

10.00.00 Philological sciences

10.00.00 Филологические науки

UDC 316.472.4:81'271.2

**Interpersonal Communication and its Peculiarities
in the lexico-Semantic Field of “Politeness”**

¹ Tatyana N. Maximenkova

² Elena N. Tsay

¹ Karaganda State University after E.A.Buketov, Kazakhstan
Mukanov street 1a, Karaganda city, Karagandinskaya Oblast, 100026
Postgraduate student
E-mail: tanyasapr@mail.ru

² Karaganda State University after E.A.Buketov, Kazakhstan
Mukanov street 1a, Karaganda city, Karagandinskaya Oblast, 100026
PhD (pedagogics), Assistant Professor
E-mail: lenagem60@mail.ru

Abstract. The article, basing on comparative approach, attempts to examine the politeness system of speech etiquette in Kazakh, Russian and English cultures. The article offers the results on social analysis of speech etiquette in the three languages. The analysis shows the differences and similarities of greeting, address and good-bye speech etiquette.

Keywords: Speech etiquette; Kazakh language; Russian language; English language; analysis; politeness; greeting etiquette; address etiquette; good-bye etiquette; differences; similarities.

Introduction. Interpersonal communication is an important source of research as it covers all aspects of culture etiquette and speech etiquette. Each culture has its own peculiarities one of which is communication style. Communicating to the representatives of different cultures may seem difficult. To be polite to a foreigner means to be aware the polite system of a foreign country, to know all possible ways of address, greeting and good-bye system.

Materials and Methods. The main number of the sources are the materials of dissertations and social analysis. Methods. The article uses comparative method, which supposes the study by the means of comparing two or more events, facts, subjects and etc.

Discussion. Sociocultural society arrangement and its dominant cultural values are the main aspects of culture. G. Hofstede, E. Hall, F. Kluckhohn, F. Strodtbeck, W. Gudykunst, H. Triandis and other researchers proved this fact in a forcible form. Sociocultural aspects are of system-defined importance. They penetrate all the culture, appear in our mind, in axiological system, in our mode of life, in language and communication. The misbalance of sociocultural relations reflects the misbalance of the politeness system, the peculiarities of national communicative styles and dominant communicative strategies. To possess cultural aspects is very important for communicating people as it helps to understand correctly and even foretell the communicative intention of the representatives of different linguacultures. Besides, to know these aspects helps to understand the peculiarities of interpersonal communication.

Communicative function of the culture is to share information, but normative function is also important. It reflects culture's responsibility for creating standards, norms and the code of behaviour. The requirements regulating behaviour are diverse in different countries. According to this principle cultures can be subdivided into cultures of intensive norm satiation and cultures of not intensive norm satiation [1], i.e. cultures differ due to the level of behaviour and communicative behaviour.

Being the most important element of speech etiquette, address is one of the main means created by language to serve and regulate human communication, i.e. it is directly connected both with history of the nation and with the changes of society life. That means that address usage is historically changeable and socially related. The following factors influence it:

- type of speech culture of native speakers,
- social and historical relation,
- type of relations in society, social roles of speakers [2].

Address functioning in the speech of the representatives of different speech cultures reflects features relevant to each culture.

To understand specific character of national speech culture and figure out features relevant to it one should compare different cultures. M.M. Bahtin wrote about this concluding that we search for different aspects of the culture, the aspects that it does not even possess, but a foreign culture does offering a diversity of new aspects [3].

Social structure of a society always determines the development of verbal politeness and, particularly, address etiquette, as it fully reflects and states the existing social and state differences. It is best of all seen in the notions of prestige, language style, distance, status and roles and also in the definition of sex, age and other sociolinguistic criteria. In general view the above components state social distance between the participants of communication [4].

Social relationships taking place during our communication are numerous and diverse, nevertheless in cross cultural communication we first of all should figure out such general aspects as across and down distances that characterize some concrete culture. Distance and power are two main factors which define social relations between the interlocutors. The following aspects are considered to be the most important structural characteristics of a culture; they define the majority of national and cultural peculiarities of communication and can be called the determinants of the communicative behaviour of nation.

Across distance shows the level of socio-psychological proximity between communicating people. It may modify. As a result, talkers' relations may have different distance status, from formal to private. In cross cultural aspect the above mentioned type of relations defines historically created distance proper to society which can exist more or less in different cultures. [5].

Down distance shows the rate of social inequality that apart talkers caused by the fact that one partner of communication is more powerful than another. As the distance mentioned above depends on hierarchy of the communicants and their status (age and/or social), it may be called status distance.

The rate of state inequality in different cultures is various: in Kazakh and Russian cultures it is higher than in English (to prove it is to state that Russian language has the pronouns ТЫ / ВЫ and address by name and patronymic name; in Eastern cultures it is higher than in Russian: here we see a bigger diversity of the second person pronouns. We see great respect to elder people, huge estimation of status and following the hierarchy. E.g. Kazakh language has four pronouns of second person which express different shades of relations. In Kazakhstan family members and relatives address each other only by hierarchy system, for example "elder sister", "elder sister's husband", "elder uncle's wife from mother's line", etc. To address using the name is possible only to somebody junior. This system makes it possible to characterize Kazakh culture as closed; it means that speech culture agent is concentrated mostly on relationship inside the society. That is a mere example of the way culture peculiarities affect communication and define its main features. This fact proves that the conditions of language functioning act as the factor forming language [6].

The differences in socio-cultural relations find the direct reflection in communication peculiarities. English style, for example, is characterized with symmetry of interrelations between the participants of communication, high level of informality surprising representatives of different cultures i.e. addressing using name and informal greeting seniors by juniors. It makes possible to define English communication style as person-oriented. In English culture personality is important, but not social status.

In Kazakh literature the main characteristic of the notion “politeness” is that it more often includes family members: mother, father, grandfather, grandmother, brother, sister, aunt and uncle. Kazakh people suppose it is important to be polite first of all with relatives and seniors.

Russian culture does not have autonomous sphere, which we see in English culture. For Russian national mind collectiveness is important.

Social language differentiation is the brightest form of correlation between language and society, influence of social factors on language system, reflection of social structure of a society in the language. Social conditionality of a language is shown in different forms, which include the fact that definite language means obtain the functions of social symbols of a speaker belonging to one or another social group. First of all it touches etiquette language units.

To view social differentiations of the three languages: Kazakh, Russian and English properly will be easier by the application of the results of etiquette analysis conducted by the PhD (philology) Savoyskaya N.P. where she observed the differences of greeting, address and good-bye speech etiquette.

The results of greeting etiquette material analysis showed the differences between the peculiarities of Kazakh, Russian and English greeting forms. Firstly, the number of Kazakh greetings prevails, secondly in Kazakh lingua-culture the criteria of using greeting formula on the base of social, age, sex peculiarities is dominant. In Russian lingua-culture they are of little importance. For English lingua-culture, which specifies on democratic relationships, greetings are not a characteristic. Thirdly, Kazakh language has a special suffix of polite form -СЫЗ/сіз; Russian language also has such a component -те, however besides the meaning of politeness it also gives the meaning of plurality. To percept the meaning correctly we need context. Modern English does not have such indicator [7].

The analysis of good-bye forms allows to figure out both similarities and differences of the above mentioned etiquette forms in the three languages. In all three languages good-bye system is not a multiword one. Despite the good-bye formula it includes a number of phrases expressing wish, gratitude, situation estimation, invitations, intension to continue communication and care of partner. In addition all three languages have tendency to reduce number of often used good-bye formulae. And eventually the fact that good-bye situations in the languages is more or less democratic. Despite the similarities a few differences were mentioned. First of all only Kazakh language has the suffix transferring the meaning of polite address -ЫҢЫЗ. Semantics of main good-bye formulae differs a lot (in Kazakh language it is wish of health, in Russian – meaning of splitting up till the next meeting and in English – semantic meaning is lost). And finally in English language, to compare with Russian and Kazakh, there is the lack of good-bye, usually said before the split up for a long time or forever [7].

According to comparative analysis of the three languages, the following differences of person address formulae took place. The first difference demonstrates that the situation of person address forms usage does not always coincide. The second one gives the possibility to conclude that in English common used neutral form of address is Mr/Mrs/Miss + lastname (name), while the address form of Kazakh and Russian languages corresponding to it is used quite seldom. The next difference is that in English communicative culture it is very important to stress the equality of partners in communication but in Kazakh and Russian ones status and age distances are pointed out. The terms of relationship in English communication are used only in the case of addressing relatives while Kazakh and Russian spheres give a wider field of their application. Short forms of the names are used more often in English and Russian languages though this process may have different reasons. And eventually English and Russian languages are characterized with a mere frequent application of affectionate diminutive suffixes than in (English: -ie, -y; Russian: -ечк, -очк, -усик, -юшк, -ушк). Modern Kazakh language has such suffixes but mainly they are borrowed from Russian [7].

The results of the analysis of the address forms to an unknown person let to conclude that they prevail in Kazakh and Russian languages to compare with English and the situations of their usage do not always coincide. For English language zero address forms to a stranger are typical while in Kazakh and Russian languages they are not frequently used. In Kazakh and Russian languages the address forms to a stranger transfer a group and family way of life but in English – personal. And the last difference is that in Kazakh language we may view a clear opposition of

polite and common address forms expressed with the lexical pronouns сіз 'вы' и сен 'ты' and grammatical flexions ыңыз/іңіз, ңыз/ңіз, сыз/сіз (the forms are known as Сыпайы түр/Жай түр Polite Form/Common Form). In Russian language the pronoun вы and flexion –те, have double meaning: the meaning of polite address and twenty-three addresses to different addressees. In modern English such an opposition does not exist (pronoun thou 'you' was out of its application in New English Period and has the only advantage in the poetry of that time [7].

To be polite may seem difficult in different cultures as every language has its own etiquette peculiarities, its own greeting, address and good-bye forms. Every language is a unique system that needs to be studied.

The three languages compared above have their own systems of being polite. The systems are very interesting and not homogeneous. To study the culture etiquette of the languages is to study culture of the language itself.

References:

1. Kravchenko A. I. Kulturologia: Ucheb. pos. dlya vuzov. 2 izd. M.: Akademicheskii Proekt, 2001. 384 s./ Кравченко А.И. Культурология: Учеб. пос. для вузов. 2-е изд. М.: Академический Проект, 2001. 384 с.
2. Aisakova Y.A. Socialnaya I sociokulturnaya differenciacia obrasheniya v sovremennoy russkoy yazyke: dis... kand. philol. nauk. Moskva, 2008. 200 s./ Айсакова Е. А. Социальная и социокультурная дифференциация обращений в современной русской языке: дис... канд. филол. наук. Москва, 2008. 200 с.
3. Bahtin N.B., Golovko Y.B. Sociolingvistiki I sociologiya yazyka: Uchebnoye posobie. Spb.: Gumanitarnaya Akademia, 2004. 336 s./ Бахтин Н.Б., Головкин Е.В. Социоллингвистики и социология языка: Учебное пособие. СПб.: Гуманитарная Академия, 2004. 336 с.
4. Karasik V.I. Zpsr socialnogo statusa. M.: ITDKG "Gnozis", 2002, 33 s./ Карасик В.И. Язык социального статуса. М.: ИТДГК «Гнозис», 2002. 33 с.
5. Larina T.V. Katigoria vzhlivosti v aspekte mezhkulturnoi kommunikaciy: Na materiale angliyskoy I russkoy kommunikativnyh kultur: diss. Na soiskanie uchenoy stepeni dok. philol. nauk. Moskva, 2003. 495 s./ Ларина Т. В. Категория вежливости в аспекте межкультурной коммуникации: На материале английской и русской коммуникативных культур: дисс. на соискание ученой степени док. филол. наук. Москва, 2003. 495 с.
6. Kolshanskiy G.V. Kommunikativnaya funkcia I struktura yazyka / Pod. red. T.V.Bulyginoy. 2 izd., stereotip. M.: URSS Editirial, 2007. 176 s./ Колшанский Г.В. Коммуникативная функция и структура языка / Под ред. Т. В. Булыгиной. 2-е изд., стереотип. М.: УРСС Эдиториал, 2007. 176 с.
7. Savoyskaya N.P. Lingvokulturologicheskie osobennosti koncepta "vezhlivost": avtofef. dis... kand. philolog. nauk. Tumen, 2005.-24 s./ Савойская Н.П. Лингвокультурологические особенности концепта «вежливость»: автореф. дис. ... канд. филолог. наук. Тюмень, 2005. 24 с.

УДК 316.472.4:81'271.2

Межличностная коммуникация и ее особенности в лексико-семантическом поле «вежливость»

¹ Татьяна Николаевна Максименкова

² Елена Николаевна Цай

¹ Карагандинский государственный университет им.Е.А.Букетова
100026, Карагандинская область, г.Караганда, ул.Муканова 1а
Магистрант
E-mail: tanyasapr@mail.ru

² Карагандинский государственный университет им.Е.А.Букетова
100026, Карагандинская область, г.Караганда, ул.Муканова 1а
Кандидат педагогических наук, доцент
E-mail: lenagem60@mail.ru

Аннотация. В статье на основе сравнительного метода сделана попытка рассмотреть систему речевого этикета в казахской, русской и английской литературах. В статье приводится социальный анализ речевого этикета трех языков. Анализ выявляет различия и сходства этикета приветствия, обращения и прощания.

Ключевые слова. Речевой этикет; казахский язык; русский язык; английский язык; анализ; вежливость; этикет приветствия; этикет обращения; этикет прощания; различия, сходства.