

## Acting the Intangible: Hints of Politeness in Non-Verbal Form

Jumanto Jumanto<sup>1</sup>, Sarif Syamsu Rizal<sup>1</sup> & Raden Arief Nugroho<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Dian Nuswantoro, Semarang, Jawa Tengah, Indonesia

Correspondence: Jumanto Jumanto, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Dian Nuswantoro, Semarang, Jawa Tengah, Indonesia. Tel: 62-812-878-2484. E-mail: ilhamj@dsn.dinus.ac.id

Received: September 16, 2017 Accepted: October 10, 2017 Online Published: October 12, 2017

doi: 10.5539/elt.v10n11p111

URL: <http://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v10n11p111>

### Abstract

This review paper has explored politeness in non-verbal form to come to hints for indicating the ideology. Politeness in non-verbal form is researched by reviewing verbal politeness theories through interpretive techniques, and then the data in form of interpreted hints based on the reviews are analyzed by employing a coding technique. The six non-verbal hints of politeness found out based on the theoretical reviews are silence for politeness, gestures for politeness, gifts for politeness, observance of norms, rules, and regulations for politeness, adjusted behavior for politeness, and performance for politeness. The hints expectedly provide a sufficient account for non-verbal politeness in interactions or communication between a speaker and a hearer. The findings also encourage promoting harmony among speakers of languages in non-verbal interactions or communication, especially in formal situations or in the general public. The hints are hopefully also worth considering in the context of English language teaching and learning across languages and cultures in the world.

**Keywords:** verbal/linguistic politeness, non-verbal politeness, interpersonal face, social face, hint

### 1. Introduction

Language use is a matter of probabilities (Jumanto, 2014), either verbal language or non-verbal language. Conveying messages, therefore, is a matter of choices whether a speaker is using verbal language or verbal form or utterances, or they are using non-verbal language or non-verbal form or, merely called *acting* in this paper. The word acting refers to the art or practice of representing a character on a stage or before cameras (Note 1), analogically used here as acting before a particular hearer or in the general public. This acting may be in form of facial expressions or gestures, or else indicating non-verbal responses for communicating messages.

One of the messages conveyed by a speaker to a hearer is an ideology called politeness. Politeness is a message having to do with the want or the will of a particular hearer to be appreciated by a speaker of language. This concept is termed *face* by Erving Goffman (1959). Along with the development of face theory, there has been interpersonal face or social face. The former is managed together by a speaker and a hearer in a *vis-a-vis* communication, while the latter is protected together by a particular social group in interactions or communication. Interpersonal face or social face needs to be considered as well as maintained for the sake of interpersonal harmony or social harmony.

Theories of politeness on interpersonal face or social face are important for interpersonal interactions or social interactions. These interactions may be vehicled by verbal form or non-verbal form. As in the case of politeness ideology, that verbal form or utterances should be elaborated in such a way that it is perceived as conveying politeness, and so is the case of non-verbal form or actings.

This review paper on acting the intangible, i.e. hints of politeness in non-verbal form has made use of theories of verbal politeness, in which hints are interpreted through a coding technique upon the interpretive techniques applied in the verbal politeness theory reviews. The term intangible here is used to give an emphasis on the fact that politeness is a variant of meaning, thus concerning what behind the form perceived by our visual senses. Upon the hints interpreted, actings for politeness are presented, taken from real-life everyday practices in the Indonesian context within empirically logical assumption as well as experience of the researchers.

### 2. Method

This qualitative research is a literature review. A literature review requires different kinds of activities and ways of thinking (Baker, 2000). An effective review creates a firm foundation for advancing knowledge, facilitates

theory development, closes areas where a plethora of research exists, and uncovers areas where research is needed (Webster & Watson, 2002). In this review, new ideas from others' work are extracted by synthesizing and summarizing previous sources so that new theories and directions for future research can be built and suggested based on the evidence (Bolderston, 2008). The literature review in this research is done through interpretive techniques; therefore, interpreting is the main way of thinking in this research. In this research, foundation for advancing knowledge and developing theory is created from interpreting and reviewing established theories of verbal politeness to come to hints of non-verbal politeness. The hints function to limit areas for further research, i.e. non-verbal politeness. Other ways of thinking involved in this research are synthesizing and summarizing of the hints, and then elaboration of the hints into practices (actings) is made to confirm that the hints are applicable in probable real-life situations of speech communities.

Through the interpretive techniques, the researchers examine the data and interpret them through forming an impression and reporting it in a structured form. The data in form of theory reviews upon the interpretive techniques are then further analyzed through a coding technique, which consists of three steps: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Holloway, 1997; Bohm, 2004; Saldana, 2012).

In the open coding, the data in form of theory reviews are separated and conceptualized. The separated data are then reunited in the axial coding to come to major categories. The selective coding then discovers the main phenomena, i.e. a story line built by relating the major categories from the axial coding. The main non-verbal hints are then applied to practices of politeness in everyday life.

The definition of politeness as the guideline for the reviews of politeness theories in this research is the one proposed by Jumanto (2014), i.e. "Politeness is everything good that has been uttered as well as acted by the speaker to the hearer within a particular context, to maintain their interpersonal face as well as their social face". The verb *uttered* in the definition refers to verbal politeness, while the verb *acted* to non-verbal politeness. Based on the definition, the researchers examine and interpret interpersonal face and social face and their connection with verbal politeness theories to come to the non-verbal hints. It is the non-verbal hints of politeness which are to be found out in this research.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1 Review of Verbal Politeness Theories and Non-Verbal Hints Interpreted

The data in form of theory reviews here are interpreted from verbal politeness theories of Fraser & Nolen (1981), Leech (1983), Arndt & Janney (1985), Brown & Levinson (1987), Ide (1989), Watts (1989), Gu (1990), Lakoff (1990), Blum-Kulka (1992), Spencer-Oatey (1992), and Thomas' Pollyanna Hypothesis (1996). Each of the theories is reviewed and interpreted for the non-verbal hints below. A hint here is referred to as a slight indication of the existence, approach, or nature of something (Note 2) or a piece of advice that helps us to do something (Note 3).

##### 3.1.1 Fraser and Nolen (1981)

Fraser & Nolen (1981) propose a different view on politeness. They suggest that the freedom of others in interactions, also in conversations, should be adjusted to a conversational contract. The contract includes observance of norms and also rights and obligations in the interactions with others. The norms proposed by them are based on four dimensions: conventional, institutional, situational, and historical. Conventional dimensions include common rules in interactions, e.g. turns in conversation and softness or loudness of voice. Institutional dimensions include rights and obligations as ruled by a social institution, e.g. the right to speak in court and attentive silence in the church. Situational dimensions include factors in relation to roles, status, and relative power between a speaker and a hearer. Historical dimensions refer to previous interactions between a speaker and a hearer. The four dimensions vary in the applications. Politeness refers to observance to the conversational contract, while impoliteness happens due to violation of the contract. Normal interactions, i.e. interactions based on norms, thus politeness, are usually not seen, while impoliteness is usually noticed. In the eye of Fraser and Nolen, politeness is not in form of strategic interaction nor making a hearer feel comfortable, but it is merely doing the obligations acceptable to terms and conditions in the conversational contract.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from Fraser and Nolen's theory are probably (1) that observing the norms in society or rules in institutions is polite, instead of violating them, and (2) that keeping silent is polite, as it is a contract to observe when the situation calls.

##### 3.1.2 Leech (1983)

Leech (1983) studies politeness in the light of harmony and smooth social interaction, so potential face-threatening acts should be avoided. Leech has proposed 7 maxims for social harmony, i.e. maxims of (1)

tact, (2) generosity, (3) approbation, (4) modesty, (5) agreement, (6) sympathy, and (7) consideration. These maxims should be elaborated in such a way that they give benefits more to others than to one's self. Leech has formulated things a speaker should avoid doing to others (the don'ts), i.e. don't tell others what to do, don't say bad things of others, don't express happiness when others are not happy, don't attack others' view or ideas, and don't praise yourself or show off your wealth or strength.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from Leech's principles of politeness are probably (1) that making others happy, for example by giving things they would like to expect or to have is polite, and (2) that saying nothing or keeping silent when it makes others happy is probably polite.

### 3.1.3 Arndt and Janney (1985)

Arndt & Janney (1985) propose the appropriacy-based approach to politeness. This theory asserts that politeness concerns appropriate expressions in appropriate context, based on appropriate conventional rules. Arndt and Janney's theory is an interpersonal framework stressing on people as the main factor as well as the center of politeness. This theory centers on emotive communication, instead of emotional communication. The former refers to strategic modification of affective signals to influence others, determined by social sanctions, interaction norms, and civilized expectations, which enables a speaker to control their natural impulses. The latter refers to spontaneous, uncontrolled expressions of emotion. Emotive communication within this theory involves not only utterances but also para- and non-linguistic signals under three dimensions: confidence, positive and negative affections, and intensity, through verbal forms, vocal, and kinesics, termed as cross-modal emotive cues.

This theory elaborates interpersonal supportiveness. Being polite here is not to do with social expectations, but is more to avoid interpersonal conflicts. Interpersonal supportiveness is used to convey message. The main idea is that there are supportive ways and non-supportive ways to express positive and negative feelings. An effective speaker tries to minimize emotional uncertainty of the hearer by behaving as supportively as possible. This interpersonal supportiveness refers to interpersonal politeness (or tact), which differs from social politeness. Social politeness consists of linguistic forms of high convention, like traffic regulations as a set of conventional rules, which are socially appropriate. Interpersonal politeness is conciliative, while social politeness is regulative.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this Arndt and Janney's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs or cross-modal emotive cues in interaction with a hearer is polite, and (2) that observing social symbols or signs of regulations in social context is polite.

### 3.1.4 Brown and Levinson (1987)

Brown & Levinson studies politeness in line with face management, engineering the theory of face, i.e. the want of everyone by Erving Goffman (1959). In the face theory, everyone has positive face and negative. Positive face refers to the want or the will to be appreciated by others, while negative face refers to the want or the will not be deappreciated (Brown & Levinson, 1987). They have then divided utterances or verbal acts into two, i.e. face-threatening acts (FTA) and face-saving acts (FSA), and also proposed politeness and negative politeness strategies. In brief, the politeness strategies of Brown & Levinson are of 5 categories: (1) bald on records, (2) positive politeness, (3) negative politeness, (4) off the records, (5) do not do the FTA.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from the theory are probably (1) that giving something better or best to others, whether we are close to them (positive politeness) or we are not (negative politeness) is polite, and (2) that keeping silent (not doing the FTA) is polite.

### 3.1.5 Ide (1989)

Ide's theory (1989) is based on Japanese politeness. The theory highlights discernment as the main aspect of politeness, i.e. honorific forms or chosen verbal utterances demanded by the society. There are no socially neutral utterances in Japanese, but honorific and non-honorific ones. A speaker should choose either one to give information on their interpersonal relationship, even in their most banal factual statement. Use of honorific forms is a must so as to reflect a socio-pragmatic equivalence to grammatical concord. This Japanese politeness called *wakimae* is based on social conventions. Within this Ide's theory, there are four conventional rules to observe: being polite to people with higher social status, being polite to people with more power, being polite to older people, being polite in the formal situations: to the participants, the occasions, or the topic.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this Ide's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs of discernment to others with higher social status or with more power, and older people, is polite, and (2) that observing the formal situation and its participants, occasions, and topic is polite.

### 3.1.6 Watts (1989)

Watts' theory of politeness (1989) refers to emotive communication as politic behavior, i.e. sociocultural behaviors directed to instill or maintain an equilibrium of interpersonal relationship of individuals in a social group. The equilibrium does not refer to social equality, but more to maintenance of social status-quo. Politeness is a particular case of politic behavior.

Important aspects of Watts' theory are restrictive codes and elaborative codes (Bernstein, 1971; Atkinson, 1985). Restrictive codes refer to closed communicative system, while elaborative codes to open communication system. The former system is practiced by closed-groups, while the latter is practiced by open-groups. Closed social groups with closed communicative system place the group's interest above the individual's, while the open social groups with open communicative system enjoy the individual's interest above the group's. This distinction has to do with Ide's notions of volition and discernment. Discernment is practiced by a closed society, for example, Japanese, which basically has a closed communicative system. A society with volition orientation usually has open communicative system, which practices volition, i.e. conscious selection of language by a speaker. Discernment strategies demand that an individual adjust their roles within a group, while volition strategies enable an individual to be prominent beyond a social group.

In Watts' theory, a non-politic behavior is the negative deviation of politic behavior, while politeness is the positive deviation. Politeness consists of behaviors which are more than merely politic or more than merely appropriate. Politeness is a strategic conscious behavior which aims to positively influence the opinion of a hearer upon a speaker's self.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from Watts' theory are probably (1) that performing more or better than the group's interest in an open society is positive or polite, and (2) that observing and adjusting to the group's interest in a closed society is polite.

### 3.1.7 Gu (1990)

Gu (1990) views politeness from the concept of Chinese politeness. Gu explicitly links politeness to social morals and ethics, thus managing social face for politeness, instead of interpersonal face. Gu's theory is prescriptive in the concept of Chinese *limao* (politeness), and is attached to moral sanctions from the society. Politeness is not instrumental but normative. Face is not threatened when individual want is not satisfied, but it is when an individual does not observe the standards or expectations of the society. Within the Chinese concept, politeness holds the principle that individual's behaviors should be adjusted to social expectations on respectfulness, modesty, and warmth and refinement. Gu proposes four maxims of politeness, i.e. self-denigration, address, tact, and generosity.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from Gu's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs of respect, modesty, warmth, or refinement to others is polite, and (2) that giving things to others as a sign of generosity is polite.

### 3.1.8 Lakoff (1990)

Lakoff (1990) asserts that politeness has fallen into imperative rules, i.e. (1) *Don't impose*, (2) *Give options*, and (3) *Make A feel good, be friendly* (Lakoff, 1990). In the first rule, Lakoff suggests that an utterance or verbal form should not contain imposition or arrogance from the side of a speaker. Different cultures apply the three rules differently, and hence culture consequently affects social distance in the first rule, deference in the second, and camaraderie or friendship in the third. Social distance suggests strategies of impersonality, deference does those of respect, and camaraderie does those of informality. Furthermore, Lakoff sees roughly that European cultures stress more on distancing strategies, Asian cultures more on deferential strategies, and modern American cultures on camaraderie.

The non-verbal hints for politeness interpreted from this theory are (1) that keeping the considerate silence instead of making any imposition even the lightest one is polite, and (2) that producing any non-verbal signs of being friendly or making a hearer feel good is polite.

### 3.1.9 Blum-Kulka (1992)

Blum-Kulka (1992) studies politeness in the context of Israel-Jewish. This theory borrows elements of other politeness theories and interprets them in a culture-relativistic concept. The term cultural norms or cultural scripts are central in this theory. This theory embraces the concept of face-wants but the wants are culturally determined. It also admits obligatory and strategic use of language, but the scope and depth are interculturally different. Obligatory use of language in this theory is termed cultural conventions. Politeness in Blum-Kulka's

theory is about appropriate social behaviors, determined by cultural expectations or cultural norms. This theory of politeness involves cultural interpretations on interactions of four parameters: social motivations, expressive modes, social differentials, and social meaning. Social motivations refer to reasons for someone's being polite, expressive modes to linguistic forms for politeness, social differentials to situational conditions for politeness (e.g. power, distance, relationship), and social meaning of linguistic expressions in particular context.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this Blum Kulka's theory are probably (1) that giving any signs of appreciation or any conventional symbols is polite, and (2) that behaving non-verbally adjusted to particular context is polite.

#### 3.1.10 Spencer-Oatey (1992)

Spencer-Oatey (1992) studies politeness in cross-cultural context, viewing that what is respected in a particular culture is probably not so in another, e.g. the autonomy principle, which is applicable to Western cultures, but is not so in Eastern cultures. Spencer-Oatey (1992) proposes a set of dimensions called Spencer-Oatey's pragmatic scale, which comprises three needs: autonomy, approbation, and relational identity. Autonomy is preferred to imposition, approbation is preferred to criticism, and inclusion and equality are preferred to exclusion and subordination.

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this pragmatic scale theory are probably (1) that keeping silent on what others are doing is more polite than commenting or saying something about it, (2) that giving any signs of agreement or acceptance is more polite than saying something contrary or criticising, and (3) that joining a group or gathering in some situation is more polite than being alone or in exclusion within that situation.

#### 3.1.11 Thomas' Pollyanna Hypothesis (1996)

Pollyanna is a little girl in the novel Eleanor H. Porter. The girl has such interesting attitudes that she likes to see things from the bright side of life, as described by Thomas (1996). The Pollyanna principle thus suggests one to find best ways to say something. This principle also applies in why people tend to talk about interesting things than dull ones, or the bright side of life than the dark side. In verbal form, for example, the utterance *something too short* is mitigated into *something a bit short*, or the utterance *I wish you good luck* (a wish for success) is accepted, but not *I wish you bad luck* (an expression for sympathy or commiseration).

The non-verbal hints interpreted from this theory are probably (1) that giving or allowing something better or best of ours to others is polite, and (2) that making others happy or pleased with something we do is polite.

### 3.2 Hints of Politeness: From Verbal to Non-Verbal Form

Now we are coming to hints of politeness, from verbal to non-verbal form. The non-verbal hints here have been interpreted from theories of verbal politeness from Fraser and Nolen (1981), Leech (1983), Arndt and Janney (1985), Brown and Levinson (1987), Ide (1989), Watts (1989), Gu (1990), Lakoff (1990), Blum-Kulka (1992), Spencer-Oatey (1992), and Thomas' Pollyanna Hypothesis (1996). The interpretation has resulted in six hints, each of which will be accounted for in the next section.

#### 3.2.1 Silence for Politeness

The first non-verbal hint is Silence for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Fraser & Nolen (1981), Leech (1983), Brown & Levinson (1987), Lakoff (1990), and Spencer-Oatey (1992).

This hint has been referred to as a contract to observe when the situation calls for (Fraser & Nolen, 1981), as making others happy (Leech, 1983), as not doing the face-threatening act (Brown & Levinson, 1987), as not making any imposition (Lakoff, 1990), and as not commenting or saying something about what others are doing (Spencer-Oatey, 1992).

#### 3.2.2 Gestures for Politeness

The second non-verbal hint is Gestures for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Arndt and Janney (1985), Ide (1989), Gu (1990), Lakoff (1990), Blum-Kulka (1992), and Spencer-Oatey (1992).

This hint has been referred to as giving any signs or cross-modal emotive cues in interaction with a hearer (Arndt & Janney, 1985), as giving any signs of discernment to others with higher social status or with more power, and older people (Ide, 1989), as giving any signs of respect, modesty, warmth, or refinement to others (Gu, 1990), as producing any non-verbal signs of being friendly or making a hearer feel good (Lakoff, 1990), as giving any signs of appreciation or any conventional symbols (Blum-Kulka, 1992), and as giving any signs of agreement or acceptance, not of something contrary or criticising (Spencer-Oatey, 1992).

### 3.2.3 Gifts for Politeness

The third non-verbal hint is Gifts for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Leech (1983), Brown and Levinson (1987), Gu (1990), and Thomas (1996).

This hint has been referred to as making others happy, for example by giving things they would like to expect or to have (Leech, 1983), as giving something better or best to others, whether we are close to them (positive politeness) or we are not (negative politeness) (Brown & Levinson, 1987), as giving things to others as a sign of generosity (Gu, 1990), and as giving or allowing something better or best of ours to others (Thomas, 1996).

### 3.2.4 Observance of Norms, Rules, and Regulations for Politeness

The fourth non-verbal hint is Observance of Norms, Rules, and Regulations for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Fraser & Nolen (1981), Arndt & Janney (1985), and Ide (1989).

This hint has been referred to as observing the norms in society or rules in institutions, not violating them (Fraser & Nolen, 1981), as observing social symbols or signs of regulations in social context (Arndt & Janney, 1985), and as observing the formal situation and its participants, occasions, and topic (Ide, 1989).

### 3.2.5 Adjusted Behavior for Politeness

The fifth non-verbal hint is Adjusted Behavior for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Watts (1989), Blum-Kulka (1992), Spencer-Oatey (1992).

This hint has been referred to as observing and adjusting to the group's interest (Watts, 1989), as behaving non-verbally adjusted to particular context (Blum-Kulka, 1992), and as joining a group or gathering in some situation, instead of being alone or in exclusion within that situation (Spencer-Oatey, 1992).

### 3.2.6 Performance for Politeness

The sixth non-verbal hint is Performance for Politeness. This hint has been interpreted from verbal politeness theories by Watts (1989) and Thomas (1996).

This hint has been referred to as performing more or better than the group's interest in an open society (Watts, 1989) and as making others happy or pleased with something we do (Thomas, 1996).

## 4. Discussion

Based on the results of the analysis, acting the intangible or actings for politeness in the Indonesian context can be identified by hints of politeness in non-verbal form. There are, therefore, 6 (six) hints with appropriate actings as discussed here. The six hints are (a) silence for politeness, (b) gestures for politeness, (c) gifts for politeness, (d) observance to norms, rules, and regulations for politeness, (e) adjusted behavior for politeness, and (f) performance for politeness.

Silence is part of politeness in non-verbal form. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint are those concerning silence, e.g. attention, empathy, or impartiality, for example (a) keeping silent when attentive to a hearer speaking, (b) keeping silent when showing empathy to a hearer expressing sadness or misery, (c) keeping silent when angry to an annoying hearer, (d) keeping silent for showing impartiality on two or more hearers in a severe argument, and (e) keeping silent in a highly formal situation.

Gestures are also part of politeness in non-verbal form. Gestures concern facial expressions or other bodily movements and are part of non-verbal politeness. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint are, for example (a) smiling as a sign of friendliness, (b) noticing a hearer coming and approaching, (c) nodding the head as a sign of paying attention to a hearer saying a point, (d) waving the hand as a sign of acknowledging a hearer within sighting distance, and (e) bending the body when meeting a respected hearer.

Gifts are also part of politeness in non-verbal form. Gifts or things given to a hearer are part of non-verbal politeness. Better-quality gifts show more politeness than less-quality ones. This situation is the opposite of the one when a speaker empty-handed is visiting a hearer. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint in everyday life are, for example (a) giving something after a trip (trip-gift) to a hearer, (b) sending a self-cooked meal or purchased one to a neighbor hearer, (c) allowing a sum of money or valuables to a partying hearer, (d) allowing a sum of money for a hearer in bereaved situation, and (e) giving a hand to a hearer busy with loaded stuff.

Observance of norms, rules, and regulations is part of politeness in non-verbal form. Norms or rules or regulations in social life are usually passed for particular sanctions. Observance of them is part of politeness, and is regarded as normal. Meanwhile, violation of them is regarded as not polite. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint in everyday life are, for example (a) listening solemnly to an elder hearer talking, (b)

obeying what is told by a parent hearer, (c) giving something with the right hand to a hearer, (d) observing the traffic regulations, e.g. turning right or left with a lighted sign, and (e) not violating the law.

Adjusted behavior is part of politeness. Adjusting a speaker's behavior to a particular context is part of politeness in non-verbal form. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint in everyday life are, for example (a) accepting and not underestimating the group's interest, (b) joining and sitting at the group's gathering, (c) coming to an invitation by the group, (d) pretending to be happy on the group's interest, and (e) keeping and taking care of gifts from the group.

Performance in a particular manner is part of politeness in non-verbal form. Performance or body movement involves a speaker's motions or movements directed to a particular hearer within the acting distance. The non-verbal forms or actings concerning this hint are, for example (a) giving way to a hearer walking in a hurry, (b) beseeching or fetching a seat for a hearer, (c) escorting a hearer to a particular room for a meeting, (d) giving a ride or a lift to a needy hearer, (e) dressing-up best and properly for a formal situation, (f) helping an aged hearer to cross the street, and (g) traveling farther and purchasing something for the group which is better, more interesting, or more expensive than the group's interest or expectation.

To bring this discussion to an end, we can present here as the findings of the research that the hints of politeness in non-verbal form in the Indonesian context are (a) silence for politeness, (b) gestures for politeness, (c) gifts for politeness, (d) observance of norms, rules, and regulations for politeness, (e) adjusted behavior for politeness, and (f) performance for politeness. The hints of non-verbal politeness above are applicable in interactions or communication by Indonesian speakers in the real-life everyday practices. Acting the intangible or actings for politeness are probably partly or wholly also applicable to the practices of languages and culture in the world, including, the authors believe, English languages and cultures. The non-verbal forms or actings shown as exemplary practices in this research are just part of potential others in the human non-verbal interactions or communication.

The hints of non-verbal politeness in this research should be best considered by a speaker when interacting or communicating with a particular hearer especially in the formal context or situation, or in the general public. The hints should also be best considered by teachers and learners of language to encourage harmonious interactions or communication, including the contexts of English language teaching and learning. However, the authors also believe that there are shortcomings of this research, as not all variables have been controlled, e.g. speakers of different ages and or speakers of different languages or speech communities. It is a collegial suggestion that other researchers conduct a further research based on the findings of this research or other researches concerning other ideologies within non-verbal interactions or communication.

The actings derived from the hints of non-verbal politeness in this research are open to elaboration by different languages or speech communities in the world, despite presumably universal aspects of languages. Further researches on these actings are encouraged to verify or to develop the findings in this research or to find out other hints of non-verbal politeness which probably exist in particular languages or speech communities.

## References

- Arndt, H., & Janney, R. W. (1985). Politeness revisited: cross-modal supportive strategies. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 23(4), 281-300. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1985.23.1-4.281>
- Atkinson, P. (1985). *Language, structure and reproduction: An introduction to the sociology of Basil Bernstein*. London: Methuen. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203463239>
- Bernstein, B. (1971). *Class, code and control, Volume 1: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language*. London, England: Routledge & Kegan Paul. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203014035>
- Baker, M. J. (2000). Writing a Literature Review. *The Marketing Review*, 1(2), 219-247. <https://doi.org/10.1362/1469347002529189>
- Bohm, A. (2004). Theoretical coding: text analysis in grounded theory'. In U. Flick, E. Kardorff, & I. Steinke (Eds.), *A Companion to Qualitative Research* (pp. 270-275). London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Bolderston, A. (2008). Writing an Effective Literature Review. *Journal of Medical Imaging and Radiation Sciences*, 39, 86-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmir.2008.04.009>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1992). The metapragmatics of Politeness in Israeli Society. In Richard Watts, S. Ide, K. Ehlich (eds.) *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory, and Practice*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Fraser, B., & Nolen, W. (1981). The association of deference with linguistic form. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 93-109. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1981.27.93>
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness Phenomena in Modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatic*, 14, 237-257. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90082-O](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90082-O)
- Holloway, I. (1997). *Basic concepts for qualitative research*. Oxford: Blackwell Science Ltd.
- Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua*, 8(2/3), 223-248. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.1989.8.2-3.223>
- Jumanto, J. (2014). Politeness and camaraderie: how types of form matter in Indonesian context. Proceeding: *The Second International Conference on Education and Language (2nd ICEL)*. Bandar Lampung University (UBL), Indonesia.
- Lakoff, R. T. (1990). *Talking power: the politics of language in our lives*. Glasgow: Harper Collins.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. New York: Longman Group Limited.
- Saldana, Johnny. (2012). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. D. M. (1992). Cross-cultural politeness: British and Chinese conceptions of the tutor-student relationship (Unpublished PhD Thesis). Lancaster: Lancaster University.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: grounded theory procedures and techniques*. California: Sage Publications.
- Thomas, J. (1996). *Meaning in interaction: an introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Watts, R. (1989). Relevance and relational work: linguistic politeness as politic behavior. *Multilingua*, 8(2-3), 131-166. <https://doi.org/10.1515/mult.1989.8.2-3.131>
- Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: writing a literature review. *MIS Quarterly*, 26(2), xiii-xxiii.

#### Notes

1. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/acting>
2. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hint>
3. <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/hint>

#### Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).