Kankana-Ey Expressions in the Context of Politeness Theory

Ailene A. Batang, Ph.D. [1] and Maria Theresa M. Diza M.A. [2]
Pangasinan State University San Carlos Campus[1]
Pangasinan State University San Carlos Campus[2]

Abstract – Every communication act relies heavily on courtesy expressions; therefore, learning the nuances of the language used in regular discourse is essential. The purpose of this descriptive-narrative study is to discover common utterances used by Kankana-ey in their daily conversation with the theory of politeness in pragmatics. Using Purposive sampling and triangulation, the researchers found nine Kankana-ey market sellers for the study. In the assessment of data, researchers used frequency counts and percentages. The study found that Kankana-ey, regardless of age or circumstances, employs polite words and phrases in every communication.
.

Keywords – Kankana-ey, Politeness, Politeness Theory, Pragmatics

INTRODUCTION

The developing nature of human knowledge and proficiency, combined with globalization's rapid spread, steadily degrades communication abilities. As a result, people developed ambiguous attitudes, and the response to these instructional inclinations degraded into conflicts and misunderstandings. As a result, it presents a problem for what is now known as pragmatics.

Pragmatics is the study of spoken language meaning. However, other perspectives such as Yule's (Yule, 1996) interpreted pragmatics in various ways: examining speaker meaning, contextual meaning, the extent to which more is conveyed than expressed, and the expression's relationship to distance. Cipollone et al. (1998) describe pragmatics similarly: it is the study of how and why humans use language in particular ways within a context.

Levinson (1983), Leech (1983:2005), Yule (1996), Crystal (2008), and Trosborg (2010) all stressed the importance of pragmatics as a subfield of linguistics concerned with the meanings of words, sentences, and utterances in a situational context. Additionally, the speaker discloses such intentions and situates the listener within that framework (Mohammed Al-Husseini, et.al., 2015).

Considering the preceding, one can conclude that pragmatics is a linguistic field of study and an academic approach to language use. As a result, this study concentrated on comprehending Politeness Theory in conjunction with pragmatics to ascertain the language used by market vendors in the Mountain Province, specifically the Kankana-ey, in their daily utterances.

Politeness is known as "the speaker's declaration of his or her intention to mitigate face threats caused by specified face-threatening behaviors referred to as politeness strategies." (Mills, 2003, p.6) (Mohammad, Adel, Dacoudi, & Ramezanzadeh, 2016).

In general, courtesy contributes nothing to the explanation of cultural differences. However, Ellen (2001), as cited by Iryani (2012), asserts that politeness or etiquette is a social standard. Furthermore, according to Watts (2003), in the book of Iryani (2012), politeness can be defined as "how language expresses the social distance between speakers and their relationship to their social position in a community." To aid in the comprehension of the meaning of politeness, Eellen (2001) and Watts (2003) (Taavitsainen et.al., 2012) established dichotomies and categorized politeness into two categories. "First-order politeness" or "politeness1" refers to a commonplace concept or notion. In comparison, "second-order politeness" or "politeness2" is the technical term used by Watts to refer to the discursive struggle over politeness1. For example, (im)polite behavior is evaluated and commented on by lay members, rather than how social scientists elevate the term "(im)politeness" out of everyday discourse and elevate it to the status of a theoretical concept frequently referred to as Politeness Theory. Additionally, politeness1, as defined by Kasper (2003:2), provides empirical support for politeness theories. As a result, this study discusses some Kankana-ey utterances comparable to polite terms used in conversation.

Spencer-Oatey (2000) claims that politeness maxims have universal valences; one poll of a given dimension is desirable. Communication is more

accessible by cultural differences and speech contexts within the same culture. However, this is dependent on both pragmatic, contextual elements, and culturally driven politeness preferences.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study aims to understand Kankana-ey Market Vendors' experiences using courtesy words in market discussion and highlight regular occurrences and phrases. Further, to demonstrate the circumstances and prevalent expressions in ordinary conversations associated with politeness theory.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The researchers collected data for the study by conducting a random sample survey. A research instrument used to distribute questionnaires or conduct interviews with participants elicits information on a group of people's qualities, habits, or attitudes. (Cherry, 2016).

The researchers conducted a structured interview with a group of Kankana-ey in the La Trinidad Trading Post in Benguet at approximately 12:00nn, when most market sellers are no longer working. The selection process considered vendors believed to be the most talkative group regardless of age and educational qualifications. Moreover, it was an ideal moment to interview because most of the traders had time to answer the questions. Individual interviews used a tape recorder to ensure accuracy and allow the interviewer to focus exclusively on the interviewee (Patton, 2002). Administered questions reflected the frequency and time of using the expressions.

Design

In this study, a narrative design is appropriate to convey the experiences of Kankana-ey market vendors that may result in the expression of courteous communication behaviors or habits. Thomas (2012) defined it as depending on the author's personal experience to demonstrate politeness during the conversation. To substantiate its assertions, it relies on narrative theory.

Mode of Analysis

Each audio recording was transcribed and tallied using Frequency count analysis. Additionally, the researchers listed the standard terms elicited during the interview with the respondents.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The figures in table 1 show popular Kankana-ey expressions used while sharing ideas or discussion or whenever interaction is required. For example, results reveal that 42.1% of the respondents used the terms manung manang during a conversation, as one respondent expressed. *"I used manung and manang whenever I talk to people as a way of respect even if I don't know them."*

Moreover, 26.3% utilize ma'am and sir during a dialogue. Accordingly, one respondent says*, "I call my customer's sir if it's a boy or ma'am if it's a girl to show decency and appreciation for them to buy my products."*

Seemingly interesting to note is that 21% uses uncle and auntie when conversing with people. For example, one respondent expresses saying, *"I call my customers uncle and auntie for us to become close and finally bibili siya ng mga vegetables ko."*

Finally, 5.2% uses the term lolo, lola, and adding during communication. As pointed out by one respondent, "I call them lolo or lola if they are older than me to give respect, and it is also a way to show politeness."

Table 1. Kankana-ey Common Expressions

Expressions	Frequency
manung, manang	8
ma'am, sir	5
uncle, auntie	4
lolo, lola	1
ading	1

General Pragmatics is the study of the principles regulating the communicative use of language, mainly as found in conversations. The study of principles is hypothetical or widely acknowledged universals or explored exclusively through the lens of a particular language (Mohammed Al-Husseini et al., 2015).

In light of the preceding, one might conclude that pragmatics does not exclusively concern the linguistic or structural parts of language but rather the social and educational means of comprehending and interpreting language use.

Pragmatic studies are concerned with using and comprehending a context. However, utilizing and understanding the context does not demonstrate utterance; instead, the speaker's social interaction with the context plays a significant part in communication. Thus, the Politeness Theory of Brown and Levinson was

examined in this study in terms of social distance, demonstrating the theory's relevance to Kankana-ey's typical utterances.

Brown and Levinson distinguished two types of politeness – positive and negative – in their Politeness Theory. Positive politeness makes the listener feel good about themselves and contains compliments and in-group identification markers; negative politeness, on the other hand, leads the listener to believe the speaker will impose embarrassment (Oinonen, 2012).

Similarly, politeness was quantified using three sociological variables: the social distance between the speaker and the hearer, the speaker's relative "power" over the hearer, and finally, the definitive ranking of impositions in the culture, all of which employ and calculate the amount of threat to their faces.

According to Oinonen (2012), achieving positive politeness employs two unique politeness strategies: in-group identity indicators and expressing good influence toward the addressee. The subscription formulae primarily use kinship terms such as "brother" and "daughter" as in-group identity markers. This assessment of kinship phrases as markers of positive politeness is consistent with Nevalainen and Raumolin-Brunberg (1995), who regard them as forms of positive politeness when employed as address terms. However, using kinship terms for self-referential purposes or as an address form does not always imply genuine kinship, for people may use it for others who are not blood relatives.

Additionally, according to Oinonen's study, negative politeness demonstrates deference in two ways: expressing the addressee's social superiority over the speaker and enhancing the addressee's high social standing using honorifics.

According to Leech (2005) (cited in Mohamed Al-Husseini et al., 2015), an honorific form is one of the various linguistic markers used to encode politeness values. Levinson (1983) classified honorifics into two sorts to facilitate understanding: relational and absolute honorifics. The former is concerned with encoding phrases relating to social relationships in any language regarding their rank or respect and classified as a referent, an addressee, and a bystander. Thus, relational honorifics provide a distinct honorific form based on the categorization of social grounds. On the other hand, the latter type of honorific is concerned with encoding relationship terms that vary according to the speaker (or other participants) and the setting or social activity concerning the setting's formality levels, or what Levinson refers to as authorized speaker and authorized

recipients. In English, standard and formal titles such as Mr. and Mrs., sir and madam, academic titles such as Prof. and Dr, religious titles such as Father (Fr.) for priests and Sister (Sr.) in the Catholic Church, and kinship relations such as father and mother are classified as relational and absolute honorific forms (Brown, 2011)

The employment of sir, madam, and Dr as honorifics demonstrates a resemblance amongst kankana-ey languages. Furthermore, the Speech Acts elucidates that when kankana-ey speaks to educated people, or when both parties are educated, the use of honorific titles is deemed significant, thereby establishing the politeness theory.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The findings from the preceding discussions indicate that understanding negative and positive politeness according to Brown and Levinson's politeness theory prompts the communicator to use kinship terminologies and honorific forms to elicit social closeness and cooperation between the speaker and the hearer or satisfy the hearer's desire for something. And in this context, traders can successfully convince customers to purchase their products or produce by utilizing these terminologies and forms.

However, because of time constraints, we believe that additional research is needed to shed extra light on this occurrence, not just in Kankana-ey utterances but also in other languages. Finally, a closer examination of Kinship Terminologies and Honorific Titles may be conducted to further improve the research.

REFERENCES
Brown, L. (2011). *Korean Honorifics and Politeness in Second Language Learning.* Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Calmorin, L. P., & Calmorin, M. A. (2007). *Research Methods and Thesis Writing.* Quezon City, Philippines: Rex Bookstore.

Cherry, K. (2016, April 25). *What is a Survey?* Retrieved June 26, 2017, from verywelll: verywell.com

Cipollone, N., Keiser, S. H., & Vassishth, S. (1998). *Language Files: Materials fo an introduction to language and Linguistics 7th Edition.* Ohio: Department of Linguistics, the Ohio State Unversity.

Iryani, E. (2012, July 04). *Pragmatic: The analysis of Polite Language in Maxim's Theories (Study of Leech Maxim Theories).* Retrieved June 27, 2017, from endangmasterpiece: https://danks84.wordpress.com

Jucker, A. H., Taavitsainen, I., & Schneider, G. (2012). Semantic corpus trawling: Expressions of "courtesy" and "politeness" in the Helsinki Corpus. *VARIENG*.

Kasper, G. (2003). *"Politeness" Handbook of Pragmatics.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

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

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambidge University Press.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics 7th Edition.* New York: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Mohammad, S., Adel, R., Dacoudi, M., & Ramezanzadeh, A. (2016). A qualitative study of politeness strategies used by Iranian EFL llearners in a class blog. *Iranian Journal of Lanugage Teaching Reasearch*, 47-62.

Mohammed Al-Husseini, H., Shaker Al-Shaibani, G., & A., P. (2015). Pragmalinguistic Aspects of Kinship Terms in English and Arabic. *6th International Language Learning Conference* (pp. 77-90). Penang, Malaysia: Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia Cataloguing-in-Publication Data.

Oinonen, R. (2012, October 10). *VARIENG.* Retrieved June 26, 2017, from Yours to command: Politeness and an Early Modern English subscription formula: www.helsinki.fi/varieng/series/volumes/11/oinonen

Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Spencer-Oatey, H. (2000). Rapport management; a framework for analysis. *H Spencer-Oatey, ed.* , 11-46.

Spitzberg, B. (n.d.). Conversational Skills Rating Scale. *Instructional Assessment of Interpersonal Competence*. San Diego, California, USA: National Communications Association.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics.* New York: Oxford University Press.

PLEASE INCLUDE CONTACT INFORMATION:
NAME: AILENE A. BATANG & MARIA THERESA M. DIZA
CONTACT NO: 09956344114 & 09278520822
EMAIL ADDRESS: ABATANG@PSU.EDU.PH & DIZAMARIATHERESA@PSU.EDU.PH