Use of Politeness Strategies by the Teachers of Karachi University: A Gender-Based Study

Kaleem Raza Khan
Shumaila Shafket Ali

Abstract

Politeness in discourse is the desired goal in every culture but the notion of politeness varies from one culture to the other, which reinforces the influence of linguistic relativity in shaping our world view. Just as the notion of politeness varies across cultures, its notion also varies across gender. The current study aims to explore the use of politeness strategies employed by the male and female teachers of the University of Karachi to see if any gender differences exist in the nature of politeness strategies they employ. Rooted in Qualitative paradigm, case study design was employed by focusing exclusively on the teachers of the Faculty of Science and Social Sciences. The data for the study were gathered from the teachers of both the faculties using convenience and stratified sampling techniques. The data were based on 40 teachers' responses to the Discourse Completion Task (DCT) which was designed by keeping in mind commonly occurring classroom situations at the University of Karachi. In order to cross-check the validity of the teachers' responses on the DCT, some teachers' classes were also observed. The teachers' responses to the situations given in the DCT were analyzed using the Politeness theory proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), while the data gathered through classroom observation were also evaluated by employing discursive approach to see if any gender differences exist in the nature of politeness in the classroom discourse. The results of the study reveal obvious gender differences in the use of politeness strategies irrespective of the teachers' age, designation and the subject they teach. However, there are reservations in assigning the tag 'polite' or 'impolite' to any specific gender unless the students' notion of politeness is taken into consideration.

Keywords: politeness; impoliteness, face, gender, cross-cultural communication

1. Introduction

Politeness cannot be treated as an absolute term with a fixed meaning. Different linguists have defined politeness with a focus on different aspects of communication. Leech (1983) considers politeness as a component of pragmatic competence that is necessary for avoiding conflicts by adhering to the use of conversational maxims, whereas Brown and Levinson (1987) believe that politeness involves managing each other's face. According to Kasper (1990), the term 'politeness' refers to "the strategies available to interactants to defuse the danger and to minimise the antagonism" (p. 194).

Just as there is a great deal of diversity in the definitions of politeness proposed by different linguists, so is there a range of dichotomies related to politeness. One important dichotomy that has emerged in the literature on politeness is *first-order* and *second-order politeness: the* former is what Watts (1992) calls *"polite behaviour"* while for the latter he uses the term *"politic behaviour"* which according to him is "socio-culturally determined behavior directed towards the goal of establishing and/or maintaining a state of equilibrium in the personal relationships between

the individuals of a social group" (p. 50). Following Watts (1992), Janney and Arndt (1992) distinguish between *social* and *interpersonalpoliteness:* the former takes into account the social aspect of politeness while in the latter it is the pragmatic aspect that is taken into consideration. In other words, social politeness helps achieve social harmony while interpersonal politeness aims at preservation of face.

It would not be wrong to state that polite behaviour is evaluated according to the norms of the community one belongs to. Often while assigning the tag 'polite' or 'impolite' to any individual, we use our socio-cultural lens to decide whether that individual can be considered 'polite' or 'impolite' and taking the norms of our own community of practice as the yardstick for measuring politeness, we also determine the degree of politeness or impoliteness found in a person's linguistic and non-linguistic behaviour. It is not surprising therefore to find people belonging to a community where indirectness is the communicative norm, to consider others impolite simply because they themselves are direct. We often dismiss people as impolite because their communicative practices do not match with our norms of communication(Terkourafi, 2005). What is implied here is that cross-cultural communication is still the biggest challenge that humans face in today's globalized world and this challenge of cross-cultural communication is not just restricted to communication among different communities but also among people within the same community in different social encounters. Watts (2003) has aptly stated: "whether or not a participant's behaviour is evaluated as polite or impolite is not merely a matter of the linguistic expressions that she/he uses, but rather depends on the interpretation of that behaviour in the overall social interaction" (p. 9).

Besides this, norms of communication among the members of the same community can also vary across gender. There is a wealth of literature available on gender differences in discourse, which proves that gender discourse can also be treated as a form of cross-cultural communication. Since this study exclusively focuses on politeness, it analyzes gender differences related to this aspect of communication alone.

The aim of this study is to see if gender differences exist in the use of politeness strategies in the teachers' classroom discourse at the university level. The study aims to analyze the politeness strategies that male and female teachers employ in their classroom discourse at the University of Karachi. Following are the specific research questions:

a. What kind of politeness strategies are used by the teachers of Karachi University in their classroom discourse?
b. Are there any gender differences in the teachers' use of politeness strategies?

It cannot be denied that women are expected to be more polite both verbally and non-verbally as compared to men, and this expectation is in alliance with the traditional belief that women must use polite discourse irrespective of the situation they encounter. Earlier research on gender studies associated women's language with powerlessness which was true to a great extent because the data were mostly based on the language of those women who were in a subordinate position. However, associating men's language with power and women's with powerlessness without taking into account the socio-economic position they hold in society can only lead to sweeping generalizations. If women are considered more polite than men, are they actually polite even in an

authoritative position? There are often discrepancies between what is assumed to exist and what actually exists. The current study aims to explore how male and female teachers respond to a series of commonly occurring classroom situations to study the nature and the level of politeness or impoliteness in their discourse.

2. Literature Review

Being an interdisciplinary field, politeness has been explored by anthropologists, linguists, philosophers, social psychologists, and sociolinguists alike and has been studied in both intracultural and intercultural settings (Gu, 1990; Haugh & Hinze, 2003; Marquez-Reiter, 2000; Pan & Kádár, 2010; Pizziconi, 2003; Ruhi, 2006; Sifianou, 1992; Tiisala, 2004). In a recent study on politeness, Lin (2013) compares the notion of politeness in Chinese and Japanese cultures by collecting data through a questionnaire conducted on 320 participants: 160 Chinese and 160 Japanese university students in Beijing and Tokyo. Besides locating cultural differences, the study also aimed to locate gender differences in the students' responses with regard to their notion of politeness. Not much difference was found between the Chinese and the Japanese notion of politeness as students of both the cultures associated politeness with using polite verbal means including the use of honorific expressions along with attitudinal warmth. However, the researcher observed significant gender differences in case of both the Chinese and the Japanese students' notion of politeness as the female participants gave more importance to the use of polite verbal expressions than their male counterparts.

Earlier research on politeness aimed at designing a valid framework for studying politeness (Leech, 1983; Brown and Levinson, 1987). Leech (1983), proposed the *Politeness Principle* consisting of six conversational maxims: *tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement,* and *sympathy,* with the aim to analyze the nature of politeness in discourse. In the beginning, researchers also focused on studying politeness with reference to 'face', which refers to the self-image of a person that she/he wishes to display in public. 'Face' is of two types: positive and negative. The Politeness Theory that was put forward by Brown and Levinson (1987) focused on face-saving and face-threatening acts, which proved to be highly influential in the field of politeness research. Despite the limitations of their politeness theory, the framework they presented is still used in research on politeness across the world.

However, in the contemporary research on politeness, there is a paradigm shift. As a result of the popularity of pragmatics as an important field of study within linguistics, a great deal of emphasis is laid on the contextual factors that shape discourse playing a decisive role in employing politeness/impoliteness (Bousfield, 2006; Locher, 2004; 2006; 2008; Locher & Watts, 2005; Terkourafi, 2005). This has led to the emergence of *the discursive approach to politeness*, which according to Locher (2006)"recognizes the evaluative and norm-oriented character of politeness by claiming that politeness belongs to the interpersonal level of linguistic interaction. It is thus part of relational work," (p. 253). Unlike Brown and Levinson's Politeness theory which revolves around the concept of 'face', discursive approach focuses on 'relational work', which is much broader in its scope as compared to the notion of 'face', which only deals with the mitigation of FTAs whereas relational work covers "the entire spectrum of behaviour, from rude and impolite, via normal, appropriate, and unmarked, to marked and polite" (Locher, 2006, p. 250) and therefore, it is more likely to result in a better understanding of discourse in general and politeness in particular.

Focusing on the concept of relational work, there has been a growing interest among discourse analysts with reference to the use of politeness strategies employed by teachers and students in their classrooms, in the last two decades. There is a sufficient body of research on teachers' use of different politeness strategies and their relationship with students' classroom performance particularly in the English language classroom (Adel, Davoudi, & Ramezanzade, 2016; Bacha, Bahous, & Diab, 2012; Cui-yun, 2014; Monsefi & Hadidi, 2015; Sulu, 2015). One research that deserves special attention here is by Jiang (2010), who conducted an intrinsic case study of a Chinese EFL teacher's use of politeness strategies in the classroom. The data for the study were based on classroom observation and interview from both the teacher and the students. The data based on classroom discourse were divided into four categories: teacher's academic instructions, the language used for the motivation of students, teachers' linguistic expressions for evaluation of students' classroom performance, and the verbal means employed for classroom management. The results of the study reinforce the positive role of politeness in successful classroom discourse benefitting both teachers and students. The study has important pedagogical implications not only for English language teachers in particular but also for subject teachers in general for employing polite language in the classroom to create an environment that is conducive to learning.

Besides the use of politeness strategies in the classroom discourse, there is also ample research on verbal politeness/impoliteness in discourse in general (Christie, 2008; Holtgraves, 2005; Lakoff & Ide, 2005; Leech, 2005; Thomas, 1995), as well as on politeness/impoliteness with reference to gender studies in particular (Hermosilla, 2012; Holmes, 1995; 2005; Mills, 2003).

Although, the current study also focuses on gender differences in teachers' use of politeness strategies, it is different from the previous studies conducted on politeness in the sense that it is for the first time that classroom discourse is studied to explore the nature of politeness strategies employed by male and female teachers at the university level in the Pakistani context. Unlike most of the studies on English language teachers' politeness in classroom discourse, the current study is based on the analysis of the politeness strategies employed by both English language and subject teachers. The study is also unique because the data for the study are gathered through a Discourse Completion Task (DT) followed by classroom observation.

3. Methodology

This qualitative study employed multiple case study design by gathering data from the teachers of the two faculties (Social Sciences and Science) of Karachi University. The sample size of the study was based on 40 teachers using convenience and stratified sampling techniques. It was easier to gather data from the teachers we were acquainted with, in the Faculty of Science and Social Sciences, instead of approaching those who we did not know. So we used convenience sampling. Since the study focused on locating gender differences in the nature of politeness strategies teachers employed in their classroom discourse, besides convenience sampling, we also employed stratified sampling technique by dividing the sample into two homogenous groups: 20 male and 20 female teachers.

The data collection instruments used for the study included a Discourse Completion Task (DCT) followed by classroom observation. The DCT which was exclusively designed for eliciting the teachers' responses was based on five commonly occurring classroom situations at Karachi University (See the Appendix). The teachers were given the freedom to write their responses in

any of the two languages, Urdu or English or a combination of both as the use of bilingual discourse is a common practice in many classrooms at Karachi University. The teachers were given this freedom to elicit responses that are real rather than concocted which helped us get a glimpse of their real classroom discourse. A copy of the DCT with complete instructions was mailed to those teachers who preferred to type the responses whereas those who felt comfortable writing their responses on the DCT were approached in person. Except a few teachers who did not respond and those who kept procrastinating, all others regardless of their gender were highly cooperative and responded to the DCT. In order to cross-check the validity of the teachers' responses on the DCT with regard to their use of politeness strategies in the classroom discourse, eight teachers' classes were also observed and these eight teachers included 4 male and 4 female teachers from both Science and Social Sciences. We strictly adhered to the research ethics and took prior permission for classroom observation from all the teachers; only those teachers' classes were observed who gave consent. Moreover, the names of the teachers and their departments are not mentioned anywhere in the study so that their identity is not disclosed. In order to make the teachers feel at ease, instead of audio or video recording, the data were gathered through field-notes based on observation.

4. Data Analysis
The responses to the DCT have been analyzed using the politeness framework proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), while the data gathered through classroom observation are analyzed using not only Brown and Levinson's framework but also the *discursive approach to politeness.*

4.1 A gender-based analysis of the teachers' use of politeness strategies
As mentioned in the methodology that the data gathered through the DCT and classroom observation were analyzed by mainly using the politeness framework presented by Brown and Levinson (1987), the teachers' responses were categorized into the types of politeness strategies Brown and Levinson have discussed in their framework. These types include: *negative politeness, positive politeness, off-record politeness, on-record politeness, and bald on-record politeness.*

4.1.1 Negative politeness
Negative politeness mostly includes the use of interrogatives and aims at the mitigation of face threatening acts, as it does not involve any coercion on the part of the recipient(s). There was very little use of this kind of politeness strategy found in the teachers' classroom discourse and their responses to the situations given in the DCT.

Following are the only three instances of *negative politeness* found in the data gathered from the teachers' responses in the DCT and all three instances are related to situation 1 in which the teacher addresses the students who are talking to each other (Please turn to the appendix to see the situation):

    i.   May I have your attention please!
    ii.   May I know what you are discussing?
    iii. Can you repeat what I have said?

The first two examples were produced by the female teachers in response to first situation in the DCT, while the third example was produced by a male teacher. Overall, there was no significant

gender difference between the male and female teachers' responses with regard to the use of negative politeness which may be attributed to the classroom discourse in Pakistani context where the teachers are mostly expected to give direct instructions and commands whereas the use of indirect discourse often leads to communication breakdown. In Pakistani context it is common to find the use of imperatives and declaratives in the teachers' discourse.

Nevertheless, it would be highly risky to draw such a conclusion merely on the basis of the data gathered through the DCT. In one of the classes observed for this study, for instance, a female teacher was found apologizing instead of warning a student for being late by saying: "Sorry! *me~ ne* inform *nahi~ kiya ke aaj class lu~ gi*." (Sorry for not informing that I will take the class today). This kind of speech act in the teacher's discourse, which is based on unequal encounter, may sound unconventional but the apparent unconventionality of this utterance disappears when one gets to know the context. Since the teacher was unable to take the class for the last two weeks because of her illness, the students were not sure if she would take the class that day. Therefore, when some of them entered the class, the teacher ignored many of the later comers but when one of the students entered half an hour late, she realized that she should have informed the students in advance that she would take the class. This is the reason that instead of warning the late comers she considers herself responsible for their late arrival and apologizes. Keeping this context in mind, if the teacher's utterance is analyzed, she has employed the *modesty maxim* that Leech (1983) has mentioned in his discussion of the *Politeness Principle.*

4.1.2 Positive Politeness
This kind of politeness also includes use of speech acts that help mitigate Face Threatening Acts (FTAs). However, the strategies employed for positive politeness are different than the ones employed for negative politeness. Positive politeness can be achieved through the use of in-group identity markers to show solidarity with the recipients, by cracking jokes, which in the context of classroom discourse can break the rigidity of classroom teaching, and through the use of metaphors. One can also use positive politeness by making offers and promises or by avoiding disagreements. The use of positive politeness was found to be more common among the male teachers than the female teachers at the University of Karachi, as evident from the data gathered through the DCT as well as classroom observation. One of the interesting things discovered during the classroom observation of the male teachers was their use of positive politeness through metaphors and jokes; the students irrespective of their gender seemed to enjoy the male teachers' use of jokes and metaphors as the use of such strategies helped the students stay active. In contrast to the male teachers' use of these strategies, the female teachers whose classes were observed were neither found using such strategies in their classes nor did they respond to the DCT by using positive politeness.

Examples of the male teachers' responses to the DCT and their classroom discourse using positive politeness:
   i. *mere xayaal me~ tum logo~ ko apni* battery charge *karne ki zaruurat he* (I think you need to charge your battery)
   ii. *lagta he tum logo~ ko* department *se itni* attachment *ho gai he ke jaana hi nahi chaahte*. (It seems as if you feel so attached to the department that you don't want to go).
   iii. You must be tired. *mere xayaal me~ aaj ke liye itna hi kaafi he. kal yahi~ se* continue *kare~ ge.* (I think it is enough for today. We'll continue from here tomorrow).

iv. I would appreciate if you just give me 10 more minutes. *bas* topic summarize *karna reh gaya he*. (Only the summarization of the topic is left).

The first two examples are based on the teachers' response to situation #3 (See Appendix), while the last two examples are taken from the data collected through classroom observation. The first three examples are taken from the male teachers' discourse while the last example is taken from one of the female teachers' discourse during the classroom observation. It is pertinent to mention here that this is the only example of positive politeness found in the entire data based on female teachers' discourse, which indicates rare use of positive politeness on the part of the female teachers at Karachi University.

4.1.3 Off-record politeness
This kind of politeness involves use of indirect statements that generate an implicature. Such statements are face-saving in the sense that even if the illocutionary force is not understood by the addressee, it does not pose a threat to the interlocutor's face. In the data gathered through the DCT, the male teachers were found to employ off-record politeness strategies with greater frequency as compared to the female teachers.

Examples of female teachers' use of off-record politeness:
   i.   Some people are not attentive today.
   ii. I believe I had given some clear instructions at the beginning of the semester. Hadn't I?
   iii. I believe we are in the middle of a lecture.
   iv. I want only serious students in my class.

Examples of male teachers' use of off-record politeness:
   i.   A guest has arrived. We should end the class here.
   ii.   If I were a student, I would always come prepared in class.
   iii. What we are discussing is more important than anything else.
   iv.   It is better to be attentive in class.
   v.   I think the class is about to end.
   vi.   How much time is left?
   vii. I think *kisi bohat hi eham* topic *pe guftugu ki ja rari he* (I think there is serious discussion taking place on an important topic). So, I should stop.
   viii. *Kya kabhi mera* phone *baja* class *me~?* (Has my phone ever rung in class?).
   ix.   *agar raat ko jaldi soe~ to subha uThne me~ diqqat nahi~ hoti* (If we sleep early at night, we do not face difficulty in getting up in the morning).
   x.   *class ka vaqt xatm hogaya he kya?* (Has the class time ended?)

The male teachers used a variety of strategies, like presupposition, irony, overgeneralization, and rhetorical questioning, all of which indicate off-record politeness in their discourse. The female teachers, on the contrary, used very few off-record statements and there was hardly any diversity found in the strategies they employed for producing off-record politeness.

4.1.4 On-record politeness
This includes direct address forms through the use of declaratives, conditionals as well as interrogatives. It must be mentioned here that the use of interrogatives does not always imply

negative politeness. For instance, in the data gathered through the DCT, although interrogatives are used with high frequency, most of them are instances of direct discourse and cannot be considered face-saving. In fact, some of them sound overtly face-threatening. What is surprising about these examples is that most of them are used by the female teachers which indicate that the female teachers use direct discourse more often than the male teachers at the University of Karachi.

Examples of on-record politeness by female teachers in response to different situations given in the DCT:

i. What are you discussing?
ii. Why are you talking?
iii. Whose phone is ringing?
iv. Why are you late?
v. Why don't you study?
vi. Where have you been?
vii. *yahi haal raha to* pass *hone ke* chances *nahi he~* (If the situation remains the same, there are no chances of passing the exam).
viii. If there is something more important to discuss, you are free to leave.
ix. If you have something more important to discuss than lecture, leave the class.
x. You are not allowed to enter now.
xi. Next time if you are late, I won't let you in.
xii. You are grown up, old enough to be serious in studies.
xiii. You are going to pay penalty for it.
xiv. Neither you listen to the lecture carefully, nor you open your notebooks.
xv. You won't be allowed to sit for the exam, if you have short attendance.

Examples of on-record politeness by male teachers in response to different situations given in the DCT:

i. What are you discussing?
ii. Probably, you won't be allowed to appear in exams. If you want to avoid it, then try to be regular from now onwards.
iii. Pay the fine of short attendance, get permission from the Chairperson. Hope to see you in the examination Hall!

As evident from the data, the female teachers at Karachi University employ on-record statements far more frequently than the male teachers who rarely use such face-threatening acts if they encounter situations similar to the ones given in the DCT. If we compare example number (xv) produced by the female teacher with example number ii and iii by the male teachers, the difference becomes obvious. Although the male teachers also used conditionals in response to the last situation in the DCT which deals with the shortage of attendance (See the appendix), the male teachers' use of conditionals includes hedging which helps lessen the degree of warning. Both the instances produced by the male teachers are solution-oriented, unlike the female teachers' responses which sounds extremely face-threatening.

4.1.5 Bald on-record politeness
This kind of politeness strategy involves the use of imperatives and is the most direct form of discourse. The data gathered through the DCT as well as through the classroom observation show the use of this kind of politeness strategy in high frequency in the discourse of female teachers as opposed to their male counterparts.

Many instances of bald on-record politeness were also found in the female teachers' response to different situations in the DCT:

Examples of the Female Teachers' use of bald on-record statements:
  i.   Concentrate on the lecture and stop talking.
  ii. Be quiet!
  iii. Lecture ki taraf tavajjo de~ (Concentrate on the lecture)
  iv. Be punctual!
  v.   Stay out! You are too late.
  vi. apna mobile silent kare~ (Put your phone on silent mode)
  vii. Keep your cell phones silent.
  viii. Respect the decorum of the class or get ready to face the music.
  ix. fauri taur pe phone band kare~ (Turn off your phone immediately!)
  x.   Keep your cell phones off during the class.
  xi. Be regular or you will face difficulty.
  xii. Lecture revise kar ke aaya kare~ (Come to the class after revising the lecture)

Except two instances of bald on-record politeness produced by male teachers, none of the male teachers employed bald on record politeness in the DCT, which indicates that the female teachers use more direct means of communication in their classroom discourse as compared to the male teachers and can therefore be judged as less polite according to Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness. It would be more appropriate to use the expression 'bald on-record impoliteness' for such utterances, as in cultures where indirectness is the communicative norm, use of imperatives is considered to be extremely rude and face-threatening.

Nevertheless, in classroom discourse, the use of such imperatives on the part of the teachers may not be perceived as impolite especially when the tone is friendly. For instance, one of the female teachers in her classroom discourse used a series of imperatives for giving instructions to the students for the assignment that the students had to submit before the final semester exams. Despite the use of imperatives for giving instructions, her discourse did not sound face threatening because she gave the instructions in a friendly tone and also employed the discourse marker 'please' with some imperatives. Once cannot deny that the force of an imperative is softened when the polite marker 'please' is attached at the beginning of such utterances, as is the case with the following examples produced by the female teachers:

  i.   Please stop talking! You are distracting others.
  ii. Please pay attention!
  iii. Please turn to page 64.

Although 'please' as a politeness marker is often associated with requests, it is also used for making offers and invitations. According to Geis (1995) "What it seems to do is redress the face threat associated with acts that presuppose the willingness of the addressee to agree to the act" (p. 17).

Analyzed within the framework of discursive approach to politeness that makes use of the contextual factors in determining the nature of politeness/impoliteness in discourse, most of the speech acts that appear impolite on the surface may prove to be polite when analyzed within a certain context.

5. Conclusion

There were significant gender differences in the nature of politeness/impoliteness strategies the teachers employed in response to each of the situations given in the DCT as well as during their actual classroom discourse. In contrast to the results of the earlier studies on gender differences in politeness in which women were found to be using more polite markers in their discourse as compared to men, the results of the present study reveal just the opposite. The female teachers' response to each of the situations can be considered less polite than the male teachers' response in Brown and Levinson's framework. The female teachers used more imperatives than their male counterparts and the use of an imperative is associated with bald on-record politeness, which according to Brown and Levinson threatens the face of the recipient.

Although, the study reveals significant gender differences in the teachers' use of politeness strategies, attributing all the differences to gender alone would lead to an overgeneralization. For politeness is not just gender-specific but is also context-specific to a great extent. The same person can sound polite or impolite depending on the situation in which discourse takes place. Hence, any study that does not take into account the situational factors may run the risk of presenting a blurred picture of politeness in discourse.

Despite the fact, that the female teachers in the study were found to use direct discourse, particularly bald on-record statements more often than the male teachers, considering their discourse less polite than the male teachers would be misleading unless the students' notion of politeness is taken into consideration. Whether the use of direct discourse is perceived polite or impolite in the classroom context not only depends on the community of practice but also on the students' notion of what constitutes politeness which may vary depending on their gender, their ethno-linguistic background, and the relational work involved in classroom discourse.

Since the study's focus was only on the teachers' use of politeness strategies, the students' response to the teachers' discourse was not taken into account. A study can be conducted in future to fill in this gap to see how the students judge teachers' classroom discourse in order to study the impact of this discourse on their classroom behaviour in general and their classroom performance in particular. Being a small scale study, only forty teachers' discourse was analyzed and therefore the results of this study cannot be generalized. In order to increase the reliability of the results, a similar study can be conducted with a large sample.

References:

Adel, R.M.S., Davoudi, M., & Ramezanzade, A. (2016). A qualitative study of politeness strategies used by Iranian EFL learners in a class blog.*Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 4*(1), 47-62.

Bacha, N.N., Bahous, R., & Diab, L.R. (2012). Gender and Politeness in a Foreign Language Academic Context. *International Journal of English Linguistics,2*(1), 79-96.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bousfield, D. (2006). The Grand Debate: Where Next for Politeness Research? *Culture, Language and Representation, III*, 9-15.

Christie, C. (2008). *Linguistic Politeness: Theories and Applications*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Cui-yun, C. (2014). An Experimental Study on the Application of Politeness Strategies among Teachers and Students in College English Classroom. *US-China Education Review, 4*(11),814-818.

Geis, L.M. (1995). *Speech acts and conversational interaction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness Phenomena in Modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 14*(2), 237-257.

Haugh, M., & Hinze, C. (2003). A metalinguistic approach to deconstructing the concepts of 'face' and 'politeness' in Chinese, English and Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics, 35*, 1581-1611.

Hermosilla, V.S.M. (2012). Gender and Politeness: a case study on advertising discourse. *Rice Working Papers in Linguistics*, *3*, 1-16.

Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, Men and Politeness*. London: Longman.

Holmes, J. (2005). Politeness and postmodernism: an appropriate approach to the analysis of language and gender? *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 9*(1), 108-117.

Holtgraves, T. (2005). Social Psychology, Cognitive Psychology and Linguistic Politeness. *Journal of Politeness Research,* 1, 73-93.

Janney, R. W., & Arndt, H. (1992). Intracultural tact versus intercultural tact. In R. J. Watts, S. Ide & K. Ehlich (Eds.), *Politeness in language* (pp. 21-41). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jiang, X. (2010). A Case Study of Teacher's Politeness in EFL Class. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1*(5), 651-655.

Lakoff, R., & Ide, S. (Eds.), (2005). *Broadening the Horizon of Linguistic Politeness*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

 Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Leech, G. (2005). Politeness: Is There An East-West Divide? *Journal of Foreign Languages* 6, 1-30.

Lin, T. (2013). The Concepts of "Politeness": A Comparative Study in Chinese and Japanese Verbal Communication. *Intercultural Communication Studies XXII* (2),152-165.

Locher, A. M (2004). *Power and Politeness in Action. Disagreements in Oral Communication*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Locher, A.M. (2006). Polite behavior within relational work: The discursive approach to politeness. *Multilingua, 25,* 249-267.DOI 10.1515/MULTI.2006.015.

Locher, A.M. (2008). Relational work: at the intersection of cognition, interaction and emotion. *Swiss association of applied linguistics, 88*, 165-191.

Locher, A.M., & Watts, J.R. (2005). Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research, 1*(1), 9-33.

Marquez-Reiter, R. (2000). *Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A Contrastive Study of Requests and Apologies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Monsefi, M., & Hadidi, Y. (2015). Male and Female EFL Teachers' Politeness Strategies in Oral Discourse and their Effects on the Learning Process and Teacher-Student Interaction. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL), 3*(2), 1-13.

Pan, Y., & Kádár, D. Z. (2010). *Politeness in Historical and Contemporary Chinese*. London/New York: Continuum.

Pizziconi, B. (2003). Re-Examining Politeness, Face and the Japanese Language, *Journal of Pragmatics 35*, 1471-1506.

Ruhi, S. (2006). Politeness in compliment responses: A perspective from naturally occurring exchanges in Turkish. *Pragmatics 16*, 43-101.

Sifianou, M. (1992). *Politeness Phenomena in England and Greece: A Cross-cultural Perspective*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Sulu, A. (2015). Teacher's politeness in EFL class. *International Online Journal of Educationand Teaching (IOJET), 2*(4), 216-221.

Terkourafi, M. (2005). Beyond the micro-level in politeness research. *Journal of Politeness Research, 1*(2), 237-262.

Thomas, J. (1995). *Theories of politeness. Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Tiisala, S. (2004). Power and Politeness: Languages and Salutation Formulas in Correspondence between Sweden and the German Hanse. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics, 5*(2), 193-207.

Watts, R. J. (1992). Linguistic politeness and politic verbal behaviour: reconsidering claims for universality. In J. Watts, S. Ide, & K. Ehlich (Eds.), *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice* (pp 43-69). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

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

Appendix

Discourse Completion Task

Instructions: Read each situation carefully and respond in exactly the same words which you use or would use in the classroom in response to each of the given situations. You are free to use Urdu or English or write your response using bilingual discourse if it is a normal practice in your class.

Situation#1: While you are in the middle of delivering a lecture you notice a few students talking to each other instead of listening to you. How do/would you respond?
_____
_____

Situation#2: A student comes to the class almost half an hour late. What would your response be?
_____
_____

Situation#3: Youask a question and the students fail to answer. What do/ would you say?
_____
_____

Situation#4: A student's cell phone rings in the middle of the class. How do/would you respond?
_____
_____

Situation#5: A student who has short attendance in the middle of the semester has to be warned. How do/would you warn that student?
_____
_____