

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

#### 4.0 Introduction

The conceptual framework of the present study is based on the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson (1978). Politeness is seen as the communicative goal of writers to be polite in writing when presenting their work. The focus of the present study is to investigate the politeness strategies used by writers of two selected economic journals. This is in line with the view presented by Kim (1993) who argues that strategies are goal directed and they are the overall desire of a communicative act.

Additionally, in a communicative discourse, ‘strategies’ are the overall interactive goals while ‘tactics’ are the devices used to realize the strategy (Nierenberg; 1973; Kim, 1993; Mulholland, 1994; Sokolova and Szpakowicz, 2007). Therefore, in this study all linguistic devices that journal writers use to achieve their interactive goal to be polite will be classified as tactics.

A total of twelve articles published from one local published journal, *Malaysian Journal of Economic Studies* (MJES) and one international journal publication, *Economic Growth* (EG), starting 2004 to 2009 formed the corpus. Throughout this chapter, the following abbreviations are used:

MJES	: <i>Malaysian Journal of Economic Studies</i>
EG	: <i>Journal of Economic Growth</i>
JWs	: Journal Writer(s)
abs	: Abstract
intro	: Introduction
meth	: Methodology
resl	: Results
disc	: Discussion
concl	: Conclusions

The following excerpt illustrates how examples taken from the data are presented as examples in this chapter:

Excerpt 1

[...] During the 1940s and early 1950s, economists were struggling with questions and provided different partial answers. It was not until 1957 that Solow (two decades later Nobel laureate) came up with an economic rationale became the basis for post modern analysis and estimations of TFP.

MJES-08/05/meth p. 4

Excerpt 2

[...] Once again, it is important to emphasize that . . . because in **practice output gains would often be magnified by secondary** effects.

EG-06/03/resl.p.17

In Excerpt 1, **MJES-08/05/meth, p.4** refers to the *Malaysian Journal of Economic Studies*, article number 5, published in 2008 in the methodology section on page 4. In Excerpt 2, **EG-06/03/resl, p.17** refers to *Economic Growth*, article number 3, published in 2006 in the result section on page 17.

To facilitate the discussion of the identified strategies, words or phrases being discussed will be highlighted either in **bold** or underlined (depending on which is required). This format is used throughout the chapter. Mainly **bold** will be used to highlight the main strategies and underlining will be used if in the same sentence has other strategies to be discussed. Any insertions by the researcher in any of the examples to facilitate the reading will be in square brackets [...].

In a total of 133,396 words as corpus, this study found that JWs use the following politeness strategies in the writing of economic journals. Therefore, the presentation of findings will be based on the four (4) types of positive politeness namely; Positive Politeness Strategies, Negative Politeness Strategies, Bald-on-record Strategies and Off-Record Strategies.

#### **4.1 Positive Politeness Strategies**

This section will present the results of the analysis of positive politeness strategies found in the corpus. According to Brown and Levinson (1978) positive politeness refers to people's desire to gain the approval of others by portraying a positive self image or personality. It follows that in this study Journal Writers (JWs) try to portray their self image in their writing. In positive politeness, redress is directed to the addressee's positive face as that the writer's need is to be liked and understood.

This section will first present the findings of the analysis of the MJES corpus followed by the findings from the EG corpus.

#### 4.1.1 Positive Politeness Strategy in MJES

To begin with, a total of 55.332 words formed the corpus collected from 6 articles from MJES. The data revealed that MJES writers employed eight (8) tactics for the purpose of being polite when writing their articles. In the analysis, as mentioned earlier, all linguistic devices that help to deliver the goal to be polite are recorded as tactics. The desired goal of positive politeness strategy is realized through the use of the following tactics as presented in Table 4.1.

**Table 4.1: Positive Politeness Tactics in MJES**

No	Tactics	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	By informing readers about the research	48	24.61
2	By using in-group identity marker	40	20.51
3	By sharing a similar view	32	16.41
4	By giving reasons	22	11.30
5	By acknowledging the contribution of others	20	10.25
6	By using in-group pronouns	19	9.74
7	By sharing emotional response	7	3.58
8	By showing humility	7	3.58
	<b>Total</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>100%</b>

As seen in Table 4.1 a total of 195 positive politeness tactics were found in the MJES corpus. The tactic *by informing readers about the research* made up nearly a quarter of the total tactics (24.61%). This is followed by the tactic *by using in-group identity marker* (20.51%) and the tactic *by sharing a similar view* (16.41%). The table above reveals that these were the top three tactics used by JWs in MJES.

The following section presents a set of the examples categorised as politeness strategies in MJES.

### **Tactic 1: By informing readers about the research**

This is the tactic used most by MJES JWs in this study. It is found that JWs used this tactic to inform the readers on the objectives, aims and purpose of their study. The following Examples (1-4) show how JWs conducted the study.

(1) **The objective of this paper** is to explain in layman's term what TFP is and what is not, and the pitfalls that surround its use as an objective of policy making . . .  
MJES 08/05/intro, p.2

(2) **This paper is concerned with** the economic welfare implications of the involvement of the diaspora in the economic activity of the countries origin. . .  
MJES 05/02/intro, p.10

As seen in Examples (1-2), JWs used phrases such as 'the objectives of this paper,' 'This paper is concerned with' as a way to inform others of the main aim(s) of their study.

(3) **This paper aims to** make two contributions to the literature on corruption.  
MJES 07/04/intro, p.2

(4) Therefore, considering the above scenario, **the purpose of this study** is to examine the total economic impact . . . in addressing this issue we shall simulate the effect of various changes in crude oil . . . .  
MJES 07/04/intro, p.2

As seen in Examples (3-4) JWs used phrases such as 'This paper aims to' and 'the purpose of this study' also as a way to inform others about the possible contribution in the future.

According to Mulholland (1994), when people inform others of their intentions, they try to reduce audience uncertainty. Thus, this can be viewed as a positive politeness strategy as this offers a possible contribution in the existing pool of knowledge. This concurs with the work of Myers (1989) who states that writer can be viewed as being polite when they inform readers of the strength and advantages or the possible contribution of their studies.

The data also revealed that JWs informed readers of the steps taken to collect or analyze their data. This can also be viewed as a positive politeness tactic as in Example (5):

- (5) **In this study, we collected** published data from 2000 input-output (I-O) which was the latest published for Malaysia.

MJES 07/04/intro, p.5

The study also found that JWs informed readers of the methodology or approach taken to analyse their data as in Examples (6-7) below:

- (6) **In the econometric analysis, we employed** the log linear of the constant model to measure elasticity of price of crude based on . . .

MJES 07/04/intro, p.2

- (7) Though the output-input model is employed as a major framework this study **also uses econometric approach for forecasting the quantity and** price of exports and imports of crude petroleum.

MJES 07/04/intro, p.2

As is seen in Examples (6-7), JWs informed readers of the framework and approach used in their research as they explain the additional methods used apart from the major framework of the study. In the Example (7) above, JW explained that the additional method used and the purpose for doing so was the 'econometric approach for

forecasting the quantity and price' of the products in his study. This is a tactic used by JW to be polite as Brown and Levinson (1978) state that the natural outcome of choosing this tactic is to demonstrate the good intention in satisfying the readers' positive face.

### **Tactic 2: By using in-group identity markers**

In-group identity markers convey in-group membership and they include in-group usage, address forms of intimate addressing term, jargons or slogan (Brown and Levinson, 1978). This is the second most frequently used tactic in the MJES corpus. The corpus revealed that JWs used in-group identity markers to bring about elements of closeness in order to close distance between JWs and readers. The following examples illustrate this:

- (8) By way of conclusions: **Dear Policy makers.**

MJES-08/05/concl, p.15

- (9) In particular, since the crisis there has been a political transition from authoritarianism to liberal democracy, which has been eventful but 'surprisingly' less dramatic than many '**pundits**' had predicted earlier . . . .

MJES-06/03/intro, p.22

As seen in Examples (8-9), JWs used in-group identity markers such as 'Dear Policy makers' and 'pundits'. In Example 8 the identity markers 'Dear' can be seen as a tactic that brings about closeness between the JW and the economic policy markers (e.g: government, economic institution). In Example (9) the identity marker 'pundits' was used to address people such as the experts, analysts and economic practitioners and to acknowledge their expertise as a member of the in-group.

The analysis also found that JWs used technical terms to indicate in-group identity markers. Technical terms are used to show solidarity and identify common grounds between the hearer and speaker. In this study, the use of technical term represents shared knowledge between JWs and journal readers. The following examples show this:

- (10) . . . The most simple such form is the so-called **Cobb-Douglas production function** . . [which refers to] the elasticity of output with respect to each input.

MJES-08/05/intro, p.4

- (11) Though **the input-output model** is employed as a major framework, this study also use **econometric approach** for forecasting the quantity and price of exports and imports of crude petroleum.

MJES-07/04/intro, p.2

As seen in Examples (10 and 11) JWs used technical terms such as ‘input-output model’ and ‘econometric approach’ as a way to inform others of the shared knowledge among economists. As technical terms or jargons are usually understood only by people in same area, this could be seen as a politeness tactic to convey in-group membership as jargons are used only among those with similar expertise (Myers:1989; Mulholland: 1994).

In Examples (12-13) below JWs appear to show shared knowledge among their in-group members and this can be viewed as a positive politeness strategy.

- (12) By this time the lingering political instability and the lacklustre economic performance induced Sukarno to introduce ‘**Guided democracy and Guided Economy**’ . . . .

MJES-06/03/disc, p.24

- (13) The government was able to continue with ‘**macroeconomic populism**’ in the absence of institutional checks and balance.

MJES-06/03/disc, p.38



As seen in Example (12-13) JWs used a familiar jargon and slogan among the esoteric readers such as ‘Guided democracy and Guided Economy’ and ‘macroeconomic populism’ to indicate shared knowledge as only among those working in the economic field would be able to know what these refer to.

### **Tactic 3: By sharing a similar view**

According to Mulholland (1994), when people share similar views, they appear to be in agreement with one another. Similarly Kwok (1997) contends that the strategy of sharing a similar view could be seen as a politeness strategy as seeking for approval or support from others is a positive politeness strategy. In the following Examples (14-15), JWs are seen to share a similar view with other scholars in order to support their line of argument:

- (14) **My view is that** one can list the possible sources of growth of an economy the way, for example, **Olson (1996)** does, that is, as an organisational device, or as a tool to think about growth in a systematic way.

MJES -08/05/meth. p.6

- (15) ... and this outcome is consistent with recent literature that argues that countries that push themselves and learn into areas where they do not have comparative advantage, do well (**Hausman et al.2005; Rodrik 2006; Hausman and Rodrik 2006**)

MJES -08/05/concl. p.13

As seen in Example (14), JW acknowledged ‘Olson (1996)’ as a means of sharing a similar view with him. This tactic concurs with Myers (1989) who mentioned that when people share similar view they are in solidarity with one another and this can justify the action of JWs. Furthermore, in Example (15) JW uses ‘Hausman et al.2005; Rodrik 2006; Hausman and Rodrik 2006’ cited to show agreement that Singapore has done a

well job in advanced technologies. By sharing similar views it shows JW's attempt to be in solidarity with the previous scholars.

#### **Tactic 4: By giving reasons**

An act of reasoning can be seen as a politeness tactic because it reduces the face threat act in FTA (Mulholland, 1994). This study found that JWs provided reasons to substantiate their claim as illustrated in the following example.

- (16) To examine the decision of any individual, we have to compute his/her maximum utility in each and every possible configuration, **Because administrative service are necessary input in any production process**, an individual can only achieve a utility of zero in the autarky structures . . .

MJES 05/02/reslt, p.28

- (17) The model developed shows that corruption increases the economic welfare of privileged groups in Asia at the expense of the rest of society. **Corruption is an important issue** because high level profiteering is a major cause of disaffection among the working class in Asia . . .

MJES 04/01/reslt, p.28

In the above Examples (16-17), JWs used the lexical item 'because' in order to substantiate their reason. By giving a reason JWs in Example (16) satisfy the positive face of the reader by explaining the reason for a particular step taken in the study and reduce the information gap between the JWs and readers. In this case JW tried to explain why it was necessary to examine decisions made by individuals. The reason was highlighted with the use of 'because'. Similarly in Example (17), JWs gave a reason for emphasizing on why corruption was an important issue. This could be seen as a politeness tactic because the reader is informed of the reason and why it is important to study corruption in the mentioned context.

### **Tactic 5: By acknowledging the contribution of others**

It was found that JWs acknowledged the contribution of others in order to give credit and compliment them for their work. According to Brown and Levinson (1978), the Speaker satisfies the Hearer's positive-face by acknowledging others by crediting them. In this case, it would be satisfying the reader's positive face by the writer. The following Example (18) shows this:

- (18) During the 1940s and early 1950s, economists were struggling with questions and provided different partial answer. It was not until 1957 that **Solow (two decades later Nobel laureate)** came up with an economic rationale became the basis for most modern analysis and estimations of TFP. This solution **was most ingenious**. . . .

MJES-08/05/meth, p. 4

As is seen in Example (18) JWs gave credit to Solow who later became a Nobel laureate and complimented the findings as 'most ingenious'. This can be seen as an honour to the pioneer of the theory, in addition to show credibility to the quality and framework used by JWs in their study.

The following Example (19) also shows how JWs complimented and described works of other scholars:

- (19) The input-output model is concerned with the inter-dependence or inter-industry relationship between.... **the input-output model which was developed by Leontif (1951) has been widely used** both in developed and developing countries to examines the economic impact on the economy due to changes in exogeneous variable.

MJES-07/04/intro, p. 3

As is seen in Example (19), JWs explicitly credited ‘Leontif (1951)’ as the pioneer of ‘input-output model’ in economics. This could also be seen as a politeness tactic because JWs showed respect to the people acknowledged in the journal article.

This study also reveals that JWs used the tactic of acknowledging the contribution of others by describing the work in order to show significance of their work. This could be seen as politeness tactic as JWs showed respect to the person, as shown in Examples (20-21) below:

- (20) **Hirschman (1987) has explored the meaning and measurement of ethnicity** in Malaysia in his analysis of the census classifications until 1980. He notes that the first modern census was carried out in 1871 for the Straits Settlements . . .

MJES-09/06/intro p. 11

- (21) **Franklin Fisher, among others, spent years in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s working out different aspects of the problem.** The results, for interested readers are summarized and discussed in . . .

MJES-08/05/intro, p.9

As seen in Examples (20-21), JWs acknowledged cited scholars, by describing their work JWs acknowledged the contribution of their studies. Thus, this could be seen as a politeness tactic as Brown and Levinson (1978) point out that when speaker acknowledging or crediting others, it is intended to satisfy the positive-face of the other person. In this case, it was the scholars cited or the people mentioned such as ‘Hirschman and Franklin Fisher’.

#### **Tactic 6: By using in-group pronoun**

According to Myers (1989), in-group markers such as pronouns are used to show solidarity with scholars and researchers. The data revealed that JWs used the pronouns

‘we, us, our’ in the examples below to show solidarity among the researchers in the field of economics as well as to include the readers of the journals.

(22) If Gricheld (1988) as argued, it’s not clear what TFPG measures are, then **we** cannot know what their determinants are. . . .

MJES 08/05/intro, p.13

(23) Seldom does a paper written by economists cause immediate impact among policy makers. Most economics paper are, let **us** face it, written in a language that is alien to most of the latter.

MJES 08/05/intro, p.1

In the Examples (22-23) JWs of MJES used the pronoun ‘we’ and ‘us’ that appear to represent ‘everyone’ such as JWs, readers and scholars in the economic field. This could be seen as positive politeness tactic because it tends to show solidarity between JWs and others in the economic field.

In the following Examples (24-25), JWs also used ‘we’ and ‘our’ to represent the researcher and fellow researchers.

(24) In addressing this issue, **we** shall simulate the effect of various changes in crude petroleum price on sectoral output and revenue collected by the government by employing....

MJES 07/04/intro, p.2

(25) **Our** Model allows for estimation of revenue collected by the government in the form of direct and indirect taxes as a result of an increase in production output.

MJES 07/04/meth, p.10

In Examples (24-25) above, the pronouns ‘we’ and ‘our’ represent the researcher and co-researchers respectively to show solidarity with each other. The pronouns in Examples (24-25) show that JWs were not standing alone but as an extended family either as a powerful group behind the JWs or more likely as in a partnership.

### **Tactic 7: By sharing emotional response**

Emotional response refers to the expressions of emotions, feelings, and mood. In writing the articles, the capacity to express this type of socio-emotional communication is reduced because body language, facial expressions, and vocal intonations are eliminated. However, according to Myers (1989), JWs share their emotion by exhibiting responses such as surprise at a new discovery; satisfaction at the progress of the research and disappointment at the failure of received idea. According to Mulholland (1994), when people exhibit emotions, they could narrow the distance and promote understanding among people. In the Examples (26-27) below, JWs of MJES shared their emotional response in their writing to express pleasure, satisfaction and disappointment with their findings:

(26) A sustained economic growth and development took place after this political change. The economic growth record for the next three decades was **impressive** . . . This indicates that the benefits of economic growth were widely shared and this led to improvement in all major social indicators.

MJES 06/03/intro, p.25

(27) They argue that it is . . . **Unfortunately**, the problem is true and ‘splitting total growth into its alleged sources’ **is a meaningless** exercise.

MJES 08/05/intro, p.10

As is seen in Example (26), JWs used the words ‘impressive’ to express pleasure of discovering facts in their study. However, in Example (27) JWs showed their dissatisfaction by using the word ‘unfortunately’. According to Myers (1989), when people show instances of emotional response in their study, it is an indication to achieve a common goal, rather than the response or desire of an individual. Thus, this too can be viewed as a politeness tactic.

### **Tactic 8: By showing humility**

Humility or humbleness is a quality of being courteously respectful of others, the quality of being modest, and never being arrogant or all knowing (Brown and Levinson, 1978:129). In this study, it was found that JWs used the tactic of humility as a way of humbling themselves by pointing out the shortcomings and acknowledging others so that they may not be viewed as all knowing.

In Examples (28-29), JWs acknowledges their shortcoming by stating that their study ‘may not be a perfect measure’ and ‘this study does not capture the effect on sectoral costs of production an inflation in the economy’ to indicate the limitation of their study. This could be seen as a way of JWs showing humility and not to appear all knowing in the field of economics.

(28) In this case, the value of different outputs can be summed up . . . for this reason, the standard units of labour productivity estimates are dollars (or whatever other currency) per worker (or per hour) of a base year. **As one can see, this may not be a perfect measure** of what intrinsically productivity is, but is certainly useful one.

MJES 08/05/intro p.3

(29) This paper attempts to examine the impact of an increase in crude petroleum price . . . As Malaysia is a net crude oil exporter . . . **However this study does not capture the effect on sectoral costs of production an inflation in the economy.**

MJES 07/04/conc p.11

#### **4.1.2 Positive Politeness Strategies in EG**

This section presents the findings based on the analysis of positive politeness strategies in EG. A total of 78.064 words formed the corpus based on 12 articles collected from this journal.

The data revealed that EG writers employed eight (8) tactics for the purpose of being polite in the writing of economic journals. All linguistic devices that help to deliver the desired goal of positive politeness strategy are realized through the use of the following tactics as presented in table 4.2

**Table 4.2: Positive Politeness Tactics in EG**

<b>No</b>	<b>TACTICS</b>	<b>FREQUENCY</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
1	by using in-group identity marker	62	20.37
2	by using in-group pronoun	59	19.34
3	by informing readers about their research	40	13.11
4	by sharing a similar view	37	12.13
5	by giving reasons	23	7.54
6	by acknowledging the contribution of others	22	7.21
7	by showing humility	9	2.95
8	by sharing emotional response	6	1.96
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>100%</b>

As seen in Table 4.2, a total of 258 positive politeness tactics were found in the EG corpus. The top three tactics employed are by using in-group identity marker (20.37 %), followed by using in-group pronoun (19.34%) and by informing the readers about the research (13.11%).

The following section presents a set of the examples categorised as politeness strategies in EG:



### **Tactic 1: By using in-group identity markers**

This is the tactic most used by EG's JWs in this study. It is found that JWs used this tactic to indicate group membership and to bring about the elements of closeness in order to show solidarity as well as to close the distance between JWs and readers. The following Examples (30-32) showed how JWs conducted the study.

In-group identity markers convey in-group membership and they include in-group usage, address forms of intimate terms, technical terms, jargons or slogan (Brown and Levinson : 1978; Myers : 1989). This present study found that JWs employed in-group identity marker such as technical terms to bring about the elements of closeness between JWs and readers. This is revealed in the following Examples 30 – 32:

(30) ... thus producing big equivalent **ad valorem** rate changes, that is, big changes in percentage rate.

EG-04/01/met. p.8

(31) Since the inclusions of initials **GDP per capita** in a dynamic panel can lead to biased coefficients (Nickell, 1981), we also provide a consistent specification that uses lagged **GDP per capita** as an instrument

EG-04/01/dis. p.12

(32) We are able to construct; the ratio of agricultural prices to the economy-wide labor supply (**LANDLAB**); the ratio of agricultural land the economy to industrial prices (**PAM**); the ratio wages rates to farm land rents (**WR**); total factor productivity in agriculture (**TFPG**); and labour productivity in manufacturing (**INDPROD**)

EG-05/02/meth p.11

As seen in Examples (30-32), JW used technical terms such as 'ad valorem, GDP per capita, LANDLAB, PAM, TFPG and INDPROD' as a way to inform others, using shared knowledge among the economists. As technical terms are usually understood by

people in specific research areas this could be seen as a politeness tactic. This concurs with the work of Mulholland (1994), who state that JWs can be viewed as being polite when they use technical terms to indicate in-group identity markers.

### **Tactic 2: By using in-group pronouns**

According to Myers (1989), in-group markers such as pronouns are used to show solidarity with scholars, researchers and people in scientific community. In this study, it was found that JWs use pronoun such as “we, us, our” to express that the writers *do not stand alone* but as an extended family. The following Example (33) shows the case.

- (33) ...The conventional approach to these question is driven by what **we** might call the ‘fundamentals’ view of the world.

EG-07/04/intro p.2

In Example (33) JWs used the pronoun ‘we’ that appears to represent ‘everyone’ in the economics field. The use of the pronoun ‘we’ appears to show that JWs are in solidarity and are in the same position with the others, in addition to standing as an extended family. Thus, it was possible for JWs to mitigate any claims they make in the article.

In the following Examples (34-35), JWs use the pronoun ‘our’ and ‘we’ to represent themselves and their co-researchers:

- (34) **Our** approach has a different micro foundation than either of these, and yields an empirical examination that is much more fine-grained.

EG-07/04/intro, p.3

- (35) To check the robustness of **our** findings against these concerns, **we** have also constructed **our** measures with the World Trade dataset which....

EG-07/04/meth, p.11

(36) This allows **us** to study the extent to which the VRS model...

EG-06/03/intro, p.6

As is seen in Examples (34-35) JWs used the pronoun 'our' and 'we' that represent themselves and their co-researchers. In addition, in Example (36) JWs used the pronoun 'us' to also represent the esoteric audiences. This shows that JWs could mitigate any claim they make in their criticism while minimizing the FTA by including themselves in the criticism. Thus this can be viewed as a politeness tactic.

### **Tactic 3: By informing readers about their research**

It is found that JWs used this tactic to inform readers on the possible contributions to economics, the strength of their study and steps taken by the researchers in conducting their studies. In the following Examples (37-38), JWs informed readers about the possible contributions of their study:

(37) **This papers offers explanations** based on changing export market growth or transportation cost decline.

EG-04/01./abs, p.1

(38) **We present in this paper** a complementary argument that emphasizes the idiosyncratic elements in specialization patterns. . .

EG-04/01./intro, p.1

Examples (37-38) above shows JWs used phrases such as 'This papers offers explanations' and 'We present in this paper' as a way to inform others of the strengths and possible contribution of the study. This concurs with the work of Myers (1989) and Mulholland (1994), who stated that writers can be viewed as being polite when they inform readers of the strengths, advantages or the possible contributions of their study.

The study found that JWs also informed readers about the strengths of their research.

This could also be viewed as a politeness tactic as revealed in Example (38):

- (39) This paper **exploits recently-collected data** documenting relative factor price trends over the very long run and **points out** that there was another, equally radical structure break which occurred in north-west Europe. . .

EG-05/02./intro, p.1

In Example (39) JWs informed readers of the strength of the paper as it ‘exploits recently-collected data’ and ‘points out’ something which could satisfy the positive face of the readers.

The data also revealed that JWs informed readers of the steps taken in their studies.

This can also be viewed as positive politeness as this could satisfy the curiosity of readers of the steps taken in collecting data. In Example 40, JWs inform readers of the steps taken in their study:

- (40) **We also include human capital as a regressor**, since it plays a role in our theoretical framework. **We add the (physical) capital-labor ratio and a rule of law index** as well to account for neoclassical explanations for economic growth. Finally, we show both OLS and IV result.

EG-07/04./meth, p.18

In this Example (40) JWs explained the details of their study by informing the steps taken in their study such as ‘We also include human capital as a regressor’ and ‘We add the (physical) capital-labor ratio and a rule of law index . . .’. This tactic could be seen as a politeness tactic as it allows JWs to guide readers to the methodology of the study.

#### **Tactic 4: By sharing similar view**

When people share similar views, they appear to be in solidarity with one another. Kwok (1997) states that the strategy of shared similar views could be seen as an action of showing solidarity, seeking for approval or support from others in a polite way. In the following Example (41), JWs used the tactic of sharing similar view to seek for approval, support so as to justify their arguments:

- (41) The first was a transition to modern industrial growth and the second was a transition towards a more open trading development . . . the older evidence seemed to support this view; for example **Hoffman's (1955) data show a dramatic acceleration of industrial output after 1770 . . . .**

EG-07/04/intro. p.4

In Example (41) JWs supported their view by quoting Hofman's (1955) data to 'show a dramatic acceleration of industrial output after 1770...' . JWs could use this tactic to justify the credibility and familiarity of their claim in their research field. This could be viewed as politeness tactic because JWs showed their solidarity with scholars of previous studies. In the following Example (41), JWs shared similar result of previous studies to justify their findings of their own study:

- (42) Finally, the estimated coefficients of the distance to the frontier are both statistically and economically highly significant in all estimates in tables 2-4. **This result is consistent with the argument of Aghion and Howitt (2006) and the model of Griffith et al (2003)** that the further behind the technology frontier a country is, the stronger is its growth potential provided that the right institutions are set in place and that R&D is undertaken.

EG-08/05/reslt, p.17

In Example (42) JWs claimed that the result of their study was 'consistent with the argument of Aghion and Howitt (2006) and the model of Griffith et al (2003)'. This can also be viewed as positive politeness as JWs showed solidarity with the result of

previous studies and thus are able to save the positive face of scholars of previous studies.

### **Tactic 5: By giving reasons**

Giving reasons can be viewed as a politeness tactic because it supplies reasons for the act, and reduces the face threat involved in the FTA (Mulholland, 1994). This study found that JWs used the lexical item 'because' in order to give and substantiate their reasons. It was found that JWs gave reasons to explain and justify the steps they took in their study by indicating the cause and effect as seen in Example (45) below:

- (45) We have drawn (ZP) as less step than (LL), **because** otherwise scale economies would be strong that the dynamic behaviour of the model would be unstable under reasonable specification

EG-07/04/met, p.7

In Example (45), the JWs gave a reason for one action in their study. It was found that the JWs used the lexical item 'because' in order to substantiate their reasons. Here JW employed a positive politeness tactic by giving a reason regarding the action in his article, in order to satisfy positive face of the audiences in his statement. This can also be seen in the following Example (46):

- (46) Note that, in contrast to our first approach, this method probably understates the amount of output variation due to multiple equilibria. This is **because** it ignores some dynamic or general equilibrium effects that might follow an equilibrium switch;

EG-06/03/meth, p.7

As seen in Example (46), JW justified their methodological approach by giving a reason for their action by using the lexical item 'because'. This can be viewed as positive politeness as readers are given an explanation about what was going on in the study.

## **Tactic 6 : By acknowledging the Contribution of Others**

It was found that JWs of EG used this tactic to acknowledge the contribution of others in previous studies. According to Mulholland (1994) crediting, complementing or appreciating could show the eagerness to be a member of the academic scientific community as well as showing respect to others. This is another tactic of politeness strategies as illustrated in Examples (47-48).

- (47) **Ha and Howith (2007) provide probably the first empirical attempt to discriminate between the Schumpeterian and semi-endogenous growth theories.**

EG-08/05/ disc, p.27

Examples (47-48). JWs gave credit to previous researchers or pioneers in the field. In Example (47), JWs acknowledged ‘Ha and Howith’ as the ones who did the ‘first empirical attempt’ to distinguish the mentioned theories. The credits given by JWs to earlier scholars as the pioneers of the study could be seen as a politeness tactic. This can also be seen in the following Example (48):

- (48) As we noted . . . **The point has been made recently and prominently by Rodriguez and Rodrik (2001).**

EG-04/01/intro p.6

In Example (48), JWs complimented and described the work of ‘Rodrigues and Rodrik’ and supported their findings. By using this tactic, JWs can be viewed as being polite as they acknowledge prior researchers and their studies.

### **Tactic 7: By showing humility**

Humility or humbleness is a quality of being courteously respectful of others, the quality of being modest, and never being arrogant or all knowing. This study found that JWs humbled themselves as a way to point out the shortcomings in their studies. The following Example shows this:

- (49) **We do not claim any novelty** for the idea that specialization patterns are not entirely predictable. It has been long understood that . . . .

EG-07/04/intro, p.2

In Example (49) JWs were being humble by claiming that they ‘do not claim any novelty’ for the contribution of their study as there may be others who could be more knowledgeable in the field. This can be viewed as politeness tactic as this tactic could show that JWs are not trying to be arrogant with their finding.

The data also revealed that JWs showed their humility by admitting the limitation of their study. This can be viewed as positive politeness as seen in the two examples below:

- (50) **We do not claim to have shown** a relationship between economic growth and overall ‘openness’ or ‘outward orientation’ . . . .

EG-07/04/ intro p.2

- (51) **Our implicit theoretical framework is a traditional static trade model** (the specific factors model), with exogenous endowments and technology. **Clearly the world was more complicated than that**, and the growth models cited above all reflect this; but the fact that such a simple open economy framework can explain so much is telling in its own way.

EG-05/02/ intro p.7



In Example (50) JWs admitted that what they found in their study might not be as profound by humbly saying that they ‘do not claim to have shown a relationship between economic growth and overall ‘openness’ or ‘outward orientation’. However, what they have found may be a contribution in the field.

Similarly in example (51) JWs admitted the limitations of their framework that might not possibly cover the whole scope of the study but would suffice to explain the phenomenon. The use of this tactic can be viewed as a humility tactic as JWs admit the limitation of their research.

**Tactic 8: By sharing emotional response.**

According to Mc.Closkey (1986) and Mulholland (1994) emotional response refers to the expressions of emotions, feelings, and mood. Furthermore, in writing, the capacity to express this type of socio-emotional communication is reduced because body language, facial expressions, and vocal intonations are eliminated. However, according to Myers (1989) JWs share their emotions with the community by exhibiting responses that assumes shared knowledge such as surprise at a new discovery, satisfaction at the progress of the discipline and disappointment at the failure of received idea, in their writings. In example (52) and (53), JWs of EG shared their emotional response by expressing pleasure and surprise in the findings of their study:

(52) **A remarkable result . . .** This result highlights the importance of international spillovers effects and, at the same time, reinforces the finding in the previous section that foreign research, intensity, particularly, is an important engine of TFP growth

EG-08/05/reslt.p.22

- (53) We can establish that local stability for both the interior equilibria is a possible outcome, given a suitably specified intersectoral labor migration process. This is a **surprisingly** result since standard approaches to stability analysis. . . .

EG-06/03/reslt, p.14

In example (52) the phrase ‘A remarkable result’ was used to express pleasure on the ‘result highlights’. Similarly, in Example (53), the lexical item ‘surprisingly’ was used to express pleasure and satisfaction of the extraordinary research results. This can be viewed as positive politeness as stated by Mulholland (1994), that when people exhibit emotions, they could narrow the distance and promote understanding.

The data also revealed that JWs showed disappointment through their emotions when showing the weakness in their study or the lack of information in the economics field.

The following two examples illustrate this:

- (54) The key trade driving down the Europe rents in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century was trade in grain; **unfortunately**, we do not have intercontinental price gaps for grains prior to 1800, however, figure 3 plots Anglo-American wheat price gaps from 1800 to 1999.

EG-05/02/intro, p.10

- (55) . . . i.e. that the propensity to patent and the average value of patents are approximately constant over time. **Unfortunately**, there is not much research done in this area. Mansfield (1986) finds little change in the propensity to patent patentable innovations over time in the US.

EG-08/05/intro p.6

As seen in Examples (54-55), JWs, show dissatisfaction or unhappiness by using the phrase ‘Unfortunately’ to express disappointment. According to Myers (1989) when people show instances of emotional response in their study is an indication to achieve a common goal, rather than the response or desire of an individual. Thus, this too can be viewed as a politeness tactic.

## 4.2 Negative Politeness

The present section will present and explain the negative politeness strategies found in the corpus from MJES and EG.

According to Brown and Levinson (1978:129), negative politeness refers to performing an FTA with redressive action, or strategy oriented towards negative face of audience i.e. to freedom of action and freedom from imposition. Conclusively we could say negative politeness combines both on-record delivery and redress of an FTA. This section begins with the tactics found in MEJS followed by those found in EG.

### 4.2.1 Negative Politeness in MJES

The data revealed that MJES JWs used five (5) types of tactics for the purpose of being polite in the writing of articles. The desired goal of negative politeness strategy is realized through the use of the following tactics as illustrated in Table 4.3 below:

**Table 4.3: Negative Politeness Tactics in MJES**

No	TACTICS	NUMBERS	Percentage (%)
1	By hedging	121	56.54
2	By using nominalization	31	14.48
3	By impersonalizing	27	12.61
4	By being pessimistic	19	8.87
5	By comparing	7	3.27
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>214</b>	<b>100</b>

As seen in Table 4.5, a total of 214 negative politeness tactics were found in the MJES corpus. More than a half of the total tactics used by JWs of MJES was *hedging* (56.54%). This is followed by the tactic by using *nominalization* (14.48%) and by *impersonalizing* (12.61%). The table above reveals that these were the top three tactics of negative politeness found used in MJES. The following section presents the set of the examples categorised as negative politeness strategies in MJES.

### **Tactic 1: By hedging**

Hedging is a strategy that speakers use to mitigate and soften the force of their utterances (Brown and Levinson: 1978; Myers: 1989). In this present study, it was found that hedging was used in economic journal articles to convey persuasive effect and to be polite. This study found that JWs hedge through the following ways:

- The use of tentative verbs
- The use of adverbs
- The use of modals
- The use of conditional ‘if’

#### **Tactic 1.1: The use of tentative verbs**

The data revealed that JWs used tentative verbs such as ‘seem’, ‘suggest’ or ‘appear’ to hedge the following examples highlight this case:

(55) Most economist do not **seem** to know **seem** to be aware either of the fourth issues

MJES-07/04.reslt p.13

- (56) Whilst the beginnings of international flows of human capital can be traced to the decades of the sixties and the seventies, recent data **suggests** that emigration of skilled people from developing countries continues unabated.

MJES -05/02/concl. p.10

- (57) Comparing the SRM and CRM, it **appears** that aggregation bias does exist.

MJES -04/01/meth. p.14

In Examples (55-57) JWs hedged to show uncertainty by using tentative verbs ‘seem, suggest and appear’. The use of these lexical items brings about the mitigation effects and a degree of probability that aids to save the negative face of both readers and JWs.

### **Tactic 1.2: The use of adverbs**

The data revealed that JWs expressed uncertainty by using adverb like: ‘**probably**’ or ‘**likely**’ to hedge. The following Examples demonstrate this:

- (58) First, the authors admit that the assumptions needed to apply the method (see above) **probably** do not apply to the Chinese economy. . . .

MJES -08/05/intro. p.10

- (59) . . . namely, the implications for the fact technical progress is, most **likely**, not Hicks neutral.

MJES-08/05/intro. p.11

In Examples (58-59) JWs hedge to show uncertainty by using ‘probably’ and ‘likely’ to bring about the mitigation effects and a degree of uncertainty that aids to save the negative face of both readers and JWs.

### **Tactic 1.3: The use of modals**

The data revealed JWs expressing uncertainty using modals like: ‘could’, ‘would’, ‘should’ to hedge, the following examples show this.

- (60) Economists started inquiring about the conditions under which so-called micro-production function like the one above **could** be summed up so as to yield the aggregate production function. . .

MJES -08/05/intro. p.9

- (61) Indeed, in the absence of productivity changes, the incentives to accumulate **would** have been much lower, and the resulting capital accumulation **would** have also been significantly lower.

MJES -08/05/intro .p.6

- (62) If higher labour productivity growth is indeed a desirable objective, for its key long run growth ‘a policy agenda towards higher productivity growth **should** take market failure as its starting point and **should** be carefully designed so as to avoid government failure and reduce. . .

MJES -08/05/intro. p.7

In Examples (60-62) JWs hedged to show uncertainty by using the hedging like ‘could, would, or should’. The use of these lexical items brings about the mitigation effects and a degree of uncertainty without necessarily showing a confusion or vagueness in the statement, which aids to save the negative face of both readers and JWs.

### **Tactic 1.4: The use of conditional ‘if’**

The data revealed that JWs hedged by using the conditionally ‘if’. According to Myers (1989) also Brown and Levinson (1978), the conditional ‘if’ can be used to express uncertainty and to distance the writer personally from the claim or assumption. The following examples illustrate this:

- (63) Or one may speculate. What it would have happened to the cake (economy) **if** it had been baked (managed) by a more competent baker. . . .  
MJES -08/05/meth, p.11

- (64) The situation becomes worse **if** the privileged groups acquire more control and influence over the economy.  
MJES -08/05/reslt. p.11

- (65) The answer perhaps yes, **but if** [and] **only if** one could show that much numbers represent. . . .  
MJES -08/05/reslt. p.11

In Examples (63-65), JWs used the conditional ‘if’ to express uncertainty as the condition of a result or situation is dependent on the other. This can be seen as negative politeness as JWs distanced themselves from the assumption or claim.

## **Tactic 2: By using nominalization**

Nominalization is known as the process of turning verbs into abstract nouns in the sentences. However, according to Brown and Levinson (1978) and also Myers (1989) when we nominalize the subject, a sentence becomes more wordy and formal, which helps to create distance between the writer and claim stated in the sentences. Similarly, this study recorded that nominalization tactic was found to maintain the distance between JWs and the readers.

- (66) The conclusion is that it is very difficult **to argue convincingly** that the residual measure TFPG is, unambiguously, a measure of the ‘aggregate’ rate of technical progress, or of anything meaningful that policy makers should care about, because it can be affected by policy making.  
MJES -08/05/find. p.15

- (67) **The determination on the order of integration**, of series is a necessary procedure that precedes the analysis of long run relationships among variables.  
MJES -07/04/intro p.4

In Examples (66-67) nominalization has made the statements more formal and thus, help create distance between JWs and their readers. This formality can be viewed as negative politeness tactic because the act could reduce the impact of imposition in the text (Mulholland, 1994).

### **Tactic 3: By impersonalizing**

According to Brown and Levinson (1978) and Myers (1989), the tactic of impersonalisation has often been referred to as objectivity and replicability of scientific investigation which may suggest the attribution of a possible FTA to a third party. Similarly Mullholland (1994) stated that the impersonalising tactic is used when speaker does not want to impinge on H. The following Examples (68-70) show JWs redressed the FTA by impersonalizing the statements in their texts:

(68) While **this thesis** could be true (that is, Singapore pushed itself into technologies too far ahead of itself to benefit from learning by doing), the evidence is not clear.

MJES-05/02/ intro p.10

(69) **This paper** develops a Walrasian general equilibrium model with division of labour, economies of specialisation, and endogenised corruption as a rational choice of each individual.

MJES-04/01/intro. p.34

(70) Though the input-output model is employed as a major framework, **this study** also uses an econometric approach for forecasting the quantity and price of exports and imports of crude petroleum.

MJES-07/04/intro, p.2

In Examples (68-70) JWs redressed the potential threat of some FTA's by using phrases such as 'this paper', 'this thesis' and 'this study'. JWs appear to have removed themselves as a subject in the text by referring to themselves as the third party. This can



be viewed as negative politeness tactic allowing them to reduce the impact of any imposition.

In the following two examples, JWs impersonalized others in economic texts by using personal pronouns such as ‘one’ and ‘you’:

- (71) TFP is neither a toll nor an objective. Some authors have even claimed that economics needs a theory of TFP. This is very dubious (see Felipe...). It will only give **you** a headache because **you** will never understand the real meaning of the number that **you** calculated . . . simply disregard it and do not waste time calculating it.

MJES -08/05/reslt. p.15

- (72) This may seem silly. However, this is what growth accounting does. What would happen . . . if **one** added a given amount of extra flour (capital)? Or **one** may speculate about what it would happened to. . . .

MJES -08/05/intro, p.6

As is seen in Example (71- 72), JWs used the pronouns ‘you’ and ‘one’ to reduce the act of imposition. According to Mulholland (1994) and Myers (1989), when JWs use the pronouns ‘you’ and ‘one’ they position themselves to have the same power and rank of position with others.

#### **Tactic 4: By being pessimistic**

According to Brown and Levinson (1978), being pessimistic is a strategy of negative politeness as it redresses the negative-face by explicitly expressing doubt on the situation. Mulholland (1994) states that being pessimistic could minimize any imposition of an FTA.

In Examples (73-74) JWs are being pessimistic about the changes of some measures undertaken by the authorities.

(73) The most elaborate and well designed anti-corruption measures **will be useless** if they are not enforced by political leadership and followed by the reform and evolution of a system.

MJES -04/01/intro, p. 34

(74) Corruption as a dominant component has been institutionalized . . . Political leaders have pledged to eradicate corruption to the public, **while in most cases it is hard to succeed** as corruption in these countries has been institutionalized.

MJES -04/01/intro. p. 24

As seen in Examples (73-74) JWs mentioned that the measures undertaken to improve corruption 'will be useless' and 'it is hard to succeed' unless certain conditions were met. This could be seen as being pessimistic, redressing the negative face of others such as the authorities and policy makers.

### **Tactic 5: By using comparison**

According to Mulholland (1994), by comparing, a speaker could bring together two or more things by pointing out the common qualities between them. This study found that JWs from MJES used comparisons in their writing to point out the qualities of the acknowledged object (i.e. persons or countries) to readers. The following Example (75) illustrates this.

(75) This justified the growing leadership clout of Indonesia in the region in general . . . With the rise in **Soeharto's** stature in the region, he was referred to as Indonesia's Father of Development (Bapak Pembangunan) whilst his economy development strategy remained market-friendly and outward-oriented . . . much in the same way as **General Park Chung Hee** pursued economic development in South Korea

MJES 06/03/ Intro, p.22

As seen in Example (75), JWs compared two persons i.e. ‘Soeharto’ and ‘General Park Chung Hee’, to point out their common qualities and their reputations. This can be viewed as a negative politeness tactic, as readers can independently form their own opinion about the people acknowledged by JWs. In Example (76), JWs compared two countries to point out their similarities:

(76) The **index** for **Malaysia** is not as high as say, India, but is about the same as **Canada** and much greater than, say, the UK

MJES 09/06/ Intro, p.8

As seen in Example (76), JWs pointed out that Malaysia and Canada are similar in terms of economic index. Thus, readers of economic journals can independently form their own opinion about the two countries.

#### 4.2.2 Negative Politeness in EG

This section presents the findings on the negative politeness found in EG. The data revealed that EG JWs used four (4) types of tactics to achieve the goal of being polite in the writing of economic journals.

**Table 4.4: Negative Politeness Tactics in EG**

No	TACTICS	NUMBERS	Percentage (%)
1	By hedging	157	55.87
2	By impersonalizing	44	15.65
3	By being pessimistic	42	14.94
4	By using comparisons	6	2.14
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>281</b>	<b>100.%</b>

Table 4.5 above shows that a total of 281 negative politeness tactics was found in the EG corpus. The tactic *by hedging* makes up more than a half of the total tactics (55.87%) found for negative politeness in the corpus. This is followed by *impersonalizing* (15.65%) and *by being pessimistic* (14.94). The table above reveals that these were among the top three tactics of negative politeness found used in EG.

The following section presents the set of the examples categorised as negative politeness strategies in EG.

### **Tactic 1 : By hedging**

Hedging is a strategy that speakers use to mitigate and soften the force of their utterances (Brown and Levinson: 1978; Myers: 1989). In this present study, it was found hedging was used in economic journal articles to convey persuasive effect and being polite. This study found that JWs hedge through the following ways:

- The use of tentative verbs
- The use adverbs
- The use of modals

#### **Tactic 1.1: the use of tentative verbs**

The data revealed that JWs used tentative verbs such as ‘seem, suppose, appear suggest or appear’ to hedge. The following examples show this:

(77) At first sight, diamonds **seem** to play a large role in India and Armenia, but both countries retain their high EXPYs even with diamonds removed from the calculation.

EG-07/04/ intro. p.13

- (78) In fact, forward-looking behaviour on the part of . . . **Suppose**, for Example, that we start at a level of  $m$  which falls short of . . . .

EG-07/04/resl, p.7

- (79) Considering the long-run relationship between ... This **suggests** that semi-endogenous growth theory has some promise in accounting for the cross-country variation in TFP growth.

EG-08/05/meth. p.10

- (80) A few other cases where countries **appear** to have very large EXPY values relative to per capita GDP are...

EG-07/04/reslt p.14

In Examples (77-80), JWs of EG hedged to show uncertainty by using tentative verbs ‘seem, suppose, suggest and appear’. The use of these lexical items brings about the mitigation effects and a degree of probability that aids to save the negative face of both readers and JWs.

### **Tactic 1.2: the use of adverbs**

The data revealed that JWs of EG also hedged by using lexical items such as ‘probably’ or ‘likely’. The following two examples show this:

- (81) Even trademarks, which are **probably** the closest one can come to measuring the variety of goods, may not completely approximate new goods, and old goods may not disappear by a fixed 20% depreciation rate.

EG-05/02/discs, p.24

- (82) . . . Furthermore, the period from 1913 to 1945 is **likely** to be a period in which the variables are measured with errors as discussed in footnote.

EG-08/05/discs, p.20

In Examples (81-82), JWs hedged to show uncertainty by using lexicals, ‘probably’ and ‘likely’, The use of these lexical items brings about the mitigation effects and a degree of uncertainty that aids to save the negative face of both the readers and JWs.

### **Tactic 1.3: the use of modal**

It can be seen from the data that JWs expressed uncertainty by using modals such as ‘might’, ‘could’, ‘would’, and ‘should’. As seen in the following examples:

(83) The conventional approach to these questions is driven by what we **might** call the ‘fundamentals’ view of the world.

EG-07/04/intro, p.1

(84) The conflict **could** be caused by cross-country measurement errors.

EG-08/05/discs, p.17

(85) Once again, it is important to emphasize that . . . because in practice output gains **would** often be magnified by secondary effects.

EG-06/03/resl, p.17

(86) These results are strongly in ... If some of the research intensity is driven by TFP growth, it **should** have been revealed by the Granger causality tests,....

EG-08/05/discs, p.22

In Examples (83-86), JWs hedged to show uncertainty by using modals such as ‘might, could, would, and should’. The use of these lexical items brings about the mitigation effect and a degree of uncertainty without necessarily showing a confusion or vagueness in the statement. The use of these modals could aid JWs to hedge and thus save the negative face of both readers and JWs.

## **Tactic 2: By impersonalizing**

According to Mulholland (1994) as well as Brown and Levinson (1978) state that impersonalizing is a tactic used when speaker does not want to impinge on hearers. The following Examples (87-89) show JWs redress the FTA by impersonalizing the statements in their text.

(87) **This model** is a specific Example of the variable-returns-to-scale (VRS) models of trade theory.

EG-08/05/ abs, p.8

(88) **This paper** asks whether the income gap between rich and poor nations can be explained by multiple equilibria. We explore the quantitative implications of a . . . . .

EG-06/03/ abs, p.1

(89) This requires data on innovative activity that go back much further than the century of data used in **this study**.

EG-08/05/ discs, p.2

In Examples (87-89) JWs redressed the potential threat of some FTA's by using phrases such as 'this model', 'this paper' and 'this study'. JWs of EG appear to have removed themselves as a subject in the text into a third party. This can be viewed as a negative politeness tactic which allows the reduction of the impact of imposition. In the following two examples, JWs impersonalized themselves in economic texts by using the personal pronouns such as 'one' and 'you' as shown in the examples below:

(90) . . . show that while closed economy models similar to **the one** estimated earlier work well before 1800, they do not work at all well from the 19th century on.

EG-05/02/ intro, p.15

- (91) . . . note in Figure 1 the protectionist drift worldwide between 1865 and World War I, a modest anti-globalization backlash if **you** will, registering a slow retreat from the liberal pro-global trade positions in mid-century

EG-04/01/ intro, p.9

As is seen in Example (90-91), JWs used the pronoun ‘you’ and ‘one’ to reduce the act of imposition. According to Myers (1989), when writers use the pronoun ‘you’ and ‘one’ in their writing, they position themselves as the same power and rank of position with others.

### **Tactic 3: By being pessimistic**

According to Brown and Levinson (1978), being pessimistic is a strategy of negative politeness as it redresses the negative-face by explicitly expressing doubt on the appropriateness of the speech act. Mulholland (1994) states that being pessimistic could minimize any imposition of an FTA.

In Examples (92-93) JWs are being pessimistic about the changes of some measures undertaken by the people in economic fields.

- (92) Assigning countries . . . is always tricky, since its hard to measure overall openness . . . more importantly **its difficult to isolate the effect of trade policies alone.**

EG-04/01/intro, p.6

- (93) **It may be difficult to give the relationship with human capital** a direct causal interpretation, since the causal effect may go from [EXPY] to human capital rather than vice versa.

EG-07/04/intro, p.16

As seen in Examples (92-93) JWs are being pessimistic by indicating that ‘its difficult to isolate the effect of trade policies alone and ‘It may be difficult to give the



relationship with human capital'. Being pessimistic could be viewed as a negative politeness tactic as this would redress the negative face and avoid impingement of others in the statement.

#### **Tactic 4: By using comparison**

According to Mulholland (1994), by using comparison, the speaker could bring together two or more things by pointing out the common qualities among them. This study found that EG JWs used comparisons to point out the qualities of the objects (i.e. countries) to readers. The following Examples (96-97) show this.

- (94) . . . In the same year, Tariff in ***Brazil and Columbia*** (the most protectionists LDC) were almost 10 those in ***China and India*** (the least) . . .

EG 04/01/ Intro, p.9

- (95) Its worth remembering at this juncture that **China** and **India** have both been experiencing very rapid economic growth . . .

EG 04/01/ Intro, p.17

As seen in Example (94), JWs compared these countries i.e. 'Brazil with Columbia' and 'China with India' to point out their common qualities and their reputations. Similarly in Example (96), JWs compared two countries i.e. 'China and India' to point out the similarities between them. This can be viewed as negative politeness tactic as the readers are allowed to form their own opinion independently about the countries that are mentioned by JWs.

### 4.3 Bald-on-record

This section presents the bald-on-record tactics that are found in the MJES and EG corpus. According to Brown and Levinson (1978) bald-on-record strategies refers to performing the FTA in a direct and concise way without any redressive action. This study found instances when JWs provide no effort to minimize threats to the readers face.

#### 4.3.1 Bald-on-record in MJES

This section presents the analysis of data of bald-on-record in MJES. The data revealed that MJES JWs used two (2) types of tactics for the purpose of being polite in the writing of economic journals as illustrated in Table 4.5 below:

**Table. 4.5: Bald-on-record Tactics in MJES**

NO	TACTICS	NUMBERS	Percentage (%)
1	By using direct criticism	27	56.25
2	By using direct argument proposition	21	43.75
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>48</b>	<b>100 %</b>

As seen in the Table 4.5, a total of 48 bald-on-record tactics were found in the MJES corpus. MJES JWs employed the tactic *by using direct criticism* by more than a half of the total tactics (56.25%). The other is *by using direct argument proposition* (43.75%).

The following section presents the set of the examples categorised as bald-on-record strategy in MJES.

## **Tactic 1: By using direct criticism**

According to Mulholland (1994) a direct criticism is offered to rectify a situation and that can alter something for the better. In addition, Mulholland (1994) states a direct criticism can be viewed as a bald-on-record strategy because when the intention of the speaker is made known to others, a criticism is offered.

In this study, JWs criticised researchers and the results of their studies and this can be seen as a bald-on-record strategy. In the following, Examples (96-98) show that JWs criticized the results or the methodology used.

(96) **The problem is not the data themselves** but how they are used to formulate, implement and monitor policies  
MJES 09/06/concl, p.24

(97) . . . yes, it is true that TFPG determines long-run growth . . . but in the context of the neoclassical growth model. **It is not self evident fact.**  
MJES 05/02/intro, p.8

(98) This result, . . . **is not much use for empirical purpose** since empirical estimates of the elasticities tend to be unreliable.  
MJES 08/05/intro, p.4

As seen in Examples (96-98), JWs criticized directly the results or methodology in the studies they reviewed. In the above examples, such as ‘The problem is not the data themselves’, ‘It is not self evident fact’. and ‘is not much use for empirical purpose’ can be viewed as a direct criticism as JWs do not redress the face needs of researchers who conducted the mentioned studies.

## **Tactic 2: By using direct argument proposition**

Argument Proposition is rational statement with oppositional to address future possibilities or suggestion and to indicate a course of action (Mulholland, 1994). This study found that JWs used a direct argument proposition to recommend future behaviour or action. Examples (99-100) show this:

(99) In other words, **for anti-corruption measures to be effective, they must be properly designed, and must be sponsored and upheld sincerely by political leaders.**

MJES-05/0/ concl, p.34

(100) It will only give you a headache because . . . why it moves up or down; or the policies to ‘improve’ it. Simply **disregard it and do not waste time calculating it.**

MJES-08/05/ concl, p.10

As seen in the Examples (99-100) above, JWS gave a direct argument proposition to the readers or people in economics by using statements such ‘to be effective, they must be properly designed and must be sponsored’ and ‘disregard it and do not waste time calculating it’. This can be viewed as politeness tactic as JWs offer a direct argument proposition as a form of bald-on-record suggestion.

### **4.3.2 Bald-on-record in EG**

This section presents the analysis of data of bald-on-record in EG. The data revealed that similarly EG JWs used two (2) types of tactics for the purpose of being polite in the writing of economic journals as presented in the Table 4.6 below:

**Table 4.6: Bald-on-record Tactics in EG**

No	Tactics	Numbers	Percentage (%)
1	By using direct criticism	33	58.93
2	By using direct argument proposition	23	41.07
<b>Total</b>		<b>56</b>	<b>100%</b>

As seen in the Table 4.6 above, a total of 56 bald-on-record tactics were found in the EG corpus. EG JWs employed the tactic *by using direct criticism* by more than a half from the total tactics (58.93%) and it followed *by using direct argument proposition* tactic (41.07%). The table above also shows that only two types of tactics categorized under bald-on-record politeness strategy were found in EG.

The following section presents the set of the examples categorised as bald-on-record strategy in EG.

**Tactic 1: By using direct criticism**

According to Mulholland (1994) to criticize is to influence the person who is being criticized. Criticism can be directed to a person or it could be a general criticism of some ideas, opinions, or events in the world. This study found that direct criticism is used by JWs to criticize a person regarding their capability in economic expertise.

(101) . . . its use as an objective of policy making. As a consequence, I will argue that **it is useless and even misleading** for policy purpose.

MJES-08/05/intro, p.2

- (102) While economist know trade policy experience since 1950 well enough, **they do not know the pre-1950 experience quite well.** They should know it better.

EG-04/01/intro, p.2

- (103) Most economics papers are, let us face it, **written in language that is alien** . . .

MJES-08/05/intro, p.1

As seen in Examples (101 and 102), JWs criticised that a suggestion given by some economists as being ‘useless and even misleading and that . . . they [economist] do not know the pre-1950 experience well’. In addition, in Example (103), JWs claim that the written language used in the economic journals ‘is alien’ to common people. Examples (101-103) can be viewed as a direct criticism as JWs do not hedge or conceal their FTA.

### **Tactic 2: By using direct argument proposition**

*Argument Proposition* is a rational statement with oppositional to address future possibilities or suggestions and to indicate a course of action (Mulholland, 1994). This study found that JWs used a direct argument proposition to recommend future behaviour or action. Examples (104-105) show this:

- (104) . . . This illustrate that **we do not need to know anything** about  $A_a$ ,  $A_n$  or  $L$  to derive the alternative equilibrium solution. Instead, **all we need to know is** the form of the equation . . . and the value of the employment . . . .

EG-06/03/meth. p.15

- (105) When comparing different policy options, **it is important to keep in mind** that reducing child-labor and improving the welfare of children do not always go hand in hand . . .

EG-09/06/reslt. p.19

As seen in the Example (104). JWs used the tactic of *direct argument proposition* to those in economics by using statements such ‘we do not need to know anything’ and ‘all we need to know is’ . This can be viewed as a form of bald a bald-on-record. Similarly in Example (105), JWs claims that it was necessary ‘to keep in mind’ the importance of reducing child-labour and improving their welfare. This could be seen as a direct argument proposition tactic that aims to ‘hit the head of the nail’ on the importance of proper policing.

#### **4.4 Off-record Strategies**

Off-record politeness strategies are communicative acts that do not give any clear communicative intention of the speaker (Brown and Levinson, 1978). In this study JWs leave the interpretation of the communicative act upon the reader and therefore provide a number of defensible interpretations.

##### **4.4.1 Off-record Strategies in MJES**

The data revealed that MJES JWs used two (2) types of tactics for the purpose of being polite in the writing of economic journals. This section recorded all linguistic devices that help to deliver the desired goal or strategy as tactics. The desired goal of politeness strategy is realized through the use of the following tactics as presented in the Table 4.7 below:

**Table 4.7: Off-record Tactics in MJES**

No	Tactics	Numbers	Percentage (%)
1	By using rhetorical questions	16	59.3
2	By using metaphors	11	40.7
<b>Total</b>		<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>

As seen in the Table 4.7 above, a total of 27 off-record tactics were found in the MJES corpus. The data show that MJES JWs employed more of the tactic *by using direct criticism* (59.3%) compared to *by using metaphors* (40.7%). The table above also highlights, only two types of tactics were found for off-record politeness strategy in MJES.

The following section presents the set of the examples categorised as off-record strategies in MJES.

#### **Tactic 1: By using rhetorical question**

Mulholland (1994) claims that one way to make an imposition without losing face to either party is to hint indirectly by using rhetorical questions because these questions do not actually need answers from the readers. Thus, the use of rhetorical questions could redress the impact of imposition because readers are made to think and make judgements for themselves as seen in Examples (106-108).

(106) Today, economists and statisticians apply the methodologies, produce hundreds of estimates and derived policy implications . . . **but what lies behind the numbers?**

MJES 08/05/intro, p.5



(107) Aren't capital and technical progress the two sides of the coin?

MJES 08/05/intro, p.6

(108) The experience of Malaysia has also shown that only does measurement of ethnic data support policy . . . **should we then continue to collect ethnic data?**

MJES 09/06/conc, p.2

As seen in Examples (106-108) the series of rhetorical questions were posed. Thus the rhetorical questions urge readers to think and make judgements for themselves on the questions asked by JWs. Hence, the use of rhetorical questions in MJES can be viewed as an off-record politeness tactic as follows.

(109) **Why has corruption become a serious problem in Asian countries? Is it possible to control or to minimize corruption in these countries? . . .** Corruption as a dominant component has been institutionalized in the public service in parts of Asia. Political leaders have pledged to eradicate corruption to the public, while in most cases it is hard to succeed as in corruption has been institutionalised.

MJES 04/01/meth, p.23

(110) **Why is Indian diaspora investment is so low, especially compared to Chinese investment in China . . .**

MJES 05/02/ intro, p.11

(111) **In the sense that it is a concept without sound economic foundations, what are economists, planning and statistical agencies calculating? . . .**

MJES 08/05/meth, p.11

These could be seen as off-record politeness as the readers are required to think and decide at that particular point. In addition, the rhetorical questions appear to attract the minds of the readers before explanations were given by JWs. The following examples (109-111) show the case.

#### **Tactic 4: By using metaphors**

One way to make to make an imposition on someone without any loss of face to either party, is to hint indirectly at it, through the use of metaphors. (Mulholland : 1994). This study found that JWs used the tactic of metaphors to perform an FTA so as to save both JWs and audience's face. These Examples (112-115) below explain the case.

(112) In fact by the early 1990s, Indonesia gained the status of a second generation '**miracle economy**' in Southeast Asia.

MJES 06/03/discs p.22

(113) This led this many observers to term the country an economic '**basket case**'

MJES-06/03/abs, p.1

(114) There is a very simple, but at the same time very deep problem about what this methodology: the so-called '**cake problem**'... imagines one bakes of cake. One combines flour, yeast, water, sugar, etc, then after the cake is bake, suppose one makes the following claim : 30 per cent of the size (or of the taste is due to . . . one thing is to ask what will happen to the cake (economy) if one added a given amount of extra flour (capital) . . . .

MJES-08/05/intro p.6

The Examples (112-114) showed the use of metaphors to illustrated the phenomena in the economic field and proposed a shared knowledge among the esoteric readers without being afraid to oppose or look arrogant other economist, as this tactic used phrases 'miracle economy', 'basket case' and 'cake problem' to represent the thought of JWs. This can be viewed as a off-record politeness tactics because this tactic allowed JWs to say the truth without looking arrogant, so as to save both JWs and audience's face.

#### 4.4.2 Off-record Strategies in EG

This section presents the analysis of data of off-record strategies in EG. The data revealed that EG JWs used two (2) types of tactics for the purpose of being polite in the writing of economic journals. This section recorded behavioural actions and linguistic devices that help to deliver the desired goal or strategy as tactics. The desired goal of politeness strategy is realized through the use of the following tactics as presented in the Table 4.8 below:

**Table 4.8: Off-record Tactics in EG**

NO	TACTICS	NUMBERS	Percentage %
1	By using rhetorical questions	18	64.3
2	By using metaphors	10	35.7
TOTAL		28	100%

As seen in the Table 4.8 above, a total of 28 off-record tactics were found in the EG corpus. There were two (2) off-record tactics found in the analysis of EG articles, namely *by using rhetorical question* (64.3%), and the tactic *by using metaphor* (35.7%).

The following section presents the set of the examples categorised as bald-on-record strategy in MJES.

##### **Tactic 1: By using rhetorical question**

Mulholland (1994) claims that one way to make an imposition on someone, without losing face to either party is to hint indirectly by using rhetorical questions because the readers do not need to answer these questions. Thus, the use of rhetorical questions

could redress the impact of imposition because the readers are made to think and make judgements for themselves on the imposition made. The following Examples (116-117) show this.

(115) But what sparks such shifts from one equilibrium to another? Who leads and who follows? **Why did it happen in the 1920s and 1950s and could it happen again?**

EG-04/01/conc. p.22

(116) The dramatic reversal in distributional trends from a steep secular fall to a steep secular rise in wage-land ratios-which occurred some time early in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. **What explain this reversal?**

EG-05/02/intro. p.5

As seen in Example (115) the rhetorical questions were used by JWs to trigger journals readers to think and make judgements for themselves. Similarly, in Example (116) the rhetorical question ‘What explain this reversal?’ was not answered by JWs. The rhetorical questions appear to be directed to journal readers who are required to make their own judgement and thus redress the impact of the imposition made by JWs. Thus, the use of rhetorical questions in MJES can be viewed as an off-record politeness tactic.

The data also revealed that JWs also gave some answers to some rhetorical questions they asked. Though these questions were answered by JWs, the point at which the rhetorical questions were asked in the article could be seen as off-record politeness as readers were required to think and make judgement at the particular point. In addition, the rhetorical questions appear to attract the minds of readers before explanations were given by JWs. The following Examples (117-120) show the case.

- (117) **Why do countries produce what they do and does it matter?** . . . We present in this paper a complementary argument that emphasize [the questions]. . .

EG-07/04/intro, p1

- (118) **Why did the tariff-growth correlation changed?** We discuss eight hypthesis

EG-04/01/intro. p.22

- (119) **How were wage-rent ratios determined in pre-19<sup>th</sup> century England?** . . . the wage-rent ratio was *negatively* related to agricultural productivity. . .

EG-04/01/intro. p.1

As seen in Examples (117-119), the three rhetorical questions seem as a device to attract the minds of readers before the JWs provided the explanations. These tactics could be seen as a tactic of off-record politeness as the readers are required to think and make judgement.

## **Tactic 2: By using metaphors**

To hint indirectly, with the use of metaphor is one way to make an imposition on someone, without loss of face to either party, Mulholland (1994). This present study's findings is in line with Mullholland's stated earlier, where JWs employed the tactic of using metaphor to perform an FTA so as to save both JWs and audience's face. The Examples (120-121) show the case.

- (120) We found this result surprising given the stress that W.Arthur Lewis has placed on this '**engine of growth**' . . . .

EG-04/01 p.11

- (121) Since the low output equilibrium is associated with low aggregate TFP, the model also helps to explain the '**twin peaks**' in the cross country distribution of TFP . . .

EG-06/03/intro p.7

The Examples (121-122) showed the use of metaphors to illustrate the phenomena in economic field without looking arrogant, as this tactic used phrases 'engine of growth', and 'twin peaks' to represent the thought of JWs. This can be viewed as an off-record politeness tactic because this tactic allowed JWs to say the truth without looking arrogant, so as to save both JWs and audience's face.

#### **4.5 The Distribution of Politeness Tactics in Economic Journals**

This section will first present the distribution of the politeness strategies in MJES corpus followed by the distribution from the EG corpus.

##### **4.5.1 The distribution of positive politeness tactics in MJES and EG**

The Tables.4.9, 4.10 and 4.11, in the following page show the distribution and frequency of positive politeness tactics found in the MJES and EG articles.

**Table 4.9: Distribution of Positive Politeness Tactics in MJES**

No	Tactic Used	Frequency					Total	Percentage (%)	
		Abstract (abs)	Introduction (intro)	Method (meth)	Result (resl)	Discussion (discs)			Conclusion (concl)
1	By informing readers about the research	4	12	8	9	8	7	48	24.61
2	By using in-group identity marker	4	12	6	5	8	5	40	20.51
3	By sharing a similar view	2	9	8	8	2	3	32	16.41
4	By giving reasons	-	6	2	4	6	4	22	11.28
5	By acknowledging the contribution of others	-	6	3	3	5	3	20	10.25
6	By using in-group pronoun	0	6	5	6	1	1	19	9.74
7	By sharing emotional response	-	1	-	3	3	-	7	3.59
8	By showing humility	-	3	-	3	1	-	7	3.59
<b>Total</b>		10	55	32	41	34	23	<b>195</b>	
		5.13	28.20	16.41	21.02	17.43	11.79	<b>100 %</b>	

As is seen in Table 4.9, JWs in MJES have found to use eight (8) types of positive politeness tactics. The data reveals that the top three of politeness tactics are; *by informing readers about the research* (24.61%), *by using in-group identity marker* (20.51%) and *by sharing a similar view* (16.41). Table 4.9 also shows that the tactics *by sharing emotional response* (3.59%) and *by showing humility* (3.59%) were found to be the least distributed.

In terms of overall distribution, the Introduction sections of MJES had the most number of tactics (28.2%), followed by the Results section (21.02%) and Discussion (17.43%). The top three tactics were distributed differently in the data. The tactic by informing readers about the research were found to be highest in the introduction (n=12), results (n=9) and methods, discussion (n=8)

It is interesting to note that the tactics *by sharing emotional response* and *by showing humility* were least used by MJES JWs, but were distributed in the same sections of the articles, namely, introduction, results and discussion section.



**Table 4.10: Distribution of Positive Politeness Tactics in the EG**

N O	TACTICS USED	FREQUENCY						Total	Percentag e (%)
		Abstract (abs)	Introduction (intro)	Method (meth)	Result (resl)	Discusion (disc)	Conclusions (concl)		
1	By using in-group identity marker	5	<b>18</b>	17	15	5	2	62	24.03
2	By using in-group pronoun	2	<b>24</b>	8	11	8	6	59	22.86
3	By informing readers about their research	4	10	9	7	5	5	40	15.50
4	By sharing similar view	-	12	11	11	3	-	37	14.34
5	By giving reasons	-	8	5	5	2	3	23	8.91
6	By acknowledging the contribution of others	-	14	4	-	4	-	22	8.52
7	By showing humility	-	5	-	2	2	-	9	3.48
8	By sharing emotional response	0	3	<b>1</b>	-	2	-	6	2.32
<b>TOTAL</b>		11	94	55	51	31	16	<b>258</b>	
		4.26	36.7	21.3	19.76	12.01	6.20	<b>100%</b>	

As is seen in Table 4.10, JWs in EG used eight (8) types of positive politeness tactics. The data reveals that the top three of politeness tactics are; *by using in-group identity marker* (24.03%), *by using in-group pronoun* (22.86%) and *by informing readers about the research* (15.50%). Table 4.10 also shows that the tactics *by showing humility* (3.48) and *by sharing emotional response* (2.32) were found to be the least distributed.

In terms of overall distribution, the Introduction sections of EG had the most number of tactics (36.7%), followed by the Method section (21.03%) and Result (19.76%). The top three tactics were distributed differently in the data. The tactic *by using in-group identity marker* were found to be highest in the Introduction (n=18), Methods (n=17) and Results (n=15). It is interesting to note that the tactics *by sharing emotional response* (n=9) and *by showing humility* (n=6) were least used by EG JWs in their articles.

**Table.4.11: Comparison of Positive Politeness Tactics in Distribution**

No	Journals	Frequency						Total	Percentage (%)
		Abstract (abs)	Introduction (intro)	Method (meth)	Results (resl)	Discussion (discs)	Conclusions (concl)		
1	MJES	10 (2.2%)	55 (12.1%)	32 (7.1%)	41 (9.1%)	34 (7.5%)	23 (5.1%)	195	43.05
2	EG	11 (2.42%)	94 (20.7%)	55 (12.1%)	51 (11.3%)	31 (6.54%)	16 (3.53%)	258	56.95
<b>TOTAL</b>		21 (4.63%)	149 (32.7%)	87 (19.2%)	92 (20.3%)	65 (14.34%)	39 (8.6)	<b>453</b>	<b>(100%)</b>

As is seen in Table 4.11, this study found 453 tactics of positive politeness strategies used by JWs. These tactics appear in every section of the articles both in MJES and EG. However, as seen in Table 4.19, JWs of MJES and EG used positive politeness tactics mostly in the Introduction (149 or 32.7%), Results (92 or 20.3%) Literature review sections (87 or 19.2%).

Additionally, in Table 4.19 JWs of EG (94 or 20.7%) appear to have consistently used more politeness tactics in the Introduction section compared MJES (55 or 12.1%). In the section of Literature review MJES (32 or 7.1%) compared with EG (55 or 12.1%), and in the section of Results MJES (41 or 9.1%) while EG (51 or 11.3%). This study suggest that EG JWs use more positive politeness tactics in the introduction, Literature review and Results sections compared to MJES.

#### **4.5.2 The distribution of negative politeness tactics in MJES and EG**

Table 4.12, 4.13 and 4.14, in the following page show the distribution and frequency of negative politeness tactics found in the in MJES and EG articles.

**Table 4.12: Distribution of Negative Politeness Tactics in MJES**

NO	Tactics Used	Frequency						Total	Percentage (%)
		Abstract (Abs)	Introduction (Intr)	Method (Meth)	Result (Reslt)	Discusion (Discs)	Conclusions (Con)		
1	By hedging	3	46	14	24	23	11	121	56.54
2	By using nominalization	2	10	6	6	4	2	31	14.48
3	By impersonalizing	3	11	2	6	4	3	27	12.61
4	By being pessimistic	1	11	4	5	3	3	19	8.87
5	By using comparison	-	4	1	2	-	-	7	3.27
<b>TOTAL</b>		9	82	27	43	34	19	<b>214</b>	
		4.20	38.31	12.61	20.09	15.88	8.87	<b>100 %</b>	

As seen in Table 4.12, JWs of MJES have used the five (5) types of negative politeness tactics. However, these tactics do not appear in every section of the articles. The data reveals that these 5 (five) negative politeness tactics in MJES were only found distributed in three sections of the journals namely; Introduction (38.31%), Methodology (12.61%) and Result (8.87%). While, 4 negative politeness tactics were distributed in the sections of Discussion (15.88 %), Conclusions (8.87%) and Abstract (4.20%) in MJES articles.

The data also reveals the top 4 (four) politeness tactics, namely, *by hedging*, *by using nominalization*, *by impersonalizing* and *by being pessimistic* were distributed in all sections of MJES articles. Furthermore *Hedging* (56.54%) is tactic used most in 3 (three) different sections of articles, that is, Introduction, Result and Discussion sections. The table also shows the highest frequency of all tactics is found in Introductions. Meanwhile, the tactic by *using comparison* is found least distributed in MJES articles.

**Table 4.13: Distribution of Negative Politeness Tactics in EG**

NO	TACTICS USED	FREQUENCY						Total	Percentage (%)
		Abstract (Abs)	Introduction (Intro)	Method (Meth)	Result (Reslt)	Discusion (Disc)	Conclusions (Concl)		
1	By hedging	3	51	31	29	27	16	157	63.05
2	By impersonalizing	2	16	11	7	4	4	44	17.67
3	By being pessimistic	3	16	11	6	4	2	42	16.68
4	By using comparison	-	4	2	-	-	-	6	2.40
<b>TOTAL</b>		8	87	55	42	35	22	<b>249</b>	
		3.21	34.93	22.08	16.86	14.05	8.83	<b>100 %</b>	

As seen in Table 4.13, JWs of EG have used a total of four (4) types of negative politeness tactics. However, these tactics do not appear in every section of the articles. The data reveals, these 4 (four) negative politeness tactics were only found distributed in two sections in EG, namely; Introduction (34.93%) and Methodology (22.08%). While, 3 (three) negative politeness tactics were distributed in the sections of Result (16.86), Discussion (14.05 %), Conclusions (8.83%) and Abstract (3.21%) in EG articles.

The data also reveals the top three politeness tactics, namely; *by hedging*, *by impersonalizing* and *by being pessimistic*, were found distributed in whole sections of MJES articles. Furthermore, *Hedging* (63.05%) is tactic most used in 4 different sections of articles (Introduction, method, result and discussion). The table also shows the highest frequency of all tactics is found in introductions. Meanwhile, the tactic *by using comparison* is found least distributed in MJES articles.



**Table.4.14: Comparison of Negative Politeness Tactics in Distribution**

No	Journals	Frequency						Total	Percentage (%)
		Abstract (abs)	Introduction (intro)	Method (meth)	Results (resl)	Discussion (discs)	Conclusions (concl)		
1	MJES	9 (1.98%)	82 (17.7%)	27 (5.8%)	43 (9.3%)	34 (7.34%)	19 (4.1%)	214	46.22
2	EG	8 (1.7%)	87 (18.8%)	55 (11.9%)	42 (9.1%)	35 (7.55%)	22 (4.85%)	249	53.77
<b>TOTAL</b>		17 (3.75%)	169 (36.5%)	82 (17.7%)	85 (18.35%)	69 (15.2%)	41 (9.1%)	<b>463</b>	<b>100%</b>

As is seen in Table 4.14, this study found 463 tactics of negative politeness strategies used by JWs. These tactics was found in every section of the articles both in MJES and EG. Moreover, as seen in Table 4.20, MJES and EG JWs used negative politeness tactics mostly in the Introduction (169 or 36.5%), Results (85 or 18.35%) and literature review sections (82 or 17.7%).

Additionally, it is noted, that JWs of EG have consistently used more politeness tactics than JWs of MJES. It is shown in the section of Introduction, MJES (82 or 17.7%) compared EG (87 or 18.8%), and Literature review, MJES (27 or 5.8%) compared EG (55 or 11.9%). This study reveals that EG JWs use more negative politeness tactics in the Introduction and Literature review, however, in the sections of Results, it was found MJES (43 or 9.3%) compared EG (42 or 9.1%), this shows that MJES leads in terms of frequency usage in this section.

#### **4.5.3 The distribution of bald on record tactics in MJES and EG**

The Tables 4.15, 4.16 and 4.17, in the following page show the distribution and frequency of bald-on-record tactics found in the various sections of MJES and EG articles.

**Table 4.15: Distribution of Bald-on-record Tactics in MJES**

No	Tactic Used	Frequency						Total	Percentage (%)
		Abstract (abs)	Introduction (intr)	Method (meth)	Results (resl)	Discussion (discs)	Conclusions (concs)		
1	By using direct criticism	1	5	3	12	5	1	27	56.25
2	By using direct argument proposition	-	1	1	8	7	4	21	43.75
<b>TOTAL</b>		1	6	4	20	12	5	<b>48</b>	
		2.08	12.5	8.33	41.66	25	10.41	<b>100 %</b>	

As seen in Table 4.15, JWs of MJES have used two (2) types of tactics in totally and categorize under bald-on-record politeness strategies. However, one of the tactics does not appear in every section of the articles. The data reveals, there were 2 two sections in MJES was found in high frequency in distribute these two tactics, namely; Result (41.66%) and Discussion (25% %).

The data also shows, the tactic *by using direct criticism* was found distributed in whole sections of MJES articles. The data in the table above also highlight the tactic *by using direct argument proposition* was not found distributed in the section of abstract.

Furthermore, Table 4.16 show the distribution of bald-on-record based on the sections in the EG,

**Table.4.16: Distribution of Bald-on-record Tactics in the EG**

No	Tactic Used	Frequency						Total	Percentage (%)
		Abstract (abs)	Introduction (intr)	Method (meth)	Results (resl)	Discussion (discs)	Conclusions (concs)		
1	By using direct criticism	1	5	3	14	7	3	33	58.92
2	By using direct argument proposition	-	1	-	10	7	5	23	41.07
<b>TOTAL</b>		1	6	3	24	14	8	<b>56</b>	
		1.78	10.71	5.35	42.85	25	14.68	<b>100 %</b>	

As seen in Table 4.16, JWs of EG have used two (2) types of tactics and these are categorized under bald-on-record politeness strategies. However, one of the tactics (By using direct argument proposition) did not appear in 2 (two) sections (abstract and methodology) of the articles. While, the data reveals that bald on record politeness strategies in EG was found distributed in all section and have a high frequency of distribution in the sections of Result (42.85%) and Discussion (25%).

The data also reveals, the tactic *by using direct criticism* was found distributed in whole sections of MJES articles, while *by using direct argument proposition* tactic was not found distributed in the section of Abstract and Methodology.

**Table.4.17: Comparison of Bald-on-record Tactics in Distribution**

No	Journals	Frequency						Total	Percentage (%)
		Abstract (abs)	Introduction (intr)	Method (meth)	Results (resl)	Discussion (discs)	Conclusions (concs)		
1	MJES	1 (0.6%)	6 (5.7%)	4 (3.84%)	20 (19.23%)	12 (11.54%)	5 (4.80%)	48	(46.1%)
2	EG	1 (0.6%)	6 (5.7%)	3 (2.8%)	24 (23.1%)	14 (13.5%)	8 (7.7%)	56	(53.8%)
<b>TOTAL</b>		2 (1.9%)	12 (11.5%)	7 (6.7%)	44 (42.3%)	26 (25%)	13 (12.5%)	<b>104 / (100%)</b>	

As is seen in Table 4.17, this study found 104 tactics of *bald-on-record* politeness strategies used by JWs. These tactics appear in every section of the articles in MJES and EG. However, as seen in Table 4.22, JWs of MJES and EG used bald-on-record politeness tactics mainly in the Results (44 or 42.3%) and Discussion sections (26 or 25%).

Additionally, it is noted in Table 4.22, that JWs of EG have consistently used more politeness tactics. In the Results section MJES (20 or 19.23%) compared with EG (24 or 23.1%) and section of Discussion MJES (12 or 11.54%) compared with EG (14 or 13.5%). This study suggest that EG JWs use more bald-on-record politeness tactics in the Results and Discussion sections compared to MJES.

#### **4.5.4 The distribution of off-record tactics in MJES and EG**

Table 4.18, 4.19 and 4.20, in the following page show the distribution and frequency of off-record tactics found in the various sections of MJES and EG articles.



**Table 4.18: Distribution of Off-record Tactics in MJES**

No	Tactic Used	Frequency						Total	Percentage (%)
		Abstract (abs)	Introduction (intr)	Method (meth)	Results (resl)	Discussion (discs)	Conclusions (concs)		
1	By using direct criticism	1	7	-	4	3	1	16	59.25
2	By using direct argument proposition	-	6	2	1	2	-	11	40.74
<b>TOTAL</b>		1	13	2	5	5	1	<b>27</b>	
		3.70	48.14	7.40	18.51	18.51	3.70	<b>100 %</b>	

As seen in Table 4.18, JWs of MJES have used two (2) types of tactics that categorized under bald-on-record politeness strategies. However, these tactics did not appear in every section of the articles. There were three sections in MJES where these two tactics were distributed in high frequency, namely; Introduction (48.14%), Result (18.51%) and Discussion (18.51%).

The data in the table above reveals the tactic *by using direct criticism* was found distributed in 5 sections of MJES articles. While the tactic *by using direct argument proposition* was not found distribute in the sections of abstract and conclusions. Table.4.19 below shows the distribution of negative politeness tactics found in the various sections of EG articles.

**Table 4.19: Distribution of Off-record Tactics in the EG**

No	Tactic Used	Frequency						Total	Percentage (%)
		Abstract (abs)	Introduction (intr)	Method (meth)	Results (resl)	Discussion (discs)	Conclusions (concs)		
1	By using direct criticism	2	8	2	4	2	-	18	64.28
2	By using direct argument proposition	-	6	0	3	-	1	10	35.71
<b>TOTAL</b>		2	14	2	7	2	1	<b>28</b>	
		7.14	50	7.14	25	7.14	3.57	<b>100.%</b>	

As seen in Table 4.19, EG JWs used two (2) types of off-record politeness tactics in their articles and the two tactics appear in almost every section of the articles. The data also shows that the study recorded distribution in high frequency of these two tactics in the Introduction (50%) and Result (25%) sections.

The data also reveals the tactic *by using direct criticism* was found distributed in 5 sections of MJES articles. The table above also highlight the tactic *by using direct argument proposition* was not found distributed in the section of abstract and discussion.

**Table.4.20: Comparison of Off-record Politeness Tactics in Distribution**

No	Journals	Frequency						Total	Percentage (%)
		Abstract (abs)	Introduction (intr)	Method (meth)	Results (resl)	Discussion (discs)	Conclusions (concl)		
1	MJES	1 (1.8%)	13 (23.6%)	2 (3.6%)	5 (9.%)	5 (9.%)	1 (1.8%)	27	(49.1%)
2	EG	2 (3.6%)	14 (25.5%)	2 (3.6%)	7 (12.7%)	2 (3.6%)	1 (1.8%)	28	(50.9%)
<b>TOTAL</b>		3 (5.45%)	27 (49.1%)	4 (7.3%)	12 (21.8%)	7 (12.7%)	2 (3.6%)	<b>55</b>	<b>(100%)</b>

As seen in Table 4.20, this study found 55 tactics of *off-record* politeness strategies used by JWs. These tactics appear in every section of the articles both in MJES and EG. However, as seen in Table 4.25, MJES and EG JWs used off-record politeness tactics mostly in the Introduction (27 or 49.1%) and Results (12 or 21.8%). Additionally, it can be seen in Table 4.20, that JWs of EG have consistently used more politeness tactics. In the introduction MJES (13 or 23.6%) compared with EG (14 or 25.5%), and in Results section, MJES (5 or 9%) compared with EG (7 or 12.7%). This study suggest that EG JWs used more off-record politeness tactics in the Introduction, and Results sections compared to MJES. In addition, of all the politeness strategies, the off-record strategy was the most unpopular; compared with negative, positive politeness or bald-on-record strategies, the data above illustrates only 55 tactics were found in both MJES and EG.

As a result, there was not much difference in the amount of off-record strategy between the two groups of journal writers as seen in the table above. This result was unexpected because some previous studies found that off-record were used significantly in the Asian writing than American writing (Paarlahti, 1998; Maier, 1992). However, the findings show that both JWs of EG and MJES used quite a similar number of this strategy. Therefore, it can be concluded that off-record strategy was considered to be less appropriate in journal writing.

#### **4.6 Comparison of Politeness Strategies in Local and International Economic Journals**

The finding in this section compares the politeness strategies found in the corpus. The collection of twelve (12) economic journals from the selected economic journals showed the four types of politeness strategies as listed in Brown and Levinson (1978)

that were employed in MJES and EG, namely, positive politeness, negative politeness, bald-on-record, and off-Record politeness strategies. Furthermore, the section below compares and discusses these four types of politeness strategies.

#### 4.6.1 Comparison of Positive Politeness Strategies in MJES and EG

This section presents the comparison of positive politeness strategies found in MJES and EG. Table 4.21 on the following page presents the tactics, total numbers and frequencies used by JWs that were found in MJES and EG.

**Table 4.21: Comparison of Positive Politeness Tactics in MJES and EG**

N O	TACTICS	JOURNALS		TACTICS FOUND (TOTAL & %)
		MJES	EG	
1	By using in-group identity marker	40 (8.83%)	62 (13.6%)	102 (22.51%)
2	By informing readers about the research	48 (10.59%)	40 (8.83%)	88 (19.42%)
3	By using in-group pronoun	19 (4.19%)	59 (13.02%)	78 (17.21%)
4	By sharing similar view	32 (7.06%)	37 (8.16%)	69 (15.23%)
5	By giving reasons	22 (4.85%)	23 (5.07%)	45 (9.93%)
6	By acknowledging the contribution of others	20 (4.41%)	22 (4.85%)	42 (9.27%)
7	By showing humility	7 (1.54%)	9 (1.98%)	16 (3.55%)
8	By sharing emotional response	7 (1.54%)	6 (11.32%)	13 (2.87%)
TOTAL		195 (43%)	258 (57%)	<b>453</b> (100%)

As seen in Table 4.21, JWs of EG (57%) used more positive politeness tactics than JWs of MJES (43%). However, as shown in the Table 4.21, both JWS of MJES and EG similarly have used eight (8) types of positive politeness tactics in their articles. These positive politeness tactics were realized in **453** excerpts identified in MJES and EG. Further, this study revealed the top three tactics used by JWs of MJES were *by informing readers about the research* (10.59%), *by using in-group identity marker* (8.83.%) and *by sharing similar view* (7.06%). The top three tactics used by JWs of EG are *By using in-group identity marker* (13.6%), *by using in-group pronoun* 13.02%) and *by informing readers about the research* (8.83%). In comparison, JWs of EG preferred using *in-group identity marker* but JWs of MJES preferred *informing readers about the research*. Interestingly; there is a sharp difference for the use *using in-group pronouns* this made up (13.02%) of the total tactics used by EG JWs. Only (4.14%) were found in the MJES corpus. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that both JWs of MJES and EG were found used the tactic of *by showing humility* and *by sharing emotional response* least than (2%) in their articles.

As mentioned above, this study shows that JWs of EG have used more positive politeness tactics than JWs of MJES. However, it must be kept in mind that generalization cannot be made because of the limited amount of data, also in average articles of EG were much longer than the articles in MJES. As a result of this, it could also say that the JWs of EG have shown to use more politeness strategies. In which in their mind, it is better to be overwhelmingly polite instead of taking the risk of being rude. Therefore, for them, being polite is wiser than being too little. In addition, this study highlights JWs of EG appeared to be more professional whereas several of part of the articles from MJES gave the impressions of being somehow too casual, too personal and detached.



#### 4.6.2 Comparison of Negative Politeness Strategies in MJES and EG

This section presents the comparison of negative politeness strategies found in MJES and EG. Table 4.22 below presents the tactics, total numbers and frequencies used by JWs that found in MJES and EG.

**Table 4.22: Comparison of Negative Politeness Tactics in MJES and EG**

NO	TACTICS	JOURNALS		TACTICS FOUND (TOTAL & %)
		MJES	EG	
1	By hedging	121 (26.1%)	157 (33.9%)	278 (60.04%)
2	By impersonalizing	27 (5.83%)	44 (9.50%)	71 (15.33%)
3	By being pessimistic	19 (4.1%)	42 (9.1%)	61 (13.2%)
4	By using nominalization	31 (6.7%)	-	31 (6.7%)
5	By using comparison	7 (1.54%)	6 (1.32%)	13 (2.86%)
TOTAL		214 (46.2%)	249 (53.8%)	<b>463</b> <b>(100%)</b>

As seen in Table 4.22, JWs of EG (53.8%) were found used more negative politeness tactics than JWs of MJES (46.2%). However, as shown in the table 4.22, MJES JWs and EG JWs have different numbers of tactics used, (5) types of positive politeness tactics were found in MJES and (4) tactics in EG. Underlying this fact, JWs of MJES leads in the number of tactic used in negative politeness even though EG JWs lead in total number of negative politeness tactics (463) found in the articles.

This study revealed the top two tactics used by JWs of MJES and EG JWS were similar namely, *by hedging*, and *impersonalizing*. However, they are differ in the *use of being pessimistic* (EG-9,1%) and nominalization (MJES-6.7%) as the 3<sup>rd</sup> tactic most used by the JWs of each journal.

Furthermore, it is interesting to noted as well that the tactic of nominalization only found distributed in MJES articles. This result is not surprising because this tactic for negative politeness is used between acquaintances and it is more formal way of being polite than positive politeness (Brown and Levinson; 1978).

#### 4.6.3 Comparison of Bald-on-record Strategies in MJES and EG

This section presents the comparison of Bald-on-record politeness strategies found in MJES and EG. Table 4.23 below presents the tactics, total numbers and frequencies used by JWs that found in MJES and EG.

**Table 4.23: Comparison of Bald-on-record Tactics in MJES and EG**

N O	TACTICS	JOURNALS		TACTICS FOUND (TOTAL & %)
		MJES	EG	
1	By using direct criticism	27 (25.9%)	33 (31.7%)	60 (57.7%)
2	By using direct argument proposition	21 (20.2%)	23 (22.1%)	46 (44.2%)
TOTAL		48 (46.1%)	56 (53.8%)	<b>104</b> <b>(100%)</b>

As seen in Table 4.23, JWs of EG (53.8%) were found used more bald-on-record tactics than JWs of MJES (46.1%). However, as shown in the table 4.23, both MJES JWS and EG JWs have used similarly (2) types of bald-on-record tactics.

This study revealed (2) tactics used by JWs of MJES and EG JWS were similar namely, *by using direct criticism* and *by using direct argument proposition*. However, its only 104 excerpts that are identified as bald-on-record tactics in MJES and EG articles . Hence bald-on-record strategy is not very popular; compared with negative and positive politeness strategies.

A seen in the data above, it shows that there was a very little difference in the amount of bald-on-record strategies in both journals. Brown and Levinson (1978: 74) noted an act is performed baldly or without redress when it is done in the most direct, clear, unambiguous, and concise way possible. Therefore bald-on-strategy is not quiet appropriate in journals, whereas the JWs as a member of academic or scientific community need to create a friendly atmosphere among researchers themselves, to mitigate the impact of imposition in their actions also to fit with the demands of the academic community that expects scientific language to be objective and formal.

#### **4.6.4 Comparison of Off-Record Strategies in MJES and EG**

This section presents the comparison of off-record politeness strategies found in MJES and EG. Table 4.24 below presents the tactics, total numbers and frequencies used by JWs that found in MJES and EG.

**Table 4.24: Comparison of Off-Record Politeness Tactics in MJES and EG**

N O	TACTICS	JOURNALS		TACTICS FOUND (TOTAL & %)
		MJES	EG	
1	By using rhetorical questions	16 (29.1%)	18 (32.7%)	34 (61.8%)
2	By using metaphors	11 (20%)	10 (18.2%)	21 (38.2%)
TOTAL		27 (49.1%)	28 (50.9%)	<b>55</b> <b>(100%)</b>

As seen in Table 4.24, JWs of EG (50.9%) were found used more bald-on-record tactics than JWs of MJES (49.1%). However, as shown in the table 4.24, both MJES JWs and EG JWs have used similarly (2) types of off-record tactics. These off-record tactics are realized in **55** excerpts that are identified in MJES and EG. Table 4.24 also revealed that JWs of EG have used mostly off-record politeness tactic of using *Rhetorical question* (32.7%) and *metaphor* (18.2%).

This study suggests that generally JWs of EG use more off-record than JWs of MJES. However, off-record strategy is the most unpopular strategies compared with negative and positive politeness strategies or bald-on-record but the off-record tactics seems effective to create a friendly atmosphere and to mitigate the impact of imposition in the articles.

The table 4.25 in the next page will show the choice of politeness strategies used by both MJES JWs and EG JWs in their journal articles.

**Table 4.25: Choice of Politeness Strategies**

Politeness Strategies	Journals					
	MJES			EG		
	Number of tactics & total used		Percentage (%)	Number of tactics & total used		Percentage (%)
1. Positive Politeness	8	195	40.28	8	258	53.31
2. Negative Politeness	5	214	44.21	4	249	51.45
3. Bald-on Record	2	48	9.92	2	56	11.57
4. Off-Record	2	27	5.58	2	28	5.78
<b>Total</b>	17	484	100%	16	591	100%

As seen in the Table. 4.25 above, JWs of MJES and EG were explicitly used 4 strategies namely, positive politeness, negative politeness, bald-on-record, and off-record politeness strategy. The corpus also recorded that JWs of EG were totally employed 591 politeness tactics, while JWs of MJES were recorded used 484 tactics.

In positive politeness strategy, it was found that JWs of MJES and EG explicitly used eight (8) tactics as shown in the table above. In the Negative politeness JWs of MJES employed more tactics (5) than JWs of EG (4). In the Bald-on- record strategy, the corpus recorded that JWs of MJES and EG shared the same two (2) tactics, Similarly in the off-record strategy both JWs also employed 2 tactics.

## 4.7 SUMMARY

The focus of the present study was to investigate the use of politeness strategies in economic journal articles by exploring the theory from Brown and Levinson (1978) alongside Myers (1989) and Mulholland (1994). This present study found that the politeness strategies employed in economic journals use four (4) types of politeness strategies namely; *positive politeness, negative politeness, bald on record, also off-record politeness strategies.*

The corpus analysis recorded four politeness strategies were found explicitly in many tactics such as positive politeness with (8) tactics, negative politeness with (4) tactics, bald-on-record with (2) tactics and off-record politeness with (2) tactics.