ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889,
2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-5

# Pragmatics and Politeness Strategies in English Communication

**Shukurullayeva Hulkaroy Vohid qizi**
Student, Chirchik State Pedagogical University
Scientific adviser: **Eshonqulova Sarvinoz Yashinovna**, teacher CHSPU

**Abstract:** Pragmatics, the study of language in context, is essential for understanding the nuanced use of English in communication. This article examines how politeness strategies, as a core aspect of pragmatics, function in English interactions. Drawing on Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory, the article explores how speakers manage face-threatening acts (FTAs) through linguistic choices such as indirectness, hedging, and honorifics. A qualitative study involving native and non-native English speakers was conducted to investigate the use of politeness strategies in requests, apologies, and disagreements. Findings show that cultural and contextual factors significantly influence the selection of strategies, underscoring the importance of pragmatic competence in achieving effective and respectful communication.
**Keywords:** Pragmatics, politeness theory, English communication, speech acts, face-saving strategies, indirectness, intercultural communication, sociolinguistics, conversational implicature

**Introduction:** Language is more than a system of grammar and vocabulary; it is a social tool used to negotiate relationships, express attitudes, and manage interpersonal dynamics. In English communication, the use of politeness strategies is a key pragmatic function that helps maintain social harmony and mitigate potential conflicts.

Pragmatics focuses on how meaning is constructed and interpreted in context, including the speaker's intention, the listener's inference, and the situational factors involved. Politeness strategies are among the most researched topics in pragmatics, as they reveal how people use language to show respect, avoid offense, and navigate power relationships. This article explores how politeness operates in English, reviewing relevant literature and presenting findings from a small-scale study on how different speakers employ these strategies in real-life interactions.

## Literature Review

**Pragmatics and Its Scope:** Pragmatics, as defined by Levinson (1983), is the study of the relation between language and context. It involves various aspects such as speech acts, deixis, presupposition, implicature, and politeness. Pragmatic competence—the ability to use and interpret language appropriately in social contexts—is essential for effective communication, especially in multicultural settings where norms may differ.

**Speech Acts and Politeness:** Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) introduced speech act theory, which categorizes utterances based on their function (e.g., requesting, apologizing, promising). These acts often involve face-threatening situations, as described in Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory. According to their model, people employ positive and negative politeness strategies to address others' face wants—desires for approval and autonomy, respectively.

**Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory:** Brown and Levinson proposed four main strategies to deal with FTAs:

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889,
2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024



• Bald on-record: Direct and clear (e.g., "Close the window.")
• Positive politeness: Shows solidarity and friendliness (e.g., "Could you help me out, buddy?")
• Negative politeness: Respectful and indirect (e.g., "Would you mind closing the window?")
• Off-record: Highly indirect, implying rather than stating (e.g., "It's a bit cold in here.")
These strategies are influenced by the context, including power relations (P), social distance (D), and the imposition of the act (R).

**Cultural and Contextual Influences:** Politeness norms vary across cultures. In English-speaking societies, especially Western contexts, indirectness is often associated with politeness. However, in some cultures, directness may be seen as a sign of honesty. Thomas (1995) emphasized the risk of "pragmatic failure" in intercultural communication, where misinterpreting politeness norms can lead to misunderstandings or offense.

**Methodology:** This study aimed to explore how politeness strategies are used in English communication among speakers from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. It focused on speech acts such as requests, apologies, and expressions of disagreement.

**Participants:** Fifteen participants (eight native speakers and seven non-native speakers of English) aged 20–45 were selected through purposive sampling. They came from various professional and academic settings and represented different first-language backgrounds (e.g., Chinese, Arabic, Spanish, and Russian).

**Data Collection:** Data were collected through semi-structured interviews and role-play scenarios. Participants were asked to respond to hypothetical social situations requiring polite language. Scenarios included asking for a favor, declining an invitation, and correcting someone's mistake.

**Data Analysis:** Responses were transcribed and categorized based on Brown and Levinson's framework. The frequency and types of strategies used were analyzed, and qualitative comments were examined to explore participants' reasoning and attitudes toward politeness.

**Results and Discussion**

**Use of Politeness Strategies:** Both native and non-native speakers employed a range of politeness strategies, but with notable differences in frequency and preference. Native speakers tended to favor indirectness and hedging, particularly in negative politeness (e.g., "I was wondering if you could…"). Non-native speakers, depending on their L1 norms, sometimes opted for more direct forms that might seem abrupt in English (e.g., "Give me your notes." instead of "Could I borrow your notes?").

**Influence of Cultural Background:** Participants from collectivist cultures (e.g., China, Arab countries) showed a higher tendency toward positive politeness, using phrases that emphasized group identity or mutual benefit. Conversely, participants from individualistic cultures leaned toward negative politeness to respect autonomy.
One participant commented: "In my culture, it's rude to say 'no' directly, so I usually give a soft excuse. But in English, I'm still learning how to say it politely without sounding dishonest."

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889,
2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-5

This illustrates how pragmatic transfer—applying L1 norms to L2—can cause communication challenges.

**Face Management in Apologies and Disagreements:** Apologies involved elaborate negative politeness strategies, including hedges and expressions of regret (e.g., "I'm terribly sorry for the inconvenience"). Disagreements were often mitigated by markers like "I see your point, but…" or "I'm not sure I agree entirely."

Native speakers were generally more comfortable using off-record strategies, relying on context and tone. Non-native speakers sometimes misjudged the strength of indirectness, either being too vague or unintentionally blunt.

**Pragmatic Competence and Language Proficiency:** The study showed that higher linguistic proficiency did not always correlate with pragmatic competence. Some advanced L2 speakers still struggled with polite forms or cultural appropriateness. This supports Kasper and Blum-Kulka's (1993) argument that pragmatic competence is a separate dimension that must be explicitly taught.

**Conclusion:** Politeness strategies are an essential part of pragmatic competence in English communication. This study confirms that speakers rely on various strategies to navigate face-threatening acts and that these strategies are influenced by linguistic background, culture, and context. Misuse or misunderstanding of politeness can lead to pragmatic failure and hinder effective communication.

Language educators should integrate pragmatic awareness and cross-cultural training into curricula, helping learners recognize and appropriately use politeness strategies. Future research should expand to different speech communities and explore digital communication, where politeness norms are rapidly evolving.

**References:**

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). How to Do Things with Words. Oxford University Press.
2. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987).
Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge University Press.
3. Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (Eds.). (1993). Interlanguage Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.
4. Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.
5. Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge University Press.
6. Thomas, J. (1995). Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics. Longman.
7. Holmes, J. (2013). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (4th ed.). Routledge.
8. Spencer-Oatey, H. (2008). Culturally Speaking: Culture, Communication and Politeness Theory. Continuum.
9. LoCastro, V. (2012). Pragmatics for Language Educators: A Sociolinguistic Perspective. Routledge.