

Pragmalinguistic Strategies In Business Email Correspondence And Meeting Discourse: Politeness Conventions, Turn-Taking, And Conversational Implicature

Kholmetova Gulshoda Shahzod kizi

Student, Chirchik State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

Prof. Ahmad Baisov

Assoc. Scientific advisor, PhD, Chirchik State Pedagogical University, Uzbekistan

Received: 20 March 2026; **Accepted:** 21 April 2026; **Published:** 11 May 2026

Abstract: This article analyzes the pragmalinguistic strategies deployed in two central genres of professional English communication: business email correspondence and business meeting interaction. Drawing on Brown and Levinson's politeness theory, the turn-taking model of Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, and Grice's Cooperative Principle, the study examines how professional communicators manage face, allocate conversational turns, and exploit conversational implicature to accomplish institutional and interpersonal goals. The analysis demonstrates that indirect request strategies, modal hedging, and cooperative discourse markers are characteristic features of both genres, and that their deployment is shaped by cross-cultural norms that constitute a key dimension of professional communicative competence in international business contexts.

Keywords: Business email, face management, politeness, turn-taking, conversational implicature, pragmalinguistics, BELF.

Introduction: The study of professional communication in English has become a central area of applied linguistics research, driven by the expansion of international business contexts where English operates as a shared medium among professionals from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Two genres occupy a particularly important place in this landscape: business email correspondence, which has become the dominant medium of written professional communication globally, and business meeting discourse, which represents the most pragmalinguistically complex form of professional spoken interaction. Both genres require participants to simultaneously manage institutional goals, interpersonal relationships, and face concerns, deploying pragmalinguistic strategies that go well beyond grammatical accuracy. Developing awareness

of these strategies is a practical priority for students and professionals in Uzbekistan preparing for international business communication.

Three complementary frameworks underpin the analysis. The first is Brown and Levinson's politeness model, which distinguishes between positive face (the desire for approval of one's self-image) and negative face (the desire for freedom from imposition), arguing that communicators mitigate face-threatening acts in proportion to the social distance, power differential, and cultural imposition ranking involved. The second is the turn-taking model developed by Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, which identifies rules governing the allocation of speaking turns at transition relevance places in conversation. As Handford demonstrated through corpus analysis, these rules operate in institutionally modified ways in professional meeting

settings, where pre-established agenda structures and the role of the meeting chair constrain the options available to participants. The third framework is Grice's Cooperative Principle and its conversational maxims, which explain how interlocutors convey meaning beyond the literal content of utterances through implicature. Safarov usefully situates these frameworks within a broader account of communicative purpose, observing that professional communicators pursue informational, relational, and institutional goals simultaneously in every communicative act.

Business email correspondence is among the most extensively studied genres in professional communication pragmalinguistics. Bargiela-Chiappini and Nickerson established that professional written communication is organized around generic conventions encoding institutional roles and communicative purposes. In email, opening formulas, request formulations, and closing sequences each perform distinct pragmalinguistic functions. Opening salutations encode information about the perceived social distance and power relationship between sender and recipient, with choices between Dear Dr. Smith, Dear John, and Hi John carrying quite different relational implications.

Requests in business email consistently favor indirect strategies that minimize the impositive force of directives and attend to the recipient's negative face. Modal constructions such as Could you please confirm... and Would it be possible to... appear far more frequently than direct imperatives because they perform negative politeness work by reducing the apparent imposition on the recipient. Bjørge demonstrated that power distance shapes these strategies significantly, with communicators in high-power-distance organizational cultures using more elaborate deference strategies when writing upward in the hierarchy. Gains identified epistemic hedging as a defining feature of the genre, arguing that the permanent written record creates particular pressure toward qualification. Zhu showed that professionals from different cultural backgrounds employ markedly different request strategies in English email, making the explicit development of genre-specific politeness awareness essential for Uzbek professionals in international contexts.

Business meetings represent the most pragmalinguistically complex form of professional interaction, where participants manage the pressures of task-focused institutional discourse alongside the interpersonal demands of face management and relationship maintenance. The turn-taking system in meetings differs from ordinary conversation because the meeting chair holds special rights in floor

allocation, and participants must deploy specific floor-claiming strategies, such as if I could just add to that or I think the point here is, to enter the discourse without violating institutional norms. Koester further distinguished between disruptive interruptions, which violate a speaker's right to complete a turn, and cooperative overlaps, which signal engaged alignment with the current speaker.

Conversational implicature functions as a central mechanism in meeting interaction. When a participant appears to violate a conversational maxim, for example by responding to a concrete proposal with an account of existing organizational commitments rather than a direct answer, the apparent violation generates an implicature that conveys a position more safely and face-protectingly than a direct response would. Firth documented how business lingua franca participants manage such implicature through what he termed the let-it-pass strategy, allowing apparent communicative gaps to pass without repair in order to maintain the flow of interaction. Poncini confirmed through ethnographic analysis that managing disagreement requires especially careful pragmalinguistic work, as participants seek to challenge each other's positions while maintaining the positive interpersonal relations essential to ongoing collaboration. Tannen demonstrated that interruption patterns are systematically linked to cultural background and institutional role, with important implications for cross-cultural meeting interaction. Khakimov argues that pragmalinguistic competence in professional settings demands this kind of genre-specific awareness: not just grammatical proficiency but the capacity to deploy institutionally appropriate conversational strategies in response to the specific relational and organizational dynamics of each communicative situation.

The pragmalinguistic analysis of business email and meeting discourse reveals that both genres depend on the systematic deployment of indirect speech acts, modal hedging, and face-management strategies that serve simultaneous epistemic, relational, and institutional functions. In business email, these strategies are most visible in the formulation of requests and the management of opening and closing sequences; in meeting interaction, they operate through the strategic allocation of turns, the management of interruption, and the exploitation of conversational implicature to convey positions without the face threat of direct statement. Cross-cultural variation in the deployment of these strategies constitutes a significant dimension of pragmalinguistic competence in international business contexts. For students and professionals in Uzbekistan operating in international business environments, developing

explicit awareness of these genre-specific pragmalinguistic conventions, beyond grammatical and lexical proficiency, is essential preparation for effective professional communication in English as a business lingua franca.

cultural settings. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 55(3), 189–207.
<https://doi.org/10.1109/TPC.2012.2208393>

REFERENCES

1. Bargiela-Chiappini, F., & Nickerson, C. (Eds.). (2014). *Writing business: Genres, media and discourses*. Routledge.
2. Bjørge, A. K. (2007). Power distance in English lingua franca email communication. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17(1), 60–80.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2007.00133.x>
3. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Firth, A. (1996). The discursive accomplishment of normality: On lingua franca English and conversation analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 26(2), 237–259.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(96\)00014-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(96)00014-8)
5. Gains, J. (1999). Electronic mail: A new style of communication or just a new medium? *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(1), 81–101.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(97\)00028-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(97)00028-8)
6. Giménez, J. C. (2000). Business e-mail communication: Some emerging tendencies in register. *English for Specific Purposes*, 19(3), 237–251.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(98\)00030-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(98)00030-8)
7. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics*, Vol. 3: *Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
8. Handford, M. (2010). *The language of business meetings*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Khakimov, M. (2013). *Fundamentals of pragmalinguistics*. Akademnashr.
10. Koester, A. (2006). *Investigating workplace discourse*. Routledge.
11. Poncini, G. (2004). *Discursive strategies in multicultural business meetings*. Peter Lang.
12. Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.1974.0010>
13. Safarov, Sh. (2008). *Pragmalinguistics*. O'zME.
14. Tannen, D. (1994). *Talking from 9 to 5: Women and men at work*. Morrow.
15. Zhu, Y. (2012). Politeness in email requests in cross-