Materiallar to'plami · Conference Proceedings

TIL, TARJIMA VA TA'LIM: GLOBAL KOMMUNIKATSIYA VA RAQAMLI INNOVATSIYALAR DAVRIDA YANGI YONDASHUVLAR

03 October 2026

UDK 81

ZAMONAVIY LINGVISTIKA VA GLOBAL KOMMUNIKATSIYA

UNDERSTANDING FACE AND FACE MANAGEMENT IN COMMUNICATION

Muniskhon Mashrabovna Muslima*

Farg'ona davlat universiteti

✉ munnurmatova@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article examines the concept of face from a psycholinguistic perspective, with particular emphasis on its role in interpersonal communication and social interaction. Face is understood as a socially constructed and interactionally negotiated self-image that individuals seek to maintain, protect, and enhance in communicative encounters. The study considers how speakers' linguistic choices contribute to face management across different communicative and cultural contexts. Particular attention is given to politeness strategies, speech acts, pragmatic choices, and the cognitive and social factors underlying communicative behaviour. Drawing on major theoretical approaches to face and facework, the article explores the relationship between linguistic expression, pragmatic competence, social identity, and interpersonal relations. The analysis demonstrates that face management is a dynamic process shaped by speakers' communicative intentions, perceptions of social relationships, and culturally determined expectations. The study therefore highlights the importance of integrating psycholinguistic, pragmatic, and sociocultural perspectives in explaining how interlocutors construct, maintain, negotiate, and potentially threaten face in everyday communication.

Keywords

psycholinguistics, face, facework, interpersonal communication, social identity, cultural context, politeness strategies, speech acts, pragmatic competence, linguistic strategies.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23277705

Language is an important means of communication to build relationships among people. Communication is considered the need of any person. Linguistic and non-linguistic means are used to ensure this need. Obviously, language and linguistic means take the lead in communication, and a person narrates his thoughts, desires, purposes through the language.

Language is social phenomenon, language cannot exist outside society. Communication also takes place in society. The issues of language associated with society, existence, development are studied in linguistics within the framework of sociolinguistics. Communication is a complex and dynamic process that involves the exchange of information, ideas, and emotions between individuals. Speech acts play a crucial role in this process, as they are the building blocks of communication.

Pragmatics involves the study of meaning in context, highlighting how speakers use language to achieve specific social goals. This section discusses how pragmatic competence influences face management in conversation.

Linguopragmatics, a subfield of pragmatics, focuses on the study of how language is used to convey meaning in social contexts.

There are specific conditions, principles of any interaction. The subject, topic and style of conversation, the purpose of the participants of communication are often important factors to consider. For example, when conversation is conducted on sport, the speaker and the listener are required to apply sport related linguistic

units. If communication is conducted in a formal way, it is an important condition for the interlocutors to use formal style (speech). Moreover, the age, gender, social status, profession of the interlocutor are significant in communication, the speaker should talk taking into account who the listener is. The purpose of communication is as important as the factors mentioned above. Because there will be an intended goal from any communication. Goals such as asking for something, informing, delivering a message provide the basis for the dialogue. Communication without any purpose will be irrelevant and ineffective.

Any conversation has certain goals of conducting. The linguistic units and expressions applied to achieve the goal are of great importance in oral or written communication.

Such rules as not violating the boundary with the listener, treating the listener with respect are the rules to be followed. And following these rules requires politeness from the speaker. If the speaker does not adhere to the principles of politeness, his speech is rude, offensive, communication is not carried out effectively, and the intended goal of communication is not achieved.

In the study of face, it is essential to consider various cultural backgrounds, as they influence how individuals perceive and manage face in communication. Theoretical perspectives suggest that cultural dimensions, such as individualism versus collectivism, shape face-related behaviors. For instance, in collectivist cultures, maintaining group harmony may take precedence over individual face concerns, leading to different linguistic strategies compared to individualistic cultures, where personal autonomy and self-expression are prioritized. This theoretical framework posits that understanding face management requires a nuanced appreciation of cultural contexts and social dynamics.

The concept of "face" originally introduced by sociolinguist Erving Goffman, refers to the positive social value a person claims for themselves in interaction. In pragmatic terms, face is crucial for understanding how individuals navigate social encounters. This article investigates the psycholinguistic dimensions of pragmatic face, focusing on how language use reflects and constructs social identities.

Individuals strive to maintain their self-image (positive face) and avoid embarrassment (negative face) during interactions. This section reviews key concepts in face theory, including face-threatening acts (FTAs) and politeness strategies.

Theoretically, data collection in studies of pragmatic face can be conceptualized through various frameworks that emphasize the importance of context in language use. Naturalistic conversations and structured interviews serve as methods to explore how individuals navigate face-threatening acts (FTAs) within their social environments. Theoretical discourse analysis provides a lens through which to examine linguistic strategies employed in these interactions. By analyzing speech acts, politeness strategies, and contextual cues, researchers can theorize about the mechanisms through which speakers negotiate face and the implications for social identity construction.

From a theoretical perspective, linguistic strategies for managing face can be categorized into several key frameworks. These include indirectness, mitigation, and humor, each serving distinct functions in protecting positive and negative face. Indirectness allows speakers to soften requests or criticisms, thereby minimizing potential threats to face. Mitigation involves using language that reduces the impact of FTAs, while humor can diffuse tension and foster camaraderie among interlocutors. Theories of politeness (e.g., Brown and Levinson's model) provide a foundation for understanding these strategies, suggesting that their application varies significantly across cultural contexts. For example, while humor may be perceived as an effective face-saving strategy in some cultures, it could be viewed as inappropriate or disrespectful in others. This highlights the need for a theoretical framework that accounts for the interplay between cultural norms and pragmatic language use in face management.

The study underscores the intricate relationship between language use and social identity in the maintenance of face. Future research should explore the implications of digital communication on face dynamics and the role of cultural variations in pragmatic strategies.

References

[1] Arndt, H., & Janney, R.W. (1985). Politeness revisited: Cross modal supportive strategies. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 23(4), 281-300.

[2] Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. Multilingua, 8(2-3), 223-248.

[3] Lakoff, R. (1973) ‘The logic of politeness’; or minding your p’s and q’s’, Papers from the 9th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. 292 - 305.

[4] Mashrabovna, N. M., & A’zamjonovna, Y. S. (2022). THEORETICAL CONCEPT OF POLITENESS BASICS IN DIFFERENT-REGIONAL VARIATIONS. IJODKOR O’QITUVCHI, 3(25), 25-27.

[5] Mashrabovna, N. M. (2022). MAIN TYPES OF LANGUAGE POLITENESS. PEDAGOGS jurnali, 20(2), 50-53.

[6] Mashrabovna, N. M. (2022). NOVERBAL MULOQOTNI IFODALOVCHI

[7] VOSITALAR. Finland International Scientific Journal of Education, Social Science &Humanities, 10(11), 5-7.

[8] Nurmatova, M. M., & Ismoilova, D. R. (2021). BUILDING THE STRATEGIC

[9] COMPETENCE IN THE HETEROGENEOUS COMMUNICATION. ВЕСТНИК

[10] МАГИСТРАТУРЫ, 65.