

A NEW LINGUISTIC VIEW TO POLITENESS STRATEGY

¹Shamahmudova Aziza Furkatovna, ²Jaime Fernández FernándezPhD of the Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages¹, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages²

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this work is to move towards a new definition of politeness strategy. No wonder, as Brown argues, politeness "[...] is the most obvious manifestation of life and social interaction of people, the linguistic trait that reveals most of all the nature of human communication is clear." So after looking at the different concepts of this as suggested by different authors, it should be relevant to start with the definitions suggested by Bow Franch and Garces Conejos (2003), Brown (2000) and Garces Conejos (1995), and Sperber (1997) over different types of beliefs which consists of human knowledge to develop a sentence on the knowledge structures on which politeness strategy is based.

Key words: *speech act, politeness, courtesy, social norms, concept, context, interlocutors, social status, illocutionary power.*

According to authors such as Helen (2001: i), Escandell Vidal (1996 a: 136-137), Fraser (1990-2002), Casper (1998: 677) or Thomas (1995: 149) as the term is polite in the lexical inventory one of its most common meanings was that it referred to improved behaviors based on adherence to a series of norms and social conventions that each sociocultural group establishes in order to prescribe behavior that is expected in certain contexts, that is, in better ways. This traditional view of politeness as a social norm (Fraser, 1990) "Courtesy" as Helene (2001: 30) calls it, has been associated with the time for the use of certain registers or linguistic styles, which are a consequence of the fact that behavior based on formality, was considered a polite language.

However, as Kasper (1998: 677) explains, the concept of politeness in pragmatics should not be applied exclusively to the use of language that some social classes or some people do in very specific contexts, but rather it should be extended to include the linguistic behavior of any person.

After the emergence of the works of philosophers of language such as Grice (1975) Searle (1969), several studies have emerged in which politeness is seen as the motivation. The main thing that prompts subjects to behave linguistically in such a way that specific, delving into the reasons for this motivation and trying to offer a vision scientific use of language, which is dominated by its social and interactive aspect. The position that these works offer a completely different scientific conceptualization and analysis the phenomenon in question, Helen (2001: 30) uses the courtesy token to refer to them. However, most linguists or pragmatists who have tried politeness scientifically shows great confusion when talking about it.

For example, several authors of oriental cultures (Hill, Ida, Ikuta, Kawasaki, Ogino, 1986; Ide, 1982, 1989; Ida, Hori, Kawasaki, Ikuta, Haga, 1986; Matsumoto, 1989) associated this with reverence, that is, with respect, which some people manifest themselves in relation to others because of their higher status, in contrast to age, etc. using numerous grammatical techniques such as forms treatment. A vision of politeness is clearly associated with this using certain linguistic registers, that is, with language variations that people act on the basis of their perception of the situation communicative in which they are immersed (Smith, 1992). In other works, courtesy was considered an integral property of utterances and speech acts, since what their achievements were analyzed to establish a hierarchy of more or less courteous actions, even comparing their encodings in two or several languages to establish systematic correlations between them (Ogino, 1986; Smith, 1992). However, Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987), Fraser and Nolen (1981: 98) and Thomas (1995: 152-157) argue that

registration or certain actions are of interest to pragmatists only if their choice and use is understood as the result of a stratum oriented towards maintaining or changing position or status of interlocutors.

Finally, within this set of studies that conduct a scientific analysis of courtesy are works considering this as a purely pragmatic phenomenon because it is a strategic behavior in which people try to avoid interpersonal conflict (Kasper, 1990) or achieving a wide range of interactive goals, among which the creation, maintenance, improvement, change or the destruction of their social relationships (Thomas, 1995: 157-158). Fraser (1990, 2002). Within the framework of these studies, three groups are distinguished:

a) Lakoff's rules of courtesy (1973, 1977) and the principle of courtesy Leech (1983), whose common starting point is the Grice's Principle of Cooperation (1975) and in which their authors do not offer definitions. Despite this, it is intuitively clear that for Lakoff (1973: 297) courtesy is to avoid violation, while for Leech (1983: 104) courtesy - "[...] an essential link between" Principle of Cooperation "and the problem of how to correlate the meaning of the proposal with his illocutionary power."

b) Brown and Levinson model (1978, 1987), kindly provided suggests potential aggressiveness towards the image of one or more interlocutors, so this consists in reducing it so that communication between two potentially aggressive parties.

c) Authors who associate the concept of politeness with the concept of adequacy or assignment of behavior to a specific context, among which there are
Mention should be made of Escandell Vidal (1996 b, 1998), Fraser (1990, 2002), Fraser and Nolen (1981), Jary (1998 a, 1998 b), Meyer (1995) or Zimmin(1981).

In her extensive survey of various models of politeness, Helen (2001: 23) classifies data from Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987), Lakoff (1973, 1977) and Leeches (1983) as nuclear energy due to its great influence on most later research on this topic. In this first set, this author also includes six other studies and models that represent the most current trends and developments that have been developed in this area based on the three models cited:

1. Model Gu (1990), whose politeness is to be satisfied expectations of respect, modesty, or sophistication from the group.

2. The Ide model (1982, 1989), in which, as we have already mentioned, the kindly he has a character of discernment.

3. Research of Blum-Kulk (1992), based on Brown's model and Levinson (1978, 1987), who explains the cultural norms or schemes. Each interlocutor decisively determines the factors influencing his language behavior.

4. Fraser and Nolen's Conversational Contract (1981), in which the vision courtesy that we also mentioned.

5. Model Arndt and Jenny (1985, 1991), for whom courtesy consists of avoid interpersonal conflicts by expressing messages with which the sender shows the recipient their interpersonal support.

6. A study by Watts (1989) in which politeness is conspicuous behavior and stylized, responsible for the correct functioning of the interaction and for a detailed criticism of this model see Padilla Cruz (2004).

In addition to this set of nuclear theories, there is another set of models which we call peripheral devices (Padilla Cruz, 2004: 135) because of its impact on research the politeness was less. Among them, Helen (2001: 23-29) includes the following works:

a) Ehlich (1992), for which politeness consists in evaluating action speaking listeners or third parties of the standard socially acceptable behavior that each individual perceives as a consequence of his perception of the Generalized Other.

b) Kasher (1986), who explains politeness by the principle of rationality, in the power by which a person chooses an action that allows him to achieve a goal is determined in the most efficient way and at the lowest cost. According to this author, the more effective the individual's action should be, the more its implementation would mean a higher cost in terms of courtesy.

c) Meier (1995), which is based on the concept of refurbishment, i.e. effort a speaker must make to correct behavior unsuitable.

d) Werkhofer (1992), for whom politeness motivates and structures behavior of each person, because it directly depends on their respective rights and responsibilities determined by public order and their identity.

In the second set of peripheral models, also included the approach Scollon (1983, 1995), which are based on the Brown and Levinson model (1978, 1987) to develop three courtesy systems that establish interactive rules. But as we have already noted it is difficult to come to a clear definition and Quite satisfactory politeness for not meeting criteria. That is why i believe that it is appropriate to accept one that reflects some of the most important contributions. I wonder what has been done about this.

Following Bow Franch and Garces Conejos (2003) and Garces Conejos (1995), we can say that politeness is a linguistic codification of social interaction, that is transmission of information about social relations between people who they interact. The mentioned linguistic coding may have the main purpose of avoiding interpersonal conflict or preservation of the image of exchange participants communicative, but should always be understood as a result of behavior rational, in which the speaker chooses the language form that best suits the social context in which it is located. As Brown correctly adds (2000: 83) politeness, in fact, consists of "[...] special treatment of people in saying and acting something while taking into account their feelings.

Likewise, said linguistic coding should be adapted for interactive purposes that speaker pursues, among which will be creation, maintenance, improvement or deterioration of their social attitudes enjoying with peers. As suggested by Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987), contextual factors affecting in the indicated codification of social relations - the relative strength of each subject (P), social distance between them (D) and the degree of performance of actions that are intended execute (I). It should be added, as suggested, for example, by Garces Conejos.(1995) or Spencer-Oatey (2000), the affect (A) experienced by the interlocutors. For Thus, we can conclude that politeness will be in part about efficient calculation. The weight and influence of these contextual factors in interaction, so that a person can adapt their language behavior to the values of these parameters. In any case, the use and manipulation that this subject does later this adaptation will be strategic.

Starting with the Skollon approach(1983, 1995), in a recent article we argue that politeness is about adapting behavior in relation to the courtesy systems that the interlocutors want to establish, maintain or modify. However, we believe that the problem is the cognitive nature of politeness, as well as the consequences of this for social interaction.

REFERENCES

- [1] ARNDT, H.; R. W. JANNEY (1985): «Politeness Revisited: Cross-Modal Supportive Strategies», *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 23: 281-300

- [2] BLUM-KULKA, S. (1992): «The Metapragmatics of Politeness in Israeli Society», en WATTS, R. J.; S. IDE; K. EHLICH (eds.) (1992): *Politeness in Language: Studies in Its History, Theory and Practice*. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter. 255-279.
- [3] BOU FRANCH, P.; P. GARCÉS CONEJOS (2003): «Teaching Linguistic Politeness : A Methodological Approach», *IRAL*, 41: 1-22.
- [4] BROWN, P. (2000): «How and Why Are Women More Polite: Some Evidence from a Mayan Community», en COATES J. (ed.) (2000): *Language and Gender. A Reader*. Oxford, Blackwell. 81-99.
- [5] EELLEN, G. (2001): *A Critique of Politeness Theories*, Manchester, St. Jerome Publishing HLICH, K. (1992): «On the Historicity of Politeness», en WATTS, R.; S. IDE; K. EHLICH (eds.) 71-107.
- [6] ESCANDELL VIDAL, M. V. (1996 a): *Introducción a la Pragmática*, Barcelona, Ariel. (1996 b): «Towards a Cognitive Approach to Politeness», *Language Sciences*, 18:629-650.
- [7] FRASER, B. (1990): «Perspectives on Politeness», *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14: 219-236. GARCÉS CONEJOS, P. (1995): «Revisión crítica de algunos de los postulados de la teoría de la cortesía lingüística propugnada por Brown y Levinson», *Quaderns de Filologia:Estudis Lingüistics*, 1: 43-61.
- [8] GRICE, H. P. (1975): «Logic and conversation», en COLE, P.; J. MORGAN (eds.) (1975): *Syntax and Semantics. Vol. 3: Speech Acts*. New York, Academic Press. 41-59.
- [9] GU, Y. (1990): «Politeness Phenomena in Modern Chinese», *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14: 237-257.
- [10] HILL, B.; S. IDE; S. IKUTA; A. KAWASAKI; T. OGINO (1986): «Universals of Linguistic Politeness. Quantitative Evidence from Japanese and American English», *Journal of Pragmatics*, 10: 347-371.
- [11] IDE, S. (1982): «Japanese Sociolinguistics Politeness and Women's Language», *Lingua*, 57: 57-385.
- [12] ZIMMIN, S. (1981): «Sex and Politeness: Factors in First and Second Language Use», *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 27: 35-58.

E-ISSN NO:2349-0721