Politeness Strategies in Communication

Ruziyeva Nilufar Xafizovna

Department of English Literary and Translation Studies, Foreign Languages Faculty, Bukhara State University, Uzbekistan
e-mail: n.x.ruziyeva@buxdu.uz

Abstract. Linguistic politeness has occupied a central place in the social study of language; even it has been the subject of intensive debate in sociolinguistics and pragmatics. A lot of linguistic scholars have carried out studies on linguistic politeness in a wide range of cultures. As a result, several theories have been proposed on linguistic politeness and have been established as scholarly concept. The major aim of this paper is to review the literature on linguistic politeness as a technical term. It will present some of the most widely used models of linguistic politeness in literature. It also tries to gloss the basic tenets of different theoretical approaches, the distinctive features of one theory versus another. There are some concepts of politeness that will become the subject of discussion of this article. These concepts are proposed by Robin Lakoff, Penelope Brown and Steven Levinson Geoffrey Leech.

Kalit so'zlar: linguistic politeness, universalist, contrastivist, Conversational Implicature, intentional indirectness, interpretable indirectness, social contexts, Cooperative Principle, sociolinguistics, pragmalinguistics.

Introduction

People communicate since they are part of the society. They simply have to talk with each other. It's a fundamental need, and a pleasure for humans to be part of relationships. It's speech which plays the main role in communication. The main function of spoken language is to "socialize individuals to integrate people in social nets by enabling them to communicate in a quick and direct way with immediate feedback from the addressee." (Dontcheva-Navratilovak, 2005, p.66).

Throughout speech one can simplify complicated ideas into a wide range of simple meanings. However, the function of speech is not only to convey information of certain meanings, but it is also connected to interaction between people. This interaction is supposed to be polite. As the majority, if not all, of cultures suggest to enable

According to Jucker (2016, p. 96), "Literary texts can be seen as communicative acts between real authors and real readers even if the text is read by readers who live centuries after the author" and even if the author could not possibly have had a clear image of his or her potential audience or even of the fact that his or her texts would still be read long after his or her death.

According to Brown and Levinson(1978), the strategies of politeness involve three broad mechanisms: the speaker may convey that some wants, goals, desires, or objects of the hearer are admirable and interesting to him too. Also, the speaker may stress common membership in a group or category, and thus, emphasizing that both speaker and hearer belong to some set of persons who share some wants. The last mechanism is that the speaker can claim common perspectives with the hearer without necessarily referring to in group membership the participants of any conversation to feel comfortable, and to enjoy conversations and social interaction in general. Brown and Levinson's politeness theory

was originally published in 1978 and revised in 1987. It has given scholars an enormous amount of analysis methods.

Without this theory, we would not be in a position to consider the phenomenon of politeness as a fundamental aspect of human socio- communicative interaction. It provides several presentations of insights into human behavior. Also, it has been saved as a touchstone for otherresearchers who felt the need to go beyond it. But it is clearly a class of its own in terms of its comprehensiveness, organization and level of argumentation. In fact, according to Aydinoglu (2013), "the notion of politeness and impoliteness has been one of the controversial issues and has been defined in many different ways since politeness theory was first introduced by Brown and Levinson". Brown and Levinson's model consists of two parts: The first part is the fundamental theory about the nature of politeness and how it functions in interaction. The second part is a list of positive and negative politeness strategies from three languages: Tamil, Tzeltal and English. Brown and Levinson use the term "Face" which is derived from that of Goffman (1967), and from the English folk term, which ties face up with motions of being embarrassed, humiliated or losing face. Thus, face, the public self image consists of two related aspects: The first one is the "positive face" which is the positive aspect self image or personality (including the desire that this self–image be appreciated and approved of). The second aspect is the "negative face", the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction, the freedom of action and the freedom of imposition. Therefore, positive politeness is the reduction of a person's public self- image or personality. It also represents similarities among the speaker and the hearer. Then comes the negative politeness, which is the politeness of nonimposition or the "formal politeness".

Theoretical Background and Literature Review

According to Jucker (2016), fictional texts constitute complex communicative acts between an author and an audience, and they regularly depict interactions between characters. Both levels are susceptible to an analysis of politeness. Many scholars discuss the notion and the definition of "politeness". In their early studies, Brown and Levinson emphasize on the aspect of "face" more than other scholars. Leech (1983) deals with politeness in another way. He uses his "six maxims" to differentiate between the ways in which language is constrained by different social factors. Politeness according to leech is the polite social behavior within a certain culture. Gu (1990) explains the "conversational maxims approach".

Gu's maxims are a worthy source for cross cultural studies. On the other hand, Fraster and Nolan (1981) consider the politeness as the fulfillment of rights and obligations.

Watts (1989) talks about a "complementary" relationship between Brown and Levinson's face needs, Gu's six maxims and Fraster and Nolan's conversational rights and obligations. Culpeper (1998) states that there is no specific definition or meaning of politeness. He adds that politeness can be recognized by the linguistic strategies. After these different explanations for the notion of "politeness", different studies adopt these explanations in order to analyze some literary works.

We construct and release a large collection of politeness-annotated requests and use it to evaluate key aspects of politeness theory. We build a politeness classifier that achieves near-human performance and use it to explore the relation between politeness and social factors such as power, status, gender, and community membership. We hope the publicly available collection of annotated requests enables further study of politeness and its relation to social factors, as this paper has only begun to explore this area.

Adabiyotlar

1. Broadening the Horizon of Linguistic Politeness / edited by Robin T. Lakoff and Sachiko Ide . John Benjamins Publishing Co. Amsterdam. The Netherlands 2005. P.5.

2. Касымова, Н. Ф. (2011). Асимметрия при переводе интеррогативов с вопросительным словом what (на материале английского, русского и узбекского языков). Вестник Челябинского государственного университета, (11), 70-73

3. Xafizovna , R. N. . (2023). The Study of Context: From Static to Dynamic. Miasto Przyszłości, 32, 242–246.

4. Ruziyeva Nilufar Xafizovna, & Akhmedova Shahnoza Murodilloyevna. (2022). THE STUDY OF CULTURE IN CULTURAL STUDIES. Conferencea, 276–278.

5. Xafizovna, R. N. . (2022). Linguistic Politeness Theory Review: Yueguo Gu, Sachiko Ide, Shoshena Blum Kulka, Bruce Frasher and William Nolen, Hornst Arndt and Richard Janney. Pindus Journal of Culture, Literature, and ELT, 2(5), 145–152.

6. Ruziyeva Nilufar Xafizovna, & Xolova Madina Boboqulovna. (2022). Politeness In Literary Works: An Overview. Eurasian Research Bulletin, 7, 200–206.

7. Xafizovna, R. N. (2022). On Linguistic Politeness Theory: Robin Lakoff's Theory of Politeness, Brown and Levinson's Theory of Politeness, Geoffrey Leech's Theory of Politeness. Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture, 3(6), 66-74.

8. Ruziyeva N. (2020). FACE CONCEPT IN THE CATEGORY OF POLITENESS. European Journal of Humanities and Educational Advancements, 1(4), 15-20.

9. Zokirova N. S. Discursive ontology of (literary) translation. innovative development in the global science, Boston, USA. – 2022.

10. Zokirova, N. (2023). TARJIMADA LINGVOKOGNITIV DUNYO MANZARASI, LINGVISTIK ONG VA LINGVISTIK ANGLASHNING O'ZARO MUNOSABATLARI. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 29(29).

11. Xafizovna, R. N. (2022). Discourse Analysis of Politeness Strategies in Literary Work: Speech Acts and Politeness Strategies. Spanish Journal of Innovation and Integrity, 5, 123-133.

12. TILNING NOMINATIV VA EKSPRESSIV FUNKSIYALARINING O'RGANILISHI F Narzullayeva ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu. uz)

13. Linguistic Units Representing Members of the Human Head in English and Uzbek Languaculture SR Narzullayeva, Firuza Olimovna, Mirzoyeva Spanish Journal of Innovation and Itegrity 12 (No:12 for the month of …

14. Ruziyeva Nilufar Xafizovna (2021).The category of politeness in different linguocultural traditions. ACADEMICIA: AN INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH JOURNAL 11 (2), 1667-1675

15. Fayziyeva Aziza Anvarovna. (2022). CONCEPTUAL METAPHOR UNIVERSALS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK. JournalNX - A Multidisciplinary Peer Reviewed Journal, 8(04), 54–5.

16. Markova Yelena Sergeyevna, & Ruziyeva Nilufar Xafizovna. (2024). The Role of Politeness in Communication. Miasto Przyszłości, 44, 239–242. Retrieved from https://miastoprzyszlosci.com.pl/index.php/mp/article/view/2413

17. 15. GRAMMATICAL TRANSFORMATIONS IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES FO Narzullayeva - Innovative Development in Educational Activities, 2023

18. 16. Markova , Y. S., & Ruziyeva , N. X. (2024). REQUEST LENGTH AS POLITENESS MATTERS. SCHOLAR, 2(2), 227–231. Retrieved from https://researchedu.org/index.php/openscholar/article/view/6140

19. 17. FO Narzullayeva - Innovative Development in Educational Activities, 2023types of transformation in Uzbek and English languages. GRAMMATICAL TRANSFORMATIONS IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES

20. https://scholar.google.com/scholar?oi=bibs&cluster=16288581761549737229&btnI=1&hl=en

21. Yokubova, S. (2020). So'z birikmalari tasnifi. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu. uz)*, *1*(1).

22. Khojieva, M. Y., & Yokubova, S. Y. (2021). Language and speech expression of personal descriptions. *TJE-Tematics journal of Education ISSN*, 2249-9822.

23. Yokubova, S. Y. (2023). O'ZBEKONA GAP QURILISHIDA FE'LNING TUTGAN O'RNI. *Educational Research in Universal Sciences*, *2*(11 SPECIAL), 421-426.

24. Yokubova, S. Y., & Usmonova, M. B. (2023). OBYEKTLI BIRIKMALARNING QURILISH QOLIPLARI XUSUSIDA. *PROSPECTS AND MAIN TRENDS IN MODERN SCIENCE*, *1*(5), 46-50.

25. Yokubova, S. (2021). Tibbiy matnlarda obyektli birikmalarning voqelanishi. *Центр научных публикаций (buxdu. uz)*, *7*(7).

26. Yokubova, S. (2021). Относительно формального грамматического описания объектных соединений. *Центр научных публикаций (buxdu. uz)*, *7*(7).

27. Yokubova, S. (2020). Объектные сочетания. *ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu. uz)*, *1*(1).