

POLITENESS THEORY IN LANGUAGE

Hamrakulova Gulandom

Master student of Jizzakh State Pedagogical institute

e-mail:gulandon.hamraqulova@mail.ru

Abstract

The culture of contemporaneity presents itself through various concepts and discourses that constitute the category of everyday life, which they reveal and portray. In linguistic terms, the category of everyday life is manifested in different forms of communication, and first of all in the system of norms and models of speech behavior, known as speech etiquette. The goal of the article is to analyze the use of politeness forms in some languages. Politeness strategy is analyzed in speech acts of apologies and condolences, through their pragmatic structure.

Keywords: Politeness, positive politeness, negative politeness, bald on record, off-record, inter-cultural framework,

INTRODUCTION

The president of Uzbekistan Shavkat Mirziyoyev says “We mobilize all the forces and capabilities of our state and society for the development and happiness of our young people as independent thinkers, with high intellectual and spiritual potential, who are not inferior to their peers in any field in the world”.

Absolutely, it is very important to bring up the youth in spiritual. It comes to the politeness category. This word gives multiple definitions. One meaning is: “marked by an appearance of consideration, tact, deference, or courtesy.” Although politeness is not a direct synonym for diplomacy and tact, they are certainly related. Therefore, as this is a study on communicating with diplomacy and tact, we will pay significant attention to the idea of politeness and cover various academic approaches to this concept.

Politeness is described as a concept that people have a social self-image and try to protect it. “We think of politeness in general terms as having to do with ideas like being

tactful, “We think of politeness in general terms as having to do with ideas like being tactful, modest and nice to other people” Politeness can be shown in a variety of ways, linguistically, which is concerned with verbal communication, non-linguistically, which is concerned with other concepts of communication such as body language or a variety of both.

Politeness is best expressed as the practical application of good manners or etiquette. It is a culturally defined phenomenon, and therefore what is considered polite in one culture can sometimes be quite rude or simply eccentric in another cultural context. While the goal of politeness is to make all of the parties relaxed and comfortable with one another, these culturally defined standards at times may be manipulated to inflict shame on a designated party.

There are many reasons why politeness is important in life but one of them is that if you're polite, you are more likely to achieve your objectives and get what you want. Also, people are more likely to take you seriously and deal with you in a good way. We think that politeness in many positive conditions for them. For example, there are some types of politeness in our lifestyles. There are four types of politeness strategies, described by Brown and Levinson that sum up human "politeness" behavior: Bald on Record, Negative Politeness, Positive Politeness, and Off-Record-indirect strategy.

THE MAIN PART

Now we will look up the strategies of politeness:

Bald on-record strategies usually do not attempt to minimize the threat to the hearer's face, although there are ways that bald on-record politeness can be used in trying to minimize FTAs implicitly. Often using such a strategy will shock or embarrass the addressee, and so this strategy is most often utilized in situations where the speaker has a close relationship with the audience, such as family or close friends. Brown and Levinson outline various cases in which one might use the bald on-record strategy, including:

Instances in which threat minimizing does not occur

- Great urgency or desperation

Watch out!

- Speaking as if great efficiency is necessary

Hear me out:...

- Task-oriented

Pass me the hammer.

- Little or no desire to maintain someone's face

Don't forget to clean the blinds!

- Doing the FTA is in the interest of the hearer

Your headlights are on!

- Instances in which the threat is minimized implicitly
- Welcomes

Come in.

- Offers

Leave it, I'll clean up later.

Eat!

Positive politeness strategies seek to minimize the threat to the hearer's positive face. They are used to make the hearer feel good about himself, his interests or possessions, and are most usually used in situations where the audience knows each other fairly well. In addition to hedging and attempts to avoid conflict, some strategies of positive politeness include statements of friendship, solidarity, compliments, and the following examples from Brown and Levinson:

Attend to H's interests, needs, wants

You look sad. Can I do anything?

Use solidarity in-group identity markers

Heh, mate, can you lend me a dollar?

Be optimistic

I'll just come along, if you don't mind.

Include both speaker (S) and hearer (H) in activity

If we help each other, I guess, we'll both sink or swim in this course.

Offer or promise

If you wash the dishes, I'll vacuum the floor.

Exaggerate interest in H and his interests

That's a nice haircut you got; where did you get it?

Avoid disagreement

Yes, it's rather long; not short certainly.

Joke

Wow, that's a whopper!

Negative politeness can be called "politeness as a strategy for self-protection". There are many advantages of practicing this form of sustained negative politeness – keeping a safe distance from others. Even when being critical. It is related to understanding that sustained courtesy provide an opportunity of keeping as safe distance from others while minimizing negative feeling about such detachment. Cold detached respect for others were once a trait cultivated among aristocratic families. Probably not without reason, as this is a powerful tool for minimizing conflict. The key idea here can be formulated as "familiarity breeds contempt". Here are variants of the same simple verbal request, varying from "positive, direct" to "negative, indirect":

Shut the door Direct, bald on record. No politeness (maximally efficient communication)

How about shutting the door. Direct, on-record, positive politeness: you suggest an option not an action. Addresses face-saving issues of imposing action on somebody (inclusiveness)

Would not you mind if we shut the door? Negative politeness: Same as positive politeness, but the request is conditional and offer is reversed

It's warm in here, is not it ? Indirect and ambiguous: max negative politeness. Essentially this is hint, not a suggestion or direct request of particular action. Due to ambiguity multiple interpretations possible with some probably not exactly that same as you want.

2. Off-record: This strategy is more indirect. The speaker does not impose on the hearer. As a result, face is not directly threatened. This strategy often requires the hearer to interpret what the speaker is saying. Off-record indirect strategies take some of the pressure off. You are trying to avoid the direct FTA of asking for a beer. You would rather it be offered to you once your hearer sees that you want one. e.g (I't so hot, it makes you really thirsty)

Example of the off-record (indirect)

Give hints: It's a bit cold in here.

Be vague: Perhaps someone should open the window. Be sarcastic, or joking: Yeah, it's really hot here.

For example, a speaker using the indirect strategy might merely say "wow, it's getting cold in here" insinuating that it would be nice if the listener would get up and turn up the thermostat without directly asking the listener to do so.

CONCLUSION

This study made an attempt to introduce the principles of the most well-known theories of politeness critically. As it was indicated the earliest theories of politeness was seeking universal principles of verbal interaction based on which they can provide a universal framework for polite verbal behavior on the one hand.

On the other hand, the theories accounted for the variation of such social factors as distance, power, and weight of imposition respectively and the consequent influence of these variables on the formulation of politeness strategies.

Moreover, it was pinpointed that depending on social and contextual variables the interpretation of polite and impolite behavior is different from culture to culture.

In this regard, it seems that with the ever-increasing number of interactions among people coming from different cultural backgrounds, two different frameworks should be developed in future orientations of theories of politeness. First, there should be some universal principles and rules considered to be polite for taking into consideration, when people from different cultural background are going to interact politely. This framework could be an intercultural framework of politeness. Second,

within every culture, the interaction of people belonging to the same cultural background should follow the rules and principles of the shared norms of interaction within that particular culture, that is, inter-cultural framework. The consideration of culture-specific norms of interaction can contribute to intra-cultural interactions to be polite.

Although, the development of a universal framework of politeness for intercultural interactions seems demanding and depends on a number of cultural characteristic, the framework seems plausible, as there are frameworks such as political conventions which are taken into account in international relations. Therefore, the consideration of polite interaction among people coming from different cultural background calls for a universal intercultural framework shared globally.

REFERENCES

1. Brown, P. & Levinson, S. Universals of language usage: Politeness phenomena. Pp. 56-324 in Questions and Politeness, edited by E. Goody. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1978.
2. Goffman, E. Interaction ritual: Essays on face to face behavior. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company. 1967.
3. Ehlich, K. On the historicity of Politeness. Pp. 71-107 in Politeness in Language: studies in its History and Practice, vol. Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs, edited by R. J. Watts, S. Ide, & K. Ehlich. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1992.
4. Lakoff, R. The limits of politeness: Therapeutic and courtroom discourse. *Multilingua* 8:101-129. 1989.
5. Kasper, G. Interlanguage pragmatics. Pp. 183-208 in learning second and foreign languages, edited by H. Byrnes. New York: The Modern Language Association of America. 1998
6. Brown, Penelope and Steven C. Levinson. Politeness: Some Universal in Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

7. Watts, Richard J. Sachiko Ide and Konrad Enlich (ed). *Politeness in Language: Studies in Its History, Theory and Practice*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2005.
8. Thomas, Jenny. *Meaning in Interaction*. Edinburgh: Longman, 1995
9. Lakoff, R. 1973. The logic of Politeness; or minding your p's and q's. Papers from the 9th Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistics Society. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.
10. Dunn, C. D. (2011). "Formal forms or verbal strategies? politeness theory and Japanese business etiquette training". *Journal of Pragmatics*. **43** (15): 3643–3654. [doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2011.06.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.06.003).