Zoltán Németh

THE FIRST STEPS TOWARDS THE FIRST-ORDER POLITENESS RESEARCH IN UDMURT[1]

The research is the continuation of my dissertation written at the Department of the Finno-Ugrian Philology of the University of Szeged. However, in this research I do not analyse politeness on my own like I did in my dissertation, as I include answers of native speakers of the language. They express their own ideas about the different answers I got during my PhD research. This study is based on interviews conducted with 10 native speakers of the Udmurt language. These speakers not only represent different age groups but they have different backgrounds as well: I included speakers of the southern and the northern dialects of the language, there are students and teachers of the Udmurt State University and there are two speakers who had been living abroad for at least two years at the time of recording. There were three main exercises to complete during the interview: in the first one they had to express their opinions about answers that I had acquired earlier in different politeness situations, in the second one they had to group answers based on which ones can belong to the same speaker and in the last one I showed them the correct groups of answers and they had to identify the age, the gender, the dialect and the place of origin of the speaker. Their answers can be really helpful to support my previous results or to open a new perspective in the research because, as native speakers, they are able to understand small differences that could be easily skimmed over by non-native speakers. This research has two main parts. In the first part the native speakers express their ideas about answers in given situations and in the second part they try to identify the age, the gender, the dialect and the place of origin of the speakers based on their answers. In the first part the answers usually matched with each other but the interpretation of the Udmurt second past in this situation led to the biggest contradiction in this research. Some of the speakers (as I expected) said that it makes the sentence more polite, but there were some speakers who felt exactly the opposite way about it because in their interpretation it means that the speaker used this tense to avoid responsibility. From the second part it draws out clearly, that there is no age, gender, dialectal or geographical group of speakers who could be easily identified by the given answers and the speakers mainly, but not exclusively, used stereotypes for identification. The result of this is that the answers were about as accurate as taking a blind guess.

Keywords: contemporary Udmurt language, first-order politeness, Socipragmatics.

DOI: 10.35634/2412-9534-2021-31-3-521-536

Introduction

I already invested some years into researching politeness in the Udmurt language. One of the main reasons behind this is that I wanted to do my research on a topic which lacks the attention of researchers of Uralic studies and the speakers can actually benefit from it in their lives. Politeness research fitted the picture perfectly, as the Finno-Ugric languages spoken in Russia are not really researched from a sociopragmatic point of view, but this kind of research would be very beneficial. The reason behind this latter one is that the speakers of the Udmurt language are more and more exposed to international communication, as they are the most visible minority language in Russia [22]. To be successful in international communication it is inevitable to know and understand the norms of the participants. Someone can try their best to be as polite as possible, but the concept of politeness can be different in different cultures, and these differences can lead to misunderstandings. One of the examples I often mention as I experienced it for myself is related to Hungarian language. In Hungarian it is quite common that at the end of an e-mail people write *Előre is köszönöm a segítségét!* 'Thank you for your help in advance'. The reason behind this is that the speaker wants to show that he/she is thankful for the attention paid to him/her, no matter if the other person is capable to helping or not. However, for other speakers, this can sound like an obligation to him/her as I already said thank you for it. Which means that although I wanted to be very polite, I turned out to be impolite in the situation. This is a good example, because it perfectly shows that how small things in our speech can lead to misunderstandings.

Earlier I dealt with second-order politeness research. This means that in my research I collected data from native speakers and based on their answers I tried to find out on my own what could be the logic behind their answers, based on assumptions I could make. I was interested in four speech acts: negative responses,

apologies, responses to compliments and requests. The climax of that research was my dissertation. This present research is the continuation of that. I thought that the next step that should be taken in my research is moving on towards first-order politeness. This means that in this research I cooperated with native speakers who helped my work with their explanations of the situations. A research of this kind is perfect to support the theses I made based on the results or to put them in another perspective I, as a non-native speaker of the language, would not have thought about. This present study is meant to be the first step towards this transition. I focused on two points: on the one hand I am interested in how people would interpret answers that are specially selected: e.g. it has code-switching, the answer was quite different from the other answers, it has or could have special word forms in them. On the other hand I was interested if there is a group of speakers that can be easily identified by their way of speaking, because it can show if there is a specific social group of the speakers that would require special attention, and which could be used as a control group in another research, as they would be the ones to which the other groups could be compared.

This study built up in the following way: after the introduction I write about the theoretical background of the research, which is followed by the presentation of the informants I worked with and the questionnaire I used during my data-collection. After that, I discuss the results I got in the different tasks, and I the explanations given by the informants. These answers are grouped into two categories: in the first one I write about those explanations not having any stereotypical background and then the ones that are based on them. In the last section I summarize the results.

Theoretical background

In this section I will discuss three topics: first I will discuss how the politeness is defined from a sociopragmatic point of view, after that I will discuss what is meant by apologies (as the situations I used in my research belong to this speech act), and finally I will discuss the topic of first-order politeness research.

In the case of the politeness research there are two main theories that are considered as the starting point of this research field: one of the is the connected to the name of Leech [17] who based his theory on Grice's [8] maxims and the other one is the theory of Brown and Levinson [2] who based their theory on the face theory of Goffman [6]. According to the former one, we are talking about politeness in those cases when the speaker does not obey at least one of the Maxims, because this way he/she tried to avoid the other person to be hurt. In the case of the latter the starting point is that speaker has two faces: a positive one, and a negative one. The positive face represents that the person wants to be appreciated for what he or she has done, and the negative one represents that the person wants to act independently based on his or her own will. In those cases, when the speaker person doesn't act on his/her own will, or the other shows a negative attitude towards his/her actions, we are speaking about face threatening acts. We are talking about politeness when the speaker tries to minimize the threat towards the face of the other person even by exposing his/her own face to a threat. The theory that was introduced by Brown and Levinson [2] was amended later by one of the biggest critics of this theory, Foley [5] who wrote that it is important in these situations that both participants of the interaction should feel appreciated. This is an important remark, especially in the case of the situations in which the speakers apologize, as in those cases the speaker needs to protect rather his own face then the other person's. This amendment will actually have a really important role in the interpretation of these situations.

The apology is categorized as an expressive by Searle [23]. According to him we are talking about apology when the speaker carries about an action that is evaluated by the other in a negative way, so the speaker expresses his/her regret. By this definition it is also visible that the apology is a reaction to a given situation. Later Leech [17] defined the apology in the following way: the aim of the apology is to maintain the harmony between the participants of the interaction and it is carried out by an action which is profitable for the listener on the expense of the speaker. Seventeen years later Márquez Reiter [18] put this definition in another way and defined apology as an action which protects the face of the listener and threatens the face of the speaker. Holmes [11] discussed a special trait of the apologies: although the addressee of the apology is the listener, as he/she is the one having a negative attitude towards the action that was carried out, but the person, whose face is being protected from the threat is the speaker as he/she is the one whose action is evaluated in a negative way. The last theory that I mention in this study in connection with apologies is the one connected to the name of Goffman [7]. According to him, the apologies belong to two main categories: there are ritual compensations and substantive compensations. The former one is used in those cases, when the loss of the listener is virtual/theoretical, and expressing our regrets is enough to restore the harmony between

the speaker and the listener, and the latter one is used, when the speaker suffers a real life loss, and verbal compensation is not enough.

Last but not least I would like to discuss first-order politeness research. As I mentioned it above the main difference between the second- and the first-order politeness is that in the former one the researcher tries to draw conclusions based on his/her own knowledge about the language use, while in the latter one the researcher works together with native speakers to analyze how politeness works in the researched language. Each one has its own benefits: native speakers have much more experience in their language use, therefore they understand minor differences in meanings that could be easily floated by a non-native speaker researcher, but at the same time coming from a different culture can bring new perspectives into examining the language.

These two types of research were differentiated for the first time by Watts et al. [27]. The starting point for the differentiation could have been the emic-etic theory by Pikes [21] or Harris' [9] theory about emic and etic opposition. The common point of these two theories is that there are the emic elements that somehow can be related to a given group, they are familiar for them, and there ate the etic element which cannot be related to that group. Watts et al. [27] defined the first-order politeness as "the various ways in which polite behavior is perceived and talked about by the members of sociocultural groups" [27, p. 3], while second-order politeness as "a term within the theory of social behavior and language use" [27, p. 3], or as Haugh [10] have put it: first-order politeness is what is felt polite by the speakers of the language, and second-order politeness is what is considered polite from a scientific point of view. It was Eelen [4] who developed the theory even further. In Eelen's theory first order politeness has two categories: the way politeness really appears in the language (politeness in action) and the idea of the speakers how politeness should work (politeness in concept). In the same theory second-order politeness is defined as the branch that explains the results of the first-order politeness [4].

Methodology

The informants. Prior to the introduction of the informants, there are two things to be mentioned. First, at Udmurt State University, BA studies are not three, but four years long. This will be important in connection with the changes I carried out in the research that I will introduce in the next paragraph. Second, there is an informant that I refer to as the main informant. The reason for that is that (s)he answered the questionnaire I used for my dissertation, his/her answers were included in this research (more about that in the next chapter) and some of the informants were chosen based on his/her identity, as there is a person, who is closely related, and both of the teacher know him/her well.

My original plan for this research was to ask ten people: one person who took part in the research my dissertation was based on, one person who is closely related to the previous one, two teachers of the Institute of Udmurt Philology, Finno-Ugristics and Journalism of the Udmurt State University (they have met a lot of students, so they have a very good knowledge about how the speakers of the different dialects sound), two students of the institute speaking the same dialect as the first informant, two students who speak a different dialect and finally two native speakers of the Udmurt language living abroad for at least two years (mainly living abroad, but sometimes visiting Udmurtia was acceptable). Also, according to the original idea the research would have been carried out in person with the informants currently living in Udmurtia and the ones living abroad would have been interviewed online. Unfortunately, because of the well-known reasons (COVID-19 pandemic) there was no opportunity for the research to be carried out in person, so it completely happened online. This situation affected the choice of informants as well, but all in all it had a positive effect on my research. As it was carried out online, and the group of those speakers that are current students of the above mentioned institute and personally known by me well enough to contact them through the internet without being a complete stranger, the possibilities were highly limited. So, in the case of the four students the criteria for selection was changed: people who studied at least one year concurrently in the BA program with the main person of my research. This way I got a seven-year interval. This also meant, that the age of the possible informants has been shifted a bit to an age-interval I know more people from, so there was a bigger choice of informants. I also decided to go that way, that from both dialects (the main informant's own dialect, and the different one) should be represented by a female and a male informant. Even this way I ended up with one person who was not a well-known person for me, but he/she was not a stranger completely, as during my previous travels to Udmurtia I completed a linguistic course with her group, so we were acquaintances. The positive side of this change is that these four participants are closer in age to the main participant, so the way how they use the language is more similar than the original target group's. Although this way

some informants are only former students of the institute, but for the sake of simplicity, I will still refer to them by the term students.

From a sociolinguistic point of view the following information can be shared about the informants:

- The representation of the genders is almost equal: there are 6 female and 4 male informants.
- The territorial representation is quite equal as well: my original plan was to include mainly speakers of the northern and the southern dialect of Udmurt, but at the end I ended up with five speakers of the Southern dialect, four speakers of the Northern dialect, and one person represents the central dialect, but that person's village is located quite close to the line where the northern dialect starts.
- Talking about the age of the informants: the age of the close relative, and the students are really close to the age of the main informant (twenty-one or three years plus/minus), the two teachers are both above forty. The two informants living abroad are between the age of the two previous groups.
- I asked all the informants about which language do they consider as native: Udmurt / Russian / Both / Other, and all of them chose Udmurt exclusively.

The last thing I would like to mention is that one of the participant's answers will be taken into consideration in the first two exercises but not in the third. The reason behind this, is that he/she said about the second exercise that it is not possible to be solved with the information provided (he/she was the only one who chose this option, but an answer like this is also helpful, so I took this one into consideration) and the third exercise is connected to the second, so a bit after starting the third one, he/she opted out from solving it. I did not want to include a half-solved exercise, so in the case of the third exercise I did not include his/her answers.

The questionnaire

The questionnaire that I used consists of three exercises. All the exercises contained the same five situations with the same twenty-five answers. Before discussing the exercises, I introduce the situations and the answers.

In my dissertation I examined four politeness situations: apology, request, negative answer and response to compliments, but in this questionnaire, I included five situations from the apologies. The situations are based on the ones that Szili [26] used for her research on Hungarian students, with some minor changes. The questions were translated by me and the translations were checked by Ekaterina Suncova, the Udmurt lecturer of the Department of Finno-Ugrian Philology of the University of Szeged. She is a native speaker of Udmurt and has a high proficiency in Hungarian. For each situation I had five answers. In all the situations the answers of the same five people were included. In every case one of them was the answer of the main informant, and the other four got selected because at least one of their answers were interesting in some way (use of Russian words, possibly impolite answer and the use of Udmurt second past), and I wanted to hear the opinion of native speakers about them. Udmurt second past is a grammatical feature discussed in multiple studies before [14; 15; 16; 20], but summarized in a few words: this is a past form that is mainly, but not exclusively, used to express that an action that the speaker has second-hand information about, when the person did not have control over the action that took place. This latter use makes it perfect to express politeness, as the speaker can use this to protect his/her face by emphasizing, that he/she did not carry out the situation on purpose, but by mistake.

The answers of five different people were included so the main informant of this research would not feel uncomfortable if he/she finds out that those are his/her answers that are in question, and this way even if (s)he realize, it just seemed like one those five. This way I could also guarantee the anonymity I promised in my data-collection for the dissertation. The inclusion of five people's answers resulted in reduction of the number of situations included in this research, because if all the situations would have been included, they could have been too much to handle for the informants. A total of twenty-five answers seemed like the sweet spot: enough for the research, but not too much for the informants.

To randomize the answers of the different situations I placed them into the list in a random order, and all the answers got a unique ID number, generated by a random number generator. The randomly generated numbers for the answers of the first situation were one-digit numbers, in the case of the second ones two-digit numbers and so on. The number of digits were growing on purpose, to help the informants in their second task (more of that a bit later).

As it was mentioned earlier, the research has been carried out online. The application of choice was Zoom for multiple reasons: easy to handle, I used it before, so the user interface was familiar, it gives the

opportunity to record the interview, it is available on all platforms and in most cases it is available without the separate installation of the application beforehand. I contacted all the participants through social media and told them that I am carrying out research, and would appreciate their participation, that it would take about thirty minutes (a subjective approximation, but it did vary between thirty and sixty minutes depending on the informant), and they were informed that that it will happen in Zoom. If they responded positively then the person could suggest a time suitable for him/her. I tried to be as flexible as possible, but if the time did not fit at all, we decided on a time suitable for both of us. Before each interview a meeting had been scheduled in Zoom, and the link had been sent to the participant a few minutes before the interview started. When the connection was established, they were informed that the interview was going to be recorded, but no third person will have access to it. It was not a problem for anyone. Some of them asked if they could switch off the camera for the recording. In two cases they were asked to switch off the camera to maintain the quality of the voice because the signal of the connection was low. When the recording started they were informed that the research has three exercises, they will be introduced to them one by one, that there could be words that are misspelled, but I did not changed them for the sake of authenticity (except for one, but it will be explained in a footnote where it is discussed) and that they should not care about the numbers after the answers before they are informed about the purpose of them. After providing all the necessary information the screen got shared with them and this is how they had access to the research, only getting as much information as needed for the task. At the end the recording was stopped before the questions regarding personal data. This supported the anonymity of the participants.

After the explanations the research started with the first task. The five situations were shown separately. On every page there was a table, the situation itself was described on the left side, and the answers (with their randomized numbers) were listed under one another. The informants were asked in this task to read the situations and the answers, and then express their ideas about them on their own along the lines like: Which one would they use?, Which is the most polite one? Which is the least polite one? etc. After giving the examples they had the opportunity to talk freely about anything they felt important. After that if there was a feature I was interested in but was not mentioned by the informant they were asked about those directly. When they finished their explanation, they got access to the next situation.

These are the situations and the answers they were working with (here the answers are corrected from typos and mistakes, heavily relying on what the informants suggested as correct forms in those cases) with English translations provided.

1. *Бускельдылэн пичи пиезлы кыл сётӥды, солэсь математикая гуртысь ужзэ эскероды шуыса. Берло нош со сярысь воксё вунэтйды. Ӵуказеяз пичи пи дорады лыктэ но юа, малы дораз ӧд пыралэ шуыса.* 'You promised your neighbor's little child that you will check his/her homework in Mathematics. The next day the little child comes to you and asks, why didn't you come?'

- *Копак вунэтӥськем. Вождэ эн вай.* (4)[2] 'I forgot it completely. Don't be angry.[3]'
- *Ой, мон воксё вунэтӥ со сярысь. Вождэ эн вай, пожалуйста. Бӧрысь мон одно ик вуо дорад.* (6) 'Oh, I completely forgot it. Don't be angry, please. Next time I will definitely come.'
- *Вождэ эн вай, чылкак йырысятым потӥз. Жингыртоно вал мыным.* (3) 'Don't be angry, it completely went out of my head. I should have been rung.'
- *Воксё вунэтӥськем ук, малы ачид ӧд ветлы?* (9) 'I completely forgot it, why didn't you come yourself?'
- *Извини монэ пожалуйста! Мон толон со сярысь воксё вунетӥ.* (7) 'Forgive me, please. I completely forgot it yesterday.'

2. *Дышетӥсьты Тйледлы книга сётӥз. Тӥ верады вал, книгазэ туннэ бергес берен берыктӥсьокды шуыса, но шӧдтэк-шорысь тодады лыктэ, книгазэ гуртады вунэтӥллямды шуыса. Дышетӥсь: Ваид-а книгаме?* 'The teacher gave you a book. You told him/her that you will bring back his/her book today, but suddenly you realize that you left his/her book at home. Teacher: Did you bring my book?'

---

[2] As I mentioned above the answers are from previous research. For the sake of the transparency of the text I did not write the ID of the people here, later where I describe the results this information will be provided.

[3] This is the closest translation to the Udmurt expression. The literal translation of the expression is 'Don't bring your green', that is connected to the green color of bile, that is often considered as the byproduct of anger.

• *Вунэтй сьӧрам басьтыны. Луоз-а урокъёс бере сое вайыны?* (93) 'I forgot to bring it with me. Is it possible to bring it after class?'

• *Вунэтйськем. Собере ваё. Вождэс эн вае.* (55) 'I forgot. I'll bring it later.[4] Don't be angry!'

• *Гуртэ вунэтйськем, ӵуказе ваё.* (44) 'I forgot it, I'll bring it tomorrow.'

• *Вождэс эн вае! Мон книгадэс гуртэ вунэтйськем. Яралоз-а аскы вайыны Тӥлед?* (90) 'Don't be angry! I forgot your book. Can I bring it to you tomorrow?'

• *Вождэс эн вае, но мон сое вунэтй. Быгатйсько туннэ жытазе яке урокъёс бере вайымы. Яралоз-а озьы?* (19) 'Don't be angry, but I forgot it. I can bring it to you this evening, or after class. Is it okay that way?'

3. *Тй одйг бӧлъякты дорын официант[5] луыса ужаськоды. Одйгезлы кунодылы уг яра, Тй солы мукет сиён ваиды шуыса.* 'You are working as a waiter at the place of one of your relatives. One of the guests is unhappy, because he/she got a different food than the one he/she ordered.'

• *Вождэс эн вае! Мон туннэ нырысетй нунал ужасько. Мон али ни ваё тӥлесьтыд заказдэс.* (277) 'Don't be angry! This is my first day working here. I'll bring your order right now'.

• *Мар ке уг яра ке, быгатйсько ӧтьыны администраторез. Кулэ-а?* (669) 'If you don't like something, I can call the manager. Do you need that?'[6]

• *Ойдолэ ми мукетсэ ваём.* (369) 'Let us bring you another one.'

• *Вождэс эн вае, али воштом сиёнэз.* (634) 'Don't be angry, we will change the food now.'

• *Вождэс эн вае. Сейчас мон тӥледлы ваё мар куриды. (234)* 'Don't be angry. I will bring you now what you asked for.'

4. *Эшты, кудйз тодэ, Тй ноку но дырыз дыръя уд лыктйське шуыса, 30 минут ӵоже возьма Тӥледыз. Эшты: Остэ! Вуид-а мар-а?! Мон тонэ кудняла возьмасько ни!* 'Your friend who knows that you never arrive on time is waiting you for 30 minutes already. Your friend: Oh my God! You arrived, or what? I've been waiting for you for ages.'

• *Тон тодйськод ук кыӵе мон… Вождэ эн вай. Мон туж тыршо мукет пумиськонэ берамытэк вуыны.* (5320) " 'You know what I am like… Don't be angry. I'll really try my best to arrive on time to the next meeting.'

• *Тон ведь тодйськод, мон дырыз дыръя уг вуилйськы шуыса.* (2389) 'You know that I do not arrive on time.'

• *Вождэ эн вай, тодйськод ук кыӵе мон.* (9996) 'Don't be angry, you know what I am like.'

• *Вождэ эн вай, пожалуйста. Мыным туж возьыт сомында возьмад ни.* (8649) 'Don't be angry, please. I'm ashamed of how much you waited already.'

• *Ой, ну, вождэ эн вай. Тодйськод, кӧня мон дасяськисько.* (6387) 'Oh, well, don't be angry. You know, how much time it takes me to get ready.'

5. *Тй – компанилэн кивалтйсез. Тӥледлы туннэ кенешен кивалтоно. 30 минутлы бергес вуиды.* 'You are the head of a company. Today you must chair a meeting. You arrived 30 minutes late.'

• *Вождэс эн вае. Времяез не расчитал(а)[7].* (34643) 'Don't be angry. I miscalculated the time.'

• *Вождэс эн вае, пожалуйста. Яра-а на собеседование ортчытыны? Мон дырме кӧня ке расчитать ӧй кар.* (89769) 'Don't be angry, please. Is it still okay to have the meeting? I miscalculated my time a bit.'

• *Вождэс эн вае, бергес вуэме понна. Вазьгес ӧз пӧрмы лыктыны.* (82333) 'Don't be angry because of my late arrival. I couldn't arrive earlier'

• *Вождэс эн вае.* (77149) 'Don't be angry.'

---

[4] Lit. 'I'll bring it after that'

[5] As it will be visible at Picture 1, there was a typo because официант was misspelled as оффициант

[6] Lit. 'If something is not liked, I can call the manager. Is it needed?'

[7] The only change I made in the questionnaire, is that I made it inambigous whether the past form of the Russian verb was used as *расчитал* or *расчитала*. It would have given away the gender of the speaker who gave that answer but in exercise 3 it is one of the tasks of the speaker to tell me what gender do they assume based on the answers. Grammatical gender is not a feature of Udmurt langauge (same for other Finno-Ugric languages), so it did not cause a problem at other places.

- *Вождэс эн вае, берами шуыса. Кыӵе ке уже шедиз, сое шедьтыны тырши.* (82169) 'Don't be angry for being late. I happened to have some work, I tried to solve that.'

The second and the third tasks are connected to each other, as the purpose of both of them is to find out if it is possible to identify the speakers by their language use, but they take a different approach. In Task 2 they had to try to group the answers, and in Task 3, after revealing the correct way of ordering trying to define characteristics of the people who gave the answers.

1. Бускельлэн пичи пиез.   2. Дышетӥсьлэн книгаез   3. Оффициант   4. Эш возьмаське   5. Кивалтӥсь бере кыле

Копак вунэтӥськем. Вождэ эн вай. (4)	Вунэтӥ сьӧрам басьтыны. Луоз-а урокъёс бере сое вайыны? (93)	Вождэс эн вае! Мон туннэ нырысь нунал ужасько. Мон али ни ваё тӥлэсьтыд заказдэс. (277)
Ой, мон воксё вунэтӥ со сярысь. Вождэ эн вай, пожалуйста. Бӧрысь мон одно ик вуо дорад. (6)	Вунэтӥськем. Собере ваё. Вождэс эн вае. (55)	Мар ке уг яра ке, мон быгатӥсько ӧтьыны адяминистраторез. Кулэ-а? (699)
Вождэ эн вай, чылкак йырысьтым потӥз. Жингыртоно вал мыным. (3)	Гуртэ вунэтӥськем, чуказе ваё. (44)	Ойдолэ ми тӥледлы мукетсэ ваём. (396)
Воксё вунэтӥськем ук, малы ачид ӧд ветлы? (9)	Вождэс эн вае! Мон книгадэс гуртэ вунэтӥськем. Яралоз-а аслы вайыны тӥлед? (90)	Вождэс эн вае, али вош톰 сиёнэз. (634)
извини монэ пожалуйста! Мон толон со сярысь воксё вунэтӥ. (7)	Вождэс эн вае, но мон сое вунетӥ. Быгатӥсько туннэ жытазе яке урокъёс бере вайыны. Яралоз-а озы? (19)	Вождэс эн вае. Сейчас мон тӥледлы ваё мар куриды. (234)

Тодӥськод ук кыӵе мон… Вождэ эн вай. Мон туж тыршо мукет пумиськонэ берамытэк вуыны. (5320)	Вождэс эн вае. Времяез ик расчитал(а). (34643)
Тон ведь тодӥськод, мон дырыз дыръя уг вуылиськы муген. (2389)	Вождэс эн вае, пожалуйста. Яра-а на собеседование ортчытыны. Мон дырме нӧняме расчитать ӧй кар (89769)
Вождэ эн вай, тодӥськод ук кыӵе мон. (9996)	Вождэс эн вае, бергес вуэме понна. Вазьгес ӧз пӧрмы лыктыны. (82333)
Вождэ эн вай, пожалуйста. Мыным туж возьыт сомында возьмад ни нужен. (8649)	Вождэс эн вае. (77149)
ой, ну, вождэ эн вай. Тодӥськод, кӧня мон дасяськисько. (6387)	Вождэс эн вае, берами шуыса. Маин амтем уже шедиз, сое шедьтыны тырши. (82169)

Picture 1: Task 2 of the research

Before introducing the informants to the second task, they were told that the numbers behind the answers gain their significance now. They were informed that the answers are from five different people, all of them gave an answer for each situation and the answers will appear in tables, the answers belonging to the same situation are in the same column, and their task is to pick an answer for each situation for each person. To put it in another way: they should make five groups of five answers. The number of digits of the numbers are there to help them, as they should pick their answers that way: every person should be matched with a one-digit number, a two-digit number and so on. To help them remember the situations they were provided with a small summary of the situations in order, located at the top of the page. They have some time to think about their answers, they had the possibility to make less than five groups if they are not sure about all of them, or they can say that based on the answers provided it is not possible to group the answers. To help the informants as much as possible when they told the groups they came up with, the answers they used before will be crossed. I was surprised in a positive way because I expected a few informants to opt-out from this task, but this happened only once, regardless the clarification that it is a valid option. This was the task that had the biggest variation in time, as some of the speakers answered quite quickly, while others needed much more time, but they were never rushed to finish it, they could use as much time as they needed.

Before showing them task three they were told, that in that part they will see what the correct groupings of the answers were, or to put it in another way, what were the answers belonging to the same person. They were comforted, that they do not have to worry whether they grouped the answers correctly or not. They got the situations and the answers in a two column five row table on separate pages for each person. In the left column they had the small summaries of the situations (the same ones as in Task 2) and on the right column the answers given by that person. Their task was to tell me, based on the answers, the gender and the age of that person, whether they are the speaker of the Northern, the Southern or the Central dialect of Udmurt, and the region (rus. *район*, udm. *ёрос*) of that person. They were also asked to elaborate on their reasoning. The twist in this task that they did not know about, that the only difference between these people was that they

were from different regions, and therefore they were the speakers of different dialects, but actually they were all female, and the biggest difference in age was 3 years. I decided to go this way, because the dialect is the property that is the easiest to identify based on the differences in the vocabulary and in grammar. As the gender was the same and the age was almost the same for all of them, I had an easier task to identify, if there is proper reasoning behind their guesses, or they are just relying on stereotypes.

The analysis

Task 1

In this section the most important evaluations that the informants gave are discussed. Among these evaluations there will be some, that are more general ones, about more answers, but there will be answer-specific ones as well. The answers will be referred to by their randomly generated numbers.

In the first situation the first answer to mention was number 6. Five informants out of the ten said that this is the politest answer from the five and five people said that they would use this one. But actually, the five people saying that this is the politest one were not the same ones, as the ones saying that they would choose this one to say in a situation. It will be visible later, that this is a common tendency: the politest answer is not always the ultimate choice of the informants. Although this was the most popular answer, there was one person who said that in its presented form, he/she doesn't consider this sentence as a correct response in the situation. According to his/her explanation, the last sentence of the answer is a bold statement. Although the speaker offers help in the future, there is no time indicated when it will happen, it could seem like an empty statement.

Answer number 3 and 9 got similar evaluations. They were considered neutral answers by some of the informants, but in four cases both answers were considered impolite, or close to impolite. The reasoning of all informants in both cases were the same: the person tries to take less responsibility in the situation and tries to shift some blame onto the other person. One informant also mentioned about answer 9, that it is okay to use, but only in those situations when the participants are in a good enough relationship. This shows some contrast with the things one could experience in Hungarian. According to my experiences, in case of the speakers of Hungarian the two situations would not have been this similar. Asking the other person why didn't he/she come, would be considered rude by the Hungarians as well. But asking the other person why he/she didn't call me, or why didn't they send a message wouldn't be considered impolite by the Hungarians. It is a small thing to ask for and wouldn't be considered shifting the blame onto the other person. It would be rather considered giving permission for next time, to disturb in a similar situation. This would try to make the other people think that we are humans as well, we also make small mistakes, but feel free to correct us. However, asking the other person to come and remind us would be impolite in Hungarian as well, because it demands a much bigger effort from the other person. In the case of the Udmurt speakers it seems much more like if you give your word to someone, you are 100 % responsible for the situation. In case of answer number 9 just like in the case of number 6 there was one person, who went against the flow and said that this is the one they would use.

The most common comment about answer seven is not related to politeness (as it was mainly considered as a polite answer) but something that supports the fact that mixing Russian expression in their speak is quite common. Four of the informants mentioned that it could be more Udmurt, but this is a good answer, and many people would say it this way, with the same amount of Russian elements.

After this section they got two questions: do they think that it makes the answer more polite if the speaker says the verb forget in the second past form (as this expresses that they had no control over the situation, and this way, try to defend their own faces). The other question was whether the modal words like *ук* would make the answers more polite. The latter question was included starting from the second informant. The original idea was to ask only the first question, but in the first interview, after asking the first question the informant said that in their opinion the second past form has no effect on the politeness, but these modal words have, as they show, that the speaker has emotional connection to his/her answer.

The answers for the first question was quite diverse. Five out of the ten informants said that it makes no difference (one saying that in their dialect they rather use the second past form), three of them said that it makes the answer more polite (one of them saying that it makes the speaker emotionally connected to the answer) and two of them said that for them the use of the second past makes them feel that the person would like to take less responsibility. Although this is the smallest group of the informants, this answer was quite surprising, because my expectation was that they would consider the sentences with the second past form

more polite. A possible explanation for this is that what they consider polite is a bit different what is linguistically considered polite. As it was mentioned above Foley [5] wrote that in a politeness situation both of the participants should feel appreciated. So, what those two people considered impolite was just an attempt from the speaker to defend their own face by expressing that they had no control over that situation. On the other hand, if we take into consideration that according to the evaluations the speaker should take 100 % responsibility if they don't keep their word can support the idea of these last two people.

In the case of the second question there was no controversy. Half of the people said explicitly, that the modal words make the answers more polite, two people said that it shows that the person is emotionally connected to their answer and the last 3 people said, that it just puts the verb much more in the focus, but has no effect on the level of politeness of the answer.

In the second situation the first answer to mention is number 44. Seven out of the ten informants said that it is impolite, and two more said, that it is a normal answer, but it would be much better if the speaker would have said at least a sorry. This latter two can be connected to those seven saying that this is impolite, just the level of the considered impoliteness is the one that is different.

The evaluations of answers number 90 and 19 were quite similar: they were both considered very polite. Number 19 got more votes as the most polite one, but on the other hand about half of those people who considered this one as the most polite said, that they would rather use number 90, because number 19 is way too polite, more than needed.

In the case of the third situation answer number 277 was considered the most or the second most polite answer. However, there were some interesting answers as well: although many people said that this answer had the correct amount of explanation, there was one person who said that it is way too much. We can see the trend that usually most people agree on the decisions, but there is always a person who thinks completely opposite. In these cases, and it is true for the previous situations as well, I mention if there is a person who thinks the opposite, but I count it as a marginal thing, because it seems to be caused by only personal preferences.

The next answer, number 699, was the one considered the most impolite answer. Eight people said that it is impolite, one said that it is an okay answer, and one said that he/she thinks that it is a Russian way of acting in that situation, that instead of taking the responsibility the waiter asks if the guest wants him/her to call the manager. The interesting thing about this latter one is that no other person identified it as a Russian way or any other way of acting. In this case I would rather say that it is not 100 % that Russians would act like this in a situation. As it was visible earlier, according to the data, as for the Udmurt norms, you have to take 100 % responsibility for your promises. The job of a waiter can be translated as a person who promises to bring the food the person asked for. As he/she did not do it in the situation and tries to get out of responsibility by calling the manager the person does not follow the Udmurt norms, so it has been affected some way. As Russian is the language and culture having the biggest influence on the Udmurts that person can assume that it should be a Russian way of acting in a situation like this. In other words, Russian here doesn't definitely stand for Russian itself, rather something that is not Udmurt.

In the fourth situation the tendency I was talking about before appeared again: there was an answer which was chosen as one of the most (number 5320), or the most polite by the majority of the people, but most of them said that it wouldn't be their choice in their speech in this situation because it is way too serious, and way too long for an answer to a friend (although fewer people chose it but the case was similar with answer number 8649). The difference between this and the other cases before is that earlier they just marked different sentences as the politest and the one they would use, but in this case, they explicitly said that they wouldn't use it.

Answer number 2389 was considered a regular answer that is correct in this situation, also one person mentioned that this is a typical answer in case of the younger generations but two people said that it is not polite (enough) because the speaker did not say sorry. This is another phenomenon that was visible before, the answer would be okay if only there had been a sorry. Some people even stated during the interviews that it is an inevitable element of the apologies, that you say, 'I'm sorry'. One person even said multiple times that in these situations you should say 'I'm sorry', by this you make sure that you included politeness in your answer, and then you say your explanation. This can make one think that *вождэс эн вае* 'I'm sorry (formal)' and *вождэ эн вай* (I'm sorry, informal) in those cases serve much more as marker to show that I am polite in the situation, rather than a request for forgiveness.

The most popular answer in this situation was number 9996. Most people chose this answer as what they would use. It wasn't the most polite one, even some people who chose it as their go-to sentence said that this is even a bit impolite, but as in this situation they are talking to a friend, he/she understand this the situa-

tion, and wouldn't be disturbed by its impolite manner. Although fewer people chose it, but answer number 6387 was a similar situation, many people considered it a bit impolite, but okay to use between friends.

In the case of the fifth situation we encounter the most common tendency again. Answer number 89769 is considered as one of the politest answers, if not the politest one, but people wouldn't use it. In addition to saying that it is way too polite, it is mentioned by more informants that this is unprofessional of a director to ask whether they can have the meeting or not. As the head of that company, he/she would be the one who decides what to do, and the other should follow his/her words. The situation was similar in the case of answer number 82169 it was also considered too much.

With four votes answer number 82333 was the most popular choice to use by the informants. Based on their previous answers I would suggest that they chose this one because the person says sorry, and after that gives a short, professional excuse that is not into much detail. This is also supported by the fact that answer number 77149 was evaluated by the informants as a too short answer and some said that this is unprofessional as well: one of the informants said, that a good director should give at least a small explanation, and another said that it would be only okay, if that person was not the one holding the meeting just taking part in it, as would like to be polite, but wouldn't like to disturb the meeting.

Task 2

As it was mentioned above, in this part I was interested in whether they can group the answers belonging to the same person, or they cannot. So as a first step I show the correct groups, by the numbers of the sentences:

- Speaker 1: 3, 93, 634, 5320, 82169
- Speaker 2: 4, 55, 234, 2389, 34643
- Speaker 3: 7, 90, 277, 8649, 89769
- Speaker 4: 6, 19, 699, 6387, 77149
- Speaker 5: 9, 44, 396, 9996, 82333

As one of the informants opted-out from this task I only examined the answers of nine informants. I included only those answers in this research where the informant identified at least three sentences belonging to the same speaker. The reason behind this is that two answers could be matched by accident as well.

First take a look on the results from the speakers' point of view. There were no such cases, where all five answers were connected to a speaker. There were four cases in which four were matched correctly: Speaker 1: 3-93-5320-82169; Speaker 2: 4-55-234-34643; Speaker 3: 90-277-8649-89765; Speaker 5: 9-396-9996-82333. There were seven cases in which 3 were matched correctly: Speaker 1: 3-93-634; Speaker 2: 55-234-2389, 4-55-2389, 4-55-234; Speaker 4: 699-6387-77149 (this combination appeared two times), 6-19-699. Those speakers, who had their answers matched correctly in both categories are Speaker 1, Speaker 2 and Speaker 4. As it is visible Speaker 2 got recognized the most (four times), then Speaker 4 (three times), Speaker 1 (twice) and finally Speaker 3 and Speaker 5 (once each).

Looking at the results from the informants' point of view it turns out that not only the number of good answers were low, but the number of those who gave correct answers as well. From the nine informants only five could make correct matchups, and even their number of correct answers are disproportionate. There were two informants that gave four correct answers (two times guessing a group of four, and two times guessing a group of three each), three informants giving one correct answer (all three of them guessing a group of three) and there were four informants who could not guess any (and also there was the tenth informant who opted-out). To put it in another way two people guessed eight of the eleven answers taken into consideration, the remaining three were given by three different person (one each) and the others could not make any correct groups.

At first glance it could seem that this is due to the fact that all the answers were given by girls, from the same age and all of them were the speakers of either the speakers of the Northern or the Central dialect. However, it would be a rushed decision because there are some facts that can put the results in a different light:

1. The main informant grouped only three of his/her own answers correctly.

2. The close relative of the main informant could not match at least three of his/hers.

3. Only one person said that this task is not possible, and none of them made less than five groups which means that the other nine should have found some kind of logic to make their decisions.

4. If the results are due to the similarity, then in task 3 the gender and/or the age and/or the dialect should get a really high percentage showing, that those answers are way too similar to each other to distinguish them from each other.

Task 3

As I would like to protect the main informant, the relative and the one who opted-out I do not uncover which answer was given by which informant (main, relative, teachers, students, the ones living abroad)

Table 1: **The results for Speaker 1**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Gender	F	M	F	F	F	F	M	M	F
Age	20-25	25-27	~20	18-25	20-30	25	17-18	20	38
Dialect	N	C	S	S	N	N	–	–	S
Region	Debes/ Igra	–	–	Grakh	–	–	–	–	Alnash / Grakh / Kukmor

Speaker 1 is a female, who was 18 when I acquired her data, and speaks the Northern dialect of Udmurt as she is from Igra region. So, based on the results only the 66.6 % of the people I asked guessed her gender correctly, the average age guessed was 21.17 which is 3.17 years off, only 33.3 % guessed the dialect correctly and only 11.1 % guessed the region correctly[8].

Table 2: **The results for Speaker 2**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Gender	M	F	M	F	M	M	M	M	M
Age	23–25	20	40	20–30	20–40	17–18	40	~20	20
Dialect	N	S	N	C	N	N	C	–	C
Region	Debes/ Igra	Pichi Purga	–	Deri	–	–	–	–	Deri

Speaker two is a female, who was 18 when I acquired her data, and speaks the Central dialect of Udmurt as she is from Deri region. So, based on the results only the 22.2 % of the people I asked guessed her gender correctly, the average age guessed was 26–27 which is 8.27 years off, only 33.3 % guessed the dialect correctly and 33.3 % guessed the region correctly.

Table 3: **The results for Speaker 3**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Gender	F	F	F	M	F	F	F	F	F
Age	30	30	40	20-25	–	20	18–19	~20	50
Dialect	N	C	N	N/C	N	C	S	N	N
Region	Balezino	Igra	Glazov	Sharkan / Yakshur-Bodya	~~Debes~~	–	Alnash / Pichi Purga	–	Balezino

Speaker 3 is a female, who was 19 when I acquired her data, and speaks the Northern dialect of Udmurt as she is from Balezino region. So, based on the results 88.9 % of the people I asked guessed her gender correctly, the average age guessed was 28.88 which is 9.88 years off, 61 % guessed the dialect correctly and 44.4 % guessed the region correctly.

Table 4: **The results for Speaker 4**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Gender	F	F	M	F	M	M	F	F	M
Age	20–23	18	25–30	25–30	30	35	24–25	30	26
Dialect	N	C	C	S	N	S	–	N/C	S
Region	–	Sharkan	–	Pichi Purga	–	–	Izhevsk	–	Pichi Purga

---

[8] In case of the regions I labeled the guess correct if the person said the exact region, or a neighbouring region.

Speaker 4 is a female, who was 19 when I acquired her data, and speaks the Northern dialect of Udmurt as she is from Debes region. So, based on the results the 55.6 % of the people I asked guessed her gender correctly, the average age guessed was 25.6 which is 6.56 years off, only 27.8 % guessed the dialect correctly and 11.1 % guessed the region correctly.

Table 5: **The results for Speaker 5**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Gender	M	M	F	?	M	M	F	M	F
Age	30-35	22-23	60-70	25-30	30-40	35	24-25	~30	18
Dialect	C	S	N/C	S	S	S	–	N	S
Region	Izhevsk / Deri	Pichi Purga	–	Alnash / Pichi Purga	–	–	Izhevsk		Pichi Purga

Speaker 5 is a female, who was 21 when I acquired her data, and speaks the Central dialect of Udmurt as she is from Sharkan region. So, based on the results only the 33.3 % of the people I asked guessed her gender correctly, the average age guessed was 32.2 which is 11.2 years off, only 16,7 % guessed the dialect correctly and 0 % guessed the region correctly.

The following decisions can be drawn: although there were some answers that were quite close, on average the gender was guessed correctly in 53,32 % of the cases, the age was usually 7.816 years off with really extreme values sometimes, the dialect (that was considered as the easiest to guess) was guessed correctly in 31.1 % of the cases and the location where the person is from have been guessed in the 19,98 % of the cases if the neighboring region is counted as correct as well.

In my opinion this shows that in case of apologies neither of those parameters have an effect on the language use. In the case of the gender and the dialect there are only a few percent differences between the average result and the possibility of blind guessing: 3.32 % in the case of the gender, and 2.2 % in the case of the region. Following the same logic the 19,98 % percent in the case of the place of origin could be considered high, as there are twenty-five regions, so there is a 4 % chance if we guess blindly, but actually in one case no one guessed the region correctly, in two cases only one person, and there were two regions that got high results. This fact, supported by that that the region was recognized mainly by dialectic words or grammatical forms and nothing related to politeness. At last, the guesses of the age of the speakers was off by 7.816 years. This is the hardest to define whether it is low or high but if we take it into consideration that the average age of the people whose answers were analyzed was 19.5 this is a high difference. The reason behind this is that if we take into consideration that in their culture a 19.5 years old woman usually has no children, no husband, and if she attended university she is in the beginning of her studies not much after high school, and a 27.3 years old woman usually have a children, has a husband, and if attended university already have a BA diploma, but could have a second BA or an MA level diploma next to it, it seems obvious, that there is a huge difference in their social status.

These results combined with the results of task 2 (stating that the small number of correct answers in task 2 is due to the similarity of the speakers) would have definitely been a rushed decision. In task 3 the overall result shows that the informants had a low success rate identifying the gender, the age, and the dialect of the speakers. Furthermore, Speaker 2, whose answers were grouped correctly the most in task two, was one of the least identified people in task 3: only 22 % of the speakers guessed the gender correctly, her average guessed age was 8.27 years off and only 33 % guessed the dialect correctly. Those few cases when they had close ideas about the identity of a speaker can be the results of the fact that those speakers matched the stereotypes more than the others. To find this out in the next chapter I discuss the most common reasoning in task 3 given by my informants to support their answers.

The reasoning of the speakers

Reasoning with no stereotypical background

Although all the speakers were the representatives of the Central or the Northern dialect the word *жингыртыны* 'to ring, to call someone' was considered as an indicator of someone being the speaker of the Southern dialect, because according to my informants the speakers of the Central and the Northern dialects

tend to use the Russian *звонить* 'to ring, to call someone' in an „Udmurtised" form: *звонитьтыны, звонить карыны*.

The use of the word *ойдолэ* 'let's' was mentioned as a word mainly used by the users of the Southern dialect.

Many informants mentioned that one of the indicators of the dialects is whether the speaker uses *тӥледлы* 'to you (plural or formal)' or *тӥлед* 'to you (plural or formal)'. The latter is the one used by the speakers of the Northern dialect and the former by the ones speaking the Southern dialect.

One of my informants considered the word *гуртэ* 'to home' an indicator that the speaker is a representative of the Northern dialect, because in the South they prefer to use *доре* 'to home'.

According to my informants the word *аскы* 'tomorrow' shows that a speaker is the representative of the northern dialect because it is a dialextic variant there for *ӵуказе* 'tomorrow'.

The last thing I would like to mention here is on the edge of being stereotypical. Many informants considered a Speaker Northern if they used Russian words in their sentences. This statement has linguistic background, as it is known that the Northern dialect is heavily influenced by the Russian language and the Southern dialect is heavily influenced by the Tatar language [3, p. 4]. However, the effect of these languages is not exclusive for these dialects, and it is also known, that the Udmurts often use *суро пожо кыл* 'mixed language' [22, p. 108, p. 111]. In her dissertation about attitudes towards Russian and Udmurt, Shirobokova [24, p. 89] who is a native speaker of the language states that according her own experiences this kind of language use is quite common in her target group. Although that target group consists only the speakers of one village, but in 2010 from the 349 inhabitants of the village 335 were Udmurts [24, p. 79], so 96 % of them. Also, the village is located in the Udmurt dominant Sharkan region (speakers of the Central dialect), where the 83,1 % of the inhabitants were Udmurts in 2010 [24, p. 75]. If it is common to use *суро пожо кыл* in such an Udmurt dominant territory, then it is safe to assume that it is common in the less Udmurt dominant regions as well. Taking all this into consideration it is clear that in those cases, where a Speaker was labeled as Northern for using Russian expressions tends to be stereotypical, although it is supported by linguistics as well.

Reasonings based on stereotypes

One of the most common stereotypes seemed to be connected to the length of the answers. In many cases my informants considered someone a woman if the answer was long and considered someone a man if the answer was short. Their explanation was that women usually speak a lot more than man: they explain the situation much more in details, or they are more polite, and being polite elongates the speech. On the other hand, men usually don't speak more than necessary. However, some of the explanations contradicted each other: they agreed on that part that the speaker is male, as he gave short responses, but some of them said that this is typical to young man, as they don't really like to speak, while others said that short answers are typical for old men for multiple reasons: they don't have to explain themselves, they do not have time to be polite as they have too much work to do, or because of their age they are tired, and do not want to spend too much energy on explaining themselves.

What seemed to be another often used stereotype was that if a person is less polite that they would have expected in that situation or not polite at all then they are young and/or male. They usually used the Russian word *дерзкий* (or the „Udmurtised" *дерзкой*) to explain this kind of behavior. According to the Russian Explanatory Dictionary [1] the meaning of this word can be 'disrespectful', 'rude', 'defiant', 'recklessly brave', 'desperate' or 'risky'. So, in this situation it means something like 'someone who dares to breach the norm'. The informants seemed to agree that the less polite someone is, the younger they are, but it seemed to be random when it was considered a male property. There weren't specific answers that would have triggered this decision.

Another common stereotype used by the informants: if someone uses forms mainly used in the standard variant of the Udmurt language, then that person is from either from the capital city of the Udmurt Republic, Izhevsk or from Deri region (the region that surrounds Izhevsk). As Kozmács [13, p. 67] mentions the institutes associated with standardization were the newspapers, the printing houses, the TV and radio programs and the Udmurt theatre. Also, the Udmurt State University (where the Institute of Udmurt Philology, Finno-Ugristics and Journalism is located) and the Udmurt Institute of History, Language and Literature, which is the Udmurt Research Centre of the Uralic Department of the Russian Academy of Sciences can be found in this city. So Izhevsk is a cultural and scientific center of Udmurtia. This makes it understandable,

why they associate the standard language with this city. However, this doesn't mean that they would use the standard variant of the language only here.

The last two stereotypes are both connected to the female speakers. The first is emotionality. Some of my informants said, that they guessed some of the speakers to be a woman, because they gave emotional answers. The other stereotype was triggered by one verb: дасяськисько 'I am getting ready'. Two of my informants decided the gender of the speaker by the fact that she explains being late by the fact that she was getting ready.

Of course, these stereotypes are not Udmurt language specific ones. Some of them are listed by Mills [19], who researched the connections between gender and politeness, as well. She mentions that women are usually considered more polite then man, as two of the main stereotypes about the women's behavior is trying to avoid conflict and being cooperative [19, p. 203]. She also mentions Holmes' [12] theory, that for women the way they express themselves is also very important, while for men the most important thing is the exchange of information. Mills also mentions [19, p. 221] that there is a stereotype that women tend to use excessive amount of politeness forms, and expressions related to politeness.

The time needed for getting ready is also a stereotype commonly associated with women. It is an often-used element of movies, jokes, or memes, so we cannot say, that it would be a specific Udmurt stereotype. However, in Russia it is a bit more intensive. A commonly used characterization about women from Russia is that they seem to go even to the shops with full makeup and in their finest dresses. Usually it is explained by the idea that in the Second World War the country lost a lot of men on the battlefields, so the girls always have to show their topnotch form so they will have a chance to find a husband.

It is also common that the capital city of a country (or in the case of the Udmurt, the capital of a republic within the federation) is associated with the standard language. Smakman [25, p. 42] mentions the case of Tokyo. He writes that in Japan mistakenly the Tokyo variant is considered by many as the standard variant of Japanese. The reason behind this is that Tokyo is the largest city, a cultural and industrial hub of Japan, and the most prominent university is found there. This perfectly falls in line with the situation of the Udmurt language.

Summary

Although there were always one or two people among my informants who perceived the answers completely differently than the others, it is safe to say that the speakers usually agreed on what is polite and what is impolite. The biggest disagreement was in the case of the interpretation of the use of the second past form. According to the theory, the use of it would indicate politeness, as the speaker tries to minimize the threat on his/her own face by emphasizing that the he/she did not have any control over the action. Some of the speakers considered these forms more polite than the first past form, correlating with the theory, but another group of the speakers felt that the emphasizing the lack of control makes the apology impolite, as they try to sneak out of the responsibility. This is definitely a topic that should be looked deeper into in a future research. In my opinion one of the best ways to examine this could be a research from a dialectic point of view, because it is quite probable, that this difference can be in connection with how widespread the use of the second past form is in the given dialect (the speakers of the southern dialect tend to use it more than the speakers of the northern dialect). It could be also compared to the interpretation of the use of this verb form in the Tatar language, which has affected and still does affect the Udmurt language, and has the same linguistic phenomenon. The informants usually did not really feel any problems with the Russian codeswitching; they said that it is quite common that Udmurts speak like this, especially the representatives of the younger generation. In the case of the answer that was included because of its impolite manner has been described by some informants as Russian effect. In my opinion in this case it is not exactly Russian what should be interpreted, but rather foreign, not Udmurt. They did not say it is Russian, because it would definitely be a Russian characteristic phenomenon to be rude, just not typical for Udmurt, therefore unfamiliar. As Russian is a language which has a huge influence on the Udmurt language it could have been the reason behind the assumption, that being rude is a Russian influence as well.

In the second part of my research I was interested in whether the speakers can identify any social group of the speakers based on their language use. Based on my results I can say that they could not really identify the speakers. The close relative could not identify the main informant's characteristics correctly, although he/she meets him/her on a daily basis. On the other hand the main informant correctly identified the characteristics of "himself/herself", and his/her reasoning was *Мон но озьы верасал* 'I would say the same

way'[9] but did not realise how close he/she was to the truth, as those were his/her answers. The informants' answers in average were as close as if they would have blindly guessed the answers. However, except for one speaker no one said that it is not possible to identify the speakers age, gender, dialect, and place of origin, and they also grouped the answers based on which one of them could belong to the same person. As it was visible, in case of the age and the gender they almost always relied on stereotypes. Some of these stereotypes were quite specific, but some of them were more opaque and the same reasoning could be used for different groups. Based on this research with ten informants I would not draw far-reaching conclusions, maybe a bigger study with more informants would bring a different results, but as for now it implies that actually there is no specific social group of speakers that would have such a specific way of language use that differentiates them from the others easily.

<div align="center">REFERENCES</div>

1. *Bol'shoy tol'kovy slovar'.* Kuznecov S.A. (ed.) St. Petersburg: Norit, 1998. (In Russian).
2. Brown P., Levinson S.C. *Politeness: Some universlas in language usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. (In English).
3. Edygarova-Mantel S. The varieties of the modern Udmurt language. *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* 62, 2014, pp. 376–398. (In English).
4. Eelen G. *A critique of politeness theories.* Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing, 2001. (In English).
5. Foley W. *Anthropological Linguistics: An introduction.* Blackwell, 1997. (In English).
6. Goffman E. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior.* New York: Doubleday, 1967. (In English).
7. Goffman E. *Relations in Public.* London: Allen Lane, 1971. (In English).
8. Grice P. Logic and conversation. *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts.* Cole P., Morgan J.L. (eds.) New York: Academic Press, 1975, pp. 41–58. (In English).
9. Harris M. Emics and etics revisited. *Emics and etics. The insider/outsider debate.* Headland T., Pike K., Harris M. (eds.) Newbury Park: Sage, 1990, pp. 48 – 61. (In English).
10. Haugh M. Epilogue: The first-second order distinction in face and politeness research. *Journal of Politeness Research.* Vol. 8, iss. 1. Berlin, Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2012, pp. 111–134. (In English).
11. Holmes J. Apologies in New Zealand English. *Language and Society.* Vol. 19. Issue 2, 1990, pp. 155–199. (In English).
12. Holmes J. *Women, men and politeness.* London: Longman, 1995. (In English).
13. Kozmács I. Kisebbségi nyelvhasználat – anyaország nélkül. *Fórum Társadalomtudományi Szemle* Vol. X. Issue 3., 2008, pp. 41–70. (In Hungarian).
14. Kubitsch R. *Evidencialitás a mai udmurt nyelvben.* – Szegedi Tudományegyetem: MA thesis, 2017. (In Hungarian).
15. Kubitsch R., Németh Z. Az evidencialitás udvariassági stratégiaként történő használata az udmurtban. *Tudományos eredmények a nagyvilágból – bővített kiadás: Válogatás a Campus Mundi ösztöndíjasok tanulmányaiból.* Tóth B. (ed.) Budapest: Tempus Közalapítvány, 2019, pp. 87–94. (In Hungarian).
16. Kubitsch R., Németh Z. Evidential forms as politeness strategies in Udmurt from a pluricentric point of view. *European Pluricentric Languages in Contact and Conflict.* Muhr R. (ed.) Berlin: Peter Lang Verlag, 2020, pp. 207–221. (In Hungarian).
17. Leech G. *Principles of pragmatics.* London, New York: Longman Group Ltd., 1983. (In English).
18. Márquez Reiter R. *Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Uruguay – A contrastive study of requests and apologies.* – Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2000. (In English).
19. Mills S. *Gender and politeness.* UK: Cambridge, 2003. (In English).
20. Németh Z. Vzaimosvyaz' form vezhlivogo obrashcheniya i neochevidnogo proshedshego vremeni v sovremennom udmurtskom yazyke [The relationship between politeness forms and the non-witnessed past tense in the contemporary Udmurt language]. *Permistika XVII: Dialekty i istoriya permskikh yazykov vo vzaimodeystvii s drugimi yazykami. Materialy XVII Mezhdunarodnogo simpoziuma* [Permistics XVII: Dialects and history of the Permic languages in comparison with other languages]. Malceva M.A. (ed.) Kudymkar: Kudymkarskij Pedagogicheskij Koledzh, 2018, pp. 167 – 173. (In Russian).
21. Pikes K.L. *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behaviour.* The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter, 1967. (In English).
22. Pischlöger Ch. Udmurt on Social Network Sites: A comparison with the Welsh Case. *Linguistic Genocide or Superdiversity?: New and Old Language Diversities.* New York: Channel View Publications, 2016, pp. 108–132. (In English).
23. Searle J. *Expression and Meaning: Studies In The Theory of Speech Acts* – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979. (In English).

---

[9] I would give the same answers.

24. Shirobokova L. *Az udmurt-orosz kétnyelvűség (Udmurt Köztársaság, Sarkan járás, Muvyr község)*. Dissertation. Budapest: Nyelvtudományi Doktori Iskola. ELTE., 2011. (In Hungarian).
25. Smakman D. 2012. The definition of the standard language. A survey in seven countries. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language 218*, 2012, pp. 25 - 58. (In English).
26. Szili K. *Tetté vált szavak – A beszédaktusok elmélete és gyakorlata*. Budapest: Tinta Könyvkiadó, 2013 (In Hungarian).
27. Watts R., Sachiko I., Ehlich K. Introduction. *Politeness in Language. Studies in its history, theory and practice*. Watts R., Sachiko I., Ehlich K. (eds.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992. pp. 1-17. (In English).

Németh Z., PhD student of the Department of Finno-Ugrian Philology
University of Szeged
Egyetem str., 2, Szeged, Hungary, 6722
E-mail: nemethzoltan991@gmail.com

З. Немет

ПЕРВЫЕ ШАГИ В ИССЛЕДОВАНИИ ВЕЖЛИВОСТИ ПЕРВОГО ПОРЯДКА В УДМУРТСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

DOI: 10.35634/2412-9534-2021-31-3-521-536

Настоящее исследование является продолжением моей диссертации, написанной на кафедре Финно-угорской филологии Университета Сегеда. В статье я не анализирую выражение вежливости, как это делалось в диссертации, поскольку я включаю ответы носителей языка. Они выражают собственные идеи относительно различных ответов, полученных мной в ходе выполнения диссертации. Исследование основано на интервью, проведённых с десятью носителями удмуртского языка. Эти респонденты представляют не только различные возрастные категории, но и имеют другие особенности: говорящие на южных и северных диалектах, студенты и преподаватели Удмуртского государственного университета, как минимум два года (на момент проведения интервью) живущие за рубежом носители языка. Во время интервью предполагалось выполнить три основных задания: в первом они должны были выразить свое мнение об ответах, полученных ранее в различных ситуациях выражения вежливости, во втором нужно было сгруппировать ответы на основании того, какие из них могут принадлежать одному и тому же говорящему, и в последнем были показаны правильные группы ответов, и респонденты должны были определить возраст, пол, диалект и происхождение говорящего. Их ответы могут быть полезными для подтверждения результатов моего предыдущего исследования и для раскрытия новой перспективы в исследовании, поскольку носители языка видят малейшие различия, которые могут быть упущены людьми, не являющимися носителями. Исследование состоит из двух основных частей. В первой части носители языка выражают свои мысли относительно ответов в конкретных ситуациях, а во второй части они определяют возраст, пол, диалект и происхождение носителей на основе их ответов. В первой части ответы обычно совпадали друг с другом, но интерпретация использования неочевидного прошедшего времени удмуртского языка привела к значительному противоречию в этом исследовании. Как и ожидалось, некоторые из говорящих указали, что использование неочевидного прошедшего времени делает предложение более вежливым, но другие респонденты указали обратное, потому что в их интерпретации это означает, что говорящий старается избежать ответственности, используя эту временную форму. Из второй части исследования чётко видно, что не существует возрастной, гендерной, диалектной или географической группы говорящих, которую можно было бы легко выявить по данным ответам, и говорящие в основном, но не исключительно, использовали стереотипы для идентификации. В результате их ответы были примерно такими же точными, как и слепое предположение.

Ключевые слова: современный удмуртский язык, вежливость первого порядка, социопрагматика.

Немет Золтан, аспирант кафедры Финно-угорской филологии
Сегедский Университет
6722, Венгрия, г. Сегед, ул. Эдетэм 2
E-mail: nemethzoltan991@gmail.com