1=Poor	
Items	Grade
Contribution to existing knowledge	2
Organization and readability	2
Soundness of methodology	2
Evidence supports conclusion	2
Adequacy of literature review	3
❖ Strengths This is basically a literature review.	
❖ Weaknesses This is not a research paper as the author calls it. It hardly contributes to existing knowledge	
❖ Suggestions to Author/s The topic is interesting. Research investigation into its nature and effects on local communities would be encouraged.	

Comments from Reviewer B

❖ Evaluation (Please evaluate the manuscript by grade 1-5)	
5=Excellent 4=Good 3=Average 2=Below Average 1=Poor	
Items	Grade
Contribution to existing knowledge	3
Organization and readability	2
Soundness of methodology	2
Evidence supports conclusion	2
Adequacy of literature review	3
❖ Weaknesses	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some grammatical, punctuation, capitalization, and spacing mistakes, some phrases should paraphrase and need to proofreading. - The article/paper was not a research article, it just a theoretical review, so correct the abstract, correct the method (it no need to employ the grounded theory design or auto ethnography), match it with the results and discussion. Do not put the Indonesia because there were no data and evidence suggested the author's interpretation. - There was no summary and conclusion of the article - Mistaking in writing the references 	
❖ Suggestions to Author/s	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Correcting the abstract and method based on article form such as non research article or theoretical review - Give additional sub topic for the conclusion - Correcting the references based on the guideline 	

Acting the Intangible: Hints of Politeness in Non-Verbal Form
(English Language Teaching; Paper ID-70630)

SUGGESTIONS FROM EDITOR		
No.	Points of Suggestion	Actions or Responses Done
1	Revising the paper according to <i>Paper Submission Guide</i> : http://submission.ccsenet.org .	Adjusted
2	Adding DOI persistent links to references (if any)	Adjusted
3	Improving the paper according to the reviewer's suggestions.	Adjusted
SUGGESTIONS FROM REVIEWER-1		
No.	Points of Suggestion	Actions or Responses Done
1	Investigating research into the topic's nature and effects on local communities.	Done; some sources provided
SUGGESTIONS FROM REVIEWER-2		
No.	Points of Suggestion	Actions or Responses Done
1	Correcting the abstract and method based on article form (e.g. non-research article or theoretical review).	Done; adjusted to review paper
2	Giving additional sub-topic for the conclusion.	Done; elaboration of the hints, adjusted
3	Correcting the references based on the guideline.	Done; including new sources

Semarang, Indonesia: 9 October 2017

Sincerely,
The authors,

Jumanto Jumanto; Sarif Syamsu Rizal; Raden Arief Nugroho

Acting the Intangible: Hints of Politeness in Non-Verbal Form

Abstract

This research paper has explored politeness in non-verbal form to come to hints for indicating the ideology. Politeness in non-verbal form is researched by reviewing verbal politeness theories through interpretive techniques, and then the data in form of interpreted hints based on the reviews are analyzed by employing a coding technique. The six non-verbal hints of politeness applied on real-life everyday practices found profusely widespread in the Indonesian context are silence for politeness, gestures for politeness, gifts for politeness, observance ~~to~~/of norms, rules, and regulations for politeness, adjusted behavior for politeness, and performance for politeness. The hints expectedly provide a sufficient account for non-verbal politeness in interactions or communication between a speaker and a hearer across languages and cultures in the world. The findings also encourage promoting harmony among speakers of languages in non-verbal interactions or communication, especially in formal situations or before public.

Keywords: verbal/linguistic politeness, non-verbal politeness, interpersonal face, social face, hint

1. Introduction

Language use is a matter of probabilities (Jumanto, 2014), either verbal language or non-verbal language. Conveying messages, therefore, is a matter of choices whether a speaker is using verbal language or verbal form or utterances, or they are using non-verbal language or non-verbal form or, merely called in this paper, **actings**. The word acting refers to the art or practice of representing a character on a stage or **before cameras**¹, analogically used here as acting before a particular hearer or before public. These actings may be in form of facial expressions or gestures, or else indicating non-verbal responses for communicating messages.

One of the messages conveyed by a speaker to a hearer is an ideology called politeness. Politeness is a message having to do with the want or the will of a particular hearer to be appreciated by a speaker of language. **This concept is termed as face by Erving Goffman (1959)**. Along with the development of face theory, there has been interpersonal face as well as social face. The former is managed together by a speaker and a hearer in a vis-a-vis communication, while the latter is protected together by a particular social group in interactions or communication. Interpersonal face or social face needs to be considered as well as maintained for the sake of interpersonal harmony or social harmony.

Theories of politeness on **interpersonal face as well as those on social face are** both important for interpersonal interactions or social interactions. These interactions may be vehicled by verbal form or non-verbal form. As in the case of politeness ideology, that verbal form or utterances should be elaborated in such a way that it is perceived as conveying politeness, and so is the case of non-verbal form or actings.

This **research paper** on Acting the Intangible: Hints of Politeness in Non-Verbal Form has made use of theories of verbal politeness, in which hints are interpreted through a coding technique upon the interpretive techniques applied in the verbal politeness theory reviews. The term intangible here is used to give an emphasis on the fact that politeness is a variant of meaning, thus concerning what behind the form perceived by our visual senses. Upon the hints interpreted, actings for politeness are presented, taken from real-life everyday practices within empirically logical assumption as well as experience of the researcher.

2. Method

This qualitative research employs **a grounded theory and is an autoethnography**. Grounded theory is an inductive type of research, based or "grounded" in the observations or data from which it was developed; it uses a variety of data sources, including quantitative data, review of records, interviews, observation and surveys (Ralph, Birks, and Chapman, 2014). Meanwhile, autoethnography is a form of qualitative research in which an author uses self-reflection and writing to explore their personal experience and connect this autobiographical story to wider cultural, political, and social meanings and understandings (Ellis, 2004; Maréchal, 2010). This inductive type of research is based on data in form of theory reviews on verbal politeness, which are then developed by the researcher by using his personal experience, hence autoethnographic, to address an issue, i.e. non-verbal hints of politeness.

The data analysis is done through interpretive techniques, in which the researcher examines the data and interpret them through forming an impression and reporting it in a structured form. The data in form of theory reviews upon

Comment [V1]: The article/paper was not a research article, it just a theoretical review, so correct the abstract, correct the method (it no need to employ the grounded theory design or autoethnography), match it with the results and discussion. Do not put the Indonesia and there were no data and evidence suggested the author's interpretation

Comment [V2]: Correct the method

¹<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/acting>

50 the interpretative techniques are then further analyzed through a coding technique, which consists of three steps:
51 open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Holloway, 1997; Bohm, 2004; Saladana,
52 2012).

53 In the open coding, the data in form of theory reviews are separated and conceptualized. The separated data are then
54 reunited in the axial coding to come to major categories. The selective coding then discovers the main phenomena,
55 i.e. a story line built by relating the major categories from the axial coding. The main non-verbal hints are then
56 applied to practices of politeness in everyday life.

57 The definition of politeness as the guideline for the reviews of politeness theories in this research is the one
58 proposed by Jumanto (2014), i.e. "Politeness is everything good that has been uttered as well as acted by the speaker
59 to the hearer within a particular context, to maintain their interpersonal face as well as their social face". The verb
60 uttered in the definition refers to verbal politeness, while the verb acted to non-verbal politeness. **Interpersonal face**
61 **as well as social face in the definition is also there in the theories to be reviewed and interpreted for the non-verbal**
62 **hints. It is the non-verbal hints which are to be found out in this research.**

Comment [V3]: Rephrasing

63 3. Results

64 3.1 Review of Verbal Politeness Theories and Non-Verbal Hints Interpreted

65 The data in form of theory reviews here are interpreted from verbal politeness theories of Fraser & Nolen (1981),
66 Leech (1983), Arndt & Janney (1985), Brown & Levinson (1987), Ide (1989), Watts (1989), Gu (1990), Lakoff
67 (1990), Blum-Kulka (1992), Spencer-Oatey (1992), and Thomas' Pollyanna Hypothesis (1996). Each of the theories
68 is reviewed and interpreted for the non-verbal hints below. A hint here is referred to as a slight indication of the
69 existence, approach, or nature of somethingⁱⁱ or a piece of advice that helps us to do something.ⁱⁱⁱ

70 3.1.1 Fraser & Nolen (1981)

71 Fraser & Nolen (1981) propose a different view on politeness. They suggest that the freedom of others in
72 interactions, also in conversations, should be adjusted to a conversational contract. The contract includes observance
73 of norms and also rights and obligations in the interactions with others. The norms proposed by them are based on
74 four dimensions: conventional, institutional, situational, and historical. Conventional dimensions include common
75 rules in interactions, e.g. turns in conversation and softness or loudness of voice. Institutional dimensions include
76 rights and obligations as ruled by a social institution, e.g. the right to speak in court and attentive silence in the
77 church. Situational dimensions include factors in relation with/to roles, status, and relative power between a speaker
78 and a hearer. Historical dimensions refer to previous interactions between a speaker and a hearer. The four
79 dimensions vary in the applications. Politeness refers to observance to the conversational contract, while
80 impoliteness happens due to violation of the contract. Normal interactions, i.e. interactions based on norms, thus
81 politeness, are usually not seen, while impoliteness is usually noticed. In the eye of Fraser and Nolen, politeness is
82 not in form of strategic interaction nor making a hearer feel comfortable, but it is merely doing the obligations
83 acceptable to terms and conditions in the conversational contract.

84 The non-verbal hints interpreted from Fraser and Nolen's theory are probably (1) that observing the norms in society
85 or rules in institutions is polite, instead of violating them, and (2) that keeping silent is polite, as it is a contract to
86 observe when the situation calls.

87 3.1.2 Leech (1983)

88 Leech (1983) studies politeness in the light of harmony and smooth social interaction, so potential face-threatening
89 acts should be avoided. Leech has proposed 7 maxims for social harmony, i.e. maxims of (1) tact, (2) generosity, (3)
90 approbation, (4) modesty, (5) agreement, (6) sympathy, and (7) consideration. These maxims should be elaborated in
91 such a way that they give benefits more to others than to one's self. Leech has formulated things a speaker should
92 avoid doing to others (the don'ts), i.e. don't tell others what to do, don't say bad things of others, don't express
93 happiness when others are not happy, don't attack others' view or ideas, and don't praise yourself or show off your
94 wealth or strength.

95 The non-verbal hints interpreted from Leech's principles of politeness are probably (1) that making others happy, for
96 example by giving things they would like to expect or to have is polite, and (2) that saying nothing or keeping silent
97 when it makes others happy is probably polite.

98 3.1.3 Arndt & Janney (1985)

99 Arndt & Janney (1985) propose +the appropriacy-based approach to politeness. This theory asserts that politeness
100 concerns appropriate expressions in appropriate context, based on appropriate conventional rules. Arndt and
101 Janney's theory is an interpersonal framework stressing on people as the main factor as well as the center of
102 politeness. This theory centers on emotive communication, instead of emotional communication. The former refers
103 to strategic modification of affective signals to influence others, determined by social sanctions, interaction norms,
104 and civilized expectations, which enables a speaker to control their natural impulses. The latter refers to spontaneous,
105 uncontrolled expressions of emotion. Emotive communication within this theory involves not only utterances but
106 also para- and non-linguistic signals under three dimensions: confidence, positive and negative affections, and
107 intensity, through verbal forms, vocal, and kinesics, termed as cross-modal emotive cues.

108 This theory elaborates interpersonal supportiveness. Being polite here is not to do with social expectations, but is
109 more to avoid interpersonal conflicts. Interpersonal supportiveness is used to convey message. The main idea is that
110 there are supportive ways and non-supportive ways to express positive and negative feelings. An effective speaker
111 tries to minimize emotional uncertainty of the hearer by behaving as supportively as possible. This interpersonal
112 supportiveness refers to interpersonal politeness (or tact), which differs from social politeness. Social politeness
113 consists of linguistic forms of high convention, like traffic regulations as a set of conventional rules, which are
114 socially appropriate. Interpersonal politeness is conciliative, while social politeness is regulative.

115 The non-verbal hints interpreted from this Arndt and Janney's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs or
116 cross-modal emotive cues in interaction with a hearer is polite, and (2) that observing social symbols or signs of
117 regulations in social context is polite.

118 3.1.4 Brown & Levinson (1987)

119 Brown & Levinson studies politeness in line with face management, engineering the theory of face, i.e. the want of
120 everyone by Erving Goffman (1959). In the face theory, everyone has positive face and negative. Positive face refers
121 to the want or the will to be appreciated by others, while negative face refers to the want or the will not to be
122 deappreciated (Brown & Levinson, 1987). They have then divided utterances or verbal acts into two, i.e.
123 face-threatening acts (FTA) and face-saving acts (FSA), and also proposed politeness and negative politeness
124 strategies. In brief, the politeness strategies of Brown & Levinson are of 5 categories: (1) bald on records, (2)
125 positive politeness, (3) negative politeness, (4) off the records, (5) do not do the FTA.

126 The non-verbal hints interpreted from the theory are probably (1) that giving something better or best to others,
127 whether we are close to them (positive politeness) or we are not (negative politeness) is polite, and (2) that keeping
128 silent (not doing the FTA) is polite.

129 3.1.5 Ide (1989)

130 Ide's theory (1989) is based on Japanese politeness. The theory highlights discernment as the main aspect of
131 politeness, i.e. honorific forms or chosen verbal utterances demanded by the society. There are no socially neutral
132 utterances in Japanese, but honorific and non-honorific ones. A speaker should choose either one to give information
133 on their interpersonal relationship, even in their most banal factual statement. Use of honorific forms is a must so as
134 to reflect a socio-pragmatic equivalence to grammatical concord. This Japanese politeness called wakimae is based
135 on social conventions. Within this Ide's theory, there are four conventional rules to observe: being polite to people
136 with higher social status, being polite to people with more power, being polite to older people, being polite in the
137 formal situations: to the participants, the occasions, or the topic.

138 The non-verbal hints interpreted from this Ide's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs of discernment to
139 others with higher social status or with more power, and older people, is polite, and (2) that observing the formal
140 situation and its participants, occasions, and topic is polite.

141 3.1.6 Watts (1989)

142 Watts' theory of politeness (1989) refers to emotive communication as politic behavior, i.e. sociocultural behaviors
143 directed to instilling or maintaining an equilibrium of interpersonal relationship of individuals in a social group. The
144 equilibrium does not refer to social equality, but more to maintenance of social status-quo. Politeness is a particular
145 case of politic behavior.

146 Important aspects of Watts' theory are restrictive codes and elaborative codes in the theory of Basil Bernstein (1971;
147 Aitkinson, 1985). Restrictive codes refer to closed communicative system, while elaborative codes to open
148 communication system. The former system is practiced by closed-groups, while the latter is practiced by

Comment [V4]: Put in the reference

149 open-groups. Closed social groups with closed communicative system place—the group's interest above the
150 individual's, while the open social groups with open communicative system enjoy the individual's interest above the
151 group's. This distinction has to do with Ide's notions of **volition** and discernment. Discernment is practiced by a
152 closed society, for example, Japanese, which basically has a closed communicative system. A society with volition
153 orientation usually has open communicative system, which practices **volition**, i.e. conscious selection of language
154 by a speaker. Discernment strategies demand that an individual adjust their roles within a group, while volition
155 strategies enable an individual to be prominent beyond a social group.

156 In Watts' theory, a non-politic behavior is the negative deviation of politic behavior, while politeness is the positive
157 deviation. Politeness consists of behaviors which are more than merely politic or more than merely appropriate.
158 Politeness is a strategic conscious behavior which aims to positively influence the opinion of a hearer upon a
159 speaker's self.

160 The non-verbal hints interpreted from Watts' theory are probably (1) that performing more or better than the
161 group's interest in an open society is positive or polite, and (2) that observing and adjusting to the group's interest in
162 a closed society is polite.

163 3.1.7 Gu (1990)

164 Gu (1990) views politeness from the concept of Chinese politeness. Gu explicitly links politeness to social morals
165 and ethics, thus managing social face for politeness, instead of interpersonal face. Gu's theory is prescriptive in the
166 concept of Chinese *limao* (politeness), and is attached to moral **sactions** from the society. Politeness is not
167 instrumental but **normatif**. Face is not threatened when individual want is not satisfied, but it is when an individual
168 does not observe the standards or expectations of the society. Within the Chinese concept, politeness holds the
169 principle that individual's behaviors should be adjusted to social expectations on respectfulness, modesty, and
170 warmth and refinement. Gu proposes four maxims of politeness, i.e. self-denigration, address, tact, and generosity.

171 The non-verbal hints interpreted from Gu's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs of respect, modesty,
172 warmth, or refinement to others is polite, and (2) that giving things to others as a sign of generosity is polite.

173 3.1.8 Lakoff (1990)

174 Lakoff (1990) asserts that politeness has fallen into imperative rules, i.e. (1) Don't impose, (2) Give options, and (3)
175 Make A feel good, be friendly. (Lakoff, 1990). In the first rule, Lakoff suggests that an utterance or verbal form
176 should not contain imposition or arrogance from the side of a speaker. Different cultures apply the three rules
177 differently, and hence culture consequently affects social distance in the first rule, deference in the second, and
178 camaraderie or friendship in the third. Social distance suggests strategies of impersonality, deference does those of
179 respect, and camaraderie does those of informality. Furthermore, Lakoff sees roughly that European cultures stress
180 more on distancing strategies, Asian cultures more on deferential strategies, and modern American cultures on
181 camaraderie.

182 The non-verbal hints for politeness **interpreted from** this theory are (1) that keeping the considerate silence instead of
183 making any imposition even the lightest one is polite, and (2) that producing any non-verbal signs of being **friendly** or
184 making a hearer feel good is polite.

185 3.1.9 Blum-Kulka (1992)

186 Blum-Kulka (1992) studies politeness in the context of Israel-Jewish. This theory borrows elements of other
187 politeness theories and interprets them in a culture-relativistic concept. The term cultural norms or **cultural scripts** is
188 central in this theory. This theory embraces the concept of face-wants but the wants are culturally determined. It also
189 admits obligatory and strategic use of language, but the scope and depth are intercultural different. Obligatory use
190 of language in this theory is termed cultural conventions. Politeness in Blum-Kulka's theory is about appropriate
191 social behaviors, determined by cultural expectations or cultural norms. This theory of politeness involves cultural
192 interpretations on interactions of four parameters: social motivations, expressive modes, social differentials, and
193 social meaning. Social motivations refer to reasons for someone's being polite, expressive modes to linguistic forms
194 for politeness, social differentials to situational conditions for politeness (e.g. power, distance, relationship), and
195 social meaning ~~to~~ of linguistic expressions in particular context.

196 The non-verbal hints interpreted from this Blum Kulka's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs of
197 appreciation or any conventional symbols is polite, and (2) that behaving non-verbally adjusted to particular context
198 is polite.

199 3.1.10 Spencer-Oatey (1992)

200 Spencer-Oatey (1992) studies politeness in cross-cultural context, viewing that what is respected in a particular
201 culture is probably not so in another, e.g. the autonomy principle, which is applicable to Western cultures, but is not
202 so in Eastern cultures. Spencer-Oatey (1992) proposes a set of dimensions called Spencer-Oatey's pragmatic scale,
203 which comprises three needs: autonomy, approbation, and relational identity. Autonomy is preferred to imposition,
204 approbation is preferred to criticism, and inclusion and equality are preferred to exclusion and subordination.

205 The non-verbal hints interpreted from this pragmatic scale theory are probably (1) that keeping silent on what others
206 are doing is more polite than commenting or saying something about it, (2) that giving any signs of agreement or
207 acceptance is more polite than saying something contrary or criticising, and (3) that joining a group or gathering in
208 some situation is more polite than being alone or in exclusion within that situation.

209 3.1.11 Thomas' Pollyanna Hypothesis (1996)

210 Pollyanna is a little girl in the novel Eleanor H. Porter. The girl has such interesting attitudes that she likes to see
211 things from the bright side of life, as described by Thomas (1996). The Pollyanna principle thus suggests one to find
212 best ways to say something. This principle also applies in why people tend to talk about interesting things than dull
213 ones, or the bright sides of life than the dark sides. In verbal form, for example, something too short is said as
214 something a bit short, or I wish you good luck (a wish for success), but **not** I wish you bad luck (a **sympathy** or
215 commiseration).

216 The non-verbal **hints interpreted from** this theory are probably (1) that giving or allowing something better or best
217 of ours to others is polite, and (2) that making others happy or pleased **of** with something we do is polite.

218 3.2. *Hints of Politeness: From Verbal to Non-Verbal Form*

219 Now we are coming to hints of politeness, from verbal to non-verbal form. The non-verbal hints here have been
220 interpreted from theories of verbal politeness from Fraser & Nolen (1981), Leech (1983), Arndt & Janney (1985),
221 Brown & Levinson (1987), Ide (1989), Watts (1989), Gu (1990), Lakoff (1990), Blum-Kulka (1992), Spencer-Oatey
222 (1992), and Thomas' Pollyanna Hypothesis (1996). The interpretation has resulted in six hints, each of which will be
223 accounted for in the next section.

224 3.2.1 Silence for Politeness

225 The first non-verbal hint is Silence for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by
226 Fraser & Nolen (1981), Leech (1983), Brown & Levinson (1987), Lakoff (1990), and Spencer-Oatey (1992).

227 This hint has been referred to as a contract to observe when the situation calls for (Fraser & Nolen, 1981), as making
228 others happy (Leech, 1983), as not doing the face-threatening act (Brown & Levinson, 1987), as not making any
229 imposition (Lakoff, 1990), and as not commenting or saying something about what others are doing (Spencer-Oatey,
230 1992).

231 3.2.2 Gestures for Politeness

232 The second non-verbal hint is Gestures for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories
233 by Arndt & Janney (1985), Ide (1989), Gu (1990), Lakoff (1990), Blum-Kulka (1992), and Spencer-Oatey (1992).

234 This hint has been referred to as giving any signs or cross-modal emotive cues in interaction with a hearer (Arndt &
235 Janney, 1985), as giving any signs of discernment to others with higher social status or with more power, and older
236 people (Ide, 1989), as giving any signs of respect, modesty, warmth, or refinement to others (Gu, 1990), as
237 producing any non-verbal signs of being friendly or making a hearer feel good (Lakoff, 1990), as giving any signs of
238 appreciation or any conventional symbols (Blum-Kulka, 1992), and as giving any signs of agreement or acceptance,
239 not of something contrary or criticising (Spencer-Oatey, 1992).

240 3.2.3 Gifts for Politeness

241 The third non-verbal hint is Gifts for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by
242 Leech (1983), Brown & Levinson (1987), Gu (1990), and Thomas (1996).

243 This hint has been referred to as making others happy, for example by giving things they would like to expect or to
244 have (Leech, 1983), as giving something better or best to others, whether we are close to them (positive politeness)
245 or we are not (negative politeness) (Brown & Levinson, 1987), as giving things to others as a sign of generosity (Gu,
246 1990), and as giving or allowing something better or best of ours to others (Thomas, 1996).

247 3.2.4 Observance to Norms, Rules, and Regulations for Politeness

248 The fourth non-verbal hint is Observance to Norms, Rules, and Regulations for Politeness. This hint has been
249 interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Fraser & Nolen (1981), Arndt & Janney (1985), and Ide (1989).

250 This hint has been referred to as observing the norms in society or rules in institutions, not violating them (Fraser &
251 Nolen, 1981), as observing social symbols or signs of regulations in social context (Arndt & Janney, 1985), and as
252 observing the formal situation and its participants, occasions, and topic (Ide, 1989).

253 3.2.5 Adjusted Behavior for Politeness

254 The fifth non-verbal hint is Adjusted Behavior for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness
255 theories by Watts (1989), Blum-Kulka (1992), Spencer-Oatey (1992).

256 This hint has been referred to as observing and adjusting to the group's interest (Watts, 1989), as behaving
257 non-verbally adjusted to particular context (Blum-Kulka, 1992), and as joining a group or gathering in some
258 situation, instead of being alone or in exclusion within that situation (Spencer-Oatey, 1992).

259 3.2.6 Performance for Politeness

260 The sixth non-verbal hint is Performance for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness
261 theories by Watts (1989) and Thomas (1996).

262 This hint has been referred to as performing more or better than the group's interest in an open society (Watts, 1989)
263 and as making others happy or pleased ~~ef~~with something we do (Thomas, 1996).

264 **4. Discussion**

265 Based on the results of the analysis, acting the intangible or actings for politeness in the Indonesian context can be
266 identified by hints of politeness in non-verbal form. There are, therefore, 6 (six) hints with appropriate actings as
267 discussed here. The six hints are (a) silence for politeness, (b) gestures for politeness, (c) gifts for politeness, (d)
268 observance to norms, rules, and regulations for politeness, (e) adjusted behavior for politeness, and (f) performance
269 for politeness.

270 Silence is part of politeness in non-verbal form. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint are those
271 concerning silence, e.g. attention, empathy, or impartiality, for example (a) keeping silent when attentive to a hearer
272 speaking, (b) keeping silent when showing empathy to a hearer expressing sadness or misery, (c) keeping silent
273 when angry to an annoying hearer, (d) keeping silent for showing impartiality on two or more hearers in a severe
274 argument, and (e) keeping silent in a highly formal situation.

275 Gestures are also part of politeness in non-verbal form. Gestures concern facial expressions or other bodily
276 movements and are part of non-verbal politeness. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint are, for
277 example (a) smiling as a sign of friendliness, (b) noticing a hearer coming and approaching, (c) nodding the head as
278 a sign of paying attention to a hearer saying a point, (d) waving the hand as a sign of acknowledging a hearer within
279 sighting distance, and (e) bending the body when meeting a respected hearer.

280 Gifts are also part of politeness in non-verbal form. Gifts or things given to a hearer is part of non-verbal politeness.
281 Better-quality gifts show more politeness than less-quality ones. This situation is the opposite of the one when a
282 speaker empty-handed is visiting a hearer. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint in everyday life are,
283 for example (a) giving something after a trip (trip-gift) to a hearer, (b) sending a self-cooked meal or purchased one
284 to a neighbor hearer, (c) allowing a sum of money or valuables to a partying hearer, (d) allowing a sum of money for
285 a hearer in bereaved situation, and (e) giving a hand to a hearer busy with loaded stuff.

286 Observance to norms, rules, and regulations is part of politeness in non-verbal form. Norms or rules or regulations in
287 social life are usually passed for particular sanctions. Observance to them is part of politeness, and is regarded as
288 normal. Meanwhile, violation of them is regarded as not polite. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint
289 in everyday life are, for example (a) listening solemnly to an elder hearer talking, (b) obeying what is told by a
290 parent hearer, (c) giving something with the right hand to a hearer, (d) observing the traffic regulations, e.g. turning
291 right or left with a lighted sign, and (e) not violating the law.

292 Adjusted behavior is part of politeness. Adjusting a speaker's behavior to a particular context is part of politeness in
293 non-verbal form. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint in everyday life are, for example (a)
294 accepting and not underestimating the group's interest, (b) joining and sitting at the group's gathering, (c) coming to
295 an invitation by the group, (d) pretending to be happy on the group's interest, and (e) keeping and taking care of gifts

296 from the group.
297 Performance in a particular manner is part of politeness in non-verbal form. Performance or body movement
298 involves a speaker's motions or movements directed to a particular hearer within the acting distance. The non-verbal
299 forms or actings concerning this hint are, for example (a) giving way to a hearer walking in a hurry, (b) beseeching or
300 fetching a seat for a hearer, (c) escorting a hearer to a particular room for a meeting, (d) giving a ride or a lift to a
301 needy hearer, (e) dressing-up best and properly for a formal situation, (f) helping an aged hearer to cross the street,
302 and (g) traveling farther and purchasing something for the group which is better, more interesting, or more
303 expensive than the group's interest or expectation.

304 To bring this discussion to an end, we can present here as the findings of the research that the hints of politeness in
305 non-verbal form in the Indonesian context are (a) silence for politeness, (b) gestures for politeness, (c) gifts for
306 politeness, (d) observance to norms, rules, and regulations for politeness, (e) adjusted behavior for politeness, and (f)
307 performance for politeness. The hints of non-verbal politeness above are applicable in interactions or
308 communication by Indonesian speakers in the real-life everyday practices. Acting the intangible or acting for
309 politeness is probably partly or wholly also applicable to the practices of languages and culture in the world,
310 including, the authors believe, English languages and cultures. The non-verbal forms or actings shown as exemplary
311 practices in this research are just part of potential others in the human non-verbal interactions or communication.

312 The hints of non-verbal politeness in this research should be best considered by a speaker when interacting or
313 communicating with a particular hearer especially in the formal context or situation, or before public. The hints of
314 non-verbal politeness in this research should also be best considered by teachers and learners of language to
315 encourage harmonious interactions or communication. The authors also believe that there are shortcomings of this
316 research, as not all variables have been controlled, e.g. subjects of different ages and different tribes in Indonesia. It
317 is a collegial suggestion that other researchers conduct a further research based on the findings of this research or
318 other researches concerning other ideologies within non-verbal interactions or communication.

319 **References**

- 320 Arndt, Horst & Janney, R.W. (1985). Politeness revisited: cross-modal supportive strategies. *International Review of*
321 *Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 23/4:281-300.
- 322 Atkinson, P. (1985). *Language, structure and reproduction: An introduction to the sociology of Basil Bernstein*.
323 London: Methuen.
- 324 Bohm, A. (2004). Theoretical coding: text analysis in grounded theory'. In U. Flick, E. Kardorff & I. Steinke (Eds.),
325 *A Companion to Qualitative Research* (pp. 270-275). London: SAGE Publications.
- 326 Brown, Penelope & Levinson, Stephen C. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. New York:
327 Cambridge University Press.
- 328 Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. (1992). The metapragmatics of Politeness in Israeli Society', in Richard Watts, S. Ide, K.
329 Ehlich (eds.) *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory, and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- 330 Ellis, Carolyn. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about auto ethnography*. Walnut Creek:
331 AltaMira Press.
- 332 Fraser, B. & Nolen, W. (1981). The association of deference with linguistic form. *International Journal of the*
333 *Sociology of Language*, 1981, 93-109.
- 334 Goffman, Erving. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Anchor Books.
- 335 Gu, Yueguo. (1990). Politeness Phenomena in Modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatic*, 14:237-257. DOI:
336 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90082-O](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90082-O)
- 337 Holloway, Immy. (1997). *Basic concepts for qualitative research*. Oxford: Blackwell Science Ltd.
- 338 Ide, Sachiko. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness.
339 *Multilingua*, 8-2/3 (1989) 223-248. Retrieved from:
340 http://www.sachikoide.com/1989b_Formal_Forms_and_Discernment.pdf
- 341 Jumanto, Jumanto. (2014). Politeness and camaraderie: how types of form matter in Indonesian context. *Proceeding:*
342 *The Second International Conference on Education and Language(2nd ICEL)*. Bandar Lampung University
343 (UBL), Indonesia. ISSN: 2303-1417, 2014, pp. II-335-350. Retrieved from: <http://artikel.ubl.ac.id/>

Comment [V5]: Give additional sub
topic of conclusion

Comment [V6]: See the guideline for
the reference

- 344 Lakoff, Robin Tolmach. (1990). *Talking power: the politics of language in our lives*. Glasgow: Harper Collins.
- 345 Leech, Geoffrey. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Limited.
- 346 Maréchal, Garance. (2010). Autoethnography. In Albert J. Mills, Gabrielle Durepos & EldenWiebe (Eds.),
347 *Encyclopedia of case study research* (Vol. 2, pp. 43-45). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- 348 Ralph, N., Birks, M. & Chapman, Y. (2014). Contextual positioning: using documents as extant data in grounded
349 theory research. *SAGE Open*. 4 (3). DOI: 10.1177/2158244014552425.
- 350 **Saladana, Johnny. (2012). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage. ISBN 1446247376.**
- 351 Spencer-Oatey, H.D.M. (1992). Cross-cultural politeness: British and Chinese conceptions of the tutor-student
352 relationship (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Lancaster: Lancaster University.
- 353 Strauss, Anselm & Corbin, Juliet. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques*.
354 California: Sage Publications.
- 355 Thomas, Jenny. (1996). *Meaning in interaction: an introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- 356 Watts, Richards. (1989). Relevance and relational work: linguistic politeness as politic behavior.
357 *Multilingua*8/2-3:131-166. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.9>
- 358

ⁱ<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/acting>

ⁱⁱ<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hint>

ⁱⁱⁱ<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/hint>

Acting the Intangible: Hints of Politeness in Non-Verbal Form

Abstract

This review paper has explored politeness in non-verbal form to come to hints for indicating the ideology. Politeness in non-verbal form is researched by reviewing verbal politeness theories through interpretive techniques, and then the data in form of interpreted hints based on the reviews are analyzed by employing a coding technique. The six non-verbal hints of politeness found out based on the theoretical reviews are silence for politeness, gestures for politeness, gifts for politeness, observance of norms, rules, and regulations for politeness, adjusted behavior for politeness, and performance for politeness. The hints expectedly provide a sufficient account for non-verbal politeness in interactions or communication between a speaker and a hearer. The findings also encourage promoting harmony among speakers of languages in non-verbal interactions or communication, especially in formal situations or in the general public. The hints are hopefully also worth considering in the context of English language teaching and learning across languages and cultures in the world.

Keywords: verbal/linguistic politeness, non-verbal politeness, interpersonal face, social face, hint

1. Introduction

Language use is a matter of probabilities (Jumanto, 2014), either verbal language or non-verbal language. Conveying messages, therefore, is a matter of choices whether a speaker is using verbal language or verbal form or utterances, or they are using non-verbal language or non-verbal form or, merely called *acting* in this paper. The word acting refers to the art or practice of representing a character on a stage or before cameras¹, analogically used here as acting before a particular hearer or in the general public. This acting may be in form of facial expressions or gestures, or else indicating non-verbal responses for communicating messages.

One of the messages conveyed by a speaker to a hearer is an ideology called politeness. Politeness is a message having to do with the want or the will of a particular hearer to be appreciated by a speaker of language. This concept is termed *face* by Erving Goffman (1959). Along with the development of face theory, there has been interpersonal face as well as social face. The former is managed together by a speaker and a hearer in a vis-a-vis communication, while the latter is protected together by a particular social group in interactions or communication. Interpersonal face or social face needs to be considered as well as maintained for the sake of interpersonal harmony or social harmony.

Theories of politeness on interpersonal face or social face are important for interpersonal interactions or social interactions. These interactions may be vehicled by verbal form or non-verbal form. As in the case of politeness ideology, that verbal form or utterances should be elaborated in such a way that it is perceived as conveying politeness, and so is the case of non-verbal form or actings.

This review paper on acting the intangible, i.e. hints of politeness in non-verbal form has made use of theories of verbal politeness, in which hints are interpreted through a coding technique upon the interpretive techniques applied in the verbal politeness theory reviews. The term intangible here is used to give an emphasis on the fact that politeness is a variant of meaning, thus concerning what behind the form perceived by our visual senses. Upon the hints interpreted, actings for politeness are presented, taken from real-life everyday practices within empirically logical assumption as well as experience of the researcher.

2. Method

This qualitative research is a literature review. A literature review requires different kinds of activities and ways of thinking (Baker, 2000). An effective review creates a firm foundation for advancing knowledge, facilitates theory development, closes areas where a plethora of research exists, and uncovers areas where research is needed (Webster & Watson, 2002). In this review, new ideas from others' work are extracted by synthesizing and summarizing previous sources so that new theories and directions for future research can be built and suggested based on the evidence (Bolderston, 2008). The literature review in this research is done through interpretive techniques; therefore, interpreting is the main way of thinking in this research. In this research, foundation for advancing knowledge and developing theory is created from interpreting and reviewing established theories of verbal politeness to come to hints of non-verbal politeness. The hints function to limit areas for further research, i.e. non-verbal politeness. Other ways of thinking involved in this research are synthesizing and summarizing of the hints, and then elaboration of the hints into practices (actings) is made to confirm that the hints are applicable in probable real-life situations of speech communities.

51 Through the interpretive techniques, the researchers examine the data and interpret them through forming an
52 impression and reporting it in a structured form. The data in form of theory reviews upon the interpretative
53 techniques are then further analyzed through a coding technique, which consists of three steps: open coding, axial
54 coding, and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Holloway, 1997; Bohm, 2004; Saladana, 2012).

55 In the open coding, the data in form of theory reviews are separated and conceptualized. The separated data are then
56 reunited in the axial coding to come to major categories. The selective coding then discovers the main phenomena,
57 i.e. a story line built by relating the major categories from the axial coding. The main non-verbal hints are then
58 applied to practices of politeness in everyday life.

59 The definition of politeness as the guideline for the reviews of politeness theories in this research is the one
60 proposed by Jumanto (2014), i.e. “Politeness is everything good that has been uttered as well as acted by the speaker
61 to the **hearer within** a particular context, to maintain their interpersonal face as well as their social face”. The verb
62 uttered in the definition refers to verbal politeness, while the verb acted to non-verbal politeness. **Based on the**
63 **definition, the researchers examine and interpret interpersonal face and social face and their connection with verbal**
64 **politeness theories to come to the non-verbal hints. It is the non-verbal hints of politeness which are to be found out**
65 **in this research.**

66 3. Results

67 3.1 Review of Verbal Politeness Theories and Non-Verbal Hints Interpreted

68 The data in form of theory reviews here are interpreted from verbal politeness theories of Fraser & Nolen (1981),
69 Leech (1983), Arndt & Janney (1985), Brown & Levinson (1987), Ide (1989), Watts (1989), Gu (1990), Lakoff
70 (1990), Blum-Kulka (1992), Spencer-Oatey (1992), and Thomas’ Pollyanna Hypothesis (1996). Each of the theories
71 is reviewed and interpreted for the non-verbal hints below. A hint here is referred to as a slight indication of the
72 existence, approach, or nature of somethingⁱⁱ or a piece of advice that helps us to do something.ⁱⁱⁱ

73 3.1.1 Fraser & Nolen (1981)

74 Fraser & Nolen (1981) propose a different view on politeness. They suggest that the freedom of others in
75 interactions, also in conversations, should be adjusted to a conversational contract. The contract includes observance
76 of norms and also rights and obligations in the interactions with others. The norms proposed by them are based on
77 four dimensions: conventional, institutional, situational, and historical. Conventional dimensions include common
78 rules in interactions, e.g. turns in conversation and softness or loudness of voice. Institutional dimensions include
79 rights and obligations as ruled by a social institution, e.g. the right to speak in court and attentive silence in the
80 church. Situational dimensions include factors in relation to roles, status, and relative power between a speaker and a
81 hearer. Historical dimensions refer to previous interactions between a speaker and a hearer. The four dimensions
82 vary in the applications. Politeness refers to observance to the conversational contract, while impoliteness happens
83 due to violation of the contract. Normal interactions, i.e. interactions based on norms, thus politeness, are usually not
84 seen, while impoliteness is usually noticed. In the eye of Fraser and Nolen, politeness is not in form of strategic
85 interaction nor making a hearer feel comfortable, but it is merely doing the obligations acceptable to terms and
86 conditions in the conversational contract.

87 The non-verbal hints interpreted from Fraser and Nolen’s theory are probably (1) that observing the norms in society
88 or rules in institutions is polite, instead of violating them, and (2) that keeping silent is polite, as it is a contract to
89 observe when the situation calls.

90 3.1.2 Leech (1983)

91 Leech (1983) studies politeness in the light of harmony and smooth social interaction, so potential face-threatening
92 acts should be avoided. Leech has proposed 7 maxims for social harmony, i.e. maxims of (1) tact, (2) generosity, (3)
93 approbation, (4) modesty, (5) agreement, (6) sympathy, and (7) consideration. These maxims should be elaborated in
94 such a way that they give benefits more to others than to one’s self. Leech has formulated things a speaker should
95 avoid doing to others (the don’ts), i.e. don’t tell others what to do, don’t say bad things of others, don’t express
96 happiness when others are not happy, don’t attack others’ view or ideas, and don’t praise yourself or show off your
97 wealth or strength.

98 The non-verbal hints interpreted from Leech’s **principles** of politeness are probably (1) that making others happy, for
99 example by giving things they would like to expect or to have is polite, and (2) that saying nothing or keeping silent
100 when it makes others happy is probably polite.

101 3.1.3 Arndt & Janney (1985)

102 Arndt & Janney (1985) propose **the** appropriacy-based approach to politeness. This theory asserts that politeness
103 concerns appropriate expressions in appropriate context, based on appropriate conventional rules. Arndt and
104 Janney's theory is an interpersonal framework stressing on people as the main factor as well as the center of
105 politeness. This theory centers on emotive communication, instead of emotional communication. The former refers
106 to strategic modification of affective signals to influence others, determined by social sanctions, interaction norms,
107 and civilized expectations, which enables a speaker to control their natural impulses. The latter refers to spontaneous,
108 **uncontrolled** expressions of emotion. Emotive communication within this theory involves not only utterances but
109 also para- and non-linguistic **signals under** three dimensions: confidence, positive and negative affections, and
110 intensity, through verbal forms, vocal, and kinesics, termed as cross-modal emotive cues.

111 This theory elaborates interpersonal supportiveness. Being polite here is not to do with social expectations, but is
112 more to avoid interpersonal conflicts. Interpersonal supportiveness is used to convey message. The main idea is that
113 there are supportive ways and non-supportive ways to express positive and negative feelings. An effective speaker
114 tries to minimize emotional uncertainty of the hearer by behaving as supportively as possible. This interpersonal
115 supportiveness refers to interpersonal politeness (or tact), which differs from social politeness. Social politeness
116 consists of linguistic forms of high convention, like traffic regulations as a set of conventional rules, which are
117 socially appropriate. Interpersonal politeness is conciliative, while social politeness is regulative.

118 The non-verbal hints interpreted from this Arndt and Janney's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs or
119 cross-modal emotive cues in interaction with a hearer is polite, and (2) that observing social symbols or signs of
120 regulations in social context is polite.

121 3.1.4 Brown & Levinson (1987)

122 Brown & Levinson studies politeness in line with face management, engineering the theory of face, i.e. the want of
123 everyone by Erving Goffman (1959). In the face theory, everyone has positive face and negative. Positive face refers
124 to the want or the will to be appreciated by others, while negative face refers to the want or the will not **be**
125 deappreciated (Brown & Levinson, 1987). They have then divided utterances or verbal acts into two, i.e.
126 face-threatening acts (FTA) and face-saving acts (FSA), and also proposed politeness and negative politeness
127 strategies. In brief, the politeness strategies of Brown & Levinson are of 5 categories: (1) bald on records, (2)
128 positive politeness, (3) negative politeness, (4) **off** the records, (5) do not do the FTA.

129 The non-verbal hints interpreted from the theory are probably (1) that giving something better or best to others,
130 whether we are close to them (positive politeness) or we are not (negative politeness) is polite, and (2) that keeping
131 silent (not doing the FTA) is polite.

132 3.1.5 Ide (1989)

133 Ide's theory (1989) is based on Japanese politeness. The theory highlights **discernment** as the main aspect of
134 politeness, i.e. honorific forms or chosen verbal utterances demanded by the society. There are no socially neutral
135 utterances in Japanese, but honorific and non-honorific ones. A speaker should choose either one to give information
136 on their interpersonal relationship, even in their most banal factual statement. Use of honorific forms is a must so as
137 to reflect a socio-pragmatic equivalence to grammatical concord. This Japanese politeness called wakimae is based
138 on social conventions. Within this Ide's theory, there are four conventional rules to observe: being polite to people
139 with higher social status, being polite to people with more power, being polite to older people, being polite in the
140 formal situations: to the participants, the occasions, or the topic.

141 The non-verbal hints interpreted from this Ide's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs of discernment to
142 others with higher social status or with more power, and older people, is polite, and (2) that observing the formal
143 situation and its participants, occasions, and topic is polite.

144 3.1.6 Watts (1989)

145 Watts' theory of politeness (1989) refers to emotive communication as politic behavior, i.e. sociocultural behaviors
146 directed **to instill or maintain** an equilibrium of interpersonal relationship of individuals in a social group. The
147 equilibrium does not refer to social equality, but more to maintenance of social status-quo. Politeness is a particular
148 case of politic behavior.

149 Important aspects of Watts' theory are restrictive codes and elaborative codes (**Bernstein, 1971; Atkinson, 1985**).
150 Restrictive codes refer to closed communicative system, while elaborative codes to open communication system.

151 The former system is practiced by closed-groups, while the latter is practiced by open-groups. Closed social groups
152 with closed communicative system **place** the group's interest above the individual's, while the open social groups
153 with open communicative system enjoy the individual's interest above the group's. This distinction has to do with
154 Ide's notions of **volition** and discernment. Discernment is practiced by a closed society, for example, Japanese,
155 which basically has a closed communicative system. A society with volition orientation usually has open
156 communicative system, which practices **volition**, i.e. conscious selection of language by a speaker. Discernment
157 strategies demand that an individual adjust their roles within a group, while volition strategies enable an individual
158 to be prominent beyond a social group.

159 In Watts' theory, a non-politic behavior is the negative deviation of politic behavior, while politeness is the positive
160 deviation. Politeness consists of behaviors which are more than merely politic or more than merely appropriate.
161 Politeness is a strategic conscious behavior which aims to positively influence the opinion of a hearer upon a
162 speaker's self.

163 The non-verbal hints interpreted from Watts' theory are probably (1) that performing more or better than the
164 group's interest in an open society is positive or polite, and (2) that observing and adjusting to the group's interest in
165 a closed society is polite.

166 3.1.7 Gu (1990)

167 Gu (1990) views politeness from the concept of Chinese politeness. Gu explicitly links politeness to social morals
168 and ethics, thus managing social face for politeness, instead of interpersonal face. Gu's theory is prescriptive in the
169 concept of Chinese *limao* (politeness), and is attached to moral **sanctions** from the society. Politeness is not
170 instrumental but **normative**. Face is not threatened when individual want is not satisfied, but it is when an individual
171 does not observe the standards or expectations of the society. Within the Chinese concept, politeness holds the
172 principle that individual's behaviors should be adjusted to social expectations on respectfulness, modesty, and
173 warmth and refinement. Gu proposes four maxims of politeness, i.e. self-denigration, address, tact, and generosity.

174 The non-verbal hints interpreted from Gu's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs of respect, modesty,
175 warmth, or refinement to others is polite, and (2) that giving things to others as a sign of generosity is polite.

176 3.1.8 Lakoff (1990)

177 Lakoff (1990) asserts that politeness has fallen into imperative rules, i.e. (1) *Don't impose*, (2) *Give options*, and (3)
178 *Make A feel good, be friendly* (Lakoff, 1990). In the first rule, Lakoff suggests that an utterance or verbal form
179 should not contain imposition or arrogance from the side of a speaker. Different cultures apply the three rules
180 differently, and hence culture consequently affects social distance in the first rule, deference in the second, and
181 camaraderie or friendship in the third. Social distance suggests strategies of impersonality, deference does those of
182 respect, and camaraderie does those of informality. Furthermore, Lakoff sees roughly that European cultures stress
183 more on distancing strategies, Asian cultures more on deferential strategies, and modern American cultures on
184 camaraderie.

185 The non-verbal hints for politeness **interpreted from** this theory are (1) that keeping the considerate silence instead of
186 making any imposition even the lightest one is polite, and (2) that producing any non-verbal signs of being **friendly**
187 or making a hearer feel good is polite.

188 3.1.9 Blum-Kulka (1992)

189 Blum-Kulka (1992) studies politeness in the context of Israel-Jewish. This theory borrows elements of other
190 politeness theories and interprets them in a culture-relativistic concept. The term cultural norms or **cultural scripts**
191 **are** central in this theory. This theory embraces the concept of face-wants but the wants are culturally determined. It
192 also admits obligatory and strategic use of language, but the scope and depth are interculturally different. Obligatory
193 use of language in this theory is termed cultural conventions. Politeness in Blum-Kulka's theory is about appropriate
194 social behaviors, determined by cultural expectations or cultural norms. This theory of politeness involves cultural
195 interpretations on interactions of four parameters: social motivations, expressive modes, social differentials, and
196 social meaning. Social motivations refer to reasons for someone's being polite, expressive modes to linguistic forms
197 for politeness, social differentials to situational conditions for politeness (e.g. power, distance, relationship), and
198 social meaning **of** linguistic expressions in particular context.

199 The non-verbal hints interpreted from this Blum Kulka's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs of
200 appreciation or any conventional symbols is polite, and (2) that behaving non-verbally adjusted to particular context

201 is polite.

202 3.1.10 Spencer-Oatey (1992)

203 Spencer-Oatey (1992) studies politeness in cross-cultural context, viewing that what is respected in a particular
204 culture is probably not so in another, e.g. the autonomy principle, which is applicable to Western cultures, but is not
205 so in Eastern cultures. Spencer-Oatey (1992) proposes a set of dimensions called Spencer-Oatey's pragmatic scale,
206 which comprises three needs: autonomy, approbation, and relational identity. Autonomy is preferred to imposition,
207 approbation is preferred to criticism, and inclusion and equality are preferred to exclusion and subordination.

208 The non-verbal hints interpreted from this pragmatic scale theory are probably (1) that keeping silent on what others
209 are doing is more polite than commenting or saying something about it, (2) that giving any signs of agreement or
210 acceptance is more polite than saying something contrary or criticising, and (3) that joining a group or gathering in
211 some situation is more polite than being alone or in exclusion within that situation.

212 3.1.11 Thomas' Pollyanna Hypothesis (1996)

213 Pollyanna is a little girl in the novel Eleanor H. Porter. The girl has such interesting attitudes that she likes to see
214 things from the bright side of life, as described by Thomas (1996). The Pollyanna principle thus suggests one to find
215 best ways to say something. This principle also applies in why people tend to talk about interesting things than dull
216 ones, or the bright *side* of life than the dark *side*. *In verbal form, for example, the utterance something too short is*
217 *mitigated into something a bit short, or the utterance I wish you good luck (a wish for success) is accepted, but not I*
218 *wish you bad luck (an expression for sympathy or commiseration).*

219 The non-verbal *hints interpreted from* this theory are probably (1) that giving or allowing something better or best of
220 ours to others is polite, and (2) that making others happy or pleased *with* something we do is polite.

221 3.2. Hints of Politeness: From Verbal to Non-Verbal Form

222 Now we are coming to hints of politeness, from verbal to non-verbal form. The non-verbal hints here have been
223 interpreted from theories of verbal politeness from Fraser & Nolen (1981), Leech (1983), Arndt & Janney (1985),
224 Brown & Levinson (1987), Ide (1989), Watts (1989), Gu (1990), Lakoff (1990), Blum-Kulka (1992), Spencer-Oatey
225 (1992), and Thomas' Pollyanna Hypothesis (1996). The interpretation has resulted in six hints, each of which will be
226 accounted for in the next section.

227 3.2.1 Silence for Politeness

228 The first non-verbal hint is Silence for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by
229 Fraser & Nolen (1981), Leech (1983), Brown & Levinson (1987), Lakoff (1990), and Spencer-Oatey (1992).

230 This hint has been referred to as a contract to observe when the situation calls (Fraser & Nolen, 1981), as making
231 others happy (Leech, 1983), as not doing the face-threatening act (Brown & Levinson, 1987), as not making any
232 imposition (Lakoff, 1990), and as not commenting or saying something about what others are doing (Spencer-Oatey,
233 1992).

234 3.2.2 Gestures for Politeness

235 The second non-verbal hint is Gestures for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories
236 by Arndt & Janney (1985), Ide (1989), Gu (1990), Lakoff (1990), Blum-Kulka (1992), and Spencer-Oatey (1992).

237 This hint has been referred to as giving any signs or cross-modal emotive cues in interaction with a hearer (Arndt &
238 Janney, 1985), as giving any signs of discernment to others with higher social status or with more power, and older
239 people (Ide, 1989), as giving any signs of respect, modesty, warmth, or refinement to others (Gu, 1990), as
240 producing any non-verbal signs of being friendly or making a hearer feel good (Lakoff, 1990), as giving any signs of
241 appreciation or any conventional symbols (Blum-Kulka, 1992), and as giving any signs of agreement or acceptance,
242 not of something contrary or criticising (Spencer-Oatey, 1992).

243 3.2.3 Gifts for Politeness

244 The third non-verbal hint is Gifts for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by
245 Leech (1983), Brown & Levinson (1987), Gu (1990), and Thomas (1996).

246 This hint has been referred to as making others happy, for example by giving things they would like to expect or to
247 have (Leech, 1983), as giving something better or best to others, whether we are close to them (positive politeness)
248 or we are not (negative politeness) (Brown & Levinson, 1987), as giving things to others as a sign of generosity (Gu,

249 1990), and as giving or allowing something better or best of ours to others (Thomas, 1996).

250 3.2.4 Observance of Norms, Rules, and Regulations for Politeness

251 The fourth non-verbal hint is Observance of Norms, Rules, and Regulations for Politeness. This hint has been
252 interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Fraser & Nolen (1981), Arndt & Janney (1985), and Ide (1989).

253 This hint has been referred to as observing the norms in society or rules in institutions, not violating them (Fraser &
254 Nolen, 1981), as observing social symbols or signs of regulations in social context (Arndt & Janney, 1985), and as
255 observing the formal situation and its participants, occasions, and topic (Ide, 1989).

256 3.2.5 Adjusted Behavior for Politeness

257 The fifth non-verbal hint is Adjusted Behavior for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness
258 theories by Watts (1989), Blum-Kulka (1992), Spencer-Oatey (1992).

259 This hint has been referred to as observing and adjusting to the group's interest (Watts, 1989), as behaving
260 non-verbally adjusted to particular context (Blum-Kulka, 1992), and as joining a group or gathering in some
261 situation, instead of being alone or in exclusion within that situation (Spencer-Oatey, 1992).

262 3.2.6 Performance for Politeness

263 The sixth non-verbal hint is Performance for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness
264 theories by Watts (1989) and Thomas (1996).

265 This hint has been referred to as performing more or better than the group's interest in an open society (Watts, 1989)
266 and as making others happy or pleased with something we do (Thomas, 1996).

267 4. Discussion

268 Based on the results of the analysis, acting the intangible or actings for politeness in the Indonesian context can be
269 identified by hints of politeness in non-verbal form. There are, therefore, 6 (six) hints with appropriate actings as
270 discussed here. The six hints are (a) silence for politeness, (b) gestures for politeness, (c) gifts for politeness, (d)
271 observance to norms, rules, and regulations for politeness, (e) adjusted behavior for politeness, and (f) performance
272 for politeness.

273 Silence is part of politeness in non-verbal form. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint are those
274 concerning silence, e.g. attention, empathy, or impartiality, for example (a) keeping silent when attentive to a hearer
275 speaking, (b) keeping silent when showing empathy to a hearer expressing sadness or misery, (c) keeping silent
276 when angry to an annoying hearer, (d) keeping silent for showing impartiality on two or more hearers in a severe
277 argument, and (e) keeping silent in a highly formal situation.

278 Gestures are also part of politeness in non-verbal form. Gestures concern facial expressions or other bodily
279 movements and are part of non-verbal politeness. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint are, for
280 example (a) smiling as a sign of friendliness, (b) noticing a hearer coming and approaching, (c) nodding the head as
281 a sign of paying attention to a hearer saying a point, (d) waving the hand as a sign of acknowledging a hearer within
282 sighting distance, and (e) bending the body when meeting a respected hearer.

283 Gifts are also part of politeness in non-verbal form. Gifts or things given to a hearer are part of non-verbal politeness.
284 Better-quality gifts show more politeness than less-quality ones. This situation is the opposite of the one when a
285 speaker empty-handed is visiting a hearer. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint in everyday life are,
286 for example (a) giving something after a trip (trip-gift) to a hearer, (b) sending a self-cooked meal or purchased one
287 to a neighbor hearer, (c) allowing a sum of money or valuables to a partying hearer, (d) allowing a sum of money for
288 a hearer in bereaved situation, and (e) giving a hand to a hearer busy with loaded stuff.

289 Observance of norms, rules, and regulations is part of politeness in non-verbal form. Norms or rules or regulations in
290 social life are usually passed for particular sanctions. Observance of them is part of politeness, and is regarded as
291 normal. Meanwhile, violation of them is regarded as not polite. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint
292 in everyday life are, for example (a) listening solemnly to an elder hearer talking, (b) obeying what is told by a
293 parent hearer, (c) giving something with the right hand to a hearer, (d) observing the traffic regulations, e.g. turning
294 right or left with a lighted sign, and (e) not violating the law.

295 Adjusted behavior is part of politeness. Adjusting a speaker's behavior to a particular context is part of politeness in
296 non-verbal form. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint in everyday life are, for example (a)

297 accepting and not underestimating the group's interest, (b) joining and sitting at the group's gathering, (c) coming to
298 an invitation by the group, (d) pretending to be happy on the group's interest, and (e) keeping and taking care of gifts
299 from the group.

300 Performance in a particular manner is part of politeness in non-verbal form. Performance or body movement
301 involves a speaker's motions or movements directed to a particular hearer within the acting distance. The non-verbal
302 forms or actings concerning this hint are, for example (a) giving way to a hearer walking in a hurry, (b) beseeching or
303 fetching a seat for a hearer, (c) escorting a hearer to a particular room for a meeting, (d) giving a ride or a lift to a
304 needy hearer, (e) dressing-up best and properly for a formal situation, (f) helping an aged hearer to cross the street,
305 and (g) traveling farther and purchasing something for the group which is better, more interesting, or more
306 expensive than the group's interest or expectation.

307 To bring this discussion to an end, we can present here as the findings of the research that the hints of politeness in
308 non-verbal form in the Indonesian context are (a) silence for politeness, (b) gestures for politeness, (c) gifts for
309 politeness, (d) observance of norms, rules, and regulations for politeness, (e) adjusted behavior for politeness, and (f)
310 performance for politeness. The hints of non-verbal politeness above are applicable in interactions or
311 communication by Indonesian speakers in the real-life everyday practices. Acting the intangible or **actings** for
312 politeness **are** probably partly or wholly also applicable to the practices of languages and culture in the world,
313 including, the authors believe, English languages and cultures. The non-verbal forms or actings shown as exemplary
314 practices in this research are just part of potential others in the human non-verbal interactions or communication.

315 The hints of non-verbal politeness in this research should be best considered by a speaker when interacting or
316 communicating with a particular hearer especially in the formal context or situation, or **in the general public**. The
317 hints should also be best considered by teachers and learners of language to encourage harmonious interactions or
318 communication, **including the contexts of English language teaching and learning**. However, the authors also believe
319 that there are shortcomings of this research, as not all variables have been **controlled**, e.g. **speakers of different ages**
320 **and or speakers of different languages or speech communities**. It is a collegial suggestion that other researchers
321 conduct a further research based on the findings of this research or other researches concerning other ideologies
322 within non-verbal interactions or communication.

323 **The actings derived from the hints of non-verbal politeness in this research are open to elaboration by different**
324 **languages or speech communities in the world, despite presumably universal aspects of languages. Further**
325 **researches on these actings are encouraged to verify or to develop the findings in this research or to find out other**
326 **hints of non-verbal politeness which probably exist in particular languages or speech communities.**

327 **References**

- 328 Arndt, Horst & Janney, R.W. (1985). Politeness revisited: cross-modal supportive strategies. *International Review of*
329 *Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 23/4:281-300.
- 330 Atkinson, P. (1985). *Language, structure and reproduction: An introduction to the sociology of Basil Bernstein*.
331 London: Methuen.
- 332 Bernstein, B. (1971). *Class, code and control, Volume 1: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language*.
333 London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- 334 Baker, M. J. (2000). Writing a Literature Review, *The Marketing Review*, 1(2): 219-247.
- 335 Bohm, A. (2004). Theoretical coding: text analysis in grounded theory'. In U. Flick, E. Kardorff & I. Steinke (Eds.),
336 *A Companion to Qualitative Research* (pp. 270-275). London: SAGE Publications.
- 337 Bolderston, Amanda. (2008). Writing an Effective Literature Review, *Journal of Medical Imaging and Radiation*
338 *Sciences*, 39 (2008) 86-92. DOI: [https://doi: 10.1016/j.jmir.2008.04.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmir.2008.04.009)
- 339 Brown, Penelope & Levinson, Stephen C. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. New York:
340 Cambridge University Press.
- 341 Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. (1992). The metapragmatics of Politeness in Israeli Society', in Richard Watts, S. Ide, K.
342 Ehlich (eds.) *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory, and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- 343 Fraser, B. & Nolen, W. (1981). The association of deference with linguistic form. *International Journal of the*
344 *Sociology of Language*, 1981, 93-109.
- 345 Goffman, Erving. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Anchor Books.

- 346 Gu, Yueguo. (1990). Politeness Phenomena in Modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatic*, 14:237-257. DOI:
347 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90082-O](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90082-O)
- 348 Holloway, Immy. (1997). *Basic concepts for qualitative research*. Oxford: Blackwell Science Ltd.
- 349 Ide, Sachiko. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness.
350 *Multilingua*, 8-2/3 (1989) 223-248. Retrieved from:
351 http://www.sachikoide.com/1989b_Formal_Forms_and_Discernment.pdf
- 352 Jumanto, Jumanto. (2014). Politeness and camaraderie: how types of form matter in Indonesian context. Proceeding:
353 *The Second International Conference on Education and Language(2nd ICEL)*. Bandar Lampung University
354 (UBL), Indonesia. ISSN: 2303-1417, 2014, pp. II-335-350. Retrieved from: <http://artikel.ubl.ac.id/>
- 355 Lakoff, Robin Tolmach. (1990). *Talking power: the politics of language in our lives*. Glasgow: Harper Collins.
- 356 Leech, Geoffrey. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Limited.
- 357 Saladana, Johnny. (2012). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Sage. ISBN 1446247376.
- 358 Spencer-Oatey, H.D.M. (1992). Cross-cultural politeness: British and Chinese conceptions of the tutor-student
359 relationship (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Lancaster: Lancaster University.
- 360 Strauss, Anselm & Corbin, Juliet. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques*.
361 California: Sage Publications.
- 362 Thomas, Jenny. (1996). *Meaning in interaction: an introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- 363 Watts, Richards. (1989). Relevance and relational work: linguistic politeness as politic behavior.
364 *Multilingua* 8/2-3:131-166. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.9>
- 365 Webster, Jane & Watson, Richard T. (2002). Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: writing a literature review,
366 *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (Jun., 2002), pp. xiii-xxiii. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/3250961>.

ⁱ<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/acting>

ⁱⁱ<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hint>

ⁱⁱⁱ<http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/hint>

Acting the Intangible: Hints of Politeness in Non-Verbal Form

Jumanto Jumanto¹, Sarif Syamsu Rizal¹ & Raden Arief Nugroho¹

¹ Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Dian Nuswantoro, Semarang, Jawa Tengah, Indonesia

Correspondence: Jumanto Jumanto, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Dian Nuswantoro, Semarang, Jawa Tengah, Indonesia. Tel: 62-812-878-2484. E-mail: ilhamj@dsn.dinus.ac.id

Received: September 16, 2017 Accepted: October X, 2017 Online Published: October X, 2017

doi: 10.5539/elt.v10n11p

URL: <http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n11p>

Abstract

This review paper has explored politeness in non-verbal form to come to hints for indicating the ideology. Politeness in non-verbal form is researched by reviewing verbal politeness theories through interpretive techniques, and then the data in form of interpreted hints based on the reviews are analyzed by employing a coding technique. The six non-verbal hints of politeness found out based on the theoretical reviews are silence for politeness, gestures for politeness, gifts for politeness, observance of norms, rules, and regulations for politeness, adjusted behavior for politeness, and performance for politeness. The hints expectedly provide a sufficient account for non-verbal politeness in interactions or communication between a speaker and a hearer. The findings also encourage promoting harmony among speakers of languages in non-verbal interactions or communication, especially in formal situations or in the general public. The hints are hopefully also worth considering in the context of English language teaching and learning across languages and cultures in the world.

Keywords: verbal/linguistic politeness, non-verbal politeness, interpersonal face, social face, hint

1. Introduction

Language use is a matter of probabilities (Jumanto, 2014), either verbal language or non-verbal language. Conveying messages, therefore, is a matter of choices whether a speaker is using verbal language or verbal form or utterances, or they are using non-verbal language or non-verbal form or, merely called *acting* in this paper. The word acting refers to the art or practice of representing a character on a stage or before cameras (Note 1), analogically used here as acting before a particular hearer or in the general public. This acting may be in form of facial expressions or gestures, or else indicating non-verbal responses for communicating messages.

One of the messages conveyed by a speaker to a hearer is an ideology called politeness. Politeness is a message having to do with the want or the will of a particular hearer to be appreciated by a speaker of language. This concept is termed *face* by Erving Goffman (1959). Along with the development of face theory, there has been interpersonal face or social face. The former is managed together by a speaker and a hearer in a *vis-a-vis* communication, while the latter is protected together by a particular social group in interactions or communication. Interpersonal face or social face needs to be considered as well as maintained for the sake of interpersonal harmony or social harmony.

Theories of politeness on interpersonal face or social face are important for interpersonal interactions or social interactions. These interactions may be vehicled by verbal form or non-verbal form. As in the case of politeness ideology, that verbal form or utterances should be elaborated in such a way that it is perceived as conveying politeness, and so is the case of non-verbal form or actings.

This review paper on acting the intangible, i.e. hints of politeness in non-verbal form has made use of theories of verbal politeness, in which hints are interpreted through a coding technique upon the interpretive techniques applied in the verbal politeness theory reviews. The term intangible here is used to give an emphasis on the fact that politeness is a variant of meaning, thus concerning what behind the form perceived by our visual senses. Upon the hints interpreted, actings for politeness are presented, taken from real-life everyday practices **in the Indonesian context** within empirically logical assumption as well as experience of the **researchers**.

2. Method

This qualitative research is a literature review. A literature review requires different kinds of activities and ways of thinking (Baker, 2000). An effective review creates a firm foundation for advancing knowledge, facilitates

theory development, closes areas where a plethora of research exists, and uncovers areas where research is needed (Webster & Watson, 2002). In this review, new ideas from others' work are extracted by synthesizing and summarizing previous sources so that new theories and directions for future research can be built and suggested based on the evidence (Bolderston, 2008). The literature review in this research is done through interpretive techniques; therefore, interpreting is the main way of thinking in this research. In this research, foundation for advancing knowledge and developing theory is created from interpreting and reviewing established theories of verbal politeness to come to hints of non-verbal politeness. The hints function to limit areas for further research, i.e. non-verbal politeness. Other ways of thinking involved in this research are synthesizing and summarizing of the hints, and then elaboration of the hints into practices (actings) is made to confirm that the hints are applicable in probable real-life situations of speech communities.

Through the interpretive techniques, the researchers examine the data and interpret them through forming an impression and reporting it in a structured form. The data in form of theory reviews upon the interpretive techniques are then further analyzed through a coding technique, which consists of three steps: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Holloway, 1997; Bohm, 2004; [Saladana, 2012](#)).

In the open coding, the data in form of theory reviews are separated and conceptualized. The separated data are then reunited in the axial coding to come to major categories. The selective coding then discovers the main phenomena, i.e. a story line built by relating the major categories from the axial coding. The main non-verbal hints are then applied to practices of politeness in everyday life.

The definition of politeness as the guideline for the reviews of politeness theories in this research is the one proposed by Jumanto (2014), i.e. "Politeness is everything good that has been uttered as well as acted by the speaker to the hearer within a particular context, to maintain their interpersonal face as well as their social face". The verb *uttered* in the definition refers to verbal politeness, while the verb *acted* to non-verbal politeness. Based on the definition, the researchers examine and interpret interpersonal face and social face and their connection with verbal politeness theories to come to the non-verbal hints. It is the non-verbal hints of politeness which are to be found out in this research.

3. Results

3.1 Review of Verbal Politeness Theories and Non-Verbal Hints Interpreted

The data in form of theory reviews here are interpreted from verbal politeness theories of Fraser & Nolen (1981), Leech (1983), Arndt & Janney (1985), Brown & Levinson (1987), Ide (1989), Watts (1989), Gu (1990), Lakoff (1990), Blum-Kulka (1992), Spencer-Oatey (1992), and Thomas' Pollyanna Hypothesis (1996). Each of the theories is reviewed and interpreted for the non-verbal hints below. A hint here is referred to as a slight indication of the existence, approach, or nature of something (Note 2) or a piece of advice that helps us to do something (Note 3).

3.1.1 Fraser and Nolen (1981)

Fraser & Nolen (1981) propose a different view on politeness. They suggest that the freedom of others in interactions, also in conversations, should be adjusted to a conversational contract. The contract includes observance of norms and also rights and obligations in the interactions with others. The norms proposed by them are based on four dimensions: conventional, institutional, situational, and historical. Conventional dimensions include common rules in interactions, e.g. turns in conversation and softness or loudness of voice. Institutional dimensions include rights and obligations as ruled by a social institution, e.g. the right to speak in court and attentive silence in the church. Situational dimensions include factors in relation to roles, status, and relative power between a speaker and a hearer. Historical dimensions refer to previous interactions between a speaker and a hearer. The four dimensions vary in the applications. Politeness refers to observance to the conversational contract, while impoliteness happens due to violation of the contract. Normal interactions, i.e. interactions based on norms, thus politeness, are usually not seen, while impoliteness is usually noticed. In the eye of Fraser and Nolen, politeness is not in form of strategic interaction nor making a hearer feel comfortable, but it is merely doing the obligations acceptable to terms and conditions in the conversational contract.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from Fraser and Nolen's theory are probably (1) that observing the norms in society or rules in institutions is polite, instead of violating them, and (2) that keeping silent is polite, as it is a contract to observe when the situation calls.

3.1.2 Leech (1983)

Leech (1983) studies politeness in the light of harmony and smooth social interaction, so potential face-threatening acts should be avoided. Leech has proposed 7 maxims for social harmony, i.e. maxims of (1)

tact, (2) generosity, (3) approbation, (4) modesty, (5) agreement, (6) sympathy, and (7) consideration. These maxims should be elaborated in such a way that they give benefits more to others than to one's self. Leech has formulated things a speaker should avoid doing to others (the don'ts), i.e. don't tell others what to do, don't say bad things of others, don't express happiness when others are not happy, don't attack others' view or ideas, and don't praise yourself or show off your wealth or strength.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from Leech's principles of politeness are probably (1) that making others happy, for example by giving things they would like to expect or to have is polite, and (2) that saying nothing or keeping silent when it makes others happy is probably polite.

3.1.3 Arndt and Janney (1985)

Arndt & Janney (1985) propose the appropriacy-based approach to politeness. This theory asserts that politeness concerns appropriate expressions in appropriate context, based on appropriate conventional rules. Arndt and Janney's theory is an interpersonal framework stressing on people as the main factor as well as the center of politeness. This theory centers on emotive communication, instead of emotional communication. The former refers to strategic modification of affective signals to influence others, determined by social sanctions, interaction norms, and civilized expectations, which enables a speaker to control their natural impulses. The latter refers to spontaneous, uncontrolled expressions of emotion. Emotive communication within this theory involves not only utterances but also para- and non-linguistic signals under three dimensions: confidence, positive and negative affections, and intensity, through verbal forms, vocal, and kinesics, termed as cross-modal emotive cues.

This theory elaborates interpersonal supportiveness. Being polite here is not to do with social expectations, but is more to avoid interpersonal conflicts. Interpersonal supportiveness is used to convey message. The main idea is that there are supportive ways and non-supportive ways to express positive and negative feelings. An effective speaker tries to minimize emotional uncertainty of the hearer by behaving as supportively as possible. This interpersonal supportiveness refers to interpersonal politeness (or tact), which differs from social politeness. Social politeness consists of linguistic forms of high convention, like traffic regulations as a set of conventional rules, which are socially appropriate. Interpersonal politeness is conciliative, while social politeness is regulative.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this Arndt and Janney's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs or cross-modal emotive cues in interaction with a hearer is polite, and (2) that observing social symbols or signs of regulations in social context is polite.

3.1.4 Brown and Levinson (1987)

Brown & Levinson studies politeness in line with face management, engineering the theory of face, i.e. the want of everyone by Erving Goffman (1959). In the face theory, everyone has positive face and negative. Positive face refers to the want or the will to be appreciated by others, while negative face refers to the want or the will not be deappreciated (Brown & Levinson, 1987). They have then divided utterances or verbal acts into two, i.e. face-threatening acts (FTA) and face-saving acts (FSA), and also proposed politeness and negative politeness strategies. In brief, the politeness strategies of Brown & Levinson are of 5 categories: (1) bald on records, (2) positive politeness, (3) negative politeness, (4) off the records, (5) do not do the FTA.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from the theory are probably (1) that giving something better or best to others, whether we are close to them (positive politeness) or we are not (negative politeness) is polite, and (2) that keeping silent (not doing the FTA) is polite.

3.1.5 Ide (1989)

Ide's theory (1989) is based on Japanese politeness. The theory highlights discernment as the main aspect of politeness, i.e. honorific forms or chosen verbal utterances demanded by the society. There are no socially neutral utterances in Japanese, but honorific and non-honorific ones. A speaker should choose either one to give information on their interpersonal relationship, even in their most banal factual statement. Use of honorific forms is a must so as to reflect a socio-pragmatic equivalence to grammatical concord. This Japanese politeness called wakimae is based on social conventions. Within this Ide's theory, there are four conventional rules to observe: being polite to people with higher social status, being polite to people with more power, being polite to older people, being polite in the formal situations: to the participants, the occasions, or the topic.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this Ide's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs of discernment to others with higher social status or with more power, and older people, is polite, and (2) that observing the formal situation and its participants, occasions, and topic is polite.

3.1.6 Watts (1989)

Watts' theory of politeness (1989) refers to emotive communication as politic behavior, i.e. sociocultural behaviors directed to instill or maintain an equilibrium of interpersonal relationship of individuals in a social group. The equilibrium does not refer to social equality, but more to maintenance of social status-quo. Politeness is a particular case of politic behavior.

Important aspects of Watts' theory are restrictive codes and elaborative codes (Bernstein, 1971; Atkinson, 1985). Restrictive codes refer to closed communicative system, while elaborative codes to open communication system. The former system is practiced by closed-groups, while the latter is practiced by open-groups. Closed social groups with closed communicative system place the group's interest above the individual's, while the open social groups with open communicative system enjoy the individual's interest above the group's. This distinction has to do with Ide's notions of volition and discernment. Discernment is practiced by a closed society, for example, Japanese, which basically has a closed communicative system. A society with volition orientation usually has open communicative system, which practices volition, i.e. conscious selection of language by a speaker. Discernment strategies demand that an individual adjust their roles within a group, while volition strategies enable an individual to be prominent beyond a social group.

In Watts' theory, a non-politic behavior is the negative deviation of politic behavior, while politeness is the positive deviation. Politeness consists of behaviors which are more than merely politic or more than merely appropriate. Politeness is a strategic conscious behavior which aims to positively influence the opinion of a hearer upon a speaker's self.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from Watts' theory are probably (1) that performing more or better than the group's interest in an open society is positive or polite, and (2) that observing and adjusting to the group's interest in a closed society is polite.

3.1.7 Gu (1990)

Gu (1990) views politeness from the concept of Chinese politeness. Gu explicitly links politeness to social morals and ethics, thus managing social face for politeness, instead of interpersonal face. Gu's theory is prescriptive in the concept of Chinese *limao* (politeness), and is attached to moral sanctions from the society. Politeness is not instrumental but normative. Face is not threatened when individual want is not satisfied, but it is when an individual does not observe the standards or expectations of the society. Within the Chinese concept, politeness holds the principle that individual's behaviors should be adjusted to social expectations on respectfulness, modesty, and warmth and refinement. Gu proposes four maxims of politeness, i.e. self-denigration, address, tact, and generosity.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from Gu's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs of respect, modesty, warmth, or refinement to others is polite, and (2) that giving things to others as a sign of generosity is polite.

3.1.8 Lakoff (1990)

Lakoff (1990) asserts that politeness has fallen into imperative rules, i.e. (1) *Don't impose*, (2) *Give options*, and (3) *Make A feel good, be friendly* (Lakoff, 1990). In the first rule, Lakoff suggests that an utterance or verbal form should not contain imposition or arrogance from the side of a speaker. Different cultures apply the three rules differently, and hence culture consequently affects social distance in the first rule, deference in the second, and camaraderie or friendship in the third. Social distance suggests strategies of impersonality, deference does those of respect, and camaraderie does those of informality. Furthermore, Lakoff sees roughly that European cultures stress more on distancing strategies, Asian cultures more on deferential strategies, and modern American cultures on camaraderie.

The non-verbal hints for politeness interpreted from this theory are (1) that keeping the considerate silence instead of making any imposition even the lightest one is polite, and (2) that producing any non-verbal signs of being friendly or making a hearer feel good is polite.

3.1.9 Blum-Kulka (1992)

Blum-Kulka (1992) studies politeness in the context of Israel-Jewish. This theory borrows elements of other politeness theories and interprets them in a culture-relativistic concept. The term cultural norms or cultural scripts are central in this theory. This theory embraces the concept of face-wants but the wants are culturally determined. It also admits obligatory and strategic use of language, but the scope and depth are intercultural different. Obligatory use of language in this theory is termed cultural conventions. Politeness in Blum-Kulka's

theory is about appropriate social behaviors, determined by cultural expectations or cultural norms. This theory of politeness involves cultural interpretations on interactions of four parameters: social motivations, expressive modes, social differentials, and social meaning. Social motivations refer to reasons for someone's being polite, expressive modes to linguistic forms for politeness, social differentials to situational conditions for politeness (e.g. power, distance, relationship), and social meaning of linguistic expressions in particular context.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this Blum Kulka's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs of appreciation or any conventional symbols is polite, and (2) that behaving non-verbally adjusted to particular context is polite.

3.1.10 Spencer-Oatey (1992)

Spencer-Oatey (1992) studies politeness in cross-cultural context, viewing that what is respected in a particular culture is probably not so in another, e.g. the autonomy principle, which is applicable to Western cultures, but is not so in Eastern cultures. Spencer-Oatey (1992) proposes a set of dimensions called Spencer-Oatey's pragmatic scale, which comprises three needs: autonomy, approbation, and relational identity. Autonomy is preferred to imposition, approbation is preferred to criticism, and inclusion and equality are preferred to exclusion and subordination.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this pragmatic scale theory are probably (1) that keeping silent on what others are doing is more polite than commenting or saying something about it, (2) that giving any signs of agreement or acceptance is more polite than saying something contrary or criticising, and (3) that joining a group or gathering in some situation is more polite than being alone or in exclusion within that situation.

3.1.11 Thomas' Pollyanna Hypothesis (1996)

Pollyanna is a little girl in the novel Eleanor H. Porter. The girl has such interesting attitudes that she likes to see things from the bright side of life, as described by Thomas (1996). The Pollyanna principle thus suggests one to find best ways to say something. This principle also applies in why people tend to talk about interesting things than dull ones, or the bright side of life than the dark side. In verbal form, for example, the utterance *something too short* is mitigated into *something a bit short*, or the utterance *I wish you good luck* (a wish for success) is accepted, but not *I wish you bad luck* (an expression for sympathy or commiseration).

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this theory are probably (1) that giving or allowing something better or best of ours to others is polite, and (2) that making others happy or pleased with something we do is polite.

3.2 Hints of Politeness: From Verbal to Non-Verbal Form

Now we are coming to hints of politeness, from verbal to non-verbal form. The non-verbal hints here have been interpreted from theories of verbal politeness from Fraser and Nolen (1981), Leech (1983), Arndt and Janney (1985), Brown and Levinson (1987), Ide (1989), Watts (1989), Gu (1990), Lakoff (1990), Blum-Kulka (1992), Spencer-Oatey (1992), and Thomas' Pollyanna Hypothesis (1996). The interpretation has resulted in six hints, each of which will be accounted for in the next section.

3.2.1 Silence for Politeness

The first non-verbal hint is Silence for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Fraser & Nolen (1981), Leech (1983), Brown & Levinson (1987), Lakoff (1990), and Spencer-Oatey (1992).

This hint has been referred to as a contract to observe when the situation calls (Fraser & Nolen, 1981), as making others happy (Leech, 1983), as not doing the face-threatening act (Brown & Levinson, 1987), as not making any imposition (Lakoff, 1990), and as not commenting or saying something about what others are doing (Spencer-Oatey, 1992).

3.2.2 Gestures for Politeness

The second non-verbal hint is Gestures for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Arndt and Janney (1985), Ide (1989), Gu (1990), Lakoff (1990), Blum-Kulka (1992), and Spencer-Oatey (1992).

This hint has been referred to as giving any signs or cross-modal emotive cues in interaction with a hearer (Arndt & Janney, 1985), as giving any signs of discernment to others with higher social status or with more power, and older people (Ide, 1989), as giving any signs of respect, modesty, warmth, or refinement to others (Gu, 1990), as producing any non-verbal signs of being friendly or making a hearer feel good (Lakoff, 1990), as giving any signs of appreciation or any conventional symbols (Blum-Kulka, 1992), and as giving any signs of agreement or acceptance, not of something contrary or criticising (Spencer-Oatey, 1992).

3.2.3 Gifts for Politeness

The third non-verbal hint is Gifts for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Leech (1983), Brown and Levinson (1987), Gu (1990), and Thomas (1996).

This hint has been referred to as making others happy, for example by giving things they would like to expect or to have (Leech, 1983), as giving something better or best to others, whether we are close to them (positive politeness) or we are not (negative politeness) (Brown & Levinson, 1987), as giving things to others as a sign of generosity (Gu, 1990), and as giving or allowing something better or best of ours to others (Thomas, 1996).

3.2.4 Observance of Norms, Rules, and Regulations for Politeness

The fourth non-verbal hint is Observance of Norms, Rules, and Regulations for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Fraser & Nolen (1981), Arndt & Janney (1985), and Ide (1989).

This hint has been referred to as observing the norms in society or rules in institutions, not violating them (Fraser & Nolen, 1981), as observing social symbols or signs of regulations in social context (Arndt & Janney, 1985), and as observing the formal situation and its participants, occasions, and topic (Ide, 1989).

3.2.5 Adjusted Behavior for Politeness

The fifth non-verbal hint is Adjusted Behavior for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Watts (1989), Blum-Kulka (1992), Spencer-Oatey (1992).

This hint has been referred to as observing and adjusting to the group's interest (Watts, 1989), as behaving non-verbally adjusted to particular context (Blum-Kulka, 1992), and as joining a group or gathering in some situation, instead of being alone or in exclusion within that situation (Spencer-Oatey, 1992).

3.2.6 Performance for Politeness

The sixth non-verbal hint is Performance for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Watts (1989) and Thomas (1996).

This hint has been referred to as performing more or better than the group's interest in an open society (Watts, 1989) and as making others happy or pleased with something we do (Thomas, 1996).

4. Discussion

Based on the results of the analysis, acting the intangible or actings for politeness in the Indonesian context can be identified by hints of politeness in non-verbal form. There are, therefore, 6 (six) hints with appropriate actings as discussed here. The six hints are (a) silence for politeness, (b) gestures for politeness, (c) gifts for politeness, (d) observance to norms, rules, and regulations for politeness, (e) adjusted behavior for politeness, and (f) performance for politeness.

Silence is part of politeness in non-verbal form. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint are those concerning silence, e.g. attention, empathy, or impartiality, for example (a) keeping silent when attentive to a hearer speaking, (b) keeping silent when showing empathy to a hearer expressing sadness or misery, (c) keeping silent when angry to an annoying hearer, (d) keeping silent for showing impartiality on two or more hearers in a severe argument, and (e) keeping silent in a highly formal situation.

Gestures are also part of politeness in non-verbal form. Gestures concern facial expressions or other bodily movements and are part of non-verbal politeness. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint are, for example (a) smiling as a sign of friendliness, (b) noticing a hearer coming and approaching, (c) nodding the head as a sign of paying attention to a hearer saying a point, (d) waving the hand as a sign of acknowledging a hearer within sighting distance, and (e) bending the body when meeting a respected hearer.

Gifts are also part of politeness in non-verbal form. Gifts or things given to a hearer are part of non-verbal politeness. Better-quality gifts show more politeness than less-quality ones. This situation is the opposite of the one when a speaker empty-handed is visiting a hearer. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint in everyday life are, for example (a) giving something after a trip (trip-gift) to a hearer, (b) sending a self-cooked meal or purchased one to a neighbor hearer, (c) allowing a sum of money or valuables to a partying hearer, (d) allowing a sum of money for a hearer in bereaved situation, and (e) giving a hand to a hearer busy with loaded stuff.

Observance of norms, rules, and regulations is part of politeness in non-verbal form. Norms or rules or regulations in social life are usually passed for particular sanctions. Observance of them is part of politeness, and

is regarded as normal. Meanwhile, violation of them is regarded as not polite. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint in everyday life are, for example (a) listening solemnly to an elder hearer talking, (b) obeying what is told by a parent hearer, (c) giving something with the right hand to a hearer, (d) observing the traffic regulations, e.g. turning right or left with a lighted sign, and (e) not violating the law.

Adjusted behavior is part of politeness. Adjusting a speaker's behavior to a particular context is part of politeness in non-verbal form. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint in everyday life are, for example (a) accepting and not underestimating the group's interest, (b) joining and sitting at the group's gathering, (c) coming to an invitation by the group, (d) pretending to be happy on the group's interest, and (e) keeping and taking care of gifts from the group.

Performance in a particular manner is part of politeness in non-verbal form. Performance or body movement involves a speaker's motions or movements directed to a particular hearer within the acting distance. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint are, for example (a) giving way to a hearer walking in a hurry, (b) beseeching or fetching a seat for a hearer, (c) escorting a hearer to a particular room for a meeting, (d) giving a ride or a lift to a needy hearer, (e) dressing-up best and properly for a formal situation, (f) helping an aged hearer to cross the street, and (g) traveling farther and purchasing something for the group which is better, more interesting, or more expensive than the group's interest or expectation.

To bring this discussion to an end, we can present here as the findings of the research that the hints of politeness in non-verbal form in the Indonesian context are (a) silence for politeness, (b) gestures for politeness, (c) gifts for politeness, (d) observance of norms, rules, and regulations for politeness, (e) adjusted behavior for politeness, and (f) performance for politeness. The hints of non-verbal politeness above are applicable in interactions or communication by Indonesian speakers in the real-life everyday practices. Acting the intangible or actings for politeness are probably partly or wholly also applicable to the practices of languages and culture in the world, including, the authors believe, English languages and cultures. The non-verbal forms or actings shown as exemplary practices in this research are just part of potential others in the human non-verbal interactions or communication.

The hints of non-verbal politeness in this research should be best considered by a speaker when interacting or communicating with a particular hearer especially in the formal context or situation, or in the general public. The hints should also be best considered by teachers and learners of language to encourage harmonious interactions or communication, including the contexts of English language teaching and learning. However, the authors also believe that there are shortcomings of this research, as not all variables have been controlled, e.g. speakers of different ages and or speakers of different languages or speech communities. It is a collegial suggestion that other researchers conduct a further research based on the findings of this research or other researches concerning other ideologies within non-verbal interactions or communication.

The actings derived from the hints of non-verbal politeness in this research are open to elaboration by different languages or speech communities in the world, despite presumably universal aspects of languages. Further researches on these actings are encouraged to verify or to develop the findings in this research or to find out other hints of non-verbal politeness which probably exist in particular languages or speech communities.

References

- Arndt, H., & Janney, R. W. (1985). Politeness revisited: cross-modal supportive strategies. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 23(4), 281-300. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1985.23.1-4.281>
- Atkinson, P. (1985). *Language, structure and reproduction: An introduction to the sociology of Basil Bernstein*. London: Methuen. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203463239>
- Bernstein, B. (1971). *Class, code and control, Volume 1: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language*. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203014035>
- Baker, M. J. (2000). Writing a Literature Review. *The Marketing Review*, 1(2), 219-247. <https://doi.org/10.1362/1469347002529189>
- Bohm, A. (2004). Theoretical coding: text analysis in grounded theory'. In U. Flick, E. Kardorff, & I. Steinke (Eds.), *A Companion to Qualitative Research* (pp. 270-275). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Bolderston, A. (2008). Writing an Effective Literature Review. *Journal of Medical Imaging and Radiation Sciences*, 39, 86-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmir.2008.04.009>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Blum-Kulka, S. (1992). The metapragmatics of Politeness in Israeli Society. In Richard Watts, S. Ide, K. Ehlich (eds.) *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory, and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fraser, B., & Nolen, W. (1981). The association of deference with linguistic form. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 93-109. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1981.27.93>
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness Phenomena in Modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatic*, 14, 237-257. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90082-O](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90082-O)
- Holloway, I. (1997). *Basic concepts for qualitative research*. Oxford: Blackwell Science Ltd.
- Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua*, 8(2/3), 223-248. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.1989.8.2-3.223>
- Jumanto, J. (2014). Politeness and camaraderie: how types of form matter in Indonesian context. Proceeding: *The Second International Conference on Education and Language (2nd ICEL)*. Bandar Lampung University (UBL), Indonesia.
- Lakoff, R. T. (1990). *Talking power: the politics of language in our lives*. Glasgow: Harper Collins.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Limited.
- Saladana, Johnny. (2012). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. D. M. (1992). Cross-cultural politeness: British and Chinese conceptions of the tutor-student relationship (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Lancaster: Lancaster University.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques*. California: Sage Publications.
- Thomas, J. (1996). *Meaning in interaction: an introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Watts, R. (1989). Relevance and relational work: linguistic politeness as politeness behavior. *Multilingua*, 8(2-3), 131-166. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.1989.8.2-3.131>
- Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: writing a literature review. *MIS Quarterly*, 26(2), xiii-xxiii.

Notes

1. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/acting>
2. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hint>
3. <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/hint>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Acting the Intangible: Hints of Politeness in Non-Verbal Form

Jumanto Jumanto, Sarif Syamsu Rizal, Raden Arief Nugroho

Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Dian Nuswantoro, Semarang, Jawa Tengah, Indonesia

Correspondence: Jumanto Jumanto, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Dian Nuswantoro, Semarang, Jawa Tengah, Indonesia. Tel: +62-812-878-2484. E-mail: ilhamj@dsn.dinus.ac.id

Received: September 18, 2017 Accepted: October 1, 2017 Online Published: October XX, 2017

doi:10.5539/

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/>

(If you submit your article through the online submissions system, please submit this file as supplement.)

Acting the Intangible: Hints of Politeness in Non-Verbal Form

Jumanto Jumanto¹, Sarif Syamsu Rizal¹ & Raden Arief Nugroho¹

¹ Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Dian Nuswantoro, Semarang, Jawa Tengah, Indonesia

Correspondence: Jumanto Jumanto, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Dian Nuswantoro, Semarang, Jawa Tengah, Indonesia. Tel: 62-812-878-2484. E-mail: ilhamj@dsn.dinus.ac.id

Received: September 16, 2017 Accepted: October 10, 2017 Online Published: October 12, 2017

doi: 10.5539/elt.v10n11p111

URL: <http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n11p111>

Abstract

This review paper has explored politeness in non-verbal form to come to hints for indicating the ideology. Politeness in non-verbal form is researched by reviewing verbal politeness theories through interpretive techniques, and then the data in form of interpreted hints based on the reviews are analyzed by employing a coding technique. The six non-verbal hints of politeness found out based on the theoretical reviews are silence for politeness, gestures for politeness, gifts for politeness, observance of norms, rules, and regulations for politeness, adjusted behavior for politeness, and performance for politeness. The hints expectedly provide a sufficient account for non-verbal politeness in interactions or communication between a speaker and a hearer. The findings also encourage promoting harmony among speakers of languages in non-verbal interactions or communication, especially in formal situations or in the general public. The hints are hopefully also worth considering in the context of English language teaching and learning across languages and cultures in the world.

Keywords: verbal/linguistic politeness, non-verbal politeness, interpersonal face, social face, hint

1. Introduction

Language use is a matter of probabilities (Jumanto, 2014), either verbal language or non-verbal language. Conveying messages, therefore, is a matter of choices whether a speaker is using verbal language or verbal form or utterances, or they are using non-verbal language or non-verbal form or, merely called *acting* in this paper. The word acting refers to the art or practice of representing a character on a stage or before cameras (Note 1), analogically used here as acting before a particular hearer or in the general public. This acting may be in form of facial expressions or gestures, or else indicating non-verbal responses for communicating messages.

One of the messages conveyed by a speaker to a hearer is an ideology called politeness. Politeness is a message having to do with the want or the will of a particular hearer to be appreciated by a speaker of language. This concept is termed *face* by Erving Goffman (1959). Along with the development of face theory, there has been interpersonal face or social face. The former is managed together by a speaker and a hearer in a *vis-a-vis* communication, while the latter is protected together by a particular social group in interactions or communication. Interpersonal face or social face needs to be considered as well as maintained for the sake of interpersonal harmony or social harmony.

Theories of politeness on interpersonal face or social face are important for interpersonal interactions or social interactions. These interactions may be vehicled by verbal form or non-verbal form. As in the case of politeness ideology, that verbal form or utterances should be elaborated in such a way that it is perceived as conveying politeness, and so is the case of non-verbal form or actings.

This review paper on acting the intangible, i.e. hints of politeness in non-verbal form has made use of theories of verbal politeness, in which hints are interpreted through a coding technique upon the interpretive techniques applied in the verbal politeness theory reviews. The term intangible here is used to give an emphasis on the fact that politeness is a variant of meaning, thus concerning what behind the form perceived by our visual senses. Upon the hints interpreted, actings for politeness are presented, taken from real-life everyday practices in the Indonesian context within empirically logical assumption as well as experience of the researchers.

2. Method

This qualitative research is a literature review. A literature review requires different kinds of activities and ways of thinking (Baker, 2000). An effective review creates a firm foundation for advancing knowledge, facilitates

theory development, closes areas where a plethora of research exists, and uncovers areas where research is needed (Webster & Watson, 2002). In this review, new ideas from others' work are extracted by synthesizing and summarizing previous sources so that new theories and directions for future research can be built and suggested based on the evidence (Bolderston, 2008). The literature review in this research is done through interpretive techniques; therefore, interpreting is the main way of thinking in this research. In this research, foundation for advancing knowledge and developing theory is created from interpreting and reviewing established theories of verbal politeness to come to hints of non-verbal politeness. The hints function to limit areas for further research, i.e. non-verbal politeness. Other ways of thinking involved in this research are synthesizing and summarizing of the hints, and then elaboration of the hints into practices (actings) is made to confirm that the hints are applicable in probable real-life situations of speech communities.

Through the interpretive techniques, the researchers examine the data and interpret them through forming an impression and reporting it in a structured form. The data in form of theory reviews upon the interpretive techniques are then further analyzed through a coding technique, which consists of three steps: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Holloway, 1997; Bohm, 2004; Saldana, 2012).

In the open coding, the data in form of theory reviews are separated and conceptualized. The separated data are then reunited in the axial coding to come to major categories. The selective coding then discovers the main phenomena, i.e. a story line built by relating the major categories from the axial coding. The main non-verbal hints are then applied to practices of politeness in everyday life.

The definition of politeness as the guideline for the reviews of politeness theories in this research is the one proposed by Jumanto (2014), i.e. "Politeness is everything good that has been uttered as well as acted by the speaker to the hearer within a particular context, to maintain their interpersonal face as well as their social face". The verb *uttered* in the definition refers to verbal politeness, while the verb *acted* to non-verbal politeness. Based on the definition, the researchers examine and interpret interpersonal face and social face and their connection with verbal politeness theories to come to the non-verbal hints. It is the non-verbal hints of politeness which are to be found out in this research.

3. Results

3.1 Review of Verbal Politeness Theories and Non-Verbal Hints Interpreted

The data in form of theory reviews here are interpreted from verbal politeness theories of Fraser & Nolen (1981), Leech (1983), Arndt & Janney (1985), Brown & Levinson (1987), Ide (1989), Watts (1989), Gu (1990), Lakoff (1990), Blum-Kulka (1992), Spencer-Oatey (1992), and Thomas' Pollyanna Hypothesis (1996). Each of the theories is reviewed and interpreted for the non-verbal hints below. A hint here is referred to as a slight indication of the existence, approach, or nature of something (Note 2) or a piece of advice that helps us to do something (Note 3).

3.1.1 Fraser and Nolen (1981)

Fraser & Nolen (1981) propose a different view on politeness. They suggest that the freedom of others in interactions, also in conversations, should be adjusted to a conversational contract. The contract includes observance of norms and also rights and obligations in the interactions with others. The norms proposed by them are based on four dimensions: conventional, institutional, situational, and historical. Conventional dimensions include common rules in interactions, e.g. turns in conversation and softness or loudness of voice. Institutional dimensions include rights and obligations as ruled by a social institution, e.g. the right to speak in court and attentive silence in the church. Situational dimensions include factors in relation to roles, status, and relative power between a speaker and a hearer. Historical dimensions refer to previous interactions between a speaker and a hearer. The four dimensions vary in the applications. Politeness refers to observance to the conversational contract, while impoliteness happens due to violation of the contract. Normal interactions, i.e. interactions based on norms, thus politeness, are usually not seen, while impoliteness is usually noticed. In the eye of Fraser and Nolen, politeness is not in form of strategic interaction nor making a hearer feel comfortable, but it is merely doing the obligations acceptable to terms and conditions in the conversational contract.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from Fraser and Nolen's theory are probably (1) that observing the norms in society or rules in institutions is polite, instead of violating them, and (2) that keeping silent is polite, as it is a contract to observe when the situation calls.

3.1.2 Leech (1983)

Leech (1983) studies politeness in the light of harmony and smooth social interaction, so potential face-threatening acts should be avoided. Leech has proposed 7 maxims for social harmony, i.e. maxims of (1)

tact, (2) generosity, (3) approbation, (4) modesty, (5) agreement, (6) sympathy, and (7) consideration. These maxims should be elaborated in such a way that they give benefits more to others than to one's self. Leech has formulated things a speaker should avoid doing to others (the don'ts), i.e. don't tell others what to do, don't say bad things of others, don't express happiness when others are not happy, don't attack others' view or ideas, and don't praise yourself or show off your wealth or strength.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from Leech's principles of politeness are probably (1) that making others happy, for example by giving things they would like to expect or to have is polite, and (2) that saying nothing or keeping silent when it makes others happy is probably polite.

3.1.3 Arndt and Janney (1985)

Arndt & Janney (1985) propose the appropriacy-based approach to politeness. This theory asserts that politeness concerns appropriate expressions in appropriate context, based on appropriate conventional rules. Arndt and Janney's theory is an interpersonal framework stressing on people as the main factor as well as the center of politeness. This theory centers on emotive communication, instead of emotional communication. The former refers to strategic modification of affective signals to influence others, determined by social sanctions, interaction norms, and civilized expectations, which enables a speaker to control their natural impulses. The latter refers to spontaneous, uncontrolled expressions of emotion. Emotive communication within this theory involves not only utterances but also para- and non-linguistic signals under three dimensions: confidence, positive and negative affections, and intensity, through verbal forms, vocal, and kinesics, termed as cross-modal emotive cues.

This theory elaborates interpersonal supportiveness. Being polite here is not to do with social expectations, but is more to avoid interpersonal conflicts. Interpersonal supportiveness is used to convey message. The main idea is that there are supportive ways and non-supportive ways to express positive and negative feelings. An effective speaker tries to minimize emotional uncertainty of the hearer by behaving as supportively as possible. This interpersonal supportiveness refers to interpersonal politeness (or tact), which differs from social politeness. Social politeness consists of linguistic forms of high convention, like traffic regulations as a set of conventional rules, which are socially appropriate. Interpersonal politeness is conciliative, while social politeness is regulative.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this Arndt and Janney's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs or cross-modal emotive cues in interaction with a hearer is polite, and (2) that observing social symbols or signs of regulations in social context is polite.

3.1.4 Brown and Levinson (1987)

Brown & Levinson studies politeness in line with face management, engineering the theory of face, i.e. the want of everyone by Erving Goffman (1959). In the face theory, everyone has positive face and negative. Positive face refers to the want or the will to be appreciated by others, while negative face refers to the want or the will not be deappreciated (Brown & Levinson, 1987). They have then divided utterances or verbal acts into two, i.e. face-threatening acts (FTA) and face-saving acts (FSA), and also proposed politeness and negative politeness strategies. In brief, the politeness strategies of Brown & Levinson are of 5 categories: (1) bald on records, (2) positive politeness, (3) negative politeness, (4) off the records, (5) do not do the FTA.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from the theory are probably (1) that giving something better or best to others, whether we are close to them (positive politeness) or we are not (negative politeness) is polite, and (2) that keeping silent (not doing the FTA) is polite.

3.1.5 Ide (1989)

Ide's theory (1989) is based on Japanese politeness. The theory highlights discernment as the main aspect of politeness, i.e. honorific forms or chosen verbal utterances demanded by the society. There are no socially neutral utterances in Japanese, but honorific and non-honorific ones. A speaker should choose either one to give information on their interpersonal relationship, even in their most banal factual statement. Use of honorific forms is a must so as to reflect a socio-pragmatic equivalence to grammatical concord. This Japanese politeness called *wakimae* is based on social conventions. Within this Ide's theory, there are four conventional rules to observe: being polite to people with higher social status, being polite to people with more power, being polite to older people, being polite in the formal situations: to the participants, the occasions, or the topic.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this Ide's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs of discernment to others with higher social status or with more power, and older people, is polite, and (2) that observing the formal situation and its participants, occasions, and topic is polite.

3.1.6 Watts (1989)

Watts' theory of politeness (1989) refers to emotive communication as politic behavior, i.e. sociocultural behaviors directed to instill or maintain an equilibrium of interpersonal relationship of individuals in a social group. The equilibrium does not refer to social equality, but more to maintenance of social status-quo. Politeness is a particular case of politic behavior.

Important aspects of Watts' theory are restrictive codes and elaborative codes (Bernstein, 1971; Atkinson, 1985). Restrictive codes refer to closed communicative system, while elaborative codes to open communication system. The former system is practiced by closed-groups, while the latter is practiced by open-groups. Closed social groups with closed communicative system place the group's interest above the individual's, while the open social groups with open communicative system enjoy the individual's interest above the group's. This distinction has to do with Ide's notions of volition and discernment. Discernment is practiced by a closed society, for example, Japanese, which basically has a closed communicative system. A society with volition orientation usually has open communicative system, which practices volition, i.e. conscious selection of language by a speaker. Discernment strategies demand that an individual adjust their roles within a group, while volition strategies enable an individual to be prominent beyond a social group.

In Watts' theory, a non-politic behavior is the negative deviation of politic behavior, while politeness is the positive deviation. Politeness consists of behaviors which are more than merely politic or more than merely appropriate. Politeness is a strategic conscious behavior which aims to positively influence the opinion of a hearer upon a speaker's self.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from Watts' theory are probably (1) that performing more or better than the group's interest in an open society is positive or polite, and (2) that observing and adjusting to the group's interest in a closed society is polite.

3.1.7 Gu (1990)

Gu (1990) views politeness from the concept of Chinese politeness. Gu explicitly links politeness to social morals and ethics, thus managing social face for politeness, instead of interpersonal face. Gu's theory is prescriptive in the concept of Chinese *limao* (politeness), and is attached to moral sanctions from the society. Politeness is not instrumental but normative. Face is not threatened when individual want is not satisfied, but it is when an individual does not observe the standards or expectations of the society. Within the Chinese concept, politeness holds the principle that individual's behaviors should be adjusted to social expectations on respectfulness, modesty, and warmth and refinement. Gu proposes four maxims of politeness, i.e. self-denigration, address, tact, and generosity.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from Gu's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs of respect, modesty, warmth, or refinement to others is polite, and (2) that giving things to others as a sign of generosity is polite.

3.1.8 Lakoff (1990)

Lakoff (1990) asserts that politeness has fallen into imperative rules, i.e. (1) *Don't impose*, (2) *Give options*, and (3) *Make A feel good, be friendly* (Lakoff, 1990). In the first rule, Lakoff suggests that an utterance or verbal form should not contain imposition or arrogance from the side of a speaker. Different cultures apply the three rules differently, and hence culture consequently affects social distance in the first rule, deference in the second, and camaraderie or friendship in the third. Social distance suggests strategies of impersonality, deference does those of respect, and camaraderie does those of informality. Furthermore, Lakoff sees roughly that European cultures stress more on distancing strategies, Asian cultures more on deferential strategies, and modern American cultures on camaraderie.

The non-verbal hints for politeness interpreted from this theory are (1) that keeping the considerate silence instead of making any imposition even the lightest one is polite, and (2) that producing any non-verbal signs of being friendly or making a hearer feel good is polite.

3.1.9 Blum-Kulka (1992)

Blum-Kulka (1992) studies politeness in the context of Israel-Jewish. This theory borrows elements of other politeness theories and interprets them in a culture-relativistic concept. The term cultural norms or cultural scripts are central in this theory. This theory embraces the concept of face-wants but the wants are culturally determined. It also admits obligatory and strategic use of language, but the scope and depth are interculturally different. Obligatory use of language in this theory is termed cultural conventions. Politeness in Blum-Kulka's

theory is about appropriate social behaviors, determined by cultural expectations or cultural norms. This theory of politeness involves cultural interpretations on interactions of four parameters: social motivations, expressive modes, social differentials, and social meaning. Social motivations refer to reasons for someone's being polite, expressive modes to linguistic forms for politeness, social differentials to situational conditions for politeness (e.g. power, distance, relationship), and social meaning of linguistic expressions in particular context.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this Blum Kulka's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs of appreciation or any conventional symbols is polite, and (2) that behaving non-verbally adjusted to particular context is polite.

3.1.10 Spencer-Oatey (1992)

Spencer-Oatey (1992) studies politeness in cross-cultural context, viewing that what is respected in a particular culture is probably not so in another, e.g. the autonomy principle, which is applicable to Western cultures, but is not so in Eastern cultures. Spencer-Oatey (1992) proposes a set of dimensions called Spencer-Oatey's pragmatic scale, which comprises three needs: autonomy, approbation, and relational identity. Autonomy is preferred to imposition, approbation is preferred to criticism, and inclusion and equality are preferred to exclusion and subordination.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this pragmatic scale theory are probably (1) that keeping silent on what others are doing is more polite than commenting or saying something about it, (2) that giving any signs of agreement or acceptance is more polite than saying something contrary or criticising, and (3) that joining a group or gathering in some situation is more polite than being alone or in exclusion within that situation.

3.1.11 Thomas' Pollyanna Hypothesis (1996)

Pollyanna is a little girl in the novel Eleanor H. Porter. The girl has such interesting attitudes that she likes to see things from the bright side of life, as described by Thomas (1996). The Pollyanna principle thus suggests one to find best ways to say something. This principle also applies in why people tend to talk about interesting things than dull ones, or the bright side of life than the dark side. In verbal form, for example, the utterance *something too short* is mitigated into *something a bit short*, or the utterance *I wish you good luck* (a wish for success) is accepted, but not *I wish you bad luck* (an expression for sympathy or commiseration).

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this theory are probably (1) that giving or allowing something better or best of ours to others is polite, and (2) that making others happy or pleased with something we do is polite.

3.2 Hints of Politeness: From Verbal to Non-Verbal Form

Now we are coming to hints of politeness, from verbal to non-verbal form. The non-verbal hints here have been interpreted from theories of verbal politeness from Fraser and Nolen (1981), Leech (1983), Arndt and Janney (1985), Brown and Levinson (1987), Ide (1989), Watts (1989), Gu (1990), Lakoff (1990), Blum-Kulka (1992), Spencer-Oatey (1992), and Thomas' Pollyanna Hypothesis (1996). The interpretation has resulted in six hints, each of which will be accounted for in the next section.

3.2.1 Silence for Politeness

The first non-verbal hint is Silence for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Fraser & Nolen (1981), Leech (1983), Brown & Levinson (1987), Lakoff (1990), and Spencer-Oatey (1992).

This hint has been referred to as a contract to observe when the situation calls for (Fraser & Nolen, 1981), as making others happy (Leech, 1983), as not doing the face-threatening act (Brown & Levinson, 1987), as not making any imposition (Lakoff, 1990), and as not commenting or saying something about what others are doing (Spencer-Oatey, 1992).

3.2.2 Gestures for Politeness

The second non-verbal hint is Gestures for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Arndt and Janney (1985), Ide (1989), Gu (1990), Lakoff (1990), Blum-Kulka (1992), and Spencer-Oatey (1992).

This hint has been referred to as giving any signs or cross-modal emotive cues in interaction with a hearer (Arndt & Janney, 1985), as giving any signs of discernment to others with higher social status or with more power, and older people (Ide, 1989), as giving any signs of respect, modesty, warmth, or refinement to others (Gu, 1990), as producing any non-verbal signs of being friendly or making a hearer feel good (Lakoff, 1990), as giving any signs of appreciation or any conventional symbols (Blum-Kulka, 1992), and as giving any signs of agreement or acceptance, not of something contrary or criticising (Spencer-Oatey, 1992).

3.2.3 Gifts for Politeness

The third non-verbal hint is Gifts for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Leech (1983), Brown and Levinson (1987), Gu (1990), and Thomas (1996).

This hint has been referred to as making others happy, for example by giving things they would like to expect or to have (Leech, 1983), as giving something better or best to others, whether we are close to them (positive politeness) or we are not (negative politeness) (Brown & Levinson, 1987), as giving things to others as a sign of generosity (Gu, 1990), and as giving or allowing something better or best of ours to others (Thomas, 1996).

3.2.4 Observance of Norms, Rules, and Regulations for Politeness

The fourth non-verbal hint is Observance of Norms, Rules, and Regulations for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Fraser & Nolen (1981), Arndt & Janney (1985), and Ide (1989).

This hint has been referred to as observing the norms in society or rules in institutions, not violating them (Fraser & Nolen, 1981), as observing social symbols or signs of regulations in social context (Arndt & Janney, 1985), and as observing the formal situation and its participants, occasions, and topic (Ide, 1989).

3.2.5 Adjusted Behavior for Politeness

The fifth non-verbal hint is Adjusted Behavior for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Watts (1989), Blum-Kulka (1992), Spencer-Oatey (1992).

This hint has been referred to as observing and adjusting to the group's interest (Watts, 1989), as behaving non-verbally adjusted to particular context (Blum-Kulka, 1992), and as joining a group or gathering in some situation, instead of being alone or in exclusion within that situation (Spencer-Oatey, 1992).

3.2.6 Performance for Politeness

The sixth non-verbal hint is Performance for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Watts (1989) and Thomas (1996).

This hint has been referred to as performing more or better than the group's interest in an open society (Watts, 1989) and as making others happy or pleased with something we do (Thomas, 1996).

4. Discussion

Based on the results of the analysis, acting the intangible or actings for politeness in the Indonesian context can be identified by hints of politeness in non-verbal form. There are, therefore, 6 (six) hints with appropriate actings as discussed here. The six hints are (a) silence for politeness, (b) gestures for politeness, (c) gifts for politeness, (d) observance to norms, rules, and regulations for politeness, (e) adjusted behavior for politeness, and (f) performance for politeness.

Silence is part of politeness in non-verbal form. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint are those concerning silence, e.g. attention, empathy, or impartiality, for example (a) keeping silent when attentive to a hearer speaking, (b) keeping silent when showing empathy to a hearer expressing sadness or misery, (c) keeping silent when angry to an annoying hearer, (d) keeping silent for showing impartiality on two or more hearers in a severe argument, and (e) keeping silent in a highly formal situation.

Gestures are also part of politeness in non-verbal form. Gestures concern facial expressions or other bodily movements and are part of non-verbal politeness. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint are, for example (a) smiling as a sign of friendliness, (b) noticing a hearer coming and approaching, (c) nodding the head as a sign of paying attention to a hearer saying a point, (d) waving the hand as a sign of acknowledging a hearer within sighting distance, and (e) bending the body when meeting a respected hearer.

Gifts are also part of politeness in non-verbal form. Gifts or things given to a hearer are part of non-verbal politeness. Better-quality gifts show more politeness than less-quality ones. This situation is the opposite of the one when a speaker empty-handed is visiting a hearer. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint in everyday life are, for example (a) giving something after a trip (trip-gift) to a hearer, (b) sending a self-cooked meal or purchased one to a neighbor hearer, (c) allowing a sum of money or valuables to a partying hearer, (d) allowing a sum of money for a hearer in bereaved situation, and (e) giving a hand to a hearer busy with loaded stuff.

Observance of norms, rules, and regulations is part of politeness in non-verbal form. Norms or rules or regulations in social life are usually passed for particular sanctions. Observance of them is part of politeness, and is regarded as normal. Meanwhile, violation of them is regarded as not polite. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint in everyday life are, for example (a) listening solemnly to an elder hearer talking, (b)

obeying what is told by a parent hearer, (c) giving something with the right hand to a hearer, (d) observing the traffic regulations, e.g. turning right or left with a lighted sign, and (e) not violating the law.

Adjusted behavior is part of politeness. Adjusting a speaker's behavior to a particular context is part of politeness in non-verbal form. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint in everyday life are, for example (a) accepting and not underestimating the group's interest, (b) joining and sitting at the group's gathering, (c) coming to an invitation by the group, (d) pretending to be happy on the group's interest, and (e) keeping and taking care of gifts from the group.

Performance in a particular manner is part of politeness in non-verbal form. Performance or body movement involves a speaker's motions or movements directed to a particular hearer within the acting distance. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint are, for example (a) giving way to a hearer walking in a hurry, (b) beseeching or fetching a seat for a hearer, (c) escorting a hearer to a particular room for a meeting, (d) giving a ride or a lift to a needy hearer, (e) dressing-up best and properly for a formal situation, (f) helping an aged hearer to cross the street, and (g) traveling farther and purchasing something for the group which is better, more interesting, or more expensive than the group's interest or expectation.

To bring this discussion to an end, we can present here as the findings of the research that the hints of politeness in non-verbal form in the Indonesian context are (a) silence for politeness, (b) gestures for politeness, (c) gifts for politeness, (d) observance of norms, rules, and regulations for politeness, (e) adjusted behavior for politeness, and (f) performance for politeness. The hints of non-verbal politeness above are applicable in interactions or communication by Indonesian speakers in the real-life everyday practices. Acting the intangible or actings for politeness are probably partly or wholly also applicable to the practices of languages and culture in the world, including, the authors believe, English languages and cultures. The non-verbal forms or actings shown as exemplary practices in this research are just part of potential others in the human non-verbal interactions or communication.

The hints of non-verbal politeness in this research should be best considered by a speaker when interacting or communicating with a particular hearer especially in the formal context or situation, or in the general public. The hints should also be best considered by teachers and learners of language to encourage harmonious interactions or communication, including the contexts of English language teaching and learning. However, the authors also believe that there are shortcomings of this research, as not all variables have been controlled, e.g. speakers of different ages and or speakers of different languages or speech communities. It is a collegial suggestion that other researchers conduct a further research based on the findings of this research or other researches concerning other ideologies within non-verbal interactions or communication.

The actings derived from the hints of non-verbal politeness in this research are open to elaboration by different languages or speech communities in the world, despite presumably universal aspects of languages. Further researches on these actings are encouraged to verify or to develop the findings in this research or to find out other hints of non-verbal politeness which probably exist in particular languages or speech communities.

References

- Arndt, H., & Janney, R. W. (1985). Politeness revisited: cross-modal supportive strategies. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 23(4), 281-300. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1985.23.1-4.281>
- Atkinson, P. (1985). *Language, structure and reproduction: An introduction to the sociology of Basil Bernstein*. London: Methuen. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203463239>
- Bernstein, B. (1971). *Class, code and control, Volume 1: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language*. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203014035>
- Baker, M. J. (2000). Writing a Literature Review. *The Marketing Review*, 1(2), 219-247. <https://doi.org/10.1362/1469347002529189>
- Bohm, A. (2004). Theoretical coding: text analysis in grounded theory'. In U. Flick, E. Kardorff, & I. Steinke (Eds.), *A Companion to Qualitative Research* (pp. 270-275). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Bolderston, A. (2008). Writing an Effective Literature Review. *Journal of Medical Imaging and Radiation Sciences*, 39, 86-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmir.2008.04.009>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1992). The metapragmatics of Politeness in Israeli Society. In Richard Watts, S. Ide, K. Ehlich (eds.) *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory, and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Fraser, B., & Nolen, W. (1981). The association of deference with linguistic form. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 93-109. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1981.27.93>
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness Phenomena in Modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatic*, 14, 237-257. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90082-O](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90082-O)
- Holloway, I. (1997). *Basic concepts for qualitative research*. Oxford: Blackwell Science Ltd.
- Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua*, 8(2/3), 223-248. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.1989.8.2-3.223>
- Jumanto, J. (2014). Politeness and camaraderie: how types of form matter in Indonesian context. Proceeding: *The Second International Conference on Education and Language (2nd ICEL)*. Bandar Lampung University (UBL), Indonesia.
- Lakoff, R. T. (1990). *Talking power: the politics of language in our lives*. Glasgow: Harper Collins.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Limited.
- Saldana, Johnny. (2012). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. D. M. (1992). Cross-cultural politeness: British and Chinese conceptions of the tutor-student relationship (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Lancaster: Lancaster University.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques*. California: Sage Publications.
- Thomas, J. (1996). *Meaning in interaction: an introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Watts, R. (1989). Relevance and relational work: linguistic politeness as politic behavior. *Multilingua*, 8(2-3), 131-166. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.1989.8.2-3.131>
- Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: writing a literature review. *MIS Quarterly*, 26(2), xiii-xxiii.

Notes

1. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/acting>
2. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hint>
3. <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/hint>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Reviewer Acknowledgements

English Language Teaching wishes to acknowledge the following individuals for their assistance with peer review of manuscripts for this issue. Their help and contributions in maintaining the quality of the journal are greatly appreciated.

English Language Teaching is recruiting reviewers for the journal. If you are interested in becoming a reviewer, we welcome you to join us. Please find the application form and details at <http://recruitment.ccsenet.org> and e-mail the completed application form to elt@ccsenet.org.

Reviewers for Volume 10, Number 11

Adiba Nusrat, Guilford Technical Community College, United States
Ahmet Selcuk Akdemir, Agri Ibrahim Cecen University, Turkey
Ali Dincer, Erzincan University, Turkey
Alireza Akbari, KU Leuven, Belgium
Alison Crump, McGill University, Canada
Bugra Zengin, Namik Kemal University, Turkey
Carmella Braniger, Millikin University, United States
Carolyn Tait, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand
Chris Joseph Conlan, Curtin University, Australia
Coralia Ditvall, Lund University, Sweden
Enchong Liaw, Chung Yuan Christian University, Taiwan
Erdem AKBAS, Erciyes University, Turkey
Fan-Wei Kung, Queen's University Belfast, United Kingdom
Ferit Kilickaya, Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, Turkey
Héctor Manuel Serna Dimas, Universidad EAN, Bogotá COLOMBIA, Colombia
Howzit Ernest Kwesi Klu, University of Venda, South Africa
Hüseyin Serçe, Selçuk University, Turkey
Jasna Potocnik Topler, University of Maribor, Slovenia
Marcin Laczek, University of Warsaw, Poland
Mustafa Ali Khalaf Ali, College of Education, Minia University, Egypt
Ping Yang, Western Sydney University, Australia
Qiong Li, Carnegie Mellon University, United States
Sharif Alghazo, The University of Jordan, Jordan
Trisevgeni Liantou, Greek Ministry of Education, Greece