Міністерство освіти і науки України

Київський національний лінгвістичний університет

Кафедра германської та фіно-угорської філології

Курсова робота

на тему: **ТЕОРІЯ ВВІЧЛИВОСТІ В СУЧАСНІЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЦІ: ПОЗИТИВНА ТА НЕГАТИВНА ВВІЧЛИВІСТЬ**

Студента групи Мла 02-20

Лук'янець Максим Володимирович

факультету германської філології і перекладу

денної форми здобуття освіти

спеціальності 035.041 філологія

Науковий керівник:

кандидат філологічних наук

професор Волкова Лідія Михайлівна

Національна шкала _____

Кількість балів_____

Оцінка ЄКТС _____

Київ 2024

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine

Kyiv National Linguistic University

Chair of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology

Term paper

POLITENESS THEORY IN MODERN LINGUISTICS: POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE POLITENESS

Group 02-20

Lukyanets Maxim

Germanic Philology and Translation Department

Research Adviser

Prof. L.M. Volkova

PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv 2024

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

In modern linguistic research, the human dimension is a determining factor characterizing language communication. During communicative activity, a person uses the acquisition of life and mental experience, peculiarities of perception and thinking, interests, etc. The human factor absorbed in language finds expression in the moral and cultural aspect, which regulates not only interpersonal relationships, but also communication as a whole. One of the determinants of speech behavior is the etiquette of communication reflected in a new linguistic category of politeness. For the first time, this category entered the field of linguistic research in foreign linguistics. The foundations of the theory of politeness were laid by E. Hoffmann and J. Gumpertz, followed by P. Brown, S. Levinson and others (Дзюбак, 2015).

The representation of the category of politeness in the Ukrainian language is of particular interest, since the possibility of expressing social relations between communicants in the language using grammatical means is almost not taken into account, and if it is indicated, it is fragmentary. It is these factors that determine **the relevance of our research**.

The aim of this work is to analyze and describe the methods, tactics, means and linguistic structures of politeness used in the process of communication depending on the situation, the interlocutor, and other factors that may influence the choice of language means.

So, in accordance with the aim, **the objectives** were formulated:

- to investigate politeness as a communicative category;

- to define the theory of politeness in linguistic research;

- to describe Brown-Levinson's theory and politeness strategies;

- to analyze positive and negative politeness on the basis of modern literature.

The object of this work is politeness in Modern English.

The subject of this work is politeness as a communicative category in English linguistic culture.

The following research **methods** were used: descriptive method, structural method, comparison method, analysis, continuous sampling method.

The practical value of this work lies in the possibility of using the results of this work to describe interpersonal relations in the process of teaching modern English, the culture of language communication, for the development of courses and reports on interpersonal communication. Informing the reader and the public about the available means of expressing politeness, features and pitfalls of their use.

CHAPTER ONE. POLITENESS AS A LEADING COMMUNICATIVE CATEGORY

1.1 Politeness as a communicative category

To date, there are many approaches to the concept of "politeness" among scientists, as noted by T. Holtgraves (2017), politeness cannot be considered only as a set of rules that determine our behavior. On the contrary, it is a very broad concept that covers such areas of scientific research as anthropology, linguistics, sociolinguistics, cognitive psychology, pragmatics, and others.

Any form of human communication is a culturally determined process, all components of which are closely related to the cultural and national affiliation of the participants of the communication. When exchanging information in the process of communication, there is a constant reproduction of meanings that will be determined by the cultural and personal experience of each person, which complicates communication, because the same words in different cultures can have different concepts. Accordingly, the ideas of communicators on how to express this or that communicative category may differ depending on the affiliation of the communication participants to one or another nationality (Болотнікова, 2017).

Most scientists agree that the phenomenon of politeness should be studied as a category – "a basic logical concept that reflects the most general regular connections and relationships that exist in real reality" (Словник української мови в 11 томах, 1970-1980). However, politeness is a communicative category, because it contains certain ideas about communication, communicative consciousness, rules and norms of communication. If language categories are any group of language elements that are distinguished on the basis of any common property, then "communicative categories mean the most general communicative concepts that organize a person's knowledge of communication and the norms of its implementation", i.e. "communicative concepts that are formed in the mind and determine the communicative

consciousness, as well as the behavior of the nation, group, and individual" (Дзюбак, 2015).

The study of communicative categories became possible thanks to the development of such a direction in linguistics as pragmalinguistics from the second half of the 20th century. As F. Bacevich notes, "...the research field of modern linguistic pragmatics covers all the conditions under which a person (the subject of speech) uses linguistic means in communication. These are, first of all, the conditions for adequate selection and use of language units and categories, taking into account all contextual and situational factors in order to achieve the most effective impact on the communication partner (audience, readers)" (Бацевич, 2010, p. 31).

In our study, politeness is considered as a communicative category, since it regulates communicative processes and is one of the fundamental factors of the success of interpersonal communicative interaction.

It is generally accepted that politeness is a behavior aimed at showing respect and a positive attitude towards the interlocutor in the process of communication. The main task during communicative interaction is to establish a connection, and subsequently to achieve understanding, which is facilitated by the observance of language etiquette. Language etiquette is the norms created by society in the course of cultural development that regulate language behavior within certain communicative situations. Observance of etiquette norms is a prerequisite for the further development of society in linguistic, social and cognitive directions. Polite expressions are the main means of implementing language etiquette during communication.

Politeness plays a decisive role during the exchange of information between communicators (subjects of communication), and also acts as an element of etiquette-linguistic communication. The level of politeness during communication is, as a rule, more decisive for the behavior of interlocutors than the actual content of speech. The main purpose of polite behavior is to demonstrate to the interlocutor your positive attitude towards him and to receive appropriate feedback.

Politeness as a communicative phenomenon determines the quality and level of communication (formality or familiarity). Its leading role in communication is evidenced by its non-verbal nature, as well as cultural universality. The historical and cultural heritage of a certain community definitely affects the formation of norms and ideas about polite communication, because the latter is an element of social relations. When choosing language means of polite communication, the speaker relies on social rules and norms of communication. In other words, the construction of a polite expression takes place in accordance with ethical norms, which are regulators of the communicative behavior of the interlocutors (Бацевич, 2010).

The category of politeness in general can be defined as a type of social interaction based on respect for the partner's personality. As N. Zhuravlyova notes, the internal respect we feel for another person is reflected in linguistic politeness (Журавльова, 2012, p. 7). Linguistic politeness is a component of the meaning of the statement, which is influenced by the communicative situation (semantics and pragmatics), while the linguistic means of its expression (grammar) are implemented.

So, in our work, we consider politeness as one of the concepts of morality, which is inextricably linked not only with etiquette, but also with speech communication strategies aimed at achieving the maximum efficiency of interaction between communicators. In other words, politeness as a pragmalinguistic category contains a meaningful component, represented by such external elements of polite speech as respect, benevolence, as well as a plan of expression embodied in communicative strategies and tactics, the implementation of which occurs with the help of linguistic means.

1.2 The theory of politeness in linguistic research

Despite the increased attention to the concept of politeness, until now there is no universally recognized definition of it. B. Fraser singles out four main concepts of politeness:

1) politeness as a social norm (S. Ide, R. Watts, B. Hill);

2) politeness as maxims of communication (P. Gryce, R. Lakoff, J. Leach);

3) politeness as protection of "face" (P. Brown, S. Levinson);

4) politeness as compliance with the communication contract (B. Fraser and U. Nowlen) (Fraser, 1990, p. 221).

Among the mentioned concepts of politeness, one of the leading ones is the principle of cooperation by P. Grice, who initiated the development of theories of politeness with his idea about interlocutors' interest in cooperation during communication. Reinterpretation of Grice's theory by researcher J. Leach, who considers politeness as a pragmatic phenomenon and develops his own maxims of politeness, also deserves special attention. In addition, P. Brown and S. Levinson make a significant contribution to the study of communication politeness, who present communication as a "threatening act" for the "face", a certain image or image of the interlocutor. To avoid the "threat", scientists offer a set of language tools that implement the strategies of "positive" and "negative" politeness (Fraser, 1990).

In the work "Logic and Conversation" (1975), P. Grice for the first time makes an attempt to develop the rules by which interlocutors are guided during communication. According to the researcher, the main purpose of communication is the exchange of information. For this reason, interlocutors are forced to cooperate and cooperate with each other in order to achieve maximum communication efficiency. P. Grice's principle of cooperation includes 4 maxims: the maxim of quantity, quality, relationship and manner of speech. Each of them consists of sub-maxims that regulate speech behavior.

The maxim of quantity establishes the amount of information transmitted during communication and includes the following postulates:

- *Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange)*;

- *Do not make your contribution more informative than is required*.

The maxim of quality involves observing the truthfulness of the statement and operating with information in which the speaker is confident. This maxim is clarified by the following principles:

- Do not say what you believe to be false;

- Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

The maxim of relevance refers to the appropriateness of the topic of the message and its observance in a given situation, it includes only one postulate:

- Be relevant.

The maxim of the method of speech is related to the manner of conveying the content and involves the following principles:

- Avoid obscurity of expression;

- Avoid ambiguity;

- Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity);

- Be orderly.

According to Grice, the above-mentioned maxims determine the construction of effective communication, so interlocutors are guided by them to achieve this goal. It is because of the emphasis on the effectiveness of communication, rather than the emotional component, that the use of these maxims is more acceptable for a business style. Grice emphasizes that the observance of the maxims formulated by him in communication contributes to the "rationalization" of speech, and notes that the maxims are universal, and in some situations it is appropriate to use several maxims at the same time (Grice, 1975, p. 44).

P. Grice's statement about the universality of maxims was criticized by the linguist D. Hymes, who believes that Grice's opinion about the universality of maxims is wrong, because in the process of historical development, different communities formed their own concepts of polite communication (Hymes, 1986, p. 73). Therefore, the maxims developed by Grice cannot be suitable for each individual community. This is evidenced by research in the field of intercultural communication, during which scientists recorded a constant violation of the above-mentioned maxims.

One of the following studies, conducted in the aspect of practical implementation of Grice's maxims and the development of his principle of cooperation, is carried out by scientist R. Lakoff. Based on the principle of

cooperation, the researcher develops her own rules of "pragmatic competence". It reduces Grice's maxims to just two rules, which are formulated as follows:

1) *Be clear*;

2) *Be polite* (Lakoff, 1973, p. 294).

The second rule of pragmatic competence by R. Lakoff "Be polite" includes the following components:

1. *Don't impose*;

2. *Give options*;

3. *Make the listener feel good, be friendly* (Lakoff, 1973, p. 297).

As a result of the generalization of the above-mentioned rules, the conclusion regarding their main goal becomes obvious, namely, the creation of a favorable communicative climate for the interlocutors, but in different ways. In addition, an important difference between the rules developed by the scientist in comparison with Grice's maxims is that R. Lakoff takes into account the emotional sphere of communication.

J. Leech, who in his work "Principles of Pragmatics" (1983) develops his own set of maxims, is also a prominent researcher of the theory of politeness. Several parallels can be drawn between the works of P. Grice and J. Leech. First, the opinions of Leech and Grice are unanimous regarding the existence of certain rules that guide the interlocutors in the communication process. Secondly, both scientists have developed their own maxims that promote effective communication. However, the difference is that J. Leech considers politeness in a pragmatic context (Leech, 1983, p. 80).

J. Leech singles out 6 maxims:

- Tact Maxim;

- Generosity Maxim;

- Approbation Maxim;

- Modesty Maxim;

- Agreement Maxim;

- Sympathy Maxim (Leech, 1983, p. 132).

Maxim of tact "*Minimize cost to other. Maximize benefit to other*" involves avoiding communication on potentially dangerous topics, namely: private life, individual preferences, a woman's age, salary level, marital status, occupation, evaluation of other individuals, etc.

The maxim of generosity "*Minimize benefit to self. Maximize cost to self*" assumes that the communicative act should not be uncomfortable for the participants of communication. Dominance of one conversation participant over another should also be avoided.

The maxim of approval "*Minimize contempt of other. Maximize praise of other*" emphasizes that sometimes the interlocutors' views on certain issues may not coincide. Therefore, you need to show respect for the position of your interlocutor.

The maxim of modesty "*Minimize praise of self. Maximize contempt of self*" postulates self-criticism and rejection of praise.

The maxim of agreement "*Minimize disagreement between self and other. Maximize agreement between self and other*" involves avoiding conflict situations, finding compromises and preventing open confrontation.

The maxim of sympathy "*Minimize antipathy between self and other. Maximize sympathy between self and other*" emphasizes the importance of benevolence during communication, which is the key to its successful flow.

In addition to the maxims of politeness, J. Leech develops the so-called "politeness scale", which makes it possible to determine the degree of politeness of a statement, which is demonstrated by the following examples:

1) *Answer the phone.*

2) *I want you to answer the phone.*

3) *Will you answer the phone?*

4) *Can you answer the phone?*

5) *Would you mind answering the phone?*

6) *Could you possibly answer the phone?* (Leech, 1983, p. 108).

J. Leech emphasizes the commonality of his own theory of politeness with P. Grice's principle of cooperation, because during speech, both concepts are in constant

interaction (Leech, 1983, p. 149). According to both scientists, interlocutors during communication seek to maintain a friendly attitude towards each other, which will promote their cooperation. But at the same time, unlike Grice, Leech does not emphasize the universality of his maxims, because he takes into account cultural differences regarding the ideas of communication of each individual community (Leech, 1983, p. 150).

Researcher R. Watts, a critic of P. Brown and S. Levinson's theory of politeness, offers his own vision of politeness. He believes that politeness is, first of all, a discursive phenomenon that should take into account the listener's assessment of the communicative act performed by the speaker (Watts, 2003, p. 85). R. Watts expresses the opinion that it is also worth considering such communicative phenomena as impoliteness and acceptable or neutral communicative behavior, known as political behavior. The researcher interprets the phenomenon of politeness as a method of constructing communicative behavior in accordance with the conditions and situation, which helps to make the discourse relevant and achieve the goal set by both interlocutors in the communication process (Watts, 2003, p. 143).

Linguists B. Fraser and U. Nowlen develop their own theory of politeness, in which the latter is presented as a contract between interlocutors regarding the construction of communication. The basis of their theory is the principle of cooperation by P. Grice, as well as the concept of "face" by I. Hoffman. Politeness, in their opinion, is a contract, because every communicative act involves both rights and obligations on both sides, which the interlocutors must observe in order to achieve maximum efficiency and cooperation during communication. Rights and obligations may change depending on the communicative situation. Awareness of the existence of such rights and obligations during communication occurs automatically, and speakers adapt their speech in accordance with the contract (Fraser, 1990, p. 223).

B. Fraser notes that the interlocutors do not warn each other that they are going to communicate politely, because, as a rule, they have a common goal – to build friendly communication and exchange certain information. This can be achieved only if the principle of cooperation is observed, in particular, the rules of communication,

and, therefore, the rights and obligations of the conditional contract. B. Frazer claims that, provided that the appropriate norms are observed in accordance with the communicative situation, the communicators can be called polite, and not their statements (Fraser, 1990, p. 233).

In their works, linguists R. Jenny and U. Arndt represent the phenomenon of interpersonal politeness as a tact. In addition to the concept of tact, they also formulate the concept of "social politeness". According to them, there are two types of politeness: interpersonal (or tact) and social, which differ in their functions. If social politeness concerns interaction in society, then interpersonal narrows the regulation of interaction to personal relationships, and also helps to avoid misunderstandings (Arndt & Jenny, 1992, p. 23). The ideas of R. Jenny and U. Arndt complement the theory of B. Fraser, who considers politeness as a flexible concept, because they consider interpersonal politeness to be dynamic in contrast to social politeness, which is constant and unchanging.

P. Brown and S. Levinson's theory and politeness strategies will be considered in the next section.

So, among communicative theories, the category of politeness occupies a special place. Today, among scientists, there is no consensus on the definition of the communicative category of politeness. P. Grice, R. Lakoff and J. Leech represent politeness as a principle of cooperation, the essence of which is the intention of the interlocutors to cooperate for the maximum effectiveness of communication. Scientists develop their own provisions, in particular, maxims of politeness, thanks to which it is possible to achieve this goal.

CHAPTER TWO. POLICY STRATEGIES AND PRACTICES IN MODERN LITERATURE

2.1 Brown-Levinson Politeness Theory and Strategies

Brown-Levinson's theory of linguistic politeness became a classic basis for many subsequent studies in this area, but immediately after its appearance it was subjected to severe criticism by linguists and cultural scientists. Mostly critical comments were related to the fact that the theory, being essentially an expression of the European view on the concept of "person", "actions that threaten the face" and, in general, politeness, was positioned by the authors as universal (Rajend Mesthrie & Asher, 2001, p. 188-192).

Linguists Brown and Levinson outline two types of politeness:

1. *Negative politeness* – emphasizing the interlocutor's right to choose in one or another situation; in contrast to positive politeness, negative politeness is focused on respecting the "negative person" of the listener and focuses primarily on distancing (avoidance). Brown and Levinson emphasize the formality and restraint of negative politeness. Strategies of negative politeness are designed to show the absence of communicative pressure and to assure the listener that his freedom of action will not be limited.

In the work "Politeness: some universals in the use of language" (Brown & Levinson, 1987), the authors highlight several strategies of negative politeness, for example:

1. a request for forgiveness: *"I'm sorry, I'm not good at this"* etc.;

2. use of connotation and euphemisms;

3. predominance of interrogative expressions over statements, for example: *"You prepared it yourself, didn't you?"*;

4. using objections instead of direct questions: *"Have you bought bread yet?"*;

5. use of interrogative forms: *"Could you...?"*;

6. softening the requirements by inviting the interlocutor to comment on them;

7. avoidance of excessive straightness;

8. expressions of respect;

9. depersonalization of speech;

10. use of passive forms.

According to the Brown-Levinson theory, polite behavior is a balance between expressing solidarity and maintaining a certain distance.

2. *Positive politeness* is an expression of respect for people's need to be valued and understood. Positive politeness is the formulation of a speech act that masks or reduces the threat of a "positive face". This type of politeness is oriented towards a positive self-image of the listener and is based on rapprochement and solidarity.

The basis of the strategy of positive politeness is to assure the listener that he is a friend, a valuable figure, a comrade, a trusted person. A person seeks to convey that he accepts and shares, at least partially, the desires and needs of the listener. The authors offer various strategies of positive politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987, p. 101-129), for example:

1. find out about the interests, wishes and needs of the listener and pay attention to them during the conversation;

2. express increased interest and sympathy for the listener;

3. use vocabulary that expresses concern for the interlocutor: "*Weren't you very worried?*";

4. use indicators of group affiliation (special appeals, slang, jargon, etc.);

5. avoid disagreement (use symbolic agreement, lies for salvation);

6. make offers and make promises;

7. be optimistic, joke;

8. emphasize commonality, unity of views and values.

Negative politeness is more suitable for business communication situations when communicators need to save face, maintain a certain reputation, or if they have different social status. Positive – more comfortable for everyday communication, jokes, markers of group affiliation, compliments, etc. are allowed. However, it is

important to remember that even with compliments and interest, it is important not to abuse it, because it can become like snooping and a certain useful interest.

Brown-Levinson's theory considers situations that often arise in the process of communication and create a threat to the "positive" and "negative face" of both the speaker and the listener. Such acts were called "actions that threaten the face" and were divided into four types depending on which of the "persons" the threat is aimed at (Reprint of first chapter of 1987, 2009, p. 313-316):

1. Threat to the speaker's positive face.

Expressed in the form of an apology, admission of guilt or responsibility. The authors attribute the acceptance of a compliment to this type of threat, explaining it by the fact that the speaker has a desire to downplay the positive qualities of the object of the compliment and thereby harm his "face".

2. Threat to the negative face of the speaker.

Occurs when expressing gratitude or accepting an offer, as the speaker feels a sense of duty or obligation. Such speech acts as excuses, apologies, forced promises or proposals also potentially violate the speaker's freedom of action and thus carry a threat to his "negative face".

3. Threat to the positive face of the listener.

Associated with the speaker's use of speech acts that show his indifference to the listener's feelings and desires and his "positive face". Among them, actions related to certain aspects of the listener's positive face are indicated: criticism, disapproval, accusations, mockery, insults, disagreement, challenge. In addition to them, the authors single out speech acts that threaten the "positive face" of the listener as a whole: disrespect, mention of taboo topics, boasting, accidental or intentional mistakes in the use of forms of behavior and status designations.

4. Threat to the negative face of the listener.

Occurs when using speech acts that show that the speaker can potentially violate the listener's freedom of action. Brown and Levinson single out, first, speech acts that indicate to the listener his future action: order and request, offer, advice, reminder, threat (in case of non-fulfillment). Secondly, such speech acts as an offer

and a promise cause the listener to feel a sense of obligation and debt. And, thirdly, a compliment, as well as an expression of admiration or envy, indicating the existence of a certain desire of the speaker in relation to the listener and his property. This makes the latter think that he will have to protect the object desired by others or give it to him.

P. Brown and S. Levinson emphasize that "face-threatening actions" are not a deviation from the communication process, but are a natural part of it (Reprint of first chapter of 1987, 2009, p. 313-316).

Depending on the communicative goals and the degree of "face threat", the speaker is guided by one of the following four strategies:

1. "Direct strategy" (*bald on record*). Its essence lies in the speaker's lack of intention to avoid harming the "face" of the interlocutor;

2. "Indirect strategy" (off-record). With the help of hints, the speaker tries to direct the listener to what he wants to say;

3. "Strategies of positive politeness" (*positive politeness*). By establishing friendly contact with the interlocutor, the speaker shows respect for his "face";

4. "Strategies of negative politeness" (*negative politeness*). The speaker expresses his intention to avoid the threat to his interlocutor's "face" by not interfering with his personal sphere and freedom.

In the process of communication, the interlocutors are interested in the fact that support and save each other's "face". To achieve this goal, they use a whole system of communicative strategies.

P. Brown, S. Levinson consider politeness as a means of "saving face" in communicative situations that can harm it. The theory of politeness proposed by these scholars includes such polar concepts as "positive politeness" or "approaching politeness" and "negative politeness" or "distancing politeness." Each type of politeness corresponds to the "face" (positive or negative) that the speaker seeks to "save". The first is aimed at reducing the distance between communicators and achieving agreement, and also includes emotional rapprochement, the second, on the

contrary, is aimed at maintaining or increasing the distance and showing respect for the autonomy of the listener.

2.2 Positive and negative politeness strategies based on contemporary literature

A positive atmosphere of communication helps both interlocutors to achieve their goals more easily, avoid misunderstandings or conflicts. Since different communication situations may require different approaches, it is important to understand what politeness strategies exist, and the best way to understand them is to encounter specific examples. The most common positive politeness strategies used in contemporary literature are:

1. The strategy of expressing increased interest or sympathy for the interlocutor – *"Detective Anderson: ...How is that soda?"* (King, 2018, p. 23). *"I really like your position here. I had the same thoughts, but, unfortunately, was too afraid to voice them."* Expressing compliments about the appearance, views or actions of the interlocutor evokes sympathy. *"Your blue T-shirt is incredible, where did you find it? Is it expensive? If it is not a secret."* However, in the last example, despite the compliment, there is a not very tactful question about the price, and as mentioned earlier, it is better to avoid the question about money.

2. Demonstrated strategies for using vocabulary that expresses concern for the listener. This strategy has various manifestations, for example, asking whether the addressee is comfortable, whether he needs help, etc.

"Detective Anderson: Mrs. Stanhope, would you like a short break?" (King, 2018, p. 13).

"Marcy? Are you crying? What's wrong?" (King, 2018, p. 36).

"I'd like you to pick out the man you saw behind Shorty's Pub on the evening of July 10th. Take your time." (King, 2018, p. 35).

3. Using indicators of group affiliation (such as slang, jargon, polite forms of address, etc.) in the correct context. It is important to understand that there are certain

factors for choosing this method of politeness and using it in an inappropriate social situation can lead to misunderstandings or conflicts. And even if the interlocutors are comrades or close friends in a certain situation, it may be inappropriate.

– *"Open ears, buddy, open ears."* (King, 2018, p. 28).

"Officer Wilberforce: Being taken care of as we speak, sir." (King, 2018, p. 39).

"But if you did, you'd let a pal in on it, wouldn't you?" (King, 2012).

4. The strategy of avoiding disagreement, in certain situations, if you are asked controversial or uncomfortable questions, it is better to use symbolic agreement, "lies for salvation", or change the topic – for example,

"Have you already decided who you will vote for this year? – I'm still thinking about the candidate."

"How do you like Carl? Isn't his career growth too suspicious? – I think he is a smart guy."

In this example, in order to avoid a potential conflict, the communicator had to lie. This approach is not the best, but it is very effective in communicating with people without a sense of tact.

5. The use of offers and promises is aimed at instilling trust or reassuring the interlocutor.

– *"Ritz: …Will you catch him, Detective Anderson? Detective Anderson: Oh, yes. We will catch him."* (King, 2018, p. 8)

In this example, you can see that the promise was given in response to the interviewer's question.

6. Showing interest in the wishes and interests of the interlocutor. Use of information received from the interlocutor in further communication.

"What would you like to do this summer? – Don't know yet, but I was thinking about camping for quite a while."

"I remember, you wanted to go camping, do you still want it?"

In this example, the speaker first learns about the desire of the interlocutor, and then after a long time he mentions it again. The listener will be pleased to see that his wish was not ignored or forgotten.

"What is your favorite author? – Oh, I have been reading Stephen King recently. I admire his style."

In this example, interest in the listener's hobbies is expressed, which makes it possible to choose a nice gift in the future.

7. Optimistic approach strategy, use of jokes:

"Rainwater: Oh, I am. My tongue runs like a supermarket conveyor belt on payday." (King, 2018, p. 47).

In this example, the speaker instead of simply answering that he is talkative, he uses such a humorous comparison, it helps the situation to become less tense.

8. Using the strategy of emphasizing commonality, unity of views and values:

"The recorder also draws power from the lamp cord. 'Naturally'" (King, 2012).

Here, the commonality of views is realized through the use of the inverse naturally:

"Come on guys. Most of us are aware that he is a virtuoso liar."

This example uses the inflection Most of us to demonstrate the unity of views, to indicate that all or most of the interlocutors have the same view:

"Needless to say, our choice was quite stupid. What are we going to do about consequences now?"

Needless to say (goes without saying) lets the listener know that their views on a particular issue are the same. The words *you know, you see* are also used to emphasize commonality.

9. Using compliments to adjust the interlocutor to you:

– *"You're a smart guy Terry. I knew that from the first time I met you, back when you were coaching Derek in Little League."* (King, 2018, p. 29).

The tactic of a compliment is considered the most etiquette. However, it is important to remember that it is important not to get carried away with this strategy, because politeness can start to seem like sycophancy.

Negative politeness is aimed at not seeming too pushy, not showing too much emotion and being reserved in communication. It also involves many communication strategies:

1) Using a request or apology strategy:

– *"Stanhope: If that's important I'm sorry."* (King, 2018, p. 13).

"Listen to me, Ralph. Please." (King, 2018, p. 28).

2) The speaker's use of various words or phrases to reduce the categorical nature of the statement:

"From what I know it is a kind of old standards."

Kind of, sort of, I think, it is likely, etc. are also used.

"Perhaps you can succeed in this."

In this example, modal words such as perhaps, maybe or may are used to reduce categoricalness.

3) The strategy of using connotation and euphemisms:

– *"I ask because you seem like the conversational type."* (King, 2018, p. 47).

In this example, the conversational type is used, the most neutral form to express the talkativeness of the hero.

"I have heard that you are expecting a baby. Congratulations!"

In this example, the euphemism expect a baby is used instead of pregnant, which adds a touch of politeness to the statement.

"You look a bit tired."

It is difficult to call this expression polite, but the word *a bit* is used to soften it somewhat.

4) Preferring interrogative expressions over statements, for example:

– *"Stanhope: Only he'll never go to a highschool, will he?"* (King, 2018, p. 13).

"He'll never have to worry about that now, will he?" (King, 2018, p. 13).

"As if reading his thoughts Samuel asked, 'Doesn't look like a monster, does he?'" (King, 2018, p. 42).

5) Using question forms:

– *"But how could you?..But if you did, you'd let a pal in on it, wouldn't you?"* (King, 2012).

6) The strategy of depersonalizing speech and using passive forms is:

"Officer Wilberforce: Being taken care of as we speak, sir. Now I believe you were out fishing this morning?" (King, 2018, p. 39).

This sentence is a good example of how several different strategies can be combined in one sentence.

7) An example of using personal addresses, prefixes *Detective, Mr, Mrs, Doctor* adds politeness to the conversation and adjusts the interlocutor to himself. We can say that this principle is similar to showing interest in the wishes and interests of the interlocutor and using them, because psychologically the listener is pleased that his name is remembered. In this case, emotional intimation between the interlocutors is used, and in its course a more sociable atmosphere is created, the interlocutor feels his importance in the eyes of the speaker:

– *"Detective Anderson: I do, but I need you to say it for the record, Mr. Ritz"* (King, 2018, p. 8).

8) There are also a large number of words or turns of speech that add politeness to the address:

"Can you, please pass me a salt?" using modal forms with may, can sounds more polite and tactful than *"Pass me a salt."*

"I advise you to visit a doctor, this doesn't look right", the words *advise, recommend* make the appeal more tactful. There is also the use of means of expression of opposition such as *however, otherwise*, etc.

An example of a threat to the positive face of the speaker:

"Wow, you did it! You are so awesome. I would never do it all alone. I'm not as good as you are. – Anyone would do the same."

In this case, although it would seem that there is nothing wrong with a compliment, the speaker gives a compliment, not for the purpose of praising the listener, but for the purpose of receiving praise. He downplays his positive qualities and creates a threat to his face.

The expression of threat to the negative face of the speaker can be seen in the following examples:

"Stanhope: I'm sure I'm a mess. Thank you" (King, 2018, p. 13).

In this example, a woman makes excuses for her emotions in a specific situation, thereby creating a potential threat to her negative face.

"Stanhope: If that's important I'm sorry" (King, 2018, p. 13).

This sentence is another example, here the speaker apologizes, although it is not his fault.

"Do you want my help with the birthday party? – Sure, that would be great."

In this example, the hearer accepts the speaker's offer, and the speaker can now potentially feel obligated by the promise.

A threat to the listener's positive face can be manifested in accidental or intentional mistakes when using forms of status designations or certain slang that indicates group affiliation. It is necessary to be aware of one's social position and the position of the listener.

"Open ears, buddy, open ears." (King, 2018, p. 28).

In this example, face threat does not arise due to the equal status of the interlocutors. Or using "madam" instead of "miss" when addressing a young woman can be offensive.

The manifestation of a threat to the negative face of the listener can be seen in the following example:

"Your wife is so beautiful and talented, I wish I had someone like her."

In this case, a compliment can cause anxiety in the listener, because the impression is made that the speaker is jealous of him.

"I advise you to visit a doctor, this doesn't look right."

Advice puts pressure on the listener.

First of all, it is necessary to separate positive and negative politeness, then understand which of them is acceptable depending on the situation. The first is used to increase the interlocutor's interest, show importance and respect. While the other distances the interlocutor without expressing disrespect and offense.

CONCLUSIONS

The category of politeness plays an important role in the construction and regulation of interpersonal communication, which is one of the most important spheres of an individual's activity. The functioning of communicative politeness is the subject of study in such a direction in linguistics as pragmalinguistics. To this day, scientists do not have a unified vision regarding the interpretation of the politeness category. In research, it is presented as a social norm, maxims of communication, protection of "face", compliance with the communication contract. In particular, the works of P. Brown and S. Levinson are of key importance for our research.

Strategies of positive politeness are manifested in demonstrating attention and interest in the interlocutor, striving for mutual understanding and harmony with him, taking into account his wishes and inclinations. Under negative politeness is the fear of appearing intrusive, harming the addressee, lack of emotions, restraint.

In the second chapter, we investigated the implementation of positive and negative politeness strategies based on modern literature and found out that expressing compliments, showing interest in the addressee's needs, emotionality and expressiveness of speech are the most characteristic means of demonstrating positive politeness.

The use of negative politeness helps reduce communicative pressure on the interlocutor, avoid conflicts, and prevent communicative failures. The speaker resorts to various tactics, for example, the use of means of softening the categorical nature of the statement (modal phrases, participative questions, adverbs, modal verbs, particles, turns of phrase). For the negative strategy of politeness, characteristic signs are increased self-blame, minimization of intrusion, expression of polite pessimism, etc.

Thus, politeness involves the use of certain strategies that ensure effective communication. Yes, positive politeness is aimed at reducing the communicative distance, achieving mutual understanding. In turn, the use of the negative politeness

strategy emphasizes the speaker's desire to socially distance himself from the interlocutor.

The study of politeness has further prospects for development, since the modern world cannot exist without communication and politeness is an important component of the success of any conversation. The search for correct polite communication strategies is an important area of research that allows identifying and teaching politeness strategies for successful communication.

RESUME

Курсова робота на тему: «Теорія ввічливості в сучасній лінгвістиці: позитивна та негативна ввічливість»

Виконана ……

Курсова робота складається зі вступу, двох розділів, висновку, резюме та списку використаних джерел. У першому розділі досліджено ввічливість як комунікативну категорію та охарактеризовано теорії ввічливості в лінгвістичних дослідженнях. У другому розділі описано теорію та стратегії ввічливості Браун-Левінсона, а також проаналізовані стратегії позитивної та негативної ввічливості на основі сучасної літератури. Зрештою, ця курсова робота мала на меті продемонструвати як пошук стратегій ввічливості впливає на успішність будь-якої бесіди.

У цій курсовій роботі:

сторінок – 30;

використаних джерел – 18.

LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS

1. Бацевич, Ф. С. (2010). Нариси з лінгвістичної прагматики : монографія. Львів : ПАІС. 336 с.

2. Болотнікова, А. П. (2017). Увічливість як національно-культурна категорія. *Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В. Н. Каразіна, 77*, 63-68.

3. Дзюбак, Н. М. (2015). Аспекти дослідження категорії ввічливості в сучасному мовознавстві. *Науковий часопис Національного педагогічного університету імені М. П. Драгоманова, 12*, 111-114.

4. Журавльова, Н. М. (2012). Поетика української епістолярної ввічливості ХІХ –початку ХХ століття. Запоріжжя : Запорізький національний університет. 548 с.

5. Словник української мови в 11 томах. Академічний тлумачний словник (1970–1980). URL: http://sum.in.ua.

6. Arndt, H., Janney, R. (1992). Intracultural tact versus intercultural tact. Politeness in Language : Studies in its History, Theory and Practice / [ed. by R. Watts, S. Ide, K. Ehlich]. Berlin, New York : Mouton de Gruyter. 21– 42.

7. Brown, P., Levinson, S. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use. London, New York, etc. : CUP. 345 p.

8. Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on Politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics, 14*, 219–236.

9. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and Conversation. *Syntax and Semantics, 3*, Speech Acts / [ed. by Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan]. New York : Academic Press. 41–58.

10. Holtgraves, T. (2017). Politeness. Ball State University. 31 p.

11. Hymes, D. H. (1986). Discourse : Scope without Depth. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 57*, 49–89.

12. King, S. (2018). The Outsider: A Novel. 576 p.

13. King, S. (2012). 11.22.63. 753 p.

14. Lakoff, R. T. (1973). The Logic of Politeness, or : Minding your P's and Q's. *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago. 292–305.

15. Leech, G. (1983). Principles of Pragmatics. London, New York : Routledge. 250 p.

16. Rajend Mesthrie, Asher, R. E. (2001). Concise encyclopedia of sociolinguistics. Amsterdam; New York: Elsevier. 188-192.

17. Reprint of first chapter of (1987) Politeness: Some universals in language usage. London : Routledge, 2009-01-01. 313-316.

18. Watts, R. (2003). Politeness. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. 318 p.