

Summary in Spanish

CORTESÍA Y OTROS TIPOS DE ACTIVIDADES DE IMAGEN: SIGNIFICADO COMUNICATIVO Y SOCIAL EN UN DEBATE TELEVISIVO

Nieves Hernández-Flores

1. Introducción

El tema de la cortesía y otras actividades de imagen social (*facework*, Goffman 1967) ha producido numerosos estudios empíricos en situaciones comunicativas concretas, por ejemplo, en el marco familiar, en el académico, en las interacciones de negocios, en la prestación de servicios, en el discurso político, en los medios de comunicación, etc. En estos estudios, la investigación pragmática de los últimos años ha insistido en la necesidad de describir el contexto de las interacciones a la hora de analizar e interpretar los datos. El concepto de *género comunicativo* (*communicative gender*), de Luckman (1995) trata de dar un marco conceptual y teórico a aspectos contextuales que rodean el hecho comunicativo y que juegan un importante papel en su significado y en su función. Estos aspectos contextuales se refieren al espacio físico y temporal en que se produce la interacción, la finalidad de ésta, el papel de los hablantes que intervienen, los actos que se realizan, y otras características sociales y comunicativas. Pues bien, en los estudios de cortesía e imagen, la descripción de la actividad social en que se encuentra inmersa la interacción permite analizar y describir los aspectos sociales y comunicativos que presenta, pero además reflexionar sobre en qué medida esa situación contextual puede condicionar el mismo concepto de cortesía, en concreto, cuáles son las consecuencias sociales y comunicativas de su uso en la interacción. De esta manera, la descripción del género comunicativo supone una ayuda para el investigador que trata de identificar y diferenciar actividades corteses de otras actividades de imagen en intercambios comunicativos.

El objetivo del presente estudio es analizar las características y la función de la cortesía y de otras actividades de imagen en un género comunicativo concreto: el de los debates televisivos. La hipótesis de este trabajo es que la cortesía y las actividades de imagen en general son fenómenos que deben ser descritos específicamente de acuerdo con los contextos en que aparecen a fin de dar cuenta de las estrategias usadas, su función y sus consecuencias sociales y comunicativas en la interacción. El material de análisis está constituido por un corpus de debates del programa televisivo español *Cada día*, emitidos durante 2004. Este programa era de emisión diaria y con una duración de media hora, y durante el mismo la moderadora (una conocida periodista, María Teresa Campos) y sus invitados (cinco periodistas que alternaban su presencia en el programa)

discutían la actualidad política y social, al tiempo que también intervenían por teléfono dos espectadores para dar su opinión sobre los temas debatidos.

2. Los debates televisivos como *género comunicativo*

Los debates televisivos constituyen un *género comunicativo*, es decir, un tipo de evento donde los participantes comparten un conjunto de propósitos comunes (Luckman 1995; Linell 1998), en el caso que nos ocupa, el debate del programa *Cada día*, el propósito es informar y al mismo tiempo entretener al público. El tipo de evento allí desarrollado se caracteriza por el número y características de los participantes (cinco periodistas), los temas tratados (las noticias diarias), las convenciones en cuanto a los turnos de habla (la moderadora tiene derecho a distribuirlos) y, además, por los roles desempeñados por los hablantes. Los roles están definidos por la actividad profesional de los participantes (*periodistas*), cuya característica es la de ser conocedores de los temas tratados y con capacidad para analizarlos; por su tendencia política (*portavoces de una tendencia política*), aspecto observable desde el conocimiento del medio de comunicación para el que trabajan y desde el contenido de sus discursos; y por la misma actividad del debate, donde cada participante parece tener asignado un rol de acuerdo con la actitud y el tipo de discurso que mantiene en las discusiones: hablantes con el rol de *expertos* (que aportan información y datos sobre el tema), con el rol de *polémicos* (que buscan el enfrentamiento y la polémica) o con el rol de *moderados* (que tratan de buscar posturas conciliatorias).

El discurso de los debates televisivos es de tipo semi-institucional (cf. Ilie 2001), pues incorpora tanto elementos de naturaleza institucional como conversacional. Las características institucionales son las restricciones en el contexto físico (un estudio televisivo), en la selección de hablantes, en la toma de turnos y en los temas tratados; su carácter de discurso mediado (por medios técnicos); la no presencia de los destinatarios (los espectadores); los roles relacionados con la profesión y el ser un discurso en busca de un fin preciso (informar y entretener). Las características conversacionales son el uso de lengua informal, la espontaneidad en la toma de turnos (no dirigida), el cambio de temas y de roles sin el control de la moderadora, los roles derivados de aspectos personales, y la orientación del discurso hacia el interlocutor. En suma, por sus características institucionales el discurso de *Cada día* es el propio de un programa de debate, pero por las conversacionales es más propio de una tertulia, por lo cual se podría denominar este programa como de tipo *debate-tertulia*.

3. La cortesía y otros tipos de actividades de imagen

La presencia de *actividades de imagen (facework)* en los debates televisivos ha sido objeto de anteriores estudios (Hernández Flores 2006a y b) donde se confirmaba que el comportamiento comunicativo que repercute en la situación de la imagen social de las personas (*face*, Goffman 1967) no es sólo la cortesía, sino que hay otros que también tienen un efecto sobre la imagen, como lo son la descortesía (que repercute negativamente sobre la imagen social) o lo que algunos autores han denominado *autocortesía* (Chen 2001; Boretti 2005), en mi denominación *actividades de autoimagen*, fenómeno que afecta a la propia imagen del hablante sin que la de los

destinatarios se vea directamente afectada (por ejemplo, un participante en el debate que muestra sus conocimientos sobre un tema realza su propia imagen).

Siguiendo a Bravo (1999, 2002 y en este volumen), la imagen social afectada en la interacción es de dos tipos: la de *autonomía* (lo que diferencia a la persona del grupo al que pertenece) y la de *afiliación* (lo que identifica a la persona con el grupo). Las características específicas de estas dos necesidades básicas están configuradas culturalmente, es decir, son compartidas por la comunidad cultural y bien conocidas por sus miembros. Al mismo tiempo, la imagen social está relacionada con el rol o roles que los hablantes representan en sus intervenciones comunicativas, estando también estos roles caracterizados culturalmente (Bravo 1999, 2002). En este marco, la cortesía es entendida como el comportamiento comunicativo que confirma la imagen social tanto del destinatario como del hablante, apuntando a conseguir un equilibrio entre los deseos de imagen de ambos (Hernández Flores 2002, 2004a). Esta búsqueda de equilibrio de imágenes es observada en el nivel de los actos comunicativos realizados durante la interacción y tiene el propósito de conseguir que ésta sea satisfactoria tanto comunicativa como socialmente. Por otra parte, la mitigación de amenazas a la imagen (Brown y Levinson 1987) no es la única función otorgada a la cortesía, sino que también el realce de la imagen es reconocido como una función cortés (Hernández Flores 2002, 2004b; Albelda 2004). Un ejemplo de estas posturas en torno a la cortesía, dentro del género comunicativo del debate, sería un cumplido de un/a espectador/a a la moderadora del programa, lo cual realza la imagen de afiliación de ésta en su rol de moderadora (al recibir un reconocimiento profesional por parte de sus espectadores), al tiempo que el/la emisor/a del cumplido confirma su propia imagen afiliativa en su rol de espectador/a, al mostrarse como una persona receptiva y agradecida ante el producto televisivo recibido.

4. Análisis de datos

(Ver transcripción de los datos en el artículo en inglés)

Los dos temas principales de este fragmento (ver cuadro 1, primera columna) son la temporalidad laboral y la crisis y recuperación de la Seguridad Social en España. En el momento previo a esta interacción, una espectadora ha intervenido telefónicamente para criticar las condiciones de los trabajos temporales, tema recogido por la moderadora, María Teresa Campos (MTC, en la fila 1 del cuadro) y que da lugar a la consiguiente discusión entre el participante de ideología conservadora Carlos Dávila (CD) y la participante de ideología socialista María Antonia Iglesias (MAI).

Temas principales y líneas en la transcripción	Participantes y sus roles	Actos comunicativos	Propósito comunicativo	Tipo de actividad de imagen	Situación de la imagen social (individual)
--	---------------------------	---------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------	--

El trabajo temporal 1-21	MTC moderadora	Reconocimiento (del problema de la espectadora)	Expresar solidaridad	Cortesía	Realce de la imagen afiliativa de los destinatarios (la espectadora participante y los espectadores en general): reciben apoyo. Realce de la imagen afiliativa de la hablante (la moderadora): se muestra solidaria.
	CD conservador	Objeción: <i>El supuesto problema no lo es.</i>	Defender el liberalismo económico	Actividad de autoimagen	Realce de su propia imagen de autonomía (mostrar que tiene ideas propias y válidas)
		Apoyo a la objeción: <i>Un oponente político (un ministro socialista) comparte su opinión</i>	Criticar al Partido Socialista		
MAI socialista	Contraobjeción: <i>La opinión del ministro socialista se debió a la situación del momento</i>	Defender al partido socialista	Actividad de autoimagen	Realce de su propia imagen de autonomía (mostrar que tiene ideas propias y válidas)	
La financiación de la Seguridad Social (22-40)	MAI socialista	Afirmación: <i>El gobierno socialista no sabía que la situación de la Seguridad Social mejoraría.</i>	Defender al partido socialista	Actividad de autoimagen	Realce de su propia imagen de autonomía (mostrar que tiene ideas propias y válidas)
		Afirmación: <i>El gobierno conservador adoptó una política negativa para los inmigrantes</i>	Criticar al partido conservador		

CD Conservador	Objeción: <i>El gobierno socialista fue el responsable de la crisis de la Seguridad social</i>	Criticar al partido socialista	Actividad de autoimagen	Realce de su propia imagen de autonomía (mostrar que tiene ideas propias y válidas)
	<i>La Seguridad Social se recuperó durante el gobierno conservador</i>	Ensalzar al partido conservador		

Cuadro 1. *Temas de discusión y su efecto en la imagen social de los participantes*

Este intercambio está compuesto por exposiciones de temas y sus consiguientes objeciones y contraobjeciones, lo cual es característico del género comunicativo de los debates televisivos. Con respecto a las finalidades del mismo, observamos que el hecho de que se emitan varias opiniones contrastadas, argumentadas y justificadas, consigue el propósito de aportar una información al destinatario (el espectador) sobre unos temas; el hecho de que estas opiniones se manifiesten de una manera viva, activa, rápida y polémica, le otorga al debate su carácter de entretenimiento, algo requerido por el medio televisivo. Pero además, se observa una finalidad añadida: la de exponer y defender la ideología política de los partidos a los que los periodistas son afines, al tiempo que desmontar y criticar la del contrario, lo que permite la transmisión de unas ideologías políticas al espectador. De esta manera, las finalidades del género comunicativo del debate en la secuencia analizada apuntan hacia la información, el entretenimiento y la transmisión de ideologías.

Pero además, este tipo de interacción, en cuanto a lugar de encuentro social donde a los hablantes se les supone un compromiso con lo que se discute, tiene unos efectos en su imagen social y en la relación que se establece entre ellos durante el encuentro. Así, se observa una actividad de imagen de cortesía en el comportamiento comunicativo de la moderadora, en las primeras líneas, quien expresa su solidaridad a la espectadora (primera fila del cuadro), apuntando al equilibrio entre la confirmación de la imagen afiliativa de su destinataria (la espectadora, y por extensión la de muchos espectadores con la misma postura que ésta), quien recibe apoyo a sus ideas, y de la misma hablante (la moderadora), al mostrarse como una persona solidaria. La función de la cortesía en este caso mediante los actos comunicativos de la moderadora es la de realzar la imagen social de ambas interactuantes.

Pero aparte de esta actividad de imagen de cortesía, la interacción se caracteriza comunicativamente por la expresión y defensa de la opinión propia y la crítica y rechazo de la opinión ajena, lo que podría llevar a pensar que el encuentro social no ha sido satisfactorio para la imagen de los hablantes. Es más, si nos detenemos en las estrategias comunicativas, algunas intervenciones podrían ser vistas como casos de descortesía: *No digas eso, porque no tienes razón*, es decir, el rechazo de la validez de la opinión ajena; o su respuesta: *Sí, sí tengo toda la razón del mundo, y parte del extranjero*, el rechazo de que la opinión propia no sea válida. Sin embargo, esta aparente descortesía es

efectivamente “aparente”, o un caso que aunque ‘codificado’ como descortés, no sería ‘interpretado’ como tal (Briz 2004, Albelda en este volumen), lo que puede atribuirse a la tolerancia de la interacción española hacia el desacuerdo (Hernández Flores 2002) y además al hecho de producirse en el medio televisivo, donde lo “descortés” (según Culpeper 2005) puede ser sólo parte del espectáculo. Por el contrario, parecemos encontrarnos ante casos de *actividades de autoimagen*, pues el centro de atención se sitúa en la imagen propia, la del mismo hablante, mientras que el destinatario quedaría como mero receptor comunicativo, sin que su imagen se vea de alguna forma involucrada. Los tipos de imagen que son centro de atención son los de *autonomía* (lo que diferencia a la persona de su grupo) y *afiliación* (lo que identifica a la persona con su grupo, Bravo 1999, 2002 y en este volumen). La autonomía destaca en los numerosos casos donde los hablantes exponen sus conocimientos y opinión propia resaltando su valor o mostrando la equivocación de las opiniones ajenas. Esto se observa en el empleo de actos comunicativos como los asertivos (*yo te diré que gracias a los inmigrantes*); las críticas (*los inmigrantes (...) tan mal vistos en la etapa del señor Aznar*) o las acusaciones (*no tienes razón*). Así mismo se emplean recursos pragmáticos verbales y no verbales como el uso del yo (p. ej. *y yo recojo todo*); de repeticiones: *¡porque la arruinaron! ¡porque la arruinaron! Si lo sabían ellos que la arruinaron*; énfasis: *Eso lo dijo*; exageraciones: *Pintaron un panorama negro, negrísimo, ¡mal vistos, ninguneados, por no decir que perseguidos!, sí tengo toda la razón del mundo, ¡y parte del extranjero!*; llamadas de atención: *¿Sabes lo que dijo?* y gesticulaciones.

Estas características de la imagen social están relacionadas con los roles que presentan los hablantes en la interacción: el rol de *participante en un debate* (que debe mostrar sus conocimientos, argumentar, razonar y saber desmontar las opiniones contrarias haciéndolo de forma ingeniosa y amena), el de *periodista* (que debe mostrar sus conocimientos de la actualidad informativa y su capacidad de analizar y enjuiciar la noticia); y además el de ‘*portavoz de una tendencia política*’ (que debe defender la validez de la ideología representada y rechazar las contrarias). Los dos primeros tipos de roles (*participantes en el debate* y *periodistas*) se refieren a competencias individuales, por ello serían parte de la *imagen individual* de la persona, mientras que el de *portavoz de una tendencia política*, lo sería de su *imagen grupal*,¹ es decir, hay un énfasis en las cualidades del grupo propio, lo que en parte se hace contrastándolas con los defectos del grupo ajeno (al que se critica por sus actuaciones e ideas); de esta manera se destaca la *imagen grupal de autonomía*. Al mismo tiempo, con este comportamiento el/la hablante muestra su compromiso y lealtad hacia ese grupo, y así se destaca la *imagen grupal de afiliación*. En el siguiente cuadro se resume la relación entre roles desempeñados en esta interacción y la imagen social (individual y grupal) en las diferentes actividades de imagen.

¹ Para Bravo (2002: 146) la *imagen grupal* se refiere a cómo el grupo desea verse y ser visto por otras personas o grupos (frente a la *imagen individual*, que se centra en cómo la persona desea verse y ser vista por los otros).

ROLES	IMAGEN SOCIAL INDIVIDUAL		IMAGEN SOCIAL GRUPAL	
	Autonomía	Afiliación	Autonomía	Afiliación
Moderadora		La hablante es solidaria con sus destinatarios (su público) Los destinatarios reciben reconocimiento de la hablante CORTESÍA		
Participante del debate	El/la hablante tiene conocimientos, sabe argumentar y sabe entretener ACT. AUTOIMAGEN	El/la hablante participa en la construcción conjunta del debate ACT. AUTOIMAGEN		
Periodista	El/la hablante tiene información y sabe analizar ACT. AUTOIMAGEN	El/la hablante ofrece sus conocimientos y capacidades críticas a la sociedad. ACT. AUTOIMAGEN		
'Portavoz' de una tendencia política	El/la hablante tiene una ideología propia y sabe defenderla ACT. AUTOIMAGEN	El/la hablante ofrece una ideología positiva a la sociedad. ACT. AUTOIMAGEN	El grupo tiene ideas beneficiosas para la población ACT. AUTOIMAGEN	El grupo está cohesionado por ideas firmes y coherentes (frente al oponente) ACT. AUTOIMAGEN

Cuadro 2. Rol e imagen social en el intercambio comunicativo

5. Discusión y conclusiones

En este trabajo se ha tratado de mostrar la relación entre comportamiento comunicativo y efectos sociales en el contexto de un debate televisivo. En el ejemplo analizado, no se han encontrado actividades de imagen de descortesía, hay un caso de cortesía y abundantes casos de actividades de autoimagen. La cortesía aparece en la muestra de solidaridad de la moderadora con la espectadora, al realizar la primera su imagen afiliativa al tiempo que también realiza la de la espectadora (y por extensión, la del resto de los televidentes) en un intento de conseguir un equilibrio entre los deseos de imagen de ambas partes, definición que se ha propuesto para la cortesía. Este comportamiento de la moderadora del programa supone un acercamiento a sus espectadores,

contribuyendo así a conseguir la comunicación con la audiencia, una condición requerida a los medios.

Pero además de la cortesía, hay otras actividades de imagen que pueden contribuir a conseguir estos fines. Es el caso de las actividades de autoimagen, mediante las cuales los hablantes confirman su *imagen individual de autonomía* en los roles de *participantes* en el debate y de *periodistas*, y su *imagen grupal de afiliación* en el rol de *'portavoces' de una tendencia política*. En relación con las finalidades del género comunicativo del debate, estas actividades de autoimagen se relacionan con los objetivos de *informar* (se aportan conocimientos), *entretener* (se usa un estilo comunicativo enfático) y *convencer* (se muestra seguridad y compromiso con las ideas aportadas). De ahí que se pueda concluir que no sólo las actividades de cortesía consiguen propósitos sociales, sino que en el contexto de un determinado género comunicativo, como es el de los debates, las de autoimagen pueden cumplirlo también.

Por otra parte, estas actividades de *autoimagen* podrían haber sido calificadas como de *descortesía* en otros contextos, lo que significa que si bien las estrategias comunicativas asociadas a la descortesía pueden tener un significado social descortés en algunos contextos, en otros serían simplemente apropiados (ver Bernal en este volumen). De esta manera se confirma la importancia de analizar las actividades de imagen en relación con el género comunicativo en que se desarrolla la interacción.

Por último, los resultados de este análisis y de otros anteriores (Hernández-Flores 2006a y b) parecen mostrar que un comportamiento comunicativo lo es de cortesía, descortesía o autoimagen en función de si es la imagen social individual o la grupal la afectada. Así, en las críticas a las ideologías políticas de los hablantes (interpretadas como actividades de autoimagen) es la imagen grupal la que está en juego, mientras que en otras secuencias vistas en anteriores trabajos (Hernández-Flores 2006a y b) se interpretó descortesía en casos donde era la imagen individual la que estaba en juego (por ejemplo, un periodista cuestionado en su profesionalidad o un espectador al que se obstaculiza su derecho a hablar). Es decir, que en los casos donde la imagen grupal está en juego la amenaza a la imagen de la persona sería menor que en casos donde es la imagen individual la cuestionada, si bien esta explicación sólo tendría sentido en comunidades y situaciones comunicativas donde la imagen grupal tiene menos valor que la individual (no sería así el caso, por ejemplo, de la imagen grupal vinculada a la familia en la comunidad cultural española, la cual tendría tanto o más valor que la individual).

En definitiva, en este trabajo se ha tratado de destacar la importancia de factores como el género comunicativo, las características culturales de la imagen social y de los roles y la imagen individual y grupal en el estudio de la imagen social en la interacción.

POLITENESS AND OTHER TYPES OF FACEWORK: COMMUNICATIVE AND SOCIAL MEANING IN A TELEVISION PANEL DISCUSSION*

Nieves Hernández-Flores

Abstract

TV-panel discussions constitute a communicative genre with specific features concerning the situational context, the communicative goals, the roles played by the participants and the acts that are carried out in the interaction. In the Spanish TV-debate *Cada día*, discourse is characterized as *semi-institutional* because of having both institutional characteristics – due to its mediatic nature – and conversational characteristics. In the communicative exchanges the social situation of the participants is negotiated by communicative acts, that is, facework is realised. Facework concerns the speakers' wants of face, both the *individual face* and the *group face*. In the present article face is described in cultural terms within the general face wants *autonomy* and *affiliation* and in accordance with the roles the speakers assume in interaction. In the analysis of an excerpt from the TV-debate *Cada día* two types of facework are identified: On the one hand politeness, that is, when an attempted balance between the speaker's and the addressees' face is aimed at and, on the other hand, *self-facework*, which appears when only the speaker's face is focused on. No samples of the third case of facework, impoliteness, are found in this excerpt. The results of the analysis display the relationship between the communicative purposes of this communicative genre (to inform, to entertain and to convince people of political ideas) and the types of facework (politeness, self-facework) that are identified in the analysed data.

Keywords: Facework; Politeness; Roles; Face balance; Media discourse.

1. Introduction

In the field of pragmatics, the theme of facework and politeness has triggered off empirical studies in concrete communicative situations such as family, business, academic, politics, services, media, etc. In order to analyse and interpret data, the description of the context where interactions occur has been given a main focus. The concept of *communicative genre* (Luckman 1995; Linell 1998) aims to bring a theoretical background to the relevant contextual aspects of the interactions in the interpretation of meaning and function. This is done by referring to different facts such as the physical space and time where interaction occurs, the goal of the communicative exchange, the interactants' roles and the communicative acts that arise in talk. This means that in face and politeness studies the account of the social activity where interaction occurs allows to analyse social and communicative aspects, but it allows also to discuss in which way communicative genre affects the sense that politeness and facework have in a concrete interaction. In fact, one challenge in empirical studies is to

* I am grateful to foundation *Viggo Brøndal og hustrus legat* for the support to this study.

recognise politeness in natural talk and to differentiate this from other types of facework, and this seems to be related to the nature of the context where interaction occurs. This means that, for example, communicative behaviour seen as impolite in some contexts could be seen as appropriate in other contexts (see Albelda and Bernal, both in this volume).

My purpose in this article is to search for the communicative manifestation and function of politeness and other facework in the context of a television panel discussion and to discuss in which way this context may affect the meaning of politeness and facework. My hypothesis is that politeness and facework should pass through a specific description in the contexts where they appear, that is, the aim is to elucidate the function of politeness and facework, to describe the strategies used and to circumscribe the social and communicative consequences in the communicative genre the interaction belongs to.

2. Data

In this paper, data come from five video-recorded panel discussions from the daily programs *Día a día* and *Cada día* that were broadcasted by two private Spanish channels in 2004. Both programs were conducted by a popular TV-journalist, María Teresa Campos, and five journalists participated in the debate.² The journalists' names changed from day to day but all of them showed up frequently in the program, whereby they were well known by the audience. The duration was half an hour, including a break for publicity. During the debates, two calling-in TV-viewers take part in the discussion, tell their opinions about the topic and are responded by the journalists. The topics deal with political news and their effect in people's daily life, and for this reason, topics are dealt in an easy and unspecialised way. Since the program was broadcasted at lunchtime, audience was mainly conformed by people who stay at home for lunch; otherwise housewives, retired and unemployed people were the usual audience of this program.

3. Television panel discussion as communicative genre

Television panel discussions (or TV-debates) form a *communicative genre*, that is, a class of event where participants share a set of common purposes (Luckman 1995, Linell 1998). In this case the participants seek to inform about topics of general interest, to discuss them and, because of the mediated nature of the interaction, to entertain the audience. Addressees of this communicative genre are the participants in the discussions and the audience who follows the program and has a passive purpose: To be informed and to be entertained (although a couple of members from the audience have the chance of calling to the program and giving their opinion too). Communicative genres are "originally interactionally developed, historically sedimented, often institutionally congealed and interactionally reconstructed in situ" (Linell 1998: 239). In this way, this concept includes accepted conventions about social, communicative and

² *Día a día* was broadcasted by Tele 5 during the first semester of 2004 and *Cada día* by Antena 3 during the second semester of the same year. The debates in both programs have the same structure, duration, kinds of topics and guests.

cultural aspects and, at the same time, it acknowledges that every manifested interaction is dynamic, and then reformulates and negotiates the established conventions. TV-debates are popular programs in Spanish television. Therefore some determined conditions are known and expected by the interactants: The number of participants (a hostess, five guests and two phone-participating TV-viewers), the subjects of discussion (political news) and some conventions about turn-taking (the hostess manages the turn-taking). Besides, participants in communicative genres play specific roles that are related to the activity they carry out. In this case, roles have firstly to do with the participants' professional activity: They are journalists and therefore they are supposed to bring information to people and to be able to analyse and evaluate the country's political activities. In addition to this, these journalists have been chosen because they represent different political ideologies and this fits the purpose of these debates, that is, different political meanings are expected by means of the statement of opinions, agreements and disagreements (cf. Schiffrin 1987). In *Cada día*, every guest's political option can actually be determined by knowing the media where he/she works³ and by the nature of his/her opinions during the present or previously broadcasted debates. In addition to this, other roles related with the communicative genre of debates can be ascribed to the participants by their professional characteristics and by the achievement of communicative acts in interaction; for example, the *expert in the subject* brings a lot of information and details, *the moderate participant* tries to find a balance between the different opinions, *the controversy-rousing participant* has the goal of producing controversy, etc. Finally, the participants can also play a role related with personal features such as gender, geographical origin or family situation.

Television panel discussions are integrated in the larger category of *broadcast products* like talk shows, interviews, quiz shows and audience participation debates. These programs constitute communicative genres with their own characteristics, but all of them share a mediated discourse. Discursively and interactionally, the debates of TV-program *Cada día* have, in my opinion, a *semi-institutional nature*. Following Ilie's description of talk shows this means that they have features both from institutional interaction, "participant configuration and well-established conventions", and casual conversation, "spontaneous interventions and unpredictable outcomes" (2001: 218). Characteristics of institutional interaction in my data are observed on situational constraints as the particular setting where interactions occur (a TV-studio) and the monitoring of the interaction by technical devices; discursive constraints are observed in time limitations, speaker selection and turn-taking restrictions (cf. Ilie 2001: 222). In addition to this, the institutional nature of *Cada día* is observed in other features: The goal of the debate is to inform and to influence public opinion, that is, there is a *purposeful talk*⁴; the hostess has control over pre-established topics and participants' turn-taking, then, there is *monitored topic and turn-taking*; the participants' roles refer to their professional issue (journalists) then, they have *institutional roles*, and the

³ There is an evident political division in Spanish society. Apart from the nationalist ideologies from the different regions, in a national frame Spanish public opinion is mainly divided in socialists (the Socialist Party, in the government at present) and conservatives (*Partido Popular*, in the government until 2004). This division is not only manifest in the arena of politics, but also in other parts of society such as the media. This means that newspapers, TV-channels or radio-channels adopt clear political attitudes towards one of these options.

⁴ The terms that stem from Ilie's methodological approach to talk-shows (2001) are marked in italics.

audience watching TV is the addressee of this debate (*message-oriented and multiple audience-oriented talk*).

At the same time, just as talk shows do, panel discussions in my data have characteristics of conversational interaction: Since the participants know each other and share their professional activity, communicative and social purposes are found in these debates (*spontaneous talk*); unpredictability in turn-taking, changing of topics and roles appear frequently without the control of the hostess (*negotiated topic and turn-taking*);⁵ personal features -as regional origin or private life - can arise too (*real-life roles*); and direct address to the interlocutor are observed in the debate like in conversational interactions (*interlocutor-oriented talk*).

In sum, these features proposed by Ilie for talk-shows prove to be valid for TV-panel discussions too. The difference between these two kinds of discussion programs lies rather in media-configuration features. In fact, in contrast to most talk-shows, *Cada día* has no studio audience and the participants sit around a semi-round table in the studio. Furthermore, the topics under discussion are limited to daily political issues, the participants come from the same professional area (journalists) and they appear frequently in the program. With respect to other Spanish debate programs, *Cada día* has some particular features too: It is a daily program and has short duration, topics can be negotiated in accordance with the degree of interest from the participants, i.e., there is not a full control over the topics from the hostess; the hostess participates also in the discussions; the speakers are not necessarily experts in the political subjects they are discussing, they just analyse the situation; and the participants do not hide -rather they display- their politic beliefs, that is, they do not try to be objective in their judgements, in the same way as neither the hostess hides her political sympathy (for the socialist party). Because of these issues, *Cada día* may have less institutional features than a TV panel discussion is expected to have and for this reason I am proposing to denominate this kind of program by the Spanish term *debate-tertulia*, by referring word *tertulia* to a social practice where a group of people knowing each other chats about subjects of common interest. *Tertulias* were originally held in private life (in cafés, at homes) and today they have been incorporated in the Spanish media by means of informal discussions in TV- or radio-programs⁶.

4. Politeness and other types of facework

Previous research about politeness and facework in Spanish TV-debates (Hernández-Flores 2006a y b) has displayed the presence of communicative behaviour that, in some way, affects the interactants' face. Part of this behaviour can be called politeness but other kinds of behaviour, despite it affects face, cannot be qualified as such. This fact has been observed by politeness studies in different contexts (Meier 1995; Bravo 2002; Hernández-Flores 2002; Watts 2003; Arundale 2005; Boretta 2005) and has extended the study of the relationship between communicative behaviour and face to studies in facework. *Face work* is originally defined by Goffman as "the actions taken by a person to make whatever he [or her] is doing consistent with face" (1967: 12), then, this definition includes every communicative behaviour that has to do with face and this is

⁵ F. ex., from the institutional role of *expert*, who gives her/his opinion as a specialist in the topic, to the role of *mother/father* by telling an episode from private life.

⁶ Tusón Valls (1997: 71) places *tertulia* in the border between spontaneous conversation and debates.

not restricted to politeness. However, in further explanations Goffman focuses on actions that protect face from threats and this anti-threatening action idea with regard to facework is retaken by Brown and Levinson (1987) in their proposal of politeness as the strategies that aim to avoid or mitigate face threatening acts (1987: 68)⁷. However later studies as Ting-Toomey's (1994) have proved the breadth of the term *facework* as a communicative phenomenon that affects face and is no necessarily linked to anti-threat or polite actions. In fact, *facework* allows dealing with face, and hence with the construction of social relationships by ways of communication (cf. Ting-Toomey 1994; Bargiela-Chiappini 2003; Arundale 2005). In this framework, politeness is one type of behaviour that affects face, i.e. politeness is a display of facework.

In my approach, politeness is described as communicative behaviour that aims at achieving an 'ideal' balance between the addressee's face and the speaker's face by confirming their own face wants (Hernández-Flores 2002, 2004a). In fact, human interactions have social purposes and therefore the achievement of satisfactory social interactions is a central goal. In order to reach social and communicative goals, people know that respecting, protecting and valuing the others' face is a requirement. But, at the same time, people have personal bonds to their own face and want to protect and value their own face too (cf. Watts 1992; Meier 1995; Chen 2001). Therefore people choose some communicative strategies that are socially considered appropriate in the concrete context in order to confirm their interlocutors' face expectations and, at the same time, to confirm their own wishes of face. In this way, the speakers are aware of the need to reach a kind of balance between the others' face wants and their own face wants in the communicative acts they make in their exchanges (for example an invitation, an advise, a greeting). It does not matter whether it is the addressee's face or the speaker's face that obtains the main focus of the communicative acts because in any case there is not 'an accomplished balance' but it is the 'intended balance' or 'ideal balance' that counts. As mentioned before, discursively and interactionally, 'intended balance' is located at the level of the act or set of acts that accomplish a communicative purpose. For example an invitation can be composed of several turns from the speaker who makes the invitation, and this constitutes the communicative act of invitation; on his/her side the addressee who receives the invitation and reacts to this, by an accept or a refusal, makes a new communicative act.

On the other hand, in this approach to politeness as the confirmation of the interactants' face wants, the description of face is a central issue. Face is related to two aspects: The cultural characteristics that are attributed to it by a particular community (cf. Bravo 1996, 1999, 2002 and in this volume); Hernández-Flores 1999, 2002) and the roles the speakers play in the interaction (cf. Mao 1994; Bravo 1998, 1999, 2002; Placencia 1996; De Kadt 1998; Hernández-Flores 1999, 2002). With respect to the cultural features of face, Bravo (1996, 1999, 2002 and in this volume) proposes two categories called *autonomy* and *affiliation*. *Autonomy* refers to the wish a person has to see him/herself and to be seen by the others as someone with his/her own surroundings inside the group; *affiliation* refers to the wish a person has to see him/herself and to be seen by the others as identified with his/her group. These terms have some advantages with respect to notions like *negative face* and *positive face* (Brown and Levinson 1987) since they do not implicate either social meanings (i.e. what having surroundings and be

⁷ Because of this restricted approach to facework by Goffman and Brown & Levinson, some authors prefer to avoid this notion in faces studies. F. ex. Locher and Watts (2005) propose the term *relational work*.

seen as a part of the group means for a cultural community) or a set of fixed communicative strategies in an universal way (i.e. the linguistic and non linguistic resources that are used). On the contrary, autonomy and affiliation deal with probably universal human needs that only refer to the person as someone separated from his/her group and to the person as related to his/her group. What kind of behaviour is associated to the fact of being separated from and related to the group, and how this behaviour is displayed by communicative ways, these aspects are concreted and defined in every cultural community⁸.

The other central term that is closely related to face is the concept of *role* (Goffman 1961). Role refers to the social, interactionally, situated or communicative position speakers have in concrete interactions. As seen above, some of these roles are related to the social characteristics a person has (f.ex. gender, age, geographic origin), some roles depend on the concrete communicative situation where they are (f. ex. in a TV-debate, the person who conducts the program has the role of *host/hostess*) and finally other roles depend on the communicative acts the speaker makes in the interaction. Then every person has many roles but only a few of them arise in communicative exchanges depending on the situation where he/she is and the discourse that is being produced during the exchange. Social role and face are two related aspects in the person's social identity. In fact, people are aware of the roles they play and they want their roles to be confirmed in interaction because confirming roles means to confirm the interactants' face (Bravo 1999: 164). For example if the hostess in a TV-panel discussion confirms her role of *hostess* – f.ex. by a communicative act that affirms her control over the panel- her face is confirmed too because she validates her capacity for accomplishing her professional duties. On the other hand, just as face, roles are defined culturally (Bravo 1998)

Finally, in the present approach politeness is not only understood as the communicative acts that arise when face is threatened, but as having with a broader function that includes face enhancement, that is, communicative behaviour that does not depend on the presence of threats to face, but has the purpose of confirming or enhancing the speakers' face in accordance with the roles they play. For example a compliment to the hostess about her program by a TV-viewer is a case of polite behaviour that enhances both the hostess' face (she confirms her professional competence) and the TV-viewer's face (he/she confirms his/her positive engagement in a social encounter). Politeness as face enhancement has been displayed to be very frequent in the Spanish cultural community (Hernández-Flores 2002, 2004b; Albelda 2004).

Politeness is a type of facework, but not the only one. Facework includes other social phenomena as impoliteness, that is, the communicative behaviour where "the hearer's face is intentionally attacked by the speaker, perceived as attacked by the addressee or a combination of both" (Culpeper 2005: 38). In addition to this, other types of facework focus on the speaker's face, not on the addressee's face (Meier 1995; Boretti 2005; Bravo 2000; Chen 2001; Hernández-Flores 2002; Ruhi 2006). In my approach this behaviour is called *self-facework* and it consists on focusing on one's own

⁸ In order to describe cultural features of face in a community, the use of questionnaires and interviews have proved to be very useful in studies of Spanish-speaking communities. F.ex. in Argentina (Boretti 2003) Costa Rica (Murillo 2006), Venezuela (Bolívar in this volume), and Spain (Hernández-Flores 2002; Contreras 2005). These questionnaires focus on people's meanings about politeness and appreciated social behaviour in their community (see Bolívar in this volume).

face without directly affecting the addressee's face. Focus can be positive for the speaker's face, for example in the communicative act of self-praise, or negative, for example a self-criticism.

In Spanish TV-panel discussions, politeness, impoliteness and self-facework are types of facework that alternatively appear in the interaction, that is, a sort of *oscillation of face* occurs because which interactant (speaker or addressee/s) gets focus on face and how this affects his/her/their face (positively, negatively), are facts that change all the time during the interaction (Hernández-Flores 2006a).

5. Facework in TV-panel discussions

In this paragraph, focus will stay on how facework is accomplished in interaction by communicative ways and how this attains the communicative and social goals expected in the communicative genre of TV-debates.

In the present extract, topics of discussion are the lack of permanent jobs and the situation of Social Security. A woman from the audience has called and criticized temporary jobs in her work place and this opinion gets support from the program hostess, María Teresa Campos (MTC). The topic triggers off a discussion between two guests: Carlos Dávila (CD), male, with conservative political ideology, and María Antonia Iglesias (MAI), woman, with socialist political ideology. At the end of the extract, a new participant (JAGM) tries to enter the debate. In the program there are two participants more who do not take part in this discussion.

- 1 (A woman from the audience has just taken part in the debate by telephone. She
- 2 complained about the lack of permanent jobs in hospitals)
- 3 MTC: (She looks down and then at the camera again. To the woman, talking slowly)
gracias amiga... realmente... claro, es un tema muy difícil. a todos nos gustaría,
digamos, un mundo ideal, =
'thanks dear... certainly... sure, this is a very difficult subject. All of us would
like, for want of a better word, an ideal world'
- 4 CD: pero habría que decir =
'but it should be said'
- 5 MTC: = que hubiera trabajo para todos y... =
'work for everybody and'
- 6 CD: = sí, habría que decir, había que decir que [hay que terminar con el mito este
del trabajo
7 eventual] =
'yes, it should be said, it should be said that the myth of temporary work has to
end'
- 8 MTC: = [a ver quién tiene, la llave de esto]
'let's see who has the key to this'
- 9 CD: = y del trabajo fijo porque es que, con la misma facilidad =
'and the myth of permanent work because just as easy'
- 10 MTC: que se echa a un [a un temporal se echa a un fijo]
'as a temporary worker is sacked, a permanent worker is sacked too'
- 11 CD: = [¡se entra a uno fijo!] y yo, recojo todo, [(toda la autoridad) =
'(that a temporal worker is sacked) a permanent worker is hired! and I, I pick up
everything, all the authority'
- 12 MTC: [es verdad] =

- 13 CD: ‘that’s true’
= también de [otro socialista], =
‘also from another socialist’
- 14 MTC: [es verdad]
‘that’s true’
- 15 CD: = del señor Solbes⁹, (to MAI) cuando defendió, María Antonia, =
‘from Mr. Solbes when he defended, María Antonia,’
- 16 MAI: ()
- 17 CD: =¡ole ya! cuando defendió la, los fondos de pensiones, ¿sabes lo que dijo? “nos
tenemos que olvidar, de que el trabajo, sea fijo para siempre”.
‘bravo! when he defended the, the pensions’ funds, do you know what he said?
“we have to forget the idea of permanent work forever”
- 18 MTC: bueno...
‘well...’
- 19 CD: [eso lo dijo] =
‘that’s what he said’
- 20 MAI: (she gesticulates with her hands) [¡claro! y en] aquella época también, [los
socialistas] =
‘sure! and in that time also the socialists’
- 21 CD: [(y en) ()
(estamos)]
‘and () we are’
- 22 MAI: = pintaron un panorama negro, negrísimo, que ahí está el origen del fondo de
pensiones, sobre el futuro de la Seguridad Social¹⁰ =
‘they painted a black picture, very black - and this is the origin of pensions’
funds- about the future of Social Security’.
- 23 CD: sí
‘yes’
- 24 MAI: = pero yo aprovechando que [el Pisuerga, que el Pisuerga pasa] =
‘but I will take advantage of’
- 25 CD: [¡porque la arruinaron! ¡porque la arruinaron!] =
‘because they (the socialists) destroyed it! (Social Security), they destroyed it!’.
- 26 MAI: = por Valladolid, [te diré que gracias a los inmigrantes,] =
‘this discussion to tell you that thanks to the immigrants’
- 27 CD: = [si lo sabían ellos que la arruinaron]¹¹.
‘and they (the socialists) knew that they destroyed it’
- 28 MAI: =¿eh? tan mal vistos en la etapa del señor Aznar¹². [la Seguridad Social está] =
‘you know, who (the immigrants) had a bad name in Mr. Aznar’s time, Social
Security is’
- 29 CD: [¿mal vistos?]
‘bad name?’
- 30 MAI: ¿cómo que? ¡mal vistos, ninguneados, por no decir que perseguidos! ahora la
Seguridad [Social,] =
‘sure! bad name, ignored, not to mention persecuted! now Social Security’
- 31 CD: [¡hala!] (he moves his arms)

⁹ Socialist minister of economy.

¹⁰ MAI refers to Felipe González’s socialist government (1982-1996). At this time there was a fear that Social Security could not afford pensions in future.

¹¹ CD means that Felipe González’s previous socialist government (1982-1996) destroyed Social Security.

¹² MAI refers to José María Aznar’s conservative government (1996-2004). At this time a more restrictive immigration law was approved.

- ‘come on!’
- 32 MAI: = gracias a los inmigrantes está, saliendo a flote¹³, =
‘thanks to the immigrants (*Social Security*) is on the rise’
- 33 CD: la Seguridad [Social] =
‘Social Security’
- 34 MAI: = [¡y eso] el señor [Solbes, como no] =
‘and Mr. Solbes, because he didn’t’
- 35 CD: = [la Seguridad Social] =
‘Social Security’
- 36 MAI: = tenía una bola de cristal, (*she makes a round form with her hands*) no podía
adivinarlo, [en ese momento]
‘have a crystal ball couldn’t foresee this at that moment’
- 37 CD: [la Seguridad Social,] es positiva, desde el año noventa y siete¹⁴.
y entonces las, el problema de los inmigrantes se planteaba, no sé si agraciada o
desgraciadamente, en otras proporciones de las que hay ahora. o sea, que no
digas eso, porque no tienes razón
‘Social Security has been positive since the year ninety seven, and at that
moment the problem of the immigrants was posed, whether fortunately or
unfortunately, in a different dimension than now. So don’t tell this because
you’re not right’
- 38 JAGM: claro, de todas maneras, [pérmiteme hacerle un matiz] =
‘yes, anyway, let me add something’
- 39 MAI: [sí, sí, tengo toda la razón del mundo,] ¡y parte del
extranjero!
‘oh yes, of course I’m completely and totally right!’
- 40 MTC: (*to JAGM*) = [¡a ver el matiz!, antes de que se acabe el tiempo]
‘let’s hear your opinion before time is up’

In table 1 the communicative acts that are used in the discussion and how this affects face are displayed.

Main topics and lines in the extract	Participants and their roles	Communicative acts	Communicative goal	Facework	The situation of (individual) face
--------------------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------	--------------------	----------	------------------------------------

¹³ MAI means that the economic contributions from the immigrant population have helped Social Security.

¹⁴ CD refers to the time of José María Aznar’s conservative government (1996-2004). He means that Social Security was saved by the conservatives.

Temporary employment 1-21	MTC Hostess	Acknowledgment (of the phone-participant's problem)	To express solidarity	Politeness	Enhancement of the addressees' affiliative face (the phone-participant and the audience): they receive support. Enhancement of her own (the speaker's, i.e. the hostess) affiliative face: she has social worries.
	CD Conservative	Objection: <i>The problem is not a problem</i>	To defend a liberal politics	Self- facework	Enhancement of his autonomy face: he has original and accurate opinions.
		Support to the objection: <i>An opposing politician (a socialist minister) had the same opinion as him.</i>	To criticize the Socialist Party		
MAI Socialist	Counter- objection: <i>The socialist minister's attitude was due to the situation</i>	To defend the Socialist Party	Self- facework	Enhancement of her autonomy face: she has original and accurate opinions	
Financiation of Social Security 22-40	MAI Socialist	Statements: <i>The socialist government did not know that Social Security would get better a few years later.</i>	To defend the Socialist Party	Self- facework	Enhancement of her autonomy face: she has original and accurate opinions.
		<i>The conservative government was negative towards the immigrants</i>	To criticize the Conserv. Party		
	CD Conservative	Objections: <i>The socialist government destroyed Social Security.</i>	To criticize the Socialist Party	Self- facework	Enhancement of his autonomy face: he has original and accurate opinions.
<i>Social Security got better because of the conservative politics.</i>		To enhance the Conserv. Party			

Table1. Topics of discussion and effect in the participants' individual face

This exchange in a TV-panel discussion consists of a set of explanations of topics, objections and counter-objections, that is, this is a typical interaction of this communicative genre. Three communicative goals are observed in the discussions: To inform, to entertain and to convince people of political ideas. The first goal is reached because the statement of contrasted and argued opinions gives information about some topics to the addressees (the other participants and the audience), for example, the different arguments presented by CD and MAI. The goal of entertaining the audience is attained because opinions are displayed in a quick and polemical way, with use of emphatic style¹⁵. The third goal is to transmit some specific political ideologies and to convince the audience of them. This goal is accomplished in the discussions because the participants expose and support some political ideologies, at the same time that they criticise and make counter-arguments to the opponent's ideas. For example, the conservative participant (CD) supports economic liberalism, defends the conservative government from the socialist participant's attacks, accuses a socialist minister of political incongruity and criticizes the socialist government. The socialist participant (MAI) defends the socialist government from the conservative participant's attacks, supports the socialist government management and criticizes the conservative government management. In other words, in addition to the usual goals of informing and entertaining, the goal of the TV-debate *Cada día* is also to convince people of the presented political ideologies.

On the other hand, communicative behaviour in this exchange has some effects in the interactants' face. In fact, as was pointed out in table 1, a case of politeness is observed in the hostess' communicative behaviour when she expresses her understanding and solidarity to the phone-participating TV-viewer. Politeness is expressed by the use of some communicative resources as the act of thanking (*gracias*, 'thanks'), a term of endearment (*amiga*, 'friend, dear'), the tone of voice (slow talk), generic words that point at agreement (*a todos*, 'all of us') and an expression of a positive wish for everybody (*a todos nos gustaría, digamos, un mundo ideal*, 'all of us would like, for want of a better word, and ideal world'). The addressees (the TV-viewer and the rest of the audience with either the same problem or just social worries) confirm their affiliation face in accordance with the role of *audience*, who expect to receive attention from the TV-program managers (the program hostess), that is, the addressees' face is linked to their role as *audience*. On her side, the speaker (MTC) confirms her own affiliation face by supporting her addressees face: She is sensitive to social worries and to the problems of her audience; her face is thus associated to her role of *program hostess*. This communicative act points at getting a balance between the enhancement of the addressees' face and the speaker's face, so that both sides would get a benefit for their social situation in this exchange.

But besides this communicative act of agreement and positive social effect that has been understood as politeness, the rest of the exchange (see CD and MAI's dialogue in table 1) is composed by communicative acts that may bring conflict: Support of own ideas, disagreements and rejection of the others' ideas. In addition, statements are made in a very direct way, for example, CD rejects MAI's opinion openly and MAI reaffirms incisively the validity of her opinion. In some contexts, this kind of exchanges could be understood as cases of impoliteness, but in this context, in my opinion, this is a case of

¹⁵ This style is described in the next pages when dealing with Spanish autonomy face.

self facework, that is, facework where the focus stays on the speaker's face whereas the three addressees (the participant with contrary political ideas, the set of other participants and the audience) do not receive any clear effect on their face. The speaker's face involved here concerns both *autonomy* (the social features that differentiate someone from his/her group) and *affiliation* (the social features that identify someone with his/her group) (Bravo 1999, 2002). In the Spanish cultural background, *autonomy face* is frequently displayed by self-affirmative behaviour (Bravo 1999, 2002; Hernández-Flores 1999, 2002), that is, the speaker is aware of his/her own competences and displays them because this behaviour is socially approved in his/her community. Self-affirmation is displayed in this exchange by using acts as statements (*te diré que gracias a los inmigrantes*, 'I (...) tell you that thanks to the immigrants'); criticisms (*los inmigrantes (...) tan mal vistos en la etapa del señor Aznar*, 'the immigrants (...) who had a bad name in Mr. Aznar's time') and disagreements (*no tienes razón*, 'you're not right'; *sí, sí tengo toda la razón del mundo*, 'oh, yes, of course I'm completely right'). On the other hand, pragmatic strategies that express self-affirmation are used too: The focus on *ego* by using the pronoun *yo* ('I') (*y yo, recojo todo*, 'and I, I pick up everything') and the focus on one's argument by stressing talk, for example by the way of repetitions: *¡Porque la arruinaron! ¡porque la arruinaron! Si lo sabían ellos que la arruinaron*, 'because they destroyed it!, they destroyed it! (...) and they knew that they destroyed it'; exaggerations: *Pintaron un panorama negro, negrísimo*, 'they painted a black picture, very black'; semantic intensification: *Mal vistos, ninguneados, por no decir que perseguidos*, 'bad name, ignored, not to mention persecuted'; addressing terms (*cuando defendió, María Antonia*, 'when he defended, María Antonia,'), popular expressions of Spanish culture (*jole ya!*; *aprovechando que el Pisuerga pasa por Valladolid*), exclamations (*¡hala!*, 'come on!') and gestures¹⁶.

As mentioned above, face is linked to the different roles the interactants play in a communicative exchange. In the context of this TV-debate, the speakers have the role of *participants*, entailing that they have to show their knowledge and ability for arguing in an entertaining way; more precisely, CD seems to play the role of *expert* (he brings different information and quotations in this excerpt and in the rest of the program) and MAI the role of *combatant* (she defends persuasively her ideas any time). In this way, the speakers confirm their autonomy face. Besides, they have been chosen for participating in this program because they are *journalists*, hence, they are well-informed people with the capacity of analysing situations critically, whereby they confirm their autonomy face too. Finally, their third role has to do with the political ideology they support, i.e., the participants play the role of *spokesmen/women of a political party*. In this interaction, the roles as *participants* and *journalists* suggest personal competences concerning *individual face*, but the role as spokesman/woman is linked to the group with this political ideology, that is, it has to do with *group face*¹⁷. In this way, the participants watch over their *group autonomy face* by affirming the validity of their ideas (they stress the good qualities the group has) and by contrasting this with the rival group (they criticise the others' ideas). On the other hand, *group affiliation face* appears by means of a communicative behaviour of defence towards the group. In fact, both

¹⁶ In previous empirical research, these features have also been observed in the communicative style of the Spaniards (Bravo 1996, 1999; Hernández-Flores 1999, 2002).

¹⁷ Bravo differentiates *personal face* and *group face*. *Personal face* alludes to how a person wants to see him/herself and to be seen by the others. *Group face* alludes to how a group wants to be seen by other persons or groups (2002: 146).

speakers (MAI and CD) point out the positive actions committed by their political groups and defend them from the others' attacks and thereby they express their bonds to their (political) group and loyalty and commitment with it. Affiliative face is thus related to the interactants' roles as '*spokesmen/women*' of a political ideology because in such a role, engagement with political ideas is expected. In the next table, the relationships between roles and (individual and group) face in cases of politeness and self-facework are displayed.

ROLES	INDIVIDUAL FACE		GROUP FACE	
	Autonomy	Affiliation	Autonomy	Affiliation
Hostess		The speaker is worried about her addressees (the audience). The addressees have the speaker's sympathy POLITENESS		
Participant in debate	The speaker is knowledgeable The speaker is able to develop arguments The speaker is able to entertain SELF-FACEWORK	The speaker participates in the joint construction of the debate. SELF-FACEWORK		
Journalist	The speaker is well-informed The speaker is able to make analysis SELF-FACEWORK	The speaker offers his/her knowledge and critical ability to society. SELF-FACEWORK		
'Spokesman / woman' of a political ideology	The speaker has his/her own ideology SELF-FACEWORK	The speaker offers a positive ideology to society SELF-FACEWORK	The group has accurate ideas for population SELF-FACEWORK	The group is united by coherent and strong ideas facing the opponent group SELF-FACEWORK

Table 2. Role and face in the communicative exchange

6. Discussion and conclusions

This paper has attempted to display the relationship between communicative behaviour and social effects in a media setting. By means of the concept of *communicative genre* (Luckman 1995; Linell 1998), a sample of a TV-panel discussion has been described in accordance to television contextual features, the goals of the communicative exchange (to inform, to entertain, to convince of political ideas), the interactants' roles (hostess, audience, participants, journalists and spokesmen/women of a political ideology) and the communicative acts arising in the discussion (statement of opinions, agreements, objections and counter-objections). In this interaction, discourse is semi-institutional

(Ilie 2004) because there are both institutional and conversational features; therefore, the term *debate-tertulia* has been used to define the program *Cada día*.

In the present exchange, communicative behaviour has specific consequences for the interactants' face. On the one hand, facework is accomplished by means of politeness. Politeness has been described as an attempted balance between the speaker's and the addressees' face in accordance with the roles they assume in the exchange, and this is observed at the level of the communicative acts during the interaction. The features of face are culturally described within the categories *autonomy* and *affiliation*, that on their turn refer to basic personal wants of differential aspects from the group and similarities with the group (Bravo 1999, 2002). These face wants are adapted to the characteristics of the roles in every communicative situation. In the present excerpt, politeness appears in the hostess' communicative act of agreeing and giving support to a member of the audience. This means that polite activity is related to one of the assumptions expected in the role of program conductor: To hear, appreciate and support the audience's opinions. This behaviour gives a direct contact between the hostess and her audience and for this reason it achieves communication and closeness, which are necessary requirements for the accomplishment of the program goals: To inform, to entertain, to convince.

On the other hand not only politeness, but other types of facework may also be useful for fulfilling social and communicative purposes. In fact, during the discussions, communicative behaviour points at confirming only the speaker's face wants, what has been called *self-facework*. This fact is observed, on the one hand, in the affirmation of personal competences related to the speakers' roles (*participants in a debate* and *journalists*), hence individual autonomy face is focused on. On the other hand self-facework can be observed in the defence of the ideological group the speakers belong to (*role spokesman/ woman of a political ideology*), hence group autonomy and affiliation face are also confirmed.

Self-facework behaviour is related to the goals that have been assumed for the communicative genre of television panel discussions. In fact, the statement of one's own knowledge and meanings by stressing conviction and authority (self-affirmative behaviour, a feature of Spanish autonomy face) contributes to accomplish the goal of *informing* the audience; in addition, the rhetorical style used in self-affirmative behaviour fits the goal of *entertaining* the audience; and finally, the defensive behaviour about the group political ideology (that achieves both group autonomy and group face wants of affiliation) carries out the goal of transmitting and convincing people about political ideas. In this way facework fits the particular purposes that have been assumed for this communicative genre.

In relation to this, the analysis sheds light over another aspect. In the exchange, several strategies and communicative resources that have been analysed as cases of self-facework would usually be associated to impolite behaviour in face research. This fact reveals a frequent phenomenon observed in these studies: Apparent impolite behaviour is not considered as such (Blas Arroyo 2003; Albelda 2004; Briz 2004; Bernal 2005) but as expected and no marked behaviour (*politic behaviour* cf. Watts). It seems that the interpretation of possible (im)polite interactions depends on how the communicative genre is described with regard to the situational context, the interactants' roles and the communicative goals whereby apparent (im)polite strategies may not be interpreted as such. In other words, in certain communicative genres (im)polite strategies, that is,

communicative strategies that are used for being (im)polite do not necessarily achieve an (im)polite effect.

Finally, the presence of impolite, polite or self-facework behaviour in my data seems to be related to whether individual or group face is affected. In the analysed excerpt, disagreements and criticisms may put on the interactants' face at risk, but face affected by this behaviour only concerns group face (because the criticisms are mainly directed to the political ideology of the group), whereas personal face (that would focus on roles as *participant in debate*, *journalist* or other personal roles) are not questioned. On the contrary, in previous studies with the same data (Hernández-Flores 2006a and b) impoliteness was identified in exchanges where personal values as journalist or the rights a TV-viewer has, that is, some aspects of individual face, were questioned.¹⁸ This fact suggests that a possible explanation to why certain behaviours are considered impolite in some contexts and appropriate in others (as self-facework behaviour here) could be related to whether it is group face- entailing a lesser degree of face threat- or personal face - implying a higher degree of face threat - that is affected by communicative behaviour. On the other hand, this explanation would depend on how important individual face and group face are in every cultural community and how important they are in every communicative situation¹⁹.

In sum, in this study the communicative genre, the characteristics of face and roles in a cultural community and the importance of individual and group face have been pointed out as the determinant factors for the study of facework in communicative interactions.

References

- Albelda Marco, Marta (2004) Cortesía en diferentes situaciones comunicativas. La conversación coloquial y la entrevista sociológica semiformal. In D. Bravo and A. Briz (eds.), *Pragmática sociocultural: Estudios sobre el discurso de cortesía en español*. Barcelona: Ariel, pp. 109-134.
- Arundale, Robert (2005) Face as relational and interactional: A communicative framework for research on face, facework, and politeness. *Journal of Politeness Research* 2.2: 193-216.
- Bargiela-Chiappini, Francesca (2003) Face and politeness: New (insights) or old (concepts). *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 1453-1469.
- Bernal, María (2005) Hacia una categorización sociopragmática de la cortesía, descortesía y anticortesía en conversaciones españolas de registro coloquial. In D. Bravo (ed.), *Estudios de la (des)cortesía en español. Categorías conceptuales y aplicaciones a corpora orales y escritos*. Buenos Aires: Dunken, pp. 365-398.
- Blas Arroyo, José Luis (2003) 'Perdóneme que se lo diga, pero vuelve usted a faltar a la verdad, señor González': Form and function of politic verbal behaviour in face-to-face Spanish political debates, *Discourse and Society* 14.4: 395-423.

¹⁸ In the same way, in a study of a Spanish audience participation debate, Lorenzo-Dus (2007) observes that impolite behaviour is most related to personal features of face.

¹⁹ With respect to communicative situations, in the Spanish cultural community this explanation would not work when *group* refers to the *family group*, since family face is so important or even more than *individual face*.

Boretti, Susana (2003) Tests de hábitos sociales y la investigación de la cortesía. In D. Bravo (ed.), *Actas del primer Coloquio del Programa Edice*. Stockholm: University of Stockholm, pp. 198-210. www.edice.org

Boretti, Susana (2005) ¿Actividad de imagen vs actividad de cortesía? El desarmador como estrategia interaccional. In J. Murillo (ed.), *Actas del II Coloquio del Programa EDICE*. San José de Costa Rica: University of Costa Rica, pp. 209-220. www.edice.org

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

Bravo, Diana (1998) *Face y rol social: Eficiencia comunicativa en encuentros entre hablantes nativos y no nativos de español*. *REALE* 9-10: 11-41.

Bravo, Diana (1999) ¿Imagen positiva vs. imagen negativa? Pragmática socio-cultural y componentes de *face*. *Oralia* 2: 155-184.

Bravo, Diana (2002) Actos asertivos y cortesía: Imagen del rol en el discurso académico argentino. In M.E. Placencia and D. Bravo (eds.), *Actos de habla y cortesía en español*. London: Lincom Studies in Pragmatics 5: 141-174.

Briz, Antonio (2004) Cortesía verbal codificada y cortesía verbal interpretada en la conversación. In D. Bravo and A. Briz (eds.), *Pragmática sociocultural: Estudios sobre el discurso de cortesía en español*. Barcelona: Ariel, pp. 67-93.

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

Chen, Ron (2001) Self-politeness: A proposal. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 87-106.

Contreras, Josefa (2005): *El uso de la cortesía y las sobreposiciones en las conversaciones. Un análisis contrastivo alemán-español*. Valencia: Universidad de Valencia.

Culpeper, Jonathan (2005) Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: *The Weakest Link*. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1: 35-72.

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

Goffman, Erving (1961) *Encounters. Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction*. Londres: Allen Lane The Penguin Press.

Goffman, Erving (1967) *Interactional ritual: Essays on facetoface behavior*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Hernández-Flores, Nieves (1999) Politeness ideology in Spanish colloquial conversations: The case of advice. *Pragmatics* 9.1: 37-49.

Hernández-Flores, Nieves (2002) *La cortesía en la conversación española de familiares y amigos; la búsqueda del equilibrio entre la imagen del hablante y la imagen del destinatario*. Aalborg: Institut for Sprog Internationale Kulturstudier, Aalborg Universitet, vol. 37.

Hernández-Flores, Nieves (2004a) La cortesía como la búsqueda del equilibrio de la imagen social. In D. Bravo and A. Briz (eds.), *Pragmática sociocultural: Estudios sobre el discurso de cortesía en español*. Barcelona: Ariel, pp. 95-108.

Hernández-Flores, Nieves (2004b) Politeness as 'face' enhancement: An analysis of Spanish conversations between friends and family. In R. Márquez Reiter and M.E. Placencia (eds.), *Current*

- Trends in the Pragmatics of Spanish*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 265-284.
- Hernández-Flores, Nieves (2006a) La cortesía como búsqueda del equilibrio de la imagen social: La oscilación de la imagen en un debate televisivo. In J. Murillo (ed.), *Actas del II Coloquio del Programa EDICE*, San José: Universidad de Costa Rica, pp. 37-52, www.edice.org.
- Hernández-Flores, Nieves (2006b) Actividades de *autoimagen*, cortesía y descortesía: Tipos de actividades de imagen en un debate televisivo. In J.L. Blas Arroyo et al. (eds.), *Discurso y Sociedad: Contribuciones al estudio de la lengua en contexto social*. Castellón: Universitat Jaume I, pp. 637-648.
- Ilie, Cornelia (2001) Semi-institutional discourse: The case of talk shows. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 209-254.
- Linell, Per (1998) *Approaching Dialogue. Talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical perspectives*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Locher, Miriam A., and Richard J. Watts (2005) Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1: 9-33.
- Lorenzo-Dus, Nuria (2007) (Im)politeness and the Spanish media: The case of audience participation debates. In M.E. Placencia and C. García (eds.), *Research on Politeness in the Spanish Speaking World*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 145-166.
- Luckman, Thomas (1995) Interaction planning and intersubjective adjustment of perspectives by communicative genres. In E. Goody (ed.), *Social intelligence and interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 175-186.
- Meier, Ardith (1995) Passages of Politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 24.4: 391-392.
- Mao, LuMing Robert (1994) Beyond politeness theory: Face' revisited and renewed. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21: 451-486.
- Murillo Medrano, Jorge (2006) Significados de la cortesía lingüística a a partir de la aplicación de un *test* de hábitos sociales en Costa Rica. In J. Murillo (ed.), *Actas del II Coloquio del Programa EDICE*, San José: Universidad de Costa Rica, pp. 116-136, www.edice.org
- Placencia, María Elena (1996) Politeness in Ecuadorian Spanish. *Multilingua* 15.1: 13-34.
- Ruhi, Sükriye (2006) Politeness in compliment responses. *Pragmatics* 16.1: 43-101.
- Schiffrin, Deborah (1987) *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ting-Toomey, Stella (1994) (ed.) *The challenge of facework*. New York: State University of New York.
- Tusón Valls, Amparo (1997) *Análisis de la conversación*. Barcelona: Ariel Practicum.
- Watts, Richard J. (1992) Linguistic politeness and politic verbal behaviour: Reconsidering claims for universality". In R.J. Watts, S. Ide and K. Ehlich (eds.), *Politeness in Language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 43-69.
- Watts, Richard J. (2003) *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Transcription conventions

Numbers on the left correspond to turns in the conversations

:	turn
,	pause, 0-1second
.	pause, 1-3 seconds
(<i>Pause of ... seconds</i>)	pause, over 3 seconds (time is indicated)
¿?	questions
¡!	exclamations
...	lengthened syllable
-	self-interruption
“ ”	quotation
muchos	loud pronunciation
MUCHOS	emphatic pronunciation
[]	overlapping utterance
=	turn-holding
()	unintelligible utterance
(<i>muchos</i>)	uncertain transcription
(<i>laughter</i>)	contextual comments