Finnish, as a Finno-Ugric language, is characterized as a language that favors the use of morphological and grammatical structures to denote linguistic politeness rather than lexical politeness markers (Markkanen 1985, VISK 2008). There are lexical politeness markers in Finnish, but they are more syntactically constrained and more pragmatically and semantically loaded than politeness markers in other languages (for example, *please* in English).

The aim of this study was to investigate the use of the borrowed Finnish politeness marker *pliis* (derived from English *please*) in comparison to the politeness marker *kiitos*, which, like *please*, functions as a requestive marker (see House 1989). As *pliis* in Finnish is best characterized as a stigmatized form which is mostly relegated to informal spoken language, this stage of our study made use of a grammatical acceptability test. The test was presented as a web-based survey consisting of 12 grammatical acceptability questions and 6 autobiographical questions. It was completed during the summer of 2011 by 416 native Finnish speakers from throughout Finland. The hypothesis was that the function of *kiitos* could be changing grammatically and semantically. However, the findings indicate that the use of *kiitos* is more or less unchanged, whereas the use of *pliis* is becoming (or has become) nativized.

In the survey, respondents were asked to evaluate a sample request clause that was designed to be pragmatically and socially neutral, and which contained the target items *kiitos* and *pliis*. Respondents were asked to evaluate the target items in various clausal positions, as well as to assess the age, sex, and geographical location where they thought such an utterance could be attested. In addition, respondents were asked to evaluate whether they themselves would be likely to utter the sample clause. The responses were observed using multivariate analysis methods to indicate whether the target forms and clausal positions were associated with certain groups of speakers. The social variables used for analysis included age, sex, and location of the supposed speaker, with the same social categories applied to the survey respondents. An $R^2$ test indicates that the social factors used for analysis account for only 10 percent of the variation in the data, but what is accounted for is significant ($p < .05$). The analyses indicate that *pliis* is associated with young, urban women, and this is also the social group that is more likely to claim use of *pliis*.

The most important finding of the study is that *pliis* and *kiitos* seem to be complementary in their distribution, both grammatically and pragmatically. We claim that *kiitos* serves as a marker of negative politeness, whereas *pliis* serves as a marker of positive politeness (see Wheeler 1994). In this paper, the distinctions between *pliis* and *kiitos* are illustrated through the results of the statistical analyses, as well as respondents’ qualitative comments relating to the sample clauses in the survey. These findings are supplemented with results from other studies of *pliis* and *kiitos* and through illustrative naturalistic data containing the target forms.