Міністерство освіти і науки України

Київський національний лінгвістичний університет

Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології

КУРСОВА РОБОТА

на тему «Теорія ввічливості: позитивна та негативна ввічливість.»

Студента (ки) 4 курсу МЛа 03-19 групи

факультету германської філології і перекладу
денної форми навчання
спеціальності 035 філологія
спеціалізація Германські мови та літератури
(переклад включно) перша – англійська
Курдельчук Дарина Ігорівна

Науковий керівник:
кандидат філологічних наук,
професор
Волкова Лідія Михайлівна

Національна шкала _____

Кількість балів: _____ Оцінка: ЄКТС _____

м. Київ 2023 р.

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Kyiv National Linguistic University
Chair of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology

Term Paper

Politeness theory: positive and negative politeness.

Daryna Kurdelchuk

Group MLA 03-19

Germanic Philology and Translation Department

Research Adviser
Prof. L.M.Volkova
PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv 2023

Table of contents:

Introduction

Politeness is a crucial aspect of social interaction and communication, and it plays a significant role in establishing and maintaining positive relationships. Politeness theory provides a framework for understanding how people use language to show respect, deference, and consideration for others in various social situations. Positive and negative politeness are two different strategies that individuals can use to communicate with each other in a socially appropriate manner.

The aim of the Course Paper lies in studying the politeness theory, specifically negative and positive politeness, to understand how people use language to maintain social relationships and show respect for others.

The objectives of studying this theory include:

1. Identifying the strategies people use to be polite in different social situations.

2. Understanding how language use varies across cultures and contexts.

3. Evaluating the effectiveness of different politeness strategies in achieving communicative goals.

The object of my Term Paper is the Politeness Theory.in Modern English Discourse.

The subject of the research is the communicative characteristics of the politeness theory, its functional features, positive and negative faces and the strategies of politeness.

The theoretical significance of studying negative and positive politeness lies in its ability to shed light on the complex social dynamics that shape communication. This theory helps to explain why people use certain language strategies to show respect and avoid offence. It also highlights the importance of cultural norms and social context in shaping communication patterns. By understanding the underlying principles of politeness, we can better navigate social interactions and build stronger relationships with others.

CHAPTER 1. POLITENESS THEORY

1.1. Politeness theory, Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson

The concept of politeness is multidimensional and is linked to numerous fields of scientific study. Scientists from numerous sectors have effectively investigated this phenomenon, and the necessity for such advancements has only risen over time. The scientific investigation is being carried out in the domains of philosophy and ethics, where it is portrayed as one of the key personal qualities, but the most popular are studies from the perspective of linguistics, namely pragmalinguistics.

The idea of "face," according to P. Brown and S. Levinson, covers two primary sorts of ambitions that are inherent in all speakers and are achieved by them: the desire to be positively appreciated by the interlocutor, towards whom you demonstrate respect and attention throughout discussion; the desire for a "negative face" when the speaker wants freedom of action and non-interference in his intentions by the interlocutors.

Politeness theory, introduced by Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson, is based on the concept of politeness, which is defined as attempts to restore a person's self-esteem or effectively assert good societal ideals in social interactions. To address politeness as a response to reduce or prevent face-threatening activities such as requests or insults, the sociological notion of the face (as in "save face" or "lose face") is used. Positive and negative faces, face-threatening acts (FTA), methods for executing FTAs, and variables influencing strategy choices are all important components of the theory's framework, as outlined below. For many years, Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson's politeness theory has been enormously influential in studies of politeness in several cultures. Though Brown and Levinson proposed their model as universally applicable, their theory has been challenged by other scholars in varied aspects such as its cross-cultural applicability or ways to interpret and conceptualize politeness. (Leech 1983, p.69)

In 1978, Brown and Levinson put forward their theory of politeness, which has since become the most influential theory on the subject, receiving significant

attention in the form of comments, critiques, applications, adjustments, and revisions. Their names have become almost synonymous with the term politeness, making it difficult to discuss politeness without reference to Brown and Levinson.

Brown and Levinson connect their theory to the Gricean Cooperation Principle (CP) by viewing politeness as a "rational departure" from it. However, they emphasize that civility is not equivalent to CP. The fundamental presumption underlying all communication is that it is a strategic activity, which is socially neutral and unmarked. The speaker must communicate politeness since it cannot be assumed to be operational. The principles of politeness provide the rationale for deviating from the CP when communication has the potential to threaten the face of the participants.

Brown and Levinson define civility as the act of avoiding disagreement, focusing on logic and face as the primary topics of discussion that are believed to be shared by all speakers and listeners. These qualities are embodied in a universal Model Person (MP), who can analyze communication goals and determine the most appropriate way to achieve them while taking into account the potential risks of damaging the participants' self-image or "face," and selecting appropriate tactics to minimize such risks.

"Face" refers to an individual's perception of their self-worth, reputation, and image, which everyone possesses and expects others to recognize. Interactions with others can either positively or negatively impact one's self-image. Brown and Levinson (1987) suggest that each person has two types of faces or desires: negative and positive. The positive face represents the desire to be appreciated, respected, liked, and approved of by others, while the negative face represents the desire to act freely without external constraints. In social interactions, politeness can be used to demonstrate awareness of another person's face. As a result, civility can be achieved in a social distance setting, with social distance referring to respect or reverence, and social closeness referring to friendliness, camaraderie, or unity. These ideas have been further explored by Brown and Levinson (1992) and Thomas (1997).

After performing calculations, speakers select a particular approach to structure their communicative contributions. In situations where a face-threatening act (FTA) is necessary, speakers' computations lead to a decision that results in five distinct communication options. The following FTA strategies:

To express one's needs, the bald-on record approach involves the direct address of the other person, often used in emergencies regardless of the addressee, as in "Don't do that! Get away from here!" This approach can be softened with the use of mitigating devices like "please" and "would you". Off the record, the strategy involves giving hints rather than using explicit language, such as searching for a pen in a pocket and bag without asking directly. On-record positive politeness involves appealing to common goals or friendship with expressions like "How about letting me use your pen?", but this approach carries a higher risk of refusal. Negative politeness, commonly used in most English-speaking contexts, involves using questions with modal verbs like "Could you lend me a pen?", and even asking for permission to ask a question. Positive politeness shortens the social distance between the speaker and the addressee, while negative politeness lengthens it.

1.2. Politeness principle, Geoffrey Leech

J. Leach's politeness maxims, along with Grice's idea of collaboration, constitute the foundation of the communication code. In contrast to G. Grice, who works to govern verbal communication, J. Leach makes effective attempts to build a conflict-avoidance approach. In his 1983 work, Leach proposes a method to prevent conflicts in communication by utilizing a set of maxims, including the Tact, Generosity, Approbation, Modesty, Agreement, and Sympathy maxims. Consider the civility maxims in further depth. The tact maxim governs an individual's limits. This concept distinguishes between common and personal linguistic interests. The maxim's major goal is to protect the individual's personal communication space and keep a safe distance. It states that one should avoid discussing potentially risky matters such as one's personal life, political beliefs, and so on.

1) The tact maxim advises individuals to minimize the expression of beliefs that may harm others while maximizing those that benefit others. The first part of this maxim corresponds to Brown and Levinson's negative politeness strategy, which aims to reduce imposition, while the second part aligns with the positive politeness strategy of attending to the needs and interests of the listener.

An excellent example of the tact maxim is:

"Excuse me, can I ask you a quick question?" - This statement shows consideration for the other person's time and avoids imposing on them. It also demonstrates an effort to establish a rapport with the other person before asking the question.

2) The generosity maxim, on the other hand, directs individuals to minimize the expression of beliefs that suggest or imply benefits to themselves and maximize the expression of beliefs that suggest or imply costs to themselves. Unlike the tact maxim, the generosity maxim focuses on prioritizing others.

A good illustration of the generosity maxim is :

"You don't have to worry about the notes, I'll share mine with you." - This statement shows the speaker's willingness to help the other person, even if it involves additional effort on their part. This approach is an effective way to foster goodwill and establish a positive relationship.

3) The approbation maxim advises minimizing the expression of beliefs that may disapprove of others and maximizing those that express approval. Praising others is preferred, but if it is not possible, one can give a minimal response, use euphemisms, or remain silent.

"Great job on that presentation! I enjoyed it." - This is a good example of the approbation maxim as it shows the speaker expressing approval and praise for the other person's work. This is a good way to build positive feelings and rapport, especially in an academic setting where people are often striving for recognition.

4) The modesty maxim suggests minimizing the expression of self-praise and maximizing the expression of self-disparagement.

"I'm not sure about that answer, but maybe someone else in the class can help?" - This is a good example of the modesty maxim as it shows the speaker minimizing their expertise and knowledge, and instead suggesting that someone else might be better equipped to answer the question. This can be a good way to build relationships and show humility.

5) The agreement maxim recommends minimizing disagreement with others and maximizing agreement. It aligns with Brown and Levinson's positive politeness strategies of seeking agreement and avoiding disagreement.

"I completely agree with your point about the importance of renewable energy." - This is a good example of the agreement maxim as it shows the speaker seeking common ground and agreement with the other person. This can be a good way to build relationships and show that you are engaged in the conversation.

6) The sympathy maxim advises minimizing antipathy and maximizing sympathy between oneself and others. This includes speech acts such as congratulation, commiseration, and expressing condolences, all of which align with Brown and Levinson's positive politeness strategy of attending to the listener's interests, wants, and needs.

"I am sorry to hear that you have been ill. Please let me know if there is something I can do." - This is a good example of the sympathy maxim as it shows the speaker expressing concern and support for the other person's well-being. This can be a good way to build relationships and show that you care about the people around you.

Continuous implementation of maxims is a challenging undertaking since each interlocutor develops a linguistic reputation throughout speech engagement. This process frequently occurs within the discussion itself, allocating rights, obligations, and the role that the speaker will perform throughout the act of communication with each individual. In their evaluations, participants might be driven not only by observations of speaking behaviour but also by prejudices about

particular sectors of the community, which can negatively affect ongoing communication.

Politeness is not always straightforward, and being too focused on the maxims can sometimes cause discomfort. Certain actions may be polite to the receiver but impolite to the speaker. For instance, it is customary for the recipient to reject a compliment, which can create an uncomfortable situation for the speaker. Therefore, maxims often conflict with one another. The maxim of tact, for instance, may require refusing generous offers, while the maxim of agreement may demand accepting them.

According to scientific literature, employing one maxim throughout the entire speech will not result in an effective and successful conclusion. Even adhering to all of the maxims does not ensure a positive outcome, but it can slow down the communication process. In reality, people break these rules rather than obey them.

It should be highlighted that none of the maxims is absolute and can be broken several times throughout dialogue. When the maxims of the principle of collaboration are considered, it is clear that the maxim of the number of information calls for giving no fewer facts than essential, while the maxim of the manner of action seeks to abbreviate the statement. A closer examination of the notion of civility reveals that it promotes dispute resolution.

Therefore, the maxim is not a universal means of regulating any act of communication, but the application of these norms and principles will help to better organize the conversation process, to comply with the norms and requirements of etiquette and the principles of politeness.

Researcher R. Lakoff based on the theoretical positions of G. Grice offers her list of rules of communicative behaviour in her work "The Logic of Politeness: or Minding Your P's and Q's" (1973), where she differentiates only two pragmatic principles of speech interaction, defined as "Rules of Politeness" or "Rules of Mutual Understanding":

1. Express yourself clearly;

2. Be polite (Lakoff 1973, p. 298).

"The Principle of Cooperation" by G. Grice

G. Grice, a researcher of the most comprehensive principle of interaction in communication - the principle of collaboration - was one of the first linguists to attempt to define specific rules of politeness. The realisation of the interlocutors' desire to be open during communication, consistent in certain principles, and willing to compromise in the realisation of communication goals, adhering to certain "agreements" that are determined by the chosen purpose of the conversation, in his opinion, is the key aspect of politeness (Grice 1975, p. 47).

This is the essence of Grice's collaboration idea, as articulated in his essay "Logic and Dialogue" (1975). In this monograph, the scientist gives the principle of cooperation the following characterization: "The communicative contribution of all participants in the discourse should be such that the jointly chosen direction of the dialogue receives its logical conclusion in the form of an incomplete agreement or compromise that would suit all parties" (Grice 1975, p. 50).

G. Grice establishes several universals known as communication maxims while researching the idea of collaboration. Among them are the largest amount of information, maximum quality of information, maximum relevance, and maximum mode of action. Let us take a deeper look at these propositions:

The maxim of information quality is related to the aspect of the sincerity of the message and is represented by the following principles:

- do not knowingly communicate false information;

- do not report information that lacks justification.

Breach of these norms may result in disputes among interlocutors. For example, when one speaker purposely offers misleading information while the other knows the truth, the interlocutors experience forced tension.

The maximum relevance is represented by only one thesis:

- do not deviate from the chosen topic of communication.

It is difficult to argue that in real life, none of the conceivable verbal encounters touches simply the chosen issue and does not extend beyond it. If this premise is broken, the dialogue becomes shallow and uninformative, and its strategic relevance fades. As a result, this criterion is critical in sustaining social contact during the process of verbal communication. Psycholinguists, for example, claim that if the material delivered does not correspond with the declared topic of the lecture, students' attention is immediately lost.

The maximum amount of information is related to its dosage and is based on the following postulates

- a statement should contain no less information than is necessary; - a statement should contain no more information than is necessary.

Information is not always delivered in certain areas of genuine verbal communication since the speaker cannot always manage the process of sharing information throughout a discussion. In some circumstances, there is insufficient information, while in others, information is abundant. The basis of this idea is that the speaker should endeavour to provide the appropriate quantity of information to maximise communication efficacy. Of course, this postulate is not absolute and can be broken, but breaking it will result in communication problems. If the first principle is violated, the addressee may not create the desired impression of the addressee since he or she did not present an exhaustive list of information. If the second principle is breached, the situation will have negative implications because the speaker may unwittingly confuse, mislead, or distract the listener from the main issue.

In his thesis "The Media is the Message: Politeness Techniques in Men's and Women's Voice Mail Messages," P. Hobbes documented these phenomena (2003). The researcher explored how the client's unwillingness to work with the firm might be influenced by the habit of providing more information than is required. A secretary, for example, should not respond to an inquiry regarding the manager's whereabouts by stating he or she is drinking coffee, taking a lunch break, talking to

another customer, or that the manager's whereabouts are unclear. It is preferable to limit oneself to brief responses, which will raise the organization's degree of professionalism in the eyes of the client (Hobbs 2003, p. 252).

Maximizing the mode of action involves analyzing the manner of information transfer. The general formulation of this aspect is as follows: "Speak clearly". Additional postulates of the maxim are:

- avoid ambiguity;

- be brief;

- structure your statement.

In verbal communication, a violation of the balance between the known and the unknown can result in complicated or ambiguous remarks. The use of language that the addressee does not comprehend, ambiguity in the statement, and the other person's understanding can all jeopardise the integrity of communication. under one umbrella phrase. Violations of the statement's arrangement also result in time waste and confusion.

G. Grice expands his grasp of the commonly recognised principles of spoken communication while creating the idea of collaboration, but these postulates apply not just to communication but also to other aspects of life. Grice underlines that communication becomes more effective and strategic as a result of this concept and its components. These maxims have nothing to do with grammar, but rather with the efficient use of time and linguistic resources (Grice 1975, p. 55).

The scientist's maxim theory is not the last and only acceptable one since it is feasible to distinguish a range of additional maxims relating to the social, ethical, and moral domains in speech.

It should be emphasised that the aforementioned maxims are focused on the utterance's efficiency, rationality, validity, and logic, but they disregard the utterance's expressiveness and, in most cases, relate to business rather than ordinary communication.

Hence, G. Grice's maxims provide a detailed description of the widely acknowledged phenomena of politeness, which is defined by a socially neutral complex of verbal communication that attempts to prevent unjustifiable deviations. (Hobbs 2003)

Politeness has been defined differently throughout history. The twentieth-century humanities started to view this idea as a line of verbal and nonverbal conduct aiming at generating a positive tone of communication and averting confrontations. Yet, despite criticism, P. Brown and S. Levinson's idea has been and continues to be the theoretical foundation for numerous investigations.

Although the notion of politeness has a common universal understanding, each culture and nation interprets it differently (Човганюк 2013, с. 277-282.).

CHAPTER 2. POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE FACES

2.1. Positive and negative face

Holtgraves (2002) claims that the term "face" was developed from Goffman's (1967) theory of face and face management (p. 38). Additionally, Brown and Levinson (1987) describe face as "a person's public self-image that he or she desires for themselves (p. 61-62). "Face can be lost or preserved by one of the interactional partners involved, either speakers or hearers because it symbolises what a person wants. Moreover, Wardhaugh (2010) asserts that when individuals communicate with others, both speakers and listeners must be cognizant of the concept of face (p. 292). As a result, presenters and listeners usually work together to keep each other's faces in their dialogue.

Brown and Levinson (1987) propose that faces can be classified into two types: positive and negative. According to their definition (p. 61-62), positive face refers to "A person's public self-image that he or she desires for himself." It involves the desire to be liked, admired, and favourably approved by others in one's community, and may occasionally relate to one's self-esteem. On the other hand, the negative face is "the desire of every 'competent adult member' that his acts be unhindered by others," including the right to one's personal space, freedom of action, and freedom from imposition.

2.2. Face Threatening Acts (FTAs)

Holtgraves (2002) reports that Goffman (1967: 5) defines face as the positive social value that a person successfully claims for themselves in a given interaction (p. 38). According to Brown and Levinson (1987), everyone has both positive and negative faces that they seek to maintain in social interactions (p. 63). However, it is not always possible to preserve one's face as desired in every interaction. The face of both speakers and listeners can be threatened to varying degrees. As a result, speakers and listeners may engage in actions that damage the other person's face to protect their own, known as Face Threatening Actions (FTAs). FTAs, as Brown and Levinson (1987) define them, are "Acts that impinge on the face wants of an

interactant" (p. 70). These actions are often communicated through verbal communication, such as spoken language, and can also be conveyed through nonverbal communication, such as tone and intonation.

J.K. Rowling's "Harry Potter" (2001) series includes examples of both positive and negative politeness in the interactions between the characters. Here are some examples:

Positive Politeness: One example of positive politeness in the series is the relationship between Harry and his best friends Ron and Hermione. They use positive politeness strategies such as showing interest in each other's lives, being supportive, and using friendly language. For instance, when Harry is feeling down, Ron and Hermione try to cheer him up by complimenting him and offering him words of encouragement.

The character of Hermione Granger shows interest in her friends` interests and concerns and tries to be helpful and supportive. For example, Hermione helps Harry with his broken glasses, saying, *"I know a few spells now."* By using positive politeness, Hermione creates a sense of friendship and cooperation among the characters. (Rowling J. K. Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone, p. 84)

Harry and his friends often use friendly language with each other, such as nicknames and terms of endearment, to show their closeness and affection. For example, Ron often calls Hermione "*Hermy*" as a term of endearment (Rowling J. K. Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone, p. 696), and Harry affectionately refers to his godfather, Sirius Black, as "*Padfoot*." (Rowling J. K. Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone, p. 229)

Negative Politeness: An example of negative politeness in the series is how the characters show deference and avoid imposing on authority figures such as professors and the headmaster of Hogwarts, Albus Dumbledore. For instance, the students address their teachers as "*Professor*" followed by their last name and use formal language to show respect. Additionally, the characters use indirect language

when making requests to avoid being too demanding or imposing. (Rowling J. K. Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone, p. 101).

Another example of negative politeness in the series is the use of indirect language to make requests, which avoids appearing too demanding or imposing. For example, when Harry wants to know more about his parents, he asks his godfather Sirius Black, "Do you think you could tell me about my parents?" By framing his request as a question and using a polite tone, Harry avoids sounding too pushy or demanding. (Rowling J. K. Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone, p. 26)

Positive and negative politeness strategies are used by the characters in "Harry Potter" to maintain positive relationships, show respect and deference, and avoid imposing on others. These strategies add depth and complexity to the characters and their relationships and help create a rich and immersive fictional world.

Positive politeness strategies, such as using friendly language and showing interest and support, are used by the characters to build and maintain positive relationships with each other. Negative politeness strategies, such as using deference and indirect language, are used to show respect and avoid imposing on authority figures and others.

By using both positive and negative politeness strategies, the characters in the series demonstrate a nuanced and complex understanding of social interactions and relationships. These strategies contribute to the richness and depth of the fictional world and the characters' development throughout the series. Overall, the use of positive and negative politeness in "Harry Potter" adds realism and authenticity to the characters and their interactions, making the series more engaging and relatable for readers.

CHAPTER 3. POLITENESS STRATEGIES

Based on Brown and Levinson's politeness theory, there are three primary ways to complete speech actions: positive, negative, and off-record politeness. To reduce the likelihood of face damage, the researchers suggest four politeness tactics: bald-on-record, positive politesse, negative politesse, and off-record. During face-threatening actions, speakers may choose to adopt one of these four tactics to minimize the risk of damaging the face of the hearer.

The purpose of Brown and Levinson's politeness theory is to employ politeness methods in everyday life to avoid conflict situations. The researchers differentiate four higher-order politeness tactics: the direct strategy (bald on record), the indirect strategy (off-record), the strategy of positive politeness, and the strategy of negative politeness. (Вжещ 2011).

The first tactic is the direct strategy (bald on record), where the speaker does not try to soften the harsh words to make the listener understand the situation, which is often used in emergencies or when the speaker has a higher social position.

The second tactic is the indirect strategy (off-record), where the speaker uses hints, ambiguous phrases, and implications to make the listener understand the message without damaging their face.

The third tactic is the strategy of positive politeness, where the speaker shows a positive, optimistic attitude towards the listener, respects their face and maintains a friendly attitude.

The fourth tactic is the strategy of negative politeness, where the speaker respects the listener's face but limits their freedom in some way, and the listener needs to use specific strategies to reduce the such influence

For example, in a situation where a boss needs to reprimand an employee for poor performance, the boss may choose the direct strategy (bald on record) and give harsh criticism without any attempt to soften the blow. On the other hand, the boss could choose the strategy of positive politeness and approach the conversation with a positive attitude, praising the employee's strengths while offering suggestions for

improvement. Alternatively, the boss could use the strategy of negative politeness by acknowledging the employee's autonomy and framing the conversation in a way that emphasizes the employee's choice to improve rather than being forced to do so. The four politeness tactics provide speakers with different ways to navigate face-threatening situations while minimizing damage to the face of the hearer. (Brown 1987, p. 69-70).

3. 1. Positive Politeness Strategy

Brown and Levinson (1987) defined Positive Politeness as a technique that focuses on the positive self-image of the listeners that the speaker also claims for themselves (p. 70). This approach is aimed at making the listeners feel good about themselves. One common example of the Positive Politeness strategy is giving compliments. As noted by Holtgraves (2002), compliments are a straightforward way to meet the desires of the other person and make them feel good about themselves (p. 47). Thus, compliments not only satisfy the listeners' positive face needs but also promote a friendly relationship between the speakers and listeners. "The outfit looks great on you, darling!" is an example of a complement that employs the Positive Politeness approach. According to Wardhaugh (2010), Positive Politeness can lead to friendship (p. 292). Employing numerous in-group signals in friendship is a typical technique in public speaking. Moreover, Holtgraves (2002) underlines that the usage of numerous in-group indicators such as familiar address phrases (honey, mate, bud) demonstrates the application of the Positive Politeness technique (p. 46). Including the listeners in an activity is also considered friendship. According to Holtgraves (2002), introducing hearers to a scenario enables both speakers and hearers to cooperate. As an example of an invitation, the phrase "Let's eat lunch!" employs the Positive Politeness technique. Brown and Levinson (1987) suggest that being positive is one way to utilize the Positive Politeness strategy to show respect for the hearers' positive face (p. 126). In addition, Holtgraves (2002) mentions that speakers can convey Positive Politeness by expressing optimism (p.

47). This approach also involves seeking agreement with the listener to establish a collaborative relationship. According to Holtgraves (2002), a speaker using Positive Politeness may even seek agreement when disagreeing with the listener (p. 47).

Positive politeness strategies in "Why Didn't They Ask Evans?" by Agatha Christie:

1. Expressing gratitude: Characters use expressions of gratitude to show appreciation and build positive relationships. For example, when Bobby Jones helps Lady Frances Derwent, she thanks him and offers to repay him in some way. (Christie A. Why Didn't They Ask Evans? p. 51)

2. Using friendly language: Characters use friendly language to create a relaxed and welcoming atmosphere in social interactions. For example, Bobby and Lady Frances use friendly language with each other, such as calling each other by their first names and using informal language. (Christie A. Why Didn't They Ask Evans? p.131)

3. 2. Negative Politeness Strategy

Brown and Levinson (1987) describe Negative Politeness as a communication strategy aimed at the hearer's negative face, which is the desire to maintain freedom of action and unobstructed attention (p. 129). The objective of Negative Politeness is to lessen the impositions on the listeners. Hedges and negative language are common techniques used by speakers to achieve this objective. Holtgraves (2002) identifies the use of hedges as a method to decrease the imposition of a request on the hearer (p. 45). Negative Politeness is exemplified in phrases such as "Take the snack, if you may," which allows the listener to behave freely. Additionally, Holtgraves (2002) notes that the Negative Politeness approach involves expressing pessimism about the act to be done, reducing the listener's sense of compulsion. In essence, the speaker is not seeking to restrict the hearer's freedom of action. Understanding these communication strategies is critical in comprehending how speakers use language to achieve specific social goals.

Negative Politeness creates a barrier between speakers and listeners. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), the Negative Politeness technique aims to establish space between speakers and listeners to demonstrate respectful behaviour (p. 129).

Wardaugh (2010) explains that Negative Politeness aims to show respect, offer apologies, use indirect language, and maintain formality in communication to avoid any negative impact on the listener's self-image (p. 292). This strategy involves various techniques to manage the listeners' faces. For instance, an apology is a common technique used in Negative Politeness. The sentence "I hesitate to trouble you, but..." is an example of an apology that employs the Negative Politeness strategy.

Negative politeness strategies in "Why Didn't They Ask Evans?" by Agatha Christie:

1. Indirect language: Characters use indirect language to avoid being too direct or confrontational, which can help to maintain positive relationships. For example, when Bobby asks a suspect about their whereabouts on the day of the murder, he phrases the question indirectly, saying, "You were there when Mr Savage died, weren't you?" (Christie A. Why Didn't They Ask Evans? p. 160)

2. Apologizing: Characters use apologies to show humility and acknowledge mistakes or wrongdoings, which can help to repair relationships. For instance, when Bobby comes to Mrs Rivington when her husband was out, saying, "I must apologize for coming to see you without warning, Mrs Rivington,' " (Christie A. Why Didn't They Ask Evans? p.100)

Overall, positive and negative politeness strategies are used by characters in "Why Didn't They Ask Evans?" to navigate complex social interactions and build relationships with each other. These strategies add depth and complexity to the characters and their interactions, making the story more engaging and realistic for readers.

3. 3. Off-Record Strategy

Brown and Levinson's last politeness method is the indirect strategy, which employs indirect language and removes the speaker from the possibility of being oppressive. The off-record method is to present something generic or different from the speaker's genuine meaning and rely on the hearer's interpretation to convey the speaker's goal. The speaker's ability to avoid imposing on the listener or the listener's willingness to assist can be seen as a positive outcome. This approach relies heavily on pragmatic considerations to effectively communicate the intended meaning, while also utilizing semantic meaning to avoid causing any damage to the listener's self-image. (18)

Brown and Levinson (1987) proposed the concept of "Off-Record strategy," which refers to a communication act that lacks an obvious communicative aim. Holtgraves (2002) further characterizes Off-Record communication as an indirect communication method, allowing listeners to interpret the intended meaning of the message themselves. This approach can be used by speakers to avoid imposing Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) on their listeners. For instance, the phrase "The vegetable soup is a bit bland" could be used off-record to suggest that the speaker wants the hearer to pass the salt (21)

Off-record politeness strategies in "Why Didn't They Ask Evans?" by Agatha Christie are used by characters to convey their thoughts or intentions indirectly, without appearing too direct or demanding. Here are some examples:

1. "I'm sure you have far more important things to do than listen to me." - Lady Frances Derwent, one of the suspects in the murder case, uses this phrase to indirectly ask for attention and express her importance without appearing too demanding. (Christie A. Why Didn't They Ask Evans? p. 77)

2. "You had an accident, I hear, Lady Frances,' said Dr Nicholson using this phrase to indirectly ask for information from another character, without appearing too pushy or demanding. (Christie A. Why Didn't They Ask Evans? p. 80)

In general, off-record politeness strategies in "Why Didn't They Ask Evans?" are used to maintain positive relationships between characters and avoid causing offence or appearing too aggressive. Using indirect language, characters can convey their thoughts or intentions while remaining polite and respectful. These strategies also help create tension and mystery in the story, as the characters navigate the murder investigation using subtle and indirect means of communication.

3. 4. Bald on-record strategy

Goldsmith (April 2000) explains that while there are some indirect ways to limit face-threatening behaviours with bald-on-record politeness, such as offering non-manipulative advice, the primary goal of this strategy is not to reduce the threat to the hearer's face. Using this approach can be shocking or humiliating for the listener, so it is usually reserved for situations where the speaker and listener have a strong relationship, such as with family or close friends.

Bald on-record: You do not attempt to mitigate the consequences of the FTAs. You will most likely surprise, humiliate, or make the person you are conversing with feel uncomfortable. This sort of tactic is more typical among individuals who know each other well and are at ease in their surroundings, such as close friends and relatives.

Example:

Bald on-record politeness strategies in "Why Didn't They Ask Evans?" by Agatha Christie are used by characters to convey their thoughts or intentions directly, without any attempt to mitigate the message with politeness. Here are some examples:

1. "Have you murdered her, too?" - Bobby Jones uses this blunt question when interrogating a suspect, without any attempt to soften the accusation or use indirect language. (Christie A. Why Didn't They Ask Evans? p. 146)

2. "And you had to witness his will, didn't you" - Bobby Jones uses this confident statement when revealing the solution to the murder mystery, without any attempt to hedge or soften the accusation. (Christie A. Why Didn't They Ask Evans? p. 160)

Overall, bald on-record politeness strategies in "Why Didn't They Ask Evans?" are used to convey a sense of urgency or importance, to challenge another character, or to reveal the truth directly and uncompromisingly. These strategies can be effective in certain situations where a straightforward and assertive approach is necessary. However, they can also be perceived as rude or confrontational and may cause offence or damage relationships between characters. In the context of the novel, the use of bald on-record politeness strategies creates tension and conflict between characters, as they navigate their way through the murder investigation and confront the truth.

CONCLUSION

Politeness is an essential component of intercultural communication since it governs conduct while also ensuring and organising harmonious conversation.

The essential components of the politeness theory are offered in the works of P. Brown and S. Levinson, two English scholars. "FTA" is the central notion in their theory (Face Threatening Act). As a result, politeness is founded on the notion of the public face as individual self-respect, which is related to the desire to avoid impediments in their acts as well as the need to gain praise for their actions. The participant in communication strives to escape possible risks by utilising diverse speaking methods. As a result, we distinguish between positive and negative politeness methods, each of which has unique implementation characteristics in English speech.

Good politeness tactics are reflected in exhibiting attention and interest to the interlocutor, trying for mutual understanding and agreement with him/her, and taking into consideration his/her wants and preferences. Negative politeness is the dread of looking invasive, causing damage to the addressee, emotionlessness, and constraint. Compliments, concern for the addressee's needs, emotionality, and expressiveness of the remark are the most common ways to demonstrate good politeness.

The use of negative politeness aids in the reduction of communication strain on the interlocutor, the avoidance of confrontations, and the prevention of communication failures. The speaker employs various strategies, such as employing methods to soften the categorical character of the remark (modal phrases, separating questions, adverbs, modal verbs, particles, and speech patterns). The negative politeness method is distinguished by greater self-accusation, minimising of intrusion, expression of polite pessimism, and so on.

Subsequently, politeness entails employing particular communication practices that enable efficient conversation. Positive politeness is to reduce the communication gap and achieves mutual understanding. Using the negative

politeness method, on the other hand, highlights the speaker's wish to socially remove himself or herself from the interlocutor.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Курсова робота на тему: Теорія ввічливості: позитивна і негативна ввічливість.

Виконала – Курдельчук Дарина Ігорівна

Курсова робота складається зі вступу, трьох розділів, висновку, резюме та списку використаних джерел. У першому розділі «Теорія ввічливості» представлені теорія та принципи ввічливості. У другому розділі «Позитивні та негативні сторони» представлена інформація про дії та поведінка, що загрожують особі, тобто загального враження. У третьому розділі «Стратегії ввічливості» представлена інформація про позитивні, негативні та неформальні стратегії ввічливості.

У даній курсовій роботі всього:

Сторінок – 30;

Список використаних джерел: 27.

Список ілюстрованих матеріалів: 4.

LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS:

1. Бабич, Н.Д. (1990). Основи культури мовлення. Львів: Світ.

2. Вжещ, Я.Л. (2011). Принцип ввічливості в теорії і практиці міжкультурної комунікації. Теорія збереження обличчя П. Брауна та С. Левінсона. Вісник ЛНУ імені Тараса Шевченка, 9, 251-255.

3. Човганюк, М.М. (2013). Основні концепції теорії ввічливості. Науковий часопис Національного педагогічного університету імені М. П. Драгоманова. Серія 9: Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов, 10, 277-282.

4. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

5. Brown, P. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. London, UK: Cambridge University Press.

6. Christie A. Why didn't they ask Evans?, London: HarperCollins, 1993. 216 p.

7. Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behaviour. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

8. Goldsmith, D. J. (2000). The impact of politeness and relationship on the perceived quality of advice about a problem. Human Communication Research, 26(3), 350-385.

9. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics (Vol. 3, pp. 41-58). New York, NY: Academic Press.

10. Hobbs, P. (2003). The medium is the message: Politeness strategies in men's and women's voice mail messages. Journal of Pragmatics, 35(2), 243-262.

11. Holtgraves, T. (2002). Language as social action: Social psychology and language use. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

12. Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness; or minding your P's and Q's. Papers from the ninth regional meeting, 292-305.

13. Leech, G. (1983). Principles of pragmatics. London, UK: Longman.

14. Rowling J. K. Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone, Bloomsbury Pub Ltd, 2000. 232 p.

15. Rowling J. K. Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix, Bloomsbury, 2003. 877 p.

16. Rowling J. K. Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban, Perfection Learning, 2001. 435 p.

17. Thomas, J. (1997). Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics. London, UK: Longman.

18. Wardhaugh, R. (2010). An introduction to sociolinguistics. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

19. https://dspace.hnpu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/3384/1/Нестеренко%20Н.%20П.Моделювання%20стратегій%20увічливості.pdf

20. https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politeness_maxims

21. https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politeness_theory

22. https://publikasiilmiah.ums.ac.id/bitstream/handle/11617/3462/4_LINGUISTIC%20POLITENESS%20THEORY.pdf

23. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cooperative_principle

24. https://repository.usd.ac.id/5459/2/111214111_full.pdf

25. https://www.universalclass.com/articles/business/communication-studies/politeness-theory.htm

26. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politeness_theory

27. https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.9/html

LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS

1. Christie A. Why didn't they ask Evans?, London: HarperCollins, 1993. 216 p.

2. Rowling J. K. Harry Potter and the Philosopher's Stone, Bloomsbury Pub Ltd, 2000. 232 p.

3. Rowling J. K. Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix, Bloomsbury, 2003. 877 p.

4. Rowling J. K. Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban, Perfection Learning, 2001. 435 p.