

Pragmatic Analysis of Negative Politeness in Two Selected Interviews in BBC's Program "Hard Talk"

Key words:

Face; Interviews; pragmatics; politeness; negative politeness;
positive politeness

Instructor: Amal Ahmed Hamza

Department of Translation

College of Arts

Al-Mustansiriya University

October ,2014

تحليل تداولي للتأدب السلبي لاثنتين من المقابلات
التلفزيونية المختارة من برنامج ((هارد توك))
الذي تعرضه قناة بي بي سي البريطانية

الكلمات الافتتاحية:-

وجه، مقابلات ،تداولية، تأدب ، تأدب سلبي، تأدب ايجابي

م. أمال احمد حمزة

قسم الترجمة

كلية الاداب

الجامعة المستنصرية

تشرين الاول ٢٠١٤

Abstract

This research examines negative politeness strategies in two interviews of BBC's program "*Hard Talk*". Employing Brown and Levinson's theory (1987) , this research attempts to reveal that these strategies are effective linguistic devices which can attenuate the propositional content of the message by lowering the authoritativeness and definitiveness of the utterance and by singling respect to interviewee's privacy. Using negative politeness strategies gives *Hard Talk*'s interviewers a chance to guarantee a smooth and communicative interlocution ,and gives the audience the needed benefit achieved by such informative interlocution away from any provocation.

The analysis of two randomly selected interviews shows that these strategies enable the interviewer to avoid any friction with the interviewee by keeping social distance and by paying respect or deference. Consequently, a successful and informative interview is achieved which can make the audience feel relaxed, getting the information looked for .

الخلاصة

تبحث الدراسة الحالية في آليات التأدب السلبي في حوارين تلفزيونيين لبرنامج "هارد توك" Hard Talk الذي تعرضه قناة بي بي سي التلفزيونية. لقد حاولت الدراسة الحالية ومن خلال إتباعها لنظرية (براون و ليفنسن ١٩٨٧) ان تثبت ان هذه الآليات هي وسائل لغوية فعالة يمكنها ان تقلل من حدة المحتوى الافتراضي للرسالة الخطابية وذلك بتقليل الحالة الرسمية الواثقة والجازمة للتعبير الكلامي ومن خلال إظهار الاحترام لرأي و خصوصية الشخص الذي يتم التحاور معه .

أن استخدام آليات التأدب السلبي تعطي لمن يجري الحوار في هذا البرنامج الفرصة لن يضمنوا حوارا تواصليا هادئا يحصل من خلاله المتلقي على الفائدة المتوخاة من هكذا حوارات بالحصول على المعلومة المفيدة بعيدا عن اثاره الغضب والاستياء. أن تحليل اثنين من هذه الحوارات والتي اختيرت قد اظهر ان هذه الأساليب اللغوية تمكن المحاور من تجنب اي صدام مع الشخص الذي يتم اجراء الحوار معه وذلك من خلال الاحتفاظ بالمسافة الاجتماعية بينهما ومن خلال إظهار الاحترام والاكثرات للرأي المقابل ، الأمر الذي يؤدي الى حوار ناجح مفيد يخلق لدى المتلقي شعورا بالارتياح وقد حصل على المعلومة المطلوبة.

1. Theoretical Framework of the Research

In recent years, it is observed that there is reliance of some satellite channels on talk shows where the interviewers use language of provocation with the guest, who, in return, does his best to defend his views and ideas even if they were incorrect or illogical just to prove that he/she is right and just to show his/her disagreement. At the end of such interviews, the audience (receivers) eventually come out nervous, filled with an amount of information that cannot be relied on because it stems from a source which is purely defensive and can not be regarded as an admission of reality. On the other side, the programs where the interviewers use styles of interlocution modified with polite strategies create an atmosphere which encourage the interviewee to give the correct information without having to recourse to hide or falsify the truth. Consequently, at the end of the interlocution the audience feel relaxed, getting the information looked for.

The current research tries to prove that negative politeness strategies and tactics used by the "*Hard Talk's*" interlocutors enable them to handle successful interviews since such strategies stimulate the interviewee to cooperate with his interlocutor and encourage him/her to give as much accurate information as possible. Therefore, the audience gets the desired benefit from this program.

It is hypothesized that using negative politeness strategies in TV interviews can achieve a smooth informative interlocution away from friction, giving the interviewer the means to handle a successful interview and encouraging the interviewee to be cooperative and communicative. The purpose of this study is to illustrate the use of negative politeness in BBC's program "*Hard Talk*" and to show how the interviewers make use of this strategy in order to get the necessary information from the interlocutor by making the conversation move smoothly without any friction.

Brown and Levinson (1987) view politeness essentially as a complex system for softening Face Threatening Acts (FTA) .This approach is found the most suitable for investigating politeness behavior in negotiation interaction because it acknowledges conflict, especially in Face Threatening Acts. This model which is so detailed and comprehensive has been followed in the present study. To investigate negative politeness strategies in interviews and their effect in the course of interlocution, two interviews from the BBC's program "*Hard Talk*" presented by different interviewers have been selected randomly.

2. Introduction

Language is the main tool people use in order to communicate . Whenever we speak or write, a verbal communication is achieved which is 'dialogic' in its nature, because speaking or writing is always referring to, or taking up in some way, what has been said/written before, and simultaneously anticipating the responses of actual, potential or imagined readers/listeners.(see Whatts,R.:2003). Accordingly, some researchers consider any verbal communication a dialogue. As Volosinov state:

Dialogue....can also be understood in a broader sense, meaning not only direct, face-to-face, vocalized verbal communication of any type whatsoever. A book,i.e., a verbal performance in print, is also an element of verbal communication ...[it] inevitably orients itself with respect to previous performances in the same sphere....Thus the printed verbal performance engage as it were, in ideological colloquy of a large scale; it responds to something, affairs something, anticipates possible responses and objections, seeks support, and so on. (Volosinove,1995:139)

As such, social interaction is a type of dialogue which can be achieved either by using direct verbal communication, reading, writing a text, or listening /watching something through the media. However, this interaction, whether face-to-face or electronic media , will confront friction in certain situations, when people from different cultural backgrounds and with unfamiliar communicative styles need to communicate . In order to achieve smooth communication and to transmit information effectively without any friction , people try to use certain linguistic or pragmatic strategies that help to give better understanding between participants and to

provide insights into person to person social interactions. This phenomenon is called **linguistic politeness** which is not something human beings are borne with, but something which is acquired through a process of socialization. Therefore, it is not a natural phenomenon which existed before mankind but one which has been socially and historically constructed. (see Brown and Levinson 1978 ;Fraser 1990; Reiter 2000).

3. What is meant by the term "*politeness*"?

To be polite means to behave in a manner that makes a person look tactful, deferent, or indirect. It also means to be a considerate conversational partner. Politeness is the way people preserve harmony by showing good intentions and consideration for the feelings of others. (Cutting, 2002:51) Politeness will create comfort and harmony between the speaker and the hearer. It is a very important aspect of human social interaction for it is affecting linguistic and other social behaviors. If the speaker wants to get something done from the hearer he must be polite to him/her, unless he will impede the hearer's wants or lose his face which is the public self image. (Hickey and Miranda, 2005:128)

Various disciplines have studied this term differently, each one tackling it from its own point of view. Originally, the term "polished" is used instead of "polite" in reference to forms of social behavior and during the sixteenth century sections of people preferred to use other terms instead of 'polite/politeness' such as ('good manner', 'civil', 'courtesy', 'virtues', 'good nature') and the other part preferred the terms 'gentleman', 'nobility', etc. (Watts, 2003:36) Francis (1992:63) illustrates that the ideology of politeness lay at the heart of court society and politics in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. France enforced codes of behavior on countries, which led them to subordinate themselves to an increasingly centralized political system "Politeness was thus instrumental in creating a strictly hierarchal and elitist social structure, and it was used as a means of enforcing social differences, in this sense, it did indeed become a highly efficient way of 'policing' society" (Watts, 2003:33)

In the eighteenth century, politeness meant not just etiquette, but it meant a matter of civilization. It measured the distance a person or community had from 'savagery' (McIntosh, 1998:160).

Bellegarde (1985) considers politeness an "ideological concept" and has given the following identifications for this term:

1. politeness is the ideal union between the characters of an individual's uses.
2. politeness is the ability to please others through one's external actions (e.g. through one's language usage).
3. politeness is the natural attribute of a "good character"
4. politeness is a socially acquired state of mind.

Lakoff (1975:45) defines it as "forms of behavior that have been "developed in societies in order to reduce friction in personal interaction"

According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 65ff) , politeness is a form of behavior that allows communication to take place between potentially aggressive partners. Holmes (1995:5) argues, "being polite means expressing respect toward the persons you are talking to and avoiding offending them" F. Yule (1996:60) defines politeness: "politeness, in an interaction , can then be defined as means employed to show awareness of another person's face."

4. What is Meant by "*Linguistic Politeness*"?

The best way which people can use in order to interact with each other is language, especially in the form of '*verbal communication*' since it influences conversations between individuals and shapes their interpersonal relationships. Accordingly, "*linguistic politeness*" refers to the mechanism that is used to evaluate the utterance of a speaker as being polite, impolite, tactful, generous, and modest. In this mechanism, many lexical and syntactical elements are used to modify a proposition of an utterance such as: *hedging, modality, polite lying, use of euphemism, and use of tag questions, etc.* This mechanism consists of general maxims which differ from culture to culture within a social interaction. Awareness of these maxims is very necessary when the participants of interaction are of different social background. (Leech, G.2007:170)

The main concept in linguistic politeness is *face* which represents a person's public self –image. The concept *face* is considered as the respect

that people have for each other; it is "something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction." (Brown and Levinson, 1987:66). They distinguish between *positive face* which is the desire to gain the approval of others and the need to be connected and to be a member of a group and *negative face* which is the need to be independent and to have freedom from imposition (see Yule: 1996; Mills:2003;and Vilkki:2007)

Showing awareness of someone's face can be either socially close or distant. When talking to a person that is socially distant, a stranger for example, this awareness marks respect or deference whereas by talking to a person who is socially close, like a friend, it marks friendliness or solidarity. Every participant in an interaction expects the other to respect one's own face wants. If this is not the case, face will suffer from threat, i.e., certain acts run contrary to the face wants of the addressee and /or of the speaker. (Narloch:2005) These acts which cause this type of threatening are called *Face Acts* and are divided into two types:

1. **Face-Threatening Acts (FTA)**
2. **Face-Saving Acts.(FSA)**

1. **Face –Threatening Acts (FTA):**

Those acts which are performed in an interaction when a hearer is not received respect to his/her own face/wants and consequently his/her face is threatened ,e.g.: (Give me that paper!). Brown and Levinson (1987: 67) distinguish between two types of these acts: those that threaten negative face, that is, the hearer's desire not to be impeded upon and to have freedom of action, and those which threaten positive face, i.e., the hearer's desire to be liked and approved of.

2.**Face-Saving Acts (FSA):**

Those acts which are performed in an interaction by a speaker to lessen or avoid a threat by showing respect to the hearer's face (wants) and removing the assumption of social power. These acts are divided into two types: 1. acts which emphasize a person's negative face by showing concern about imposition (*I'm sorry to bother you....,I know you are busy, but....*). 2. acts which emphasize a person's positive face by showing solidarity (*Let's do that together.....*). (see Yule,1996: 61)

5. What Makes an Interlocutor Choose Negative or Positive Politeness?

5.1. Negative Politeness:

In an interlocution, it is important to make the communication move smoothly by avoiding or minimizing "**Face-Threatening Acts**" (FTA) and by assuming that you or your opponent in a conversation may be imposing some restriction on the other, intruding on their social space. This situation is called **negative politeness** because it saves the interlocutor's **negative face**, i.e., it adheres to or 'respects' his/her rights and privileges. It presumes that the speaker will be imposing on the listener and there is a higher potential for embarrassment than in positive politeness. (Arundale;2006:164)

The following are some of the methods which can be used to achieve negative politeness:

- ❖ Using apologetic language, self-criticism, various variants of asking for forgiveness:
e.g.: (*sorry to bother you, but...*), "*I wonder if you could...*", "*you must forgive me but....*", "*I know you love roses but the florist didn't have more. I brought you geraniums instead*", in stronger form: "*Sorry, I didn't live up to your expectations....*", "*It's typical of me....*", "*I feel so stupid....*", "*I don't know what I was thinking*"
- ❖ Avoiding usage of the first name, insisting on usage of honorific terms like: "*Dr.*", "*Mr.*", "*Mrs.*" etc.
- ❖ Pluralizing the person responsible, i.e., use of plural pronouns, usage of inclusive terms : "*We forgot to tell you that you need to get your plane ticket*".
- ❖ Indication of awareness and concern for the hearer's positive self-image (*I hope you don't think me rude, but your tie is hideous*)
- ❖ Suggesting instead of coercing, minimizing imposition, showing deference and regard for territory : "*if you don't object...*", "*Won't you mind if I help myself to a beer*", "*I just want to ask you if I could use your computer?*", "*You don't have any objections to me helping myself to a bit of cake*"
- ❖ Using hedges : "*I think/believe/ think that.....*", "*As you know.....*", "*It's well known.....*", "*You and I both know...*"

- ❖ Using indirect request: "*Would not you mind if we shut the door?*" instead of "*please, shut the door.*" "*I'm looking for a comb.*" instead of "*where is my comb?*"
- ❖ Using hints: "*It's warm here*" instead of "*Shut the door*", "*That knife is sort of chews bread*" instead of "*please, sharpen the knife*"
- ❖ Being pessimistic:
"*You couldn't find your way to lending me a thousand dollars, could you?*"
- ❖ Using obviating structures, like **nominalizations**, **passives**, or **statements of general rules**:
"*Visitors sign the ledger.*"
"*I hope offense will not be taken.*"
"*Spitting will not be tolerated*"

5.2. Positive Politeness:

When a speaker in an interlocution wants to be accepted and connected to a group ;seeking to minimize the threat to the hearer's positive face, he/she tries to make the addressee feel good by performing **Face-Saving Acts** (FSA).These strategies are most usually used in situations where the two partners in an interlocution know each other fairly well (see Foley:1997). The following are some of the methods which can be used to achieve positive politeness. The examples are taken from Brown and Levinson (1987):

- ❖ Using solidarity in –group identity markers:
Hey ,mate, can you lend me a dollar?
- ❖ Avoiding disagreement:
Yes, it's rather long; not short certainly.
- ❖ Including both speaker and hearer in activity:
If we help each other, I guess, we'll both sink or swim in this course.
- ❖ Making an offer or promise:
If you wash the dishes, I'll vacuum the floor.
- ❖ Joking:
Wow, that's a whopper!
- ❖ Using compliment:
That's a nice haircut you got, where did you get it?
- ❖ Being optimistic:
I'll just come along, if you don't mind.

6. A Pragmatic Analysis of Negative Politeness Strategies in Two Interviews of *Hard Talk's* Program

6.1. The First Interview: Zeinab Badawi's Interview with Welshman Ncube.

Zeinab Badawi, the interviewer, holds an interview with Welshman Ncube, the Zimbabwean Industry and Commerce Minister on September 18th, 2012. He was part of the opposition, led by its main leader Morgan Tsvangirai, who became leader Morgan Tsvangirai, and held the position of the prime minister after 2008 elections. Nevertheless, Ncube splits the opposition ahead of election by leading breakaway faction against his prime minister, Tsvangirai.

In this interview, the interviewer, Zeinab Badawi, tries to reveal to her audience get the truth of this breakaway faction and to show whether the interviewee, Ncube, is right or wrong in his excuses. She wants to show if the opposition politicians in Zimbabwe have learnt the lessons of the violence and disputed elections of 2008 in which Robert Mugabe and his party Zanu PF outmaneuvered the Movement for Democratic Change and held on to power. To reach this target, the interviewer should guarantee a smooth interlocution with less tension and politeness strategies are the method which enable her to reach this aim.

The first and most frequent strategy used is hedges which are used 30 times. Thus, the first sentence of the interview has a hedge device, namely downgrader, represented by the word "*just*". From the very beginning, the interviewer would like to guarantee a smooth introduction with informative real answers. Since the interviewer has insufficient knowledge of the truth of the breakaway faction led by Zeinab Badawi, this hedging device serves as a form of self protection. Let us consider the following two extracts:

Zeinab Badawi " *It's a general rule in politics, isn't it? not just in Zimbabwe: weaken the opposition by splitting it. That's what you've done.*"

Welshman Ncube: " *Well, it is of course correct that if the parties that are opposed to Zanu PF it would be that much easier to win the elections than when we are fighting from our different corners.*"

It is clear that the interviewer prefers to put her wondering in the form of statement rather than in the form of a direct question, decorating it with three negative politeness strategies: obviating device in the expression "*It's*

a general rule", hedges in the word "*just*", and passivization in the expression "*weaken the opposition by splitting it*". These devices attenuate the imposition of the utterance and guarantee the cooperation of the interviewee as it is obvious from Welshman Ncube 's answers in which he agrees with what the interviewer says and confirms her information. The two expressions in his reply "*of course*", and "*correct*" are good evidences.

After minimizing the imposition of her previous questions, the interviewer feels that the interlocution is under control and now it is appropriate to change her style a little bit for the purpose of variation and to be sure of his truthfulness. Thus, she suddenly surprises her partner with a face –threatening act when she asks him a personal direct question:

"Are you equating Morgangan Tsvangirai, the prime minister, with President Robert Mugabe who has been in power for 32 years?"

The interviewee feels that his face is threatened and therefore he defends himself by disagreeing with her opinion. As such, his answer comes clear and direct:

"I'm not equating anyone....."

Feeling that tension begins to creep into the interview, Badwai prefers to interrupt his defense. Her interruption is modified by two politeness strategies, namely :hedges in the two expressions "*a little bit*" and "*just*" , and the plural of the pronoun "*us*". By doing so, she takes all responsibility off the interviewee in order to make the interlocution go back to its smooth movement:

"So which colleagues are you talking about here because you are being a little bit indirect. Just spell it out for us. Are you accusing the MDC faction led by Prime Minister Morgan Tsvangirai of waging some kind of campaign against your faction?"

It is noticed from the above quotation that the interviewer's clear and direct question comes after two sentences modified with politeness strategies mentioned previously. This method provides her with the means to take a stance towards his opinion , casting credibility and objectivity on her speech which consequently leads her to get from her guest a direct and clear answer:

"No, I'm saying the things which divide us ,the things which divide us a the time of the split are essentially to do with the things I'm talking about....."

Varying politeness strategies without sticking to just one type creates an interesting and easygoing interlocution. The following devices have been used, each for its own purposes:

❖ suggestion

- a. to minimize the imposition of the utterance, as in the following:

"Let me just fill people in of course that the MDC split back in 2005 when Morgan Tsvangirai didn't want to contest the [senate] elections."

"let's face it that was from a very low base, things are going backwards now."

- b. to show deference

"Let me remind you.."

"But let me ask you..."

❖ passivization

- a. to obviate the direct assessment of the interviewee's speech

"Are you accusing the MDC faction led by Prime Minister Morgan Tsvangirai"

"..but there was a breakaway faction led by Arthur Mutambara.."

- b. to cast credibility on the speaker's speech

"...there is a lavish praise heaped upon Morgan Tsvangirai by various international figures..."

"...eventhough progress has been made..."

"But these elections, no date, they should be held by June..."

❖ pluralization

- To show inclusion and solidarity:

"we disagree with it..."

"When we look at the Global Political Agreement....and we saw what the French called "cohabitation""

❖ modals

They provide the means for the interviewer to take a stance towards the point of view of the interviewee and thereby to show respect to it:

"we must all be clear and united in that the alternative government we want to establish will in fact, not just in deeds, will in fact be different from Zanu PF government."

"...that government will be different from Zanu PF.."

"When we say we must be non-violent we must mean it and we must live it."

"I would like clear answer..."

"I will just economy since you have raised it"

"...any benefits will trickle do WELSHMAN NUCBE.."

"...the army would not the MD..."

"...he will not contest elections.."

❖ Indirect Request

They attenuate the ranking of imposition:

"I would like a clear answer.."

❖ Hints

They show awareness of the interviewer's face :

"But have you achieved that? You are the minister far commerce and industry, trade and so on and you look at Zimbabwe and the state of the people, one and half million people on the verge of starvation according to the United Nations World Food Program , or will need food assistance rather."

❖ Being pessimistic

To show the point of view tactfully:

"But you are stating quite clearly that has been a failure, not only because of the difficulties with Robert Mugabe, but within the MDC itself, it's been a failure."

"It's not just political instability because people don't know when the elections are going to be happening and so on but it is also because of the so-called indigenization policy that came into effect in Zimbabwe in 2011 whereby foreign companies have got to hand over 1 percent of their controlling share to local companies and that has scared a lot of foreign companies."

From the analysis of the interview, it becomes clear that the interlocutor , **Zeinab Badawi** , doesn't use politeness strategies in all sentences. The moment she feels controlling the interlocution, she surprises her guest with a direct question with no mitigating devices. As such, she succeeds in getting a direct answer from her interviewee, as it is obvious in the following excerpts:

Zeinab Badawi : *Are you equating Morgan Tsvangirai the Prime Minister, with President Robert Mugabe who has been in power for 32 years?*

Welshman Ncube: *I'm not equating anyone. I'm simply saying those things that divide us go to the heart of our opposition to Zanu PF.*

Zeinab Badawi : *What have you got against Morgan Tsvangiria ?*

Welshman Ncube: *Absolutely nothing against the person of Morgan Tsvangiria*

Zeinab Badawi : *So what do you answer to that quote "highly divisive and should be taken off the political stage" ?*

Welshman Ncube: *Well, again that's Dell's opinion, as democrats we respect it but we disagree with it.*

Table (1)

Frequencies and Rates of Negative Politeness Devices in Zeinab Badawi's interview.

Negative Politeness Devices	Zeinab Badawi's interview Frequency.	%
Hedges	40	59%
Passivization	8	11%
Suggestion	6	8%
Modal	4	5%
Pluralization	3	4%
Indirect Request	2	2%
Pessimism	2	2%
Quotation	1	1%
Hints	1	1%
Total	67	100

6.2. The Second Interview: Sarah Montague's interview with Steve Keen

Sarah Montague interviewed economist Steve Keen on the BBC's *Hard Talk*, on November 24th, 2011. The topic of the interview is the world economic crisis. He claims that the world expects to face another great depression. Steve Keen is one of the few economists to have predicated the global financial crisis. And while he used to be a lone voice challenging the economic consensus, more and more people are now listening to him. His way of avoiding Depression are: bankrupt the banks, nationalize the financial system and short all over again.

Accordingly, the interviewer has used politeness strategies in order to make her interviewee give her the necessary information which will enable the audience to face the Great Depression. However, she has overused certain strategies such as : *pluralization*, *passivization*, and *modals*. Various purposes are achieved by using these strategies:

1. To take off all the responsibility of the interviewee and to show solidarity. Pluralization is overused and is used 21 times.
2. To show respect for the interviewee's point of view, and to sound factual by mitigating the interviewer's claims through the use of modals.
3. To provide ample support for the interviewer's statements and to sound objective. Passivization is overused.

The interviewer succeeds to get the necessary information from her guest by using one of these devices is hedges which helps to reveal the interviewee's values and beliefs. Let's consider the following examples:

Sarah Montague :*I know you've spoken to those protestors in Sydney. When you think about their anger- it's neither left nor right –but it's certainly not right-wing.*

Steve Keen: *That's right. That's one of the positives to me.*

Using hedges in the expression "*I know*" mitigates the imposition of the utterance and consequently makes the interviewee agree with what has been said and emphasize the truth of her assumption represented by his answer "*That's right....*"

In the following example , the interviewer varies the style of her speech. By beginning with an informative statement, followed by a sentence with a hedging device represented by the verb "*wonder*". Then, she cited a quotation and at the end comes her sudden question. These varied interactional strategies succeeds to achieve effective communication. The interviewee's direct and detailed answer is a good evident for that.

Sarah Montague: *The government*

Steve Keen: We'd have to give

It is also noticed that the interviewer creates a smooth and informative interlocution through the use of other politeness strategies, such as : *hints*, *quotation*, and *pessimism*. *Hints* enable the interviewer sound unsure and indirect and consequently guarantee informative response from the interviewee:

Sarah Montague: *The best we can hope for is a lost two decades?*

Steve Keen : If we leave..

Using quotation presumes impersonality and social distance, a device which indicates deference to the interviewee's negative face.

Sarah Montague: *...You've said, "You should be occupying the economics departments of universities."*

Steve Keen : Yes. Because you don't get into as disastrous a situation as we are in now without extraordinarily bad thinking. And economics departments were the source of that bad thinking.

Pessimism is another negative politeness strategy which enables the interviewer to show her point-of- view tactfully and to assess the interviewee's speech indirectly:

"Your solution is remarkably radical"

"So it's too interconnected to do it in the "

"It's basically, you're rewarding failure"

"Your argument is that actually instability can be a good thing"

In some parts of the interlocution, the interviewer attempts to save the interviewee's positive face (his desire for approval) by emphasizing closeness, intimacy, and commonality. She achieves this aim by using two of the positive politeness strategies namely, compliment and optimism.

Sarah Montague : *You were called a tall poppy for doing so because you were going against the grain.*

Steve Keen: Oh, Yeah.

Sarah Montague: *They {economists} are so wrong and you are so right?*

Steve Keen: They are so wrong and they should know they're so wrong but they don't know their own literature well enough to realize that they are wrong.

Sarah Montague: *We 're going to give all effectively per capital. If you have any debts it has to go to that.*

Steve Keen: That's right, it pay, the debt down first of all.

Table (2) Frequencies and Rates of Negative Politeness Devices in Sarah Motague's interview

Negative Politeness Devices	Sarah Montague's interview Frequency.	%
Pluralization	21	33%
Modal	14	22%
Hedges	12	19%
Passivization	4	6%
Quotation	4	6%
Pessimism	4	6%
Hints	3	4%
Indirect Request	1	1%
Total	63	100

7. Conclusion

Interviews are the best way of understanding a complicated situation and seeing it from someone else's perspective. The present study concludes that a successful and informative interlocution can be achieved through the use of negative politeness strategies. These strategies adhere to an interviewee's rights and privileges, since it saves his self image (negative face).

The analysis of two *Hard Talk*'s interviews which were selected randomly reveals that the interviewers prefer to handle their interlocution in a way that enhances the interviewee to answer directly without hiding or decorating the facts. The interviewers' weapon for doing so is negative politeness which lowers the authoritativeness and definitiveness of the utterance and singles respect to interviewee's privacy.

Using negative politeness strategies give *Hard Talk*'s interviewers a chance to guarantee a smooth and communicative interlocution and give the audience the needed benefit and informative interlocution away from any provocation.

On the whole, many factors influence the ideology of politeness such as time, society, culture and some other social circumstances.

References

1. Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1987). **Politeness: some universals in language usage**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Coulthard, M. (1994). **On Analysis and Evaluating Text. In Advances in Written Text Analysis**, Coulthard, M.(ed.), 1-11.London:Routledge.
3. Cutting, J.(2002).Pragmatics and Discourse: A resource book for students. Routledge: Routledge University Press.
4. Francis, G., and Hunston, S. (1992) **Analyzing Everyday Conversation**. In Coulthard, R. (ed.) *Advances in Spoken Discourse*. London: Rutledge.
5. Fraser, Bruce (1990).**Perspective on Politeness**. Journal of Pragmatics 14 (1990) 219-236 North Holland.
6. Hickey ,Leo and Stewart, Miranda (2005). **Politeness in Europe**. Clevedon :Multilingual al Matters Ltd.
7. G. Eelen (2001). **A Critique of Politeness Theories**.Manchester,UK:St Jerome.
8. Holmes, J. (1995). **Women, Men and Politeness**. New York::Longman.
9. Lakoff, R. (1975). **Language and Woman's Place**. New York: Harper Colophon.
- 10.Leech, Geoffrey. (1993). **The Principles of Pragmatics**. London/New York: Longman.
- 11.Leech.,Geoffrey (2003).**Towards an Anatomy of Politeness in Communication**. International Journal of Pragmatics.V.14. p101-103.
- 12.Leech.,Geoffrey (2007) **Politeness: is there an east-west divide?**.Journal of Politeness Research . 3 (2), 167-206.
- 13.Levinson, S. (1983).**Pragmatics**. Cambridge :Cambridge University Press.
- 14.Mclontosh, Carey(1998). **The Evolution of English Prose, 1700-1800,style,Politeness and Print Culture**.Cambridge :Cambridge University Press.
- 15.Mills, Sara (2003) .Gender and Politeness.Studies in Interactional socio-linguistics 17, Cambridge.

- 16.Reiter R, Marquez (2000). **Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Uruguay**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 17.Vilkki,Liisa,(2007).**Politeness,Face and Facework;Current issues**.A man of Measure, In Festschrift in Honour of Fred Karlsson,Pp 322-332.
- 18.Stubbsm, M.(1996). **Towards a modal grammar of English : A matter of prolonged fieldwork**. In Text and Corpus Analysis, 196-228.Oxford:Blackwell.
- 19.Volosinov, V.N. (1995). **Marxism and the Philosophy of Language** . translated by L Matjka and I.R. Titunik. London: Roulledge.
- 20.Watts, R., Ide, S. and Ehlich, K.,eds. (1992). **Politeness in Language : Studies in its History, Theory and Practice**. Berlin, New York: Mounton de Gruyter.
- 21.Watts,J.(2003)..**Politeness**.Cambridge University Press.
- 22.Yule,George (1996). **Pragmatics**.Oxford: Oxford University Press.