

POLITENESS AND GENDER

Myroslava Fabian

Uzhhorod National University

Introduction. Over decades people have been arguing about different language usage and comprehension between men and women. One of the main disputable issues in the study of sex differences in language use has been found in the area of linguistic politeness. Research on politeness matters in an attempt to reveal the systematization of interaction through the formulation of rules, has focused on the exploration of "politeness" with regard to others. Politeness is a central concept in linguistic pragmatics and it is one of the most relevant aspects of human communication. Politeness does not only involve linguistic realizations, but also "the broad communicative spectrum including paralinguistic and kinetic detail" [2, p.58].

Objectives. So, first of all let's define what "politeness" and "gender" mean. R. Lakoff, who is considered "the mother of modern politeness theory" defines politeness as "a system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by minimizing the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange" [12, p.34]. R. Watts identifies politeness as linguistic behaviour which is perceived to be beyond what is expectable. It is viewed as "explicitly marked, conventionally interpretable subset of "politic behavior" responsible for the smooth functioning of socio-communicative interaction and the consequent production of well-formed discourse within open social groups characterized by elaborated speech codes" [19, p.136]. Politeness is the key to all of our relationships and it plays a fundamental part in the way we interact and communicate with each other. As D. Kadar puts it, politeness "is not limited only to conventional aspects of linguistic etiquette, but encompasses all types of interpersonal behavior through which we explore and maintain our relationships" [10, p.13].

J. Holmes goes further and defines politeness as a term which is used to refer to behavior actively expressing positive concern for others, as well as non-imposing distance behavior [6]. There are two distinctive types of politeness: positive and negative. The former is based on the notion that the addresser pays respect to the addressee's face, whereas the latter is based on avoidance, ultimately having non-interference with the addressee's freedom of action. Politeness can be shown and expressed in a variety of ways: linguistically (concerned with verbal communication) and non-linguistically (concerned with non-verbal communication).

Speaking of gender, it is usually described simply as being either male or female. Unlike identity, gender role is defined as "the outward manifestations of personality that reflect the gender identity... and is manifested within society by observable factors such as behavior and appearance" [8, p.318]. Gender appears to be explained as an unwritten

set of appropriate rules for male and female behaviour with relation to certain society and culture. People are taught how to behave since childhood with the help of surroundings such as family, school, media, etc. Generally speaking, females are stereotypically considered to be emotional, gentle and nurturing whereas males are seen as aggressive, strong and rational. J. Holmes characterizes women's speech as being more polite than men's [6].

Significance. The relation between gender and language has been the interest of many sociolinguists since the 2nd half of the last century, and is still ongoing, with new approaches and research. The main topic here is the connection between the ways of using particular languages and the social roles of men and women who speak these languages. Such considerations about language and sex differences according to which women are more likely than men to express positive politeness and to use mitigating strategies to avoid or minimize threatening their interlocutors' face can be found in many publications on the topic in question. Thus, women tend to interrupt less in conversation and be more attentive listeners than men. Although this claim has been scientifically proven to be true in most contexts, sex differences and politeness research is a complicated issue that varies with culture and many other factors like discourse topic, class, power, relation, personality, educational and societal status, age, etc.

Discussion. Many publications on gender and politeness prove that in general women are more polite than men. In this respect much emphasis is put on the differences between men's and women's language use: "Most women enjoy talk and regard talking as an important means of keeping in touch, especially with friends and intimates. They use language to establish, nurture and develop personal relationships. Men tend to use language more as a tool for obtaining and conveying information" [7, p.37]. Furthermore, J. Holmes bases her research on Brown and Levinson's idea of positive and negative face. She says that women use more positively orientated politeness and men use more negatively orientated politeness, and suggests that the reason for this is that women and men have different perceptions of what language is used for:

- Men use language as a tool to give and obtain information (also referred to as the referential function of language). Women use language as a means of keeping in touch (also known as the social function of language).

As politeness is included into the social function of language, it seems that women are more polite than men. J. Holmes uses 2 speech acts within politeness to re-enforce her ideas:

- Compliments
- Apologies.

Women pay and receive more compliments, and regard them as positive and affective politeness devices.

Men tend to consider compliments as less positive than women do, and often see them as face threatening or at least not as unambiguous in intentions.

J. Holmes suggests that the discrepancies in male to male and female to female complimentary language may be due to differences in perception concerning the

purpose of compliments. The hypothesis is that women use compliments to build connections, while men use them to make evaluative judgments. There is certainly plenty of evidence as to differences between women and men in the area of language. It is well established, for example, that girls are verbally more intelligent than boys. Over many years, women have demonstrated an advantage over men in tests of fluency, speaking, sentence complexity, analogy, listening, comprehension of both written and spoken material, vocabulary, spelling. Men are more likely to stutter and have reading disabilities as well as to suffer speech disorders. D. Napoli is of the opinion that men interrupt women more than vice versa; ignore the topics that women initiate in conversation; do not give verbal recognition of the contributions women make to standard forms (such as "ain't") than women, but men are innovative, accepting language changes more readily than women [15, p. 138]. Such statements, however, often lack support by reliable researches on speakers' characteristics and social as well as cultural background. D. Tannen discusses that due to the fact that males speak a language of status and independence whereas females focus on connection and intimacy, their communication is cross-culturally similar and thus, it is not easy. She presumes that the appropriate way to get on well with other gender members is to have an understanding of their activities, attitudes and language behavior [18, p.34]. Furthermore, females, unlike males, use more colorful vocabulary, for e.g. names of colors such as mauve, aquamarine, magenta, lavender, as well as empty adjectives like sweet, adorable, charming, divine, etc.[11, p. 318-319].

R. Lakoff in her book "Language and Women's Place" studies various aspects of women's speech including hedges, empty adjectives and tag questions, among others, and the way women are socially constructed to speak the way they do. She claims that young girls are taught to speak and act like ladies, and are ostracized if they do not [11, p. 40]. Boys are not treated so harshly and are not discouraged from using "rough talk", as this behavior is socially acceptable from a boy rather than from a girl. This socialization process often leads to men and women speaking what is called "men's talk" and "women's talk".

M. Montgomery also makes claims about differences concerning politeness and gender. In Montgomery's study of multiple modals in the "Linguistic Atlas of the Gulf States", he stated that the sex of the interviewer is the single most important factor contributing to the occurrence of multiple modals [14]. The study involved men and women of different races, ages, social status and genders being interviewed to assess the frequency of their multiple modal uses. The frequency of multiple modal uses was found to be twice that of men than of female interviewers, irrespective of location or any social categories. On the basis of this finding, Montgomery argues that both men and women are more sensitive to the face of a woman they are speaking with than to that of a man. In other words, they are more polite to women. Montgomery goes on to say that if the sex of the interviewer is the social variable that correlates most strongly and consistently with multiple modal use, this indicates that speakers, more than anything about who they are themselves, are aware of their interlocutor and make

linguistic adjustments based on who that person is. This finding by M. Montgomery provides evidence of the role of politeness across geographical and social differences and agrees with the stereotype concerning manners and politeness towards women in the South of the United States. Within the Latin American context, P. Brown and M. Cordella investigated gender and politeness in Mexico and Chile [3; 4]. P. Brown focused on interactional details of a court case in the Mexican community of Tenejapa and compared them with the characteristics of social interaction typical of that society. It was found out that the particular context of the courtroom allowed direct face-to-face confrontation not acceptable in other situations of the same society and transformed gender meanings.

Few researches have been carried out on gender and politeness in the Japanese linguistic studies. For instance, S. Ide [8] investigated the phenomenon of polite speech among Japanese women and men. The study was based on a survey of 256 male and 271 female college students of middle class parents in Tokyo. It was found out that gender differences in language are the result of the duplex indexing functions of deference and demeanour - two types of behavior characterizing politeness in this context. Also in Japan, J. Smith [17] examined the linguistic practices of Japanese men and women giving directions, and explained gender differences in terms of a general theory of politeness as well as the culturally specific strategies for encoding politeness and authority in Japanese speech. In a more recent study, J. Saito [16] particularly explored seven Japanese male workplace superiors' linguistic practices of directive speech acts usage. The findings revealed that the gender of the speaker, in addition to various contextual factors, plays a significant role in the choice of the directive form chosen, and that actual practice is not always consistent with gender stereotypes. J. Pilkington [as cit.in7] investigated the pattern of politeness strategies in women's and men's groups working in the bakery in New Zealand. She collected her data by recording the interactions between a group of women and a group of men, and found out that women are likely to agree or at least respond to the assessment of their interlocutors, unlike the men. The study concluded that New Zealand women tend to use positive politeness frequently, while men most frequently use bald on-record politeness. It is worth mentioning that the differences in language use by gender have been discussed and researched in a lot of studies on various sociolinguistic issues. In addition to previous above-mentioned findings, S. Mills, by analysing various types of data (interviews, questionnaires, audio- recordings of conversations and anecdotes) discussed stereotypes of gender and politeness [13]. She points out that politeness is often considered to be a woman's concern. Thus, women's linguistic behavior is often characterized as being concerned with co-operation (more positively polite than the men's) and the avoidance of conflict (more negatively polite than the men's). It happens because there is an assumption that women are powerless. Furthermore, women may show their powerlessness in language, thereby, this situation marks their subordination.

We suggest that women are more likely to use positive politeness than men. For women, being positively polite means being friendly, cooperative, and supportive, agreeing and encouraging with others. In addition, if women are found to disagree, they

tend to soften their disagreeing utterances and modify them more often than men do. Women's speech is expected to be less aggressive, less innovative and more conversational. Level of education appears to be of much importance, and women's talk is usually associated with home and domestic activities, while men's – with the outside world and business activities. In recent years women began to think in rather different ways, enabling their children to grow socially and linguistically. Moreover, women speak nicely to have the chance to get better and well-paid jobs which depends on communication abilities rather than on strength.

Conclusion and research perspectives. When analysing politeness as well as impoliteness in relation to gender, it is not enough to simply analyse males' and females' use of seemingly self-evidently politeness strategies within particular interactions. What must be focused on is the gendered domains of speech acts like politeness and the perceived norms of the community in practice. Of primary importance here is the way individuals come to a judgment of an utterance or series of utterances as polite or impolite, and the way this judgment is not a once and for all act, but it is something which takes up a great deal of interactional work with others. Furthermore, the power of feminine and masculine strategies of speech must also be considered in relation to what is achieved in the long term within the interaction. It can also enable us to observe how the individuals perform their gendered identities in various ways within different communities.

References

1. Bailey G. and Tillery J. The Routledge Effect: the impact on interviews on survey results in linguistics // *American Speech*, vol 78, No. 4.-1999.- P.389-402.
2. Brown P. and Levinson B. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.*- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.-230p.
3. Brown P. Gender, Politeness and Confrontation in Tenejapa.- *Discourse Process*, 13 (1), 1990.-P.123-141.
4. Cordella M. Spanish Speakers Apologizing in English: A cross-cultural pragmatic study // *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 14 (12), 1991.- P.115- 138.
5. Eelen G. *A Critique of Politeness Theories.* - Manchester: St. Jerome, 2001.-138p.
6. Holmes J. *Women, Men and Politeness.* London: Longman, 1995.-318p.
7. Holmes J. *Women Talk Too Much.*- London: Penguin Books, 1998.- 213p.
8. Ide S. Gender and Function of Language Use: Quantitative and Qualitative Evidence from Japanese // *Pragmatics and Language Learning*, 3, 1993.- P.117-129.
9. Jordan K. Gender Role. *Encyclopedia of women's health.*-New York: Springer US, 2004.-522p.
10. Kadar D. *Understanding Politeness* // Kadar D., Haugh M.-Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.-308p.
11. Lakoff R. *Language and Woman's Place.*-New York: Harper&Row, 1975.-322p.
12. Lakoff R. *The Limits of Politeness*// *Multilingua* 8, 1990.-P.101-129.
13. Mills S. *Gender and Politeness.*- Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.-314p.

14. Montgomery M. Multiple Modals in LAGS and LAMSAS // From the Gulf States and beyond: the legacy of Lee Peterson and LJAGS.- Montgomery and Nunnally (Eds.). Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama, 1998.- P. 90-122.
15. Napoli D. Language Matters: A guide to everyday questions about language.- New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.-417p.
16. Saito J. Gender and Linguistic Ideology: A re-examination of directive usage by Japanese male superiors in the workplace. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).- University of Hawai'i at Manoa, USA, 2010.
17. Smith J. Women in charge: Politeness and directives in the speech of Japanese women// Language in Society, 21 (1), 1992.- P.59-82.
18. Tannen D. You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation.- New York: William Morrow, 1995.-342p.
19. Watts R. Relevance and Relational Work: Linguistic politeness as linguistic behaviour // Multilingua, 8/2-3, 1989.- P.131-166.

Резюме

Стаття торкається однієї з найактуальніших проблем сучасного мовознавства – поняття гендера в мові та особливостей його прояву. Розкриття специфіки вираження ввічливості в мові чоловіків та жінок відбувається шляхом виділення найсуттєвіших характеристик їхнього повсякденного мовлення та впливу різноманітних екстралінгвальних чинників. Значна увага приділяється теоретичним аспектам дослідження ввічливості в контексті її гендерного застосування.

УДК 811.124 ' 373

**ДО ПРОБЛЕМИ СПЕЦИФІКИ ЛЕКСИКИ НОВОЛАТИНСЬКОЇ МОВИ
(на матеріалі II–IV томів праці М. Лучкая "Historia Carpatho-Ruthenorum")**

Барбіл О. В.

ДВНЗ «Ужгородський національний університет»

Постановка проблеми та її визначення. Оскільки у XVII – XVIII ст. під впливом європейських традицій латинська мова проникла майже в усі сфери життя, то кількість писаних нею пам'яток в Україні велика. У Закарпатті теж є багато латиномовних текстів, які дотепер не привернули належної уваги дослідників.