FACE-SAVING BEHAVIOR

Authored by
mohammad looti

October 16, 2025

RECOMMENDED CITATION

mohammad looti (2025). *FACE-SAVING BEHAVIOR*. PSYCHOLOGICAL SCALES. Retrieved from https://scales.arabpsychology.com/?p=47309

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM

FACE-SAVING BEHAVIOR

Primary Disciplinary Field(s): Social Psychology, Communication Studies, Sociology, Intercultural Communication

1. Core Definition

Face-saving behavior refers to the actions taken by an individual to protect, maintain, or restore their personal dignity or public image--known academically as "face"--following a social interaction that threatens this image. The concept of **face** is defined as the positive social value an individual effectively claims for themselves in a given social encounter. It is the idealized sense of self that others recognize and acknowledge, and it is inherently social, meaning it exists only when interactionally granted by others. Therefore, face-saving behaviors are fundamentally protective mechanisms designed to prevent the erosion of one's standing or to mitigate the embarrassment or shame caused by a blunder, mistake, or challenge.

These behaviors are often closely related to the broader concept of facework, which encompasses all actions taken to maintain face, whether proactively (preventative facework) or reactively (corrective facework). Face-saving specifically focuses on the corrective actions initiated immediately following a face-threatening act (FTA). An FTA can range from a minor social accident, such as tripping in public, to a significant professional failure, such as being publicly exposed for incompetence. As illustrated by the provided source material, if an individual falls over, their immediate action (e.g., laughing it off, quickly checking surroundings, or pretending they meant to do it) is an attempt to uphold their dignity in the immediate aftermath of the embarrassing event.

The motivation underlying face-saving behavior stems from the universal human need for approval and belonging. When face is lost, an individual experiences psychological distress, often manifesting as shame or profound embarrassment, and the potential consequence is social isolation or reduced status. Thus, face-saving acts are vital for maintaining both individual psychological equilibrium and the stability of the social structure. The success of a face-saving behavior is measured by the degree to which the individual's claimed identity is ratified or accepted by the surrounding audience, allowing the interaction to proceed smoothly without the face threat disrupting the shared reality of the participants.

2. Etymology and Theoretical Foundations

The academic understanding of face-saving behavior draws heavily from the sociological insights of Erving Goffman. In his seminal 1955 essay, "On Face-Work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction," Goffman formalized the concepts of "face" and "facework," drawing inspiration partly from the Chinese concept of *lian* (moral character) and *mianzi* (social prestige). Goffman

argued that social interaction is a ritual performance where participants are highly invested in maintaining their own face and the face of others, treating social encounters as sacred ceremonies requiring tactical maneuvering.

Goffman's framework established facework as the foundational ritual mechanism for preserving social order. The emphasis is on interactional diplomacy; participants engage in a delicate dance where they must collaborate to minimize threats to face. Face-saving behaviors, in this context, are part of the "corrective process" used when a participant inadvertently commits a "misstep" or "offense" that disrupts the interactional consensus. This corrective process often involves four stages: challenge, offering, acceptance, and thanks, all aimed at restoring the previous state of equilibrium.

A second major theoretical foundation comes from Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson's Politeness Theory (1987). Building directly on Goffman, Brown and Levinson conceptualized face into two types: **Positive Face** (the desire to be approved of and appreciated by others) and **Negative Face** (the desire to be unimpeded, free from imposition, and autonomous). Face-saving behaviors, under Politeness Theory, are strategic choices made by speakers to mitigate the face-threatening potential of their messages, either by addressing the hearer's positive face (e.g., using compliments) or negative face (e.g., using apologies or hedges). While Politeness Theory focuses more on preventative language strategies, the underlying mechanism--protecting both self-face and other-face--remains consistent with the core idea of face-saving as a necessary social lubricant.

3. Key Characteristics and Strategies

Face-saving behaviors are predominantly reactive and defensive, initiated after a threat has already occurred. They can be broadly categorized into two main strategic types: avoidance and remediation. Avoidance strategies involve maneuvering to prevent the threat from becoming public or refusing to acknowledge the threat's severity. Remedial strategies, conversely, are explicit attempts to account for the behavior and restore the damaged image.

Common remedial face-saving tactics include the use of **accounts**, which are linguistic constructions intended to explain and justify unexpected or inappropriate behavior. These accounts typically take the form of either **excuses** (admitting the act was bad but denying full responsibility, often by citing external factors or lack of intent) or **justifications** (accepting responsibility for the act but denying its negative quality, often by citing higher loyalties or necessary consequences). For example, a student who submits a late assignment might use an excuse ("My dog ate my homework") or a justification ("I prioritized helping a colleague in an emergency"). Both are face-saving attempts to minimize the perceived failure associated with lateness.

Beyond verbal accounting, non-verbal cues also constitute crucial face-saving strategies. These

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM

include physical withdrawal, nervous laughter, deflection through humor, or dramatic shifts in posture or demeanor, as seen in the example of the person who trips and immediately tries to act busy or unconcerned. Crucially, the effectiveness of any face-saving behavior relies on its uptake by the audience. The audience must participate in the restoration ritual, often by politely ignoring the offense, accepting the excuse, or providing subtle cues of forgiveness. This mutual effort highlights that face is not individually owned but interactionally co-constructed and maintained.

4. Cultural Dimensions of Face-Saving

The application and interpretation of face-saving behavior vary significantly across cultures, primarily along the dimension of individualism versus collectivism. In **individualistic cultures** (e.g., Western Europe, North America), the primary concern is usually **self-face**--maintaining personal autonomy, achievement, and competence. Face-saving strategies in these contexts are geared toward individual dignity and are often more direct and defensive.

Conversely, in **collectivistic cultures** (e.g., East Asia, Latin America), the emphasis is on the group, and maintaining face extends beyond the self to include **other-face** and **mutual-face** (the face of the relationship itself). In these societies, preserving harmony and respecting hierarchy are paramount. Therefore, face-saving acts are often highly indirect, elaborate, and sensitive to social rank. Criticizing someone in public, even justly, is seen as a profound face threat not only to the criticized person but potentially to the criticizer and the entire group's harmony.

Intercultural communication scholars, notably Stella Ting-Toomey, have demonstrated how misunderstandings frequently arise when differing face concerns collide. For instance, what an American manager might perceive as a straightforward, necessary confrontation to save self-face (e.g., addressing a subordinate's failure directly) might be interpreted by an Asian subordinate as a devastating, unacceptable loss of face (other-face threat), potentially leading the subordinate to withdraw or resign. Understanding these cultural variances is critical for effective global communication and conflict resolution, as the very definition of what constitutes a "face threat" and what counts as a "face-saving remedy" changes based on the cultural script.

5. Significance in Conflict and Negotiation

Face-saving behavior is arguably the most critical variable in determining the outcome and conduct of interpersonal and international conflict. In conflict situations, participants often prioritize saving face over achieving substantive goals, particularly when the conflict involves identity or values. When an individual feels their competence, integrity, or authority is challenged, their immediate behavioral priority shifts from problem-solving to defending their public image.

Effective negotiators and mediators recognize that conflicts frequently escalate because one party perceives the other's actions as a severe face threat. By addressing face concerns first,

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM

negotiators can de-escalate tension. Strategies used in negotiation to save face include allowing the opposing party to publicly justify concessions, providing a legitimate "out" (an excuse for backing down), or framing a compromise as a win for both sides (mutual-face saving). Without these diplomatic maneuvers, even minor disagreements can become intractable, as no party is willing to suffer the humiliation of being seen as having "lost" the argument.

Furthermore, face-saving acts help preserve the long-term relationship, even after short-term conflict. If an apology or explanation is successfully offered and accepted (a complete face restoration cycle), trust and future cooperation are maintained. Conversely, failure to adequately engage in facework during conflict can lead to enduring resentment and the permanent breakdown of the relational ties, demonstrating the immense relational impact of these behaviors.

6. Criticisms and Debates

While highly influential, the face-saving framework has faced several academic criticisms. One major critique revolves around the generalizability of Goffman's original model. Critics argue that Goffman's work, heavily focused on middle-class, Western, American interactions of the 1950s, overemphasizes the tactical and instrumental nature of face maintenance, potentially overlooking genuine emotional responses and moral dimensions of interaction.

A second line of critique, often directed at Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory, questions the universal application of positive and negative face distinctions. Researchers argue that while the underlying desire for approval and autonomy exists globally, the specific weighting of these two types of face, and the strategies used to manage them, are far more culturally contingent than the theory initially allowed. For instance, critics suggest that in some non-Western cultures, a third type of face, perhaps "moral face" or "integrity face," holds greater weight than either positive or negative face as defined in the Western tradition.

Finally, some communication scholars debate the distinction between face-saving behavior and mere impression management. While the two are related, face-saving is specifically triggered by a threat and aimed at damage control, whereas impression management is a continuous, proactive process of self-presentation. The debate often centers on where one concept ends and the other begins, particularly in high-stakes professional environments where maintaining a flawless public image is a constant necessity rather than merely a reaction to a specific blunder.

Further Reading

Goffman, E. (1955). On Face-Work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction.
Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.
Facework and Face-Threatening Acts: Overview and Applications.

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM

Psychology Dictionary Entry on Face-Saving Behavior.

ARABPSYCHOLOGY.COM