

Summary in Spanish

INFLUENCIA DE LOS FACTORES SITUACIONALES EN LA CODIFICACIÓN E INTERPRETACIÓN DE LA DESCORTESÍA

Marta Albelda Marco

El objetivo de este trabajo es observar si los actos codificados como amenaza a la imagen poseen siempre un efecto descortés, a partir del análisis de diversos factores situacionales. Para ello se han analizado dos corpus de habla del español, cada uno de ellos con diferentes rasgos situacionales, formales e informales.

La teoría de la cortesía de Brown y Levinson (1987 [1978]) explica que si un acto amenazador de la imagen (AAI) se efectúa sin subsanación, se realiza una acción descortés. Sin embargo, siguiendo a autores como Culpeper (1996), Kienpointner (1997), Bernal (2005), existe un falso efecto de descortesía en algunos actos de habla codificados como amenazantes, pero no interpretados como tales en la situación comunicativa concreta. Este tipo de pseudodescortesía ha sido calificado como *mock impoliteness* (Culpeper 1996: 352), *insultos rituales* (Labov 1972, Kienpointner 1997), *anticortesía* –acciones ridiculizadoras e insultos- (Zimmermann 2003: 49; Bernal 2005) o *(des)cortesía interpretada* (Briz 2004). Cada uno de estos autores ha determinado diferentes factores para la aparición de esta pseudocortesía (grupos sociales, edad, sexo). Mi hipótesis es

- a. que los factores situacionales en que se desarrolla una interacción afectan a la interpretación de la cortesía y de la descortesía. De este modo, siguiendo a Briz (2004), se puede hablar de *(des)cortesía codificada* cuando se analiza de modo teórico y de *(des)cortesía interpretada*, cuando se analiza en una situación comunicativa determinada.
- b. a la vez, la cortesía y la descortesía también se analizan de distinto modo según la unidad de estructura conversacional que se tenga en cuenta.

Bases teóricas. Los rasgos situacionales. Descortesía codificada e interpretada

En cuanto a las bases teóricas, el artículo se refiere a: 1. el concepto de *situación comunicativa*, 2. la relación de dependencia de la *(des)cortesía* a la situación comunicativa y 3. la oposición *(des)cortesía codificada/ interpretada*.

Se argumenta que no son equivalentes los conceptos *contexto* y *situación comunicativa*; esta última es un subconjunto de los factores que configuran el contexto. Los rasgos situacionales que se han tenido en cuenta son: +/- *solidaridad entre los interlocutores*, +/- *relación vivencial de proximidad*, +/- *fin interpersonal de la*

interacción, +/- problematicidad temática, +/- marco interaccional cotidiano. Además, se han analizado dos rasgos más: *+/- aceptación lingüística y social del otro* y *+/- pertinencia de ideomas* (el hecho de que la imagen esté más o menos comprometida, en función de los componentes culturales de imagen propios de cada cultura). La descortesía será interpretada de acuerdo con la polaridad de estos parámetros (si son positivos o negativos) y el grado que presenten.

La hipótesis de la influencia que los factores situacionales ejercen en la descortesía se basa en la distinción conceptual trazada por Briz (2004) entre *(des)cortesía codificada/ (des)cortesía interpretada*. La diferencia entre lo codificado y lo interpretado viene dada por el análisis pragmático, el cual incorpora en su base los rasgos situacionales en que tienen lugar los discursos lingüísticos. La cortesía codificada se refiere al hecho de que las intervenciones corteses están parcialmente convencionalizadas en la lengua, en cuanto que “una forma lingüística puede asociarse convencionalmente a una estrategia cortés” (Briz 2004: 72). Así, por ejemplo, en cada lengua y cultura están convencionalizados distintos actos de habla (órdenes, sugerencias, consejos, deseos), el modo de atenuarlos o intensificarlos y los distintos rituales o fórmulas de cortesía (saludos, halagos, manifestaciones de acuerdo o de desacuerdo). Todo ello supone quedarse en el nivel codificado. Sin embargo, cuando se valora ya no un acto aislado, sino integrado en su discurso, es posible que no coincida lo codificado como cortés con lo interpretado. En este nivel, además de lo dicho, se juzgan las reacciones de los interlocutores, las intenciones de los hablantes, las implicaturas conversacionales, etc., factores que a su vez vienen determinados por los rasgos situacionales. De este modo, las formas lingüísticas codificadas se interpretan en los contextos concretos, teniendo en cuenta los rasgos situacionales.

La oposición codificación/ interpretación de la (des)cortesía está fundamentada en una concepción dinámica del discurso, en la que se distinguen diversas unidades estructurales. En cada una de ellas, los fenómenos conversacionales se analizan de distinto modo y pueden dar como resultado, incluso, conclusiones opuestas. De acuerdo con Briz and Val. Es. Co. (2003), el discurso se organiza en torno a unidades en un orden externo y en un orden interno. Dejando a un lado el orden externo, en el interno se distinguen dos unidades monológicas, el *acto* y la *intervención*, y dos unidades dialógicas, el *intercambio* y el *diálogo*. Las unidades monológicas son emisiones de un mismo interlocutor en las que no se considera la relación con los demás; mientras que las dialógicas suponen la presencia alternada de dos o más interlocutores y por tanto, entran a formar parte en el estudio de estas otros elementos extralingüísticos, especialmente los de carácter social. En una intervención comunicativa (unidad monológica) la *cortesía codificada* sería fácilmente identificable por sus características lingüísticas, mientras que en el nivel del intercambio (unidad dialógica) la *cortesía interpretada* es observada mejor, en tanto que la alternancia de intercambios lingüísticos permite mayor dinamismo en lo codificado, "hasta el punto de que lo codificado como cortés deje de serlo, incluso puede llegar a interpretarse como descortés" (Briz 2004).

Corpus

Por un lado, se han analizado dos corpus de habla del español peninsular con parámetros situacionales formales: Un corpus de 24 entrevistas semidirigidas entre

hablantes de nivel sociocultural alto (Gómez Molina (coord.) 2001) y un corpus de 8 conversaciones transaccionales entre el dependiente de una agencia y sus diversos clientes (Contreras 2004: II-XX). Los rasgos situacionales de las entrevistas son: relación de +/- igualdad social entre los interlocutores, relación de desigualdad funcional, relación vivencial de desconocimiento mutuo, marco de interacción no familiar, no cotidiano y temática no especializada. En cuanto a las conversaciones en la agencia de viajes, se caracterizan por una relación de igualdad social entre los interlocutores, relación de desigualdad funcional, relación vivencial de desconocimiento mutuo, marco de interacción no familiar, no cotidiano y temática especializada.

Por otro lado, se ha analizado el corpus de conversaciones coloquiales de Briz and Val.Es.Co (2002), que recoge 19 conversaciones grabadas secretamente en diversas situaciones informales. En este corpus los interlocutores mantienen una relación vivencial de conocimiento mutuo y existe entre ellos una igualdad social y/o funcional, el marco de interacción es familiar o cotidiano y la temática, no especializada.

En cada uno de estos corpus se ha aplicado el análisis de los siguientes rasgos situacionales y sociolingüísticos: 1. relación social de igualdad entre los interlocutores, 2. relación vivencial de proximidad, 3. fin interpersonal, 4. presencia de ideomas de la cultura española (imagen comprometida), 5. problematicidad temática, 6. aceptación, 7. marco interaccional cotidiano, 8. tipo de relación entre los interlocutores y 9. nivel sociocultural. Los resultados aparecen en los cuadros 1 y 2 del artículo. A lo largo del análisis se comentan una serie de muestras extraídas del corpus.

Resultados del análisis en corpus formales

En los dos corpus formales apenas se han encontrado actos de amenaza a la imagen y los que hay poseen poca intensidad en cuanto a la amenaza y, además, se reparan. En el artículo se comentan algunos casos de codificación de actos amenazantes que si no se hubieran reparado se aproximarían a una interpretación descortés.

En el caso de las conversaciones en la agencia de viajes, la presencia de amenazas se reduce a proposiciones formuladas de manera más o menos directa (imperativos, perífrasis de obligación), ligeras objeciones o recriminaciones, desacuerdos y presentación de inconvenientes a las ofertas. En cuanto a las peticiones de información estas se atenúan mediante el uso del tiempo verbal condicional, de justificaciones (*es que, porque*), la expresión de la reducción de importancia de la petición (*sólo quería saber*), etc.

En las entrevistas semidirigidas, los actos de amenaza a la imagen todavía son más escasos y menos intensos que en las conversaciones de la agencia de viajes. Su bajo porcentaje se debe en gran parte a las normas discursivas y sociales que regulan este tipo de discurso y al estrecho margen de dinamismo social e interaccional que permiten (Albelda 2004: 126). Una de tales normas atañe a la conveniencia de mantener la distancia entre los interlocutores, por lo que, en general, se respeta la opinión de los informantes y se evita crear o entrar en conflictos verbales. En el artículo se recogen algunos ejemplos de desacuerdos y discrepancias, que, como se ha dicho, tienden a mitigarse.

A diferencia de los resultados obtenidos en el corpus informal, en ninguna de las intervenciones del corpus formal se documenta la *pseudodescortesía*, por lo que se puede deducir que los factores situacionales no favorecen su realización: lo codificado

como descortés también se interpreta como descortés. En definitiva, los datos muestran que, en situaciones formales, o se es descortés abiertamente - en los dos corpus analizados es muy poco frecuente - o se emite el acto amenazante reparado, esto es, se acude a estrategias de cortesía negativa.

Resultados del análisis en conversaciones informales

En cuanto a las conversaciones coloquiales, el análisis ha sido presentado en el cuadro 2 de forma más detallada, puesto que existe una mayor diversidad de situaciones entre cada una de ellas, a diferencia de lo que ocurre en las interacciones de los dos corpus formales, que son más homogéneos.

La relación existente entre los interlocutores es claramente distinta a la de los corpus formales. En este corpus las relaciones son en general de familia, de amistad y otro tipo de vínculos que crean las relaciones habituales de la vida cotidiana (trabajo, vecindario).

De las 19 conversaciones coloquiales analizadas, no hay problematización temática en todas ellas y, por tanto, no en todas ellas se codifica descortesía. El artículo se detiene en las conversaciones que presentan problematización temática. En algunas dicha problematización es una constante de toda la conversación (H.38.A1, ML.84.A1, RV.114.A1, VC.117.A1), mientras que en otras es un hecho que ocurre en algunas partes de esta (L.15.A1, S.65.A1, AP.80.A1, J.82.A1, MA.341.A1, PG.119.A1).

En las cuatro conversaciones donde la +problematización es constante coinciden también otros dos rasgos: -aceptación lingüística y social del otro y -ideomas (ausencia de compromiso de la imagen). Estos tres rasgos dan cuenta de la presencia de descortesía como factor sustancial de dichas interacciones. Sin embargo, en las conversaciones en que sólo se produce +problematización de manera puntual, sí que hay +aceptación, puesto que se han empleado estrategias de cortesía para evitar riesgos de amenaza a la imagen. Al analizar las diversas conversaciones con mayor profundidad, se observa que el estilo de descortesía es distinto en cada una de ellas.

Las diferencias fundamentales en el terreno de la descortesía entre los dos tipos de corpus analizados residen en una mayor presencia de la descortesía en las conversaciones informales y en tipos de descortesía distintos también en el corpus de registro informal. En este último corpus se pueden distinguir tres modos diferentes de descortesía¹:

- descortesía abierta y no reparada (en términos de Culpeper 1996, *bald on record impoliteness*)
- descortesía reparada (mediante estrategias corteses)
- descortesía fingida (*mock impoliteness*, Culpeper 1996: 352), que en este trabajo se ha denominado *pseudodescortesía*.

En el artículo se ofrecen ejemplos comentados en los que se observa cómo determinados rasgos situacionales informales neutralizan en su interpretación actos de habla codificados como descorteses. A continuación se muestra un ejemplo, en el que la neutralización del posible efecto descortés del acto amenazante se debe especialmente a

¹ Ver también Bernal en este volumen.

la relación de solidaridad entre los interlocutores. Además, existe entre ellos una relación de igualdad funcional y social y el marco de interacción es cotidiano. Se produce un desacuerdo: la hablante A, mujer, emite una valoración negativa de su cuerpo; S, hombre, recrimina esa afirmación mediante una pregunta retórica; A rechaza la recriminación de S y se opone a su evaluación (*¡OY QUE NO!*) y, por último S interviene con otro acto de desacuerdo cercano al insulto (*tú flipas*), increpando a su interlocutora. De nuevo, aunque se codifican como descortesía en el nivel monológico, no se interpreta en esta situación como tal a nivel dialógico; más bien, al contrario, la intención de S es realizar un piropo, valorizar el cuerpo de su interlocutora y, en consecuencia, halagarla:

- J: mira↓ Láser Medicina/ hablando de láser
A: pos eso es lo que necesito yo↓ porque yo tengo el cuerpo to(do) estropeado↓ sí yo no voy mal encaminá (RISAS)
S: ¿tú tienes el cuerpo estropeado?
A: **¡OY QUE NO!**
S: **tú flipas** [AP.80.A1: 852-857]

Conclusiones

El análisis de las conversaciones informales ha mostrado que con frecuencia se desarticula la relación biunívoca entre actos codificados como amenazas y su interpretación como descortesías. En muchas conversaciones los hablantes han realizado AAI a nivel monológico, pero sin que su intención, en el intercambio comunicativo, fuera mostrarse descortés. Esto ocurre fundamentalmente en las situaciones donde hay proximidad social y relación de igualdad, el marco de la interacción es cotidiano y la imagen social no está comprometida (-ideomas). Junto a ello, cabe señalar que en la cultura española la existencia de conflictos no se contradice con que la imagen social sea aceptada y fructífera (Bravo 1999: 169). Se entiende así que en determinadas situaciones la descortesía pueda reforzar la solidaridad y la afiliación al grupo (Leech 1983; Culpeper 1996). Esta es una prueba más para el cuestionamiento de la concepción universal de imagen postulada por Brown y Levinson (1987 [1978]).

En las interacciones de carácter formal, por un lado, no se ha documentado ningún caso de desajuste entre codificación e interpretación de la descortesía; por otro lado, apenas se ha realizado descortesía codificada. El análisis aquí realizado confirma la hipótesis de partida: la ausencia de pseudodescortesía en los corpus formales y su aparición en los informales es una muestra evidente de la determinación que los rasgos situacionales ejercen sobre la interpretación de la descortesía.

Respecto a la pseudodescortesía, se ha explicado por parte de algunos autores como un deseo de ofrecer una actitud antinormativa entre los miembros de un determinado grupo generacional. Sin embargo, como se ha podido observar a lo largo de este estudio, el desajuste entre descortesía codificada e interpretada no se debe sólo a los casos que la literatura sobre el tema ha calificado como *mock impoliteness* y cuya función es fortalecer una identidad dentro de un determinado grupo social (Labov 1972; Culpeper 1996; Zimmermann 2003). Esta pseudodescortesía presenta otras funciones en la cultura hispana peninsular. Por un lado, en ocasiones, su función es facilitar y/o promover la afiliación al grupo, pues determinados actos amenazantes se interpretan como una manifestación de confianza, que nada tiene que ver con una actitud

antinormativa. Por otro lado, se ha observado que ciertos actos codificados como amenazantes realzan la imagen del destinatario. En este sentido, a las características propuestas por Labov (1972) y Zimmermann (2003) para dar cuenta del fenómeno que se ha tratado, habría que añadir los rasgos situacionales informales comentados (Briz y Val.Es.Co. 2002: 18 y ss.): relación vivencial de proximidad entre los hablantes, igualdad social y/o funcional de los interlocutores, marco de interacción cotidiano y temática no especializada.

Por último, se ha demostrado que es pertinente distinguir niveles estructurales en la conversación para estudiar los fenómenos pragmalingüísticos. En este caso, la descortesía ejerce una distinta incidencia en unidades de la conversación monológicas (acto e intervención) y dialógicas (intercambio y diálogo).

INFLUENCE OF SITUATIONAL FACTORS ON THE CODIFICATION AND INTERPRETATION OF IMPOLITENESS²

Marta Albelda Marco

Abstract

By analysing the influence of situational factors, this paper aims to determine if all face-threatening acts indeed have an impolite effect. Two types of peninsular Spanish speech corpora (formal and informal) were examined, each with different situational features. The theoretical maxims applied to this study are based on Briz (2004), who distinguishes between codified (im)politeness and an interpreted (im)politeness. The initial findings reveal that the features of the communicative situation may neutralise the codified impoliteness in certain speech acts. These features include the relation of solidarity between the interlocutors, the subject or topic of the speech, the purpose and the social and common proximity among the speakers, among other things. Such features seem to influence to some extent the interpretation of those acts that conventionally could be considered as impolite. Thus, contrary to the principles generally accepted in Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness (1987), the findings of this analysis indicate that certain situational factors may, on occasion, lead the speakers to be less concerned about minimizing face offences even though this lack of concern does not actually involve damage to the other.

Keywords: Impoliteness; Communicative situation; Face-threatening acts; Spanish oral corpora.

1. Introduction

Brown and Levinson (1987) proposed their theory of politeness to explain the need to redress possible offences to speakers' faces. In this sense, it would be universally accepted that a face threat to the image of the other should be avoided or compensated. If the face-threatening act (FTA) takes place without repair, an impolite action may be carried out. However, as authors like Culpeper (1996), Kienpointner (1997), Zimmermann (2003), Briz (2004) and Bernal (2005) suggest, in some speech acts codified as face-threatening, there is a false effect of impoliteness, but it is not interpreted as such in the specific communicative situation. This pseudo-impoliteness is described as *mock impoliteness* (Culpeper 1996, 2005), *ritual insults* (Labov 1972; Kienpointner 1997), *anti-politeness* – mocking actions and insults- (Zimmermann 2003; Bernal 2005) or *interpreted (im)politeness* (Briz 2004). Following Labov (1972), Culpeper (1996) attributed this pseudo-impoliteness to certain social groups, normally low or marginal sociocultural groups. According to Zimmermann (2003: 57-59), *these groups are formed by young people that are constructing their male gender identity*. Likewise Bernal (2005) claims that this phenomenon is also present in groups of other speakers, not only young people and men.

² The author is grateful to Dr. Debra Westall for revising this manuscript.

My hypothesis is that the situational factors involved in any given conversational interaction influence the interpretation of (im)politeness, which in some cases, will differ from its codification. This hypothesis is based on Briz's proposal (2004), which distinguishes *codified politeness* from *interpreted politeness*, which becomes, in some cases, impoliteness. The difference between *what is codified* and *what is interpreted* comes from a pragmatic analysis of the situational features in which linguistic speech takes place. This pragmatic study requires a non-ethnocentric perspective to analyse social and linguistic politeness. Research into the configuration of face for non-English speakers has focused mainly on cultural factors, such as differences among countries, traditional ways and the like. This paper, however, emphasises the influence of situational features, comparing corpora of contrasting communicative situations and highlighting an aspect of politeness which has yet to be studied in full in the field of Pragmatics: the absence of correlation between *what is said* and *what is interpreted*.

To this end, this paper is divided into two parts. First, I will describe the theoretical framework for this research: 1) what is understood by a communicative situation, 2) how politeness relates to the communicative situation in which it takes place and 3) what is considered codified and interpreted politeness. In the second part of the paper, I will illustrate the validity of my initial hypothesis by contrasting two types of corpora with different situational features, formal and informal. Finally, I hope to be able to determine if these external features can influence the interpretation of impoliteness and can remedy possible impolite outcomes.

2. Theoretical background

2.1. *The communicative situation*

Although frequently used as synonyms, the concepts of *context* and *communicative situation* should first be distinguished. On the one hand, *context* is the sum of all the extralinguistic factors that accompany a statement or a dialogue: Cultural factors, geographic-spatial factors, sociological variables of the speakers (age, sex and sociocultural sector) as well as situational characteristics, that is, the features of the communicative situation (Briz and Val.Es.Co.³ 2002: 18-19). On the other hand, the *communicative situation* or situation of use is a subgroup of all factors that form the context. The communicative situation is thus the extralinguistic component that integrates all the other elements; it is the final subgroup of characteristics that determine the selection of one linguistic form or another (Albelda 2004). Culture determines and restricts linguistic behaviours among speakers; the geographic variety of the language and culture enhance this process of restriction; the sociological variables limit the speakers' linguistic choices even further. Consequently, in a given communicative situation, the speaker will make use of those forms considered appropriate (Briz and Val.Es.Co. 2002: 27; Albelda 2004: 114-115). It is in the specific communicative situation, the final result of all the aforementioned contextual circumstances, that linguistic values truly originate.

³ The research group referred to as Val.Es.Co., *Valencia Español Coloquial*, studies different aspects of colloquial conversation from a corpus of the language spoken in the area of Valencia (Spain).

According to Briz (1998: 41) as well as Briz and Val.Es.Co. (2002: 18), the communicative situation depends on these four situational features:

- 1) the social and functional relationship between the speakers (relationships of power and solidarity)
- 2) the existential relationship of proximity or distance (degree of knowledge and common experience between the interlocutors)
- 3) the interactional framework in which communication takes place (the physical space and the spatial relationship among speakers)
- 4) the subject matter (the topic or content of the discourse).

These situational features determine the degree of formality (more formal or more informal) of the communicative situation.

2.2. *Politeness/impoliteness in informal and formal communicative situations*

The dependent relationships of politeness on the communicative situation have been discussed by Lakoff (1973), Lim and Bowers (1991), Carrasco (1999), Bravo (1993, 1996, 2002), Hernández-Flores (2002 and in this volume), Briz (2003, 2004) Albelda (2004, 2007) and Kaul de Marlangeon (see contribution to this volume) among others. These authors agree that the features of the communicative situation determine the presence of (im)politeness and the value it acquires. Lim and Bowers (1991: 422) pointed out that “as intimacy increases, relational partners have more obligations to cooperate with each other and therefore become more willing to tolerate a certain level of imposition and criticism”. However, this does not mean that the use of polite strategies is less frequent in cases of greater familiarity (Carrasco 1999: 32; Hernández-Flores 2002: 107) nor that a greater degree of privacy necessarily leads to a greater tendency toward impoliteness (Culpeper 1996: 350-351), as confirmed through analyses of colloquial conversations containing *face-flattering acts* (FFAs) (Kerbrat-Orecchioni 1996) and FTAs⁴.

Furthermore, Hernández-Flores (2002) and Albelda (2004) indicated that, as in formal situations, the speaker usually projects his/her image before others in informal situations. Although in private the individual can “relax, take off the mask, leave his/her text and leave his/her character aside” (Goffman 1959), it does not imply that the efforts of the polite behaviour are avoided or that they are exceeded by the impolite ones. Leaving one’s mask aside does not mean that one’s image disappears but rather that one’s image is different, more sincere and authentic, the image without the mask. In informal situations social behaviour standards are also common, but “as they are less strict, the manifestations of politeness are less evident” (Hernández-Flores 2002: 107).

In formal situations there is also politeness as well as impoliteness. Although impoliteness is especially prevalent in political discourse (Blas Arroyo 2001; Bolívar 2003, see Bolívar’s contribution to this volume), potentially impoliteness is evident in other formal situations (Kienpointner 1997). In brief, both politeness and impoliteness appear in formal and informal situations, and this paper will show that there are

⁴ Their analysis shows that politeness is not suspended in familiarity situations, in disagreement with Calsamiglia and Tusón (1999: 163). *Vid.* the criticism by Hernández-Flores (2002: 104).

qualitatively different types of (im)politeness depending on communicative situations (Carrasco 1999: 32).

2.3. *Codified (im)politeness / interpreted (im)politeness*

Impoliteness in each communicative situation may be classified following Briz (2004), as *codified (im)politeness* or *interpreted (im)politeness*, since “polite activity depends on at least two persons” (Briz 2004: 67). Therefore, speech acts can be fully evaluated only if the context is considered. The concept of *codified politeness* refers to the polite interventions which are partially conventionalized or standardized in the language, since “one linguistic form is traditionally related to a specific polite strategy” (Briz 2004: 72). Thus, for example, different speech acts are codified in each language and culture (commands, suggestions, advice, desires), as are the formulas to attenuate or intensify them; different rituals or politeness formulas are also conventionalized (greetings, praise, expressions of agreement or disagreement). All this entails remaining on the codified level. However, when evaluating not just the act itself, but taking into account that it is integrated in the discourse as a whole, we often see that what is codified as polite is not always interpreted as such. At this level, in addition to the above, speakers’ reactions, their individual or group intentions, their conversational participation, for example, are judged since speech behaviour is restricted by a culture and determined by the situational characteristics. Therefore, codified linguistic forms are interpreted in the specific contexts, considering the situational characteristics.

Two other features heighten the influence of the situational characteristics when interpreting (im)politeness (Briz 2004: 79-87): +/- linguistic and social acceptance of the other (agreement/disagreement) and +/- pertinence of ideoms, that is, common cultural components of image for each culture or social group, which implicates the speaker before others⁵. Impoliteness will be interpreted depending on the polarity and the degree of influence of these parameters (if they are positive or negative) and the situational characteristics.

The opposing codification/interpretation of (im)politeness is based on a dynamic conception of speech, one in which different structural units can be identified. In each of them, the conversational phenomena are analysed differently and each may lead to opposing conclusions. According to Briz and Val.Es.Co. (2003), speech is organized around units in external order and internal order. On the external level, the conversation progresses by means of *turns* and *alternation of turns* (Briz and Val.Es.Co. 2003: 14-28). On the internal level, two monological units are apparent, the *act* and the *intervention* (ibid. 31-45), as well as two dialogical units, the *exchange* and the *dialogue* (ibid. 28-30). The monological units are delivered by the same interlocutor without considering the relationship with the others; whereas the dialogical units involve the alternate presence of two or more interlocutors and are therefore included in the study of these other extralinguistic factors, especially those of a social and situational nature. Further, in a communicative intervention, *codified politeness* would be easily identified by its linguistic characteristics (Briz 2004: 71-73), while in an exchange and in a dialogue, *interpreted politeness* could be observed by a higher dynamism of what is codified in the exchange of linguistic forms “to the extent that what is codified as polite

⁵ In Spanish culture, self affirmation and trust (Bravo 1999 and *Introduction* to this volume).

is no longer polite; it can even be interpreted as impolite" (Briz 2004: 72; vid. Bravo 2002: 146).

3. Analysis of impoliteness

The initial hypothesis is applied to a contrastive analysis of formal and informal interactions in three different corpora of peninsular Spanish. On the one hand, two spoken corpora with formal situational parameters were analysed: one of semi-controlled interviews between speakers of a high sociocultural level (Gómez (coord.) 2001) and another of transactional conversations recorded at a travel agency (Contreras 2004: II-XX). On the other hand it is a corpus of colloquial conversations (Briz and Val.Es.Co. 2002). Two formal corpora were selected, in contrast to the single informal corpus, since the transactional purpose of both formal corpora reduces greatly the appearance of (im)politeness and the work of social image. In order to draw valid conclusions, a larger number of samples is certainly needed. The fact that the same conclusions were reached in two different discursive modalities (interviews, conversations) but with the same situational characteristics, however, reinforces the hypothesis that the situational characteristics influence the phenomenon of (im)politeness.

The corpus of interviews contains 24 interviews, elaborated to extract varied and sociolinguistic data from the interviewees. The characteristic situational features are:

- 1) relation of +/- social equality between interlocutors
- 2) relation of functional inequality
- 3) existential relation of mutual lack of knowledge
- 4) nonfamiliar and uncommon framework of interaction
- 5) non specialized subject matter.

The corpus of recordings at the travel agency consists of 8 conversations between an employee and different clients. The situational features include:

- 1) social equality between interlocutors
- 2) relation of functional inequality
- 3) existential relation of mutual lack of knowledge
- 4) nonfamiliar and uncommon framework of interaction
- 5) non specialized subject matter.

The informal corpus consists of 19 conversations, with these situational features:

- 1) the speakers maintain an existential relation of mutual knowledge
- 2) they share a mutual relation of social and functional equality
- 3) the interactional framework is familiar or common
- 4) the subject matter is not specialized.

In order to contrast the different corpora, the situational features were analysed in each as were the linguistic and social +/--acceptance of the other, the +/- pertinence of ideoms and, for the study of manifestations of impoliteness, the presence or absence of

problematic subject matters (Briz 2004: 87). It should be noted that the existing relationship between the interlocutors (roles) and their sociocultural level is also indicated.

3.1. *Analysis of the formal interactions*

The results from the analysis of the two formal corpora are presented together, that is, the total set of interactions of the corpus since their features are similar (Table 1). These features include 1) social equality relation among speakers, 2) existential proximity relation, 3) interpersonal purpose, 4) presence of ideoms of the Spanish culture (compromised image), 5) problematic subject matter, 6) acceptance, 7) common interactional framework, 8) type of relationship between interlocutors and 9) sociocultural level.

CORPUS	Social equality relation	Exis-tencial prox.	Inter-personal purpose	Ide-oms	Problem subject	Accept-ance	Common interactio framework.	Type of relation	Socio-cultural level
Gómez	+ -	-	-	+	-	+	-	Interviewer Interviewee	High
Contreras	+	-	-	+	-	+	-	Employee Client	Average

Table 1. *Situational features of formal interactions*

The data in Table 1 indicate that the communicative situation of the interactions is formal; although the social and functional relation is mainly one of equality, there is no close existential relationship (lack of knowledge between interlocutors and absence of shared experiences), the purpose of the interactions is not interpersonal (socializing) but rather transactional, and the physical space (framework) in which the interaction takes place is not familiar to the speakers. In addition, there is a strong commitment to the image (+ ideoms), which, in turn, involves avoiding any problematic subject matter and favouring acceptance and agreement. The fact of being transactions emphasises the interlocutors' will to maintain good relationships, to be polite and to protect the image of the other. In these two formal corpora no explicit or open impolite situations were found, that is, intentionally sought (in terms of Culpeper's 1996: 356, *bald on record impoliteness*).

However, without being +problematic, a detailed study of the interviews and conversations reveals cases in which the face-threatening acts are codified, despite their low frequency. Most of these acts are redressed or mitigated, since, due to their situational factors (formal), not to repair them would have led to their being interpreted as impolite. In the travel agency corpus, these acts are reduced to proposals formulated in a more or less direct manner (imperative, periphrasis of obligation, example 1), slight objections or recriminations (example 2), disagreements or presentation of disadvantages to the offers (example 3)⁶:

⁶ The transcription signs used in the oral corpus herein are specified in **Annex 1**. These examples have been translated in a rather literal fashion for the reader (**Annex 2**); however, given the distinct conversational norms of English and Spanish, and exact rendition is not possible.

- (1) *vosotros tenéis que mirar a ver QUÉ hotel os gusta más* (2Zanzíbar, 15-16)
- (2) A: (...) *y muchas veces hay muuchas posibilidades que puedes cambiar ↓ uuna ciudad por ootra ¿sabes?*
 B: *ya/ pero si no conocemos las ciudades ↓/ pues tampoco tenemos el criterio paaara/ ¿sabes? elegir uno u otro/ ese es el problema* (Fjordos, 71-76)
- (3) A: (...) *Copenhague Estocolmo Ooslo// y luego/// interior de los Fjordos Oslo y Estocolmo (5") dieciséis días o dieciocho días*
 B: *no/ dieciséis días/ lo que tampoco queremos es ir de maratón porque entonces§*
 A: *§no no claro* (Fjordos, 49-53)

In the semicontrolled interviews, the face-threatening acts are even less frequent than in the other formal corpus. Their low percentage is, to a large extent, due to the formal situational features as well as the discursive and social standards that regulate this type of speech and the narrow margin of social and interactive dynamism that they allow (Albelda 2004: 126). One of these standards is the convenience of maintaining distance among the speakers; therefore, in general, the opinion of the informants is respected and creating or initiating verbal conflict is avoided.

On the other hand, as in the corpus of travel agency conversations, in the corpus of interviews, the degree of the acts that could be threatening is moderate, as seen in examples 4, 5 and 6.

In (4) the interviewer (A) disagrees with the informant (B); he does so by objecting to the opinion of the other speaker:

- (4) B: *mm yo lo que siempre hee intentado conn- con la gente con la que trabajaba es ee/ provocar esas inquietudes y esa curiosidad/ que ampliara suu- su horizonte (...) porque es quee realmente su únicoo- lo único que les motiva es/ e beberse una botella de litro de cerveza oo- oo tomarsee no sé cuántos éxtasis un fin de semana*
 A: *sí/ pero/ si fueras realmente madre/ porque a veces como psicóloga/ es fácil tomar esa postura esa actitud que tú tomas/ pero como madre*
 B: *mm realmente yo creo que la misma ¿eh?/ más o menos* [JRG. 97-3.: 394-409]

Certain discrepancies are also verified, as example (5) shows. The informant, B, expresses her opinion about China; in the summary of her intervention she expresses the attraction she feels for Chinese and, without any previous reference to the Japanese, she also includes them in her comments. Speaker A's disagreement refers to the cultural diversity between the Chinese and Japanese, which illustrates her disagreement with B for having compared them:

- (5) A: *cuéntanos tus ilusiones sobre China/ si tienes*
 B: (...) *aparte siempre me han atraído mucho tanto los chinos como los japoneses*
 A: *¿sí?// hombre los japoneses están en esa línea también de disciplina/ y de trabajo/ etcétera etcétera/ los chinos no tanto pero bueno* [JRG. 98-4: 374-382]

Nevertheless, the discrepancies in this corpus tend to be diminished, as indicated by the discourse marker *pero bueno* (5). Further, in example (6), the interviewer

produces a face-threatening act, also of light intensity, reproaching B by means of the interjection *¡mujer!* that reveals the brief and irrelevant response of A:

- (6) *A: pero ¿eso es sentirse solo/ es producto del individualismo de esta sociedad? ¿tú qué opinas?*
B: creo que es un poco de todo
A: ¡mujer!
B: un poco de todo (risas)/ pero es que no sé como explicarlo [JRG. 98-1: 144-157]

In both formal corpora, politeness strategies are constantly used to minimize the impact of different speech acts that, otherwise, could be threatening. Thus, it is common that in the travel agency corpus, the requests for information are moderated using conditionals (*a ver si me puedes...*), justifying intentions (*es que, porque*) and attenuating requests (*sólo quería saber*), etc.:

- (7) *quería saber*→*eeh*→/ *los precios de un billete paraa*→/ *París* (1París, 3-4)
- (8) *B: verá*↓ *e es que estaba buscando u un viaje para/ nuestra luna de miel y nos gustaría ir aa Zanzibar/// a ver si me puedes/ encontrar algo* (2Zanzibar, 3-5)
- (9) *mira*↓ *quería hacerte una pregunta*→ *porque* *resultaa*→/ *que me tengo que ir a Asturias*→// *a MANchester*→/ *y entonces sólo quería saber el precio de idaa* (5Manchester, 3-6)

In brief, as this analysis reveals, face-threatening acts are infrequent in the two formal corpora and those found are only slightly threatening and, what is more, they are immediately redressed. Since these situational features do not soften the acts codified and interpreted as impolite, the speakers themselves feel obliged to find an alternative to such impoliteness, and they do it by means of redress strategies. Nonetheless, in contrast to what is described in the following section, what is known *pseudo-impoliteness* was not identified in any case; thus, the situational features do not seem to favour their accomplishment.

3.2. Analysis of the informal conversations

Given the situational diversity of each conversation included the informal corpus, the features analysed are not presented in block, but are broken down for each conversation⁷ (Table 2, part 1 and part 2):

CONVER-SATIONS	Social equality relation	Exis-tencial prox.	Inter-personal purpose	Ide-oms	Problem subject	Accept-ance	Common interactio framew.	Type of relation	Socio-cultural level
----------------	--------------------------	--------------------	------------------------	---------	-----------------	-------------	---------------------------	------------------	----------------------

⁷ The combined marking with a positive (+) and a negative (-) sign in certain features of the table – note that these are not situational factors but sociolinguistic ones– indicates that during a given conversation there are sequences in which this feature is present or absent. The order of the signs is also relevant: (+-) the conversational feature appears more frequently; (-+) means that there are more sequences without the feature.

H.38.A1	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	+Friendship	Average
ML.84.A1	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	Boy/ girlfriend	Average
L.15.A1	+	+	+	+	+ -	+	+	Friendship	Average
S.65.A1	+	+	+	+	+ -	+	+	Neighbours	Average
AP.80.A1	+	+	+	+ -	- +	+	+	+ Friendship	Low
J.82.A1	+	+	+	+ -	- +	+	+	Friendship	High
G.68.B1	+	+	+	+ -	-	+	+	Family	Low
RB.37.B1	- + ⁸	- +	+	-	-	+	+	Employee/ employer Friends/Family	Low Average
H.25.A1	+	-	+	+ -	-	+	+	Shop assistants Customers	Average

Table 2 (part 1). *Situational features of informal interactions.*

CONVER- SATIONS	Social equality relation	Exis- tencial prox.	Inter- personal purpose	Ide- oms	Problem subject	Accept- ance	Common interactio framew.	Type of relation	Socio- cultural level
BG.210.A	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	Family	Low
MA.341.A	+	+	+	+ -	+ -	+ -	+	Neighbours	Low
PG.119.A1	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+Friendship	Low
RV.114.A	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	Family	Low
EL.116.A1	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	Family	Average
VC.117.A	+	+	+	-	+	-	+	Family	Average
XP.48.A1	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	Co-workers	High
MT.97.A1	+	-	+	+ -	-	+	-	Co-workers	High
IM.339.B1	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	Family	High
IH.343.A1	+	+	+	+ -	-	+	+	Family	High

Table 2 (part 2). *Situational features of informal interactions.*

With regard to the type of relationship between the interlocutors, there are differences between this corpus and the two formal corpora. Here, the relationships are, in general, linked to family (with a greater or lesser degree of kinship), of friendship (also in different degrees) and other types of bonds created by the usual relationships of everyday life (work, neighbourhood). It is also interesting to consider the presence of ideoms (situations in which the image is more or less compromised), because they require greater attention to the care of social relationships and, hence, they may call for politeness strategies.

The analysis of the data from the 19 colloquial conversations (Table 2) yielded no problematic subject matters and no instances of impoliteness⁹. In some conversations

⁸ In this case, the combination of the signs (-) and (+) refers to both types of relationship in this conversation: (-) for the relationship employee-employer (housekeeper/ home owner), (+) for the family relationship (brothers/sisters and parents).

⁹ This sociolinguistic analysis contradicts the idea that greater familiarity leads to a greater degree of impoliteness heightened more frequent instances of impoliteness (Culpeper 1996: 350-351).

the subjects are constant throughout the entire conversation (H.38.A1, ML.84.A1, RV.114.A1, VC.117.A1), in others these problems are only evident in parts of the conversation (L.15.A1, S.65.A1, AP.80.A1, J.82.A1, MA.341.A1, PG.119.A1). In the four conversations where the +problems are constant, two other features appear: -acceptance and -ideoms (absence of face threats). These three features justify the presence of impoliteness as a substantial factor in these interactions. However, in the conversations in which there is only +problems momentarily, there is +acceptance, since politeness strategies were used to avoid the risk of face threatening.

A more detailed examination of the different shows seen that the impoliteness style is distinct in each. In the informal corpus, three different manners of impoliteness were recorded: Bald on record impoliteness (canonical), redressed impoliteness (by means of polite strategies) and mock impoliteness (Culpeper 1996: 352)¹⁰.

Conversations [ML.84.A1], [RV.114.A1] and [VC.117.A1] mainly correspond to open and non redressed impoliteness: [ML.84.A1] is a lovers' quarrel; in [RV.114.A1] and in [VC.117.A1], there are arguments between family members. Item (10) is an example of open impoliteness during the lovers' quarrel. Impoliteness is both codified and interpreted. The situational factors explain why there is no redress: the topic involves disagreement, and the relationship between the interlocutors is close, with functional and social equality. Reproachful rhetorical questions, commands, insults and complaints are codified; in other words, threatening acts are interpreted as impoliteness:

- (10) *B: DÍMELO/ NO↓ DÍMELO/ ¿TÚ QUIERES QUE ESTÉ YO AQUÍ AGUANTANDO QUE TÚ ESTÉS MAL?§*
A: § NO QUIERO QUE ESTÉS AGUANTANDO
B: ENTONCES ¿¿QUÉ QUIERES QUE HAGA!?!/ ¡OSTRAS! ES QUE/ ¡JODER!
A: BUENO↓ YA ESTÁ BIEN/ VES POR QUE→/ ES QUE NO/ DE VERDAD↓ NO LO ENTIENDO↓ SIEMPRE PASA LO MISMO
B: vale↓ no chilles ¡joder! (...) tío/ tú estás de sicólogo↓ nano/ ¡yo flipo!
 [ML.84.A1: 248- 264]

Redressed impoliteness is frequent in the conversations with momentary thematic problems: in these cases distinguishing between codified/interpreted impoliteness is irrelevant, because they are both strategies of positive and negative politeness (using the terminology of Brown and Levinson 1987) will make speakers responsible for redressing or avoiding the occurrence of threat¹¹. The rest of this section will focus on false impoliteness.

The conversation that best illustrates this type of impoliteness in the Val.Es.Co. corpus is conversation [H.38.A1], frequently commented in the works on the subject (Zimmermann 2003; Briz 2003, 2004; Bernal 2005 and in this volume). However, its presence is more pronounced in the analysed corpus, since informal communicative situations favour this type of imbalance between acts codified as threats yet not interpreted as impolite. Thus, these imbalances were found in other conversations in the Val.Es.Co. corpus and the different informal situational features make it possible.

¹⁰ Culpeper (2005) recently proposed additional types of impoliteness.

¹¹ Beyond the scope of this paper, this type of impoliteness is well-studied in other research. For an in-depth study of this type of redressed impoliteness in peninsular Spanish *vid.* Bravo (1993, 1996), Hernández-Flores (2002).

In the following extract (11), interlocutors G and L openly express an opinion contrary to E's opinion, so that a disagreement is codified at the level of the act, but in the structural unit of the exchange (dialog) is not interpreted as impolite. The topic of the sequence, the intention of the speakers and the friendship that binds them are situational features that prevent any interpretation of impoliteness. Speakers G and C do not wish to offend E's face, but quite the contrary, they aim to enhance it.

- (11) *E: síi/ yo conozco gente// parezco muy liberal pero// la verdad es que soy muy conservadora*
L: mujer/ en todo no↓ °(tía)°
E: yo sí/ liberaal- soy conservadora enn- pues en lo que interesa como to'l mundo// pero vamos no soy nada liberal↓ lo contrario/// lo que pasa↑ es que yo respeto mucho lo que dice la gente↓ a mí- cada uno que haga lo que quiera yy
L: yo por ejemplo no lo haría
E: bien yo qué sé yo por ejemplo↑ no sée/ a mí me parece muy bien lo que hace cada uno↓ que yo no estoy de acuerdo↑ no quiere decir que yo le critique/// °(¿entiendes?)°
G: pues ya está/ entonces eres liberal↑/ porque el ser liberal empieza por uno mismo
E: vamos a ver/ ser liberal ¿por que YO- yo me rijo por unas normas↑/ y yo conservoo/ unn- yo qué sé§
G: § pues ya está [L.15.A2: 365-381]

Speaker E tries to make her friends (L and G) see that she is not a liberal and, consequently, does not adapt to the ideology common to her condition. L and G reject E's self appraisal, but rather draw attention to the positive values of their friend, who describes herself in negative terms. Therefore, the disagreement cannot be interpreted as impolite.

Example (12) illustrates another instance in which impoliteness is neutralised given the feature of solidarity among the participants. The speakers of this conversational fragment are bound by friendship; in addition, there is a mutual relationship of functional and social equality while the interactional framework is common; they are on familiar ground at the meeting place and they all belong to the club. There is a difference in opinions: Speaker A, a woman, expresses a negative opinion of her body; S, a man, recriminates her with a rhetorical question; A rejects the recrimination of S and disagrees with his judgement (*¡OY QUE NO!*) and, finally S expresses disagreement again and almost insults his listener (*tú flipas*), criticizing her. Although threats are codified on the monological level, these are not interpreted as such in this situation on the dialogical level; on the contrary, S's intention is to offer a flattering comment to positively assess his friend's physical appearance and consequently, he actually compliments her:

- (12) *J: mira↓ Láser Medicina/ hablando de láser*
A: pos eso es lo que necesito yo↓ porque yo tengo el cuerpo to(do) etropeao↓ sí yo no voy mal encaminá (RISAS)
S: ¿tú tienes el cuerpo estropeado?
A: ¡OY QUE NO!
S: tú flipas [AP.80.A1: 852-857]

In the following example, (13), the possible conflict that could cause the codified act to be impolite, from the echo and rhetorical question, is not interpreted as such. *¿¡Cómo me voy a quedar?!* is a statement that not only expresses denial but also

reproaches the interlocutor; a discourse marker *hombre* is also added, which in this case reinforces the reproach. However, this act takes place in a friendly conversation and the variety of situational features cancels any impolite interpretation: interpersonal purpose, relationship of solidarity as well as social and functional equality among speakers, existential relation of proximity, absence of ideoms. In addition, as observed in the context, the feature +acceptance is met in the listeners, since they do not show that they feel threatened:

- (13) *S: ya te quedas ¿no?/// la- a la reunión que tenemos luego*
A: ¿a qué reunión?§
J: § ¿a qué hora la tenéis↓ Sergio?
S: a las diez
J: ¿a las diez?
A: ¿de qué?/ noo↓ ¿;cómo me voy a quedar!?!/ hombre↓ tengo que jalar y to(do)
S: ¿jalar y to?
A: y el niñoo/ por ahí tirao (...) [AP.80.A1: 184-193]

As the analysis of the corpus reveals, false impoliteness or pseudo-impoliteness is frequent in colloquial conversations. Codified acts are threats that do not involve the interpretation of impoliteness, and they can even reinforce solidarity within the group (Culpeper 1996: 353; Bravo 1999, 2002). In fact, one of the social values that has been attributed to the Spanish culture is that the existence of conflicts does not contradict an accepted and fruitful social image (Bravo 1999: 169). In fact, in cases of a close interpersonal relationship, if a speaker is very polite with his/her interlocutor, the latter may take offence or note mistrust on the part of his/her hearer. That impoliteness is a manifestation of confidence and of the relation of proximity in certain situations is yet another argument against the universal concept of image postulated by Brown and Levinson (1987). Many of the acts that Brown and Levinson considered as impolite are actually just the opposite in peninsular Spanish, they are recognised as indicators of group affiliation (Bravo 1999; Bravo's contribution to this volume), of sincerity with the group and, therefore, of reinforced social bonds.

4. Conclusions

In an abstract way, it seems logical to think that the acts codified as face threatening lead to an interpretation of impoliteness, but this is not the result in certain sequences of the corpus of colloquial conversations: In these communicative situations the biunivocal relation between acts codified as threats and their interpretation as impolite is frequently broken up. In many conversations the speakers produced such codified acts at the monological level, but without any intention in the communicative exchange to be impolite, as for example throughout [H.38.A1]. This happens in particular in situations of social proximity and equal relations; the framework of the interaction is common and the social face is not compromised (-ideoms). However, in the formal interactions, on the one hand, no case of disruption between codification and interpretation of impoliteness was documented, and, on the other hand, codified impoliteness barely appears. The analysis confirms the initial hypothesis of this paper; the absence of pseudo-impoliteness in the formal corpus and its presence in the informal corpus are clear evidence of how situational features influence the interpretation of impoliteness. In

general, the influence of the situational features on the linguistic phenomena should be extrapolated to any analysis into the codified/ interpreted opposition because when situational features are taken into account interpreted politeness is examined.

The phenomenon called here *pseudo-impoliteness* has been explained as a desire to offer an anti-standard attitude to the members of a given generational group. Thus, according to Zimmermann, “in interpersonal relationships between young males who maintain friendly or group identity relationships, the constitution of the *generational identity* is achieved, on the contrary, by means of anti-politeness strategies” (Zimmermann 2003: 58). However, as noted throughout this study, and specially in section 2.2., the disruption between what is codified as impolite and its varied interpretation is not just due to cases described as *mock impoliteness* in the literature, whose function is to reinforce an identity within a certain social group (Labov 1972; Culpeper 1996; Zimmermann 2003). This pseudo-impoliteness involves other functions in the peninsular Hispanic culture. On the one hand, its function is sometimes to facilitate and/or promote group affiliation -and not only between young males (Bernal 2005 and paper in this volume)- (see example 13), because threatening acts at the codified level are interpreted as an expression of trust, which has nothing to do with an anti-standard attitude. On the other hand, as illustrated in examples (11) and (12), the acts codified as threatening may be interpreted as just the opposite: they enhance the image of the targeted interlocutor. In this sense, to justify the phenomenon under study, to the features suggested by Labov (1972) and Zimmermann (2003) it would be necessary to add the informal situational features (Briz and Val.Es.Co. 2002: 18 and following): existential relationship of proximity between speakers, social and/or functional equality among the speakers, familiar and common interactional framework and non-specialized subject matter.

It is crucial to note the relevance of this analysis in terms of targeting and distinguishing the different structural levels of the conversation and studying each for pragmalinguistic phenomena, since these phenomena can lead to different results. In this case, impoliteness has a distinct impact on monological conversation units (act and intervention) and dialogic (exchange and dialogue) ones.

References

- Albelda, Marta (2004) Cortesía en diferentes situaciones comunicativas. La conversación coloquial y la entrevista sociológica semiformal. In Diana Bravo and Antonio Briz (eds.), *Pragmática sociocultural: Estudios sobre el discurso de cortesía en español*. Barcelona: Ariel, pp. 109-134.
- Albelda, Marta (2007) *La intensificación como categoría pragmática: revisión y propuesta*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Bernal, María (2005) Hacia una categorización sociopragmática de la cortesía, descortesía y anticortesía en conversaciones españolas de registro coloquial. In Diana Bravo (ed.), *Cortesía lingüística y comunicativa en español*. Buenos Aires: Dunken, pp. 365-398.
- Blas Arroyo, José Luis (2001) “No digas chorradas...”. La descortesía en el debate político cara a cara. Una aproximación pragma-variacionista. *Oralia* 4: 9-45.

Bolivar, Adriana (2003) La descortesía como estrategia política en la democracia venezolana. In Diana Bravo (ed.) (2003a), *Actas del Primer Coloquio Edice. La perspectiva no etnocentrista de la cortesía: Identidad sociocultural de las comunidades hispanohablantes*. University of Stockholm, pp. 213-226.

Bravo, Diana (1993) *La atenuación de las divergencias mediante la risa en negociaciones españolas y suecas*. Manuscript. University of Stockholm.

Bravo, Diana (1996) *La risa en el regateo: Estudio sobre el estilo comunicativo de negociadores españoles y suecos*. University of Stockholm, Edsbruck: Academitryck.

Bravo, Diana (1999) ¿Imagen 'positiva' vs. imagen 'negativa'? *Oralia* 2: 155-184.

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

Bravo, Diana (2003a) *Actas del Primer Coloquio Edice. La perspectiva no etnocentrista de la cortesía: Identidad sociocultural de las comunidades hispanohablantes*. University of Stockholm, www.edice.org

Bravo, Diana (2003b) Actividades de cortesía, imagen social y contextos socioculturales: Una introducción. In Diana Bravo (ed.) *Actas del Primer Coloquio Edice. La perspectiva no etnocentrista de la cortesía: Identidad sociocultural de las comunidades hispanohablantes*. University of Stockholm, pp. 96-108.

Bravo, Diana, and Antonio Briz (eds.) (2004) *Pragmática sociocultural: estudios sobre el discurso de cortesía en español*. Barcelona: Ariel.

Briz, Antonio (1998) *El español coloquial en la conversación*. Barcelona: Ariel.

Briz, Antonio (2003) La estrategia atenuadora en la conversación cotidiana española. In Diana Bravo (ed.) (2003), pp. 17- 46.

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

Briz, Antonio, and Val.Es.Co. Group (2003) Un sistema de unidades para el estudio del lenguaje coloquial. *Oralia* 6: 7-61.

Briz, Antonio, and Val.Es.Co. Group (2002) *Corpus de conversaciones coloquiales*. Appendix of *Oralia*. Madrid: Arco/Libros.

Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson (1987 [1978]) *Politeness. Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Calsamiglia, Helena, and Amparo Tusón (1999) *Las cosas del decir*. Barcelona: Ariel.

Carrasco, Antonio (1999) Revisión y evaluación del modelo de cortesía de Brown y Levinson. *Pragmalingüística* 7: 1-44.

Contreras, Josefa (2004) *El uso de la cortesía y las sobreposiciones en las conversaciones. Un análisis contrastivo alemán-español*. Ph.D., CD-Rom, University of Valencia.

Culpeper, Jonathan (1996) Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 349-367.

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

- Goffman, Erving (1959) *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.
- Gómez, José Ramón (coord.) (2001) *El español hablado de Valencia. Materiales para su estudio*. Appendix XLVI of *Cuadernos de Filología*, Valencia: University of Valencia.
- Hernández-Flores, Nieves (1999) Politeness ideology in Spanish colloquial conversation: The case of advice. *Pragmatics* 9.1: 37-49.
- Hernández-Flores, Nieves (2002) *La cortesía en la conversación española de familiares y amigos*. Institut for Sprog og Internationale Kulturstudier, vol. 37. Aalborg: University of Aalborg.
- Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Catherine (1996) *La conversation*. Paris: Seuil.
- Kienpointner, Manfred (1997) Varieties of rudeness, types and functions of impolite utterances. *Functions of language* 4.2: 251-287.
- Labov, William (1972) *Language in the inner city: Studies in the black English vernacular*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lakoff, Robin T. (1973) The logic of politeness; or minding your p's and q's. In *Papers from the Seventh Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago: University Press, pp. 292-305.
- Leech, N. Geoffrey (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Lim, Tae-Seop, and John W. Bowers (1991) Facework. Solidarity, approbation, and tact. *Human Communication Research* 17.3: 415-450.
- Zimmermann, Klaus (2003) Constitución de la identidad y anticortesía verbal entre jóvenes masculinos hablantes de español. In Diana Bravo (ed.), *Actas del Primer Coloquio Edice. La perspectiva no etnocentrista de la cortesía: Identidad sociocultural de las comunidades hispanohablantes*. University of Stockholm, pp. 47-59.

Appendix 1. Transcription key

The following symbols are used herein as developed for the Val.Es.Co. corpus:

A:	Intervention of interlocutor identified as A.
§	Immediate succession, without noticeable pause, between emissions of different speakers.
=	Maintaining the turn of a participant in overlapping.
[Place where overlapping or superposition begins.
]	End of simultaneous speech.
-	Re-starts and self-interruptions without pause.
/	Short pause, less than half a second.
//	Pause between half a second and one second.
///	Pause of one second or more.
(5")	Five-second silence; time is indicated in pauses of more than one second, when it is particularly significant.
↑	Rising intonation.
↓	Falling intonation.
→	Maintained or suspended intonation.
PESADO	Noticeable or emphatic pronunciation (two or more capital letters).
(())	Indecipherable fragment.
((siempre))	Questionable transcription.
(en)tonces	Reconstruction of a lexical unit that has not been completely uttered or when it hinders comprehension.

◦()° Fragment uttered softly or almost whispering.
aa/ nn Vocalic enlargements/ Consonant enlargements.

Annex 2. Translation of examples

(1) 'You two need to decide WHICH hotel you like best'

(2)

'A: (...) and often there are many possibilities that you can change↓ one city for another, you know?

B: yeah/ **but if we don't know the cities**↓/ then we don't have any reference too/ you know? choose one or another /that is the problem'

(3)

'A: (...) Copenhagen Stockholm Ooslo/// and then// the interior of the Fjordos Oslo and Stockholm (5") sixteen days or eighteen days

B: no/ sixteen days/ **we don't want to do a marathon either 'cause then**§

A: § no no of course not'

(4)

'B: mm what I have always tried to do with the people I worked with is to/ make them restless and curious/ to expand their horizons (...) because what really motivates them/ is to drink a litre of beer or- or take I don't know how much extasis at the weekends

A: **yes/ but/ if you really were a mother/ because sometimes as a psychologist/ it is easy to take that position that attitude that you take/ but as mother**

B: mm I really believe it is the same, don't you?/ kind of'

(5)

'A: talk about your dreams of China/ if you have any

B: (...) besides I've always been interested in both the Chinese and the Japanese

A: really?// **man** the Japanese are also disciplined/ and hardworkers/ and so on/ **the Chinese not so much but well'**

(6)

'A: but is that being lonely/ is it the result of individualism in this society? what do you think?

B: I think it is a bit of everything

A: **c' mon!**

B: a bit of everything (laughter)/ but I don't know how to explain it'

(7)

'**I wanted** to know→ eeh→/ the price of a ticket too→/ Paris'

(8)

'B: **you see**↓ *I wanted to find a trip for/our honeymoon and we'd like to go to Zanzibar/// see if you can/find something for me'*

(9)

'**listen**↓ **I wanted to ask you a question → because** it turns out I have to go to Asturias→// to MANchester→/ and so **I just wanted to know** the one way fare'

(10)

'B: SAY IT/ NO/ SAY IT/ YOU WANT ME HERE PUTTING UP WITH YOU 'CAUSE YOU FEEL BAD?§

A: § I DON'T WANT YOU TO PUT UP WITH ANYTHING

B: THEN WHAT DO YOU WANT ME TO DO!?!/ SHIT! IT' S/ DAMN!

A: WELL↓ THAT' S ENOUGH/ YOU SEE→/ IS THAT NO/ REALLY↓ I DON'T UNDERSTAND↓ IT'S ALWAYS THE SAME

B: OK↓ don't damn it! (...) man/ you need a shrink↓ man/ It's amazing!

(11)

'E: yes/ I know people// I look very liberal but// the truth is that I am very conservative

L: **c' mon / not in everything**↓

E: I am/ liberaal- I am conservative in- well in what is interesting like everybody// but I am not at all liberal↓ quite the contrary/// the problem what I mean is that↑ I highly respect what people say↓ for me people can do what they want and

L: for example I wouldn't do it

E: well what do I know for example↑ I don't know/ I think it's ok what each one does↓ if I don't agree↑ it does not mean that I'm criticizing/// °(do you understand?)°

G: **that's it/ then you are liberal**↑/ because being liberal begins with oneself

E: let's see/ being liberal because I follow the rules↑/ and I still keep/ I don't know what§

G: § **well that's it**'

(12)

'J: look↓ Laser Surgery/speaking of laser

A: so that's what I need ↓ because my body' s totally trashed ↓ yeah, I got it all wrong (LAUGHTER)

S: your body trashed?

A: **YOU BET!**

S: **you are out of your mind**'

(13)

'S: you are staying/ aren't you?/// for our meeting later

A: what meeting?§

J: § what time is it↓ Sergio?

S: at ten

J: at ten?

A: no way?/ noo↓ **how can I possibly stay!?!/ man**↓ gotta eat and all

S: eat and all?

A: and the kid/ down there alone (...)'