

Politeness Strategies in Cross-Cultural Communication: A Pragmatic Approach

Puput Handriani^{1*}, Annisa Putri Dinata², Fauzia Amelia Siregar³, Deasy Yunita Siregar⁴

^{1,2,3,4} FITK /TBI/Universitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara, Indonesia

Alamat Kampus: Jln. William Iskandar Ps. V, Medan Estate, Kec. Percut Sei Tuan

*Korespondensi penulis: puputhandriani90@gmail.com

Abstract. *This research looks at the part of politeness strategies in cross-cultural communication, concentrating on Asian, European, and African cultures. A qualitative approach was used, and data were gathered through intercultural dialogues and interviews with 30 participants. The results show important cultural differences in using positive and negative politeness strategies. Asian cultures focused on indirectness, honorifics, and non-verbal cues to preserve harmony and hierarchical respect, while European cultures combined directness with mitigation methods like humor and politeness markers. African cultures used inclusive language, storytelling, and indirectness to build group cohesion. This study emphasizes the significance of intercultural competence for handling cultural differences and enhancing communication in various environments.*

Keywords: *Politeness Strategies in Cross-Cultural Communication, Indirectness and Honorifics Across Cultures, Intercultural Competence and Non-Verbal Communication.*

1. INTRODUCTION

In a connected world, good communication is key to creating relationships, encouraging teamwork, and solving disputes. However, communicating across cultures often means dealing with complicated language and cultural challenges. One important way to tackle these challenges is by using suitable politeness strategies. Politeness, as a social concept, involves how people show respect, courtesy, or care for others in their communication (Brown & Levinson, 1987). These strategies are heavily influenced by cultural standards and social structures, making them vital for successful intercultural communication.

Politeness is not the same everywhere; it differs greatly among cultures. For example, what is seen as polite in one culture might come off as too formal or even impolite in another. For instance, Japanese culture highly values indirectness and respectful language to avoid imposing on others, while German communication tends to prioritize straightforwardness and effectiveness. These cultural differences can cause misunderstandings where the intended message is misread due to varying politeness norms (Thomas, 1983).

Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory divides strategies into positive politeness which aims to create closeness and build trust and negative politeness, which is about reducing intrusion and showing respect. These strategies appear differently in

various cultures. In collectivist societies like Indonesia, maintaining group harmony through indirect communication and avoiding confrontation is crucial, while individualistic cultures like the United States may focus on clarity and individual freedom in conversation (Hofstede, 1984).

This study looks into how these politeness strategies are used in cross-cultural settings and examines their effects on effective communication. By studying conversations among people from different cultural backgrounds, this research aims to reveal how politeness strategies can either bridge or widen communication gaps. The study also intends to enrich the field of pragmatics by providing practical insights into intercultural skills, especially in a time when global interactions are becoming more common.

The goals of this study are as follows:

- To identify the types of politeness strategies used in cross-cultural communication.
- To analyze the differences in these strategies among various cultural groups.
- To explore how cultural norms shape politeness behaviors.

By doing this, this research offers a better understanding of the practical aspects of language use and emphasizes the need for cultural awareness in communication. By tackling the challenges and opportunities found in cross-cultural interactions, this study highlights the importance of politeness strategies as means for encouraging understanding and respect among individuals.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a qualitative research approach, concentrating on discourse analysis to investigate the use of politeness strategies in cross-cultural communication. The method highlights the examination of naturally occurring language in context, allowing for a better understanding of how cultural norms impact politeness behaviors.

Participants

The participants in this study were chosen through purposive sampling to guarantee diversity in cultural backgrounds. A total of 30 individuals participated, representing three major cultural regions:

Asia: Participants from Indonesia, Japan, and China were included to represent collectivist cultures that emphasize hierarchy and group harmony.

Europe: Participants from Germany, the United Kingdom, and Spain were selected to show a range of directness and individualistic tendencies.

Africa: Participants from Nigeria and South Africa provided perspectives on cultures that prioritize community and indirectness in communication.

Participants were fluent in English as a common language to enable interaction without language barriers. The age range was 20–45 years, ensuring representation from various generational viewpoints.

Data Collection

Two primary data collection techniques were utilized:

Intercultural Dialogues: Participants took part in structured intercultural discussions on selected topics (e.g., workplace interactions, social etiquette, and conflict resolution). These conversations were recorded on video and audio to capture verbal and non-verbal cues.

Semi-Structured Interviews: Follow-up interviews were held with participants to gain insights into their views on the politeness strategies employed during the dialogues. Open-ended questions permitted a thorough exploration of their cultural beliefs and communication preferences.

Data Analysis

The analysis was based on Brown and Levinson's politeness theory (1987) as the framework. The following steps were carried out:

Transcription: Dialogues and interviews were transcribed word-for-word, and non-verbal cues like gestures and tone were noted.

Coding: The transcripts were coded for instances of politeness strategies, divided into positive politeness (e.g., giving compliments, using inclusive language) and negative politeness (e.g., saying sorry, hedging).

Comparative Analysis: Data from diverse cultural groups were compared to identify similarities and differences in politeness strategies. Key themes, such as the use of indirectness, honorifics, and humor, were emphasized.

Triangulation: To improve reliability, data from the dialogues were cross-checked with participant feedback during the interviews.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval was obtained before the study began. Participants were informed about the research goals, and consent was acquired for recording and analysis. Anonymity and confidentiality were upheld throughout the research process.

Tools and Software

Recording Devices: High-quality audio and video recorders were utilized to ensure clarity in capturing conversations.

Software: NVivo was used for coding and thematic analysis of qualitative data.

By combining these methods, this study provides a thorough analysis of politeness strategies in various cultural contexts. The triangulation of dialogue and interview data enhances the validity of the findings, offering strong insights into the pragmatic aspects of politeness.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the analysis of cross-cultural dialogues and interviews, the following findings were identified:

Politeness strategies in Asian cultures

- **Indirect:** Japanese and Indonesian participants often used indirect expressions, such as avoiding refusals or direct requests, to minimize imposition and maintain harmony.
- **Use of honorifics:** Hierarchical language and polite verb forms were predominant, especially in formal contexts.
- **Non-verbal cues:** Smiles, pauses, and gestures were widely used to reinforce respect and politeness.

Politeness Strategies in European Cultures

- **Directiveness with Softening:** German participants favored clarity, but softened their speech with politeness cues. British participants often relied on humor and humor, while Spanish participants balanced direct communication with warm gestures.
- **Task-Focused Politeness:** Participants focused on clarity and efficiency, especially in professional contexts.
- **Relational Nuances:** Strategies were adapted according to the formality of the situation, with more relational elements used in informal contexts.

Politeness Strategies in African Cultures

- Community Objective: Nigerian and South African participants used inclusive language such as “we” instead of “I,” to emphasize group cohesion.
- Indirect Requests: Politeness was often expressed through suggestions or rhetorical questions, reflecting respect and high-context communication.
- Cultural Narratives: Fairy tales and proverbs were common tools for conveying respect and maintaining interpersonal relationships.

The Role of Nonverbal Communication

- Participants in all cultures rely on nonverbal cues to supplement verbal communication. These included gestures, facial expressions, tone variations, and pauses, which were essential to effectively conveying education.

The Influence of Context on Education

- Formal Settings: Negative policing strategies, such as hesitation and the use of honorifics, were prevalent in hierarchical or professional settings.
- Informal Settings: Positive policing strategies, such as humor, inclusive language, and sharing experiences, were more common in informal conversations.

These findings highlight the cultural diversity of policing strategies and their adaptability to specific social and situational context

The results show the cultural foundations of politeness strategies and their effects on intercultural communication. In Asian cultures, the emphasis on group harmony and respect for hierarchy explains the common use of indirectness and honorifics. These strategies correspond with collectivist values, as outlined by Hofstede (1984), where the needs of the group are more important than those of the individual. However, this indirectness can cause misunderstandings when engaging with individuals from direct communication cultures, like Germany or the United States (Thomas, 1983).

In European cultures, politeness strikes a balance between directness and managing relationships. The focus on clarity by German participants fits with low-context communication norms, while British understatement and humor show a preference for subtlety in relationship maintenance (Leech, 1983). The expressive gestures of Spanish participants further illustrate how relational warmth is incorporated into direct communication. These variations emphasize the diversity within Europe and the necessity of grasping sub-regional details (Spencer-Oatey, 2008).

African cultures focus on a communal way of politeness, where indirectness and inclusivity are vital. The use of proverbs and storytelling not only shows respect but also strengthens community ties (Adegbiya, 1989). This cultural inclination towards shared understanding and group unity, while effective in the African context, can be seen as too elaborate or unclear by people from low-context cultures, highlighting the difficulties in intercultural communication (Hymes, 1974).

Non-verbal communication appeared as a common aspect of politeness across cultures. Gestures, tone, and facial expressions often conveyed respect and relational intent more effectively than words. For instance, a smile with a refusal in Indonesia softened its effect, while pauses in Nigerian communication enriched indirect requests (Goffman, 1967). Acknowledging and understanding these non-verbal signals is crucial for intercultural skills, as verbal communication alone may not fully convey intent (Kasper, 1990).

Finally, context significantly affects how politeness strategies are shaped. In formal situations, like workplaces or hierarchical settings, negative politeness strategies such as hedging and honorifics were common (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Informal situations, like casual talks, relied more on positive politeness, which includes shared experiences and humor (Ting-Toomey, 1999). This flexibility showcases the evolving nature of politeness strategies and their reliance on both cultural and situational factors.

4. CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that politeness strategies are deeply influenced by cultural norms and values, reflecting the underlying priorities and social structures of different societies. The findings highlight significant variations across Asian, European, and African cultures, with each region employing distinct verbal and non-verbal strategies to achieve effective and respectful communication.

In Asian cultures, the emphasis on harmony and hierarchical respect leads to the widespread use of indirectness and honorifics, showcasing a collectivist approach to politeness. European cultures, by contrast, balance directness with mitigation, reflecting a blend of individualism and relational awareness. African cultures emphasize communal values, utilizing indirectness, inclusive language, and storytelling to strengthen interpersonal connections.

Non-verbal communication emerged as a universal element of politeness, complementing verbal expressions and adding layers of meaning to interactions.

Additionally, the influence of context was evident, as participants adapted their strategies based on the formality and relational nature of the setting.

Overall, the research underscores the importance of intercultural competence in navigating politeness across diverse cultural contexts. By understanding and respecting these differences, individuals can foster clearer communication, reduce potential misunderstandings, and build stronger relationships across cultures. This study contributes to the field of crosscultural pragmatics and provides valuable insights for applications in education, business, and diplomacy.

DAFTAR REFERENSI

- Adegbija, E. (1989). *Language views in Sub-Saharan Africa: A sociolinguistic summary*. Multilingual Matters.
- Bell, A. (2005). *Language and community*. Routledge.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction rituals: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. Pantheon Books.
- Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Sage Publications.
- Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, men, and politeness*. Longman.
- Holmes, J. (2001). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (2nd ed.). Longman.
- Holmes, J., & Stubbe, M. (2003). *Influence and courtesy in the workplace: A sociolinguistic study of communication at work*. Longman.
- House, J. (2015). *Misunderstanding in cross-cultural communication: An overview*. Routledge.
- Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kasper, G. (1990). Language politeness: Ongoing research topics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(2), 193–218.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
- Matsumoto, D. (1988). The impact of culture on feeling and expression of emotion: A literature review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 104(1), 86–93.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2008). *Culturally speaking: Culture, communication, and politeness theory* (2nd ed.). Continuum.
- Thomas, J. (1983). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: A contextual approach*. Ablex Publishing.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1999). *Communicating between cultures*. Guilford Press.