POLITENESS IDEOLOGY
IN SPANISH COLLOQUIAL CONVERSATION:
THE CASE OF ADVICE

Nieves Hernández-Flores

1. Introduction

Within politeness studies, several researchers have pointed out the close links of the interactants' strategies with the social rules that are observed in their community (Fraser and Nolen 1981, Gu 1990, Watts 1992, Chen 1993). With this background, Meier remarks that politeness is "doing what is socially acceptable" (1995: 387) and Ehlich states that "in order to be able to qualify politeness as such, we need to know what constitutes the standard, the constitutive process being social" (1992: 76). These statements lead us to affirm that politeness is based on a social ideology, i.e. on a set of ideas about behaviour which are shared by a community and, hence, are recognized as appropriate in the community. As such, I believe that the members of this community have to follow the rules in order to continue their membership in the group. On the other hand, in the framework of politeness as face work, it seems relevant to know what the social standard of a community is in order to describe the face wants of its members; this allows us to analyse what strategies can be qualified as polite in this community and the reasons for using politeness strategies in specific situations.

Recent cultural approaches to politeness have used the particular features of their cultural identity in order to describe politeness phenomena in their communities. Mao (1994) deals with *mianzi* ('prestige' or 'reputation') and *lian* ('the respect of the group for a man with a good moral reputation') as components of Chinese face, that become evident in polite Chinese interactions. Placencia (1996) collects social notions as *el qué dirán* ('what people will say') and *guardar las apariencias* ('to keep appearances') and other notions closer to the familial background such as 'personalism' ('the building of social and business life around personal relationships') as relevant to Ecuadorian politeness. In her turn, De Kadt (1998) deals with *hlonipha* ('to pay respect') as a central concept in polite Zulu interactions. The question arising here is whether these particular cultural values, or those coming from other cultures, can be included into the universal concepts of negative and positive face, in accordance with the features allocated by the theory of Brown and Levinson (1987) to these concepts: to be unimpeded in one's actions and to be approved by the group.

This article is in keeping with the approach to politeness in accordance with a particular social ideology concerning face, in this case the social ideology arising in

European Spanish colloquial conversation[1]. In this way, I suggest that some of the cultural values that form Spanish face wants and that are working in this kind of interaction present problems as far as their inclusion into the universal notions of negative and positive face is concerned. Therefore, an approach that fits the specific face wants of Spanish interactants is required. For this purpose, Bravo's research about Spanish face will be used (1996, 1997, 1998a and 1998b). On the other hand, I believe that the reason for being polite is not limited to the occurrence of a threat to the interactants face, as Brown and Levinson's theory affirms. In my view, politeness can also be used for enhancing and strengthening the interactants' relationship in accordance with the particular ideology of the group, in this case Spanish interactants in everyday conversation. For dealing with this, the focus of this analysis will be two sequences of conversation which include advice. I aim to respond to how and why politeness strategies appear in these sequences.

2. The notions of face and politeness in Brown and Levinson's theory

Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness is based on the notion of face, i.e."the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself" (1987: 61). The concept of face is accepted in most current studies of politeness, but it arouses controversy when one is dealing with what face consists of, mainly because of the different cultural values involved in this concept. In Brown and Levinson's view, face consists of two related and universal wants:"the desire to be unimpeded in one's actions (negative face) and the desire (in some respects) to be approved of (positive face)" (1987: 13). Although, these scholars recognise that the notion of face is expected "to be the subject of much cultural elaboration" (1987: 13), they consider that such elaboration stemming from different cultural communities can be described within their universal model (1987: 13-15; 61-62). This proposal presents some problems of adequacy to cultural values from some communities. In fact, the features ascribed to face wants focuses on the individuality of people, on their right to privacy[2], by claiming own territories (negative face) and social approbation of own wants (positive face). Wierzbicka points out that the focus on individualism is a characteristic cultural value of Anglo-Saxon communities, but this value is not shared by other communities (1991, ch. 2). In this way, cultural approaches to face display that some cultural values have problems fitting the definitions of negative and positive face. F. ex. in Chinese, Mao proves that *miànzi* and *liam* have different social postulates from negative and positive face.

---

[1] Briz (1995) defines colloquial conversation in accordance with four features: equality of the speakers' situational roles, i.e. the concrete roles that are played in the situation are equal (I would like to add: apparently equal, since during interaction the speakers' roles are negotiated all the time); close relationship between the speakers since they know each other and they have some shared experience; the physical frame is known by the speakers (the place where conversation occurs); and topics of conversation belong to common and unspecialised knowledge. The more of these features a conversation has, the higher degree of colloquialness the conversation attains. The conversations of my data include all four features.

[2] Wierzbicka affirms that the word privacy has no equivalent in Polish and she ascribes this concept to central values of Anglo-Saxon culture (1991: 47). Also the Spanish sociologist De Miguel observes that there does not exist a translation of this English word in Spanish; he attributes this fact to the absence, in the Spanish setting, of the reality that is aimed at by the English term. (1990: 84)

Although *miànzi* and negative face have in common the notion of 'respect behaviour' they refer to different facts: negative face refers to the individual's territorial integrity and *mianzi* refers to the individual's dependence on society recognition. *Lian*, as positive face, deals with 'the desire to be liked and approved by the others' but it has a much different background from positive face: it has a deep moral sense, it is not negotiable and it is not attached to any sense of closeness, as positive face is (1994: 461-462). In Ecuadorian Spanish, Placencia displays that deference, an important cultural value operating in Ecuadorian face, is not due to the wish of protecting one's territory (negative face) as Brown and Levinson state, but to the performance of some social rules that appoint status to the members of the group (1996: 21). In my own research of Spanish colloquial conversation, I can observe that the desire to be unimpeded (negative face) is not a requirement for the smooth running of the interaction. In fact, acts such as asking things or giving advice are accepted in Spanish colloquial interactions, while other acts such as offering and complimenting have good social consideration; nevertheless, all of them are said to be potentially threatening for the negative face of the hearer (Brown and Levinson 1987: 66). On the other hand, being disapproved of, a potential threat to positive face (1987:66), occurs often in Spanish colloquial (and probably also in non colloquial) conversations. Disapproval becomes evident through the high controversy that may arise in discussions; yet, controversy is appreciated because it shows engagement with the conversation[3].

A critical approach to Brown and Levinson's theory has been developed by Bravo, who makes a step forward in cultural based studies of face by proposing the description and delimitation of the cultural values that constitute face in particular sociocultural groups in order to reach a better understanding of the communicative behaviour of this group (1998b). An attempt to incorporate Bravo's proposals into my research of Spanish colloquial interactions will be dealt with in the next section.

3. The *contents* of face in Spanish culture

In comparative research about Swedish and Spanish business interactions, Bravo (1996) approaches face by supporting her research in some cultural studies (Fant 1989 and 1992) and her own analysis results. In order to attain a more precise view of Spaniards and Swedes' face, she uses the concepts of *autonomy* and *affiliation*. Because they deal with the relationship between the *ego* and the *alter*, these concepts have some connections with Brown and Levinson's concepts of negative and positive face; nevertheless, they work at different levels and they refer to different facts. *Autonomy* and *affiliation* are methodological categories dealing with face and responding to a human requirement: the first category refers to the fact of perceiving, and to be perceived by people, as someone with his/her own surroundings inside the group; the second category refers to the fact of perceiving, and to be perceived by people, as an integrated part of the group. These categories do not refer to what *having own surroundings* and *being integrated in the group*

---

[3] These features have been displayed in anthropological research (cf. Thurén 1988) and general studies about Spanish society (cf. De Miguel 1990) and speech communities in the U.S.A. (Cf. Schiffrin 1984; Tannen 1992: 28ff.). These features also appear in a questionnaire over seventy Spanish natives (the analysis is still in progress). I asked them about verbal behaviour in social situations and attitudes to the use of politeness.

mean for people, as the terms negative and positive face do (*having surroundings* is understood as *being unimpeded* while *being integrated* means *being approved* in Brown and Levinson's theory). On the contrary, what the categories of *autonomy* and *affiliation* aim at in terms of social behaviour is open to cultural interpretation. In other words, the social meaning of the human claims of autonomy and affiliation for the different groups is not universal, but linked to the cultures values ascribed by the ideology of the group (as the cultural values displayed by Mao, Placencia and De Kadt, cited above).Then, *autonomy* and *affiliation* are dealt with by Bravo as *empty* methodological categories which are required to be *filled* with *contents,* i.e. with the components of one group's socio-cultural identity. The claim of no imposition and the searching for approval probably work as *contents* of *autonomy* and *affiliation* in some communities but these *contents* do not fit other communities where the social standard is different. Thus, the *content*s of the categories of face *autonomy* and *affiliation* have to be defined in the particular sociocultural group[4].

   In Spanish business interactions, Bravo proves some cultural assumptions about the *content*s of face in this setting. In the *autonomy* category, one of the *content*s is "el deseo de verse frente al grupo como un individuo original y consciente de sus cualidades sociales positivas". (1996: 63) ('The individual's wishes to be seen as an original person and that s/he is self-aware of his/her positive social qualities.') In order to fulfill this face requirement, the individual is expected to display her/his self-confidence by means of assertive behaviour. I believe that this feature of *self-affirmation* is not exclusive of business interactions; it can fit my own data of Spanish colloquial conversation as well as an assumption of one of the *content*s of face (in the category of *autonomy*). As it was mentioned above, in a Spanish setting, conversation is seen as a pleasant activity where controversy and the utterance of original ideas from the participants are appreciated (in verbal ways by the use of assertions, f. ex.). Thurén (1988) confirms the importance of *self-affirmation* in an anthropological work of a Spanish community (a neighbourhood in the town of Valencia). She observes that: "It is important to express your opinions forcefully and persuasively; one should be able to persuade through showing the invincible structure and logic of one's opinions and also demonstrating their emotional charge, because what is emotionally strong carries its own logic;" (1988: 217). In my view, in Spanish colloquial conversation, *self-affirmation* allows the speaker to stress her/his own positive social qualities and thus it makes her/him stand out in the group.

   On the other hand, according to Bravo, one of the possible *contents* for *affiliation* in the Spanish context seems to be the notion of *confianza* that is translated by Thurén as "closeness or a sense of deep familiarity" (1988: 222). The concept of *confianza* belongs to the sphere of Spanish sociability and it refers to "a style of interaction or communication. It is usually felt to be very positive, for the same reasons as friendship is." (1988: 223). If the speakers have *confianza* they are allowed to speak or act in an open way; no *confianza* means distance, and distance is evaluated negatively in a context of friends and relatives in Spain. Therefore, *confianza* is mainly found in the familial background and, by extension, it includes people "whom you know and whom you are affectively tied to" (Fant

---

[4] The different *contents* of *autonomy* and *affiliation* in Swedish and Spanish groups have been also displayed by Bravo (1996, 1997, 1998b) in her comparative research of business interaction.

1992: 149).[5] In my opinion, interactants strive to gain *confianza* in my data of colloquial conversation because this means that an affective atmosphere can be reached so that the individual feels that s/he is accepted and integrated in her/his group. In these conversations, the search for *confianza* is especially expected between interactants with a less than close relationship (distantly related family, friends or neighbours) who aim to confirm their right to belong to the group by acting as if *they had a close relationship*, a trait that is not inherent to their relationship. In other words, in my data of colloquial interactions one of the ways that the individual has for fulfilling her/his need for *affiliation* is by attaining the *confianza* of her/his group. The social notions of *self-affirmation* and *confianza* have links between them: the individual has the right to be self-affirmative because s/he has the group's *confianza*; at the same time, as Bravo (1996: 63) points out, the individual has to renew her/his right to stay in the group - the right of having the group's *confianza*- by showing her/his own positive qualities -by being self-affirmative-. Thus, *autonomy* and *affiliation*, with the particular *contents* given by the particular cultural values, are not opposite, but both are linked parts of the individual's face.

Since Brown and Levinson do not refuse the cultural components of face, it can be argued that these features from Spanish interactions can be included, in a broad way, in their universal concepts of negative and positive face. In this case, *self-affirmation* would be a cultural variation inside the general features of negative face and *confianza* would be included in positive face. Nevertheless, in my opinion, this attempt would present confusing research results because of the restrictive cultural features ascribed to negative and positive face by Brown and Levinson's theory. On the one hand, the face want of *self-affirmation* (the desire to be seen by others as someone with good social qualities) does not refer to the fact of being or not being unimpeded in one's actions, as negative face does, but to the wish of standing out from the group. This also means that *self-affirmation* focuses on the individual as s/he is seen by the group, while negative face focuses on the individual as someone independent of the group. With regard to *confianza* (sense of deep familiarity), this notion does not refer to the wish of being appreciated and approved of (positive face) but to the wish of achieveing closeness, because closeness in the Spanish setting allows the posibility of acting and talking in an open way, as in familial background (this is valued as positive because of the social importance of family in the Spanish model of society). As *self-affirmation*, the social notion of *confianza* focuses on the acceptance of the individual inside the group, while positive face stresses the acceptance of the individual (of her/his individuality) by the group.

From another point of view, the ideal of *confianza* conflicts with the features of negative face because *confianza* means a close relationship between the interactants and this would threaten their negative face; on the other hand, the features of positive face do not fit the ideal of *self-affirmation*, since *self-affirmation* entails decisive and emotional assertions that can threaten the ideal of being approved of. In brief, I believe that the

---

[5] *Confianza* goes beyond the sphere of one's own family and friends and it can also be aimed at in daily social interaction. Fant observes that: "A person's social acceptance is crucially dependent on his/her being able to establish a network of such family-like bonds. The fact that the social bonds are "calqued" on family bonds has one important consequence: once the bond is established, you expect an affective acceptance of your person to be operative, an acceptance that is not directly dependent on your actions. This entails that self-affirmation and assertiveness be neutralized as a social threat". (Fant 1992: 150). In Spanish business interaction, Bravo (1996) proves that *confianza* is part of the affiliative face of this social group.

concepts of negative and positive face of Brown and Levinson display some particular cultural features that do not fit the Spanish sociocultural ideology of colloquial conversations.

4. Advice and politeness

In this analysis, I will focus on sequences that include advice because they can exemplify the occurrence of politeness. In Brown and Levinson's view, the reason for using politeness with advice is its potential threat to the negative face of the hearer (1987: 76), i.e. advice is included in the type of acts that "put some pressure on the hearer to do (or refrain from doing) the act". (1987: 66). If we consider that *being free of imposition* is the individual's face want, then it is possible to consider the potential threat to the face because advice would be understood as a speaker's imposition on the hearer's freedom of decision and action. However, if we consider *self-affirmation* (the individual's wish to be seen as an original person and self-aware of her/his positive social qualities) as content of the *autonomy* of the individual then the threat is not always produced. In fact, since advice involves the utterance of the speaker's personal ideas, *self-affirmation* would stand for the engagement of the speaker with these ideas. Giving advice works as the speaker's (the advice-giver) desire for *self-affirmation*, because s/he is expressing a personal (and good, under her/his view) idea, whereas the hearer (the advice-receiver) still has the right of accepting or rejecting advice, i.e, stressing her/his own competence in making a decision (*self-affirmation*). On the other hand, *confianza* (the interactants' ideal of *affiliation*) supports the accomplishment of advice. *Confianza* appears because the interactants have a close relationship that allows them to speak openly; in other words, *confianza* provides an open and friendly background for expressing personal ideas, in this case, for expressing advice. At the same time, the speaker reaffirms the right to have her/his interlocutors' *confianza* by displaying her/his *self-affirmation*, i.e. by giving advice.

      Then, another question arises: if we consider that giving advice is not necessarily threatening in Spanish colloquial conversation but that politeness strategies arise in sequences holding advice anyway, what is the reason for being polite? In my opinion, and as other researchers have pointed out, (Kerbrat Orecchioni 1992, Haverkate 1994, Kienpointner 1997, Bravo 1998b) politeness is not always used because of conflictual reasons, as a way of avoiding or mitigating a threat to the other's face. Politeness can instead be used as a way of reaching a friendly and pleasant interaction, which brings the relationship up in accordance with the cultural rules for social contact in the particular group. In Spanish colloquial conversation, the reason for being polite would then be the necessity of keeping a balance between the interactants' faces, i.e. between their respective wishes of *autonomy* and *affiliation.* In interaction, this balance of face works in accordance with the features established of the roles of the speakers by the Spanish sociocultural ideology.

      In the next section, I propose an analysis of two conversation sequences that include advice under the approach that I have just proposed here, i.e, politeness as a way of strengthening the social links between the interactants in accordance with their face wants: *self-affirmation* and *confianza*.

5. Analysis

My data are tape-recorded conversations between friends and relatives in Salamanca (Spain) during situations of visits. The situational roles of the interactants (Hosts/hostesses and guests) will be used in the analysis. In addition, other relevant features from their social role will be added (age, gender and relationships between them).

(1) The speakers and their roles:

PILI: woman, 55 years old. Hostess.
GABRIEL: man, 57 years old. Host. Married to Pili.
MARÍA: woman, 26 years old. The hostess' and host's daughter.
JULIÁN: man, 26 years old. Maria's boyfriend.
JUAN: man, 44 years old. Guest.
ELSA: woman, 42 years old. Guest. She and her husband (Juan) have a newly established friendship with Pili and Gabriel.

Situation: Pili, Gabriel, María and Julián are seated on the banks of a river at their country house in a dry area of Spain. They have several types of animals at the house, and some ducks have just been incorporated too. Elsa and Juan arrive to visit their friends. They were expected, but not at any concrete time.

1	Elsa:	buenas tardes
		'good afternoon'
2	Pili:	buenas tardes
		'good afternoon'
3	María:	[hola]
		'hello'
4	Julián:	[buenas tardes]
		'good afternoon'
5	Elsa:	estamos de amos de casa y hasta que no se friega... se... *(slight*
6		*laugh)* tal... *(moving the dog away)* ¡chucho!
		'we were doing housework and since the washing up wasn't done... the... so... mutt!'
7	Pili:	dice Celia que los
		'Celia says that the'
8	Elsa:	*(she sees the ducks in the river)* ¡huy! =
		'wow!' =
9	Pili:	ah, ¿(eso) no lo habías visto? =
		'oh, haven't you seen (this) before?'
10	Elsa:	= ¿pero tenéis también patos?=
		'so, do you have ducks also?'=
11	Pili:	= ¿eh?
		'what?'
12	Elsa:	= ¡ay qué bonitos!
		= 'oh, how pretty they are!'
13	Pili:	( ) dice Celia que cuando
		( )'Celia says that when'
14	Elsa:	¿por qué?
		'why?'
15	Juan:	*(he is watching the trouts leaping in the river)* ¡allí hay una
16		chiquinina, chiquinina, chiquinina!
		'there there is a little, little, little trout!'
17	Elsa:	*(she watches the ducks)* ¡ay qué bonitos! =
		'oh, how pretty they are!'

18	Pili:	nosotros empeza- empezamos llevan-
		'we started, we started by bringing'
19	Elsa:	= ¿por qué no traéis... cisnes?
		= 'why don't you bring... swans?'
20	María:	¿cisnes? [¿aquí?][6]=
		'swans? here?'
21	Elsa:	[(claro).]
		'sure.'
22	María:	= *(slight laugh)*
23	Elsa:	pa' que anden por aquí. ha dicho tu padre que va a hacer, el arca de
24		Noé.
		'so they can be around here. your father has said that he's making, Noah's ark.'
25	Gabriel:	es que ya lo es =
		this is it already'
26	Julián:	ya está... en camino
		'this is already... on the way'
27	Gabriel:	= éste es el arca de Noé, ya.
		'this is Noah's ark already'

In this sequence, after a brief interchange of greetings (lines 1-4), three topics arise. Two of them (lines 7, 13, 14 and 18 and lines 15 and 16) are peripheral topics, since they are not continued by the interactants; the third one concerns Elsa's observation of her friends' new ducks (lines 8-12, 17 and 19-27). Advice arises in line 19 (*¿por qué no traéis... cisnes? 'why don't you bring... swans?'*). As we can see, the speaker is proposing a change of the situation (having swans in the river with the ducks) even if the addressees have not set out any situation that pushes the speaker to advise; it is not solicited advice[7]. If we take *negative and positive face* as the components of Spanish face, giving unsolicited advice leads us to consider the threat to the face of the hearer. On the other hand, if we consider *autonomy* and *affiliation* with their *contents* of *self-affirmation* and *confianza* as part of Spanish face, giving or rejecting advice does not seem to be threatening[8].

In this example, the advice-giver is proposing an idea to her friends, not because she actually thinks that her friends' country house needs swans, but because by the way of advice she displays her engagement with the conversation and she gets involved in the *efficient running* of the relationship. This engagement is supported by the preceding acts of the sequence, i.e. greeting (lines 1), justification for the delay (lines 5-6) and compliment

---

[6] In Spain, swans are uselly in parks, i.e. in green and well kept areas. The area where this conversation takes place is arid, which is why María expresses surprise at Elsa's idea (having swans).

[7] I found twenty four sequences containing advice in my data and none of it was solicited by the addressees. In three cases, advice arises as a positive reply to an idea from the addressee that the speaker considers right; in five cases, as a negative reply to an action or a thought from the addressee that the speaker considers wrong. In six cases, advice arises in order to help the addressee resolve a problem that the hearer has set out. In ten cases advice appears as reaction from the speaker to a problem or situation affecting the addressee, but only in the speaker's eyes since the addressee has not mentioned anything.

[8] Also in American English, by using Brown and Levinson's features for face, Decapua and Huber display that unsolicited advice shows people's engagement in related stories or descriptions arising in daily conversation and this is not seen as a threat in many situations. Besides, they point out that advice has other functions in interaction apart from the searching of solutions to problems, as for example *to establish or maintain rapport* (1995: 128).

(lines 8, 10, 12 and 17). From the perspective of Spanish *face-work*, the advice-giver's behavior is the wish to be seen as a person with ideas, that is, it focuses on her *autonomy.* At the same time, she shares her ideas, i.e., she is searching *confianza*, especially because her situational role (guest) pushes her to confirm that she is accepted in her friends' home. By attaining *confianza,* the advice-giver resolves her need of *affiliation*. On the other hand, the negative response to advice (lines 20 and 22) does not mean that the addressee has rejected the advice-giver's wishes of *autonomy and affiliation*, but that the addressee is also claiming her own *autonomy*, in this case her right to assert personal ideas.

This face-work carries on beyond the expected sequence (advice-rejection of advice) in a third part, consisting of the defense of advice by the advice giver (lines 21, 23, 24). Elsa supports her wish of *autonomy* by referring to her idea in humoristic terms: she recalls a funny statement made by Gabriel (making Noah's ark). Furthermore, by introducing another speaker's statement, Elsa displays her engagement in the conversation (thus she claims her *affiliation*). In his turn, Gabriel takes the oportunity (Elsa's mention of his idea) for claiming his own *autonomy* (by showing his pride in his *Noah's ark*) (lines 25 and 27).

In brief, giving advice and the subsequent acts are not a threat to the interactants' faces, but a way of reaffirming their faces in accordance with their roles. In this bargaining between the interactants' faces, politeness is the way of stressing the hearer's face at the same time that the speaker keeps his/her face in a good position. In fact, by giving advice, the advice-giver stresses her right of *autonomy* and *affiliation*, but she is also concerned about her addressees' faces. Then she addresses a series of acts to the hearers (greeting, justification, noticing the new animals of the house, compliment and, finally, advice) that function as a polite ritual in Spanish culture. Additionally, in her defense of advice, Elsa introduces another speaker (Gabriel) by incorporating his jokes, thus she is taking into consideration her friend's face. In her turn, the advice-receiver is looking after the advice-giver's *autonomy* and *affiliation* by mitigating her rejection (she responds with a question and a slight laugh), i.e. her own *self-affirmation.*This searching for the equilibrium of faces by the interactans leads us to interpret the sequence as polite.

Another sequence from my corpus follows this explicative proposal, in this case by the assertion of advice that solicits concrete action from the addressee.

(2) The speakers and their roles:

PILI: woman, 55 years old. Hostess.
BELINDA: woman, 35 years old, Pili's sister-in-law. Guest.

(*Pili and Belinda are in Pili's house. Pili's brother, brother-in-law and sister-in-law (Belinda) are visiting. Her three sons and her daughter are also there. All are seated at a table except Pili, who is serving a meal for all of them*)

1	Belinda:	Pili, ¿te quieres sentar tú y...?
		'Pili, do you want to sit down and...?'
2	Pili:	sí, no, pero prefiero, prefiero estarme... eso y luego ya me siento más
3		tranquilita.
		'yes, no, but I prefer, I prefer to stand... this and afterwards I can sit down a bit calmer'.

4 (*Four seconds pause*)

5 Belinda: *(To Pili, who continues serving dishes)* ¿por qué no lo dejas aquí y
6   que se vayan echando?
                        'why don't you leave it *(the food)* here and let them *(the guests)* serve themselves?

7 *(No answer. Another speaker initiates an unrelated topic)*

In this sequence, Belinda is the advice-giver and advice arises in two parts. Firstly by means of the verb *to want* inserted in a question (line nr.1) and, after the addressee's negative response, by way of a concrete proposal (lines nr. 5-6).

In terms of *face*, advice is explained by the social and situational role of the advice-giver (Belinda): she is a woman and she is the guest. In a Spanish context, women are expected to make food and to serve the meals for the guests, as it occurs here. Because she is a woman, the advice-giver knows how much work having guests is; therefore, she gives advice that, if followed, would avoid work to the advice-receiver, that is, the advice-giver searches to be in solidarity with the advice-receiver. Furthermore, the advice-giver has the role of guest and then, by the same strategy of avoiding work to her hostess, she aims to confirm her right to be invited to eat in her home. Finally, she achieves it because her hostess gives her a response that plays down the task. By showing solidarity and concern for the advice-receiver, the advice-giver achieves *confianza*, that is, she confirms her *affiliation* face in her group. In this way the addressee's positive or negative response to advice is not so important, since the advice-giver's face has already been reaffirmed.

On her side, the advice-receiver rejects the advice twice; the first time by a negative response that she mitigates when she hesitates in her response (*yes, no, but, I prefer)* and when she plays down her task by using a diminutive in the adjective (*tranquil<u>ita</u>*, lines 2-3); the second time she does not say anything, probably because another speaker takes the turn and there is a change of subject in the conversation. By asserting her wish to accomplish the task, the advice-receiver is defending her role of hostess and thus, she is claiming her wish of *autonomy*; at the same time, she sees her *affiliation* confirmed because of the advice-giver's interest in her. On the other hand, both interactants use politeness strategies in order to achieve the equilibrium between their faces (the advice-giver confirms the advice-receiver's face by trying to help her; the advice-receiver confirms the advice-giver's face by mitigating her rejection to advice). In this framework, advice does not display any threat to the interactants' faces, but it strengthens links between them.

6. Conclusion

In this article, I have sustained that politeness phenomena respond to the social ideology of a particular sociocultural group. The notions of *self-affirmation* and *confianza* have been introduced as some components of the social ideology of Spaniards in colloquial interactions. These social components present difficulties in fitting the universal face wants of negative face and positive face from Brown and Levinson's theory because of the different focus on the relationships between the individual and her/his group. Therefore, a neutral categorization of face has been proposed using Bravo's categories *autonomy* and *affiliation* that in a Spanish context include the face wants of *self-affirmation* and *confianza*. In this context, I supposed that the use of politeness in Spanish colloquial

conversation is not always due to the wish of avoiding or mitigating a threat to the face, but to the wish of enhancing the relationship between the interactants. The analysis of two samples from my data which includes examples of advice have displayed some common features: advice arises without a demand from the addressee, it presents clear assertions and it is rejected by the hearer. By understanding advice as a threat to the speakers' faces (considering Brown and Levinson's negative and positive face), Spanish colloquial conversation seems to be a dangerous interactional field, and this does not fit the friendly atmosphere that appears in my data. Regarding *autonomy* and *affiliation* with their contents of *self-affirmation* and *confianza* as being part of Spanish face confirms the absence of threat to the faces: advice in the first example serves to flatter; in the second one, to help. Both features are felt as being positive in Spanish social context. In the absence of threat, politeness would serve as a tool for achieving the equilibrium between the interactants' face wants in order to enhance the conversation and strengthen the social links between the interactants..

The case of advice confirms that the speakers follow the particular ideology of a sociocultural group; in this case, Spaniards when they interact with their friends and relatives. This ideology takes into account the roles played in the Spanish setting (as, f. ex, the set of roles from my sequences), some behaviours, more or less ritualized, and the cultural values of Spanish ideology. *Self-affirmation* and *confianza* have been pointed out as some of the face needs of the Spaniards when they interact with friends and relatives, but it is sure that there are other contents involved in Spanish face. To know these contents seems to be necessary in order to reach a better understanding of Spanish interactions. In this way, an open field is displayed for future research by means of real data analysis and the support of questionnaires and anthropological studies.

Transcription conventions[9]

The numbers on the left side correspond to the lines of the text. The names of the speakers are figurate. The transcription is orthographical but phonetic considerations are taken into account in a few words with particular pronunciation in informal context (as *pa'* instead of *para*).

:	turn
,	pause, 0-1second
.	pause, 1-3 seconds
(*Pause of … seconds*)	pause, over 3 seconds (time is indicated)
¿?	questions
¡!	exclamations
...	lengthened syllable
-	self-interruption
[ ]	overlapping utterance
=	turn-keeping
( )	unintelligible utterance
(claro)	hesitant transcription
(laugh)	contextual comments.

---

9   Transcription conventions are partially taken from Briz 95 and Payrató 95.

References

Blum-Kulka, S. (1990) You don't touch lettuce with your fingers: Parental politeness in family discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14 (2): 259-288.

Bravo, D. (1996) *La risa en el regateo: Estudio sobre el estilo comunicativo de negociadores españoles y suecos*. Stockholm: Institutionen för spanska och portugisiska.

Bravo, D. (1997) ¿Reirse juntos?: un estudio de las imágenes sociales de hablantes españoles, mexicanos y suecos. *Diálogos Hispánicos* 22: 315-364.

Bravo, D. (1998a) La atribución de significados sociales en el discurso hablado: perspectivas extrapersonales e interpersonales. Paper presented at *I Simposio Internacional de Análisis del Discurso*, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, April 1998.

Bravo, D. (1998b) (forthcoming) ¿Imagen 'positiva' vs imagen 'negativa'?: pragmática socio-cultural y componentes de 'face'. *Oralia* 2.

Briz, A. et al. (1995) *La conversación coloquial. Materiales para su estudio.* Valencia: Universidad de Valencia.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1987) *Politeness. Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: University Press.

Cátedra, M. (1991) *Los españoles vistos por los antropólogos*. Madrid: Júcar Universidad.

Chen, R. (1993) Responding to compliments. A contrastive study of politeness between American English and Chinese speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 20: 49-75.

De Capua, A. and Huber, L. (1995) If I were you... advice in American English. *Multilingua*, 14 (2): 117-132.

De Kadt, E. (1998) The concept of face and its applicability to the Zulu language. *Journal of Pragmatics* 29: 173-191.

Ehlich, K. (1992) On the historicity of politeness. In R. Watts, S. Ide & K. Ehlich (eds.), *Politeness in Language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 71-107.

Escandell-Vidal, M. V. (1996) Towards a cognitive approach to Politeness. In K. Jaszczolt and K. Turner (eds.), *Contrastive semantics and pragmatics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 629-650.

Fant, L. (1989) Cultural mismatch in conversation: Spanish and Scandinavian communicative behaviour in negotiation settings. *Hermes* 3: 247-265.

Fant, L. (1992) Scandinavians and Spaniards in negotiation. In A. Sjögren and L. Janson (eds.), *Culture and Management in the Field of Ethnology and Business Administration*. Stockholm: Stockholm School of Economics. Institute of International Business, 125-153.

Fraser, B. & Nolen, W. (1981) The association of deference with linguistic form. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 27: 93-100.

Goffman, E. (1967) *Interactional ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. New York: Anchor Books.

Gu, Y. (1990) Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 237-257.

Haverkate, H. (1994) *La cortesía verbal*. Madrid: Gredos.

Ide, S. (1989) Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua* 8 (2): 223-371.

Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. (1990, 1992, 1994): *Les interactions verbales*, 3 vol. Paris: A. Colin.

Kienpointner, M. (1997) Varieties of rudeness. Types and functions of impolite utterances. *Functions of Language* 4 (2): 251-287.

Mao, L. R. (1994) Beyond politeness threory: 'Face' revisited and renewed. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21 (5): 451-486.

Matsumoto, Y. (1988) Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness Phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 12 (4): 403-426.

Matsumoto, Y. (1989) Politeness and conversational universals. Observations from Japanese. *Multilingua* 8 (2): 207-221.

Meier, A. J. (1995) Passages of politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 24 (4): 391-392.

Miguel, A. de (1990) *Los españoles. Sociología de la vida cotidiana*. Madrid: Temas de hoy.

Payrató, L. (1995) Transcripción del discurso coloquial. In L. Cortés Rodríguez (ed.), *Actas del I Simposio sobre análisis del discurso oral. El español coloquial.* Almería: Universidad de Almería. 43-70.

Placencia, M. E. (1996) Politeness in Ecuadorian Spanish. *Multilingua* 15 (1): 13-34.

Schiffrin, D. (1984) Jewish argument as sociability. *Language in Society* 13(3): 311-355.

Sifianou, M. (1992) *Politeness phenomena in England and Greece: A cross-cultural perspective.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Tannen, D. (1992) *That's not what I meant! How conversational style makes or breaks your relation with others*. London: Virago.

Thurén, B. M. (1988) *Left hand left behind. The changing gender system of a barrio in Valencia, Spain*. Stockholm: Stockholms Studies in Social Anthropology.

Villemoes, A. (1995) Culturally determined facework priorities in Danish and Spanish business negotiation. In K. Ehlich and J. Wagner (eds.) *The discourse of business negotiation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Watts, R. (1992) Linguistic politeness and politic verbal behaviour: Reconsidering claims for universality. In R. Watts, S. Ide and K. Ehlich (eds.) *Politeness in Language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 43-69.

Wierzbicka, A. (1991) *Cross-cultural pragmatics. The semantics of human interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.