A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF POLITENESS STRATEGIES AND SPEECH ACTS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

https://doi.org/10.70728/phil.v05.i04.073

Otaboyeva Mazmuna Rakhimovna
ORCID: 0009-0004-5445-3782
mazmuna.rahimovna@gmail.com
Rustamova Mohinabonu Sherzod qizi
mohinabonurustamova2007@gmail.com
Kokand State University

Abstract: Language is not only a system that embraces grammar and vocabulary; it is a sophisticated realm that embraces patterns of human interaction. As an exemplary, a pragmatic perspective not only focuses on what is said but also how it is expressed or conveyed within a particular situation or context. In recent years the emphasis and investigations towards politeness strategies have been reached into its zenith. Admittedly, politeness is a central aspect of communication, reflecting social norms, cultural values and interpersonal relationships. In this paper research work I will try to elucidate the politeness strategies and speech acts in diverse circumstances in Uzbek and English discourse.

Keywords: politeness strategies, discourse, pragmatic perspective, speech acts, interpersonal relationships

INTRODUCTION

The main components of the pragmatic competence is politeness, which serves as a mechanism for balancing social distance and relationships. To put it succinctly, politeness strategies urge people to regulate harmony, diminish social harmony as a dichotomy they are expressed in order to express respect, navigate stark differences in power, rank and status. According to our theme speech acts, which refer to requesting, apologizing, complimenting and criticizing among social interactions or contexts.

Also throughout recent years the realization of politeness strategies or speech acts are quite prevalent and deeply influenced and assimilated by cultural norms and values, different languages encode different ways and they reflect distinct social structures and cultural complexations. When it comes to comparative analysis of English and Uzbek involves invaluable insights that they opine some interesting frameworks that shape communicative behavior.

First and foremost, we will analyze English language contexts that are associated with individualistic cultural norms, that they have some partiality to emphasize

(cc) BY

personal sentiments, indirectness and the mitigation of compelling circumstances. As a logical corollary, speakers frequently tend to rely on minimizing some risks by adding modal verbs, hedging expressions and indirect additives that embrace politeness traits. Paradoxically, Uzbek reflects a conventional, social structure, where respect, age and some kinds of rituals are hugely taken into account. As it is widely circulated through honorifics, respectful pronouns and culturally embedded norms.

The most indispensable aim of this research work is to conduct a comparative analysis of politeness strategies and speech acts in two different languages: English and Uzbek. The article addresses the following questions:

How are politeness strategies are realized in Uzbek and English with real exemplifications?

What linguistic mechanisms are used to perform key speech acts?

How do cultural values influence and shape such kind of strategies?

Why we are dedicating all of our effort towards exploring such kind of studies, that are some logical reasons, that the significance lies in its contribution to intercultural pragmatics as comprehending and understanding fully these differences for developing effective communicative competence that eliminates several misapprehensions that may appear during cross-cultural communication.

LITERATURE REVIEW

As it is previously stated, the study of politeness strategies and speech acts have been severely searched in the realm of pragmatics. One of the most influential theory in politeness strategies sphere is the face theory is the individuals' self-realization theory and self-image. Based on the studies that has been conducted reveal that face consists of two dimensions: positive face (the willing to be appreciated) and negative face (the desire for autonomy). Politeness strategies especially in today's globalized world are substantially romanticized that they have a strong opportunity to minimize face-threatening acts.

Regarding to some of the scholars' research works like Brown and Levinson politeness strategies are generally categorized into positive politeness and negative politeness and indirect (off-record) strategies. These categories are highly useful because they provide significant skills that maintain interpersonal relationships in communication.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a qualitative research approach based on discourse analysis and comparative methodology. The research focuses on analyzing examples of politeness strategies and speech acts in English and Uzbek.

The data consists of naturally occurring expressions, including requests, apologies, compliments, and forms of address. These examples are selected from everyday communication contexts.

(cc) BY

Speech act theory, originally developed and founded by Austin (1962) and later refined by Searle (1969), sustains a foundation and the core of language functions and pragmatics. Debriefing more clearly about this theory, utterances perform actions such as promising, reflecting and informing. Due to these factors Searle classifies speech acts into various categories:

Representatives (statements of fact or belief)

Directives (attempts to get the listener to do something)

Commissives (commitments to future action)

Expressives (expressions of feelings and attitudes)

Declarations (utterances that change reality)

It is inevitably claimed that there are millions of nations all over the world and throughout different states and circumstances they tend to bond each other, respectively following some rules like taking cross-cultural differences into account that signify cultural differences influence the language use. Pragma linguistic scholars such as Leech (1983) and Thomas (1983) emphasize that pragmatic cognitive knowledge and competence involves not only being aware of linguistic formulas or forms, but also several cultural limitations are severely paramount.

In case we rely heavily on English cultural norms, English is often associated with low-context, individualistic cultures, where communication is accurately understandable towards person's autonomy. Conversely, in some Uzbek contexts politeness is assigned with conventional respectful forms. In the following paragraphs we try to highlight some of the expressions to symbolize politeness among people.

Furhermore some differences and divergences may be detected in the realization of specific speech acts. In English, apologies are typically explicit and self-oriented, often including intensifiers (really, sincerely) and personal responsibility ("I'm terribly sorry for the inconvenience"). Uzbek apologies, however, tend to emphasize modesty and relational harmony. Speakers may downplay their actions and include conditional expressions ("Agar xato qilgan bo'lsam..."), which soften the admission of fault and reflect humility.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As a same token as at the same time, complimenting behavoir differs thoroughly. English speakers usually accept compliments directly with expressions like "Thank you", which reinforces positive face. Uzbek speakers, on the other hand, often reject or downplay compliments ("Yo'q, unchalik emas"), which reflects cultural norms of care and humility. This difference can sometimes lead to pragmatic misunderstanding in intercultural communication, where an English speaker may perceive such responses as lack of confidence, while in Uzbek culture they are considered polite.

Research has been arranged confess that, English politeness highlights the importance of indirectness and mitigation. Holmes (1995) admits that English speakers

(cc) BY

have some hedging devices as “perhaps”, “maybe”, “a bit” to mitigate statements and in order to signify the real meaning without any inaccuracies.

As a paradigm: “Maybe you could recapitulate the progress test”.

“I think it might be better to change this”.

Such kind of vivid and softening expressions reduce some riots and tensions the force of the utterance and help to maintain social courteousness.

Furhermore, when it comes to studies on Uzbek pragmatics indicate that Uzbek speakers have a huge partiality towards morphological markers, respectful pronouns.

Misol uchun:”Siz bizga shuni ko‘tarishib yubora olasizmi?” “Could you please assist us in lifting this?”

“Sen yordam berib yubora olasanmi?” “Could you please help?”

As we can realize the main differences although they may seem subtle, the usage of siz instead of sen emphasized respect and urges people to mindfulness, while people encounter any strangers if they want to request any question, it is much more appropriate to utilize suffixes and verb forms contribute to the expression of politeness.

In the realm of pragmatic and cultural depth they have a function that are ascribed as powerful pragmalinguistic tools that have some abilities to encode social relationships, cultural expectations. A closer and more explicit investigations reveal that English address forms which are largely shaped by egalitarian values. The prevailing circulation of first names even in semi-formal contexts reduce the misconceptions:

“Emily, could you review this report?”

“Hi, John I just wanted to ask some misunderstandings about the meaning?”

Most commonly in formal and semi-formal settings such as workplaces, switching quickly to the titles like first names is widespread, signaling openness and approachability.

Strategically, the usage of titles are on this trendy mode:

“Good afternoon, Professor Smith”.

“Excuse me, Dr. Brown, could you spare your little time to solve this matter?”

These examples exert that English politeness strategies are neutral and it suits with the contextual formality.

On the versus, Uzbek forms are deeply derived as they are rooted in respect, cultural conventions and social hierarchy. They are extended beyond family relationships and are widely applied with social interactions:

"Assalomu alaykum, ustoz"

"Xayrli kun, opa, yaxshimisiz?"

"Aka, menga yordam berib yubora olasizmi?"

Such kinds of social expressions are highly recommended to use in order to socialize people who have older age and social status.

(cc) BY

More interestingly, Uzbek residers surpass not to use people's direction names, preferring universal and rational names instead. This kinds of situations confess that Uzbek speakers prefer overviewing rather than individualism.

Therefore, there are softening mechanisms that encompass etiquette expressions that play a central role in mitigating the risks and provides with moral insights.

In English "please" is highly conventionalized to signify the meaning:

"Please, send me the revised version"

"Could you possibly check my assignment, please "

Without using the softening expression "please" our request may be sounded as imperative and too direct.

In Uzbek contexts the parallel version of please "iltimos" is used by following grammatical utterances:

"Iltimos, bu masalani tushuntirib bera olasizmi?"

"Iltimos, biroz kuting"

Additionally,instead of iltimos Uzbek speakers use some verb softening forms:

"Iltimos, bu hujjatni kòrib bera olasizmi?", "Bu masalani hal qilishga yordam berib yubora olasizmi?".

There is something that I must stress very heavily is that balancing the harmony between cultures and nations apologies are explicit, direct and self-oriented:

"I'm really sorry for this messy unexpextation".

"I sincerely apologize for my mistake".

"I didn't mean to interrupt you".

In Uzbek such kind of apologies are more closely tied to transparency and humility:

"Kechirasiz, bezovta qildim".

"Uzr, tushunmovchilik bòlibdi".

When socializing people what are senior citizens, speakers intensify politeness:

"Kechirasiz, ustoz xato qilibman".

Moreover, when Uzbek people want to admit their fault, they not only confess, but also they try to incorporate some relational balancing terms:

"Agar notòg'ri gapirib qòygan bòlsam, uzr sòrayman".

The most influential theory of politeness strategies is using compliments and criticism in our interactions. English tend to praise people directly, positive and without any hesitations:

"That is a brilliant idea".

"You look gorgeous today".

"Your presentation is bewitching".

Responses are equivalent to the feedbacks:

"Thank you, appreciate this".

(cc) BY

Criticism is, however, carefully mitigated, particularly with modal verbs:

" You might reconsider this part again".

"It could be enhanced by adding more details".

In Uzbek compliments we can acknowledge that they are highly modest and respective:

"Zòr chiqibdi, gap yòq".

"Judayam yaxshi qilibsiz".

Although the compliments are highly blissfula and agile, the responses downplay the praise:

"Yòq, unchalik emas".

"Shunchaki harakat qilib kòrdik".

Criticism in Uzbek language may be respectful by framing with positive additives:

"Yaxshi ishlabsiz, lekin yana ozgina qòshimchalar bilan boyitsangiz bòlardi".

"Balki boshqacha qilib kòrsakmikin".

CONCLUSION

Politeness strategies and speech acts in English and Uzbek differ significantly due to cultural values and social structures. English tends to emphasize indirectness and individual autonomy, while Uzbek focuses on respect, conventions, and social harmony. These differences highlight the importance of developing pragmatic and intercultural competence for effective communication.

References

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

2. Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words. Oxford University Press.

3. Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge University Press.

4. Leech, G. N. (1983). Principles of pragmatics. Longman.

5. Holmes, J. (1995). Women, men and politeness. Longman.

6. Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. Applied Linguistics, 4(2), 91-112.

7. Yusupov, O. (2012). Pragmatika asoslari. Fan nashriyoti.

8. Mahmudov, N. (2018). Nutq madaniyati va muloqot etikasi. O‘zbekiston nashriyoti.

9. Abdurahmonov, G. (2015). Tilshunoslik nazariyasi. Sharq nashriyoti.

10. Safarov, Sh. (2008). Pragmalingvistika. Fan nashriyoti.

11. Culpeper, J., & Haugh, M. (2020). Pragmatics and the English language. Palgrave Macmillan.

(cc) BY

12. Kádár, D. Z., & Haugh, M. (2021). Understanding politeness. Cambridge University Press.

13. Locher, M. A., & Watts, R. J. (2021). Politeness theory and relational work. Journal of Pragmatics, 175, 1-10.

14. Taguchi, N. (2020). The Routledge handbook of second language acquisition and pragmatics. Routledge.

15. Sifianou, M., & Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, P. (2022). Pragmatics and its interfaces. De Gruyter.

(cc) BY