



## **Politeness Strategies Of Filipino Teenagers In The Household**

**Marilyn M. Llorica<sup>1</sup>, Rowena V. Sosas<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*University of Southern Mindanao, Philippines*

<sup>2</sup>*University of Southern Mindanao, Philippines*

### **APA Citation:**

Llorica, M.M., Sosas, R.V., (2022). Politeness Strategies Of Filipino Teenagers In The Household , *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18(4), 1357-1368; 2022.

Submission Date: 13/11/2022

Acceptance Date: 25/12/2022

---

### **Abstract**

Politeness achieves effective communication and maintains relationship. More so, Filipinos are always known to be docile, respectful, and courteous when conversing with the elders however, related studies stated that the absence of politeness becomes evident in teenager's response in conversing with their parents. This qualitative research study employing discourse analysis investigated the different politeness strategies of Filipino teenagers in their household. It used a corpora of ten household conversations of parents and teenagers. Conversations were observed and recorded with the signed and approved informed consent form (ICF). The study was analysed using the framework of Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies. Results revealed that the four politeness strategies were present in the conversation between teenagers and parents in the household. Filipino teenagers generally utilized positive politeness to express kinship and to keep close relationship with their parents while chatting and conversing at home; bald on records to offer a clear and explicit message; negative politeness to lessen the coercion to their parents and off record to drop indications. These politeness strategies of Filipino teenagers in the household show that they are respectful in conversation with their elders however at times lack the appropriate respect and manner when they directly command their parents to do something. Further, teenagers converse with their parents by showing friendly behaviour that shows warmth but were also unmannered at some point. This shows that their behaviour has something to do with the upbringing and with how they were raised and what culture and environment they grew up with. Indeed, the environment and mores at home had an impact on the politeness methods used in the household conversations.

*Keywords:* politeness strategies, Filipino teenagers, household conversation, Philippines

---

### **1. Introduction**

In today's world, the absence of politeness is apparent in conversation, especially in a discourse with teenager and parents. Some teenagers think it is universally accepted not to be polite in conversing. Lakoff (1973) stated that politeness is the behaviour we believe is suitable in specific contexts to establish and sustain good social relationships with other people. To achieve effective communication and maintain the stabilization of a relationship, politeness strategies should be employed and be evident

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author.

*E-mail address:* [rvsosas@usm.edu.ph](mailto:rvsosas@usm.edu.ph)

in conversing. Learning how to behave politely and linguistically is one of the socializing goals. Hamrakulova (2020) stated that the best way to define politeness is the use of excellent manners or civility in everyday settings like how American speakers resort to politeness strategy in motivating graduates during commencement exercise (Mubarak & Rhaif, 2022).

Anyhow, a family is a group of close friends or relatives who give sense of belonging and group identity, as well as strong bonds of loyalty, emotion, and opportunity to experience history and future (Wamboldt & Reiss, 1989). Bonvillain (2019) stated that the relationships between family members are strengthened by communication inside the group. Moreover, good communication through the use of politeness contributes significantly to the message. Communication makes one unique and what makes one humane. However, teenagers in recent times appear to be more liberated and vulgar in communicating because of numerous factors that influenced them.

More so, some teenagers in terms of communicating believe that they have the authority to say whatever they want regardless of the consequences. Hamrakulova (2020) stated that adult people make observations about the lack of politeness where it is anticipated in conversation with teenagers. Makaria and Adawiyah (2021) also stated that teenagers are on the search for their own identity, and they frequently associate with their peers in this pursuit. It causes an unstable personality, making individuals more impulsive and difficult to control in their activities, particularly socializing. Teenagers are no longer concerned about whether or not their words may cause harm to others.

In the Philippines, there are not so many researchers who conducted politeness strategy as their research topic. Additionally, while some researchers study politeness strategy on a global scale, none of them specify their study in a household environment. In addition, this qualitative research study aimed to look into what politeness strategies teenagers use when speaking with their parents in their household.

## *1.1 Literature Review*

### *Politeness Theory*

Politeness is described as effort to restore a person's self-esteem in social interactions by effectively asserting desirable social principles. The category of everyday life appears in numerous types of communication in linguistic terms, most notably in the speech etiquette system of rules and models of speech activity (Hamrakulova, 2020). Face-saving approaches were first suggested by Brown and Levinson (1987), and the topic of politeness has subsequently been examined in a variety of languages and situations. Brown and Levinson's concept can be found in the majority of politeness research (Ondigi, 2021).

Eelen (2014) mentioned that the current perspective can still be referred to as a model of politeness even if it differs from the preceding viewpoints in that politeness is still seen as a system and even though these concepts are now viewed differently. Some theories choose to retreat into the linguistic-technical corner by restricting politeness to a linguistic-technical term, despite the fact that this is merely a temporary posture on the path to a theory based on acknowledged social standards.

Sukarno (2018), examined politeness in relation to the use of demand, is another recent study on the subject. He highlights and displays the necessity of politeness in communicating. This correlates with Kdar and Haugh (2013) which claimed that individuals can employ their speech actions efficiently according to society's social norms, which are exclusive to that society. These norms describe how community members should behave politely toward one another. Despite this, it is still too early to understand politeness across languages and cultures because politeness is universal as a notion but not as an action. Kida (2011) stated that social distance can be represented using specific linguistic bureaucracy to convey respect, courtesy, and politeness. The level of imposition, meanwhile, reveals an addresser's rank and willingness to push his or her ideas and objectives on others.

In a similar manner, Cohen (2020) stated that the degree of imposition is linked to the speaker's ability to impose his goal on the listener. Consequently, since they control the preferred language forms utilized when expressing any verbal act appropriately in line with the social context, it is crucial to pay attention to those social components. Scollon and Scollon (2012) recreated Brown and Levinson's study, that social interactions may resemble vertical courtship between individuals who are no longer on the same social level. Due to the fact that not all structural connections now generate social distance among people, it is crucial to avoid confusing social distance with individual differences in social strength with regard to the second issue, social distance.

In his book *Principles of Pragmatics*, Geoffrey N. Leech developed an inclusive framework to study politeness through speech actions such as requests, offers, praises, apologies, thanks, and replies to these. This framework coupled a common concept of politeness with a Grand Strategy of Politeness. In Grand Strategy of Politeness, Leech (2005) stated that in order for a speaker to be well mannered, he must consider attention constraints while speaking with others. According to him, the speaker's primary restraint was placing a high emphasis on matters relating to other people, while their minor constraint was doing the opposite with matters relating to themselves. Leech's (2005) concept is likely to be applied and followed to explain politeness in every act of communicative engagement in Western languages like English as well as Eastern languages like Chinese, Japanese, and Korean.

In this regard, Leech (2005) argued that his idea is certainly considered one among pragmaticism and that it tends to be associated with Brown and Levinson's (1987) ideas, as each has played an influential personal role in pragmatic research and has maintained leading theories despite all of the criticisms leveled at them. The version's compatibility with Westerners and its insufficiency for Eastern cultures and languages were the main points of his criticism. Leech disagreed with Brown and Levinson's classification of negative and positive faces, which was meant to be totally based on Goffman's idea of a face.

On the other hand, Terada, Okazoe, and Gratch (2021) stated that being especially courteous is dependent on the possible danger of a communication act. They claimed that the variables involved in evaluating face threats, as described by Brown and Levinson, may have an impact on the politeness strategies used in explicitly positive speech acts. The question examined in their study is the variations in a virtual agent's politeness techniques have an impact on the negotiated outcomes in a non-zero-sum situation. They added that politeness is an element of the toolbox that humans use to manage the social rewards and penalties associated with all encounters. In their result, positive politeness, which does not put the other person's face in danger, resulted in fairer negotiated deals, but agents who employed the off-record method were able to get more concessions from their human counterparts.

Grice's interpretation of cooperative conceptions, which has been criticized for its ambiguity and inconsistency, forms the majority of Leech's maxims and politeness approach. Second, the objection shifted its focus to Leech's (1983) proposal for a massive and inappropriate variety of maxims, because if such a wide variety became accepted, no one could manage the addition of new examples to the contrary (Brown & Stephen, 1987). Finally, Leech's pragmatic concepts have been questioned because they are mostly centered on Western cultures. For the time being, Leech (2005) argued for Brown and Levinson's universality in their concept.

Furthermore, the tact maxim, which specializes in reducing the pressure of speaking acts on behalf of interlocutors, has received an excessive amount of attention. Dybko (2010) looked into how headlines function in terms of politeness. The goal of the investigation was to see how effective Leech's (2005) Grand Strategy of Politeness was at delving into the language of advertising. This study identified a set of real slogans that have been utilized for the purpose of advertising, and a version was used to assess the chosen phrases. The examination of classified advertising used in headlines revealed that the framework for the Grand Strategy of Politeness appears to be the most relevant and effective method.

This is due to the various linguistic and social features it provides in social interaction, which make it appear every day to individuals of all cultures and relevant to most speech acts such as requests, apologies, and complaints. Chen, He, and Hu (2013), who examined requests made in American English,

Japanese, and Chinese concurred with Leech's (2005) claim that there is no difference between the Eastern and Western varieties of the politeness strategy. However, given that Leech's (2005) paradigm of politeness has shown that it is applicable to many cultures, including Western and Eastern, its methodologies can be applied to specific acts of communication in specific languages.

Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness is often disregarded by discursive techniques of analysis because it overly relies on speech act theory, according to Grainger (2018) by observing the flow of the conversation and how tasks were assigned, as well as by making observations regarding the relationship between the utterances' shape and the context in which they are made, it was shown in the interaction that the meaning of these utterances can be observed in the data itself. In this method, some of Brown and Levinson's most valuable constructivist concepts are applied to the data. Through examination of a courtroom conversation, some concepts from Brown and Levinson's theory—such as face-threatening behavior and positive and negative politeness—are shown and provided with a vocabulary to talk about dynamic situated interaction. They are accompanied with references to the appropriate behavior expectations for the situation, as well as knowledge of how meaning is defined and negotiated by participants throughout contact.

In another related study, Mahmud (2019) stated that in class, English students utilized a variety of terms to demonstrate their politeness. Greetings, thanks, addressing phrases, apologizing, and fillers were among the expressions used. There were also some phrases drawn from the pupils' everyday language that was utilized to soften the presentation. Positive and negative politeness were assigned to these utterances.

Azwan (2018) claimed in another study that Ambonese people are more prone to use more than two or three strategies to refuse requests. Ambonese people utilize positive politeness strategies such as expressing gratitude, which is combined with addressed form, reason and give new alternatives while interacting with strangers. Ambonese people like to mix addressed form, reason, promise, joke, or provide new solutions as sub-strategies of positive politeness strategy in solidarity politeness systems such as close relationships. Ambonese people tend to adopt negative politeness strategies such as apologies, deference, and being typically indirect in a hierarchical politeness structure.

### *Communication*

Communication is the process of creating, expressing, and interpreting ideas, facts, opinions, and attitudes to accomplish a specific goal. To succeed or advance, a speaker must be an excellent communicator. A poor communication system could lead to misunderstandings and confusion (Radovic Markovic & Salamzadeh, 2018).

Akilandeswari, Kumar, Freeda, and Kumar (2015) defined communication as the process of conveying a message to someone or a group of people. When a message was sent clearly and directly, and the receiver gets it in the same way as the sender intended, it is considered to be successful communication. The message is conveyed to a person or people. Effective communication occurs when the message is sent without ambiguity and is received by the recipient in the same way that the sender intended. If the message is misunderstood by the recipient or fails to elicit comprehension, the communicator should be aware that barriers have an effect on communication. It is only effective when the listener understands the intended message.

Language and communication are in some ways related to both the natural sciences (cognitive psychology and neurology are concerned with how humans use their brains and motor systems to send and interpret structured signals) and the humanities because they involve how humans use their brains and motor systems to send and interpret structured signals (Rocci & Saussure, 2016). It is about how humans share thoughts, emotions and experiences that shape all aspects of life in society, from basic communicative and representational needs to subtle and elaborated artistic and technological achievements). Castells (2013) mentioned that the more diverse and rapidly these inputs are, the more the communication sphere becomes a catalyst for societal change. The communicant is given the ability

to react or respond to the information or message presented to the communicator. To put it another way, communicators receive instant feedback from communicants, resulting in a tangled mutual understanding.

## *1.2 Research questions*

This study investigated the politeness strategies teenagers employ in the household. Specifically, it aimed to answer the question:

1. What politeness strategies do teenagers use in the household?

## **2. Method**

### *2.1 Sample / Participants*

The researchers observed and recorded ten conversations of parents and teenagers in the household. Children ages 13-19 and their parents living in the same house were the research participants. They were oriented of the research details with the Informed Consent Form (ICF).

### *2.2 Instrument / Material*

The discourse analysis was used in this qualitative study. Since this study was about language that extends beyond the sentence, it was employed as the research design. This study focused on the fundamentals and identifies how people make sense of and communicate through language. The goal of this study was to identify politeness strategies in teenagers' speech. This study provides readers with information about politeness methods in conversation and how they were applied.

Discourse analysis examines how language units are utilized in actual texts to communicate meaning because it focuses on clarifying the meaning given and formed in the text, it is also known as the study of text meaning. Emphasize the message's choice of language function and use the existence or absence of that function as evidence to explain the text's purpose, target audience, and the nature of the suggested social interaction between the text author and the target audience (Lwin, 2022). This framing served as a guide for the researchers as they investigated how teenagers interact with their parents at home.

### *2.3 Data collection and analysis*

In data collection, researchers observed the discourse of parents and teenagers in the household setting. The researchers chose a suitable time when the parent and teenagers are present in their homes then the recordings commenced. To make it attainable, the researchers issued a consent letter to potential research participants. The researchers and participants were conversing and communicating to acquire the essential data. The participants were selected and they were given a consent form as permission to be recorded. All 10 participants met the required criterion to be a participant in the study.

To have a better knowledge of the discourse, the researchers carefully went through and arranged interview transcripts, statement notes, and other non-textual resources in data analysis. When evaluating a study that focuses on examining the values, meanings, beliefs, thoughts, feelings, and emotional characteristics of the topic being studied (Teddlie & Tashakkori (2011). Most qualitative data analysis entails categorizing or coding the data. In order to make sense of enormous volumes of data, it basically involves reducing the volume of raw data, finding important patterns, and finally drawing meaning from data and building a logical chain of evidence (Patton, 2002). The researcher studied the

definition and other examples of the four politeness strategies to better obtained factual and intelligible data.

### 3 Results and Discussion

This chapter will show the results and discussions from the investigation into the politeness strategies of teenagers in the household based on Brown and Levinson's politeness theory.

**Table 1.** The Politeness strategies of the teenagers in the household.

Theme	Frequency of Occurrence	Sample Emblematic Quotes
Positive Politeness	General	<p>T: Inom ka Mi? P1 (T: Mom, do you want to drink?)</p> <p>T: Kaon na Pang. P5 (T: Father, let's eat)</p> <p>T: Sino nag luto nito? Masarap gud. P9 (T: Who cooked this one? This tastes good.)</p>
Negative Politeness	Variant	<p>T: Chocolate. Diko ganahan atong vanilla, mura kog masakiton. Wait lang, guniti sa palihog Mi kay palungon sa nako ang blower. P1 (T: I don't like chocolate vanilla. It is like I have a fever whenever I drink it. Wait, Mom, can you hold this for me? I'll just turn the blower off)</p> <p>T: Pahingi ako nyan please. P8 (T: May I have that one, please?)</p>
Off-record	Variant	<p>T: Aha? Sa taas? Unya di naman ka kasaka ana. P5 (T: Where? Upstairs? You probably can't climb the stairs anymore)</p> <p>T: Kaganina ba, hapit malugaw ang kan'on nimo Mang. P5 (T: Mom cooked the rice earlier like a porridge)</p> <p>T: Oo, nag ambon lang yun saglit tapos yun lang. Di naabutan ng isang minute. Oh, crispy pa ang ating pulutan. Ma, kain na oh. Init pa yan. P8 (T: Yes, what we experienced there was a light rain. It didn't last for a minute. This is still crisp. Let's eat, mom; it's still hot)</p>
Bald-on record	Variant	<p>T: Naay nanawag. P7 (T: Someone's calling.)</p> <p>T: Kainin niyo nayan oh. Mabugnaw yan. P9 (Eat this one or this will get cold.)</p> <p>T: Oh, si M*** yung ketchup! P9 (T: M*** (baby) is playing with the ketchup.)</p> <p>T: Ma, ang iring sa lamesa! ... P10 (T: Ma! The cat is on the table! ...)</p>

Legend:

General 50% up

Typical 25% -40%

Variant 24% down

The table consists of the four politeness strategies of Brown and Levinson. During the observation, teenagers generally use positive politeness strategies when conversing with their parents. The first column is positive politeness and the conversation below shows how teenagers employ this strategy:

*Teenager: Inom ka Mi? P1*  
(Ma, do you want to drink?)

*T: Ipaligid ligid sa abo, maligid ligiran ang tae sa iring (laugh). Giunsa nimo pag luto sauna Ma, lami lagi tong paligid ligid nimo sauna Ma? Masking wa lagi toy kalayu. P1*  
(It will be rolled into the cinder with cats' poop all over there. How did you cook it last time? It tastes good even it was not cooked on the fire)

*T: kaon na Pang. P5*  
(Dad, let's eat)

*T: Ha? Dika mag kanin? May lagnat ka pa pala? P8*  
(Ha? You won't eat? Do you still have a fever?)

*Parent 1: Parang may ubo't sipon, masakit pa katawan ko.*  
(I think I still have a flu)

*T: Bakit man yan? Mag sawsawan ka, Ma? P8*  
(Why is that? Do you want some sauce?)

*T: Sino nag luto nito? Masarap gud. (Eating) P9*  
(Who cooked this one? This taste good)

As stated above, in the first conversation, the speaker is offering a hot choco to his parent. "Mi" is used when the teenager conversed with his mom, asking her if she wants to drink. She calls his mother "Mi" short for mommy. Brown and Levinson emphasize also that when expressing a fulfillment to the hearer's want such as offering anything that pleases the speaker in some ways is a positive politeness strategy.

In the second conversation, the teenager and his parent are talking about a certain food made from in unique process and the teenager compliments his parent on how he liked the food when the teenager tasted it before. The speaker is asking what the hearer has an interest in as a topic of conversation because it is evident how the parent responds to the conversation regarding that matter. And compliments, on the other hand, are spoken acts that are generally meant to protect, accentuate, or elevate the addressee's face which is the main goal of positive politeness strategy.

In the third conversation, Brown and Levinson highlighted also how showing hospitality to the hearer is a positive politeness. "Kaon na, Pang"<sup>P5</sup> (Father let's eat) the speaker is saying to his father that he should better eat. The teenager called her father "Pang" short for father.

In the fourth conversation, the teenager is noticing and attending to the hearer's conversations, the speaker is displaying a concern for the listener's needs. It emphasizes the intimacy between the teenager and the parent. Brown and Levinson also stated how showing concerns to the hearer is a characteristic of positive politeness. The speaker is saying "... Dika mag kain? May lagnat ka pa pala?" (You won't eat? Do you still have a fever?) shows that the speaker is concerned about the welfare of her mother.

In the last conversation, the speaker politely offers appreciation or admiration for the food. The teenager is directly commending how good the food is. The teenager is employing friendly behavior that shows warmth toward the interlocutor. As the teenager stated "...masarap gud" means that the food is appetizing and she compliment her parent for it.

Positive politeness is concern with creating familiarity and asserting common ground. The threat to the hearer's face is lessened by using a positive politeness strategy. It is observed that teenagers compliment their parents in some ways. They uttered words that made the other feel good within himself/herself. It is visible how a verbal act explicitly or quietly acknowledges someone else, usually the person being addressed. Additionally, teenagers inviting their parents to eat was evidently shown in

their discourse. Brown and Levinson stated that it is part of the politeness strategies because it does imply a positive attitude and character towards the hearer.

The second column in the table is the Negative politeness strategy. It was shown that some of the teenagers being observed employed a negative politeness strategy. The frequency of occurrence of the negative politeness strategy is variant. The data examined shows how teenagers do not intend to impose. The conversation below shows how negative politeness appeared in the context of the teenager's conversation:

*T: Chocolate. Diko ganahan atong vanilla, mura kog masakiton. Wait lang, guniti sa palihog Mi kay palungon sa nako ang blower. P1*  
(I don't like the vanilla one. It is like I have a fever whenever I drink it. Wait, Mom, can you hold this for me? I'll just turn the blower off)

*T: Pahingi ako nyan please. P9*  
(Can I have that one, please)

Negative politeness strategies are concerned with avoiding imposition on the listener and using modal verbs which is apparent in their statement "can" and the statement of a speaker is displaying deference to avoid offending the hearer. The statement "...Wait lang, guniti sa palihog Mi kay palungon sa nako ang blower" P1 (*Wait, Mom, can you hold this for me? I'll just turn the blower off*) and "Pahingi ako nyan please" P10 (*May I have that one, please?*) indicates independence of action and autonomy in making their own decisions without interference stated by Brown and Levinson and modal verb "may" is present in the statement stated.

The third column in the table is off-record strategy. This strategy is used with variable frequency. It was shown that some of the teenagers being observed also employed an off-record strategy:

*T: Wala man, kaafford naman og floorwax ang teacher. Di naman mi elementary Ma na madalag floorwax ang ubang teacher. P4*  
(None so far. The teachers can already afford a floor wax. We are not elementary pupils anymore that we give a floor wax as a payoff.)

*T: Aha? Sa taas? Unya di naman ka kasaka ana. P5*  
(Where? Upstairs? You probably can't climb the stairs anymore)

*T: Kaganina ba, hapit malugaw ang kan'on nimo Mang. P5*  
(Mom cooked the rice earlier like a porridge)

*T: Oo, nag ambon lang yun saglit tapos yun lang. Di naabutan ng isang minute. Oh, crispy pa ang ating pulutan. Ma, kain na oh. Init pa yan. P8*  
(Yes, what we experienced there was a light rain. It didn't last for a minute. This is still crisp. Let's eat, mom; it's still hot)

In the first conversation, the teenager and parent are talking about the assignment of the teenager but he says, "Wala man, kaafford naman og floorwax ang teacher. Di naman mi elementary Ma na madalag floorwax ang ubang teacher" P4 (*None so far. The teachers can already afford a floor wax. We are not elementary anymore that we will give a floor wax*) shows an ambiguous statement that has more meaning than the word itself.

In the second conversation, the speaker is likely saying less than what is required. Stating "Aha? Sa taas? Unya di naman ka kasaka ana" P5 (*Where? Upstairs? You probably can't climb the stairs anymore*) is a vogue statement because the speaker is not stating the complete thought that she wants to express such as the reason why her parent will be having a hard time climbing the stairs.

On the third conversation, the teenager said "Kaganina ba, hapit malugaw ang kan'on nimo Mang" P5 (*Mom cooked the rice earlier like a porridge*) is displaying and relying on implication. Although it is subtly implied thus, the teenager was depending on the parent's capacity to understand and comprehend the

teenager intended meaning. The teenager was trying to say that the rice was cooked with a lot of water that almost turned to porridge. However, the speaker's statement was said in an indirect manner.

On the fourth conversation, "...Di naabutan ng isang minute."<sup>p5</sup> (*It didn't last for a minute.*) is an example of hyperbole. However, what the teenager wanted to convey is that the rain did not last long and it just stopped. The speaker exaggeratedly defines how the rain lasts so it means there is more meaning than what was conveyed.

The fourth column in the table is bald-on record politeness. It was shown that some teenagers being observed also employed a bald-on record strategy. In the same manner, the frequency of using this strategy varies. The bald-on strategy was evident in the statement below:

T: Ma, e monitor daw Ma aha gaadto si Tito Ma. <sup>p1</sup>  
(*Monitor where uncle goes.*)

T: Naay nanawag. <sup>p7</sup>  
(*Someone's calling.*)

T: Kainin niyo nayan oh. Mabugnaw yan. <sup>p9</sup>  
(*Eat this one or this will get cold*)

T: Oh, si M\*\*\* yung ketchup! <sup>p9</sup>  
(*Ma! Mayo (baby) is playing with the ketchup.*)

T: Ma, ang iring sa lamesa!... . <sup>p10</sup>  
(*Ma! The cat is in the table! ...*)

The conversation shows how the speaker speaks directly to the other person. The statements: "Ma, e monitor Ma aha gaadto si Tito Ma."<sup>p1</sup> (*Monitor where uncle goes.*), "Naay nanawag."<sup>p7</sup> (*Someone's calling.*), "Kainin niyo nayan oh. Mabugnaw yan."<sup>p9</sup> (*Eat this one or this will get cold.*), "Oh, si M\*\*\* yung ketchup!"<sup>p9</sup> (*M\*\*\* (baby) is playing with the ketchup.*), "Ma, ang iring sa lamesa!..."<sup>p10</sup> (*Ma! The cat is on the table! ...*) seems necessary and highly efficient. The requests of the teenagers were expressed in words that were spoken directly to the listener. It is an easy way to communicate without imposing oneself. The threats to the hearer's face are not at all attempted to be reduced the risks to the hearer's face. And they are an example of imperative forms that shows a command to the hearers as how Brown and Levinson defined bald-on record.

The "face" is made during a certain conversation or communication. By claiming that specific actions pose a threat to face, Brown and Levinson (1987) strengthened their case. The social self-image that one displays or intends to display toward the other individual is referred to as the face. Face threats can take on a variety of forms and styles, and they can occasionally be directed at the listener or the speaker. They argued that a person's threatening approach had an effect on the preservation of relationships. Despite the fact that we are all concerned with protecting others' faces, sometimes we act in ways that are impolite and put others' faces in danger.

Every person has two face needs: the positive face and the negative face, according to Brown and Levinson (1987) wanting one's "activities unimpeded by others" is a negative face. A positive face is the desire to "be desirable to at least some individuals." As was already noted, people generally attempt to avoid acts that harm other people's faces because we are all concerned with keeping others' faces (FTA).

Teenagers when it comes to conversing with their parents in the household generally use positive politeness strategies in which they communicate respectfully and show a common ground to the hearer. This emphasizes friendly behavior that shows warmth toward the interlocutor. However, some of the teenagers who were being observed made use of negative politeness, bald-on record, and off-record strategies.

In addition, this implies that they exhibit deference so as not to offend, hedging, and framing disagreements as opinions are some of the methods teenagers use. As well, they are employed to directly address the listener or the other person to communicate the speaker's desire. They are sometimes straightforward in speaking without imposing themselves. They occasionally do not make any attempt to lessen the risk to the hearer's face. And in order for the speaker's intent to be understood by the listener, they use the off-record method involves saying something vague or otherwise distinct from what the speaker actually means. It is dependent on implication. This tactic, which breaks conversational rules to imply a specific recommended course of action, is extremely subtly worded.

Generally, this means that the teenagers' demeanour when it comes to communicating depends on their background, environment, and the upbringing of the teenagers are also a benefactor to the attitude they show in their household especially conversing with their parents.

Findings run parallel with Hamrakulova (2020) who stated that adult people make observations about the lack of politeness where it is anticipated in conversation with teenagers and most teenagers today are discourteous to older people. Sarania (2019) stated that parents were both bewildered and hurt by their children's behavior. Since they feel like they already know what to do, teenagers dislike being nagged. This daily issue will soon lead to arguments and later cold wars between parents and teenagers. When interacting with elders, teens come across as somewhat careless and dismissive. Makaria and Adawiyah (2021) which stated that teenagers have unstable personality, making individuals more impulsive and difficult to control in their activities, particularly socializing.

As well, the result is in consonance with Utari and Sulandari (2019) who stated that teenagers control their language, converse fluently, show respect for one another, and refrain from insulting their parents. They contemplate how older people might feel if they were treated disrespectfully, they typically have regard for older people. And the respect that teenagers show for elders is greatly influenced also by their morality.

### **3 Conclusion**

On the whole, Brown and Levinson's four politeness strategies were present in the conversation between teenagers and parents in the household. However teenagers are respectful yet at times impertinent when conversing with their parents and family members. More so, teenagers primarily utilized positive politeness to express kinship and to keep close relationships with their parents while chatting, bald on records to offer a clear and explicit message, negative politeness to lessen the coercion to their parents, and off record to drop indications. Additionally, elements like age gap, mores, and social distance had an impact on the politeness methods used in the household conversations. This shows that their behaviour has something to do with how they were raised, their culture, the environment that they grew up with, and their upbringing.

### **4 Ethics Committee Approval**

The authors confirm that ethical approval was acquired from the Research and Extension Services Office of the University of Southern Mindanao, Kidapawan City Campus, Philippines with control no. 663 in first semester of school year 2022-2023.

### **Acknowledgements**

We express sincerest gratitude to the Administration of the University of Southern Mindanao Kidapawan City Campus for the trust and support as we conducted this research study.

## References

- Akilandeswari, V., Kumar, A. D., Freeda, A. P., & Kumar, S. N. (2015). Elements of effective communication. *New Media and Mass Communication*, 37, 44-47.
- Azwan, A. (2018). Politeness strategies of refusals to requests by Ambonese community. *LINGUA: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Dan Pengajarannya*, 15(1), 1-6.
- Bonvillain, N. (2019). *Language, culture, and communication: The meaning of messages*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Castells, M. (2013). *Communication power*. Oxford University Press.
- Chen, R., He, L., & Hu, C. (2013). Chinese requests: In comparison to American and Japanese requests and with reference to the “East-West divide”. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 55, 140-161.
- Cohen, A. D. (2020). Considerations in assessing pragmatic appropriateness in spoken language. *Language Teaching*, 53(2), 183-202.
- Dybko, K. (2010). The Role of Politeness in Advertisements’ Slogans: A Study within Gricean Pragmatics. *ACTA PHILOLOGICA*, 20.
- Eelen, G. (2014). *A Critique of Politeness Theory: Volume 1*. Routledge.
- Grainger, K. (2018). “We’re not in a club now”: a neo-Brown and Levinson approach to analyzing courtroom data. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 14(1), 19-38.
- Hamrakulova, G. (2020). Politeness theory in language. *Mental Enlightenment Scientific Methodological Journal*, 2020(2), 151-157.
- Kdar, D. Z., & Haugh, M. (2013). *Understanding politeness*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and woman's place. *Language in society*, 2(1), 45-79.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). Pragmatics, discourse analysis, stylistics and “The Celebrated Letter”.
- Leech, G. (2005). Politeness: is there an East-West divide. *Journal of Foreign Languages*, 6(3).
- Lwin, S. M. (2022). Discourse analysis. In *Research Anthology on Applied Linguistics and Language Practices* (pp. 1573-1595). IGI Global.
- Mahmud, M. (2019). The use of politeness strategies in the classroom context by English university students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(3), 597-606
- Makaria, E. C., & Adawiyah, R. R. R. (2021, February). Teenagers’ Promiscuity of Alpha Generation. In *The 2nd International Conference on Social Sciences Education (ICSSE 2020)* (pp. 204-209). Atlantis Press.
- Mubarak, A. S. J., & Rhaif, K. K. (2022). Politeness strategies in motivational storytelling by American commencement speakers. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18(1), 22-39.
- Ondigi, E. A. (2021). A review of politeness. *Journal of African Studies and Ethnographic Research*, 3(4).

- Teddlie, C., & Tashakkori, A. (2011). Mixed methods research. *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*, 4, 285-300.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. sage.
- Radovic Markovic, M., & Salamzadeh, A. (2018). The Importance of Communication in Business Management, The 7th International Scientific Conference on Employment, Education and Entrepreneurship, Belgrade, Serbia.
- Rocci, A., & de Saussure, L. (Eds.). (2016). Verbal communication (Vol. 3). Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.
- Sarania, S. M. D. (2019). Clash of Bloods: Sentiments of Parents and Teenagers Having Conflict with Each Other. *Ascendens Asia Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Abstracts*, 3(20).
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S.W., (2012). *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse approach*. Blackwell Oxford.
- Sukarno, S. (2018). Politeness strategies, linguistic markers and social contexts in delivering requests in Javanese. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(3), 659-667.
- Terada, K., Okazoe, M., & Gratch, J. (2021, September). Effect of politeness strategies in dialogue on negotiation outcomes. In *Proceedings of the 21<sup>st</sup> ACM International Conference on Intelligent Virtual Agents* (pp. 195-202).
- Utari, A. P., & Sulandari, S. (2019). Respectful Attitude on Adolescents to Elderly.
- Wamboldt, F., & Reiss, D. (1989). Defining a family heritage and a new relationship identity: Two central tasks in the making of a marriage. *Family Process*, 28, 317-335.

---

## AUTHOR BIODATA

**Dr. Rowena Vasquez-Sosas** is an Associate Professor and a lecturer of research and linguistics at the University of Southern Mindanao, Kidapawan City Campus, Philippines. She is inclined in qualitative methods of research in applied linguistics and language education. Most importantly, she is a proud member of the *Iglesia Ni Cristo* (Church of Christ) and is holding a duty in finance. She can be contacted at rvsosas@usm.edu.ph.

**Marilyn M. Llorica** is a student at the University of Southern Mindanao, Kidapawan City Campus, Philippines taking up Bachelor of Secondary Education major in English. She is the managing editor of *The Techno-Builders*, the official student publication of the University of Southern Mindanao, Kidapawan City Campus. Qualitative research is her interest. She can be contacted at mlllorica@usm.edu.ph