

The Importance Of Human Communication Systems And The Teaching Of The English Language

Taghi Jabbarifar, Yazd University, Iran

ABSTRACT

This study presents an overall review of the paradigms that contribute to the making and development of functional human linguistics and communication skills and the teaching of language.

Keywords: Human Communication Systems; English Language Teaching; Linguistics

INTRODUCTION

Language cannot exist in a vacuum. It is vitally related to the society from which it springs. A description of language not referencing society is incomplete. Earlier approaches to the study of language including Structuralism and Transformational Generative Linguistics were primarily formalistic in nature. Both of these approaches completely ignored the social aspect of language. They primarily investigated the formal nature and behavior of languages. Their main objective was to study the phonological, morphological, and syntactical aspect of language. While Structuralism did not consider the domain the semantic aspect of language, Noam Chomsky realized the importance of the meaning and regarded it as a powerful tool in a linguistic analysis.

STRUCTURALIST APPROACH

Structuralism was developed in America in the first half of the 20th century. Leonard Bloomfield's book *Language* published in 1933 contains the manifesto of Structural Linguistics. Structuralists regarded linguistics as a physical science and were interested in analyzing and classifying the forms of various grammatical categories. Like true scientists, they were interested in collecting and analyzing data and formulating the general principles, which could be applicable to the data of language. Structuralists believe that linguistic units like sentences, words, and morphemes are structured strings of various linguistic units and are associated with one another in a structural relationship. These linguistic units like phonemes, morphemes, and words have no meaning in isolation. They become significant only when they combine together to form a network of systems. Structuralists confined their study to the form and function of words and avoided relying on meaning. They tried their best to make the study of language as scientific as it could be and rejected various notional definitions like 'noun is the name of a person, place, or thing' or 'a verb is a word that denotes action' given by the traditional grammarians.

TRANSFORMATIONAL GENERATIVE APPROACH

In 1957 with the publication of Noam Chomsky's book *Syntactic Structures* Transformational Generative Linguistics came into being as a result of dissatisfaction against Structuralism. While structuralism confined itself to the description of the data, Transformational Generative Linguistics went a step further and took into consideration native speaker's intuitive knowledge of the language as the data. Transformational linguists "aim to specify the nature of language competence, seen as a highly abstract system of rules which underlie performance" (Allen & Corder, 1974, p. 66). They regarded language as a mental phenomenon, which is acquired and not inherited, and the data for its study are available through intuition. It is universal in the sense that all languages share some common features with respect to their phonological, morphological, and syntactical organizations. Generative grammars have attached priority to syntax with respect to semantics and completely ignored the social aspect of language.

Structuralists regarded linguistics as a purely physical science, which is interested in analyzing and classifying data. They completely excluded meaning out of their study as it is outside the scope of scientific analysis due to its arbitrariness and introspective nature. "But by accepting ambiguity and synonymy as among the basic data of linguistics, Chomsky opened a door for semantics" (Leech, 1983, p. 2). Since expression of meaning is governed by context, which includes various socio-cultural factors, semantics is later on extended to pragmatics.

THE FUNCTIONAL APPROACH

However, Chomsky missed the important point when he confined his study only to the linguistic competence of the native speakers and refused to go beyond it. Philosophers like Searle, Austin, and Hymes were able to discover this leak, which was a great hindrance in the way of the perfection of Chomskian paradigm. They all contributed in different ways to the functional or pragmatic approach to the study of language. These philosophers opposed Chomsky's approach by charging him of ignoring the situational use of language. According to them, people use language in different types of socio-cultural situations, which govern their lives. Any approach that disregards the social aspect of our lives is bound to be incomplete. A person cannot become competent in the use of language unless he learns to use a language in various socio-cultural situations. The functional grammarians discovered this lacuna and tried to overcome it by incorporating in their works' socio-semantic functions of speech acts. Philosophers like Austin (1962), Halliday (1970), and Leech (1983) gave momentum to the functional approach. These philosophers and linguists were of the view that when a person utters a sentence, he is not only using his vocal apparatus in speaking something but through his utterance he is also performing some communicative act; and through this communicative act, he is performing some social function.

THE SPEECH ACT APPROACH

Austin (1962) contributed significantly to the functional paradigm by relating meaning to its elocutionary force. He believes that a person utters a sentence not only to convey something but also to perform some act. When a person utters a sentence like - 'I promise to come back within a week', he is not making a simple statement but is performing the act of promising. According to Austin, "a complete account of the meaning of a sentence cannot be restricted to semantic analysis as these are usually understood and that they must be extended to include information about the kind of speech act involved in uttering the sentence - that is, its illocutionary force" (Boyd & Thorne, 1969, p. 58). In languages, words perform multiple functions and different functions of words are governed by different contexts in which they are uttered. Context or the underlying conditions, which are in the background and shape the utterance, often provide us clues to distinguish various functions of utterance from one another. The speech act approach developed by Austin particularly "focuses upon knowledge of underlying conditions for production and interpretation of acts through words" (Shiffrin, 1944, p. 6).

It is very unfortunate that the term 'speech-act' is widely misunderstood. Many people believe it to be the act of vocal utterance or an act of communication through spoken language. But Austin's doctrine of speech-act "gives explicit recognition to the social or interpersonal dimension of language behavior and provides a general framework for the discussion of the syntactic and semantic distinctions that linguists have traditionally described in terms of mood and modality" (Lyons, 1977, p. 725). The earlier linguists attached more importance to sentences and utterances and regarded them as the minimal unit of human communication system. Austin looked at communication system through the goal-oriented pragmatic point of view. For example when a person says to a stranger, "There is a dog in my house," he not only informs him about the presence of the dog in the house but also warns him never to think of trespassing his house. Austin regarded the performance of a speech act as the smallest unit of communication system. Austin divided the speech acts into locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary. Locutionary act refers to the utterance of a sentence with a certain sense in a context. It includes the phonetic act, the phatic act, and the rhetic act. Illocutionary act is an act performed in saying something and refers to "utterances, which have a certain conventional force" (Leech, 1983, p. 176). Perlocutionary act refers to the results or consequences achieved by saying something.

In the beginning of his discussion Austin has made a distinction between performative (short) utterances and constative (descriptive) utterances. This distinction is related to the various functions performed by language. In his work *How to Do things with Words* (1962), Austin says that constative utterances refer to the statements which describe some event, process, or state of affairs and which can be characterized as either true or false. Performative

utterances, on the other hand, instead of evaluating something as true or false, are used to do something. The difference between constative and performative utterances depends upon the difference between saying something and doing something by the means of language. Austin, in this way, challenged the view of the logical positivists who thought that language makes only empirically verifiable statements. According to them language had only one function; i.e., descriptive. All the other utterances are classified as emotive. But people like Wittgenstein who were earlier associated with this theory, soon came to realize that language utterances are heterogeneous and are determined by various social conventions. A person becomes competent in the use of language by learning to use a language in different types of social contexts. Besides relating the use of language to social situations, Wittgenstein also relates the semantic aspect of a word to its use. Thus both Wittgenstein and Austin "emphasize the importance of relating the function of language to the social contexts in which languages operate and insist that, not only descriptive, but also non-descriptive utterances should be of concern to the philosopher" (Lyons, 1977, p. 728).

Another philosopher who made significant contributions to speech act theory and who enriched it is Searle (1969). According to Searle, a theory of language is a part of a theory of action (1969, p. 17). Searle rejected the distinction between meaning and speech acts, which Austin had indirectly made; He says that "the study of speech acts are not two independent studies but one study from two different points of view" (1969, p. 18). Searle holds that there are two types of speech acts – direct speech acts and indirect speech acts. He believes that whenever a speaker wishes to perform some goal with the help of the use of language, it requires a chain of actions. In a direct speech act, a speaker believes that the hearer understands his message and this understanding of the message will lead him to perform the desired action. Searle defined indirect speech acts as "cases in which one illocutionary act is performed indirectly by way of performing another" (1971, p. 60). Searle regards that both direct and indirect speech acts are performed at the same time and the performance of the one leads to the performance of the other. For example, the utterance "This room is very hot, isn't it?" implies that the speaker wants the hearer to switch on the cooler. Thus through an indirect speech act exemplified above a direct speech act is performed. The indirect speech act leads the hearer to infer that the speaker wants him to switch on the cooler. But Professor Leech is not satisfied with means-ends analysis. He is of the view that we cannot restrict all the uses of language to only instrumental function, as "we cannot treat all discourse as motivated by the goal of bringing about some result in the mental or physical condition of the addressee" (Leech, 1983, p. 40). "The concept of goal," says Professor Leech "should be applicable to the phatic use of language, the avoidance of taboo subjects and taboo vocabulary, etc. and other cases where although the pattern of linguistic behavior may be clear, few people would claim that the user is aware of the goals that motivate this behavior" (1983, p. 40). Apart from classifying speech acts into direct and indirect: Searle also classified illocutionary acts into various categories. His classification is based on the politeness principles. According to Searle, assertives commits to the truth of the expressed proposition are neutral as regards to politeness (Leech, 1983, p. 105). Assertives include stating, suggesting, boasting, complaining, claiming, reporting, and belong to the collaborative category of illocutionary functions. Directives are the speech acts "intended to produce some effect through action by the hearer: ordering, commanding, requesting, advising, and recommending are examples" (Leech, 1983, p. 106). These acts in most of the cases belong to the competitive category of illocutionary functions. In the next place come commissives, which "commits to some future action; e.g., promising, vowing, or offering." These illocutionary acts are related to convival function of politeness. Expressives express the "speaker's psychological attitude towards a state of affairs which the illocution presupposes; e.g., thanking, congratulating, pardoning, blaming, praising, condoling, etc." Expressives like commissives also belong to the group of convival as in them the "illocutionary goal coincides with the social goal" (Leech, 1983, p. 104). The last category in the classification of illocutionary acts based on politeness maxims is the class of declaratives. Declaratives "bring about the correspondence between the propositional content and reality; e.g., resigning, dismissing, christening, naming, excommunicating, appointing, sentencing, etc." (Leech, 1983, p. 106). Declaratives according to Searle are institutional acts and do not involve politeness.

All verbal utterances take place in various types of socio-cultural situations. Hence an important feature of speech acts is that they have a close affinity with the socio-cultural background of the speakers and listeners. Human languages are culture specific. Speech acts differ from culture to culture. Individuals while communicating or interacting with the other individuals have to manage the socio-cultural conventions. These socio-cultural conventions play a vital role in human communication system. All languages differ from each other in these socio-cultural aspects pertaining to the context and form. Language also differs in the use of the conventional principles of politeness, co-operation, informativeness, truthfulness, relevance, perspicuity, and clarity. Hence the

theory of speech acts which relates meaning to its illocutionary force is of great relevance. For example, 'He will come on Monday' can be analyzed as 'I predict he comes on Monday' and 'He may come on Monday' can be analyzed as 'I guess he comes on Monday.' In the above examples, modals 'will' and 'may' are related to the illocutionary forces of the speaker's mental acts of predicting and guessing respectively.

SYSTEMIC APPROACH

Halliday (1985) who came forward with his systemic approach made an impressive contribution to the functional paradigm. He is of the opinion that a text is a product of social and cultural context from where it develops. Halliday and other systemic linguists are of the view that people use language with one another in order to manage their social lives. Systemic linguists believe that the use of language is functional. They shifted the focus from the study of formal properties of language to the functional aspects of language use. Halliday believes that "the investigation of language as social behavior is not only relevant to the understanding of social structure; it is also relevant to the understanding of language" (1973, p. 65). Language performs various socio-semantic functions in our lives and society. The function of language is to express meaning – meaning, which the members of the society want to exchange with one another in order to communicate. This meaning is always influenced by the socio-cultural context in which it is shared by the members of the speech community. Systemic linguists also believe that 'the process of using language is a semiotic process, a process of making meanings by choosing' (Eggins, 1994, p. 2).

Halliday and various systemic linguists believe that a language is organized in a particular way to suit the socio-cultural functions that it has to perform. Systemic linguists hold that a language is not a means of communication but it is a means of social communication and as a means of social communication it has to perform some important functions. The first important function a language has to perform is experiential or ideational function. He says, "Language serves for the expression of 'content'; i.e., of the speaker's experience of the real world, including the inner world of his own consciousness. We may call this ideational function. In serving this function language also gives structure to experience, and helps to determine our way of looking at things, so that it requires some intellectual effort to see them in any other way than that which our language suggests to us" (Halliday, 1970, p. 143). We express our experience of reality through the ideational function. Language communicates the experience of the world as well as helps us in interpreting it. Halliday's main concern is how this expression of reality is reflected in the linguistic organization of language. Halliday refers to the system of transitive verbs and says that transitive verbs in English express a process which includes the role of two participants- 'an action' and 'a goal' and a circumstantial role like that of place or time.

In addition to ideational function; i.e., describing his experience of the world – the world mould him as well as the world of his inner consciousness – Halliday also recognizes two important functions which are related to the sociological aspect of language and which also help us in determining how a language is structured. The second important function of language, according to him, is interpersonal function. Interpersonal function of a language is reflected in the grammatical category of mood as reflected in various sentence types like declarative, interrogative, and imperative and also through the system of modals. According to Halliday, an individual has to play a number of different types of roles keeping in view the social functions. The three choices in the mood system perform various communicative functions like declaring, asking a question, making a request, and giving a command. Apart from the system of moods, various modal verbs is also used for performing various types of social activities and conventions. Modality is directly related to the social functions of language. Modality, which expresses different semantic implications like permission, request, obligation, necessity, possibility, etc., is used to perform different communicative acts. The system of medals consists of various choices at the semantic level. But the semantics of modals is often influenced by various socio-cultural factors as well. Earlier in Structuralism and Transformational Generative Linguistics, this aspect of language has been kept out deliberately as it is beyond the scope of scientific analysis. Halliday and other socio-linguists are of the view that the utterance of a sentence cannot be confined to a mere linguistic act. An utterance, according to them, is a performance of an action. Thus Halliday tries to establish a relationship between function and structure of a language. According to him, language is structured in a particular way to suit the various functions, which it has to perform. Through the Interpersonal function, language serves as a means of social interaction and serves to manage our social relations. A language expresses various roles and performs various communicative functions like questioning somebody, requesting or commanding somebody, or telling something. These functions as reflected in the mood category establish social relations between various

members of our society. Like these sentence types, modal verbs can, may, will, must, etc. also express various social functions such as making a request, seeking permission, expressing rights, obligation and possibility, etc.

Halliday refers to the third function of language as textual. Textual function refers to the organization of various component of language into a coherence body called text. Halliday is of the view that "the basic unit of language in use is not a word or a sentence but a 'text', and the textual component in language is the set of options by means of which a speaker or a writer is enabled to create both texts-to use a language in a way that is relevant to the contexts" (1970a, pp. 160-161). Thus, by text Halliday means organization of words and sentences into messages. A language doesn't consist of words or sentences only. What is important in language is the structuring of words and sentences according to the context. A text comes into existence only when various components of language are structured according to the context. A text is meaningless if it is divorced from its context.

Halliday regards textual function of language as an 'enabling function' (Halliday, 1970, pp. 143, 165) and regards it more important than the ideational and the interpersonal functions of language. Professor Leech, however, disagrees with Halliday in this respect and refuses to call the textual function a 'function at all' (1983, p. 57). He also disagrees with Halliday who includes all the three functions of language within the domain of grammar. According to Professor Leech, "the ideational belongs to grammar (which conveys ideas to the hearer through a sense-sound mapping) and the interpersonal function and the textual function belong to pragmatics" (1983, p. 57). The ideational function refers to the grammatical stage when a speaker encodes his message into sound symbols or visual marks. Once text is created through the organization of phonetic and semantic material, it becomes the means of transmitting message (textual) and the message is transmitted from the speaker to the hearer with an end to influence the opinion of the listener (interpersonal). The textual function has its own important role to play in the functional paradigm. Without the organization of linguistic material into coherent whole called text, the interpersonal function; i.e., to influence the attitude and opinion of the listener through a text, cannot become a reality.

HYMES AND COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

The publication of Chomsky's lectures on 'Government and Binding' draws the attention of the linguist towards the primacy of syntax in a linguistic study. However, Chomsky like the structuralist, confined his study to the formalistic aspect of syntax and completely ignored the speech situations in which sentences are uttered. This restriction of Generative grammar to formalism paved the way for various linguists and philosophers to come out with new paradigms. Socio-linguist like Hymes (1974) rejected Chomsky's conception of linguistic competence, which would be useless without taking into consideration the rules of language use. Hymes holds that "an adequate approach must begin by identifying social functions, and discover the ways in which linguistic features are selected and grouped together to serve them" (1974, p. 196). In the beginning of 1970's, Lakoff (1974) and other linguist realized that syntax couldn't be divorced from the speech situations from where it emerges. His realization that syntax is the product of various socio cultural speech situations laid to the birth of a new discipline called Pragmatics. Pragmatics didn't come into being overnight. It came into existence as a consequence of various theories – the theory of speech act, systemic grammar 'cooperative principle, and the politeness principle spelled out by philosophers and linguists like Austin and Searle, Halliday, Lakoff, Grice, Brown, and Levinson, and Leech. Austin and Searle's speech act theories and Halliday's functional grammar stressed the social aspect of language study and realized the limitations of syntactical analysis of language. All the approaches mentioned earlier taken collectively contribute to the functional paradigm and resulted in the birth of a new discipline which later on came to be known as Pragmatics.

PRAGMATICS

The endeavours of various socio-linguists and philosophers to fit the study of syntax into the functional paradigm contributed to the birth of Pragmatics. Syntax is the study of the formal characteristics of sentences and semantics is the study of meaning "purely as a property of expressions in a given language, in abstraction from particular situations, speakers or hearers" (Leech, 1983, p. 6). Pragmatics is the study of sentences in relation to various speech situations in which they are uttered. We can demarcate a line between the two fields of study (i.e., semantics and pragmatics) only with the help of speech situations. Pragmatics deals with the meaning of utterances. Utterance meanings cover the following speech situations: (i) addresser and addressee, (ii) context, (iii) goal, (iv) illocutionary act, and (v) utterance (Leech, 1983, p. 15). "Pragmatics", thus, "is distinguished from semantics in being concerned with meaning in relation to a speech situation" (Leech, 1983, p. 15).

Pragmatics, we have already said earlier, is an amalgamation of various paradigms of linguistics like the speech act theory, the systemic paradigm, the cooperative principle, and the politeness principle. In the previous sections of this paper we have already dealt in detail the speech act theory of Austin and Searle, and the functional paradigm of Halliday. Now in order to have a complete understanding of the background of pragmatics, we would like to give an account of the cooperative principle and the politeness principle.

THE COOPERATIVE PRINCIPLE

Utterances should not only be grammatically correct but they should also be pragmatically acceptable. Pragmatics deals with the rules of language use in various socio-cultural situations. The ability to produce situationally, contextually, and culturally appropriate utterances could be called pragmatic competence (Lakoff, 1973, p. 296). Grice (1975) develops the rules of conversational management, which recommends the means which help us in achieving pragmatic competence. These rules developed by Grice tell us how people use language and how the goals of communication can be achieved effectively. One such principle advocated by Grice to achieve conversational goals refers to the cooperative use of language and hence is called cooperative principle. Cooperative principle reflects "the logician's traditional concern with truth" (Leech, 1983, p. 80) and requires contributions from an individual as and when required in order to achieve the desired results from the talks in which he is participating. This principle advocates some maxims of conversational management in order to achieve the intended conversational goals. These maxims (Grice, 1975, pp. 41-58) are as follows:

- Maxim of Quality
 - Say only what you believe to be true
 - Do not say anything without having sufficient evidence
- Maxim of Quantity
 - Be as informative as is required
 - Don't contribute extra information than necessary
- Maxim of Relevance
 - Don't contribute irrelevant information not bearing any relations to your exchange
- Maxim of Manner
 - Be perspicuous
 - Avoid ambiguity
 - Avoid obscurity
 - Be brief
 - Be orderly

These maxims recommend to the participants various ways of the cooperative use of language. In order to communicate in a successful, reasonable, and cooperative way, the participants should be sincere, relevant, and clear in their conversational exchanges. This is the only cooperative way of speaking. Grice's theory has been challenged on the ground that no one actually speak in the way recommended by Grice. However, Grice himself doesn't mean that people should follow these recommendations strictly. Such a course is neither desired nor possible. Grice's implication is that we often do not stick to these principles in our conversations on the surface level but listeners assume that these principles are being observed by the speakers at some deeper level. These maxims refer to references beyond the semantic level of utterances. Grice termed these references as conversational implicatures which are different from semantic or logical implication where the implication is confined only to superficial level whereas conversational implicatures take into consideration not only the semantic context at the surface level but also assumptions about the reasonable and logical means of conducting the cooperative use of language.

Besides being attacked on the practical grounds that the theory doesn't "stand up to the evidence of real language use" (Leech, 1983, p. 80), objections have also been raised that the maxims of the cooperative principle (CP) are culture – specific and language-specific and not universal in nature. These maxims are applicable to different societies in different ways and there are some linguistic communities to which only some of the maxims are applicable. In order to overcome these weak points of CP, Politeness Principle is added to it (CP) as a complement. The CP regulates "what we say so that it contributes to some assumed illocutionary or discoursal goal (S)" (Leech, 1983, p. 82) and the politeness of principle (PP) regulates how we say so that social harmony and intimate relations

will be maintained. The CP enables the listener to assume that the speaker is being cooperative. But total dependence on CP would lead to instability of social and friendly relations. Hence to save the society from disintegration and to maintain the cordial relations between members of the society PP becomes important and hence is seen as a complement of the CP.

THE POLITENESS PRINCIPLE

Exchange of message is not the only aim of human communication. Man is a social being and hence his aim is to carry forward communication in an amicable atmosphere through mutual trust and cooperation. This cooperation is impossible unless addressee and addressed show concern for each other's sentiments and interests. Politeness means showing concern for the feelings of others. The main aim of human interactional exchange is to establish friendly and warm relations and to maintain them by avoiding conflicts and tensions. CP refers to the assumptions extracted by the listeners from the assertions made by the speakers. Politeness has to be expressed by the speakers themselves and its violation by anybody is always regarded as impolite behavior.

Philosophers like Lakoff (1973), Brown and Levinson (1978), and Leech (1983) suggest some politeness strategies to maintain social harmony and to strengthen the bond of friendship among individuals. Lakoff (1973, pp. 292, 305) suggests three principles of politeness: (a) Don't force anybody, (b) Give freedom to choose, and (c) make the addressee feel comfortable. He recommends various strategies like passivization, impersonalisation, use of technical terminology, hedging, and euphemism to create a congenial atmosphere and to gain the confidence of the addressee. By using certain rhetorical devices like hedges and particles, the addresser can avoid various assertions, which can offend the listener and can gain the faith and confidence. Lakoff believes that these rules, except some minor deviations, are universally applicable on all the languages and can be used consciously as well as unconsciously.

Brown and Levinson (1978) group politeness strategies into two categories – positive politeness strategies and negative politeness strategies. These strategies contribute to the interpersonal function of language and assist us in the smooth functioning of conversational exchange. Positive politeness strategies are aimed at raising further the politeness of the speech acts, which are already polite. Brown and Levinson claim that through positive politeness, strategies speakers and listeners show respect and concern for "the interest and approval of each other's personality" (1978, p. 101). The speaker employs positive politeness strategies when he claims common objective with the hearer and expresses his desire to help him in fulfilling his wants. These wants include goals and values. Participants employ positive politeness strategies when they exchange, "presuppositions indicating shared wants, etc." (Brown & Levinson, 1978, p. 101). These strategies require a hearer to cooperate and appreciate the statements and action of the hearer. The speaker tries to convey to the hearer that his interests and ends are of interest and concern for him also and with respect to ends, both of them belong to the same group or category. Negative politeness strategies are meant for "social distancing just as positive politeness strategies are meant for minimizing social distance" (Brown & Levinson, 1978, p. 130). Contrary to positive politeness strategies which function as "social accelerator" (Brown & Levinson, 1978, p. 130), negative politeness strategies "put a social brake" (Brown & Levinson, 1978, p. 130) on the interaction by taking help of the "rituals of avoidance" (Brown & Levinson, 1978, 129). People always wanted to enjoy liberty with respect to their lives and actions. They generally do not want any intervention in their actions and movements. Negative politeness strategies are used with an end in view to minimize the encroachment upon the freedom of others. Positive politeness strategies rely on intimacy whereas negative politeness strategies are used to save the negative face of the hearer. A speaker can be indirect, kind enough to give the listener choice to save his face and also should distance himself from coercing the hearer, if he has to nullify his interference and sufficiently respect the personal identity and freedom of the hearer.

Leech (1983) contributes to the politeness principle by discussing various maxims of politeness with regard to the process of minimization and maximization. His maxims, which are primarily based on showing concern and respect for the others, are grouped into six categories. These six types of politeness maxims, according to Prof. Leech, are as follows (1983, p. 132):

- Tact Maxim (in impositives and commissives)
 - Minimize cost to others
 - Maximize benefit to others

- Generosity Maxim (in impositives and commissives)
 - Minimize benefit to self
 - Maximize cost to self
- Approbation Maxim (in expressives and assertives)
 - Minimize dispraise of others
 - Maximize praise of others
- Modesty Maxim (in expressives and assertives)
 - Minimize praise of self
 - Maximize dispraise of self
- Agreement Maxim (in assertives)
 - Minimize disagreement between self and others
 - Maximize agreement between self and others
- Sympathy Maxim (in assertives)
 - Minimize antipathy between self and others
 - Maximize sympathy between self and others

The above maxims dealing with the interpersonal rhetoric include two participants – self and others. The speaker represents self whereas others include the hearer as well as third parties expressed by third person pronouns. However, Professor Leech is of the view that politeness towards a listener who is present and participating in the interaction is more important than politeness towards a third party. He also warns that these maxims of politeness should be observed with care so that the speaker's concern for the others should not be misinterpreted as flattery and sycophancy. Our talks should not be too modest to be regarded as tiresome and insincere. Prof. Leech also discusses metalinguistic aspects of politeness, which deals with "the way conversation is managed and structured by its participants" (1983, p. 139). Speech is one of the important means by which people try to build and project their personal image. They endeavour to present to the world their image of being kind and considerate towards others. People employ various metalinguistic devices like hedging, etc. to fructify their endeavours. These metalinguistic devices create atmosphere of cooperation among people. Through this cooperation people try to project and maintain their self-image.

CONCLUSION

Since the expression of various notional categories depends on socio-cultural factors and the context in which exchange takes place between the interlocutors, the functional approaches have the greater pedagogical potential to enhance the communicative competence of the learners. The main aim of a teaching program is to develop communicative competence in the learners by equipping them with the knowledge of using a language correctly according to the various socio-cultural situations. A speaker has to perform various illocutionary acts and social goals by assuming to follow pragmatic principles in an interpersonal rhetoric. It is in fact various socio-cultural situations that determine the use of various semantic and formal categories in language. In language, words and sentences perform multiple functions according to the different contexts in which they are uttered. Any teaching of language will remain superficial without a consideration of various functional paradigms, which take into account various speech situations. If the study of language is confined only to the formal and semantic analysis of the data available to us and ignores the context of the utterance, it will not help us in understanding the intended meaning of the speaker in making his utterance. The communicative meaning of the addresser can be decoded only if we familiarize students with the context of the utterance, otherwise if interpreted in isolation, the utterance would lead to ambiguity. But the parameters and principles mentioned above help us in solving ambiguities, which are the result of divorcing language from its socio-cultural background, and confining its study to its formal and semantic aspects.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Taghi Jabbarifar, Ph.D., holds a PhD degree in educational administration from University of Pune (India), MA from Denver University (USA), and BS from Central Michigan University, (USA). He is currently a lecturer in the Department of Education, Yazd University, Iran. E-mail: jabarifar@yazduni.ac.ir

REFERENCES

1. Allen, J. P. B., & Widdowson, H. W. (1974). Grammar and language teaching. In J. P. B. Allen & S. P. Corder (Ed.), *The Edinburg course in applied linguistics*. London: OUP.
2. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
3. Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language* (12th impression, 1973). London: George Allen and Unwin.
4. Boyd, J., & Thorne, J. P. (1969). The deep grammar of modal verbs. *Journal of Linguistics*, 5, 57-74.
5. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Moulton.
7. Eggins, S. (1994). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics*. London: Pinter.
8. Grice, H. P. (1975). *Syntax and semantics, vol. 3, speech acts* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.
9. Halliday, M. A. K. (1970a). *Functional diversity in language as seen from a consideration of modality and mood in English* (6, pp. 322-65). *Foundations of Language*. Dordrecht: The Netherlands.
10. Halliday, M. A. K. (1970b). Language structure and language function. In J. Lyons (Ed.), *New horizons in linguistics* (4th Impression, 1973, pp. 140-65). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
11. Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language* (2nd Impression, 1974). London: Edward Arnold.
12. Hymes, D. (1974). On communicative competence. In Pride and Holmes (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
13. Lakoff, R. (1973). *The logic of politeness: Or, minding your p's and q's*. Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, 292-305.
14. Lakoff, R. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London, New York: Longman.
15. Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics* (Vol. I & II). Cambridge: CUP.
16. Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts: All essay on the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: At the University Press.
17. Searle, J. (1971). What is speech - act? In J. F. Rosenberg & C. Travis (ed.) (1971, pp. 614-28).
18. Shiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford UK. Cambridge USA: Basil Blackwell.
19. Trudgill, P. (1995). *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

NOTES