フェイスと外国語学習
Face and Language Learning

武田　礼子 TAKEDA, Reiko

● 国際基督教大学大学院アーツ・サイエンス研究科
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, International Christian University

Keywords 普遍的フェイス，文化特有のフェイス，感情，外国語学習
universal face, culture-specific face, emotions, language learning

ABSTRACT

一般的にフェイス（面子）研究の原点は, コミュニケーション研究であるが, 外国語教育研究において, フェイス研究の実証研究は稀少であるため，未だに発展途上の分野である。本稿では，フェイスと外国語学習を考察する。まず背景にある，ゴフマン（1967）のフェイス理論，またその影響を受けたブラウンとレヴィンソン（1987）のポライトネス理論を論じる。次にゴフマンと同様，フェイスを普遍的だと論じるリンとバウワーズ（1991）が提唱する構成概念を紹介する。また中国発祥と言われる文化特有のフェイスの具体例として，中国人留学生を対象とした研究も紹介する。本稿では普遍的・文化特有，それぞれの立場のフェイスの諸研究を考察し，感情とフェイスの関連のように潜在的可能性のある分野にも触れ，外国語教育への応用も検討する。

This article reviews the underexplored area of face and language learning. While face research can generally be traced to communication studies, little has been studied empirically on face in second language research. This article starts with Goffman's (1967) concept of face, which is the precursor of Brown and Levinson's (1987) discussion of positive and negative face. Other researchers, such as Lim and Bowers (1991) also share Goffman and Brown and Levinson's idea of a universal face construct, but face is considered a culture-specific phenomenon, which is said to have originated in China. This article introduces research on both universal face and culture-specific face, including studies involving Lim and Bowers' (1991) face construct, as well as those involving Chinese students in the UK. This article concludes with the implications that emotions have on face, and the impact that emotions and face have in the language classroom.

1. Introduction

This article reviews the literature on face and language learning. Much of the existing body of literature on face can be traced to communication studies from both a Western and Asian perspective, especially concerning Chinese participants. This is no surprise as the concept of face is said to have Chinese origins, starting in pre-Confucian times (Sueda, 2014). To date, while the subject of face and language learning has been mentioned briefly in the literature, it remains underexplored since much of it is experiential and not empirical.

Face is a double-edged sword for language learners. On the one hand, they are not expected to be proficient because they are still in the process of learning the target language. Varonis and Gass (1985), whose study on interactions between dyads of native English speakers and non-native speakers, indicate that interaction between non-native speakers take longer to negotiate and require more repair work until the conversation resumes. They attribute this to non-native speakers feeling that they have little to lose even if they do not understand, and thus, do not "lose face by negotiating meaning" (Varonis & Gass, 1985, p. 85) when interacting with other non-native speakers as they would with native speakers.

On the other hand, when teaching speech acts in a foreign language, teachers need to be mindful of the importance of face in relation to the sociolinguistic and contextual variables, as well as the possible ramifications. For example, refusals are complex because they involve the risk of "offending one's interlocutor" (Beebe, Takahashi & Uliss-Weltz, 1990, p. 56) and indirectness may be necessary.

Language teachers' attempts to elicit learners' questions in order to promote their participation can pose challenges. Waring (2012) points out that language learners may be concerned about maintaining their "teachers' identity as a competent professional" (Waring, 2012, p. 744) should they ask their teachers questions for clarification during class. At the same time, learners' questions may be interpreted as their lack of competence in understanding the teacher's explanations. Waring's view confirms that of Watson's (1999) in that when Chinese students respond to their teachers' questions, saying yes to confirm their understanding is a face-saving response for seeking harmony.

2. Face as a universal phenomenon

In the West, Goffman (1967) has been considered the forerunner in the research on face (Sueda, 2014). His concept of face is based on the premise that we live in a world where we interact with others, and through these interactions people form their impressions of us. Goffman defines face as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself," (Goffman, 1967, p. 5) based on the impressions others have. He asserts that one is said to have face when self-image is consistent with how s/he is perceived by others. On the other hand, Goffman warns that since one's social face is on loan to him/her from society it will be withdrawn if others prove that s/he is unworthy of it.

2.1 Goffman's concept of face

Goffman's basic tenet is that interaction is a prerequisite of face, as face is valued by both self and others. Next, based on the "rule of self-respect and the rule of considerateness" (Goffman, 1967, p. 11), one saves his/her own face and that of others. Finally, should one's face be threatened, face-saving actions, or face-work, come into play. Goffman's idea of face-work is that it counteracts face-threatening events and are practiced as long as one does not sacrifice his/her own face or that of others.

Goffman states that "underneath their differences

in culture, people everywhere are the same" (p. 44), thus, implying that human nature and face are similarly universal. Attributing their concepts of face to Goffman, Brown and Levinson (1987) share the same concept that face is universal.

2.2 Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies

Brown and Levinson (1987) base their discussions of politeness strategies on the accepted premise that people have basic wants that are shared, which they wish to satisfy. According to Brown and Levinson (1987) one's basic wants are manifest in face, which consist of negative face and positive face. Negative face refers to one's wants to not be imposed. On the other hand, positive face refers to one's desire to be "understood, approved of, liked or admired" (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 62). Although it is ideal to have our wants met by others, this is not always the case as some actions are intrinsically face-threatening.

Brown and Levinson refer to actions to avoid face-threatening acts (hereinafter, FTAs) as politeness strategies. First, the speaker is faced with a choice of doing or not doing the FTA to the hearer. Upon deciding to do the FTA, the speaker then decides whether to go *on record* (italics added), where the message is conveyed clearly and directly, or *off record* (italics added), where the message is communicated indirectly. When going on record, which is face-threatening, one can choose to do the FTA *baldly, without redress* (italics added), where the FTA is done in the most direct way, without jeopardizing his/her relationship with the hearer. The alternative is to take redresssive action (italics added), which means to give face to the hearer by attempting to "counteract the potential face damage of the FTA" (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 69). Brown and Levinson propose two ways to give face. First, through positive politeness, the speaker does what needs to be done to satisfy the hearer's face wants, or positive face, such as behaving in a friendly manner. On the other hand, negative politeness assures that the speaker satisfies the hearer's negative face by not interfering with his/her freedom.

Although Goffman (1967) and Brown and Levinson (1987) acknowledge cultural differences, they assert that the concept of face is universal. The next section introduces two alternative constructs of face. First, Lim and Bowers' (1991) construct argues against the dichotomized model in the universal concept of face.

3. Alternative concepts of face

3.1 Lim and Bowers' concept of universal face

Lim and Bowers (1991) make two arguments against Brown and Levinson's (1987) concept of face. One argument is against their assertion that negative politeness and positive politeness are mutually exclusive, meaning that positive politeness strategies are employed to maintain one's positive face, and negative politeness, for one's negative face. Lim and Bowers argue that the dichotomy does not satisfy complicated communicative acts. For example, if one's negative face is threatened, it can be alleviated by a negative politeness strategy (e.g., avoidance, in order to minimize the imposition), and at the same time be an expression of positive face (e.g., by showing affection or respect). On the other hand, if one's positive face is threatened, both negative politeness and positive politeness strategies can be employed. If one's work is criticized, for example, the criticism can be minimized through avoidance or be a sign of closeness of the relationship.

In their second argument, which is aimed at Brown and Levinson's (1987) concept of positive face, Lim and Bowers contend that there are two types of positive face. While one refers to the desire to be included through a sense of belongingness, the other is to have one's abilities be appreciated through positive evaluation. As a result, they

propose three types of face: fellowship face, competence face, and autonomy face (Lim & Bowers, 1991). While fellowship face, or "the want to be included" (p. 420) and competence face, or "the want that their abilities be respected" (p. 420) are based on positive face, autonomy face or "the want not to be imposed on" (p. 420) is similar to negative face.

3.1.1 Applicability of Lim and Bowers' model to Japanese university students

Yokomizo (2012) studied 204 Japanese university students' participation behavior in relation to their face needs. She focused on their non-participation in the classroom, their desire to be recognized by their professors, and their attitude towards professors' learning students' names. Results show that Japanese university students generally feel resistant towards question-asking in the classroom, due to their anxiety to speak in front of others and their relationship with others, which contribute to their non-participation.

Yokomizo's (2012) study indicates that students who do not feel resistant to volunteer in class have a high autonomy face. In contrast, those who feel resistant to volunteer felt that classroom participation only sets them apart from others in terms of their competence. This is a reflection of their tendency to avoid having their autonomy, fellowship, and competence faces violated. Furthermore, out of the two groups of students who desired to be recognized by professors and believed professors should learn students' names, while one group consists of students who tend to be cooperative and value harmony, the other group has students who wish to be acknowledged as intelligent students. This indicates the first group's high fellowship face and the second group's high competence face.

In a case study on Japanese university returnee students, Sueda (2014) employs Lim and Bowers' (1991) face construct to study participants' responses to written prompts. Returnees are students who repatriate to Japan after a "prolonged sojourn abroad" (Kanno, 2000, p. 362) and are mostly children of businessmen. Sueda's (2014) study explores how participants negotiate their multiple identities as returnees while revealing different aspects of the three faces.

One male participant identifies himself as a "*kuroko*" (Sueda, 2014, p. 119), or taking a supporting role, in the football team in his Japanese school. When he created the team he felt he was a better supporter than a leader, by helping people perform well. His interview indicates that he has both fellowship and competence needs. In contrast, a female participant expressed that there was a difference in her personality between when she spoke English and Japanese. While her competence face was honored because of her competence in English, too much face honoring made her feel uncomfortable, as her fellowship needs were not met.

This section describes Lim and Bowers' (1991) three types of face in response to the limitations of positive face and negative face. Furthermore, universal face has been argued in studies on culture-specific face. The next section discusses Chinese face mechanism as an example of face in a particular culture.

3.2 Culture-specific face: The Chinese face mechanism

In this section, Chinese face is discussed for two reasons. First, the origins of face can be traced back to the Chinese concept of face (Ho, 1976; Mao, 1994), which provides an example of the development and evolution of face in a non-Western culture. Second, a case study on Chinese face in the classroom presents a different aspect of language learners.

3.2.1 Chinese concepts of face: *miànzi* and *liǎn*

Reviewing Chinese face gives insight on elements

missing in Western interpretations of face (Sueda, 2014). While *miànzi* stands for the prestige or reputation one achieves through getting on in life, or a measure of recognition by society (Chang & Holt, 1994), *liǎn* represents the society's confidence in the integrity of one's moral character (Ho, 1976; Mao, 1994). While loss of *miànzi* is to suffer a loss of reputation due to failure based on group judgment (Mao, 1994), loss of *liǎn* is more serious as it becomes impossible for one to "function properly within the community" (Ho, 1976, p. 868). Furthermore, the loss of one's *liǎn* is damaging to one's *miànzi* as the *miànzi* becomes difficult to maintain (Mao, 1994). In comparing the concept of Chinese face and that of Brown and Levinson (1987), Mao explains that Brown and Levinson's definition is centered on one's self-image, or individual face. However, Chinese face is closely connected to the community's perception and judgment of one's character and behavior. According to Mao, "Chinese face depends upon, and is indeed determined by the participation of others" (Mao, 1994, p. 460).

Chang and Holt (1994) state that while *miànzi* can be claimed by individuals, it can also be shared by members of an ingroup. However, individuals are also expected to uphold the *miànzi* of the ingroup. While relationships could be disrupted if *miànzi* is mishandled among members, *miànzi* can also be a lubricant for smooth relationships. Literature on relational and interpersonal aspects of Chinese students and classroom dynamics suggests that face is present in the language classroom.

3.2.2 Face and Chinese students in the classroom

Face has been recognized as a key concept which English language teachers in China need to be mindful of as face highlights Chinese hierarchical relations (Cortazzi & Jin, 1996). Simpson (2008) warns that Western English language teachers in China should not underestimate the importance of face and fear of face loss because they are the reasons of Chinese students' reticence. In response to Western teachers' perceptions of Chinese students' classroom behaviors filtered through their values and standards (Clark & Gieve, 2006, p. 63), Liu (2002) defends Chinese students by stating that their silence is meant to be a sign of respect. He also proposes that understanding cross-cultural differences in classroom silence is necessary to encourage Chinese students to speak up.

While there is research on Chinese students and face in the classroom, studies dealing with face constructs are limited. Based on classroom observations and interviews, Wu (2009) identified four face-related factors based on *miànzi* among Chinese students: low-risk face, collective face, hierarchical face, and harmonious face. In terms of low-risk face, participants avoided situations, which are perceived as unclear or unpredictable, by remaining silent in order not to be judged by others. In terms of collective face, attention is given to maintain mutual-face and other-face. For example, one student's reticence is attributed to collective face, and his mistakes put him and other Chinese colleagues to shame. Hierarchical face is manifest in the hierarchical structure in Chinese society, which is replicated in classroom relationships in the UK. Although the study takes place in the UK, which is an example of a small culture being co-constructed between teachers and students, the participants' large culture values and attitudes from China are replicated (Clark & Gieve, 2006; Wu, 2009). Findings by Wu reveal how participants' face concerns influence classroom interaction.

4. Implications

Research on face has shifted from taking a linguistic approach, where meanings of utterances are based on a formula, to an interactional and

relational approach, where participants co-construct face meanings (Arundale, 2006). As a result, implications of face studies include attention to emotions, which arise in the process of interaction between self and others (Qi, 2011).

According to Ho, Fun and Ng (2004), although emotions of guilt, shame, and embarrassment are considered "the most painful of human experiences," (Ho et al., 2004, p. 64), they are difficult to distinguish as different experiences are associated with these emotions. Qi (2011) claims that different states of face result in the arousal of emotions, such as shame, which is associated with face loss. From a Western perspective, according to Scheff (1997), shame, which is a normal part of social control, becomes disruptive when one is denied, leading to alienation. According to Sueda (2014), when face is threatened, one's shame becomes stronger, but shame is difficult to acknowledge since people do not want to accept the pain that results from shame.

Due to its association with shame, it may be no surprise that face has been underexplored in language learning research, as learners' emotions can be unpleasant. However, emotions are not always experienced alone (Parkinson, Fisher & Manstead, 2005), as language learning does not take place in a vacuum. In fact, just as people have impact on emotions, emotions have impact on people (Parkinson et al., 2005).

5. Conclusion

This article has reviewed face (i.e., universal and culture-specific), face mechanism, and the emotions associated with face, in order to explore how face operates in the classroom and among language learners. As face among language learners is complicated, more needs to be explored on its potential influential role in the language classroom, such as whether pedagogy can influence or even reduce face concerns, or whether it can enhance learners' face and performance.

In language learning, face and emotions have not been overlooked as foreign language anxiety (FLA) research has shed light on face-threatening situations. While FLA comprises three parts (i.e., communication apprehension, test anxiety and fear of negative evaluation), difficulty in speaking has been the most frequently cited concern (Horwitz, Horwitz & Cope, 1986). As negative evaluation of learners' performances is related to face, communication apprehension needs to be further studied when exploring their face concerns.

Face and emotions have been addressed to different degrees in FLA studies. English language learners with low proficiency are not only judged about their language ability and but also their significance as individuals, which makes language learning face-threatening (Cummins, 1996; cited in Pappamihiel, 2002). Furthermore, they can be concerned about being labeled as show-offs (Yan and Horwitz, 2008). This paradox represents the complexity of face and emotions in language classrooms, as learners' performance in a foreign language can threaten one's own face and be face-threatening to others. However, simply acknowledging face and emotions in language classrooms may not be sufficient. It may be necessary to give more attention to face in the language classroom and explore further as to how it can contribute to one's language learning experience.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Professor Suzanne Quay for her detailed feedback in writing this paper.

References

Arundale, R.B. (2006). Face as relational and interactional: A communication framework for

research on face, facework, and politeness. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 2, 193–216.

Beebe, L.M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. Scarella, E. Andersen, & S.D. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55–73). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Chang, H-C., & Holt, G.R. (1994). A Chinese perspective on face and inter-relational concern. In S. Ting-Toomey (Ed.), *The challenge of facework: Cross-cultural and interpersonal issues* (pp. 95–132). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Clark, R., & Gieve, S.N. (2006). On the discursive construction of 'the Chinese learner.' *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 19* (1), 54–73.

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1996). English teaching and learning in China. *Language Teaching, 29*, 61–80.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. NY: Pantheon.

Ho, D.Y. (1976). On the concept of face. *American Journal of Sociology, 81* (4), 867–884.

Ho, D.Y., Fu, W., & Ng, S.M. (2004). Guilt, shame and embarrassment: Revelations of face and self. *Culture and Psychology, 10* (1), 64–84.

Horwitz, E.K., Horwitz, M.B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *The Modern Language Journal, 70* (2), 125–132.

Kanno, Y. (2000). Kikokushijo as bicultural. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 24*, 361–382.

Lim, T-S., & Bowers, J.W. (1991). Facework: Solidarity, approbation, and tact. *Human Communication Research, 17* (3), 415–450.

Liu, J. (2002). Negotiating silence in American classrooms: Three Chinese cases. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 2* (2), 37–54.

Mao, L.R. (1994). Beyond politeness theory: 'Face' revisited and renewed. *Journal of Pragmatics, 21*, 451–486.

Pappamihiel, N.E. (2002). English as a second language students and English language anxiety: Issues in the mainstream classroom. *Research in the Teaching of English, 36*, 327–355.

Parkinson, B., Fischer, A.H., & Manstead, A.S.R. (2005). *Emotion in social relations: Cultural, group, and interpersonal processes*. New York: Psychology Press.

Qi, X. (2011). Face: A Chinese concept in global society. *Journal of Sociology, 47* (3), 279–295.

Scheff, T.J. (1997). *Emotions, the social bond, and human reality: Part/whole analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Simpson, S.T. (2008). Western EFL teachers and east-west classroom-culture conflicts. *RELC Journal, 39* (3), 381–392.

Sueda, K. (2014). *Negotiating multiple identities: Shame and pride among Japanese returnees*. Singapore: Springer.

Varonis, E.M., & Gass, S. (1985). Non-native/ non-native conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics, 6* (1), 71–90.

Waring, H.Z. (2012). "Any questions?": Investigating the nature of understanding-checks in the language classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 46* (4), 722–752.

Watson, D.I. (1999). 'Loss of face' in Australian classrooms. *Teaching in Higher Education, 4* (3), 355–362.

Wu, X. (2009). The dynamics of Chinese face mechanisms and classroom behavior: A case study. *Evaluation & Research in Education, 22* (2–4), 87–105.

Yan, J.X., & Horwitz, E.K. (2008). Learners' perceptions of how anxiety interacts with personal and instructional factors to influence their achievement in English: A qualitative analysis of EFL learners in China. *Language Learning, 58* (1), 151–183.

Yokomizo, T. (2012). Daigakusei no jugyo sanka koudou to feisu neezu to no kakawari: Hatsugen suru koto ni taisuru teikoukan oyobi hi ninshiki yokkyu, ninshiki doryoku yokkyu kara miete kita mono [The relationships between university students' active classroom participation and face needs]. *Journal of Kawaguchi Junior College, 26* (2), 17–32.