POLITENESS IN LINGUISTICS

Azamova Intizor Ashur qizi
1st Year Student of Zarmed University
Mavlonova Ugiloy Khamdamovna
Head of Languages Department, PhD,Associate Professor of Zarmed University
Bukhara, Uzbekistan, dagotys@mail.ru

Abstract
Politeness is a crucial aspect of human communication, shaping interactions and reflecting social hierarchies, cultural norms, and individual relationships. In the field of linguistics, politeness studies examine how speakers manage face-threatening acts, the balance of social power, and the politeness strategies they employ in various contexts. This article explores the theory of politeness in linguistics, focusing on the concept of "face", the difference between positive and negative politeness, and how cultural differences influence politeness strategies. Additionally, we discuss pragmatic aspects of politeness, its role in language use, and examples across languages.

Keywords: politeness, linguistics, face theory, pragmatics, social power, cross-cultural communication, face-threatening acts.

Introduction. Politeness in communication is a fundamental feature of human interaction, transcending linguistic boundaries to reflect social structure and cultural expectations. In the field of linguistics, politeness is generally studied within the framework of pragmatics, a branch that deals with the ways in which context and meaning influence language use. Politeness theory, most notably developed by sociolinguists Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson (1987), focuses on how speakers manage their interactions to minimize the risk of offending or threatening the social face of their conversational partners.

The concept of "face", drawn from Erving Goffman's (1967) work, is central to understanding politeness. According to this theory, face refers to a person's social identity or the positive self-image they present in public interactions. In linguistic politeness theory, individuals use a range of strategies to maintain face and avoid "face-threatening acts" (FTAs), which could lead to social embarrassment or loss of status. This article will discuss key aspects of politeness in linguistics, including the distinction between positive and negative politeness, the role of face-threatening acts, and cross-cultural variations in politeness.

Main Body. Face Theory and Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs). The concept of "face" is fundamental in the study of politeness. Erving Goffman's seminal work on face as a social construct introduced the idea that people engage in a delicate balancing act when presenting themselves in public. Brown and Levinson expanded on this, arguing that communication often involves threats to an individual's face, which can be mitigated through politeness strategies.

Face-threatening acts (FTAs) are communicative actions that may damage a person's self-image. For example, direct criticism, requests, or refusals can threaten a person's "positive face" (the desire to be liked and appreciated) or "negative face" (the desire to be free from imposition). These acts are not necessarily harmful but require careful management to preserve harmonious social relations.

© 2026Scottish International Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

Positive vs. Negative Politeness. Brown and Levinson (1987) distinguish between two types of politeness strategies: positive politeness and negative politeness.

- **Positive Politeness**: This strategy seeks to reinforce the listener's self-esteem and emphasize the speaker's solidarity or closeness. It involves actions like compliments, praise, or expressing shared interests. For instance, saying "I'd really appreciate it if you could help me with this" not only makes a request but also emphasizes the speaker's desire for closeness and cooperation.
- **Negative Politeness**: This strategy aims to minimize the imposition on the listener and show respect for their autonomy. It often involves hedging, indirectness, or using formal language. For example, instead of saying, "Give me the pen", a speaker might say, "Could you possibly lend me the pen for a moment?" to reduce the imposition.

Both strategies reflect an understanding of face needs, and the choice between them depends on the social context, relationship between the participants, and cultural norms.

Politeness and Social Power. One of the main reasons politeness strategies vary across different languages and cultures is the role of social power. In hierarchical societies, speakers may use elaborate politeness forms to acknowledge the social rank or status of others. In contrast, in more egalitarian societies, politeness may be less formal and more reciprocal.

For instance, in Japanese, the use of honorifics like "san" or "sensei" is a reflection of social respect, where language is tailored to reflect deference based on the speaker's relationship to the listener. Similarly, in languages like French, the use of "vous" (formal "you") vs. "tu" (informal "you") marks a distinction in respect, age, or familiarity.

In contrast, in many English-speaking cultures, while politeness is important, it may not be as rigidly tied to social hierarchies as it is in other languages. A closer examination of politeness strategies reveals how language reflects and reinforces social dynamics, with speakers using various forms of politeness depending on factors like status, age, and familiarity.

Cross-Cultural Differences in Politeness. Politeness is deeply shaped by cultural expectations, and different societies have different norms for what constitutes polite behavior. In some cultures, indirectness and formality are highly valued, while in others, directness is seen as a sign of clarity and honesty.

For example, in the United States, directness and clarity are often appreciated in communication, and requests may be made more straightforwardly. However, in many Asian cultures, such as in China and Korea, politeness is often expressed through indirect speech acts, maintaining a level of respect and humility in interactions. In these cultures, face-threatening acts are minimized through elaborate rituals, honorifics, and indirect requests.

This cultural variability highlights the fluid nature of politeness, shaped by historical, social, and interpersonal factors.

Pragmatic Aspects of Politeness. The use of politeness strategies is also influenced by pragmatic factors such as context, relationships, and discourse. Pragmatics, the study of language in context, helps explain why speakers choose particular forms of politeness depending on the conversational setting. For example, in formal settings like business meetings or academic conferences, individuals may adhere to negative politeness strategies, avoiding imposition and maintaining professional boundaries.

© 2026Scottish International Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

In informal contexts, however, the same speakers might switch to positive politeness strategies, signaling closeness and familiarity. This dynamic shift in politeness strategies demonstrates the adaptability and fluidity of politeness in interaction.

Conclusion. Politeness in linguistics is not just about manners; it is a complex and dynamic set of strategies employed to navigate social relationships, minimize face-threatening acts, and reflect cultural norms. The theory of politeness, particularly Brown and Levinson's distinction between positive and negative politeness, provides valuable insights into the ways in which language is used to manage social identity and power dynamics.

Cross-cultural variations highlight how politeness norms differ around the world, with language reflecting underlying social values. Understanding politeness in linguistic terms allows us to better comprehend the intricacies of communication and the ways in which people maintain social harmony in a variety of contexts.

References

1. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. Pantheon Books.
3. Holmes, J. (2013). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (4th ed.). Routledge.
4. Lakoff, R. (1973). *The Logic of Politeness; or, Minding Your P's and Q's*. Chicago Linguistic Society.
5. Watts, R. J. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Mavlonova Ugiloy Khamdamovna. (2024). LINGUISTIC CONDITIONING OF POLITENESS CATEGORY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK ARTISTIC DISCOURSE. *International Multidisciplinary Journal for Research & Development*, *11*(11). Retrieved from https://www.ijmrd.in/index.php/imjrd/article/view/2095
7. Mavlonova Ugiloy Khamdamovna. (2024). POLITENESS AND ITS MEANS IN THE FIELD OF PHILOLOGY. *Ethiopian International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *11*(12), 315–317. Retrieved from http://www.eijmr.org/index.php/eijmr/article/view/2289
8. Mavlonova Ugiloy Khamdamovna. (2024). LINGUISTIC CONDITIONING OF POLITENESS CATEGORY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK ARTISTIC DISCOURSE. *Ethiopian International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *11*(11), 448–451. Retrieved from http://www.eijmr.org/index.php/eijmr/article/view/2171
9. Mavlonova, Ugiloy Khamdamovna (2023) *Factors of Formation and Study Principles of Irony.* International Journal on Integrated Education, 6 (4). pp. 105-109. ISSN 2620-3502
10. Khamdamovna M. U. et al. The Rules Of Politeness And National Features Of Etiquette In Different Countries //Boletin de Literatura Oral-The Literary Journal. – 2023. – T. 10. – №. 1. – C. 3910-3918.
11. Mavlonova U. K., Saakyan R. Y. Characteristics of Irony and its Expression as a Component Part of Author Modality //International Journal on Integrated Education. – 2023. – T. 6. – №. 4. – C. 110-114.
12. Khamdamovna, M. U. (2021). The use of Irony in Uzbek Poems as a Speech Decoration. *CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE*, *2*(11), 17-20. https://doi.org/10.47494/cajlpc.v2i11.242

© 2026Scottish International Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.

13. Khamdamovna, M. U. . (2021). Irony and Sarcasm in English Humour. *"ONLINE - CONFERENCES&Quot; PLATFORM*, 78–82. Retrieved from http://papers.online-conferences.com/index.php/titfl/article/view/597
14. Khamdamovna M. U., Saidakhmedovna U. D., Izatilloyevna K. D. Text Forming Features of Irony in American Prose //Journal of Positive School Psychology. – 2022. – С. 9691–9697-9691–9697.
15. MU Khamdamovna. Irony as a Topical Form of Comic. International Journal on Integrated Education. Volume 5, Issue 6, Jun 2022. P. 4-7. e-ISSN : 26203502 p-ISSN : 26153785
16. Khamdamovna, M.U. 2022. Irony Expressed by Adjectives and Verbs in English Literature. *International Journal on Integrated Education*. 5, 12 (Dec. 2022), 281-283.

© 2026Scottish International Conference on Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation. All Rights Reserved.