

# Journal of Communication and Cultural Trends (JCCT)

Volume 6 Issue 2, Fall 2024


ISSN(P): 2706-9141, ISSN(E): 2706-915X

Homepage: <https://journals.umt.edu.pk/index.php/jcct>



Article QR



- Title:** **Cross-cultural Pragmatic Analysis of Pakistani and American Political Talk Shows**
- Author (s):** Neelma Riaz<sup>1</sup>, Samia Tahir<sup>1</sup>, and Zahida Younas<sup>2</sup>
- Affiliation (s):** <sup>1</sup>National University of Science and Technology, Islamabad, Pakistan  
<sup>2</sup>Capital University of Science and Technology, Islamabad, Pakistan
- DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.32350/jcct.62.02>
- History:** Received: May 20, 2024, Revised: August 19, 2024, Accepted: September 04, 2024,  
Published: September 30, 2024
- Citation:** Riaz, N., Tahir, S., & Younas, Z. (2024). Cross-cultural Pragmatic Analysis of Pakistani and American Political Talk Shows. *Journal of Communication and Cultural Trends*, 6(2), 20–43. <https://doi.org/10.32350/jcct.62.02>
- Copyright:** © The Authors
- Licensing:**  This article is open access and is distributed under the terms of [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)
- Conflict of Interest:** Author(s) declared no conflict of interest



**UMT**

A publication of

School of Liberal Arts

University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan

# Cross-cultural Pragmatic Analysis of Pakistani and American Political Talk shows

Neelma Riaz<sup>1\*</sup>, Samia Tahir<sup>1</sup>, and Zahida Younas<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>NUST School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Islamabad, Pakistan

<sup>2</sup>Capital University of Science & Technology, Islamabad, Pakistan

## Abstract

Politeness is a contextually expected behaviour, in which the addressee's face wants are of seminal importance. Its basic purpose is the smooth flow of conversational exchange between the interlocutors, without any confrontation and miscommunication. This study focuses on the pragmatic analysis of the selected political interviews. These include one Pakistani and one American political talk show. The aim of the current study is to explore the cross-cultural differences in the utilization of various politeness maxims and strategies in Pakistani and American political talk shows. Applying the conversational maxims of Leech (1983) on the selected talk shows, the impact of flouting the speech maxims was analyzed. This research also observed the use of certain politeness strategies in order to avoid damage or risk to the face. Furthermore, different impoliteness strategies employed in order to attack the face of the hearer were also analyzed and discussed in detail in both Pakistani and American talk shows. It is hoped that the present study brings to board some preponderant features of both the Pakistani and American politicians' realization of politeness strategies.

**Keywords:** face threatening acts, flouting, impoliteness strategies, politeness, politeness principle, politeness strategies, pragmatics, talk shows

## Introduction

Among the pool of different genres of broadcasting, we see a variety of emerging talk shows discussing a wide range of different issues, aired by different TV channels. These talk shows are of great importance for the public since they are aimed at throwing light upon reality. If we look deeper, these talk shows are also of great importance for the linguists to deal with

---

\*Corresponding Author: [neelma.riaz@seecs.edu.pk](mailto:neelma.riaz@seecs.edu.pk)

a variety of linguistic phenomena. In this era of great economic, cultural and technological advancement, the significance of these talk shows has highly increased, with an increase in the scope for debate and discussions.

During the twenty-first century, people all over the world developed tremendous interest in a particular area of pragmatics i.e. politeness (Jewad et al., [2020](#)). This interest has led to a plethora of work and a lot of empirical studies being conducted in this field. Hence, not only cross-cultural or inter-language empirical studies but different journals have also played their role and have contributed to the study of the field of politeness.

Politeness is a contextually expected behavior (Kádár, [2017](#)), in which the addressee's feelings and face are of seminal importance and the basic purpose of which is the smooth flow of conversational exchange between the interlocutors, without any confrontation and miscommunication (Sidiropoulou, [2021](#)).

### **Problem Statement**

The problem addressed in this study is the lack of understanding of the influence of politeness and impoliteness strategies on cultural differences in political talk shows, particularly in Pakistani and American contexts, and how these differences impact the dynamics of conversation and potential for confrontation.

### **Literature Review**

A comprehensive and organised literature evaluation is essential for situating every research project within the framework of prior scholarly works. Numerous scholarly investigations have delved into the techniques of politeness and impoliteness in media conversation within various cultural contexts. The politeness theory developed by Brown and Levinson ([1987](#)), for instance, has been extensively used to examine face-saving and face-threatening behaviors in a variety of communication contexts, including talk shows on the media. The impoliteness framework developed by Culpeper ([1996](#)) has also been widely applied to analyze antagonistic exchanges in political speech, especially in Western media contexts like American and British talk shows. Furthermore, research on the use of rudeness in political debates has been done by Bousfield ([2008](#)) and Harris ([2001](#)), showing how politicians frequently break conversational norms in an effort to dominate or attack opponents.

Though these studies offer insightful information, they mostly concentrate on Western contexts (such American or British media) or non-Western settings separately, without comparing the two. There is still a dearth of research on the use of etiquette and impoliteness in Pakistani media, especially when it comes to political discussion shows. Moreover, there are surprisingly few studies comparing the cross-cultural distinctions between American and Pakistani political discourse. The absence of comparison investigation leaves a significant vacuum in our knowledge of how politeness and impoliteness tactics work in these various media environments. In order to bridge that gap, this study examines the similarities and contrasts between the usage of conversational maxims and impoliteness methods in American and Pakistani political talk shows—a topic that has not received enough attention in the literature as yet.

With an emphasis on Pakistani and American contexts, the current study attempts to investigate the cross-cultural variations in politeness and impoliteness tactics in political talk shows. Understanding the mechanisms underlying politeness, impoliteness, and the violation of conversational maxims requires a thorough assessment of important frameworks and theoretical models, which is necessary to support this investigation. The important works of Leech (1983), Brown and Levinson (1987), and Culpeper (1996) are reviewed in this section, which also critically note the need for more studies that connect these theories to actual political discourse, especially in the area of cross-cultural studies.

### **Leech's (1983) Politeness principle**

Leech's (1983) Politeness principle consists of the following six maxims.

1. Tact Maxim: Minimize cost to other; maximize benefit to other.
2. Generosity Maxim: Minimize benefit to self; maximize cost to self.
3. Approbation Maxim: Minimize dispraise of other; maximize praise of other.
4. Modesty Maxim: Minimize praise of self; maximize dispraise of self.
5. Agreement Maxim: Minimize disagreement between self and other; maximize agreement between self and other.

6. Sympathy Maxim: Minimize antipathy between self and other; maximize sympathy between self and other.

In the discipline of pragmatics, one of the founding works is Leech's (1983) Politeness Principle. Watts (2003) pointed out that Leech's model emphasises the cost-benefit ratio in encounters and places more emphasis on the hearer than the speaker. According to Leech, politeness serves as a practical instrument that reduces friction in communication by taking into account the needs of both the speaker and the hearer. It is not just about manners or social norms. By reducing conflict and promoting social harmony, his six politeness maxims—Generosity, Approbation, Modesty, Agreement, and Sympathy—all contribute to the balance of interpersonal interactions (Watts, 2003, pp. 66–67).

Although Leech's approach is broadly relevant to a variety of discourse forms, high-stakes political communication is particularly resonated with the model's emphasis on minimising costs and maximising gains. Since speakers on political talk shows frequently hold divergent opinions, it is imperative that manners be used strategically to keep the discourse civil. A detailed examination of how these politeness norms manifest in culturally distinctive contexts—political discourse in particular—is, nevertheless, lacking in the body of current scholarship. More research into the varied applications of these maxims in political talk shows is necessary given the various sociopolitical environments in Pakistan and the US.

### **Flouting the Maxims**

A crucial component of pragmatic theory is flouting conversational maxims, as defined by Grice (1975) and elaborated by Levinson (1983), particularly in situations where speakers want to convey more than what is expressly said. Flouting is the intentional breaking of conversational rules by speakers in order to create implicature, which is an oblique meaning that the hearer must decipher. Flouting is a means of communicating indirectly while adhering to the norms of a cooperative discussion, as noted by Grundy (2000).

When it comes to political talk programs, where sarcastic conversation is typical, breaking rules is a common way to express disagreement, criticism, or satire while still being polite. Though conversational maxims have been discussed extensively in theoretical literature, there is still a dearth of research examining how hosts and politicians in various cultural

contexts (e.g., Pakistan and the US) use flouting as a tactic to either strengthen or weaken the politeness dynamics of a conversation. By examining actual political interviews via the prism of broken maxims and their implications for the tone and result of the conversation, this study seeks to close this gap.

### **Brown and Levinson's (1987) Universal Model of Linguistic Politeness**

One of the most important and persistent theories in the study of linguistic politeness is Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness. The notion of “face”, which Brown and Levinson define as a person's public self-image that can be either protected (negative face) or affirmed (positive face), is introduced in their model. Their paradigm is especially applicable to political discourse, since upholding one's face is frequently a crucial component of communication and public personas and reputations are continuously at risk.

In order to perform certain face threatening acts, people adopt a variety of different strategies so as not to offend others and maintain healthy and cordial relationships. The model of politeness proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), introduces four different politeness strategies, which the speakers adopt during their interaction for performing FTAs. These are:

- Bald on record
- Positive politeness
- Negative politeness
- Off record

### **Face Threatening Acts**

The model outlines five essential techniques for executing face-threatening behaviours (FTAs), from off-record politeness techniques (where the speaker alludes to the act without explicitly declaring it) to bald on record techniques (where no attempt is made to mitigate the FTA). In between these two extremes, negative politeness methods minimise imposition and avoid conflict, while positive politeness strategies seek to validate the hearer's self-image by expressing approbation or solidarity. The work of Brown and Levinson is very relevant to cross-cultural settings because it makes it possible to compare how various societies value face protection during social interactions.

Although Brown and Levinson's methodology is widely used, little has been done to fully utilise its potential for examining cross-cultural communication in political talk programs. Specifically, there is a dearth of study on the use of politeness methods to negotiate face-threatening acts by American and Pakistani political officials, who come from radically different socio-cultural backgrounds. In order to determine how these tactics affect the dynamics and flow of political discourse, this study will look at how politicians and hosts in both nations employ politeness techniques.

### **Culpeper's Impoliteness Strategies**

In response to the politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987), Culpeper (1996) also proposes his own framework for impoliteness and named it the impoliteness super strategies. These according to Culpeper are “opposite” regarding their orientation to face. For instance, these strategies are designed such that they attack the face unlike the politeness strategies, which are designed to save, maintain or enhance the face. The impoliteness super strategies are given below:

#### ***Bald on Record Impoliteness***

It is typically deployed “where there is not much face at stake, and where there is an intention on the part of the speaker to attack the face of the hearer” (Culpeper, 1996, p. 351).

#### ***Positive Impoliteness***

The use of strategies which are designed to damage the positive face wants of the addressee.

#### ***Negative Impoliteness***

The use of strategies which are designed to damage the negative face wants of the addressee.

#### ***Sarcasm or Mock Politeness***

Sarcasm or mock politeness for social disharmony is the opposite of banter or mock impoliteness for social harmony.

While Brown and Levinson (1987) concentrate on the ways in which speakers defuse potentially embarrassing situations, Culpeper (1996) presents the idea of impoliteness as a phenomenon that is equally important

but in the other direction. The purpose of impoliteness methods is to cause harm rather than to appear nice, which makes them extremely important in confrontational situations like political discussions. Culpeper describes tactics that resemble decency tactics but are intended to cause harm rather than keeping face intact. For instance, positive and negative impoliteness aim to weaken the addressee's positive and negative faces, respectively, but bare on record impoliteness strikes the face directly with no attempt at redress. Another important tactic for disguising impoliteness under the pretence of politeness is sarcasm or fake politeness.

In political talk shows, where confrontation, criticism, and power struggles are frequently on display, Culpeper's framework is especially pertinent. Politicians often use rudeness as a means of undermining their rivals, establishing their authority, or rallying their constituency. Nevertheless, not much research has been done on how cultural variations influence the adoption of rudeness tactics in these situations. By examining how rudeness is created and interpreted in political talk shows in Pakistan and the US, this study aims to close that gap and provide insights into the larger cultural values that shape public political discourse.

While the previously listed theories provide strong frameworks for examining politeness and impoliteness in social interactions, there is a notable deficiency in studies that employ these models to examine political speech across cultural boundaries. In particular, there are few studies comparing the deliberate use of impoliteness and politeness in American and Pakistani political talk shows. It's critical to comprehend how cultural norms influence the use of politeness methods in these situations, especially in light of the growing globalisation of media and the prominence of televised political debates. In order to close the gap, this research will undertake a cross-cultural pragmatic analysis of a subset of political interviews, concentrating on the ways in which techniques of politeness and impoliteness affect the dynamics of the discourse and the likelihood of conflict.

The fundamental theories of politeness and impoliteness have been described in this literature review, with an emphasis on their applicability to the study of political discourse. While complete frameworks for understanding how people negotiate social relationships are provided by Leech (1983), Brown and Levinson (1987), and Culpeper (1996), there is still a definite need for empirical research that applies these theories to



cross-cultural political contexts. This study intends to add to the increasing corpus of research on cross-cultural pragmatics by analysing how these methods are used in American and Pakistani political talk shows, providing insights into how politeness and impoliteness shape political discourse. While foundational theories such as Leech's (1983) politeness maxims, Brown and Levinson's (1987) face-saving model, and Culpeper's (1996) impoliteness strategies provide robust frameworks for analyzing social interactions, they have not been extensively applied to political discourse, particularly in cross-cultural settings. Previous research has predominantly concentrated on broad social interactions, resulting in a considerable void regarding the application of these tactics in politically charged and highly visible environments. By doing a cross-cultural pragmatic analysis of political talk shows in Pakistan and the US and investigating how cultural norms influence the employment of politeness and impoliteness methods in these circumstances, this research seeks to close that gap.

Studies specifically examining the differences in politeness and impoliteness methods between American and Pakistani political talk shows are lacking. By examining how cultural differences affect the application of these techniques, this study seeks to close this knowledge gap and provide fresh perspectives on political communication in a range of cultural situations. This research bridges the gap in the literature by performing a cross-cultural examination and going beyond theoretical storytelling to practical application in a very important domain.

### **Significance of the Research**

The present study is significant because of various reasons. This study focuses on the cross-cultural pragmatic analysis of the selected political interviews. Applying the conversational maxims on the selected interviews, the impact of flouting the speech maxims was analyzed. We see that due to flouting of the maxims, the conversation cannot progress smoothly (Fitri & Qodriani, 2016). It is through observing these conversational maxims that a conversation takes place in a favourable atmosphere, without giving rise to any sort of friction between the addresser and the addressee. Secondly, this research explores the phenomena of politeness that is very crucial for establishing and maintaining relationships with others in society. There are various politeness strategies that are preferred in different regions of the world. Technological advancement has reduced the world to a global village in which people from around the globe have come closer, therefore,

the awareness of the politeness strategies favoured in different parts of the world is very crucial. Furthermore, it is conducive to facilitate social communication and affability among the people belonging to those parts of the world. Conversely, by ascertaining the most predominant politeness strategies in different cultures, the possibility of the potential confrontation and miscommunication among these people also gets reduced when they come into contact with one another (Mahmud, [2019](#)). It is hoped that the present study brings to board some preponderant features of both Pakistani and American politicians' realization of politeness strategies.

### **Aims and Objectives of the Study**

The aim of the current study is to find out the cross-cultural differences in the utilization of various politeness maxims and strategies, in Pakistani and American political talk shows. Based on this broader aim, the objectives of the current study are:

- To examine the impact of flouting the conversational maxims (by Leech) in the conversations between the host and the guest in selected political talk shows.
- To find out politeness or impoliteness strategies used by Pakistani and American politicians/hosts in political talk shows in order to establish relationships and the impact of these strategies on the conversations.

### **Research Questions**

Q1. What is the impact of flouting the conversational maxims (by Leech) on the conversations between the host and the guest in selected political talk shows?

Q2. What politeness or impoliteness strategies are used by Pakistani and American politicians and hosts in political talk shows in order to establish relationships and what is the impact of these strategies upon the conversations?

### **Research Methodology**

The present study is both quantitative and qualitative in nature. i.e., “the data consists of words, views, opinions, responses and numerical data” (Creswell, [2009](#)). The researcher chose to present the results in quantitative form, since the researcher aimed for concrete numbers of the occurrences.

Furthermore, including qualitative analysis allows the researcher to broaden the scope of the analysis and to discuss the examples more thoroughly.

### Data for the Research

The selected sample for this study comprises one Pakistani and one American political talk show. The researcher has selected the talk shows only from 2016. Only *one-to-one* interviews have been selected. The language of the selected Pakistani talk shows is Urdu whereas it is English in case of the American talk shows. The data selected for this study, comprising four talk shows, was taken from YouTube, as given below in Table 1.

**Table 1**

*Data selected for this study*

Sample, S#1 Pakistani Political Talk show		Sample, S#2 American Political Talk show	
Show	11 <sup>th</sup> Hour	Show	Meet the Press
Telecast on	ARY News	Telecast on	NBC News
Anchor	Waseem Badami	Anchor	Chuck Todd, Sen
Guest	Faisal Raza Abidi	Guest	Ted Cruz
Date	10 <sup>th</sup> March, 2016	Date	1 <sup>st</sup> May, 2016
Time Duration	35:38	Time Duration	33:44

### Research Design

The data base for the current research comprises of two selected political talk shows. A content analysis of the data was conducted. The occurrence and impact of flouting the conversational maxims proposed by Leech (1983) i.e. Tact Maxim, Generosity Maxim, Approbation Maxim, Modesty Maxim, Agreement Maxim, Sympathy Maxim was analyzed in the selected talk shows by taking individual dialogues of the hosts and the guests as units of analysis. The politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) i.e. Bald on record, Off record, Positive politeness, Negative politeness and impoliteness super strategies proposed by Culpeper (1996)

i.e. Bald on record impoliteness, Positive impoliteness, Negative impoliteness, Sarcasm or mock politeness have also been examined in the selected talk shows. Furthermore, cross-cultural differences in the flouting of conversational maxims and in the use of different politeness or impoliteness strategies were analyzed in the selected talk shows.

### Analysis and Interpretation of Data

#### Conversational Maxims of Leech

As proposed by Leech, during communication one is supposed to pay attention and take care of these six politeness maxims i.e. tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim and sympathy maxim. In order to maintain good relationships with others, saving their face, without hurting their feelings, it is necessary to follow and apply these politeness maxims in our day-to-day conversations. Thus, a well and smooth social interaction can be maintained by following the politeness principle proposed by Leech. Table 2 is given below in order to give a quantification of the total number of Leech’s maxims being flouted, on the part of both host and guest, in the selected Pakistani and American political talk shows.

**Table 2**

*Findings with reference to Conversational Maxims of Leech*

Leech’s Maxims	Pakistani Talk show			American Talk show		
	<i>Flouting</i>			<i>Flouting</i>		
	<i>Host</i>	<i>Guest</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Host</i>	<i>Guest</i>	<i>Total</i>
Tact	5	4	9	0	0	0
Generosity	0	0	0	0	0	0
Approbation	9	5	14	0	0	0
Modesty	1	4	5	0	0	0
Agreement	9	10	19	3	0	3
Sympathy	0	0	0	0	0	0

## ***Tact***

**Pakistani Talk Show.** As evident from Table 2, in the Pakistani talk show, the tact maxim is flouted five times by the host and four times by the guest. Instead of minimizing cost to the other, they are maximizing cost to other.

*“H: Daleel den.”*

One such instance is when the host asks the guest to come up with justifications regarding a certain topic. He is flouting the maxim and wants us to infer from the statement that the guest is wrong in his point of view.

**American Talk Show.** The host and the guest in the American talk show, do not flout the tact maxim even once during the entire conversation

## ***Generosity***

Generosity maxim is not flouted even once during the entire course of both the Pakistani and American talk show.

## ***Approbation***

**Pakistani Talk show.** In Pakistani talk show, there are nine instances where the host is maximizing dispraise of the guest by saying unpleasant things to him. The guest resorts to flouting the approbation maxim five times during the talk show. In the given two instances the host maximizes dispraise of the guest and implicitly conveys that the guest’s analysis and point of view is entirely wrong and faulty.

*“H: bari ajeeb baat kar rahay hain ap.”*

*“H: yar main ne itna ap ka tajziya kar k ek mahol banaya, intro diya, ap ye tajziya de rahy hain k who milay huay hain.”*

**American Talk Show.** The host and the guest in the American talk show, do not flout the approbation maxim even once during the entire talk show.

## ***Modesty***

**Pakistani Talk show.** In Pakistani talk show, the host flouted the modesty maxim not even once whereas the guest flouts it four times and commit social transgression of self-praise. The guest, in the above instance is boasting and instead of obeying the rule of minimizing praise of

self and maximizing dispraise of self, he does so in opposition to that. He maximizes self-praise and considers himself to be the saviour of his party.

*“G: Apni party k liye qurbaanian di.”*

**American Talk show.** In the American talk show the host and the guest do not flout the modesty maxim even once during the interview. They are not involved in committing the social transgressions of boasting or self-praise.

### *Agreement*

**Pakistani Talk show.** The host flouts the agreement maxim nine times whereas the guest flouts it ten times. In the given instance the guest disagrees with the host’s point of view. He makes an implicature and the hidden or implicit meaning behind his statement is that the host including the rest of the media has faulty judgements and wrong perceptions.

*“G: nahi nahi yeto asal me ap loag samajh hi ni pa rahay hain.”*

**American Talk show.** The host flouts the agreement maxim thrice whereas the guest does not flout it even once.

*“H: Republican voters are the ones rejecting you this is not a media conspiracy senator”*

*“H: Nobody says it’s a game sir.”*

In the above two instances the host disagrees with the views of the guest and flouts the agreement maxim.

### *Sympathy*

Sympathy maxim is not flouted even once during the entire course of both the Pakistani and American talk show. Neither the host nor the guest minimizes antipathy or increase sympathy among each other.

We can see from Table 1, that in the Pakistani talk show, the tact maxim is flouted nine times, approbation maxim fourteen times, modesty maxim five times, agreement maxim nineteen times whereas the generosity and sympathy maxim is not flouted even once, by both the host and the guest. There are nineteen instances where the host and the guest disagree with each other and make an implicature. They leave it upon the guest and the viewers of the show to interpret and infer the hidden meaning behind their contradictory statements. Instead of minimizing disagreement and

maximizing agreement between self and other, they maximize disagreement between self and other. This creates an aura of disharmony and the situation is aggravated. The communication becomes unpleasant between both. Similarly, due to flouting the approbation maxim by the host, the guest seems offended at times. Depreciating the guest aggravates him and makes the communication between the host and the guest uneasy. There are certain instances where the host and the guest use a more direct way of presenting their stance and seems impolite rather than choosing a more indirect and tactful manner. They make sarcastic comments and leave it upon the audience to infer the covert meaning lying underneath the statements uttered by them. There are a few instances where the guest can be held culpable for committing the social transgression of boasting and maximizes self-praise. He does so in order to save his face and project a positive image of himself and his party across the masses. Due to flouting, the host sticks to the very same question several times and the interview fails to move to the next question unless the host proves his stance.

In the American talk show, the agreement maxim is flouted only thrice whereas rest of the maxims are not flouted at all. Due to observance of the maxims the conversation runs smoothly from one question to the next and an aura of harmony is retained during the talk show.

In order to achieve a smooth conversation, observing these maxims is necessary but people do flout these maxims quite often in order to achieve some other ends. It is only through observing these conversational maxims that a conversation takes place in a favourable atmosphere, without giving rise to any sort of friction between the addresser and the addressee. In Pakistani talk shows, more maxims are being flouted as compared to the American Talk shows.

### **Brown and Levinson's Politeness Strategies**

According to Brown and Levinson, politeness strategies are developed in order to save the hearer's "face". Face actually refers to the respect that all individuals possess for themselves and maintain that "self-esteem" in private or public situations (Brown and Levinson's, [1987](#)). During conversation, people try to avoid discomforting or embarrassing others. The acts which infringe on the need of the hearers to maintain their self-esteem and self-respect are called as face threatening acts (FTAs).

Politeness strategies are developed for the purpose of dealing with these FTAs. It is by the use of these so-called politeness strategies that speakers succeed in communicating both their primary messages as well as their intention to be polite, and in doing so, they reduce the face loss that results from the interaction. It is through following the politeness strategies that a conversation takes place in a favourable atmosphere.

**Table 3**

*Findings with reference to Politeness Strategies of Brown and Levinson*

Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies	Pakistani Talk show			American Talk show		
	Host	Guest	Total	Host	Guest	Total
Bald on-record	3	8	11	1	0	1
Positive politeness	6	5	11	1	1	2
Negative politeness	4	4	8	4	0	4
Off-record	6	6	12	3	1	4

### ***Bald On-record Politeness Strategies***

**Pakistani Talk show.** As we can see from table 2, the host employs the bald on-record strategies thrice, whereas the guest employs it eight times during the interview. In the given two instances, the host baldly asks the guest to give justifications and explanations without any redress.

*“H: Samjhaen ap.”*

*“H: daleel den.”*

**American Talk show.** The host employs this strategy only once during the entire talk show whereas the guest does not flout it even once. One such instance is where the host directly says to the guest:

*“H: don't just say that but go ahead.”*

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

**Pakistani Talk show.** The host attends to the hearer's i.e. the guest's positive face wants and minimizes threat to his positive face six times



whereas the guest does so five times. In the given instance the host agrees with the views of the guest and claims common ground with him.

“H: yeto fact hai, isme to koi shak nahi.”

**American Talk show.** The host and the guest both employ positive politeness strategies only once during the entire conversation. At the end of the talk show, the host gives wishes to the guest whereas the guest also makes the host feel good and satisfies his positive face wants by addressing to it.

“H: Senator Ted Cruz, I gotta let you go. You got a lot to do in the state of Indiana. We’ll be watching. Stay safe on the trail, sir”

“G: Jack, good to be with you”

### ***Negative Politeness Strategies***

**Pakistani Talk show.** The host and the guest, both make use of the negative politeness strategies four times during the interview. Since this strategy is oriented towards the negative face wants of the hearer, hence its main aim is to avoid imposition.

“G: Ap isko samajhny ki koshish karen.”

**American Talk show.** The host employs negative politeness strategies four times whereas the guest does not employ this strategy even once during the entire conversation. In the instance given below, the host employs negative politeness strategy and caters to the negative face wants of the guest by avoiding imposition.

“H: Can you answer the question of whether you are going to support Donald Trump if he is the nominee?”

### ***Off-record Politeness Strategies***

**Pakistani Talk show.** The host and the guest both employ off-record strategies six times. There is an instance where the host indirectly asks about the present clash between MQM and the opposing party, ruled by Mustafa Kamal.

“H: Ye halki phulki moseeki ha ya baqaida band baj raha hai?”

**American Talk show.** The host employs off-record strategies thrice whereas the guest employs it only once. In the given instance the host indirectly states that the guest is being diplomatic.

*“H: So, let the record show you have not taken a position on whether you can support Trump if he's the nominee, fair enough”*

In another instance the guest sarcastically asks the host to give his views about the guest. He employs off record strategy here.

*“G: Tell me what you really think I know I'm at.”*

The basic purpose of these politeness strategies is to convey the meaning politely, without offending anybody. As we can see from the Table 3, in Pakistani talk show, both the host and the guest utilize the politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson. They employ bald on-record strategy eleven times, positive politeness eleven times, negative politeness eight times and off-record strategy twelve times. The host remains more indirect and tries to minimize threat to the positive face wants of the guest by appreciating him and making him feel good whereas the guest is mostly blunt and direct in requesting or ordering something.

In the American political talk show, both the host and the guest employ politeness strategies but those are much smaller in number as compared to the Pakistani political talk show Bald on-record strategy is employed only once, positive politeness twice, negative politeness and off-record strategy four times each.

### **Culpeper’s Impoliteness Strategies**

Culpeper believes that there are times when the speaker deliberately attacks the face of the hearer instead of saving it, due to which the conversations are not always smooth and cooperative. Culpeper’s theory of impoliteness accounts for dealing with strategies to threaten the hearer’s face, unlike the politeness strategies which deal with methods to reduce the threat to the hearer’s face.

**Table 4**

*Findings with reference to Impoliteness Strategies of Culpeper*

Culpeper’s impoliteness strategies	Pakistani Talk show			American Talk show		
	<i>Host</i>	<i>Guest</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Host</i>	<i>Guest</i>	<i>Total</i>

Bald on-record Impoliteness	0	0	0	0	0	0
Positive impoliteness	14	7	21	4	2	6
Negative impoliteness	10	4	14	6	0	6
Sarcasm/mock politeness	0	0	0	0	0	0

### ***Bald On-record Impoliteness Strategies***

The hosts or the guests do not employ this strategy during the selected talk shows.

### ***Positive Impoliteness Strategies***

**Pakistani Talk show.** The host employs positive impoliteness strategies fourteen times whereas the guest uses it seven times. When the guest asks the host to pay salaam and homage to him then the host employs positive impoliteness strategy and disagrees with the views of the guest.

*“H: Ham sab sawal karny k liye bethay hain. Sawal krna hmara kaam ha. Salaam krna hmara kaam nahi ha.”*

**American Talk show.** The host employs positive impoliteness strategies four times whereas the guest uses it two times. In the given two instances the guest seeks disagreement with the host’s opinion.

*“G: well I I don’t believe so”*

*“G: job creation has not gone up Chuck we have the lowest percentage of Americans working of any year since 1977 the Obama Clinton economy”*

### ***Negative Impoliteness Strategies***

**Pakistani Talk show.** The host employs negative impoliteness strategies ten times whereas the guest uses it four times. The speaker poses a threat to the hearer’s negative face and imposes something upon him. He restricts his freedom of action. In the instances given below, the host scorns and ridicules the analysis and judgements made by the guest.

*“H: bari ajeeb baat kar rahay hain ap.”*

*“H: yar main ne itna ap ka tajziya kar k ek mahol banaya, intro diya, ap ye tajziya de rahy hain k who milay huay hain.”*

**American Talk show.** The host employs this strategy six times whereas the guest does not employ it even once. The very first instance of this strategy is found in the very beginning of the interview. The host frightens and warns the guest that an action detrimental to the guest may happen.

*“H: you’re not gonna win this nomination without their help, don’t you know”*

### ***Sarcasm or Mock Politeness Strategies***

The host or the guest in both the Pakistani and the American political talk show, do not utilize this strategy even once during the entire course of the talk show.

Culpeper’s impoliteness strategies are designed in order to attack the face of the addressee or the hearer. It can be observed in the selected Pakistani interview that both the host and the guest are threatening the face of the other. The host keeps on counter striking the guest with terse questions, which threaten the face of the guest. The host and the guest employ positive impoliteness strategies twenty-one times and negative impoliteness strategies fourteen times. They do not employ the bald on record impoliteness and the sarcasm/mock politeness strategies. This reveals to us that both the host and the guest employ the positive and negative impoliteness strategies in abundance, in order to attack the positive and negative face wants of each other.

In the American political talk show, both the positive and negative impoliteness strategies are used six times each whereas the bald on record impoliteness and off record impoliteness strategies are not utilized by the host or the guest.

As we can see from the data and the tables, there are more instances of the impoliteness strategies employed by both the host and the guest, in Pakistani talk show as compared to the American talk show. Due to this, the host and the guest, in Pakistani talk shows are impolite more often with each other. The host bombards the guest with terse and loaded questions, which threatens the face wants of the guest. The guest too retaliates and tries to prove his stance to be correct. This hinders the flow of communication and the conversation fails to move smoothly from one question to the next. This also creates disharmony in the environment and the conversation does not remain smooth. Usually in the talk shows, the power mostly resides with the host and he leads the interview as per his requirements and desires. He

can also introduce any topic of his choice. Using impoliteness strategies, in Pakistani talk shows, he also asserts his power further in the talk show. On the other hand, due to fewer face attacks in American talk shows, the conversation runs smoothly without any discord and there is a harmony in the conversation between the host and the guest.

### **Conclusion**

As we know, in order to establish good relations and affability among people, the phenomenon of politeness is extremely important and crucial. The aim of the current study was to observe the cross-cultural differences in the utilization of various politeness maxims and strategies, in Pakistani and American political talk shows. This study focused on the cross-cultural pragmatic analysis of the selected political interviews. Applying the conversational maxims on the selected interviews, the impact of flouting Leech's maxims was analyzed. We saw that due to frequent flouting of the maxims in Pakistani political talk shows, the conversation cannot progress smoothly. Due to flouting, the host sticks to the very same question several times and the interview fails to move to the next question until and unless the host proves his stance. In the American talk show, the agreement maxim is flouted only thrice whereas rest of the maxims are not flouted at all. Due to observance of the maxims the conversation runs smoothly from one question to the next and an aura of harmony is retained during the talk show. It is through observing these conversational maxims that a conversation takes place in a favourable atmosphere, without giving rise to any sort of friction between the addresser and the addressee.

In order to indulge in an efficient and smooth conversation, it is necessary to follow the politeness strategies proposed by Brown and Levinson. By means of these strategies, one can form cordial relationships with others, without causing them any sort of offense and recognizing their positive and negative face wants. But people do not always save the face; they also attack the face wants of a person at times, due to which a friendly and cooperative conversation is not possible. The strategies proposed by Culpeper are meant to pose danger and threat to the hearer's face wants instead of reducing the threat. Due to the face threatening acts the conversation is affected negatively and the progress of interview does not remain smooth and friendly. In the American political talk show, both the host and the guest used politeness strategies but those are much smaller in number as compared to the Pakistani political talk shows.

Similarly, there are more instances of the impoliteness strategies employed by both the host and the guest, in Pakistani talk shows as compared to the American talk show. Due to this, the host and the guest, in Pakistani talk show were seen being not so polite with each other and they threatened each other's face wants many times. This hinders the flow of communication and the conversation fails to move smoothly from one question to the next. This also creates disharmony in the environment and the conversation does not remain smooth. On the other hand, due to fewer face attacks in American talk shows, the conversation ran smoothly without any concord and there was a harmony in the conversation between the host and the guest.

The findings of the current research are quite significant yet similar methodology should be applied upon a much larger sample and data, so that the findings of this research can be validated and endorsed. This will lead to a better knowledge and understanding of the cross-cultural interaction between different people.

### **Conflict of Interest**

The authors of the manuscript have no financial or non-financial conflict of interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.

### **Data Availability Statement**

The data associated with this study will be provided by the corresponding author upon request.

### **Funding Details**

No funding has been received for this research.

### **References**

- Bousfield, D. (2008). *Impoliteness in interaction*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an anatomy of impoliteness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25(3), 349–367. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00014-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00014-3)

- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative & quantitative approaches*. Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Fitri, E., & Qodriani, L. U. (2016). A study on flouting maxims in *Divergent* novel. *Teknosastik*, 14(1), 32–40.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole, & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Speech acts* (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
- Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing pragmatics* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Harris, S. (2001). *The language of the UK parliamentary debates*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jewad, H. G., Ghapanchi, Z., & Ghazanfari, M. (2020). Investigating Leech's politeness principle in conversational verses in three Surahs from *The Holy Quran*. *Asian Social Science*, 16(3), 29–42.
- Kádár, D. Z. (2017). Politeness in pragmatics. In J. S. B. S. Kádár (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 217–234). Oxford University Press.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mahmud, M. (2019). The use of politeness strategies in the classroom context by English university students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(3), 597–606.
- Sidiropoulou, M. (2021). *Understanding im/politeness through translation*. Springer International Publishing.
- Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.