Moldassanova A.A.,
Borambaeva L.A.,
Zhanabekova M.A.

Interpersonal politeness and power in linguistics

The article is about to show the role of politeness in the sphere of interpersonal communication. Politeness is studied as a strategy or a set of strategies that is orientated towards achieving positive results in communication. The choice of one or another strategy by communicators depends on both outside and inside factors such as parameters of the situation, moral and cultural values. The given research extends and systematizes knowledge about the category of politeness as the most significant element of human relations. The theory of politeness of Brown and Levinson has remained the most seminal and influential starting point for cross-cultural and cross-linguistic contrastive pragmatics. Politeness touches on the issues that are crucial not only for the sociolinguist and social anthropologist but also in the life of human beings communications. In the present study linguistic politeness is crucially conceptualized as a social phenomenon. Theoretical account of politeness provides an obvious picture of linguistic politeness in the communication strategies and distinguishes cases where politeness is communicated from those where it is not. It explains the aspects of politeness phenomenon. It presents an account of politeness phenomena.

Key words: communication, etiquette, politeness, the «face» theory, phenomena, relationship, system, interpersonal.

Молдасанова А.А.,
Борамбаева Л.А.,
Жанабекова М.А.

Лингвистикадағы тұлғааралық сыпайылық және күш ұғымдары

Мақала тұлғаарлық қатынас саласындағы сыпайылықтың ойнайтын ролін анықтайды. Сыпайылық қарым-қатынас барысындағы жағымды нәтижелерге бағытталған басшылық ету, немесе башшылық ету (стратегия) жиынтығы ретінде зерттелген. Қарым-қатынас стратегиясының таңдауы жағдайлардың әр түрлі көрсеткіштері, моралдық құндылықтар және мәдени мұраларға байланысты болып келеді. Ұсынылып отырған зерттеу жұмысы адамдар қарым-қатынасының ең маңызды бөлігі – сыпайылық ұғымы туралы тілімді кеңейтеді және өзіндік жүйеге бөледі. Лингвистикалық прагматикада Браун мен Левинсонның сыпайылық теориясы оы күнге дейінгі ең маңызды да әсерлі жұмыс болып саналады. Сыпайылық тек қана әлеуметтік лингвист пен әлеуметтік антрополог үшін маңызды емес, сонымен қатар қарапайым адамдардың өміріндегі қарым-қатынасында да елеулі орын алады. Айтылмыш зерттеу жұмысында лингвистикалық сыпайылық түбегейлі түрде әлеуметтік көрініс ретінде айқындалады. Коммуникациялық басшылық етуде айтылмыш ұғымның толығымен қағидалы түсінігі анықталады. Мақала сыпайылық феноменінің қыр-сырларын түсіндіреді.

Түйін сөздер: коммуникация, этикет, сыпайылық, «бет» қағидасы, феномен, қатынастар, жүйе, тұлғааралық қатынас.

Молдассанова А.А.,
Борамбаева Л.А.,
Жанабекова М.А.

Межличностная вежливость и сила в лингвистике

В статье раскрывается роль вежливости в сфере межличностного общения. Вежливость изучена как стратегия или ряд стратегий, которая ориентируется на достижение положительных результатов в коммуникации. Выбор стратегии коммуникации зависит от таких факторов, как ситуационные параметры, моральные ценности, культурное наследие. Данное исследование расширяет и систематизирует знание о вежливости, как самом значительном элементе человеческих отношений. Теория вежливости Брауна и Левинсона осталась самой оригинальной и влиятельной отправной точкой для межкультурной лингвистической прагматики. Вежливость затрагивает проблемы, которые крайне важны не только для социолингвиста и социального антрополога, но также и в повседневной коммуникаций обычных людей. В данном исследовании лингвистическая вежливость осмысливается как социальное явление. Теоретическое понятие вежливости раскрывает картину данного понятия в коммуникационных стратегиях. Статья объясняет аспекты феномена вежливости.

Ключевые слова: коммуникация, этикет, вежливость, теория «лица», феномен, отношения, система, межличностные отношения.

Moldassanova A.A.[1], Borambaeva L.A.[2], Zhanabekova M.A.[3],

k. p. s., docent,[1] m. p. s.[2], k. p. s., docent[3]
of Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan,
e-mail: a.moldassanova@mail.ru**,** luisa-amina@mail.ru**,** magulsim@mail.ru

INTERPERSONAL POLITENESS AND POWER IN LINGUISTICS

Politeness is an integral part of life in any human society. Whenever we address a person, we choose how polite to be, ranging from polite forms such as «dear Professor Friedman» to the more colloquial «hey, Ron.» How polite we choose to be not only reflects how close we feel to a person but also helps to create or maintain the feeling of closeness or distance. Goffman's [1] symbolic interactionism theory describes the many ways people use to communicate, create, and maintain social roles. In this theory, social distance is a prime characteristic of social roles, and politeness serves to regulate social distance. More recent theories of politeness [5] share the view that politeness serves to both signify and create social distance.

P. Brown and Levinson [5] argued that three aspects of interpersonal situations are universally related to politeness: (a) the relative power of the addressee over the speaker, (b) the degree of imposition of the to-be-performed act, and (c) the social distance between the speaker and the addressee. According to Brown and Levinson, speakers use more polite language when addressing individuals with high status than individuals with equal or low status, when asking for a big favor than a small favor, and when addressing strangers than familiar people. A considerable amount of research has supported the predicted effects on politeness of power [1], imposition (e.g., R. Brown & Gilman, 1989; Holtgraves & Yang, 1992). Since Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson first developed a theory of linguistic politeness, most sociolinguistic studies have looked at politeness in terms of «face» [3]. Social cohesion depends upon awareness and consideration of the «face needs» of others. Each participant in normal human society has two types of face need: a «positive face need» and a «negative face need». The positive face need is 'the positive consistent self-image or» personality» (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interacts' and the negative face need is 'the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction – i.e. to freedom of action and freedom from imposition' [5]. «Positive politeness» attends to a person' s positive face needs and includes such speech acts as compliments, invitations and greetings. It expresses good-will and solidarity. «Negative polieness» attends to a person's negative face needs and includes indirectness and apologies. It expresses respect and consideration [4].

Along with the theory of politeness [5], we conceptualize politeness as being both a meaningful way to signify (or reflect) social distance and as means to create(or regulate) social distance from an interlocutor. For example, a speaker can choose a very polite way of addressing a colleague to reflect the relatively large interpersonal distance between them but also to increase the social distance between them.1The literature on politeness, as the research cited earlier illustrates, has focuse on politeness as a signifier of social distance.

The question of human psychological identity is a complex issue that goes beyond the study of communication into psychology, sociology, and philosophy. Nevertheless, there is an important aspect of identity that has been recognized as an essential element in all communication, [4] i.e., the interpersonal identity of the individuals in communication.

One of the most important ways in which we reduce the ambiguity of communication is by making assumptions about the people we are talking to. As the simplest example, when we begin talking to someone we try to speak to them in a language we know they will understand.in a monolingual speech community that is rarely a problem, but in the increasingly multilingual international business community it is becoming a major issue, to be solved right at the outset of communications.

We also make significant assumptions about what kind of a person the other person is and what kind of a person he or she would like us to think of him or her as being. When Mr. Hutchins called his subordinate colleague by his first name, Bill, he projected the assumption that there was a difference in status between them and he also projected the assumption that there was a difference in status by simply using the name Bill without further comment. Bill, in turn, projected that he accepted that difference in status and ratified that by calling his employer Mr. Hutchins.

Many aspects of linguistics form depend on the speakers making some analysis of the relationships among themselves. The choice of terms of address is one of the first of these recognized by sociolinguists.

 Face is really a paradoxical concept. By this we mean that there are two sides to it which appear to be in contrast. On the one hand, in human interactions we have a need to be involved with other participants and to show them our involvement. On the other hand, we need to maintain some degree of independence from other participants and to show them that we respect their independence. These two sides of face, involvement and independence, produce an inherently paradoxical situation in all com-munications, in that both aspects of face must be projected simultaneously in any communication.

Many other terms have been used in the sociolinguistic literature to present this concept. It has been called positive face, for example, on the basis of the idea of the positive and negative poles of magnetism. The positive poles of a magnetism. The positive poles of a magnet attract, and by analogy involvement has been said to be the aspect of communication in which two or more participants show their common attraction to each other.

Involvement has also been called solidarity politeness; again, for the reason that sociolinguists want to emphasize that this aspect of face shows what participants have in common. Any of these terms might be acceptable in some contexts, but we feel that the term 'involvement' is clearest and creates the fewest analytical complications for the reader.

The independence aspect of face emphasizes the individuality of the participants. It emphasizes their right not to be completely dominated by group or social values, and to be free from the impositions of others. Independence shows that a person may act with some degree of autonomy and that he or she respects the rights of others to their own autonomy and freedom of movement or choice.

Any communication is a risk to one's own face at the same time it is a risk to the other person's. We risk our own involvement face if we do not include other participants in our relationships. That is, if we exclude others, while that may increase our own independence, it at the same time decreases our own involvement.

Looking at it from the other person's point of view, if we give too much involvement to the other person, we risk their independence face. On the other hand, if we give them too much independence, we risk their involvement.

From the point of view of face relationships, we have said above that any communication is based on sharing a symbolic system, and that such a sharing is already to some degree an expression of involvement. If negotiations are conducted among participants using different languages(but, of course, with translators),this is a situation of lesser involvement or of higher independence than if negotiations are conducted using the same language. Therefore, it is a question of face relationships to decide whether discussions should go on in separate languages mediated by translators or whether they should go on in a common language .Naturally, of course, if the negotiations go on in the native language of one of the participants(or group of participants)that will tip

the balance of involvement toward their side. It will give the other participants a sense of having their own independence limited, perhaps even unduly. At the same time, an insistence on the use of separate languages to overcome this problem can produce a sense of too great an independence, which can be felt as hostility or unwillingness to come to a common ground of agreement. The choice of language in discourse is not simply a matter of practical choice governed by efficiency of communication of information. Every such choice is also a matter of the negotiation of the face of the participants.

Linguistic strategies of involvement: some examples

There are many ways in which involvement can be shown through linguistic form. The examples which follow are just ten types which have been selected from English. While there is some disagreement among researchers about exactly which linguistic forms will be used in different languages to indicate these strategies, the examples here will give you a general idea of what we mean by linguistic strategies of involvement. (In these examples the letter »H» represents the «Hearer» to whom one is speaking, and «S» represents the «Speaker».)

1 Notice or attend to H:

« I like your jacket.»

« Are you feeling better today?»

2 Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H):

« Please be careful on the steps, they are very slippery.»

«You always do so well in school.»

3 Claim in-group membership with H:

«All of us here at City Polytechnic…»

4 Claim common point of view ,opinions, attitudes, knowledge, empathy:

« I know just how you feel. I had a cold like that last week.»

5 Be optimistic:

« I think we should be able to finish that annual report very quickly.»

6 Indicate S knows H' s wants and is taking them into account:

«I'm sure you will all want to know when this meeting will be over.»

7 Assume or assert reciprocity:

«I know you want to do well in sales this year as much as I want you to do well.»

8 Use given names and nicknames:

«Bill, can you get that report to me by tomorrow?»

We have said above that face relationship between and among participants consist of two elements: an unmarked set of initial assumption and a series of negotiations in which those unmarked as-

sumptions are either ratified or altered in some way. Under normal circumstances, face relationships remain fairly stable, and negotiation of the overriding relationship is relatively minor. When the assistant manager of sales departs meets with his or her manager, the relationship is not likely to change from meeting to meeting.

We could describe such general and persistent regularities in face relationship as politeness systems. For example, Mr. Hutchins can be expected to always address Bill by his first name, and Bill is likely to always say «Mr.» when speaking to Mr. Hutchins. Such a regular relationship indicates what we would call a politeness system, because both speakers in the system would use a certain fairly regular set of face strategies in speaking to each other.

There are three main factors involved which bring such a politeness (or face) system into being: power, distance, and the weight of the imposition.

In discussions of face or politeness systems, «power» refers to the vertical disparity between the participants in a hierarchical structure. In other words, Mr. Hutchins is above Bill in the hierarchical structure of their company. We would describe their relationship as +P (plus power) because Mr. Hutchins has special privileges (and, course, responsibilities) over Bill, and Bill owes certain duties to Mr. Hutchins. In most business and governmental structures, the organization chart shows quite explicitly what the +P relationships are. As a result the language used between such participants is relatively predictable.

In contrast to such a situation, where there is little or no hierarchical difference between participants, we would consider that to be –P or an egalitarian system. Close friends generally share a –P relationship, since neither one is considered above the other. But the relationship does not have to be among close friends. Two people who have equivalent ranks in their own companies or their own organizations might have a –P relationship even though they do not know each other at all. In international protocols in both business and government, most communications are attempted at the same level so that –P relationships can be achieved. Company presidents talk to company presidents, assistant sales manager's deal with other assistant sales managers, ambassadors talk to ambassadors, and clerks talk to clerks.

There are 3 systems in politeness: deference, solidarity, and hierarchy. Three main types of politeness system can be observed in many different contexts. We have called them the deference politeness system, the solidarity politeness system, and the hierarchical politeness system.

References

1 Ron Scollon, Suzanne, Wong Scollon, Rodney H. Jones // Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach. – London, 2011. – 64 p.

2 Tracy Rundstrom Williams // LINGUISTIC POLITENESS IN EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES: A CASE STUDY. – London, 2012. – P. 1-5.

3 Miriam A. Locher, Sage L. Graham // Interpersonal Pragmatics. – London, 2014.

4 Annie Wenhui Yang, E.Holmes // Exploring Silence Application and Politeness Strategies in Interpersonal Business Communication. – London, 2011. – 52 p.

5 Brown, P. and S. Levinson // Politeness, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – London, 2012. – P. 101-101.

6 Dӧniel Z. Кӧdӧr and Michael Haugh// Understanding Politeness. – Cambridge University Press, 2007. – P. 109-125.