

THEORITICAL APPROACH TO THE THEME

Sobirjonovna Sevinch Rakhmonkulova, a student of the
Faculty of Service at the Samarkand Institute of Economics
and Service

E-mail: xamraevsobir38@gmail.com



Annotation: Language should be learned in the cultural context of its speakers. This is because the speakers bring an intention in performing a linguistic act. Failure in understanding the intention of the speakers will lead to failure in responding to the intended message and, thus, failure in using the language. The study of how language is used in a particular context or situation is the focus of pragmatics. An important pragmatic issue concerns with politeness, i.e. showing awareness of another person's public self-image. This article highlights the politeness phenomena and the degree of success in learning English. The issues discussed include the definition of politeness, strategies of politeness, politeness in the Oriental cultures, politeness in the context of Indonesian cultures, and the implication of politeness phenomena in the teaching of English.

Key words: Language, pragmatics, phenomena, fluent, deixis, behavior, politeness, culture.

Politeness is one of sociolinguistics form. It is because politeness has a relation with sociolinguistics itself. According to Ronald Wardhaugh (2009), sociolinguistics is a study for observing relationships right above language and society. The goal is for being a better understand the language structure and how the function of language in society class. The goal of sociolinguistics is how when we studying the language, we could also understood about its social structure Politeness as a kind of sociolinguistics is one way to analyze how make students understand the material during discussion with use politeness as a part of communication without reduce the learning goals. Usually, students do not want to use politeness,

because they think that their classmate which not fluent in English will hard to absorb the material. The concept of politeness is come from Goffman's work (1955,1967). In social interaction, people represent the face to others and vice versa. It is also applied when we doing a discussion in the class, because class involve of students and teacher. The class is a social place, so politeness has to use in kind of situation, especially during discussion. It can be summarized that politeness is the use of an appropriate word or phrase in the appropriate context, which is determined by the rules that are prevalent in 160 society. In social interaction, to maintain politeness is to maintain harmonious and smooth social interaction, and avoid the use of speech acts that are potentially face-threatening or damaging. The principle is based on the use of politeness intimacy, closeness, and relationships, as well as the social distance between the speaker and the hearer. People choose and implement certain values in certain pragmatic scale, according to the culture and conditions of the existing situation in social interaction.

There are two types of politeness :

1. Showing the listener or reader that you value and respect them
2. Changing or softening what you say so as not to be direct or forceful.

In the late 1970's, the subject of politeness became a major concern in the field of pragmatics and it has been discussed widely among pragmatist. The base of this paper is to contribute some ideas for this rapprochement by considering an explanation of politeness in the framework of Relevance Theory (hereinafter, RT), a model of verbal communication in which cognition plays a central role. I will begin by discussing what is politeness. Then, I will sketch the lines along which a picture can be drawn of politeness phenomena in relevancetheoretic terms. Finally, 1 will briefly comment on some consequences of adopting such an approach. On the nature of politeness What is politeness? From social deixis to indirect speech acts, from conventional formulae to conversational strategies, from tact to friendliness, too many different things seem to have been bundled under a single label: indeed, politeness usually covers such a variety of phenomena that no consistent

characterisation seems to be within reach. In fact, in the standard meaning of the word polite at least three dimensions can be identified:

- 1) polite as civil or socially correct;
- 2) polite as kind or friendly;
- 3) polite as tactful or diplomatic.

A quick look at the literature easily shows that different researchers have favoured different senses. Echoing Fraser (1990), one could say that for Leech (1983) being polite involves making the hearer to 'feel good' (polite as friendly); to Brown & Levinson (1987) it means making him not 'feel bad' (polite as diplomatic); for Fraser himself it is 'the expected state' (polite as socially correct). Although pointing in opposite directions, both Leech's and Brown & Levinson's frameworks share a crucial property: they put the stress on the "functional" or strategic nature of politeness, against the 'old-fashioned' view that politeness is merely a set of arbitrary social conventions. Also the common distinction between 'positive politeness' and 'negative politeness' as the two sides of any politeness system emphasises the idea that the efforts made to show appreciation for the addressee or to avoid any intrusion into his legitimate privacy are the only constitutive parts of politeness. However, a central issue seems to be missing from these approaches. Conversational strategies, or conversational efforts, can only have their *raison d'être* as exploitations of a default, 'unmarked' behaviour. Put in other words, being able to prevent undesirable results or to enhance positive effects entail having first a precise knowledge of expected courses of events (including, obviously, linguistic events and behaviour), and their social consequences. If so, politeness must primarily be a matter of social adequacy, established in terms of expectations. And any sort of conversational manoeuvres used to achieve a particular aim will be necessarily derived, since they will be dependent on strategic plans assuming default or expected effects. Thus, although analysing strategic moves is a significant part of a theory of politeness, only social adequacy can be a primitive notion. Politeness: A Relevant Issue for Relevance Theory "... upon entering into a given conversation each party brings an

understanding of some initial sets of rights and obligations that will determine, at least for the preliminary stages, what the participants can expect from the other(s). "The status, the power and the role of each speaker, and the nature of circumstances" are, according to Fraser (1990: 232), the relevant parameters for calculating the initial set of rights and obligations. They "play a crucial role in determining what messages may be expected both in terms of form and content." Status, power or social role are indeed basic notions to define social relationships. But there seems to be something unique to them and to social categorisation. Ordinary categorisation uses perception as its main source of data; social categorisation, by contrast, usually has to invoke elements and establish relationships with no direct perceptual motivation. Most of our social activities depend on created categories (such as profession, role or friendship), which are defined through social convention and do not necessarily relate to any essential or perceptible property of the individual. This fact strongly suggests that social cognition should be considered as a specific, separate domain or faculty.

On the other hand, if defining factors depend ultimately on convention, a straightforward prediction will be that different cultures will presumably produce different created categories. Status, power, distance, social role or face, 162 as abstract notions, are universal; but their particular content is clearly culturesensitive: each society establishes its own conditions on what the relevant properties are that determine the values selected for each parameter. This explains why different cultures present radical differences in their politeness systems; and this explains also the misunderstandings in intercultural communication: what is polite (i.e., adequate) in a given culture may be seen as rude in other communities. Politeness can be, thus, conceived of as a matter of social adequacy. Polite is the word we use to refer to a (linguistic) behavior conforming to a given set of cultural norms: this is its central meaning; strategic uses of language should be parasitic on it. Only if a detailed characterisation is first provided of what counts as socially adequate can a proper account be offered for further-reaching manoeuvres. Politeness as social adequacy.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Bonyadi, A. & Samuel, M. (2011). Linguistic nature of presupposition in American and Persian newspaper editorials. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 3, 1-16.
2. Davoudi, M. (2005). Inference generation skill and text comprehension. *The Reading Matrix*, 5(1), 106-123.
3. Domaneschi, F., Carrea, E., Penco, C., & Greco, A. (2013). The cognitive load of presupposition triggers: Mandatory and optional repairs in presupposition failure. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 29(1), 136–146.
4. Grant, L. & Starks, D. (2001). Screening appropriate teaching materials: Closing from textbooks and television soap operas. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 39, 39-50.
5. Glanzberg, M. (2005). Presuppositions, truth values and expressing propositions. In M. Glanzberg, G. Preyer & G. Peter (eds.), *Contextualism in philosophy: Knowledge, meaning, and truth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press