

May 15th, 9:00 AM - May 17th, 5:00 PM

Facework and Rhetorical Strategies in Intercultural Argumentation

Inga Dolinina
McMaster University

Vittorina Cecchetto
McMaster University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/ossaarchive>



Part of the [Philosophy Commons](#)

Dolinina, Inga and Cecchetto, Vittorina, "Facework and Rhetorical Strategies in Intercultural Argumentation" (1997). *OSSA Conference Archive*. 23.

<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/ossaarchive/OSSA2/papersandcommentaries/23>

This Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Philosophy at Scholarship at UWindsor. It has been accepted for inclusion in OSSA Conference Archive by an authorized conference organizer of Scholarship at UWindsor. For more information, please contact scholarship@uwindsor.ca.

FACEWORK AND RHETORICAL STRATEGIES IN INTERCULTURAL ARGUMENTATIVE DISCOURSE

Inga B. Dolinina and Vittorina Cecchetto
Department of Modern Languages
McMaster University

©1998, Inga B. Dolinina & Vittorina Cecchetto

Abstract:

Intercultural discourse (especially via a *lingua franca*) adds a new dimension—facework (establishing of culture-sensitive politeness strategies)—to the theory and practice of argumentation from a number of perspectives: its specificity as compared to ordinary argumentational discourse, the interpretation of the concept of incommensurability, and the conduct of international negotiations. Politeness systems relevant for different cultures are not unpredictable, but represent linguistically and cognitively a highly generalised universal system which can be adopted by interlocutors and used in practical discourse. Politeness expressions are governed by linguistic components—by language forms of a certain type and by specific discourse patterns. The proper choice of language forms and discourse patterns adds a special dimension to argumentative schemata. The politeness—relevant packaging of discourse adds a zero-step to the normative stages of an argumentative discussion (establishing hierarchical relations as such), and needs permanent alignment of these relations, by using correct language forms and discourse patterns.

Introduction.

This paper is concerned with the linguistic aspects of facework and the facework-related rhetorical peculiarities of discourse. By "facework" we mean the methods by which interlocutors place each other in a hierarchy. Facework and facework-related rhetoric are present and important in any discourse, whether intracultural or intercultural. They are parts of language proficiency. These parts of proficiency are not acquired automatically, even in a native language, as vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar are. They must be taught specifically by adults, and are specifically taught throughout the whole of professional life. One can recollect professional "drilling" of all people in service occupations, especially in the commercial area. Someone who wants to sell you something will say: "*Is it Mrs. Smith? How are you to-day?*" (One doubts that the person really cares about how the interlocutor feels). In a shop, after a customer pays, she will hear, "*Have a good evening, ma'am.*" There are lots of lapses and embarrassments in one's native environment. But they are minor problems in comparison with the potential and real difficulties of intercultural communication. In this paper, we argue that facework is particularly important in communication between interlocutors who differ in their native languages and cultures.

Discourse via a lingua franca

For a long time there existed a false opinion that, in order to understand one another in such a situation of intercultural communication, it is enough for one interlocutor to learn the language of the other, that knowledge of the language by itself opens the way to a direct discourse. This opinion was partly due to the fact that, when the

parties did not know each other's languages, they used professional interpreters and translators who were specially trained in the foreign language in question. These professionals worked like mediators in the discourse process, and their mediation was generally relevant to the task of the discourse. So, on the surface, it seemed (wrongly) that the problem of intercultural communication is the problem of learning the "other" language. One seldom realized that professional "inter-language mediators" were trained not only in the foreign language *per se* (vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar, etc.), but also possessed, if they were good at their trade, a substantial knowledge of the "other" culture. They knew the history, literature, religion, system of customs and values, appropriate conversational strategies, etc. All this provided them with an ability not just to translate the information from one language to another, but also to interpret (in the real meaning of this word) a message from one linguistic and cultural domain into the message of another linguistic and cultural domain.

The contemporary situation differs from this pattern. Most communications are in direct discourse using English as a global *lingua franca*, or another of the so-called "international languages". *Lingua francas* are now used in the absolute majority of cases of intercultural communication—scholarly or civil conferences, business negotiations, all kinds of minor international treaties, etc. The use of *lingua francas* creates an illusion of mutual understanding, and a false satisfaction that there is a common linguistic basis for discourse. But the reality is not so simple: the use of one formal system of linguistic signs does not necessarily provide the interlocutors with adequate grounds for successful communication. What is usually lacking in communication via a *lingua franca* is the mutual (not just one-sided) knowledge of the partners' cultural systems of politeness strategies (facework), and of the systems of rhetorical strategies for presenting information specific for each culture. Consequently, the native speaker of the language which functions as a *lingua franca* wrongly assumes that he/she can use also the politeness systems and forms just the way they are encoded in his language. This is a mistake. Each interlocutor is generally using the discourse strategies of his/her native languages, and thus each is unable to properly decipher the content of the message.

Consequently, the discourse is damaged in two ways. First, wrong facework damages the cooperative principle, leaving a lot of suspicion and hostility between the interlocutors. Secondly, inability to decipher the structure of the discourse (the argumentative sequences) damages the ability of the participants to figure out what are the major points of the argument and what are the causal sequences. We give examples below of each of these kinds of damage to the discourse.

Problems raised by intercultural communication

Intercultural communication from the point of view of facework and rhetorical parameters adds new dimensions to argumentative discourse from several perspectives: additional features of this discourse as compared to ordinary discourse, international discourse and the problem of incommensurability, intercultural discourse as part of international negotiations. Let us consider these points.

2.1 Specifics of intercultural discourse

The rules governing formation of an intercultural discourse are in some respects more complicated than those of ordinary conversational argument.

In order for an utterance to have the effect on the listener of establishing cooperation, it must encode the appropriate level of politeness. But in intercultural communication it often happens that the speaker (A) encodes in his message the semantic components of politeness valid for his culture, whereas the listener (B) expects the semantic components which are obligatory for his culture. Thus, even if they are formally using one and the same *lingua franca*, e.g. English in an international context or Russian in the former USSR, they are using different politeness systems. Since without special training A simply does not know how to use the politeness components which B regard as obligatory, he immediately puts B in the difficult and ambiguous position of making interpersonal inferences. B must make a decision between at least three unpleasant options: A is intentionally rude and wants to break the communication, A considers B not as an equal and a respected partner but puts him in a lower position in the mutual hierarchy, or A is just a barbarian who does not know the elementary ways of the world (and who wants to speak with such an idiot!). Any of these interpretations of A's behaviour adds little desire to be cooperative.

Thus, intercultural argumentative discourse can be regarded as a third level of argumentation: the argumentative core (a claim-reason complex), conversational argumentation (as analysed in Jackson and Jacobs 1988 with its specific discursal properties), intercultural communication. Intercultural communication has all the characteristic features of conversational argument. It is not aimed to prove the truth, but much more to solve such practical problems as justification of a proposal, making a choice among competing proposals, etc. The principles of its functioning include the principles of communication generally: it needs permanent mechanisms of alignment, etc. In addition to these common features, it must be highly sensitive to politeness strategies: 1) it must include the "zero-step", when the hierarchical relation between the interlocutors is unambiguously established as that of equality (close or deferent) or superiority-subordination (concepts which we explain below); 2) and these strategies must be permanently maintained throughout the period of communication, with special attention to the possibility of alignment of occasional discrepancies in respect to politeness, in order to maintain interpersonal consensus as well as working content consensus. The semantic field of politeness and the ways of its encoding in different language forms are extremely complicated (as will be shown later), and actually unpredictable. Hence the next question arises: is it realistic to expect that a consensus in this area of facework is possible at all? Is mutual understanding possible or is there a kind of incommensurability?

2.2 Incommensurability

In very general terms, incommensurability exists when the interlocutors communicate with one another in such different ways that it is difficult to find common grounds for correlating their positions, and consequently communication itself becomes hardly possible (Hart, Willihnganz, Willard 1995). Since the basis for communication and any argument is the existence of common grounds, their absence can be considered a no-exit situation, at least in a "pure" case of argumentation. In practical life, as was shown in (Hart, Willihnganz, Willard 1995), there are cases when organizations within which the participants of different cultures carry on the discourse cannot afford the luxury of avoidance. Even if the common grounds for understanding are minimal, the need for coordinated actions is high, and there is strong economic or other pressure to find common grounds. This situation can occur, for example, in any kind of commercial negotiations between Western businessmen and Asian businessmen. Here agreement, or decision-making, is a strong "must" at all costs.

In such a situation a common ground can come not from the rationality of discussion, but from establishing the very fact of friendliness of relations between the interlocutors. And that is impossible without working out suitable

politeness relations and a politeness strategy of the conversation itself

Formally, it can look as if, once business negotiations have started, the participants are in equal positions from the point of view of hierarchy. But practically it is not so. The very fact that the conversation is conducted in a *lingua franca* (English, German, Russian, etc.) puts the native speaker of the language in a privileged position: he does not need special concentration on producing or even understanding speech as compared to the non-native speaker, and he speaks about matters that constitute the denotative/cognitive basis of his world view, because they are part of language-world knowledge. Besides, he uses the forms of etiquette which are natural for his language, and for the ideology of this language. As for the non-native speaker, however fluent he is, there is always a barrier of projecting his own world view on the language forms of the used language. In a situation which starts with verbal inequality, the "hierarchical" alignment is a strong social pressure from the beginning of the negotiations. One of the basic areas where it takes place is establishing and permanently supporting politeness strategies which provide a feeling of equality between the negotiators. So, even if the cultures themselves are to a large extent "untranslatable", and there really exists incommensurability of values, it remains possible to establish a certain satisfactory consensus of mutual friendliness, which in its turn opens the way if not to the best decisions, at least to an acceptable decision.

Decision-making in intercultural communication is not a zero-sum game in which one wins and one loses, as in a straight argument, since with the success of interpersonal relations the company wins as a whole. Thus proper facework, which provides personal comfort for the participants and a willingness to cooperate, can serve as a common ground for otherwise incommensurable situations.

2.3 International communication

The facework component of intercultural discourse can be considered an important part of international communication. Investigations in this area (e.g. Walker 1990) stress the fact that in the contemporary world the acceptable, if not predominant, form of communication is a dialogue, and not command or propaganda as it used to be quite recently. An especially important dialogue is communication with small and third-world countries.

This shift of the international political paradigm changes expectations of how communication should occur. One of these changes concerns facework. Walker, referring to Milner Ball, stresses that argumentation in this context is an exercise in expressing dignity to those whom one wants to reach, and that success in face-to-face meetings requires overcoming a lot of behavioural differences. He analysed intercultural argument at the Law of the Sea Conference with respect to conversational strategies and patterns of reasoning. His research shows that at least three types of reasoning rhetoric are used: factual-inductive (comment/reasons first, topic/ conclusion last), axiomatic deductive (topic/conclusion first, comment/reasons last) and intuitive affective (holistic). The type of strategy used reflected the pattern more normative to a certain culture, and the desire to establish one's own place in the hierarchy. For example, though for western countries a deductive method of discourse is dominant, which is a sign of egalitarian relations, in this conference's negotiations western countries were predominantly using an inductive strategy, which is a sign of respect to an equal partner, or even to a higher partner. On the other hand, the developing countries, who culturally usually prefer an inductive or even intuitive-affective type of reasoning, used a deductive strategy, which is a strong sign of refusal to be interpreted as lower partners in the discourse.

Thus, in the context of international cooperation the rhetorical-discourse patterns adopted by communicants are

a strong sign of facework strategies, as well as a sign of cultural preferences. In intercultural discourse it is important to pay attention not simply to such supposedly primary components of the communication as "what, who, where, when and why" but also to "how" it is discussed, where the "how" covers both the systems of politeness and the discursal strategies. Knowledge of the "how" serves to establish adequate face relations, and to understand what components of the message are specifically loaded with crucial information.

3. Politeness systems

Roughly speaking languages have two major devices for politeness: discourse behaviour and specific linguistic forms.

The first type includes such devices as right of speech, turn-taking, pauses, initiation-finalization of speech, question-asking, etc. It is interesting that different cultures give different significance to these elements. In some cultures (e.g. many European ones) it is the "dominant" partner who has the right to initiate speech, whereas in others (e.g. Middle Asian), it is the "subordinate" one. In some cultures it is a weak position to ask a question, in others vice versa. We shall not discuss this first type here, because these devices do not provide a basis for a calculus of semantic possibilities of the types of "hierarchical" relations, whereas linguistic forms, on the contrary give this possibility.

All languages have special mechanisms for encoding politeness, though languages can differ a lot on what particular hierarchical oppositions they mark. But if something is linguistically marked in one language, it means that this type of semantic opposition is very sensitive in this particular culture, and consequently would be sensitive to the native speakers of this particular language, regardless of what *lingua franca* or other foreign language they are using in discourse.

The specialised forms for encoding politeness, usually called "respectivity forms", include two types of components. Direct components in themselves denote +/- respectivity. Indirect components denote +/- respectivity by "shifted" usages.

Direct forms include the following cases:

a) naming — a form of direct and indirect address which exists in all languages, but differs a lot cross—linguistically. It includes titles (*Your Highness, Sir, Ma'am, tovarishch, President, Professor*), personal names (*Bill Clinton, Boris Nikolajevich Yeltsin, Mikki*), specialized derogatory forms of address (*you fool/ idiot/ bum/schizo*).

b) specialized morphological markers. Japanese is very rich in morphologically marking respectivity. For example, the affix *-mas-* as compared to the unmarked form actualizes the opposition "respective - arespective (neutral)":

yom-I-mas-u 'I read' (with respect to oneself) vs. *yom-I -u* 'I read' (casual about oneself).

Another opposition marks respectivity to the third person:

yuomi suru - 'he is reading' (casual), *o-yomi nasaru* - 'he is reading' (with great respect to him).

Russian (in the prerevolutionary period) had clitics: *-s* expressed high respect, and could be added to any word of the sentence (generally pragmatic focus, or topic), whereas the clitic *-ka*, which is in wide use at present, marks low respect.

c) lexicon - Languages generally differentiate a substantial number of their lexemes as high and low in terms of expressing respect. They are best seen in oxymorons like:

Madam, shut up, please.

The professor's underpants were showing.

My dog was assassinated last year.

Japanese has some parts of its lexicon (generally areas referring to people, body parts, possessions, and human activities) highly organized in a hierarchical way — "high" and "low" honorifics. And proper usage of these words requires complicated social training. Some aboriginal languages of North America and some Paleosiberian languages have politeness-relevant distinctions among lexemes which are connected with gender differences. Mixing up the lexicon here shows disrespect for both men and women.

Shifted forms are represented by the following cases:

a) use of pronouns, in their secondary "social deixis meaning". An example is the use of 1 PL *we* for address to one person widely adopted by caretakers to address a "weaker" interlocutor. This case is often mocked. For example, in a detective story a nurse is addressing Inspector Morse, who is in hospital after an operation and who is at last allowed to have a sparse breakfast: "Well, today we had a nice breakfast". "Maybe you had a nice breakfast", thinks Morse. Another example is the usage of *tu/vous* or *du/Sie* forms, which causes so many difficulties for English-speaking people using French, German, Spanish, Italian, Russian, etc.

b) Use of speech acts in their non-iconical functions: shift from the imperative form to a question, change of mood, change of the affirmative form of a question to the negative. The use of shifted forms is especially difficult, since the meaning of the shift is different in different cultures, and one must be extremely cautious in using them in a foreign language, including *lingua francas*.

English as a *lingua franca* is in a very vulnerable position. It can easily step on someone's aching toe, not because of bad intentions, but because of its semiotic structure: in comparison with other languages, it has a very poor system of markers for encoding respectivity, and consequently (to speak about the influence of the form of the language on the cognitive area) not a very rich system of typologically possible semantic oppositions which are identified by speakers of English. So the more it is used as a *lingua franca*, the more its speakers must be aware of the politeness systems of other cultures. It must be mentioned in this context that English is a far less sensitive language to expression of politeness than most languages of the world, because it has very few grammatical mechanisms to mark diverse politeness relations. So for compensation of paucity of linguistic forms, speakers of English, especially when their interlocutors are users of *lingua franca* English, have to be highly sensitive to the cross-cultural system of politeness meanings and use adequate vocabulary, forms of speech acts and general rhetorical devices to implement it.

4. Politeness schema

We propose a schema covering major types of "politeness". This schema incorporates two independent parameters of "politeness": a system of possible hierarchies between the interlocutors, and a system of the components of discourse in relation to whom hierarchical relations can be marked. The first parameter is much discussed within the area of social interaction, the second parameter was formulated by a linguist (Xolodovich 1979) in connection with study of grammatical encoding of respectivity in Japanese.

4.1. Hierarchies

The semantic components forming hierarchies which investigators have identified can be generalized as a system of oppositions between equality of status (solidarity) and inequality of status (hierarchy/ power). Equality, in its turn, is represented by two subtypes — "intimate" equality and "deferent" equality. Inequality is represented by the opposition dominant (high) status — subordinate (low) status. Further, intimate equality in its turn also has subtypes: equality in high status, equality on non-marked (neutral) status and equality in low status.

Though this scheme as a semantic generalization is universal (though quite possibly not fully realized in a particular language), and not complicated in itself, its implementation in the practice of discourse is not straightforward. There are at least three domains of difficulties in intercultural communication: standards for projecting the mentioned relations to particular cases, the number of oppositions which need to be distinguished, and ways of encoding the proper relations.

The boundaries between these types and subtypes of respectivity differ cross-culturally. Only in some cases do they seem to work universally: e.g. intimate equality covering relations between close friends or persons who have known one another since childhood; deferent equality covering relations between colleagues or partners; dominant status of a higher officer in the military, police, corporate structure, etc., as compared to the subordinate status of a junior officer or a private. More often the boundaries differ: e.g. if in contemporary western cultures spouses can be characterized as intimate equals, it was not so up to the 20th century, when relations between spouses represented either inequality or deference equality, which quite definitely was marked in linguistic forms (names of address, or address pronouns). In contemporary non-western societies it is still a norm. In a Russian university relations of professors and students are definitely interpreted as neutral hierarchical: a student can address a professor using only a name with a patronymic, but the professor addresses the students, either by the first name or by a surname; the same pattern is used in business hierarchies,. In the North American context the situation is different: it is noticeably shifting to deferent equality—both sides often use as an address form either first names or Mr/Ms. More so, in the climate of looking at the university as a market place, where students are buying services provided by professors, the students often exercise the right of dominance: they can express their feelings towards the professors' performance in hardly polite ways. In many cultures parent-children opposition is interpreted as a case of inequality. Conflicts with children in modern western societies are based on the attempts of parents to exercise this very pattern (which children refuse to accept), whereas children are prone to shift to marking the relationship as intimate equality, which parents refuse to accept. A satisfactory balance can evidently be achieved by exercising strategies of deferent equality.

Besides difference in boundaries, cultures differ from one another in the number of oppositions from this scheme which obligatorily need to be distinguished. Cultures with egalitarian ideologies seem to neutralize these oppositions more, especially the hierarchical inequality oppositions, whereas more traditional cultures are highly conscious of expressing the spectrum of hierarchical oppositions.

Mechanisms of encoding these relations are very different in different languages; one cannot figure them out but must know them. But in using a *lingua franca* it is impossible to be "polite" without knowing which opposition must be encoded in a special way and what available linguistic forms are proper for doing this.

4.2 Components of discourse sensitive to politeness application

Generally when we think of politeness strategies, we think first of all about addressing the interlocutor, which in neutral English is represented by cases like:

A journalist to Bill Clinton:

-Mr. President, what are your plans concerning international communication? (Bill/ *Clinton, /*Billy, dear, etc)*

But, in reality the system of reference is much wider. As is discussed in (Xolodivich 1979) in an analysis of Japanese forms, in typical dialogue situations there can be singled out at least four types of sensitive components.

If we take the message :

John (A) told Johanna (B) that Sam (C) wrote a letter to Samantha (D)

and accept only the position of the speaker, there can be potentially identified four relationships:

- 1) hierarchical relations between A and B:
- 2) hierarchical relations between A and C
- 3) hierarchical relations between A and D
- 4) hierarchical relations between C and D

The important consequence of this multiplicity is that the scope of politeness as a semantic category is quite broad. European languages grammaticize generally only the first type of relations, expressing it by means of address forms, but they are nevertheless not deaf to other relations as well, normally encoding them by choice of vocabulary and discursal devices. For example, compare the following pairs of sentences, where the first is expressing neutral deferent relations and the second power relations of inequality:

A-B relations:

John told Johanna... -- John snapped at Joanna...; Honorable John D. informed Johanna...

A-C :

John told Johanna that Sam... -- John told Johanna, that her precious Sam/ this idiot Sam ...

A-D:

John told Johanna that Sam wrote a letter to that crazy lady.

D-C:

John told Johanna that Sam in his letter ordered Johanna to leave immediately.

4.3 The schema

The combination of the two parameters—hierarchy and scope—gives rise to the following calculus of 16 possibilities:

Scope	A-B	A-C	A-D	D-C
Hierarchies				
equality close				
equality deferent				
inequality (dominant)				
inequality (subordinate)				

In direct discourse the major burden of politeness strategies falls on the A (speaker)—B (addressee) fragment. It includes, correspondingly, two types of verbal strategies of references: self-reference and reference of the addressee. Investigations in this area show that both types of references are specifically marked by the choice of rhetorical devices within different types of discourse. As is described in (Cecchetto and Stroinska 1996) on the material of academic discourse, there is a whole set of rhetorical forms preferable in different contexts. In academic discourse one of the strategies of politeness consists of avoiding direct reference to oneself, that is use of the first person singular "I". So active constructions are usually replaced by passive, impersonal, or some modal constructions. North American discourse in this respect differs from European discourse, since it permits direct reference like *I assume*, instead of *It is assumed*, *It can be assumed*, *One can assume*.

Thus even the approximate calculus of possible scope of politeness and the relations between the members of discourse shows the complexity of the area of politeness and the number of *faux pas* which are threatening establishment of the proper facework, especially in intercultural communication.

5. Rhetorical patterns as expression of politeness strategies

Though proper choice of grammatical and lexical forms is very important, an even heavier burden of establishing facework falls on the proper choice of rhetorical strategies of discourse. They reflect in what way the pragmatic role "topic of discourse" is introduced. The topic in this context is understood as the formulation of the speaker's personal opinion.

There are two patterns for introducing it. One is a topic (conclusion)—motivation (premises) sequence, a so-called deductive strategy. The second pattern is a motivation—topic sequence, an inductive strategy. Scollon &

Wong Scollon (1995) in their investigation of intercultural professional discourse (Americans and Taiwanese Chinese, both using English) claim that a culturally typical strategy of North Americans is topic-motivation, and of Asians motivation-topic. These differences in cultural preferences can lead to two types of misunderstanding.

The first one is cognitive. Americans expect that the crucial part of message (the actual proposal) will be in the very beginning of the individual's speech. They are usually frustrated at not finding it there, and interpret the message as intentionally vague (if not highly unprofessional), intended to discourage a quick progress of negotiations, or simply as reflecting professional inability to deal with the situation discussed. Asians, on the contrary, expecting to hear the most important part of message at the end of the speech, can not only miss the point, but can interpret the last part of the speech (which in an American's speech is just polite finalization, like *It was very nice to meet you, we should have lunch together*) as the crucial content of communication. Consequently, not receiving an invitation for lunch in the next couple of days, he assumes that the American was insincere, and does not want to go on with the negotiations.

The second source of misunderstanding is due to the respectivity marked by the rhetorical patterns *per se*. Each rhetorical pattern is ambiguous. The inductive pattern marks two very different relations of hierarchy: a) the interlocutors are equal, deferent and independent; or b) the interlocutors are unequal, and the inductive pattern belongs to the subordinate interlocutor. Thus the inductive pattern marks a "strategy of independence" of remote equals and a "strategy of forced involvement" of the dependent. The deductive pattern also has two meanings: it marks a) a "strategy of independent involvement" used by close equals, and b) a "strategy of authoritarian involvement", used by a person of higher hierarchical status.

Let us consider how these rhetorical patterns are implemented in discourse.

1) Equal and deferent interlocutors demonstrate:

- a politeness strategy of *independence* marking equality of the interlocutors
- an *inductive* rhetorical pattern marking the fact that personal conclusions are not imposed on the hearer, but proposed by way of persuasion
- indirect introduction* of a topic: the conclusion is preceded by its justification, or is not directly stated at all, but arises from the discourse
- timing of introduction of the topic *postponed* during a long preliminary discourse, which often includes several turns
- long pauses* to allow the interlocutors to express their own attitude to the discussed material.

2) Equal and close interlocutors demonstrate:

- a politeness strategy of *involvement* (solidarity) marking the close equality of interlocutors who are confident of their mutual equal status
- a *deductive* rhetorical pattern marking the absence of a prohibition to express one's personal opinion for very close interlocutors
- direct introduction* of the topic, possibly introducing several topics at a time (one per interlocutor), preceding the explanation
- quick introduction* of the topic(s)
- short pauses*, with no prohibition on taking turns chaotically.

3) In hierarchical relations between interlocutors, the speaker with dominant inequality demonstrates:

- a politeness strategy of *authoritarian involvement* (the listener is forced by his subordinate position to listen and agree)
- a *deductive* rhetorical pattern (the speaker feels his full right to express his opinion and expects its acceptance from the hearer)
- direct introduction* of the topic without any preliminaries
- quick timing* (the topic sounds like an order)
- very short pauses* (the speaker actually does not expect discussion of his position)

4) In hierarchical relations between interlocutors, the speaker with subordinate inequality demonstrates:

- a politeness strategy of *involvement* marking expected subordination
- inductive* rhetorical pattern
- avoiding introduction* of the topic
- delayed timing*, if a topic is introduced

Thus, when an interlocutor in an intercultural discourse starts with a deductive strategy (and this type is a cultural norm for Americans), it sounds like promoting dominance of the speaker over the interlocutor, because the second interpretation as "close equality" cannot be admitted in professional negotiations. On the other hand, if there is no prior information about the hierarchy of the participants, to start with the inductive pattern gives way to two possibilities of interpretation from the point of view of respectivity: either the mutual deference of equals, or the speaker's acknowledgement of his subordinate status. After that there must follow a stage of confirmation of the choice. B can accept the inductive strategy, and then there is no conflict of facework. Or B can shift to a deductive strategy (introducing the topic), and here appears the conflict of facework, in case A intended only to be polite (using the inductive pattern culturally characteristic of Asians) but not to demonstrate his subordinate position.

All types of conflicts due to possible misinterpretations can be avoided if the parties are aware of the cultural differences and so do not jump to hostile interpretations. Understanding the politeness meanings of deductive and inductive patterns is crucial in intercultural discourse.

6. Conclusion

Intercultural discourse (especially that connected with usage of a *lingua franca*) adds a new dimension - facework (establishing of politeness strategies)—to the theory and practice of argumentation from a number of perspectives: its specificity as compared to ordinary argumentational discourse, the interpretation of the concept of incommensurability, and the conduct of international negotiations.

Politeness systems encoded within different cultures are not chaotic unpredictable entities. Linguistically (and consequently cognitively) they represent a highly generalised universal system. This system can be adopted by interlocutors and used in practical discourse. Politeness expressions are governed by two sets of linguistic components—language forms and discourse patterns. The choice of proper language forms and of proper rhetorical strategies forms a special dimension of argumentative strategies. The politeness-relevant packaging of discourse adds a zero-step to the stages of an argumentative discussion, where interlocutors establish their

hierarchical relations, and the permanent alignment of these relations, by using correct language forms and strategies.

Bibliography

Cecchetto, Vittorina, and Magda Stroinska. "Systems of Self-reference and Address Forms in Intellectual Discourse." *Language Sciences* . (1996) Vol 18, Nos.3-4, 777-789.

Dolinina, Inga B., and Vittorina Cecchetto. (in preparation). "Discourse, Respectivity, Stereotypes." Paper presented at IILA, Helsinki, August 1996.

Hart, Joy, Willihnganz, Shirley and Charles Arthur Willard. "When Argument Fails: How Organizations Deal with Incommensurabilities." In *Special Fields and Cases. Proceedings of the Third ISSA Conference on Argumentation (University of Amsterdam, June 21-24, 1994)*. Vol IV. Eds. Frans H. van Eemeren *et al.* Amsterdam: Sic Sat. (1995): 565-578

Jackson, Sally and Scott Jacobs. "The Conversational Approach to Critical Thinking". In *AILACT - ISSA Program, XVIII World Congress of Philosophy, Brighton, August 21, 1988*.

Scollon, Ron and Suzanne Wong Scollon. *Intercultural Communication*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.

Xolodovich, A. A. *Issues of Grammatical Theory* (Chapter: Category of respectivity).Leningrad: Nauka, 1979 (in Russian).

View Index of Papers and Commentaries
Return to Main Menu