

A Content Analysis for Interconnection between Language and Social Etiquettes

Ali Hayat¹, Danish Suleman², Sajjad HUSSAIN³, Mahmood Ahmad Azhar⁴, Shahzad ul Hassan Farooqi⁵

Abstract

This paper explores the intricate relationship between language and social etiquette, emphasizing how linguistic choices reflect and shape social norms across diverse cultural contexts while having content analysis. Using a qualitative meta-analysis, this study synthesizes findings from existing research to identify recurring content categories, such as the use of politeness strategies, language as a marker of social identity, and cultural variations in language etiquette. Findings reveal that politeness strategies, like formal address and indirect communication, serve as tools for maintaining social harmony, while language functions as a marker of identity, allowing individuals to align with social groups. Additionally, cultural differences significantly influence etiquette, with hierarchical societies often preferring more deferential forms of communication. This analysis underscores the vital role language plays in mirroring and reinforcing societal values, calling for continued research on how evolving language practices impact social behavior and etiquette.

Keywords: *Communication styles, Cultural norms, Identity and language, Language and social etiquette, and Politeness strategies.*

Introduction

Language and social etiquette, each of which has a distinct influence on how people interact, comprehend intentions, and respond to social standards, are essential for effective communication and social cohesion (Holmes, 2012). *Language* is the main communication medium, enabling people to express their ideas, feelings, and beliefs, even though social etiquette provides a framework of appropriate conduct in diverse social contexts (Brown & Levinson, 1987). Language and manners allow people to navigate difficult social situations, maintain connections, and express respect and understanding in cultural contexts (Dhital, 2023).

Certain research articles in the literature on etiquette include "Linguistic Etiquette: A Pragmatic Study" by Jdetawy and Hamzah (2020) and "Farewell and Greeting Speech Etiquette: Linguistic and Cultural Peculiarities" by Dulayeva et al. (2023). Additionally, there are numerous studies addressing the concepts of linguistic etiquette and speech etiquette. Furthermore, recent research conducted by Professor Shatha Alsaadi (2021) examines Iraqi EFL students navigating the complexities of English language etiquette and Arabic language etiquette. The questionnaire or article addresses etiquette in general, rather than specifically focusing on language social etiquette. Valsiner (2005) defines etiquette as verbal expressions of behavior, while Terkourafi (2011) describes language etiquette, or speech etiquette, as the rules that regulate the formation, order, content, character, and situational appropriateness of an expression or specific utterance.

Comprehending the correlation between language and social etiquette in linguistic contexts is particularly essential. Social and linguistic disparities can enhance communication yet may also result

¹Lecturer, Ataturk Faculty of Education, Department of English Language Teaching, Near East University, Mersin 10, Turkey. ali.hayat@neu.edu.tr. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-7053-6291> (corresponding author).

² Assistant Professor, Head of the Department English Language and Literature, Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Near East University, Nicosia 99138, North Cyprus. danish.suleman@neu.edu.tr, Orcid ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8505-0140>.

³ PhD Scholar Cyprus International University (Department of ELT), Haspolat, Mersin, Turkey sajjakhosa@gmail.com ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3968-0758>

⁴ Prof,Chairperson, Department of English, Lahore Leads University, Pakistan. mahmoodahmadazhar@gmail.com ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4277-3075>

⁵ Assistant Professor, Al-Majmaah University Saudi. Arabia. s.farooqi@mu.edu.sa. ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4409-0648>

in misunderstandings, especially when cultural standards differ markedly (Kim, 2022). This article examines the interconnected relationship between language and social etiquette, employing theoretical and empirical evidence to evaluate the roles of both ideas in facilitating efficient communication. This assessment also underscores areas requiring more investigation in digital and cross-cultural environments, where the relationship between language and etiquette is ever shifting.

This study examines the intricate connection between language and social graces by analyzing data from earlier research. Examining studies from various cultural contexts makes it clear how language shapes and is shaped by societal norms and expectations. The data collected from these studies looks at how language choices vary between formal and informal settings, highlighting how people use language to communicate clearly in various social circumstances, demonstrate respect, and reveal their social identities. This study provides a nuanced view of how language reflects broader social norms, and it also looks at how language usage varies in peer-group, professional, and educational situations. By combining previous studies, this study aims to improve our understanding of language as a dynamic tool that simultaneously responds to and reinforces cultural norms.

Research questions

What is the correlation between language and social etiquettes while employing content analysis?

Is there a connection between language and social etiquettes when utilize content analysis?

Literature Review

Theoretical Perspectives on Language and Social Etiquette

Several significant theories emphasize the relationship between Language and social etiquette. First proposed by Austin in 1962 and improved upon by Searle in 1969, Speech Act Theory examines how Language can perform acts and transmit information. According to this theory, speech acts like requesting, apologizing, or expressing gratitude have social consequences. These speech acts, whether verbal or nonverbal, are inherently social and highlight the importance of cultural norms in language interpretation (Austin, 1975).

The Politeness Theory, created by Brown and Levinson in 1987, is another crucial paradigm for understanding Language and manners. This theory holds that people use specific strategies to avoid face-threatening behaviors, which are nonverbal or vocal clues that could embarrass or impose themselves on others (Chang & Haugh, 2011). Brown and Levinson define the "positive" and "negative" politeness tactics as ways to maintain social harmony and protect one's face or public self-image and those of others. These culturally based strategies, which vary from society to society, demonstrate how language use is influenced by social etiquette (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Cultural Dimensions of Language and Etiquette

The Politeness Theory, created by Brown and Levinson in 1987, is another crucial paradigm for understanding Language and manners. This theory holds that people use specific strategies to avoid face-threatening behaviors, which are nonverbal or vocal clues that could embarrass or impose themselves on others. Brown and Levinson define the "positive" and "negative" politeness tactics as ways to maintain social harmony and protect one's face or public self-image and those of others. These culturally based strategies, which vary from society to society, demonstrate how social etiquette influences language use (Brown & Levinson, 1987).

Additionally, studies show that collectivistic versus individualistic orientations influence language use and manners. According to Matsumoto (1999), collectivistic cultures like those in East Asia and Latin America value harmony within the group and frequently use indirect communication techniques to avoid conflict. On the other hand, individualistic cultures might prefer more overt and self-expressive Language. These cultural dimensions make a more profound comprehension of intercultural communication possible, which shows how Language and manners are influenced by underlying societal values (Matsumoto, 1991).

Language and Etiquette in Social Contexts

In professional settings, Language and social etiquette are remarkably intertwined. (Shen & Lai, 2023) found that polite Language, including formal address forms and other politeness strategies, is essential to fostering a respectful environment. By using polite Language in the classroom, teachers may foster a supportive environment and provide an excellent example for the kids. In both cases, Language was used to reiterate the manners valued in these settings (Holmes & Wilson, 2022).

The impact of social etiquette on Language in informal settings varies. Eckert (2000) asserts that humor, slang, and colloquial Language are essential components of peer-group communication, and Language is commonly used to express unity and group identity. Because social decorum is less strictly maintained in certain circumstances, people could feel more at ease experimenting with Language. This demonstrates how Language may be used in informal social settings to foster a feeling of belonging and shared identity (Eckert, 2000). onova and Miroslawska (2024) established linguistic norms, including valedictions, in the Polish and Bulgarian languages. Additionally, Ismail Palic et al. (2023) investigated the speech acts of greeting and thanking among high school students, whereas Czachorowska (2023) scrutinized the etiquette in Bolesław Prus's correspondence with friends, emphasizing various epistolary courtesies including greetings, farewells, expressions of gratitude, apologies, and well-wishes. Furthermore, a study on social etiquette in the Turkish context exemplifies the evolution of societal interactions. Ali Hayat et al. (2024) included a table on Turkish social etiquette in the appendix. Zheng et al. (2024) examined digital etiquette literacy and its influence on students' learning motivation and engagement.

Language, Etiquette, and Social Identity

According to sociolinguistic research, Language is crucial in creating social identity. According to Gumperz's (1982) sociolinguistic research and the Ethnography of Communication (Hymes, 1974), people use Language to express their social identities and group membership, and social etiquette is ingrained in these linguistic decisions. Dialect usage and code-switching are examples of behaviors that show how people negotiate different social norms within diverse social or cultural groupings. The significance of Language in forming social identity is further supported by the fact that bilingual and multilingual speakers may modify their Language and manners according to the cultural setting (Gumperz, 1982).

Etiquettes Miscellaneous Studies

From a social viewpoint, social etiquette is examined in many research, including the etiquette of bribery (Thelander and Åkerström, 2022) and passenger etiquette management in Tokyo, focusing on customer service and social control (Schimkowsky, 2021). In Japan, Tiptony (2012) asserts that "manners make a nation," whereas Masakure (2017) discusses racial etiquette in Southern Rhodesia, and Izhar et al. (2023) examine linguistic etiquette for serving meals within Indonesia's Manjau Maju Lampung Tribe. A survey by Cambetis et al. (2019) investigated the regulations and etiquette around motorized mobility scooters, whereas Tham (2020) analyzed the utilization of drones for recreational activities. Additionally, online communities in Slavic languages and their communicative norms (Duskaeva and Ivanova, 2021), as well as "The Art of Niceness" concerning online learners' inhibition, honesty, and politeness (Conrad, 2002). Additionally, corporate etiquette include verbal and non-verbal communication in telephone interactions (Power, 1959) and the protocol for mobile phone deactivation, as well as theatrical etiquette (Halligan, 2009).

Conversely, in the medical domain, etiquette is crucial for social conduct, including telemedicine etiquette proficiency and its corresponding checklist (Pittmann et al., 2024) as well as the etiquette involved in the antibiotic decision-making process in Ethiopia by Alemkere et al. (2023). Additionally, Peterson (1997) addresses etiquette in medicine, while Alleje et al. (2019) examine consultation and social media etiquette in the medical field. Opsahl (2021) focuses on social media etiquette for physicians, while Bladh & Van Leeuwen (2017) discuss nurse-to-patient etiquette.

Definition as Language Social Etiquette

To achieve a comprehensive understanding of reality, one must examine the intrinsic character and practical implications of words with definitions or significant meanings. Jdetawy and Hamzah (2020) have recently defined social etiquette, encompassing the language used for welcomes, queries, or addressing others with a polite tone for the sake of comparison or understanding. Xunzi Avers' Etiquette (Milburn, 2015). improves human behavior. It enhances fundamental desire and emotion. Similarly, individuals within Chinese culture regard etiquette as a normative behavioral standard that must be adhered to in order to maintain society order (Zhang, 2008).

The language is a fundamental component of the human condition, and it is a significant factor in nearly every facet of our existence. Cognition is underpinned by language. Language underpins our experiences (Hoemann et al., 2019), functions as a framework for comprehending both ourselves and others (Charlesworth et al., 2021), influences culture and society (Stibbe, 2015), and offers profound insights into our identity, both on an individual and collective level (Kjell et al., 2022). Furthermore,

verbal expressions of behavior serve as indicators of social etiquette (Valsiner, 2005). As articulated by Terkourafi (2011), language etiquettes, commonly referred to as speech etiquettes, encompass the regulations that dictate the structure, sequence, content, characteristics, and contextual appropriateness of an expression or specific utterance.

Gaps and Future Directions

Even though the present body of research shows numerous linkages between Language and social etiquette, crucial areas still need research. Generalizing findings across various populations may be challenging because a significant amount of recent research focuses on particular cultural contexts. Furthermore, digital communication has produced new challenges for traditional etiquette ideas because online encounters sometimes need more apparent social cues. Future studies should concentrate on how social etiquette and language use alter in virtual settings (Crystal, 2004).

Methodology

This study uses a qualitative meta-analytic technique as research design to examine the relationship between language and social etiquette by synthesizing findings from previous research. However, theoretical framework of this research is content analysis where Qualitative meta-analysis, which finds thematic categories and patterns demonstrating how language reflects and maintains social norms, enables a thorough literature evaluation (Goffman, 1967; Brown & Levinson, 1987). This method provides a foundation for understanding language's intricate role in social interactions across cultural contexts.

Data Collection

Consequently, the data were collected in sociolinguistic, anthropological, and social-psychological studies and derived from peer-reviewed articles published in the last twenty years. Keywords, in this case, were language and social etiquette, politeness in language, and cultural norms in communication, which were used to conduct a systematic search in the databases: for example, JSTOR, Google Scholar, Research Gate, etc. With this search, 50 studies were found, and among these, 30 studies were included a priori as they had an appropriate methodology.

The studies discussed in this paper use a range of research approaches (from ethnographic to experimental) and provide a gallery of the perspectives on politeness theory. Brown and (Goldsmith, 2007), as well as Wilson & Meischke, 1991), produced a sort of basis on which scholars can premise their understanding of politeness. These have been elaborated in more recent works that started to challenge the notion of politeness models and pointed to the fact that one cannot explain given behavioral interaction in the communicative practice without considering such factors as gender, power and status (Holmes, 2005; Holmes, 2013). This review integrates both of these views, stressing the medium, language, emphasizing its ability to pertain to the culture of norms and the management of social relationships. Drawing from the findings of sociolinguistics and anthropology, it gives a landowner on the intricacies of politeness and its utility in creating order and orderliness in society as well as encouraging intercultural communication.

Inclusion Criteria

The sources for this analysis were identified by following guidelines that refer to language, etiquette, and cultural norms as relevant to this analysis. The current analysis focused only on quantitative studies published primarily in peer-reviewed journals, favoring those articles that provided actual data on language use as well as etiquette in different cultures and settings. Particular attention has been paid to such research issues involving the study of how social expectations and cultural norms precisely determine or instead influence communicative practices, which corresponds to two main themes of this paper. Specifically, the role of politeness in culture has been supported by studies by (Scollon & Scollon 2001). It has been a valuable addition to explaining how language has been used to regulate relationships. The clinical inclusion criteria required studies that specifically focused on the use of language when communicating politely while respecting cultural differences and cultural protocols where gestures and body language were also taken into account. To ensure that only reliable data was collected, unpublished sources in academic/peer-reviewed journals, testimonials/headlines, and articles without clearly defined and detailed methodology sections were excluded from the study. This approach helped to ensure that only the best studies of methodological quality were included and to obtain a rich and comprehensive picture of how language is used in social interactions - a critical area of interest in this research.

Data Analysis

A thematic analysis was conducted to identify recurring themes across the selected studies, categorizing findings according to topics like politeness strategies, identity signaling, and cultural differences in language use (Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2013; Eckert, 2012). Each study was analyzed individually, and patterns were cross-referenced to identify consistent findings across social and cultural contexts. This analytical approach allowed for a structured synthesis of conclusions regarding the influence of language on social etiquette.

Ethical Considerations

Since this research relies on previously published studies, traditional ethical considerations like informed consent and confidentiality were not required. However, all sources were properly cited to respect the intellectual property of original authors (Tien, 2000; Hughes, 1998).

Findings

The results of the meta-synthesis about the relationship between language and etiquette are as follows: Politeness and communication strategies, language as a social marker, and cross-cultural communication policies on the uses of language etiquette.

Politeness Strategies in Language Use

In many research papers, theorists have revealed that politeness strategies are closely related to the respect and balance of all relationships. For that reason, speakers employ formal address forms, indirectness, and politeness formulas such as honorifics in working life when interacting with individuals in power or when performing professional roles (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Mayes, 1998). These tactics also differ cross-culturally but tend to reduce social distance and promote polite interaction (Merkin, R. S. (2006)

Language as a Marker of Social Identity

Language was also found to be used in the construction of social relationships^a * social relationships^b in the same data. When people interact with others, they tend to try and conform to that specific social group by using a particular way of speaking, possibly integrating proverbs, slang, their dialect or switching between two languages (Eckert, 2012); Matsumoto, 1999). For instance, the young generation might use a demeanor when with friends and an informal tone when in classes, a workplace, or any other formal setting because of manners or personality. In cross-cultural settings, research has found that language in use can be associated with status and conformity (Markus, 1991).

Cultural Variations in Language Etiquette

Multilingual pragmatics and honoring the politeness that is attributed to such cultural practices are crucial because they enable the learner to notice that culture and etiquette define the various types of communication. However, in high power distance cultures, especially many oriental cultures, people will bend their language to those in authority. These cultures have unique greeting techniques and specific terms that are used in a peculiar method to show respect to elder people, employers or those in authority, thus supporting cultures and the culture of hierarchy sensitivity (Singh, 1990; Scollon, 2001). Regarding this, this linguistic formality is associated with the culture of people who think that in order to respect their superiors and estimate their social status, they have to. While the high power distance culture of most of the countries in Asia usually compels you to show deference when talking to your superior, most of the Western countries have a low power distance culture, which makes it preferable to share powers. These cultures do not have a competitively acute differentiation, and a person following the manager's lead, who might be a chief or director type, might be named, for instance, rudely. This shift is attributed to the higher value placed in the Anglo-Saxon countries on issues of autonomy, self-promotion and self-organizing rather than power (Hofstede, 2015). All these exposing the change of cultural behavior from the formal protocol point to the fact that politeness rather does not have a hereditary nature of a given culture, but it depends on these factors.

Furthermore, people originating from collectivistic societies, which traditionally exist in Asia and Latin America, pay much attention to the agreement of the majority and regard themselves as being mutually dependent. Therefore, direct communication is not that suitable because people prevent confrontation and attempt to maintain their faces. It is desirable, especially in large groups, owing to its informality and ability to avoid conflict and cause embarrassment while fulfilling relational obligations. On the other hand, integrative cultures common to the Western civilizations practice directness and

simplicity in writing as they promote the independence of each person and the responsibilities of each person. One way of doing this is postulated by Markus (1991). These differences in communication styles show that cultural attitudes are a complex and critical determinant of propriety or impoliteness.

Language, therefore, acts as a most important social institution as it helps in creating, stabilizing and enforcing practices and norms that are accepted within a given/ cultural community. This means that the politeness labels, identity features, and cross-cultural differences in the ways people interact all interplay in the language society's expectations. These variations serve not just the purposes of communication but also social control and personal and cultural self-definition. Such understanding corresponds to (Early, 1997; Fish, 1976) theories, which support that language is not just a tool of communication but is also a tool that regulates social behaviors according to the etiquette of society.

Conclusion

This work reveals how language constitutes a central aspect of preserving and monitoring behavioral norms across countries. When analyzing the extant literature, it is pretty clear that language is more than a way of giving and exchanging information but a highly sophisticated social process that not only mirrors cultural norms and practices but also, most often, helps reinforce or even critique them. Considering the politically correct language and polite ways of addressing someone, we come across the reality of mitigated communication that enables people to avoid offending others and shows how manners are closely connected with social norms of communication. Likewise, under the feature of language as the index of belonging, it is possible for people, having signaled their belonging to specific groups, to subsequently adapt to the use of language practices appropriate to specific roles and meeting the values of the society in which they live, thus deepening the connection between language and behavior.

This paper aims to discuss the differences in customs governing interpersonal communication across cultures with the hope of understanding that cultures do not view respect and social order in the same way. For instance, while high power distance and high uncertainty avoidance cultures may prefer to use more polite and formal modes of communication to uphold social order, other cultures may prefer using straightforward language as they support equal rights. These studies demonstrate that language and politeness are respectively interdependent and contingent on cultural values that govern people's social conduct. This study calls for a realized appreciation of the capacity of language as a mirror of social values and a regime for remitting expected values. This research could be further developed in future by considering how developing linguistic conventions, especially in societies that are becoming progressively multilingual, contribute to the changed rules of politeness. The coevolution between language and social conduct thus suggests the need to pose the following critical inquiry in the emerging culture

References

1. Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words*. Harvard university press.
2. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (No. 4). Cambridge university press.
3. Chang, W. L. M., & Haugh, M. (2011). Strategic embarrassment and face threatening in business interactions. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(12), 2948-2963.
4. Crystal, D. (2004). *Language and the Internet*.
5. Dhital, R. (2023). Applying Hofstede's Cultural Dimension Theory to Analyze Intercultural Communication Differences. *Journal of Linguistics and Communication Studies*, 2(3), 17-23.
6. Earley, P. C. (1997). *Face, harmony, and social structure: An analysis of organizational behavior across cultures*. Oxford University Press, USA.
7. Eckert, P. (2000). Linguistic variation as social practice: The linguistic construction of identity in Belten High. (No Title).
8. Eckert, P. (2012). Three waves of variation study: The emergence of meaning in the study of sociolinguistic variation. *Annual review of Anthropology*, 41(1), 87-100.
9. Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2013). *Language and gender*. Cambridge University Press.
10. Fish, S. E. (1976). How to do things with Austin and Searle: Speech act theory and literary criticism. *MLN*, 91(5), 983-1025.
11. Goldsmith, D. J. (2007). Brown and Levinson's politeness theory. *Explaining communication: Contemporary theories and exemplars*, 219-236.
12. Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge UP.
13. Gumperz, J. J. (Ed.). (1982). *Language and social identity*. Cambridge University Press.
14. Hayat, A., Ceylin keleş, H., Mekselina Bayir, Sajjad Hussain, Mehmet ullaş yurdugül, Pembe Coskuner, & Baha Bora Tanel. (2024). Turkish Language Social Etiquette Variations in Line with Social Norms.

Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 30(4), 10351–10361. <https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i4.6793>

15. Hofstede, G. J. (2015). Culture's causes: the next challenge. *Cross Cultural Management*, 22(4), 545-569.
16. Holmes, J. (2005). Power and discourse at work: Is gender relevant? In *Feminist critical discourse analysis: Gender, power and ideology in discourse* (pp. 31-60). London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
17. Holmes, J. (2012). Politeness in intercultural discourse and communication. *The handbook of intercultural discourse and communication*, 205-228.
18. Holmes, J. (2013). Women, men and politeness. Routledge.
19. Holmes, J., & Wilson, N. (2022). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. Routledge.
20. Hughes, J. (1998). Recoding intellectual property and overlooked audience interests. *Tex. L. Rev.*, 77, 923.
21. Kim, M. S. (2002). Non-Western perspectives on human communication: Implications for theory and practice. Sage.
22. Markus, H. R. (1991). Cultural variation in the self-concept. *The Self: Interdisciplinary approaches*/Springer.
23. Matsumoto, D. (1999). Culture and self: An empirical assessment of Markus and Kitayama's theory of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 2(3), 289-310.
24. Mayes, C. (1998). The Holmes reports: Perils and possibilities. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14(8), 775-792.
25. Merkin, R. S. (2006). Power distance and facework strategies. *Journal of intercultural communication research*, 35(2), 139-160.
26. Scollon, R. (2001). Action and text: towards an integrated understanding of the place of text in social (inter) action, mediated discourse analysis and the problem of social action. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, 113, 139-183.
27. Scollon, R., Scollon, S. W., & Jones, R. H. (2011). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach*. John Wiley & Sons.
28. Shen, Z., Zhao, M., & Lai, M. (2023). Analysis Of Politeness Based On Naturally Occurring And Authentic Conversations. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 19(3)
29. Singh, J. P. (1990). Managerial culture and work-related values in India. *Organization studies*, 11(1), 075-101.
30. Tien, L. (2000). Publishing software as a speech act. *Berk. Tech. LJ*, 15, 629.
31. Wilson, S. R., Kim, M. S., & Meischke, H. (1991). Evaluating Brown and Levinson's politeness theory: A revised analysis of directives and face. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 25(1-4), 215-252.
32. Pittmann, R., Danaher-Garcia, N., Adair White, B. A., & Thompson, A. (2024). Development and validation of the Telehealth etiquette competency checklist: A Delphi study. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1357633x241279494>
33. Alemkere, G., Tegegne, G. T., Molla, G. A., Belayneh, A., Muzeyin, H., Shewarega, W., Degefaw, Y., Melkie, A., Getahun, W., Tadeg, H., Alemayehu, A., Girma, E., & Amogne, W. (2023). Etiquette of the antibiotic decision-making process for surgical prophylaxis in Ethiopia: A triangulated ethnographic study. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1251692>
34. Alleje, M. L., Austria, B. C., & Shrestha, P. A. (2019). Social media etiquette in medicine. *British Journal of Hospital Medicine*, 80(9), 130-132. <https://doi.org/10.12968/hmed.2019.80.9.c130>
35. Peterson, L. J. (1997). Consultation etiquette. *Oral Surgery, Oral Medicine, Oral Pathology, Oral Radiology, and Endodontology*, 83(2), 185-186. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1079-2104\(97\)90000-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1079-2104(97)90000-7)
36. Opsahl, J. (2021). Etiquette for doctors on social media. *Tidsskrift for Den norske legeforening*. <https://doi.org/10.4045/tidsskr.21.0617>
37. Bladh, M. L., & Van Leeuwen, A. M. (2017). Nurse-to-patient etiquette. *Nursing*, 47(8), 52-56. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.nurse.0000515508.40958.fa>
38. Saab, S. (2023). DDS perspective: Etiquette in medicine. *Digestive Diseases and Sciences*, 69(1), 16-17. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10620-023-08161-3>
39. Thelander, J., & Åkerström, M. (2022). The etiquette of bribes – learning, teaching and knowing. *Nordic Journal of Criminology*, 23(2), 231-246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2578983x.2022.2089455>
40. Tham, A. (2020). Negotiating leisure etiquette in the context of drones. *Leisure/Loisir*, 44(1), 105-126. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14927713.2020.1745674>
41. Izhar, I., Rokhman, F., Rustono, & Pristiwati, R. (2023). Linguistic etiquette of serving food in local wisdom of Indonesia's Manjau Maju Lampung Tribe society. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2183610>
42. Cambetis, S., Richmond, J., & Chew, A. (2019). Motorized mobility scooter uses and knowledge of the rules and etiquette: A survey. *Physical & Occupational Therapy in Geriatrics*, 38(1), 67-84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02703181.2019.1699634>
43. Schimkowsky, C. (2021). Managing passenger etiquette in Tokyo: Between social control and customer service. *Mobilities*, 17(6), 932-950. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450101.2021.1929418>
44. Conrad, D. (2002). Inhibition, integrity and etiquette among online learners: The art of niceness. *Distance Education*, 23(2), 197-212. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0158791022000009204>

45. Tipton, E. K. (2012). Manners and mischief: Gender, power, and etiquette in Japan. *Asian Studies Review*, 36(3), 428-430. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10357823.2012.712650>
46. Power, D. C. (1959). What business thinks and says: Business telephone etiquette. *The Journal of Business Education*, 34(7), 298-299. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08832323.1959.10118441>
47. Halligan, B. (2009). Please ensure that your mobile phone is switched off: Theatre etiquette in an age of outsourcing. *Studies in Theatre and Performance*, 29(2), 193-197. https://doi.org/10.1386/stap.29.2.193_3
48. Masakure, C. (2017). Manners make a nation: Racial etiquette in Southern Rhodesia, 1910–1963. *African Historical Review*, 49(1), 114-117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17532523.2017.1327179>
49. Duskaeva, L., & Ivanova, L. (2021). The speech etiquette of professional groups. *Speech Etiquette in Slavic Online Communities*, 95-137. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-81747-3_6
50. Hoemann, K., Xu, F., & Barrett, L. F. (2019). Emotion words, emotion concepts, and emotional development in children: A constructionist hypothesis. *Developmental Psychology*, 55(9), 1830–1849. <https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000686>
51. Charlesworth, J. (2021). Managing the team. In *Leading, Managing, caring: Understanding Leadership and Management in Health and Social Care*. 165–188. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203075937-8>
52. Stibbe, A. (2011). Ecolinguistics: Language, ecology and the stories we live by. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(11), 2861–2865.
53. Kjell, O. N. E., Sikström, S., Kjell, K., & Schwartz, H. A. (2022). Natural language analyzed with AI-based transformers predict traditional subjective well-being measures approaching the theoretical upper limits in accuracy. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1), 3918. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-07520-w>
54. Valsiner, J. (2012). *The Oxford handbook of culture and psychology*. Oxford University Press.
55. Jdetawy, L. F., & Hamzah, M. H. (2020). Linguistic etiquette: a review from a pragmatic perspective. *Technium Soc. Sci. J.*, 14.
56. Tiryakian, E. A., & Goffman, E. (1968). Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior. *American Sociological Review*, 33(3), 462. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2091926>
57. Zhang, A. (2008). *Log into the World of Culture*. Chongqing University Press
58. Milburn, O. (2015). *Xunzi: The complete text*. Translated and with an introduction by Eric L. Hutton. pp. 440. Princeton, Princeton University press, 2014. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 25(3), 535-536. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1356186315000024>
59. Professor ShathaAlsaadi. (2021). Iraqi EFL students between the Scylla of English language etiquette and the Charybdis of Arabic language etiquette. *Journal of Education College Was it University*, 2(25), 1607-1616. <https://doi.org/10.31185/eduj.vol2.iss25.2754>