COMPLIANCE-GAINING REQUESTS IN EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS IN XHOSA

BY

ZOLEKA KHUZWAYO

Assignment presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts at the University of Stellenbosch.

Study leader: Dr M Dlali

APRIL 2004

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this assignment is my own original work and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it at any university for a degree.

Date

ABSTRACT

This Study investigates how favor asking may be expressed in Xhosa. Both favor asking and requesting are situated in a context, where the meaning of each is necessarily driven by the way the interlocutors interpret each other's speech. Again favor asking and requesting share the same underlying intent in that a speaker tries to get a hearer to do something. People in the working environment, more especially in the educational sector, have lots of projects to do and they are obliged to ask for favors for such projects. In the process of asking for favors, they are faced with a wide choice of strategies to choose from.

In this study, the data shows consistent use of request strategies within specific contexts. The results of this study are consistently interpretable in that the more polite is the request for compliance; the greater is the degree of compliance.

In Xhosa, unhedged performative and obligation are request strategies with the highest frequency of occurrence. There are also certain strategies in Xhosa that have a low frequency, i.e., imperative, ability, hedged performative, willingness, wishes, permissions and desire. Therefore they are not considered possible compliance strategies in Xhosa.

OPSOMMING

Hierdie studie ondersoek hoe die verskynsel van guns-vra in Xhosa uitgedruk word. Sowel guns-vra en versoeke word geritueer in 'n konteks, waar die betekenis van elk noodwendig gedryf word waarop die gesprekvoerders mekaar se spraak interpreteer. Guns-vra en verskoning deel dieselfde onderliggende bedoeling daarin dat die spreker poog om die hoorder iets te laat doen. Persone in die werksektor, meer spesifiek die opvoedkundige sektor, het talle take en projekte om uit te voer en hulle het noodwendig talle gunste om te vra vir die doeleindes van hierdie take. In die proses van gunste-vra, het sprekers 'n wye keuse van strategieë om aan te wend.

Die data in die studie toon 'n konsekwente gebruik van versoekstrategieë in spesifieke kontekste. Die resultate van hierdie studie is konsekwent interpreteerbaar daarin dat hoe meer beleefd die versoek vir voldoening is, hoe groter is die graad van voldoening.

Hierdie studie toon aan dat in Xhosa, ongekwalifiseerde performatief en verpligting die strategieë is wat die hoogste frekwensie van verskyning het. Die studie toon voorts aan dat daar ook bepaalde strategieë in Xhosa is wat 'n lae frekwensie het, naamlik die emperatief, vermoë, gekwalifiseerde performatief, bereidheid, wense, toestemming, en begeerte. Dus word hierdie strategieë nie beskou as moontlike voldoeningstrategieë nie.

ISISHWANKATHELO

Esi sifundo siphanda indlela esetyenziswayo xa kucelwa inceba EsiXhoseni. Ukucela inceba nokwenza isicelo jikelele zombini zifumaneka kumba othile, apho intsingiselo iphenjelelwa yindlela abatolikana ngayo abantu. Kwakhona ukucela inceba nokwenza isicelo zinento efanayo ezabelana ngayo kuba zizama ukucela lowo umameleyo ukuba enze into. Abantu abasemisebenzini, ngokukodwa kumaziko emfundo, banemisebenzi emeininzi abayenzayo yaye kunyanzelekile ukuba bacele inceba khon'ukuze yenziwe le misebenzi. Kulo msebenzi wokucela inceba, banyanzelekile ukuba basebenzise iindlela ezithile zokuthetha.

Kwesi sifundo, ingcombolo ibonakalisa ukusetyenziswa kweendlela zokwenza izicelo kwimiba ethile. Iziphumo zesi sifundo zitolikeka kakuhle kuba okukhona isicelo sisenziwa ngenyameko, kokukhona liba likhulu iqondo lokuba sithotyelwe.

Esixhoseni zikho ezo ndlela zokwenza zizcelo ezenzeke ngeqondo elikhulu kanti zikwakho nezo ziseqondweni elisezantsi. Ngako oko, ezikwiqondo elisezantsi azithathwa njengokuba kukho nto enokuzuzwa kuzo.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to record the following acknowledgements:

Firstly, to Dr. M. Dlali of the Department of African Languages at the University of Stellenbosch, under whose guidance my thesis was written.

Secondly, to all the people who, in their educational capacities, offered help and advice, including the principals of schools who accepted my research questionnaires in their schools.

Thirdly, to my husband, Mpumie, without whose inspiration and encouragement I would not have attempted the MA degree, and as a result would never have written this book.

Finally, to my parents, who, regardless of their low level of education, never forget to tell me that education is a key to success.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Chapter 4

Chapter 5: Responses to Requests

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 AIMS

This study endeavours to identify the various types of request strategies that are usually used by educators, both office-based and school-based, in their everyday interactions within the education system. It describes each request strategy, compares them, and determines how various educators at their different ranks use these strategies in executing their duty of leading a child towards responsible adulthood.

It goes on to explore what strategies are used by the interlocutors in complying with the requests. Once again each compliance strategy is described and compared with one another. Furthermore, an inquisition is made to find out how and why the identified compliance strategies are used within the education system. The various use of the compliance strategies in different situations is analysed to get an understanding of the behavior of the interactants.

As it is known that when a request is made, it can either be agreed with or refused; the book then determines what non-compliance strategies are used to refuse a request. This is all about finding out how the face threatening interactions are dealt with in educational contexts.

In fact the new South Africa is faced with many challenges within an education system. The curriculum, policies, methods and approaches are changing every now and then, so daily interactions to filter down these changes is an order of the day. This book is therefore an attempt to find out how the educators are coping with the pressure.

Conclusions have been reached in an attempt to understand why certain actions are taking place. It is hoped that many more flourishing and prosperous concerns will be the result of this book.

1.2 ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY

This study is divided into six chapters which are organized as follows:

Chapter 1: This chapter deals with the aims of the study and the organization of the study.

Chapter 2: In this chapter various theories on the speech acts and politeness theory are considered. The speech acts and politeness theory serve as a theoretical basis for this study.

Chapter 3: This chapter deals with the requests. Different forms of requests are also analyzed.

Chapter 4: This chapter deals with the requests and the requests' situations in Xhosa. Also an in-depth analysis of requests in Xhosa.

Chapter 5: In this chapter responses to requests and also compliance strategies are dealt with.

Chapter 6: Conclusion and general findings resulting from this study are discussed in this chapter.

CHAPTER 2

SPEECH ACTS AND POLITENESS THEORY

2.1 SPEECH ACTS

2.1.1 Thomas

J.L. AUSTIN

J.L. Austin is a philosopher, whose work became very influential because of the following four factors:

i. His book, "How to do things with words" came very timely, coinciding as it did with a growing frustration within linguistics with the limitations of truth conditional semantics.
ii. His writing is admirably clear and accessible.
iii. His work represents a consistent line of thought.
iv. His work foreshadows many of the issues which are of major importance in pragmatics today.

J.L. Austin, together with H.P, Grice and a group of like-minded philosophers working at Oxford came to be known as "Ordinary Language Philosophers".

2.1.2 Ordinary Language Philosophy

Austin based this philosophy on the fact that ordinary people manage to communicate extremely effective and relatively unproblematical with language just the way it is. He stressed that instead of striving to rid everyday language of its imperfections, we should try to understand how it is that people manage to communicate effectively with it as they do.

Logical Positivism And Truth Conditional Semantics

This philosophical system maintains that the only meaningful statements are those that are analytical or can be tested empirically. Logical positivist philosophers of language, were principally concerned with the properties of sentences which could be evaluated in terms of TRUTH or FALSITY. This approach was adopted within linguistics, within an area known as TRUTH CONDITIONAL SEMANTICS. A much more important tenet of logical positivism is that unless a sentence can, at least in principle, be verified, it is strictly speaking meaningless. Logical positivist philosophers of language and truth conditional semanticists expanded a great deal of energy debating the status of invented examples of this nature.

It was often alleged by Austin's critics that he thought that 'ordinary language' was in some way sacrosanct. But there were reasons why Austin was interested in the way ordinary people use language in everyday life, viz:

- It is generally accepted that one of the main tasks of philosophy is to make distinctions, and Austin believed that one good way to identify which distinctions are important or relevant is to examine how ordinary people do this in everyday language. Thus if ordinary language makes a distinction between COMMANDING, ORDERING, REQUESTING, and INVITING (which all have in common that the speaker (S) is using language to get the hearer (H) to do something (X)) then there is a good chance that these distinctions are important to the users of that language. Therefore, it would be a mistake to think that all the distinctions of a society wishes to make in the realm of getting H to do X are captured by the different verbs available in a given language. Nor are such distinctions by any means restricted to verbs.
- Austin also believed that there is a lot more to a language than the meaning of its words and phrases.
- He further stressed that we do not just use language to SAY things (to make statements), but to DO things (perform actions). It was this conviction which eventually led him to a theory of what he called ILLOCUTIONARY ACTS, a theory which examines what kinds of things we do when we speak, how we do them and how our acts may 'succeed' or 'fail', but he began exploring his ideas by way of the PERFORMATIVE HYPOTHESIS.

2.1.3 The Performative Hypothesis

There are three reasons why it is worthwhile examining the performative hypothesis:

- It shows how Austin's ideas developed.
- It illustrates very clearly how and why pragmatics came into being.
- Performatives constitute a very interesting subset of illocutionary verbs – performatives are fun.

What are performative verbs? They are verbs which do not make statements, but belong instead to a class of utterances called 'performatives', which (according to Austin) cannot be judged true or false, but are best understood as performing an action. The words 'I apologize' do not make a statement, but perform an act of apologizing. One useful (but not infallible) test for a performative verb is to see whether you can meaningfully insert the adverb 'hereby' between subject and verb:

'I hereby apologize'
'Ngenxa yoko ndiyangxengxeza'

but not:

'I hereby drive a red car'
'Ngenxa yoko ndiqhuba imoto ebomvu'

The first sentence is probably the least problematic: once I have uttered the words 'I apologize' no one can deny that I did apologize (even though you may suspect that my apology is insincere). Three different categories of performatives will be discussed underneath:

<u>Metalinguistic Performatives</u>

They are the most straightforward examples of performatives.

- They are self-referential (the verb refers to what the speaker of the utterance is doing).
- They are self-verifying (they contain their own truth conditions).
- They are also non-falsifiable (they can never be untrue).

In any language there is probably a fairly small and certainly finite set of metalinguistic performatives.

Examples: 1. I say that Lucy is a liar.
2. I plead not guilty.
3. I apologize for inconveniencing

All performatives are self verifying. There is a difference between metalinguistic performatives and the rest. Metalinguistic performatives as well as always being true, are, in addition, always felicitous or successful. They do not appear to depend on any external conditions for their success.

Ritual Performatives

The same automatic guarantee of successfulness does not apply to 'ritual' performatives, nor to my third category, 'COLLABORATIVE PERFORMATIVES'. Austin observed that although performatives are not subject to truth conditions, yet they can go wrong. If the felicity conditions are not observed, the performative may be infelicitous (or they may fail or be unsuccessful). Felicity conditions apply particularly to performatives associated with various rituals or very formal events. Unlike metalinguistic performatives, what have been called 'ritual performatives' are highly culturally dependent.

Examples: (I) 'I sentence you to twenty years.........'
(Ndikugweba iminyaka engamashumi amabini.........)
(ii) 'I absolve you from your sins'
(Ndiya kukhulula kwizono zakho)
(iii) 'I baptize you .... '
(Ndiya kuphehlelela...........)
(iv) 'I name this ship.........'
(Le nqanawa ndiyithiya igama ....)

Each of these can appropriately and successfully be uttered by a specified person in a specified situation (e.g. i. By a judge in a court of law, ii. By a priest, etc.)

Felicity Conditions

Austin stated his felicity conditions as follows:

A: (I) There must be a conventional procedure having a conventional effect.
(II) The circumstances and persons must be appropriate.

B: The procedure must be executed:
(I) Correctly
(II) Completely

C: Often
(I) The persons must have the requisite thoughts, feelings and intentions, and
(II) If consequent conduct is specified, then the relevant parties must do it.

Explicit Reference to Felicity Conditions

The speakers may make explicit reference to their reasons for speaking in a particular way. Often speakers make reference to the felicity conditions which allow them to perform a particular act.

Collaborative Performatives

Some writers have observed that some performatives do not have felicity conditions in the sense that a specified person must utter the words in particular circumstances, but nevertheless their success is not guaranteed. For their success they require the collaboration or particular uptake of another person.

Group Performatives

They may fall into any of the three preceding categories. Some performatives are either commonly or necessarily produced by more than one person, e.g. a report from a committee, a verdict from a jury, and a communique' from a summit conference.

Overlap of Categories

According to Thomas not all the categories are as neat or as self- contained as implied. For example it would be possible to argue that many 'ritual' performatives are also collaborative in nature. Performatives such as 'I baptize you..........' Are arguably only successful if the person concerned is willing to accept the baptism. Similarly, some 'collaborative' performatives also fall within the category of 'ritual' performatives. And the argument could be extended: Can an announcement be made if there is no one there to hear it? Can S be said to have apologized if H refuses to accept the apology?

Cross-Cultural Differences in the Use of Performatives

We have identified cross-cultural differences in the range and use of performatives mentioned above. According to Thomas, this is particularly so in the case of performatives relating to culturally-specific rituals. Obviously when one lives in a country which does not have baptism, there will be no performative form 'I baptize you..................' If the verb does exist, it cannot be used performatively. And even in countries where Sharia law operates, its interpretation may vary.

2.1.4 Collapse of Austin's Performative Hypothesis

Using his performative hypothesis, Austin had been able to demonstrate that people do not use language just to make statements about the world ; they also use language to perform actions, actions which affect or change the world in some way. According to Thomas, the effect of Austin's insight revolutionized the way people look at language and led directly to the development of pragmatics as an area of linguistic investigation. And the performative remains a very clear, par excellence example of 'how to do things with words? However, the notion that only performative verbs could be used to perform actions was untenable. Austin's performative hypothesis collapsed for a number of rather different sorts of reasons:

1. There is no formal (grammatical) way of distinguishing performative verbs from other sorts of verbs.
2. The presence of a performative verb does not guarantee that the specified action is performed.

3. There are ways of 'doing things with words' which do not involve using performative verbs.

The grammatical distinctiveness of performatives

It was not long before Austin saw that the grammatical basis on which he had initially tried to distinguish between performatives and other sorts of utterances could not be sustained. Performatives can be plural as well as singular;, can be written as well spoken. They do not, as Austin realized, have to be in the first person. e.g.

(a) **"Inkundla imfumana ummangalelwa enetyala."**
(The court finds the accused guilty.)

Nor is it essential for a performative to be in the active mood: e.g.

(b) "**Ukuqeshwa kwakho kuyaqinisekiswa."**
(Your employment is hereby confirmed.)

Nor do they have to be in the simple present tense.

Do performatives always perform actions

The 'ritual' and 'collaborative' performatives may fail because the requisite FELICITY CONDITIONS do not exist. However it also became apparent that the supposedly self verifying 'metalinguistic' performatives may also fail.

How to do things without performative verbs

According to Thomas, the most important reason for the collapse of Austin's performative hypothesis was the realization that Austin had equated "doing things with words "with the existence of a corresponding performative verb. This is clearly erroneous :there are many acts performed using language where it would be impossible, extremely odd or very unusual to use a performative verb. If we consider those acts for which English has no performative verb ,such as 'letting the cat out of bag; 'incriminating oneself ;People do not say; I hereby let the cat out of the bog. Language is used to insult but we cannot say; I hereby insult you. .Language is also used to invite ,but in English it is not unusual to say; I invite you; to perform the act of inviting .This is true for many extremely common acts; OFFERING, HINTING ,BOASTING DIVULGING, etc, are all instances of acts for which it would be most odd to use a performative verb . But, in reporting the act you would readily say: He offered me ,he hinted me etc. These examples led to Austin's introduction of a distinction between PRIMARY PERFORMATIVES (explicit performatives) and IMPLICIT PERFORMATIVES .

2.1.5 Explicit And Implicit Performatives.

An explicit performative can be seen to be a mechanisim which allows the speaker to remove any possibility of misunderstanding the force behind an utterance. According to Thomas, while it is certainly true to say, as Austin does ,that there are no substantial distinctions in meaning between explicit and implicit performatives , yet it is worth exploringthe difference in the way in which a performative utterance and it's non performative counterpart are used. Some situations (typically very formal or ritual situation) require that a specific form of language be used while others imply a stylistic difference (e.g. in the degree of formality conveyed or imply a difference in emphasis.

Examples:

(i) "**Ndiyaxolisa**".
(I apologize)

(ii) "**Ndibuhlungu**"
(I'm sorry)

Sentence 1 seems more formal than sentence 2.

(iii) **Ndiyakuqinisekisa ndimbonile izolo**.
(I assure you I did see him yesterday.)

(iv) **Ndimbonile izolo**.
(I did see him yesterday.)

Sentence 3 seems more forceful than sentence (iv).

Utterances as actions

Statements, too, are seen to have a performative aspect, and what is now needed is to distinguish between the truth conditional aspect of what a statement is and the action it performs; between the meaning of the speaker's words and their illocutionary force (Thomas 1996)

Locution, illocution. Perlocution

.

According to Thomas, utterances not only have sense but also force, Austin,in fact made a three –fold distinction:

LOCUTION - the actual words uttered.
ILLOCUTION - the force or intention behind the words.
PERLOCUTION - the effect of the illocution on the hearer.

For example ,I might say "it's cold in here" (locution)meaning I do not want the fresh air caused by fans.(illocution)and the perlocutionary effect might be that someone switches off the fans. Generally speaking there is a close and predictable connection between locution and perlocutionary effect. All competent adult speakers of a language can predict or interpret intended illocutionary force reasonably accurately most of the time.

2.2 SPEECH ACTS

The term 'speech act' was originally used by AUSTIN to refer to an utterance and 'the total situation in which the utterance is used .Today the term 'speech act ' is used to mean the same as illocutionary act' in fact you will find the terms 'speech act', 'illocutionary act', illocutionary force; and pragmatic force 'or just 'force' all used to mean the same thing – although the use of one rather than another may imply different theoretical position .

2.2.1 J.R. Searle

In his philosophical writings, Searle distinguishes between propositional content and illocutionary force. In his later work he proposes a detailed classification of the major categories of speech acts; most important of all, he points out the necessity of taking into account in the analysis of a speech act the social institution within which it was produced. Only two aspects of his work will be discussed in this discussion, viz; indirect speech acts, and his attempt to establish a set of rules for speech acts.

Indirect Speech Acts

According to Searle, an indirect speech act is one performed by means of another. A directive can be performed by means of an interrogative. However, all speech acts (except explicit performatives) are indirect to some degree and are performed by means of another speech act e.g. in making the ASSERTION – **Liza kuna**. (It is going to rain) I perform the speech act WARNING. Searle's calculation of the meaning of indirect speech acts is similar to Grice's method for getting what is said to what is meant.

Searle's condition S for Speech Acts

Searle tried to systematize and formalize Austin's work. He set out a series of conditions which, properly applied, should exclude the anomalous utterances from the category of promising. The following are Searle's rules for promising:

Propositional act	Speaker (S) predicates a future act (A) of Speaker (S).
Preparatory Condition	S believes that doing act A is in H's best interest And that S can do A.
Sincerity Condition	Speaker intends to do act A.
Essential Condition	S undertakes an obligation to do act A.

Let us see how this work in an example:

Ndiya kukwenzela into entle xa unokundilungisela le ngxaki.
(I'll do you something very nice if you can help me with this problem.)

PROPOSITIONAL ACT – The speaker believes that to do something very nice for the hearer is to the hearer's benefit (something which the hearer will enjoy).

PREPARATORY CONDITION – The speaker believes that to do something very nice for the hearer is to the hearer's benefit (something which the hearer will enjoy).

SINCERITY CON DITION – The speaker truly intends to do something very nice for the hearer.

ESSENTIAL CONDITION – In uttering these words the speaker undertakes an obligation to do something very nice for the hearer.

Searle's rules should indeed explain why 'I promise I'll come over there and hit you if you don't shut up!' is INFELICITOUS: the preparatory condition is not met. According to Searle, the issues he raises in relation to promising are of general application and so it should, in principle, be possible to establish rules of this nature for every speech act. He offers eight further examples of rules for speech acts: *requesting, asserting, questioning, thanking, advising, warning, greeting, and congratulating.* But still, four interrelated sets of problems arise from this work:

- It is not always possible to distinguish fully between one speech act and another.
- If we attempt to plug all the gaps in Searle's rules we end up with a hopelessly complex collection of *ad hoc* conditions.
- The conditions specified by Searle may exclude perfectly normal instances of a speech act but permit anomalous uses.
- The same speech act verb may cover a ran ge slightly different phenomena and some speech acts overlap; Searle's rules take no account of this.

2.2.2 Distinguishing Speech Acts

Using Searle's rules, it's not always possible to distinguish among speech acts which, although in some sense 'related' to one another (sharing certain features), are by no means interchangeable. Searle notes that in order to distinguish *order* or *command* from *request* it is necessary to introduce some additional preparatory rules:

Order and command have the additional preparatory rule that S must be in a position of authority over H. Furthermore in both, the authority relationship infects the essential condition because the utterance counts as an attempt to get H to do A in virtue of the authority of S over H.

The above rule applies to many other speech acts; an understanding of the nature of the power relationships which obtain between speaker and hearer in order to interpret the illocutionary force of many utterances. But even with this additional preparatory condition Searle's rules can only cope with the most stereotypical uses of *order* and *command.* Where the power relationship, (both speakers have equal power), between the interactants is contested, there is no guarantee that the *order/command* will be successful.

In practice, many of Searle's sets of conditions could apply to any number of speech acts and it is difficult to see what additional preparatory conditions could be introduced to distinguish *request* unproblematically from *invite*, *demand*, many uses of *ask,* etc., or *question* from *examine, inquire, quiz* or *ask,* even though most native speakers intuitively recognize that these speech acts are different from one another in important respects. In the case of other speech acts, it is only the essential condition which distinguishes one speech act from another, totally unrelated one.

2.2.3 Plugging the Gaps in Searle's Rules

People argue that Searle's rules fail to distinguish between speech acts and that they cover only paradigm cases of speech acts. But, this does not in itself provide grounds for dismissing a rule-governed approach: it could simply be an argument for improving those rules. A far more serious criticism is that although Searle claims to be setting out rules for speech acts, all he is really doing is describing the semantics of speech act verbs. Be that as it may, the question which concerns us here is whether it is possible to extend Searle's conditions to cover at least some of the subtleties of a speech act.

<u>The Speech Act of Apologizing: a Case Study</u>

PROPOSITIONAL ACT:	S expresses regret for a past act A of S.
PREPARATORY CONDITION:	S believes that A was not in H's best interest
SINCERITY CONDITION:	Speaker regrets act A.
ESSENTIAL CONDITION:	Counts as an apology for act A.

Let us see how this works in an example:

Zola says to Lisa:

'Ndiyaxolisa ngokukubetha, Lisa.'

(I'm sorry for hitting you, Lisa.)

Propositional act	S (Zola) expresses regret for a past act (hitting Lisa) which the speaker herself performed.
Preparatory condition	Zola believes that hitting Lisa was not in Lisa's best interest.
Sincerity condition	Zola is sorry for hitting Lisa.
Essential condition	In uttering the words *I'm sorry for hitting you* Zola apologizes to Lisa.

Once again, Searle's rules could cope well with simple apologies like the one I have just given. But here are ordinary examples of apologies which do not fit these rules. Let us take the conditions one by one .

(a) <u>Propositional Act</u>

- Does the act have to have been performed by the speaker?

In many cultures it is possible to apologize on behalf of someone or something else: for someone close to you or for whom you have responsibility (spouse, children, pets, the family car); for an institution with which you are associated (the company or college for which you work). People usually apologize for things over which they have no control whatsoever, such as the behaviour of their compatriots.

- Does the act have to be a past act?

Can't you apologize for a present act – *I'm sorry about the noise?* Or a future act – *I'm sorry but I won't be able to come to your party?*

- Does the speaker have to express regret formally/explicitly?

Sometimes you don't even say you apologize, you only give a reason for not meeting the expectation of the hearer. The reason could only be an apology if the hearer chooses to accept it as such.

(b) Preparatory condition

- Does the speaker have to believe that the act was/is/will be to the hearer's disadvantage?

We usually apologize to our friends for not allowing them to do what they like most, if we think they are much better off not doing it.

(c) Sincerity condition

People frequently say they are sorry when they are not. They just say sorry sometimes to end the argument, not that they are really sorry. Does this mean that they have not apologized?

(d) Essential condition

Is it, in fact, absolutely essential to utter certain words (or any words at all) in order to apologize? Sometimes people choose to be extra nice for a while, clean your house, send you flowers; can we say they have not apologized?

It is therefore clear that such constitutive rules for apologizing fail to capture what we recognize as perfectly ordinary, instances of apologizing. The rules would have to start off like this:

Propositional Act- The speaker expresses or implies or in some other way indicates regret for a past, present or future act performed by the speaker or someone or something for which the speaker has responsibility or could be seen to have responsibility (but perhaps has no responsibility whatsoever).

Preparatory Condition – The speaker may or may not believe that the act was, is or will be against H's best interests……and so on.

In trying to expand Searle's rules to reflect the way in which the speech act of apologizing operates in everyday life, the conditions becomes hopelessly complex, vague and unworkable.

Over – generality of rules

Searle has achieved the odd distinction of producing sets of conditions which are simultaneously over-specific and over-general --- which exclude valid instances of a speech act and i9nclude invalid or anomalous ones. One reason for this is that Searle treats speech acts as if they were clearly defined categories with clear- cut boundaries. In reality the boundaries between, say, commanding, ordering, requesting, asking and inviting are blurred, overlapping and fluid: the same speech act verb may cover a range of slightly different phenomena.

2.2.4 Searle's formal approach to the categorization of speech acts

There are certain contexts in which we do not expect the truth to be told: satirical comedy and funeral orations are two contexts in which we do not generally expect to hear the whole, unvarnished truth. Then again there are some culturally-specific situations in which the whole truth is not expected. There are times when a speaker does not tell the whole truth in order to avoid hurting the hearer's feelings or to avoid revealing something learned in confidence; would we necessarily classify these actions as lies?

People's reasons for classifying something as a lie or not a lie are extremely complex. We not only take account of formal considerations, but also of functional, psychological and affective factors: sometimes the way in which we classify a speech act may be influenced by considerations which are culturally-specific or which relate to the speaker's goal in speaking in a particular way. We see then that a whole constellation of features contribute to the way in which participants in interaction classify a speech act. The criteria they use are far richer and more complex than those which appear in descriptive frameworks of the type proposed by Searle, and include a range of different sorts of criteria.

Searle's rules are capable of coping only with the mo0st typical or central instances of a speech act and fail to distinguish adequately between one speech act and another. The reasons for classifying a speech act in a particular way are complex and it is often impossible to assign a speech act to a clear-cut category. The whole approach to describing speech acts in terms of rules was misconceived.

From the above discussion of the speech act of apologizing it should be apparent that it is extremely difficult (if not impossible) to devise rules which capture satisfactorily the complexity of speech acts : too many different criteria and different types of criteria are involved.

2.3 MEY (2000)

2.3.1 History and Introduction

Why Speech Acts

J.L. Austin, the principal exponent of Ordinary Language Philisophy, had an enormous impact on linguistic philosophy, and thereby on linguistics, especially in its pragmatic variant. His thinking which was known as "speech act theory" was further developed and codified by John R. Searle. The fledgling pragmatic tradition had to face the problem of the limitations imposed on linguistic thinking by a semantics based on truth conditions.

Language in Use

Many linguistic theories do not pay attention to language as an activity which produces speech acts, defined as the basic or minimal units of linguistic communication. Furthermore, speech acts are produced not in the solitary philisopher's thinking, but in actual situations of language use , by people having something in mind. Such a production naturally presupposes a producer and a consumer (human agents), whose intentions are relevant and indispensable to the correct understanding and description of their utterances. Asking how a particular communicative act functions in a particular society presupposes that we examine the conditions that hold for communication in that society. The language we use, and in particular the speech acts we utter, are entirely dependent on the context of the situation in which such acts are produced. All speech is situated speech; a speech act is never just an act of speech' but should be considered in the total situation of activity of which it is a part. We also need to take into consideration the general conditions which allow and afford a particular act of speaking.

Any discussion of intentionality should be aware of the relationships that exist among the individuals to whom the intentions are ascribed , and of the ways they perceive the others as intentional beings in a greater , societal context. What determines a speech act is the way it fits into the entire pattern of acting as a social being that is typical for the particular culture.

2.3.2 How Speech Acts Function

When uttering speech acts we do things with our words; we perform activities that bring about changes in the existing state of affairs.

According to Austin, there are three different aspects of speech acting,viz.: *locutionary aspect, illocutionary force, and perlocutionary effect.* With the understanding that locutionary aspect refers to the activity we engage in when we say something; the illocutionary force is what has occupied speech act theories most. The perlocutionary effect tells us something about people's motivation for using a particular speech act. Felicity conditions have to be met for a speech act to happen 'felicitously' or 'happily', and to prevent it from misfiring.

<u>Promises</u>

One general problem with speech acts is that the very wording of the act (e.g., 'I promise') can lead to misunderstandings. For instance, is the word *promise* a necessary element in the speech act 'promise'? Or, more generally: do I always have to use a so called 'speech act verb' to perform a speech act? And more practically: can one trust people to keep a promise even when they haven't used the word promise?

All depends on the circumstances of the promise. According to Searle something counts as something only within a specified set of rules.

There are dozens of ways to make a promise in any particular language, and it is only the context which can determine whether a particular expression counts as a promise.

A speech act's physiognomy: promising

Introduction: the problem

The problem has to do with the way different languages deal with speech acting. Typical questions are:

- How can we determine a speech act?
- How many speech acts are there, and how are they expressed in language?
- What is the relationship between a speech act and a pragmatic act?
- Are there speech acts that are found across languages, or even in all languages?

Promises: conditions and rules

Conditions

Searle enumerates nine conditions for successful promising:

1. Speakers must know how to deal with their language and they must not have any special handicaps (deafness etc.); and they must abstain from what Searle calls 'parasitic use of language' such as jokes and acting.
2. The promise must have a content.
3. At the moment of uttering, the content of a promise must have to do with a future, possible action of the speaker.
4. What is being promised must be to the advantage of the promisee.
5. The content of the promise must not be something which clearly is going to happen anyway. Conditions 4 and 5 are often called *preparatory* conditions.
6. The promiser must be sincere in carrying out the act of promising; without that intention we have no sincere promise.
7. A promiser intends to put himself or herself under the obligation of carrying out the promised act. This condition, being essential to any promising, is aptly called the 'essential' condition.

8 & 9. These conditions emphasize that the language used in promising must be the normal one, it must obey 'the semantical rules of the language'. Furthermore the conventions for using that language must likewise be the normal, that is to say pragmatically correct ones.

Before we start focusing on the specific conditions for this speech act, however, a general characteristic of the linguistic tools enabling such use is in order. This characterization is given by Searle under the name of 'illocutionary force indicating device' (IFID); generally speaking, conditions 1, 8, and 9 hold for all speech acts and their IFIDs. The specific conditions on promising are 2 through 7; from these, the following five RULES governing the use of promissory IFIDs can be extracted:

1. Only use a promissory IFID when the content of the utterance is about something which is to happen in the future. This rule captures conditions 2 and 3, above; and it is called the *content* rule.
2. Only use the IFID for promising when the promise contains something that the promisee actually wants to happen to him or her.
3. Only use an IFID for promising when the content of the promise does not concern the occurrence of an already scheduled, self-justifying or natural happening. Rules 2 and 3 are called the *preparatory rules* , in analogy with the preparatory conditions (4 and 5) above.
4. Only use a promissory IFID if you intend to carry out your promise. This is clearly *the sincerity rule,* corresponding to the sincerity condition (6) above.

The above four rules make up the 'regulations' for promising. But what is it that makes a promise a promise? That is done by the fifth rule:

5. Only use a promissory IFID on condition that the promise is uttered and recognized (accepted) as creating an obligation from the promiser to the promisee.

This finally is *the essential rule*, corresponding to the essential condition (7) above. This rule has a higher status than the other four, since it has to do with the very essence of the speech act.

The pragmatics of rules

The five rules above are divided into 'regulative' (the first four) and 'constitutive' (the fifth one) rules. A constitutive rule is one that distinguishes 'something' and nothing else (characteristics of that particular thing), while regulative rule regulates the behavior of the people and these rules may be changed at will, and by mutual agreement.

According to 'promising' the constitutive rule is that "a promise is uttered and accepted as creating an obligation from the promiser to the promisee." The regulative rule says that we shouldn't utter a promise when its content is already scheduled to happen.

Promises are sometimes broken , even if renewed. A pragmatic view on promising accepts this fact of life and makes us focus on the promiser and promisee, rather than on the promise itself. Such a view touches upon both aspects of promising: the constitutive one ('what is a promise pragmatically speaking?') and the regulative one ('how are promises dealt with in an actual social context?')

In Austin's terms, the IFIDs of speech act theory only indicate illocutionary force; they don't put that force to work. To do that we need to lift the speech act out of the domain of abstract description into that of concrete action: speech act becomes pragmatic act.

With respect to the contextual conditions for using promises, including the general conditions of 'setting up' a promisee, along with the specific ones for securing a particular 'uptake', such a role may be captured within the framework of the 'pragmatic act'. Applied to the case of promising, this implies that we cannot, in all decency, talk about promising in the abstract: every promise is a promiser's promise, made to a real life promisee. The pragmatic conditions of use for promises should therefore include these users, the promisers and promises, as well as their conditions of interaction.

According to Mey,2000, this shows that the regulative and the constitutive rules perhaps are not as easily separable as was implied earlier: the regulative rules define what the constitutive rules say they do; but the constitutive rules determine the weight that is given those rules in the daily exercise of them.

The difficulties of sharply distinguishing between constitutive and regulative rules have their roots in the often observed fact that speech act theory, even though in name and pretension a theory of action, in reality is a philosophical theory of, or about, propositions.

A pragmatic view emphasizes that the nature of speech acting always varies according to various linguistic uses, not only cross-language-wise, but also, and not least interestingly, within a single language.

2.3.3 Speech Act Verbs

The number of speech acts

Many suggestions have been offered as to the number of (principal) speech acts that any particular language has to offer. There are "lumpers", who lump together their speech acts in a few, large categories. Opposite lumpers, there are "splitters", who split up their speech acts in a great number of classes; the actual number may be "between five hundred and six hundred". Whatever the number of hypothetical speech acts, languages have historically shown their preferences for certain, well-defined exemplars of the species, and expressed this preference by bestowing the honors of specific, linguistic expressions on such acts; such expressions go by the name of speech act verbs.

Speech acts, speech act verbs and performativity

According to Mey,2000, it thus seems natural to look for expressions of linguistic activity among the members of the category 'verb', and to call those that are found to denote speech acts 'speech act verbs'. Since the verbs denoting 'real' speech acts seemed to do something ,rather than merely producing candidates for 'truth' or 'falsehood', Austin consequently called them 'performatives'. There is, however, and has always been, a certain asymmetry in the relationship between speech act verbs and speech acts proper. Not all speech acts are represented by a specific speech act verb; they may be represented by several. And, not every speech act has a corresponding, custom-made speech act verb of its own.

Among the more standard speech act verbs we find such verbs as 'to announce', 'to declare', 'to inquire' and so on. But are these always performative,i.e. performing something? Many theoreticians, have noticed that such speech act verbs often contain, or may contain, an adverb such as 'hereby'. But the use of 'hereby' at best is an indicator of speech act verbs in general, not exclusively of performativity; and also that the two categories, speech act verbs and performatives, in most cases do not coincide.

Finally there is a strange category of verbal expressions that have the property of denying what they are doing, or doing what they explicitly are denying, e.g.

(a) "Andifuni kukuhlupha, kodwa ungandiboleka imoto yakho?"
(I don't want to bother you, but could you borrow me your car?)

Mey, concludes that performativity is a property that is not specifically bound up with speech act verbs.

Speech acts without speech act verbs

According to Mey, 2000, since performativity is all over the verbal spectrum, we clearly do not need a particular speech act verb to perform a speech act, and in many cases, we cannot even properly perform the very speech act that is officially expressed by the verb, by making explicit mention of the appropriate verb. It seems clear that speech acts, as well as speech act verbs, only make sense when used in their proper contexts. As isolated lexical items, or members of a set, they have very little to tell us. That is to say: even if one observes a speech act verb in some linguistic connection, one should not believe a speech act to be taking place, before one has considered, or possibly created, the appropriate context. The surface form of a particular linguistic expression does not always and necessarily tell the truth about what it is doing. Often when trying to determine what kind of speech act we are confronted with, we may have to disregard that form, and instead look for a 'deeper' or 'implied' meaning.

2.3.4 Indirect Speech Acts

Recognizing indirect speech acts

The first way of recognizing indirect speech acts is the philosophical-semantic one; which is based on strict reasoning and certain basic principles of logic. Another pragmatic way takes its point of departure in what people actually say, and 'do with their words'. It assumes, and with a certain right that it cannot be just by accident that in our daily use of language, indirect speech acts abound, and in many cases are far more numerous than direct ones. Moreover, the whole enterprise of assigning acts to particular, mostly hypothetical or imagined situations is in jeopardy, once we start thinking of those acts as performed in their proper contextual affordances, as pragmatic acts.

The ten steps of Searle

Searle views indirect speech acting as a combination of two acts, a primary illocutionary act, and a secondary one, where the primary act operates through, and in force of, the secondary one. Searle built a ten-step pyramid of reasoning at whose summit he placed his conclusion as a logically necessary keystone.

The pragmatic view

A truly pragmatic approach would, in any case, concentrate on what users do; but it would not stop there. Users are part of world of usage: they are never alone in their use of language, but use their language as members of a speech community that reflects the conditions of the community at large. According to Mey, 2000, the real performative value of a particular 'constructed symbol', a linguistic prime such as the speech act verb 'to baptize', is actually pretty restricted. The power of language in any situation depends on two factors:

1. The power that one brings with one, in virtue of one's status, e.g. as a physician or a patient.
2. Successful negotiation in the course of the interview, which is not only asymmetrical, but also mutual.

In real world interaction, power resides in the society, but is mediated and negotiated, through the use of 'pragmatic acts', in the institutional setting of a particular societal context.

In accordance with everyday language use, the only decent categorization of a good answer to a question is one which all the participants in a particular context of question-asking and answering find acceptable.

Mey, 2000, says the normalcy of speech acting does not strictly depend on a particular verbalization; in fact, indirect speech can be a much more effective way of getting one's act together than using a regular speech act.

2.3.5 Classifying Speech Acts

The illocutionary verb fallacy

With respect to the problems having to do with the different kinds of speech acting and their relationships to illocutioanary verbs, Searle issues a general warning: "Differences in illocutionary verbs are a good guide, but by no means a sure guide to differences in illocutionary acts". Searle goes on to enumerate twelve dimensions along which speech acts can be different, such as illocutionary point, fit of speech to world and vice versa, the psychological state of the speaker, the force of the act, and so on.

Searle's classification of speech acts

Searle finds fault with Austin's taxonomy of speech acts for various reasons (inconsistency, incompleteness, and so on). His twelve criteria are supposed to lay the foundations for a better classificatory procedure, out of which Searle only uses four:

- Illocutionary point
- Direction of fit
- Expressed psychological state
- Content

As a fifth criterion (not included in Searle's dozen), Mey (2000), appropriately mentions:

- Reference (to both speaker and hearer), since speakers are the principal actors on the speech acting scene.

The five speech act categories that Searle ends up establishing are:

1. *Representatives* - these speech acts are assertions about a state of affairs in the world, and thus carry the values 'true' or 'false'. This is their 'point'; as to 'fit', they should of course, match the world in order to be true.
2. *Directives* - these speech acts embody an effort on the part of the speaker to get the hearer to do something, to direct him or her towards some goal
3. *Commissives* – they operate a change in the world by means of creating an obligation; however this obligation is created in the speaker, not in the hearer, as in the case of a directive. The difference between a request and a promise is that the first is a directive, the second a commissive.
4. *Expressives* – they express an inner state of the speaker; the expression is essentially subjective and tells us nothing about the world. The criterion of fit cannot be said to operate.
5. *Declarations* – they bring about some alternation in the status or condition of the referred to object or objects solely by virtue of the fact that the declaration has been successfully performed. When we focus on the fit between world and words, however, the declaratives seem to occupy a privileged place. A declaration has to be uttered by a person in power.

2.3.6 Austin and Searle

The importance of Austin's discovery, viz., that language is an instrument of action, not just of speaking, has not diminished over time. However, in one respect Searle's taxonomy is superior to Austin's: it is more oriented toward the real world, in as much as it takes its point of departure in what actually is the case, namely that people perform a speech act whenever they use language, irrespective of the performative criterion. Since all acts of speaking perform something in the world, they have an illocutionary character; therefore the interest of linguists and philosophers should center on those illocutionary aspects of language use, rather than on the somewhat dubious distinction between locutionary and illocutionary acts.

According to Mey, (2000), if one wants to criticize Searle and his categorization, one cannot overlook the fact that both he and Austin, as philosophers, had certain objectives in describing language which, for linguistic purposes, did not always seem that relevant. In order to illustrate their theory both use sentences that are characteristic of the case under discussion.

Mey (2000), says as pragmaticists, they should pay serious attention to contextual conditions when describing speech acts and, in general, people's use of language. If the contextual conditions for a particular speech act's being realized are not met, then there simply is no speech act, no matter what is said or written.

2.4. POLITENESS THEORY

2.4.1. Grundy (2000)

Politeness Phenomena

According to Grundy (2000), politeness principles have been considered to have wide descriptive power in respect of language use, to be major determinants of linguistic behaviour, and to have universal status.

Politeness phenomena are a paradigm example of pragmatic usage. Among the aspects of context that are particularly determinate of language choice in the domain of politeness are the power distance relationship of the interactants and the extent to which a speaker imposes on or requires something of their addressee.

Politeness phenomena are one manifestation of the wider concept of etiquette, or appropriate behaviour.

Politeness phenomena depart from the principle of maximal economy of utterance – if by maximal economy we mean uttering only the proposition to be conveyed.

2.4.2 The Effects of Politeness

Being on the receiving end of politeness affects each of us differently because polite utterances encode the relationship between the speaker and ourselves as addressee. Grundy goes on to say politeness is the term we use to describe the extent to which actions, including the way things are said, match addressee's perceptions of how they should be performed.

a) <u>Dealing with Compliments</u>

Politeness have a pervasive nature because even the choice between seemingly semantically empty categories such as anaphoric *it* and *that* is politeness driven.
According to Holmes, men tend to see compliments as threatening and women to see them as a means of expressing rapport or solidarity.

b) <u>Unequal Encounters</u>

Politeness strategies minimize disagreements especially when a person who is knowledgeable (authority) is conversing with a junior. The senior will tend to be so polite in trying to converse at the level of junior that the conversation ends up in a way that seems to be of common understanding to both speakers.

c) <u>The Preference for Agreement</u>

The speaker and the addressee will be keen to avoid disagreeing although in fact they have different opinions. This is a strong motivation in polite exchanges.

d) <u>Minimizing Face Loss</u>

If you listen carefully, you'll notice how frequently speakers try to avoid disagreement or coming out with overtly disappointing utterances. We frequently offer those we talk to something they have no asked for by way of redress rather than tell them we cannot satisfy their need. In this way we minimize their loss of face.

Politeness very often occurs where there is a difficulty of some kind.

2.4.3 Brown and Levinson's model of politeness strategies

Having studied the politeness of Tamil speakers. Tzeltal speakers and American and British English speakers, Brown and Levinson provide a systematic description of cross-linguistic politeness phenomena which is used to support an explanatory model capable of accounting for any instance of politeness. Their claim is that broadly comparable linguistic strategies are available in each language but that there are local cultural differences in what triggers their use.

In most encounters, our face is put at risk. Asking someone for a pen, or telling them they have to wait to see the dentist, or complaining about the quality of their work, all these threaten the face of the person to whom they are directed. So when we perform such actions, they are typically accompanied with redressive language designed to compensate the threat to face and thus to satisfy the face wants of our interlocutors.
In Brown and Levinson's account, face comes in two varieties, 'positive face' and 'negative face'. Positive face is a person's wish to be well thought of. Its manifestations may include the desire to have what we admire admired by others, the desire to be understood by others, and the desire to be treated as a friend and a confidant. Negative face is our wish not to be imposed on by others and to be allowed to go about our business unimpeded with our rights to free and self determined action intact.

When we have a face threatening act to perform, Brown and Levinson five strategies, viz.:

- Do the act on record baldly without redress
- Do the act on record with positive politeness
- Do the act on record with negative politeness redress

- Do the act off record
- Don't do the act

In picking one of these strategies, speakers work with an equation in which any distance differential and any power differential and any imposition are computed:

Social Distance + Power Differential + Degree of imposition = degree of face threat to be compensated by appropriate linguistic strategy

The most important point about Brown and Levinson's five strategies is that they are ranked from *Do the act on record baldly* which has no linguistically encoded compensation, through a sequence of escalating politeness strategies to *Don't do the act,* where the face threat is too great to be compensated by any language formula so that the most appropriate politeness strategy is not to do the act.

a) <u>Non-Canonical Politeness Phenomena</u>

One typical source of humour in television sit-coms is the use of politeness strategies that are not the result of expected computations of Power, Distance, and Imposition. Very often this happens in real life. Laughter, frequently in sit-coms, is one way of marking the incongruous politeness status of an utterance.

b) <u>The Universal Character of Politeness</u>

According to Grundy (2000), overclasses tend to favour distance encoding negative politeness strategies and underclasses tend to favour solidarity encoding positive politeness strategies.

Brown and Levinson believe that politeness phenomena are universal.

Matsumoro argues that in Japanese the structures associated with negative politeness strategies in Brown and Levinson's model do not have a negative politeness function but instead constitute a social register .

Objectors to Brown and Levinson's account frequently cite exotic sounding examples of apparent deference which are claimed as evidence that some notion of social order or societal interdependence rather than positive and negative face underlies politeness.

What is important about Brown and Levinson's work is their observation that politeness is not equally distributed.

From a pragmaticist's point of view, politeness is the term we use to describe the relationship between how something is said to an addressee and that addressee's judgement as to how it should be said. According to this definition, a theory of politeness is potentially capable of accounting for pragmatic uses of language, but will always be liable to being confused with a prescriptive approach to linguistic etiquette.

c) Politeness as merely Redressive

Face wants are satisfied precisely by giving priority to veracity and clarity in certain situations, including in transactional discourse such as you find in a book like this. Thus in casual conversation it is preferred to begin with a safe topic such as the weather. But this is not the case when talking on the telephone where time costs money. Both strategies are adapted to their contexts, including in particular to addressee's expectations of how talk should be directed to them in such contexts.

2.5 THOMAS

2.5.1 Theories Of Politeness

Delimiting the Concept of Politeness

Under the heading, politeness, people have discussed five separate, though related, sets of phenomena:

- Politeness as a real world goal
- Deference
- Register
- Politeness as a surface level phenomenon
- Politeness as an illocutionary phenomenon

A. Politeness as a real world goal

Politeness interpreted as a genuine desire to be pleasant to others, or as the underlying motivation for an individual's linguistic behaviour has place within pragmatics. According to Thomas, we can have no access to speakers' real motivation for speaking as they do, and discussions as to whether one group of people is 'politer' than another (in the sense of genuinely behaving better to other people than do other groups) are ultimately futile. As linguists we have access only to what speakers say and to how their hearers react.

B. Deference versus politeness

Deference is connected with politeness, but is a distinct phenomenon; it is the opposite of familiarity. It refers to the respect we show to other people by virtue of their higher status, greater age, etc. Politeness is a more general matter of showing consideration to others. Both deference and politeness can be manifested through general social behaviour as well as by linguistic means. The speaker has no choice as to whether to use the deferent form or not – usage is dictated by socio-linguistic norms. According to Thomas,(1995), if the use of a particular form is obligatory in a particular situation, it is of no significance pragmatically; it is only when there is a choice, or when a speaker attempts to bring about change by challenging the current norms, that the use of deferent or non-deferent forms becomes of interest to the pragmaticist.

It is also worth noting that the use of a deferent form does not in and of itself convey respect. Outside the appropriate socio-linguistic situation, the use of a deference marker can convey the very reverse of respect.

C. Register

The term register refers to systematic variation in relation to social context or the way in which the language we speak or write varies according to the type of situation. Certain situations or types of language use, as well as certain social relationships, require more formal language use.

As with deference, register has little to do with politeness and little connection with pragmatics, since we have no real choice about whether or not to use formal language in formal situations. Like deference, register is primarily a socio-linguistic phenomenon: a description of the linguistic forms which generally occur in a particular situation. Choice of register has little to do with the strategic use of language and it only becomes of interest to the pragmaticist if a speaker deliberately uses unexpected forms in order to change the situation or to challenge the status quo.

D. Politeness as an utterance level phenomenon

Much early work in the area of politeness focused on utterance level realizations. Walters defined his interest as being to investigate how much politeness could be squeezed out of speech act strategies alone, and to investigate the perception of politeness by native and non-native speakers of English and Spanish, using a standard lexical context in order to establish a hierachy of politeness, instructing his informants to ignore context as much as possible.

It is unsafe to equate surface linguistic form with politeness because some speech acts seem almost inherently impolite.
Thomas (1995), says we cannot assess politeness reliably out of context; it is not the linguistic form alone which renders the speech act polite or impolite, but the linguistic form + the context of utterance + the relationship between the speaker and the hearer.

E. Politeness as a pragmatic phenomenon

Most writers describe politeness as a strategy employed by a speaker to achieve a variety of goals, such as promoting or maintaining harmonious relations. These strategies may include the strategic use of the conventional politeness strategies, but also include a range of other strategies, including many forms of conventional and non-conventional indirectness. Following Fraser, Thomas (2000) have grouped the pragmatic approaches to politeness under three headings: the 'conversational maxim' view, the 'face management' view and the ? 'conversational contract' view. Thomas also included the fourth approach, which he termed the 'pragmatic scales' view, which brings together many of the strengths and avoids some of the weaknesses of the three previous approaches.

2.5.2 Politeness explained in terms of Principles and Maxims

Leech sees politeness as crucial in explaining why people are often so indirect in conveying what they mean and as rescuing the Cooperative Principle in the sense that politeness can satisfactorily explain exceptions to and apparent deviations from the CP. Leech introduces two concepts which are relevant for the present discussion: ambivalence and pragmatic principles.

A. <u>Ambivalence and politeness</u>

We observed that it is difficult to put politely into words something which is, by its nature, likely to cause offence to the hearer. This is certainly true when we are dealing with purely surface level encoding of politeness. However by employing an utterance which is ambivalent' i.e. one which has more than one potential pragmatic force, it is possible to convey messages which the hearer is liable to find disagreeable without causing undue offence.

2.5.3 Pragmatic principles

In his Principles of pragmatics, Leech introduces the Politeness Principle which runs as follows:

'Minimize (all things being equal) the expression of impolite beliefs; Maximize (all things being equal) the expression of polite beliefs'.

Leech sees the PP as being of the same status as Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP), which it 'rescues' by explaining why speakers do not always observe the Gricean maxims. There is a good deal of evidence that people do respond consciously to considerations of politeness, for instance, people will often explicitly 'mark' the fact that they cannot or not intend to observe politeness norms.

Leech introduces a number of maxims which, he claims, stand in the same relationship to the PP as Grice's maxims (Quality, Quantity, Relation and Manner) stand to the CP. Leech argues that these maxims are necessary in order to explain the relationship between sense and force in human conversation. The main maxims are:

- Tact
- Generosity
- Approbation
- Modesty
- Agreement and
- Sympathy

These maxims are formulated as imperatives. But this does not mean that they are in any sense 'rules of good behaviour'. Leech claims that they are simply the statements of norms which speakers can be observed to follow.

i) The Tact maxim

The Tact maxim means minimizing the expression of beliefs which imply cost to other; maximizing the expression of beliefs which imply benefit to other.
We can use 'minimizers' to reduce the implied cost to the hearer. But whether or not the strategy of minimizing the 'expression of cost to other' is perceived as polite or not may be highly culture-specific.

A second aspect of the Tact maxim is that of mitigating the effect of a request by offering optionality. Allowing options (or giving the appearance of allowing options) is absolutely central to Western notions of politeness.

A third component of the Tact maxim is the cost/benefit scale: if something is perceived as being to the hearer's benefit, X can be expressed politely without employing indirectness. However, if X is seen as being 'costly' to the hearer, greater indirectness may be required.

ii) The Generosity maxim

The Generosity maxim means minimizing the expression of benefit to self; maximizing the expression of cost to self. It explains why it is fine to say:

a) **"Ungahlala endlini yam"**
(You can stay in my house)

while the proposition that:

b) **"Ndiza kuhlala endlini yakho**"
(I am gonna stay in your house)

requires (generally speaking) to be expressed indirectly.

Leech also points out that some cultures attach much more importance to the Generosity maxim than do others. But there is no suggestion that members of one culture really are more generous than members of another.

iii) The Approbation maxim

It means minimizing the expression of beliefs which express dispraise of other; maximizing the expression of beliefs which express approval of other. The operation of this maxim is fairly obvious: all things being equal we prefer to praise others and if we cannot do so, to sidestep the issue, to give some sort of minimal response or to remain silent. Societies will vary greatly in the degree to which criticism is acceptable.

The 'other' may not be the person directly addressed, but someone or something dear to him or her.

Often in pragmatics we only become aware of the fact that a norm or regularity exists when someone fails to observe the norm.

iv) The Modesty maxim

It states : 'Minimize the expression of praise of self; maximize the expression of dispraise of self'. This maxim also varies enormously in its application from culture to culture. There is no suggestion that any one group actually is more modest than another. But inevitably, there are individuals within any culture who are genuinely modest or immodest.

v) The Agreement maxim

It means minimizing the expression of disagreement between self and other; maximizing the expression of agreement between self and other. As with all the other maxims, the usual caveats apply concerning the need to take account of the relationship between speaker and hearer and of the nature of the interaction in which they are involved. But, however, it is not being claimed that people avoid disagreeing with one another. Thomas (1995) simply observes that they are much more direct in expressing their agreement, than disagreement.

vi) The Pollyanna Principle

Pollyanna Principle is about putting the best possible gloss on what we have to say. In its least contentious form, this may refer only to the use of minimizers such as a bit, i.e. *a bit long – when in actual fact it is too much long.*

Its other aspects relate to relexicalization, replacing an unpleasant term with a supposedly less unpleasant one. However we can find instances of the Pollyanna Principle in operation which do not seem to be explained by other maxims or principles.

B. Problems with the Leech's approach

Thomas argues that there is a major flaw in Leech's approach to politeness as presently formulated. There appears to be no motivated way of restricting the number of maxims. In theory it would be possible to produce a new maxim to explain every tiny regularity in language use. This makes the theory at best inelegant, at worst virtually unfalsifiable.

Thomas maintains that Leech's approach , for all its problems, allows us better than any of the other approaches discussed, to make specific cross-cultural comparisons and to explain cross-cultural differences in the perception of politeness and the use of politeness strategies.

2.5.4 Politeness and the Management of Face

The most influential theory of politeness was put forward by Brown and Levinson (1987). Their theory of politeness is the concept of *face,* as proposed by Goffman, (1967). Within politeness theory 'face' is best understood as every individual's feeling of self worth or self image; this image can be damaged, maintained or enhanced through interaction with others. Face has two aspects – 'positive' and 'negative'. An individual's positive face is reflected in his or her desire to be liked, approved of, respected and appreciated by others. An individual's negative face is reflected in the desire not to be impeded or put upon, to have the freedom to act as one chooses.

2.5.5 Face – threatening acts

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), certain illocutionary acts are liable to damage or threaten another person's face, Or Hearer's negative face ; or the illocutionary act may potentially damage the speaker's own positive face or Speaker's negative face. In order to reduce the possibility of damage to H's face or to the speaker's own face, he or she may adopt certain strategies. The choice of strategy will be made on the basis of the speaker's assessment of the size of the FTA. This size can be calculated on the basis of the parameters of power (P), distance (D), and rating of imposition ®. These combined values determine the overall 'weightiness' of the FTA which in turn influences the strategy used.

i) Superstrategies for performing face threatening acts

The first decision to be made is whether to perform the FTA or not. If the speaker does decide to perform the FTA, there are four possibilities:

- Perform the FTA on-record without redressive action (bald on record)
- Perform the FTA on record using positive politeness
- Perform the FTA on record using negative politeness
- 'Off – record' strategies

If the speaker decides that the degree of face threat is too great, he or she may decide to avoid the FTA altogether.

i) Performing an FTA without any redress (bald-on-record)

There are occasions when no attempt external factors constrain an individual to speak very directly, for example, if there is an emergency of some sort, or where there is a major form of channel limitation.

If the speaker decides that the overall 'wightiness' of the FTA is very small, the request may be made 'bald-on-record'. The same is true when the face – threatening act is perceived as being in the hearer's interest.
Other situations in which no attempt is made to mitigate the FTA, regardless of the rating of the imposition, are to be found where the power differential is great. In such cases the powerful participant will often employ no indirectness at all.

ii) Performing an FTA with redress (positive politeness)

Within Brown and Levinson's theory, when you speak to someone you may orient yourself towards that individual's positive face, and employ positive politeness. They list fifteen positive politeness strategies, giving copious illustrations from many different languages.
Unsurprisingly, perhaps, a number of Brown and Levinson's positive politeness strategies find close parallels in Leech's politeness principles: 'seek agreement', 'avoid disagreement', 'be optimistic', 'give sympathy'.

iii) Performing an FTA with redress (negative politeness)

Negative politeness is oriented towards a hearer's negative face, which appeals to the hearer's desire not to be impeded or put upon, to be left free to act as they choose. Negative politeness manifests itself in the use of conventional politeness markers, deference markers, minimizing imposition, etc. Brown and Levinson list ten negative politeness strategies:

- Be conventionally indirect
- Hedge
- Minimize imposition
- Admit the impingement
- Point of view distancing

- Go on record as incurring a debt
- Impersonalize S and H
- State FTA as a general rule, etc.

iv) Performing an FTA using off-record politeness

Brown and Levinson list a further fifteen strategies for performing off-record politeness. These include: 'give hints', 'use metaphors', 'be ambiguous or vague', etc.

v) Do not perform FTA

There are times when something is so face threatening, that you don't say it. There are times when the speaker decides to say nothing and genuinely wishes to let the matter drop; there are other occasions when an individual decides to say nothing (decides not to complain), but still wishes to achieve the effect which the speech act would have achieved had it been uttered.

There is a third situation – where there is such a strong expectation that saying nothing is in itself a massive FTA.

B. Criticisms of Brown and Levinson

- Many acts can be seen to threaten the face of both S and H simultaneously
- A single utterance can be oriented to both positive and negative face simultaneously
- Saying anything at all, or saying nothing is potentially face-threatening.

2.5.6 Politeness viewed as a conversational contract

According to Fraser (1990), people are constrained in interaction by what he calls a 'conversational contract' (CC) – the understanding which people bring to an interaction of the norms obtaining within that interaction and of their rights and obligations within it. Fraser's model of politeness is very sketchy compared with those of Leech and Brown and Levinson and it is difficult to judge how it might operate in practice. His inclusion of the 'rights and obligations' dimension is welcome, and the approach fits in well with the notion of 'activity types'.

Politeness measured along pragmatic scales

Spencer-Oatey argues that the way Brown and Levinson and Leech formulated their theories of politeness left them open to being criticized on the grounds that they are culturally-biased. In order to overcome the problems of cultural-specificity, she proposes sets of dimensions. She suggests that all the research on politeness can be summarized in terms of these three sets of dimensions:

i) Need for consideration
ii) Need to be valued
iii) Need for relational identity

2.6 REITER (2000)

2.6.1 Politeness Theory

Politeness: Social or individual entity?

Once we talk about politeness we are referring directly or indirectly to society. In order for an act to be regarded as 'polite' it has to be set upon a standard which lies beyond the act itself but which is recognised by both the actor and the hearer or a third party who might be part of the interaction in a society. This standard is based on collective values or norms which have been acquired by individual agents usually early in their lives as part of a socialization process.

Politeness is not a characteristic inherent to the action itself but is constituted by an interactional relationship based upon a standard shared, developed and reproduced by individuals within a social group (Reiter, 200).

Politeness is thus a form of social interaction a form that mediates between the individual and the social. The polite or impolite act is performed by an individual whose choices for the instrumentality of such an act are based upon collective norms and whose motivation in performing the act is that of structuring social interaction.

Lakoff's rules of politeness

Reiter (2000), claims that one of the most important contributions to the study of pragmatics has been that of Grice's Co-operative Principle and his Maxims of Conversation which were formulated on the assumption that the main purpose of conversation is the 'effective exchange of information. Lakoff was among the first linguists to adopt Grice's universal construct of conversational principles in order to account for politeness phenomena. She integrates Grice's conversational maxims with her own rules of politeness in order to account for pragmatic competences and thus fall within the domain of linguistics. Lakoff posited the rules of politeness as:

- Formality: keep aloof
- Deference: give options
- Camaraderie: show sympathy

It can be deduced from Lakoff's sub-rules that politeness has to do with not intruding into other people's territory, letting the addressee take his/her own decisions and making the addressee 'feel good', hence politeness appears to be closely related to the avoidance of conflict. She further describes politeness as a tool used for reducing friction in personal interaction.

She claims that Grice's maxims fall under her first pragmatic rule, since they mainly concentrate on the clarity of the conversation. She implies that the rules of conversation are one type of politeness rule.

When it comes to the formulation of her rules, she appears to equate formality aloofness, camaraderie with showing sympathy. However, without a definition of how aloofness, deference and camaraderie work in a particular society it is very difficult to see how politeness will be expressed in that particular group, and thus one cannot make claims for the universality of the concept (Reiter, 200).

According to Brown, the problem with Lakoff's analysis is that she does not offer an integrating theory which places her rules of politeness in a framework which explains their form in terms of social relationships and expectations about humans as interactants (Reiter, 2000).

2.6.2 Leech's Principles and Maxims of Interaction

In his extension of Grice's framework Leech attempts to explain why people often convey meaning indirectly. Politeness is regarded as the key pragmatic phenomenon for indirectness and one of the reasons why people deviate from the CP.

He makes a distinction between a speaker's illocutionary goal and a speaker's social goal. He elaborates a pragmatic framework which consists of two main parts: textual rhetoric and interpersonal rhetoric, each of which is constituted by a set of principles. Politeness is treated within the domain of interpersonal rhetoric, which consists of three sets of principles: Grice's Co-operative Principle, his own Politeness Principle and his irony principle. Leech not only regards the PP as having the same status as Grice's CP but sees it as the reason for the non observance of the Gricean maxims. His PP is constructed in a very similar format to the CP and is analysed in terms of maxims: tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement and sympathy; all very subjective values impossible to measure.

Leech's maxims have a set of pragmatic scales associated with them which are considered by the hearer to determine the degree of tact or generosity appropriate in a given speech situation:

- The Cost/Benefit scale, which describes how the action is assessed by the speaker to be costly or beneficial either to the speaker or to the addressee
- The Optionality scale, which describes to what extent the action is performed at the choice of the addressee
- The Indirectness scale, which describes how much inference is involved in the action
- The Authority scale, which describes the degree of distance between speakers in terms of power over each other

- The Social Distance scale, which describes the degree of solidarity between the participants.

Leech notes that not all his maxims are of equal importance. He says that the tact maxim is more powerful than the generosity maxim, and that the approbation maxim is more powerful than the modesty maxim. Thus he suggests that his concept of politeness is more focused on the addressee than on the speaker.

He, furthermore, points out that each maxim is comprised of two sub-maxims, thus the tact maxim consists of (a) minimise cost to other, (b) maximise benefit to other; in the case of the generosity maxim, we have (a) minimise benefit to self, and (b) maximise cost to self, and so forth with the rest of the maxims.

Leech offers a distinction between what he calls 'absolute' and 'relative' politeness. The former has a positive and a negative pole since some speech acts, such as offers, are intrinsically polite whereas others such as orders, are intrinsically impolite.

Fraser points out that the problem with this approach is that Leech asserts that particular types of illocutions are polite or impolite. He leaves open the question of how many principles and maxims may be required in order to account for politeness phenomena, hence theoretically the number of maxims could be infinite.

2.6.3 Brown and Levinson's theory of Politeness

Politeness as a linguistic theory was first systematised by Brown and Levinson, who, after a comparative study of three unrelated languages, noticed many similarities in the linguistic strategies employed by speakers of the three very different languages. They observed the employment of the same strategies in other languages, thus assuming the universality of politeness as a regulative factor in conversational exchanges.

a) <u>Politeness Strategies</u>

Brown and Levinson distinguished two aspects of 'face' which they claim are universal and refer to two basic desires of any person in any interaction, 'negative face' and 'positive face'. The former is a person's desire to be unimpeded by others, to be free to act without being imposed upon. The latter is a person's wish to be desirable to at least some other who will appreciate and approve of one's self and one's personality.

Besides having 'face', competent adult members are rational agents, who will choose means of satisfying their goals as efficiently as possible.

Brown and Levinson suggest that certain acts inherently threaten the 'face' needs of one or both participants.

They regard face threatening acts as those acts which run contrary to the addressee's and/or the speaker's positive and/or negative 'face'.

Like leech, Brown and Levinson propose a scale designed to evaluate the degree of politeness required in a specific situation. Brown and Levinson claim that a speaker assesses the required face work according to three independent and culturally-sensitive social variables, which they claim are universal, viz: Distance between speaker and hearer, Power between the participants and the absolute Ranking of impositions in a particular culture, the degree of imposition intrinsic to a particular act.
In an interaction, participants, as rational agents, will choose from a set of five possible strategies which will enable them to either avoid or mitigate FTAs:

- Do the FTA on record without redressive action, baldly – when there is no risk of loss of face.
- Do the FTA on record with redressive action (positive politeness) – When the speaker tries to maintain 'face' as much as possible and at the same time tries to mitigate the potential threat of the act.
- Do the FTA on record with redressive action (negative politeness) – face still maintained as above.
- Do the FTA off-record – when the risk of face loss is great, the communicative act becomes ambiguous, i.e. a hint, and interpretation left to the addressee
- Do not do the FTA – nothing is said because the risk is too great

Brown and Levinson's distinction between negative and positive politeness is very much related to Goffman's concepts of avoidance/ presentational rituals, acts through which a speaker shows the hearer distance and involvement in an interaction, respectively.

Although Brown and Levinson acknowledge the possibility of having both forms of politeness in certain societies, they seem to regard 'negative' politeness as a more important consideration than 'positive' politeness.

CHAPTER 3

THE SPEECH ACT REQUEST

3.1 THE REQUEST

3.1.1 Ervin-Tripp et al (1987)

Understanding requests

In ongoing conversation, it is relatively rare to employ a speech act verb while performing the act itself. The relationship between the surface form of an utterance (its lexical content and grammatical form) and its function in context is far from straightforward. Within the study of speech acts, this indeterminacy is particularly salient.

a) Conventional requests

Conventional requests are sometimes called indirect requests. Typical interpretive models for hearers of conventional speech acts have the following features:

- The hearer first makes a literal interpretation of the prepositional content and illocutionary force of an utterance.
- Following this initial interpretation, the hearer checks the situation and if there is a mismatch between the literal or idiomatic interpretation and the features of the prevailing situation, the hearer restarts by moving to the next interpretation on a hierarchy of possibilities.
- If incongruence remains, the hearer tests hypotheses about the intention of the speaker, given what is said and what the situation is, using implicature or inference.
- Finally, the hearer derives the implications for action, if any, from a construal of the speaker's intentions.

According to Ervin Tripp et al, 1987, these sorts of models are inadequate. The primary difficulties with them rest with the assumption context and situation play a secondary role in the interpretive process, and that the hearer entertains non-literal interpretations of a speaker's utterance only after literal interpretations have had to be discarded.

Conventional requests are explicit in two domains. They are explicit in respect of the action requested of the hearer. This is contained in what Searle refers to as the prepositional component. They are also explicit with respect to some aspect of the prerequisites to cooperation – hearer's ability to comply: "can you?"

Conventional requests are, because of their explicitness, completely 'on-record' and are understood by very young children; they are not empirically interesting from the stand point of interpretive ambiguity.

b) Interpretive process

How do we understand what to do from what is said to us? From the explicitness of an imperative, the addressee knows who is to act, the act to do, and the object affected. But in many cases speakers do not get this far. Speakers sometimes just mention what the problem is. The desire to stay on good terms with one's addressee can lead to wanting to avoid the appearance of giving orders. When speakers are in the midst of well-coordinated joint activity they don't always need to be explicit. Sometimes they speak elliptically, sometimes a gesture suffices.

Listeners develop knowledge of what to do in practical situations. Familiar situations can be recognized typically by the setting, personnel, and activities.

c) Activity

In observing requests, Ervin Tripp et al, 1987, have been struck with the importance of familiar types of activity trajectories in the coordination of talk and action. These trajectories are projected by an observer on the basis of what is understood about the situation – goals and normal activities, or both. The commitment of each member to goals in the activities of the situation – either a speech activity in toto or speech as a component of another activity- identifies likely interpretations of any speech or gestures which occur.

d) Situation

The situations Levinson mentioned are socially shared, conventional, named events. In such events there is a structure surrounded by norms such that violations of constraints can be recognized and talked about. There may be recognizable internal structuring, episodes, phases. These are conventional, but they can vary in degree of formality. Ervin Tripp et al called these conventional situations.

e) Speaker contexts

During loosely defined activities, speakers indicate by contextual cues in their speech and in their behavior variations in activity or role of which they can be quite unaware. The differences do not bound conventional named and institutionalized activities. Rather, they are subtler, less clearly bounded, and recognizable primarily from speech features.

f) Overlapping situations

Participants are often in overlapping situations. They have the option of which of these situations to bring into the foreground of interaction.

g) Situation in interpretation

Speech is first heard to ongoing activity. The evidence for this priority is that misunderstandings are biased in the direction of the privileged, activity relevant interpretation. It is incorrect to treat context as secondary to literal or idiomatic meanings in arriving at either action or interpretation. Contexts can be determinative. They prime the hearer for certain interpretations.

3.1.2 Kim and Wilson (1994)

Introduction

People make requests for many reasons and do so in a variety of different ways. One feature of requesting is the style in which people exert influence. Cultures differ in normative styles of requesting. Kim and Wilson's article explores similarities and differences in the structure and content of cultural group's "implicit ′theories about requesting, which may account for culture-specific request styles. As people spend a large amount of time trying to get others to do things, it is conceivable that they have "implicit theories" on which to base decisions about how to request. Kim and Wilson, 1994, argues that surface-level communication differences are in fact grounded in shared cognitive knowledge about factors that constrain communication, and that this culturally shared knowledge can be used to distinguish one group from another.

Conceptualizing Implicit Theories of Requesting

Because requesting is a ubiquitous occurrence in daily life, it is likely that people hold a network of beliefs or implicit theories about it. These implicit theories may include:

a) information about potential request strategies and tactics,
b) information about different request goals or reasons for requesting,
c) information about situational factors that influence the effectiveness of strategies at accomplishing these goals (e.g. the social status, gender, and age of the requestee), and
d) information about interactive constraints on the ways requests can be made.

Interactive constraints are fundamental concerns influencing the choice of strategies in a message. They tend to affect the general character of every conversation one engages in or an individual's conversational style. Understanding the importance of these interactive constraints is essential to explaining and predicting choice of conversational strategies. Several authors suggest that two cross-cultural constraints are motivating forces in communication: appropriateness and either efficiency or effectiveness. In an analysis of interpersonal influence situations, Dillard argues that gaining compliance is the primary goal and that other concerns are secondary issues that shape how a speaker accomplishes the primary one. Appropriateness and efficiency are two critical and often conflicting dimensions that determine people's choice of conversation strategies.

Standards for social appropriateness, however, may vary across cultures. Kim and Wilson. 1994, proposed a set of five interactive constraints to account for the use of different conversational strategies in different cultures. The resulting five interactive constraints are:

a) Concern for clarity

Clarity is defined as the likelihood of an utterance making one's intention clear and explicit. If one's primary goal is to request an action, direct imperatives make the speaker's illocutionary point explicit.

b) Concern for minimizing imposition

This dimension pertains to the degree to which an utterance avoids imposing on the hearer's autonomy or interfering with the hearer's freedom of action. This is referred to as 'negative politeness' or 'deference politeness', which avoid making imposition on others, thus protecting the hearer's negative face. Request strategies vary along the dimension of minimizing imposition.

c) Concern for avoiding hurting the hearer's feelings

This refers to the degree to which a strategy shows considerstion for the hearer's feelings. When making a request, people also may consider how their projected action will affect the hearer's feelings.

d) Concern for avoiding negative evaluation by the hearer

This dimension represents the desire to avoid risking disapproval for self. Individuals attempt to behave in ways that avoid devaluation by others, by using 'approval seeking strategies'.

e) Effectiveness

If speakers undertake communicative acts to accomplish a primary goal, then it seems likely that they are concerned whether that goal will be accomplished. Judgments of communicative competence are related to the effectiveness with which primary goals are pursued.

'Likelihood of use' seems to be strongly related to the five constraints and may reveal differences in cultural members' implicit theories or beliefs about request use. It asks how likely one would be to use each strategy within a specific request situation.

Effects of Culture on Implicit Theories of Requesting

Previous empirical studies on request forms have tended to show cross-cultural stability in the rank orderings of the relative politeness of linguistic forms. According to Kim and Wilson, 1994, the rank orderings of request strategies along the constraint dimensions as well as for likelihood of use should be similar across cultures. Based on the above reasoning they proposed the following hypotheses:

H1: *The rank ordering* of the three request strategies along the five interactive constraint dimensions and for likelihood of use will be similar across cultures.
H2: *The absolute level* of judgment for strategies along the five interactive constraint dimensions and for likelihood of use will differ across cultures.
H3: Across cultures there will be a strong negative correlation between perceptions of the clarity of request tactics and perceptions of tactics and perceptions of tactics on the three relational constraints.

3.1.3 Trosborg (1995)

The speech act request

A request is an illocutionary act whereby a speaker conveys to a hearer that he/she wants the requestee to perform an act which is for the benefit of the speaker. The desire is to take place post-utterance, either in the immediate future, or at some later stage.

a) The request as an impositive act

Impositive speech acts are described as speech acts performed by the speaker to influence the intentional behavior of the hearer in order to get the latter to perform, primarily for the benefit of the speaker, the action directly specified or indirectly suggested by the proposition.

b) The request as a face-threatening act

According to Trosborg, 1995, the speaker who makes a request attempts to exercise power or direct control over the intentional behavior of the hearer, and in so doing so threatens the requestee's negative face by indicating that he/she does not intend to refrain fro impeding the requetee's freedom of action.

c) The request as distinguished from other impositive speech acts

In a request, the act to be performed is solely in the interest of the speaker and, normally, at the cost of the hearer. In contrast, a suggestion is defined as being beneficial to both speaker and hearer. In a threat, the speaker indicates to the hearer that he/she will instigate sanctions against the hearer unless he/she complies with the speaker's wishes. What is really a request may be presented as a suggestion or even as a piece of advice, a warning or a threat. By pretending that the act specified by the proposition is for the common good the speaker may try to diminish the degree of imposition.

Assignment of illocutionary force

There are several ways in which a locution can be assigned the illocutionary force of a request.

a) Mood

The theory of speech acts is based on the assumption that an utterance is composed of a proposition and a modality. However, mood is not the only way of deriving the illocutionary force of an utterance. Mood and speech act modality is to some extent independent. Conversely, a request is often realized by means of declarative and interrogative structures.

b) Performative verbs

The speaker can convey a request simply by using a performative verb which explicitly signals the illocutionary force, e.g. 'I request/order/demand.........' The verb in question marks the utterance as a request.

c) Felicity conditions

According to Searle, the force of an utterance derives from a set of necessary and sufficient conditions relating to the particular act. Given the sincerity conditions of a request, a speaker may convey a request by questioning one of the hearer- based conditions, or by asserting one of the speaker-based conditions. Searle points to the relative status of speaker and hearer as being a decisive condition for the felicitous performance of a request. Lack of authority is likely to invalidate orders, and if the speaker asked the hearer to perform an act which is clearly his/her own responsibility, the speech act is likely to be defective.

d) Requests with no explicit requestive illocutionary force

There are utterances which meet the essential condition of requests, but which nevertheless omit mention of the desired act and avoid mentioning the hearer as the intended agent. Such requests are indirect realizations of the speaker's intention to make the hearer perform and are referred to here as 'hinting strategies'.

3.1.4 Blum-Kulka (1989)

<u>Conventions and Indirectness</u>

In the domain of language use, conventions of language interact with other types of conventions, as well as with general principles of conversation, in determining pragmatic functions. According to Blum-Kulka (1989), the processes of interpretation involved rely on the following conventions and principles:

1. Conventions of language
2. Conversational principles
3. pragmalinguistic conventions
4. Contextualized conventions

For the so-called conventional indirectness the most important conventions are pragmalinguistic in nature. On the other hand, in non-conventional indirectness contextual and interpretative conventions (conversational principles) may combine in linking properties of the utterance with properties of the context.

For conventional indirectness, conventions of prepositional content (means) and linguistic form combine to signal requestive force. Non-conventional indirectness on the other hand is in principle open-ended, both in terms of prepositional content and linguistic form as well as pragmatic force. The two types of indirectness hence differ in terms of the pragmatic ambiguities potentially inherent in each.

Blum-Kulka, 1989, says it is well known that conventional indirect strategies are interpretable on at least two levels, literally or as requests. Hence, conventional indirectness is characterized by a particular kind of ambiguity which is encoded in the utterance's meaning and which allows it to be intended and interpreted on either one of two levels or on both simultaneously. Many authors say utterances in context are often the happy carriers of multiple pragmatic forces.

According to Blum-Kulka, 1989, the most important typical features of conventional indirectness seem to be the following:

1. conventionalization of means and form
2. pragmatic duality
3. negotiability

Degrees Of Universality: The Pragmalinguistic Dimension

a) Universal categories

Blum-Kulka expected request strategies in the various languages studied to display three major levels of directness, viz.:

i. the most direct, explicit level e.g. imperatives or performatives
ii. the conventionally indirect level
iii. the non conventional indirect level

The findings confirm the cross-linguistic validity of these categories, thereby indicating the universality of the category of conventional indirectness.

b) Degree of Cross-Linguistic Variation

Out of the study carried out by Blum Kulka, the following cross-linguistic similarities and differences emerged;

i. all sub-strategies of conventional indirectness vary across languages to some degree in conventions of form.
ii. languages differ in preferences shown for the use of specific sub-strategies
iii. situational range in the use of sub-strategies varies with language

Sub-strategies

- Reference to H's ability
- Reference to H's willingness
- Predicting H's doing the act
- Formulaic suggestions
- Questioning reason

The analysis of the sub-strategies of conventional indirectness in the languages studied suggests that within each language, the sub-strategies vary on at least two aspects:

1. level of standardization (conventionality of form)
2. level of requestiveness (illocutionary transparency)

c) Perspective

Requests can be speaker-oriented, hearer-oriented, inclusive "self" – oriented, or impersonal. As Blum-Kulka puts it, choice of perspective affects social meaning, since requests are inherently imposing, avoidance to name the hearer as actor can reduce the form's level of coerciveness. In most languages, most conventional requests are hearer oriented.

d) Internal modifications

Blum-Kulka (1989), had defined as "internal modifiers" elements within the request utterance proper, the presence of which is not essential for the utterance to be potentially understood as a request. Such modifiers can be multifunctional in two distinct ways. First, they may act both as indicating devices, used to signal pragmatic force, as well as socio-pragmatic devices, meant to affect the social impact the utterance is likely to have. Second, in their socio-pragmatic role, they may act either as down-graders, meant to mitigate (soften) the act or alternatively as up-graders that emphasize its degree of coerciveness.

3.2 REQUEST STRATEGIES

3.2.1 Clark and Schunk (1980)

When people make requests, they tend to make them indirectly. They generally avoid imperatives, which are direct requests, in preference for questions or assertions which are indirect requests. According to Clark and Schunk idiomatic processes creates one and only one meaning – the indirect meaning, while the multiple-meaning processes creates both the literal and the indirect meanings, though not necessarily one after the other.

The feature that makes the multiple meaning processes distinctive is their assumption that literal meaning plays a role in comprehension. The literal meaning is important in conveying politeness.

The politeness of indirect requests

In a request and its response, two people coordinate an exchange of goods. The problem with requests is that on the surface, they are inequitable. While the requester benefits from the information received from the requestee, it costs the requestee some effort to give it to requester. The requestee's face is threatened. People are polite to the extent that they enhance, or lessen the threat to, another's face. Requests can be polite or impolite, and they can be sorted into six broad categories,viz.:

- Permission
- Imposition
- Ability
- Memory
- Commitment and
- Obligation

Three factors that cut across these six categories and lead to subsidiary predictions are conditionality, negativity, and strength.

3.2.2 Kim and Wilson (1994)

Conceptualizing Requests

In a conversational setting, requesting refers to messages that indicate the speaker's desire for a hearer to bring about some desired state or event, which otherwise would not have occurred. Persuasive request situations are familiar events in everyday life and thus are quintessential examples of social speech. The ability to effectively get what one wants from other people is a highly important communicative skill, success at which has been viewed as an index of social competence. In addition, a theoretical work on requests has shown that a complex relationship exists between form, meaning, and pragmatic conditions in realizing this act. Hearers can interpret requests as intrusive on their freedom of action, and speakers may hesitate to make a request for fear of exposing a need or risking the hearer's loss of face. Therefore high social stakes are involved for both speaker and hearer in the choice of specific request forms.

Classifying Request Strategies

The ideas of strategy and tactic have been postulated to capture variations in requests. In Kim and Wilson's study, a request tactic is defined by a particular sentential form and meaning that a speaker employs to accomplish a goal, whereas a request strategy is a class of similar tactics. There have been many prior attempts to set up classifications of request strategies in different languages. In their study Kim and Wilson came up with three main strategy categories,viz.:

- Hint (mild, strong and question)
- Query (permission, ability, willingness and suggestory)
- Direct statements (want, performative, obligation, and imperative)

Each of the three can be performed in various ways using different tactics. These three main strategies seem to vary along several contextual features, including illocutionary transparency or opacity, syntactic directness, politeness, imperative force or coerciveness, syntactic features, and cost and benefit to the interlocutor.

Classification of Request Tactics

a) Hint Strategy

i. Mild Hint – The utterance contains no elements that are of immediate relevance to the intended illocution, but is still interpretable as a request through the context.

ii. Strong Hint – The illocutionary intent is not immediately derivable from the utterance; however, the utterance refers to relevant elements of the intended illocutionary act.

iii. Question Hint – The illocutionary intent is embedded in what is seemingly an information question. They take the form of an interrogation.

b) Query Strategy

i. Syntactic downgraders – They modify the utterance internally by mitigating the impositive force of the request by means of syntactic choices.

ii. Permission – A requester is offering the hearer the authority to grant the permission to make a request. The focus is on the requester's activity rather than on the hearer's.

iii. Ability Query Preparatory – The utterance contains reference to an ability preparatory condition for the feasibility of the request by questioning about the hearer's ability to perform the desired action.

iv. Willingness Query Preparatory – The utterance contains the reference to the hearer's intention, willingness, or commitment to carry out an action. The request is realized from the viewpoint of the hearer.

v. Suggestory – The utterance is phrased as a suggestion to do an action. This indicates that the requester wants what the hearer also wants.

c) Direct Statement Strategy

i. Want – The utterance expresses the requester's desire or want that an action comes about.

ii. Performative – The illocutionary verb denoting the requestive intent is modified by verbs expressing the requester's intention.

iii. Obligation – The requester implies that the hearer is under some obligation to do the desired action. It gives the hearer little choice in the matter. The obligation is here more severe than in the commitment requests.

iv. Imperative – It is the literal form of a request. What the requester wants the hearer to do is uniformly heard as request in the contexts in which it occurs.

3.2.3 Trosborg (1995)

Request Strategies

a) Indirect requests

Hints

By making a statement, for example describing an undesired state of affairs, or by asking a question, the requester can imply to his/her listener what he/she wants done. The requester can leave out the desired action altogether (mild hint), or his/her wish can be partially mentioned (strong hint).

The lack of transparency is intentional. The utterance is not just vague and non-transparent, it is specifically and intentionally vague, as it is employed by the speaker to convey a meaning which differs, in some way, from the transparent surface meaning. Despite the lack of transparency, hints are part of conversational routine and the necessary work of interpretation is a normal part of cooperative conversation which is generally taken for granted by participants in everyday interactions.

When interpreting a hint, it is often necessary to possess intimate knowledge of the other person, to have specific background knowledge, to be aware of specific situational features.

b) Conventionally indirect requests

Reference to the hearer's ability and willingness to comply with the requester's wishes and desires constitute central strategies in formulating requests. Requests that are "hearer-oriented" convey that the hearer is in a position of control to decide whether or not to comply with the request. For this reason, "hearer-oriented" requests are generally more polite than requests formulated on "speaker-based" conditions.

i) Ability

The condition of ability refers to the hearer's capacity to perform the desired act. Two different conditions are relevant: 1) the inherent capacities of the requestee, both physical and mental, 2) the external circumstances related to time, place, etc. of the action. Questions pertaining to external circumstances may present real obstacles to compliance.

ii) Willingness

Questions concerning the hearer's willingness to carry out the desired act
serve as compliance-gaining strategies by conveying to the requestee that the requester does not take compliance for granted. Requests querying the hearer's willingness may be embedded in expressions of appreciation, hope,etc., on behalf of the requester.

iii) Suggestory formulae

When employing this strategy, the requester does not question any particular hearer-based condition, rather he/she tests the hearer's cooperativeness in general by inquiring whether any conditions exist that might prevent the hearer from carrying out the action specified by the proposition. By presenting a request by means of a suggestory formula the speaker makes his/her request more tentative and plays down his/her her own interest as a beneficiary of the action.

c) Speaker-based conditions

A requester can choose to focus on speaker-based conditions, rather than querying hearer-oriented conditions, thereby making his/her own desires the focal point of the interaction. By placing the speaker's interests above the hearer's, the request becomes more direct in its demand. The speaker's statement of his/her intent may be expressed politely as a wish, or more bluntly as a demand.

d) Direct requests

When employing a statement of obligation or necessity, the speaker exerts either his/her own authority, or he/she refers to some authority outside the speaker.

i) Performatives

The inclusion of a performative verb conveying requestive intent, e.g. *ask, request, order, demand, command*, etc. explicitly marks the utterance as an order. Performative statements with requestive intent are very direct and usually authoritative.

If the requester wants to soften this form, it is possible to hedge the illocutionary force of the utterance. The result is a hedged performative.

ii) Imperatives

The imperative is the grammatical form directly signaling that the utterance is an order. In its unmodified form it is very authoritative. Orders issued by authority figures must be obeyed. If the speaker has power over the hearer, the latter is obliged to carry out the order, e.g. orders from parent to child, from principal to teacher, etc.

Summary and discussion

The presented scale of directness levels acknowledges the request as face-threatening act demanding face-work for its polite realization. If a speaker wants to carry out an act with maximum efficiency, he/she can can perform the act "baldly on record", i.e. without face redress, as in direct requests, The speaker can choose the option of going "on record", but at the same time employing face redressusing positive or negative politeness strategies.

The speaker can choose to go "off-record" and not specify his/her intention in any direct way. Such strategies add an additional element of avoidance and as such they are a natural extension of negative politeness.

Coupled with an increase in directness of the request, the requester's anticipation of compliance increases. Consequently the strategies also differ with regard to the ease with which a request can be refused.

Internal modification

There are various ways in which a requester can vary the politeness of a request.

a) Syntactic downgraders

i) Question - A question is often more polite than a statement.
ii) Past tense/negation – The inclusion of past tense and/or negation further downtones the expectations to the fulfillment of the request.
iii) Tag questions – The requester can appeal to the hearer's consent by adding a tag question to a fairly direct request, thereby softening the impact considerably.
iv) Conditional clause – The requester can distance the request further from reality by adding a conditional clause.

b) Lexical/phrasal downfraders

i) Politeness marker – In order to signal politeness the requester can add elements of deference to the request e.g. please.
ii) Consultative device – Consulting the hearer is another way of asking for the hearer's consent.
iii) Downtoner – A number of modal sentence adverbials and modal particles can be used to downtone the impositive force of a request,e.g. just, rather, perhaps, etc.
iv) Understatement – A way of decreasing the imposition forced on the hearer is to understate or in some way minimize some aspects of the desired aspect.
v) Hedge – By hedging the prepositional content the requester can be intentionally vague about certain aspects of the act to be carried out.

c) Upgraders

i) Adverbial intensifier – The requester decreases the impact on the requestee by upgrading the illocutionary force expressed by 'must' by inserting the upgrader'reaally'.

ii) Lexical intensification – The requester's choice of lexical items reveals his/her attitude. He/she can be positive/negative, and in extreme cases swear words may be used.

3.2.4 CCSARP coding manual

External contextual feature of the interaction include the social role relationship between the participants, such as their relative social distance and relative social dominance. Internal contextual features include the parameters specific to the speech act elicited like the kind of goal for request or the kind of offence committed for apologies. Both of them can be systematically differentiated across situations.

Blum-Kulka, (1989), states that a request strategy is the obligatory choice of the level of directness by which the request is realized. Directness means the degree to which the speaker's illocutionary intent is apparent from the locution. Directness is the pragma-linguistic category which lend itself to psycholinguistic validation. Request strategies are mutually exclusive which means that a Head act can only be realized through one specific request.

According to Blum-Kulka the grammatical mood of the locution conventionally determines its illocutionary force as a request. The prototypical form is the imperative, e.g. "Leave me alone".

Explicit performance of the illocutionary intent is explicitly named by the speaker by using a relevant illocutionary verb e.g.

'I am asking you to move your car.'

Hedged performative – the illocutionary verb denoting the requestive intent is modified by modal verbs or verbs expressing intention.

Locution derivable – the illocutionary intent is directly derivable from semantic meaning of the locution e.g.
'Madam, you'll have to move your car'.

Want statement – the utterance expresses the speaker's desire that the event denoted in the proposition came about e.g.
'I'd like to borrow your notes for a little while '.

Suggestory formulae – the illocutionary intent is phrased as a suggestion by means of a framing routine formula, e.g.
'How about cleaning up the kitchen'.

In preparatory – the utterance contains reference to a preparatory condition for the feasibility of the request, typically one of ability, willingness or possibility as conventionalized in the given language.

3.3. REQUEST SITUATIONS

3.3.1. (Kim and Wilson)

Kim and Wilson (1994), have listed **six** request situations , which are the following:

<u>Repay Loan Situation (Social status : Hearer - speaker)</u>

Imagine that one of your female friend , whom you have known for several years, has the habit of borrowing money and then not repaying it for long periods of time . In fact, it seems that she has been late not only when repaying money borrowed from you but also when she has received loans from other people. Two weeks ago the person borrowed 20 dollars from you. Again, the person did repay it as promised. You waited a few days more but found that you really need some cash. Now you want to ask her to return the money.

<u>Borrow Money Situation</u> (Hearer - Speaker)

Imagine that you missed breakfast and are about to have lunch at a university cafeteria. When search for , you notice that you have forgotten to bring your wallet. Given your class schedule , you have just enough time to eat but not enough time to go back home and get money before your next class. Just then, you happen to notice one of your classmates (male) , whom you have known for several years , sitting nearby. Now you decide to ask him to lend you some money.

Being on Time Situation (Hearer < Speaker)

Imagine that you are a professor in a university. In your class , group activities and participation is weighted heavily. From the start of the semester, one student (male) is continually late. He seldom makes it to class on time. Other students in the class appear to be disturbed by the student coming into class late. After class, you want to ask him to come on time for future class sessions.

Delay a Presentation Situation (Hearer < Speaker)

Imagine that you are a professor . For your class , you require individual presentations on class material . The presentation counts for 40% of the final grade and it involves demonstrating some experiments . Today is the first day of presentations but due to a backlog of material , you find it necessary to lecture for part of the time to cover material for the upcoming exam. Therefore , the last presenter (female) who had to bring various devices and electronic equipment, will not be able to present today. Now as the professor you want to ask her to delay her presentation.

Take a Day off Situation (Hearer > Speaker)

Imagine that you are a graduating senior working on a professor's (male) research project from whom you had taken several classes before. You are supposed to work in the professor's office every Tuesday and Thursday. Next Tuesday, however , you have an important interview with a prospective employer. Since the interview coincides with your working hours you need to take time off to attend the interview . In this situation, you want to ask the professor (male) for permission to take the time off.

Homework Extension Situation (Hearer > Speaker)

Imagine that you had a cold last week . Your symptoms were severe enough to stay home and rest but not severe enough to go and see a doctor. While you are almost over with your cold now , you will not be able to finish the assignment due tomorrow in one of your classes. Your professor (female) made it clear that no points will be given for late homework without a legitimate excuse. While you do not have an official medical excuse , you cannot afford a zero point on the homework. Suppose you do not know the professor very well except for the class. Now you want to ask the professor (female) to give you an extension.

Kim and Wilson (1994), further gave the following sets of samples of tactics:

Samples of Two Sets of Tactics

Repay Loan Situation

Set 1 :

1."I have run out of cash."	[Mild hint]
2."I could use the money I loaned you."	[Strong hint]
3."Do you remember the money I loaned you?"	[Question hint]
4."Would it be alright if I ask you to repay the loan?"	[Syntactic down grader]
5."May I ask you to repay the loan?"	[Permission]
6."Could you repay the loan?"	[Willingness Query Preparatory]
7."Will you repay the loan?"	[Suggestory]
8."How about repaying the loan?"	[Want}
9."I would like you to repay the loan."	[Performative]
10."I must ask you to repay the loan."	[Obligation]
11."You should repay the loan."	[Imperative]
12."Repay the loan."	[Ability Query Preparatory]

Set 2 :

1."I don't have any money."	[Mild hint]
2. "I wish I could get the money I loaned you."	[Strong hint]
3."Do you have any money?"	[Question hint]

4."I wonder if you could repay the loan?"	[Syntactic down grader]
5."Can I ask you to repay the loan?"	[Permission]
6."Can you repay the loan?"	[Ability Query Preparatory]
7."Won't you repay the loan?"	[Willingness Query Preparatory]
8."You will repay the loan, won't you?"	[Suggestory]
9."I would appreciate it if you repay the loan."	[Want]
10."I'm asking you to repay the loan."	[Performative]
11."You will have to repay the loan."	[Obligation]
12."Give me my money."	[Imperative]

3.3.2. (Trosborg)

Trosborg (1995), identified the following :

<u>Request situations</u>

- The requester has no right to demand compliance.
- The requestee has no obligation to carry out the desired act.
- The requester does not hold a dominant position over the hearer.
- The estimated difficulty inherent in making the request is high.
- The estimated likelihood of compliance is dependent on the requester's interactive , persuasive skills.

According to Trosborg (1995),the situations varied along the parameters of dominance and social distance , so that the request was directed either to a status superior (a - situation), or to a stranger (b - situation), or to a friend of equal status (c - situation). The following situations were defined (R is the requester):

<u>Requests to a person of superior status (a- situations)</u>

- An employee (R) asks his/her employer for a leave. (Leave)
- A person(R) hired as babysitter asks to be exempted from his/her commitment. (babysitter)

- A student(R) asks his/her teacher to take home the teacher's reference book. (Reference book)

Requests to a stranger

- A passenger in a train(R) asks a man next to her to help her lift her bag. (Lift help)
- A conference participant (R) asks another participant to visit him/her late that day. (Invitation)
- A student asks a newcomer to the university if he/she would be interested in sharing a flat in town. (Sharing a flat)

Requests to a friend of equal status

- A person (R) asks his/her friend to lend him/her a jacket . (Borrowing a jacket)
- An illiterate man (R) asks his friend for help to write a job application. (Job application)
- A student (R) has problems with accounting paper and asks his/her fellow student for help. (Accounting paper)

As Trosborg (995), puts it, the descriptions involved some interactional complexity in the form of some kind of conflict or social difficulty so that the request could not be easily granted by the requestee.

3.3.3. (Goldschmidt)

Favor Asking

It belongs to then directive type of speech acts, of which the request is prototypical, where the motive or purpose behind the act itself is getting an addresse to do a specific task for the speaker. Unlike in requesting , where there are no strings attached' to the request itself, in favor asking it is precisely these strings in terms of beneficence, indebtedness, reciprocity, and imposition which suggest that both concepts exist as different psychological realities. These 'added meanings ' embedded within favor asking rely on Grice's principle of cooperation and thus are implicated by inference(Goldschmidt, 1998). These added meanings make politeness critical to favor asking as they are what makes this speech act so threatening to the face – needs of the hearer. The greater the imposition of a favor , the more polite (and indirect) the phrasing of it tends to be. Because favor asking and requesting share the same underlying intent, and because requesting offers a theoretically rich data base, alogical starting point for defining favor asking would be to begin with definitions of the request.

In favor asking , though expectation is present in terms of favor compliance , it takes on an additional and sometimes more crucial and far reaching meaning, that of reciprocity. Both requesting and favor asking also have in common their primary illocutionary point: an act is asked of a hearer by the speaker , but the act itself in terms of expectation and refusal , and the social ramifications involved in the asking of the act in terms of relationships, and invested emotions oscillate between the two (Goldschmidt, 1998).

Features Of Favor Asking

- Favor asking is a speech act which involves asking for something 'outside ' of the addressee' daily routine . It therefore entails doing something which is above and beyond what is 'routinely 'done, and doing it because of a special of a special need.
- It entails doing activities that require some time and/or effort on the part of the addressee, or involves goods belonging to the addressee. It involves the lending or borrowing of some type of good e.g. item of value – either monetary or sentimental.
- It entails no role related obligation on the part of the addressee to fulfill the task. When a speaker asks a favor of someone, she recognizes that the addresse is not obligated by role to accomplish the task in question.
- Favor asking implies the notion reciprocity in terms of a return favor . The element of expectation from the speaker's perspective is clearly evident in favor asking. There is an expectation in terms of return favors, which translates into an obligation on the part of the speaker to fulfill a request for a favor by the addressee at some point in the future. The mere asking of a favor gives the addressee a permission or the right to ask a return favor of the speaker.

Favors can occur between strangers , especially in emergency situations. Since 'doing favors' can be seen as a way to repay a 'debt' in terms of reciprocity, many people believe that favor asking makes them vulnerable in that they leave themselves open to being asked a future favor by the addressee. This is why so many people choose whom they ask favors of , they don't want to be vulnerable to just 'anyone' , so they not only consider 'whom can do this for me' , but they also may consider 'whom do I want to be obligated to'. Thus obligation in terms of reciprocity is double-edged , and whether favor asking is perceived as something good or something bad usually depends on how the speaker views it , as something good or something bad.

Each of these features should be present in an utterance in order for it to be considered a favor. Yet these features aren't necessarily consciously realized in the minds of the interlocutors during favor asking. On the contrary , they are usually below the level of consciousness, yet are implicitly salient within the speech act.

Three Stages Of Favor Asking

There are three stages in favor asking and each serves an important function in the speech act. These stages are:

Pre Favor

It is the prefacing of the favor itself with an initiating move in order to prepare the addressee for the forthcoming request. The initiating move names the speech act that it prefigures. The pre favor serves to enhance the chances of favor compliance by informing the addressee both that a favor is forthcoming and that help of some type is needed on the part of the addressee. Pre favor serves important functions in the overall delivery of the

favor , such as to find out if , the favor is likely to succeed by avoiding an action that might obtain a rejection , or to seek permission to ask a favor of the addressee. Within the overall conversation , the pre favor typically occurs at or near the beginning of the conversation.

Favor

We ask favors to have a need fulfilled by someone , and this is accomplished in the second stage of the favor sequence , the favor. It is during this segment of talk that a desire is verbally expressed by defining a need on the part of one interlocutor to another. Most of the 'work' is done in terms of speech modification .Speech modification within this stage is context dependent . What transpires at this stage can sometimes determine the outcome in the response stage (Goldschmidt, 1998).

Response

Theoretically since the asking of a favor is, in fact, the asking of someone to do a (future) act a rather predictable response pattern , either positive , conditional , or negative, is required. Its formula may be represented by the following equation:

Favor – Speaker (X) asks hearer (Y) to do act (Z).
Response – Hearer (Y) responds positively to speaker (X) , thus will do act (Z).
Hearer (Y) responds positively to speaker (X) , providing that certain conditions are met.
Hearer (Y) responds negatively to speaker (X) , thus will not do act (Z).

Sentence Types Of The Pre Favor

Favors are commonly introduced in naturally occuring speech . Goldschmidt, (1998), says the majority of favors are initiated by one of three types of sentences classified in the present study as the Favor Interrogative (FInt), the Favor Declarative (FDec), and the Favor Imperative (FImp).

FInt Type

The favor interrogative occurs most often in conversation. Two different categories of questions are asked in those favors where the initiating move is interrogative in form:

- Ability and or Willingness

In this category the speaker queries whether or not the addressee is able to perform a thus far unmentioned task. This serves to prepare the addressee for an upcoming favor as well as to eliminate any potential obstacles for compliance, e.g.

Neighbour to neighbour

A. Could you do me a favor ? Can you come and help me with my sewing tomorrow, afternoon? I've got a little problem with it.
B. Sure. What time is best for you?

Permission

The speaker seeks permission to ask a favor prior to the actual asking of it , thus showing greater deference to the addressee than in the preceding type, e.g.:

Student to fellow student

A. Could I ask you a favor?

B. Sure

C. Could you help me with the assignment you have already submitted? I am experiencing some problems with it.

D. Sure I will.

FDec Type

A statement is made with regard to a forthcoming favor . The three FDec categories are:

- Embedded Permission (Friend to friend)

  I was wondering if I could ask you a FAVOR. Can you drive me home?

- Pronouncement (Friend to friend)

  A.I have a huge favor to ask.

  B. Yes.

  C. I have just received a call that I must come and fetch my mother to the hospital because she has just been attacked by a stroke. My car is in the garage for service right now. Could you fetch her ?

- Suggestion (Neighbour to neighbour)

  A. May be you can do me a favor and take my kids to school, now that I'm late.

  B. Sure, no problem.

FImp Type

The least frequently used initiating move is that of the favor imperative , "Do me a favor," which immediately precedes directive. This type remains constant in form, e.g. :

Wife to husband

A. Do me a favor and polish my shoes.

B.Sure.

What is fundamental to the three types of initiating moves is that the initiating move itself serves as a follow in the ensuing discourse.

No Pre Favor Or Initiating Move (Conventionally Indirect Speech Act)

In this category , a favor is asked without using the word 'favor'. Instead , the utterance often uses another introductory phrase such as "I was wondering if......." or "Do you think.......".All the features of favor asking are present (asking for something which is out of the addressee's daily routine, doing activities which require time and (or effort, having no role-related obligation, and implying reciprocity[in knowing that a return favor may be asked]).The presence of the word 'favor' does not necessarily ensure that a favor is being asked.

Syntactic Arrangement Of The Favor

The actual favor is usually in the form of an explicit , verb-driven utterance which has an agent (sometimes understood), an action, a beneficiary (sometimes understood), and (sometimes) an object (either direct or as part of a propositional phrase).

'get me a pen ' – Agent (understood) – verb – beneficiary – direct object.

The above example is directive in nature, and usually follows an initiating move , as in the sentence: "Could you do me a favor and take me to work?" In addition , in the longer favor narrative , the favor itself is usually followed by an explanatory adjunct which helps to establishthe need for the favor and to establish one's worthinessin asking it (Goldschmidt, 1998). In many cases , the favor following the initiating move is embedded ; however, even with the addition of the embedding expression the directive intent of the utterance is still explicit.

3.4 LARK AND SCHUNK

3.4.1 Politeness of Responses

As there are many ways of requesting , there are also many ways of responding to them. For just one request , people can respond in many ways, e.g. *What is your name?* Can be responded to as: *Lisa; I'm Lisa; Don't you know me! I'm Lisa; My name is Lisa.* A request depends to the seriousness of the requestor. Some of the above responses seem more polite than others. The more B's response raises the benefits or lowers the costs of politeness to the requestor , within limits , the more polite the requestee is. Clark and Schunk (1980), proposed an *Attentiveness Hypothesis :* The more attentive B is to all aspects of A's request , within reason the more polite B is. For indirect requests for information , there are at least four ways B can benefit A, viz.: *Precision; Clarity; Completeness ; and Informality.*

B should ordinarily be much less polite when he doesn't comply with A's request . To be attentive to A's request is, ideally to comply with it . There are, however , several ways in which B can mitigate the negative consequences of not complying, viz.: *Apologies and Explanations* (Clark and Schunk).

Experiment

Students were asked to rank order for politeness three to five alternative responses to each of eight requests that were given. For each request Clark and Schunk (1980), proposed two sets of three to five responses. One set consisted of compliant responses, and the other set of refusals to comply. The students ranked each response for politeness by writing "1" next to the most polite response , and so on down to , at most , "5".

Results

- The factor of completeness turned out to be highly influential. The compliant responses were of two types . The first, called *Answer-plus-information responses* , included a literal move like *Sure* or *Yes* or *Certainly*, and the second type, called *information-only responses* , did not.
- Clarity was an important factor too. Information-only responses were sometimes expressed as complete sentences, and sometimes in elliptical sentences.
- The literal moves also showed clarity, as they were sometimes expressed as "full" answers .
- Informality also showed up when among the compliant responses, the literal move sometimes contained *yes* and other times the less formal *certainly yes* or *sure.*
- In the refusals, the additional factors of apologies and explanations were both influential. For all responses , the apologetic response was more polite. As for

explanations, every response with an explanation was rated more polite within its set than every response without one.

Discussion

It seems the attentive response is a polite response. The response will be more polite if there are added moves , like, *sure; yes, I can; I'm sorry*. If to be polite has to be attentive to A's literal meaning, then he must be computing both the literal and the indirect meaning. He must be using a multiple-meaning process, not an idiomatic process. This conclusion is not completely justified. According to Clark and Schunk (1980), it might be argued that just as there are conventional ways of making indirect requests , there are conventional ways of responding to them politely. The link between the two is historically based but by now entirely conventional.

3.4.2. TURNBULL AND SAXTON

Modal expressions in acts of refusal of compliance

Refusal refers to the refuser's overall contribution to a conversational exchange in which a request is made and refused. Refusals contain many different acts including apologies("Sorry"), endorsements of the requested activity(e.g." I'd love to"), excuses or justifications ("I'm working then"), and offers to grant the request at some other time. Again , within each refusal there is also the particular act that on its own could be used by the refuser to convey his/her rejection of the request. This act is referred to as an act of *Refusal of Compliance* or *RCp.*

One strategy refusers may employ is to use root necessity modals and avoid the use of root possibility modals in their RCps. Use of a root necessity modal to modify the RCp ,indicates that the speaker judges that the event of refusing to comply is entailed by social or natural forces. At the pragmatic level the speaker conveys that he/she is obligated to work , and ,therefore, both has no choice but to refuse this request , and ,indeed would have to refuse any request for that time period. Interpersonally , This RCp protects the face of both interactants: the requester's face is protected by giving reasons why the request must be refused and by claiming that the refusal is impersonal, and the refuser's face is protected by the claim that he/she is a morally responsible person for whom a prior obligation takes precedence over a more recent conflicting request (Turnbull and Saxton, 1997).

A second possible strategy is for refusers to use epistemic possibility modals and avoid the use of epistemic necessity modals in their RCps. Use of an epistemic possibility modal to modify the RCp conveys the speaker's judgement that rational laws do not preclude the speaker from accepting the truth of the proposition 'no'. In other words , the speaker has expressed a very weak belief in the truth of the proposition. At the pragmatic level the speaker conveys that , because of the laws of rationality, speaker and addressee are free to accept or not accept the truth of the proposition. At the interpersonal level , the speaker conveys that he/she is not solidly committed to the RCp which , in turn, conveys the speaker's reluctance and hesitation about refusing. Being reluctant and hesitant about doing a face-threatening act protects own face by conveying an image of a caring , considerate person mitigates damage to other's face by conveying that other's positive face is of concern to the speaker (Tunbull and Saxton, 1997).

STUDY 1 : DATA AND ANALYSIS

The total set of RCps suggested that there were five semantically defined types of RCps, viz.: *Negate request, Performative refusal, Indicate unwillingness, Negated ability* and *Identify impeding event/state*

Discussion

Examination of the use of modal expressions in 70 acts of refusal of compliance revealed four main findings, viz,:

- Modal expressions occurred frequently.
- The frequency of use of modal expressions was approximately the same for all types of RCps except Identify impeding event /state, where the frequency was low.
- Only three modal structures were evident in the data ; namely , modal structures of epistemic probability/ possibility modal expressions exclusively, root necessity probability/ necessity modal expressions exclusively, and the combination of the two.

- Each of these modal structures was differentially associated with specific categories of RCps.

Turnbull and Saxton ,1997, suggest that all of these trends in the data reflect speaker's attempts to do facework. The exclusive use of epistemic probability / necessity modal expressions in RCps accomplished by negating the request or by expressing lack of interest semantically encodes the speaker's belief that the laws of rationality do not preclude the truth of the proposition.

A different strategy seems to underlie speaker's exclusive use of root necessity / probability modal expressions. The exclusive use of root necessity / probability modal expressions conveys that the speaker judges that the RCp is entailed by social or natural laws.

The facework implications of these two strategies for accomplishing RCp are also somewhat different . Since one of the preconditions for making a request is that one is able to do so , lack of ability is a good reason for not granting a request . Presenting reasons for refusing protects the face of both requester and refuser. Lack of ability may be seen also as beyond the refuser's control , an attribution that resolves the refuser of responsibility for refusing (Turnbull and Saxton, 1997).

A third modal structure is the use of the combination of the epistemic probability /possibility and root necessity/probability modal expressions. This type of structure could be interpreted as expressing a speaker's weak belief about the necessity of refusing to comply or about the necessity to engage in some unstated activity that conflicts with the requested activity.

An additional piece of supportive evidence for the claim that facework accounts for the use of modality is provided by the contrast between the very high frequency of modal expressions in all categories of RCp except Identify impeding event/state. For this type of RCp , the act of refusing to comply is done in a very indirect way by presenting reasons that prevent granting the request , reasons that in context carry the implication that one is refusing to comply.

Support for the claim that facework motivates the use of certain types of modal structures in RCps is provided not only by the modal structures that did occur but also by modal structures that are theoretically possible components of RCps but ,which ,in fact are not found in the data (Turnbull and Saxton, 1997).

Our explanation for the presence of certain modal structures but not others derive from the assumption that refusers cared about protecting / repairing face. It could be argued that this desire to should have resulted in the use of modal structures with the maximum potential to repair damage to face. What was found however , is that some speakers used modal structures with less than the maximum potential to repair damage tp face.

STUDY 2 :DATA AND ANALYSES

A data was collected to identify RCps that occur on the ways people respond to extremely demanding requests. 101 students were telephoned to find out if they were willing to participate in a psychology experiment. The data obtained was analysed as thus:

- *Negate request* – Approximately 8% of all RCps were of this type. The typical modal structure was that of the epistemic probability modal expression *I think* or *probably,* each of which convey the speaker's weak belief in the truth of the proposition *"No".*
- *Performative refusal* - 11% of all RCps were of this type and 91% (10 of 11) contained modal expressions. The majority contained epistemic modal expressions encoding probability.
- *Indicate unwillingness* – There was only one RCp of this type and it contained no modal expressions.
- *Negated ability* – RCps of this type accounted for the largest proportion ,43%, of all RCPs in this data set. Every RCp of this type contained negated root possibility modal expressions , equivalent semantically to root necessity.
- *Identify impeding event / state* – RCps of this type accounted for 37% of the RCps in the data set. Modal expressions occurred infrequently. RCps displayed a somewhat heterogeneous modal structure.

Discussion

Modal expressions were frequent and approximately equally so for all types of RCp except Identify impeding event / state. The different modal structures were evident in the data, each consistent with the view that speakers used these structures to do facework.

The use of epistemic probability / possibility modal expressions conveyed, at the interpersonal level , that speakers reluctance to refuse to comply with the request.

The modal structure employed by the largest number of speakers was that of an epistemic probability / possibility modal expression in combination with a root necessity / probability modal expression.

Support for the position that the use of all three modal structures reflects speaker's' attempts to do facework is provided also by consideration of modal that did not occur. In 101 RCps there were no instances of the use of modals of epistemic necessity , negated root necessity, or root possibility, either alone or in combination.

3.4.3. Goldschmidt

Response Options In Favor Asking

Positive Response

In the positive type of response , the hearer agrees to comply with the act. Although the agreement response affirms compliance with an act , the response itself rarely has 'yes' for an answer but rather some other means of communicating agreement such as 'sure', 'no problem', or 'okay'. Perhaps this phenomenon is due to the face-threatening risk in favor asking.

Conditional Response

The hearer agrees to comply with the favor if certain conditions are met. In these response types , compliance hinges on other factors. It is only if certain conditions are met that that the favor will be complied with , e.g., *'If I can',' if time permits', etc.*

Negative Response

There are sixteen instances in the data where compliance with the favor is not forthcoming. In no case is the negative response a flat 'no' , but rather other formulas are used in giving these responses , e.g.:

- *Apology* - With this response , the addressee expresses regret for not being able to comply with the favor e.g. *I'm sorry , but I can't stay that long.*
- *Willingness but* – This type of negative response appears to be positive , but in reality it is not , e.g.: *I'd love to but I have a previous commitment.*
- *Sarcasm* – In rare cases responses to favors are given in a sarcastic manner.

Turning down a favor is a delicate situation . People are sensitive to the needs of others and don't like to disappoint them. For this reason people are careful in their refusals so as not to bruise relationships. This is why the last type is so rare. Responses to favors are expected with little room for ambiguity (Goldschmidt,1998).

3.4.4. Ifert and Roloff

Responding To Rejected Requests

Individuals often turn to others to attain needed resources , but requests pose dilemmas for those making them and their targets. Those choosing not to communicate their needs may have to live with unfulfilled desires, whereas soliciting resources from others may lead to rejection , resulting in reluctance to make similar requests in the future.

If making a request is difficult, persisting when meeting resistance must be more so. Instead of honoring the refusal , the requester keeps pressing the target at the risk of creating psychological reactance or escalating conflict. People sometimes persist in their influence attempts despite such outcomes . Persistence appears in accounts of how persons say they influence others and, on a behavioral level , requesters do not always stop trying to convince targets after refusal (Ifert and Roloff, 1996).

The Nature Of Persistence

Persistence is defined as a voluntary choice to pursue influence goals when facing resistance from a target , and persistence is believed to depend upon two conditions. First , a decision to persist is affected by the perceived legitimacy of the request and the basis for rejection. A second condition needed to persist in sufficient skill to quell resistance.

Individuals who perceive that their requests are valid and refusals are unwarranted will be inclined to persist.. They should also be able to assess the obstacles present and to produce messages to overcome them (Ifert and Roloff, 1996).

Predictors of Persistence

Persistence is a function of the relational context in which the request is made and the obstacle expressed in the refusal. Persons often turn to intimates for aid even when such help will be costly to the target. Intimacy carries with it an obligation to provide help, and intimates are expected to monitor the other's needs and offer assistance even when no request is made.

However , intimates are not always more likely than non-intimates to persist. One can conceive of at least three types of obstacles to gaining compliance:

1. The target may be unwilling to assist.
2. Resistance could stem from the imposition created by compliance.
3. The target's inability to comply (Ifert and Roloff, 1996).

Linguistic manifestations of persistence

A persistent requester seeks to defeat the obstacles underlying a refusal. Requesters may adapt their messages to identify and attack the basis for refusal, or they may disengage from the situation (Ifert and Roloff, 1996).

CHAPTER 4

4.1 AIM

The intention of this study is to identify the different request strategies that are used by different educators (both office-based and school-based) in various education contexts. Since their ranks differ the study aims at finding out what strategies are usually used by subordinates to seniors and vice versa. The study compares the strategies used in different situations. Participants are inspectors, principals, heads of department (HODs), and post level one educators. After reading the request situations, the requesters had to make requests in relation to a particular situation. Various request strategies were used and this study aims at interpreting such strategies by comparing and analyzing them.

4.2 REQUEST SITUATIONS

The request situations of our focus are designed to vary in terms of the participant's social status, so that in each of the four situations the requester was superordinate, subordinate, or of the lowest rank to the requestee.

4.2.1 Inspector requests principal

According to the South African Constitution each and every individual has his or her own rights that need not be jeorpadised by anyone. It is against this background that nowadays inspectors no longer harass educators even though it is their duty to ensure that effective teaching and learning takes place in schools. To execute this duty inspectors have to interact with principals to see to it that the educational laws and policies are adhered to, for proper education. The inspector has to visit the schools to give guidance and support in this regard on regular basis. The following requests that are done by the inspector are examples of various encounters between the inspector and the principal:

Bad matric results

Everyone knows that the main purpose for the existence of a school is for learners to learn so that they are guided towards responsible adulthood. The school's performance is judged by its matric results. If the results are bad, it means that among the people involved; ie. the parents, the learners, the teachers, the principal, and the inspector; someone failed to do his or her work properly. The inspector, as the manager of the schools in his or her circuit has to work hand in hand with the principals to identify problems for the improvement on the teachers' and learners' performance. The inspector, a representative of the Department of Education, cannot just ignore a school that is under performing in this regard.

OBE teaching

This is the new approach of teaching which is learner centred compared to the old one which was teacher centered. With this approach the teacher must facilitate the learning process of learners, while the learners develop their learning skills. As the approach is new, there is a lot of fear, resistance, and uncertainty among the teachers. Various workshops are held regularly to change the attitude of teachers. It is against this background that inspectors have to monitor the implementation of this approach at school level.

Pregnant learner

The new education policy says, "every child has a right to learn". This saying does not exclude a pregnant learner. The old principals are having a great problem with this policy as they say it is morally wrong to keep a pregnant learner with the other learners because she is a bad sight and that spoils the discipline of the school. As much as they are right on their side, but the policy stands and the schools are supposed to be run in line with the education policy. The inspectors have a duty to see to it that this educational policy is adhered to, thus no learner should be deprived her right to learn.

Transfer of teacher

A teacher is free to transfer to any school of his/her choice if the school governing body (SGB) of the school he/she wants accepts him/her, and if the transfers are still allowed by the head office. The principal of the school he/she wants to leave cannot deny the teacher that right, although if the teacher's services were good the principal can try to plead the teacher not to go, but, the teacher is not obliged to comply. Some principals usually frustrate teachers by refusing to give them a letter of no objection to transfer, which is just a formality.

Teachers then report this to the inspectors, which are then required to caution principals in this regard.

School policy

The SGB of each school has to develop a school policy which differs from school to school, as no schools are alike. But, be that as it may, each school policy should be in line with the departmental policies of South Africa. It is the inspector's duty to ensure that every aspect of each school policy is not against the South African Schools Act.

4.2.2 Principal requests head of department

The principal as the manager of a school is held responsible and accountable for whatever happens in the school. To execute his or her duty he or she works with heads of departments, (HODs), as a team known as school management team (SMT) to ensure effective teaching and learning. The HOD is assigned a certain phase or certain subjects to head. The principal monitors the HOD's work on regular basis.The following request situations are done by principals to HODs to ensure that work is under control at all costs:

Bad results in a subject

The HOD is held responsible for a phase, which can be a foundation phase; an intermediate phase; and senior phase. At further education and training phase, the HOD is responsible for certain subjects. When results are bad in a subject, the HOD should be the first person to account before the concerned teacher (one who is actually teaching the subject), accounts to the principal.

Mark schedule

The mark schedule for each phase should be handed in by the HOD to the principal. An organized school will set a date when all mark schedules should be submitted to the principal's office, for the latter to submit it to the district office. It is therefore the duty of the

HOD to ensure that teachers do their work so that the deadline for the submission of the mark schedule is met. Once the schedule is not submitted in time, it means the principal will not meet the deadline to the district office. The principal has to interact with the HOD in this regard.

OBE workshop

As the head of the phase the HOD is supposed to be well versed about the OBE approach. In certain cases the workshop will require one teacher from each school to attend at district level, so as to come back with the information to disseminate it to other teachers. Some HODs do not like to go, probably because they are old, or they do not like the OBE, then they usually send post level one educators to attend. Principals have to guard against this practice.

Record of marks

For continuous assessment the learners' marks should be recorded in a book on a regular basis. This book is one of the books that are usually asked for by the principals to see how far the HODs are with their work. Sometimes the teachers overlook this and tend not to record the learners' marks. This is bad because it gives an impression that the work has not been done. The principal has to ensure that this book is available and updated, so that even the inspectors when they arrive they have an evidence that the work is being done.

Absenteeism by learners

The HOD is responsible for the phase, that means he is responsible for whatever is taking place in his phase. He is held accountable if something goes wrong in the phase. That is why in this situation the principal engages him on the continuous absenteeism of the learners of his phase.

4.2.3 Head of department requests teacher

The actual teaching and learning takes place in the classroom and the teacher is the class manager. The HOD is accountable for the work of the teachers under his or her supervision. He has to monitor the teacher's work to ensure proper teaching and learning, and to contribute towards the smooth-running of the school. The following are the situations on which the HOD normally requests the teacher for compliance in monitoring the school work:

Marking of scripts

For the completion of a mark schedule the learners' marks are needed from the teachers. These marks are obtained from the learners' examination marks they obtain when writing examinations. Some teachers hate marking and this can delay the completion of a mark schedule. As accountable person, the HOD has to see to it that learners' scripts are marked in good time.

Improve performance

The proper teaching and keeping up with the syllabus is the responsibility of a teacher. The HOD has to ensure that all teachers in his/her phase are carrying out well with this responsibility, and that proper teaching and learning takes place. If the teacher is lagging behind the syllabus, he/she has to answer to the HOD.

Preparation book

Teaching, like any other work requires preparation. The teacher cannot go to the classroom without having prepared the lesson. The preparation needs to be written down for reference purposes, as well as evidence to the supervisors. Teachers usually take this for granted, more especially if they have been teaching the subject for years. The HOD has to monitor the use of this preparation book.

Non-attendance in an OBE workshop

At times the teachers like to dodge their duties. Some teachers have shown a great resentment of OBE, in so much that the old ones decided to take an early pension. They hated the OBE workshops. Others would just dodge to take care of their personal problems. The HOD needs to be vigilant enough to notice the non-attendance to these workshops, and show the seriousness of not attending them. Teachers are easily trapped if you tell them to write you. They would feel that the offence is too much and will sometimes plead with the HOD not to write and promise not to do it again.

Class inspection

The HOD has to ensure that there is effective teaching and learning in/her phase. This responsibility sometimes require the HOD to go to the extent of visiting the teacher during his/her lesson to see whether the lessons are properly conducted and to offer support where necessary. Be that as it may, the teacher cannot just see the HOD entering his/her class during the lesson. The teacher needs to know when he/she will be visited in the classroom.

4.2.4 Teacher requests principal

As human beings who have families and personal problems, teachers sometimes have to ask for certain issues and or favors from their principal. The principal needs to know each and every activity that takes place in the school The teacher cannot just leave learners unattended to, without requesting from the head of the school. He has to come with tangible reasons to the principal (who is usually a fearful somebody), for him to be granted such a favor. The following are some of the issues teachers usually come up with as requests for compliance from their principals:

Change of teaching grade

The allocation of teaching subjects or grades is done in cognizance of the teacher's field of specialization. But at times the school will have a shortage for a certain subject or grade and decide to ask one of the teachers to handle that grade where there is a shortage. If the teacher feels uncomfortable he/she is free to come back to the principal so that the decision is reviewed if it is possible.

Absence from school

Teachers are having their personal problems that sometimes need to be taken care of during school hours. A teacher does not just decide to be absent from school without seeking that permission from the principal. There are leave forms that are signed when a teacher is to be absent from school. But, a teacher must first come personally to the principal with his/her problem, before bringing in leave forms.

Choir practice

A choir conductor will feel that he needs more time to practize the competition songs with the learners, especially if the competitions are close. He will then seek permission to disrupt classes so that choristers practise the song during teaching hours. It is not an easy thing to do as some principals do not like music.

Purchase of books

A teacher is responsible for the teaching of a grade or certain subjects. To get relevant books for any of the two is the responsibility of the teacher. If he has seen the books he has to request from the principal that the books be bought for him.

Admission of a relative learner

Sometimes principals have family responsibilities that they cannot run away from. A teacher will find him/herself in a position where he/she is expected to plead with the principal for the admission of a learner who is a teacher's relative. This may be because the teacher is a guardian or the parent had asked him/her to ask for the admission, as sometimes teachers' requests for admission gets first preference.

4.3 QUESTIONNAIRE

4.3.1 Copy

1. **UMHLOLI KWINQUNUNU**

A. Iziphumo zebanga leshumi azikhange zibe zihle kunyaka ophelileyo. Umhloli ucela inqununu yesikolo esichaphazelekayo ukuba iphucule iziphumo zebanga leshumi.

ISICELO:Umhloli ucela intobelo kwinqununu ukuba iphucule iziphumo zebanga leshumi.

IMPENDULO: Inqununu iyaphendula.

(i) IYATHOBELA:

(ii) AYITHOBELI:

B. Isikolo asiwulandeli umthetho ka rhulumente wokufundiswa kwabantwana ngohlobo lwe (OBE).

Umhloli ucela imqununu ukuba ifundise abantwana ngohlobo lwe (OBE).

ISICELO: Umhloli ucela intobelo kwinqununu malunga nokuba ifundise abantwana ngohlobo lwe (OBE).

<u>IMPENDULO</u>:Inqununu iyaphendula.

(i) <u>IYATHOBELA:</u>

(ii) <u>AYITHOBELI</u>

C. Umfundi okhulelweyo akavunyelwa yinqununu ukuba abhale iimviwo zokuphela konyaka zebanga leshumi. Umhloli ucela inqununu ukuba imvumele umntwana abhale iimviwo zakhe.

<u>ISICELO:</u>Umhloli ucela intobelo kwinqununu ukuba ivumele umntwana abhale iimviwo zakhe.

<u>IMPENDULO:</u> Inqununu iyaphendula.

(i) <u>IYATHOBELA</u>**:**

(ii) <u>AYITHOBELI</u>**:**

D. Inqununu iyala ukunika utitshala incwadi evumayo ukuba atshintshele nakusiphi na isikolo afuna ukutshintshelwa kuso. Umhloli ucela inqununu ukuba inike utitshala incwadi evumayo ukuba aye nakusiphi na isikolo.

ISICELO: Umhloli ucela intobelo kwinqununu ukuba inike utitshala incwadi evumayo ukuba atshintshele nakusiphi na isikolo.

IMPENDULO: Inqununu iyaphendula

.

(i) IYATHOBELA:

(ii) AYITHOBELI:

E. Umhloli ufumanisa ukuba uluhlu lwenkqubo yesikolo alwenziwanga ngokwenkqubo nemithetho elawula ezemfundo eMzantsi Afrika. Umhloli ucela inqununu ukuba ilandele inkqubo nemithetho karhulumente ukwenza uluhlu lwenkqubo yesikolo.

ISICELO: Umhloli ucela intobelo kwinqununu ukuba ilandele inkqubo nemithetho karhulumente ukwenza uluhlu lwenkqubo yesikolo.

IMPENDULO: Inqununu iyaphendula.

(i) IYATHOBELA

(ii) AYITHOBELI:

2. INQUNUNU INTLOKO YESEBE

A. Isifundo esithile asikhange sipaswe kakuhle ngabafundi bebanga leshumi kunyaka ophelileyo.

Inqununu icela intloko yeSebe ukuba iphucule iziphumo zesosifundo.

ISICELO: Inqununu icela intobelo kwintloko yeSebe ukuba iphucule iziphumo zesosifundo.

____

____

____

IMPENDULO: Intloko yeSebe iyaphendula.

(i) IYATHOBELA:

____

____

____

(ii) AYITHOBELI

____

____

____

B. Isicwangcwiso senkqubo yabantwana benqanam labaqalayo asingeniswanga yintloko yeSebe . Inqununu icela intloko yeSebe ukuba isingenise ngokukhawuleza.

ISICELO:Inqununu icela intobelo kwintloko yeSebe ukuba ingenise isicwangcwiso senkqubo yabantwana ngokukhawuleza.

____

____

____

IMPENDULO: Intloko yeSebe iyaphendula.

(i) IYATHOBELA:

(ii) AYITHOBELI:

C. Kukho izifundo zootitshala ze (OBE) zeentsuku ezimbini eziza kuba khona edolophini.Inqununu icela intloko yeSebe ukuba makuye yona kwezo zifundo.

ISICELO: Inqununu icela intobelo kwintloko yeSebe ukuba iye kwizifundo ze (OBE) edolophini.

IMPENDULO: Intloko yeSebe iyaphendula.

(i) IYATHOBELA:

(ii) AYITHOBELI:

D.Inqununu ifumanise ukuba intloko yeSebe ayinayo incwadi apho ibhala khona ingxelo zeemvavanyo zabantwana benqanam labadala. Inqununu icela intloko yeSebe ukuba ibe nencwadi apho ibhala khona ezingxelo.

ISICELO: Inqununu icela intobelo kwintloko yeSebe ukuba izibhale encwadini iingxelo zemvavanyo zabantwana.

IMPENDULO : Intloko yeSebe iyaphendula.

(i) IYATHOBELA:

(ii) AYITHOBELI:

E.Abantwana benqanam labaqalayo abasihambi kakuhle isikolo. Inqununu icela intloko yeSebe ukuba liyincedise ekusombululeni le ngxaki.

ISICELO: Inqununu icela intobelo kwintloko yeSebe ukuba bancedisane kwingxaki yokungahanjwa kwesikolo ngabantwana benqanam labaqalayo.

IMPENDULO: Intloko yeSebe iyaphendula.

(i) IYATHOBELA:

(ii) AYITHOBELI:

3. INTLOKO YESEBE KUTITSHALA

A.Utitshala akawakorekishanga amaphepha abantwana eemviwo, yaza loonto yabamba ukwenziwa koludwe lwenkqubo .Intloko yeSebe icela utitshala ukuba akorekishe ngexesha.

ISICELO: Intloko yeSebe icela intobelo kutitshala ukuba akorekishe amaphepha ngaloo mzuzu.

IMPENDULO:Utitshala uyaphendula.

(i) IYATHOBELA:

(ii) AYITHOBELI:

B.Utitshala usemva kakhulu kumsebenzi wokufundisa kwibanga leshumi. Intloko yeSebe iyamcela ukuba azame ukwenyusela umxakatho.

ISICELO: Intloko yeSebe icela intobelo kutitshala ukuba azame ukwenyusela umxakatho ekufundiseni.

<u>IMPENDULO:</u> Utitshala uyaphendula.

(i) <u>IYATHOBELA</u>:

(ii) <u>AYITHOBELI</u>:

C. Utitshala ufundisa abantwana ngaphandle kwamalungiselelo abhalwe phantsi. Intloko yeSebe iyamcela ukuba makabe nencwadi abhala kuyo onke amalungiselelo akhe okutitsha.

<u>ISICELO</u>: Intloko yeSebe icela intobelo kutitshala ukuba abhale phantsi onke amalungiselelo akhe okutitsha.

<u>IMPENDULO:</u> Utitshala uyaphendula .

(i) <u>IYATHOBELA</u>:

(ii) <u>AYITHOBELI</u>:

D. Utitshala akakhange aye kwizifundo ze (OBE) ebezifundiswa kwisikolo esikufutshane. Intloko yeSebe icela utitshala ukuba abhale phantsi atsho ukuba khange aye.

<u>ISICELO</u>: Intloko yeSebe icela intobelo kutitshala yokuba makabhale phantsi atsho ukuba akakhange aye kwizifundo ze (OBE).

<u>IMPENDULO:</u> Utitshala uyaphendula.

(i) <u>IYATHOBELA</u>**:**

(ii) <u>AYITHOBELI</u>**:**

E. Ngenxa yokubona umsebenzi katitshala ungekho mgangathweni , Intloko yeSebe icela ukuya kumphulaphula xa atitshayo ngosuku olulandelayo.

<u>ISICELO:</u> Intloko yeSebe icela intobelo kutitshala ukuba iye kumphulaphula xa atitshayo ngosuku olulandelayo.

<u>IMPENDULO</u>: Utitshala uyaphendula.

(i) <u>IYATHOBELA</u>**:**

(ii) AYITHOBELI:

4. UTITSHALA KWINQUNUNU

A. Utitshala akaqeqeshelwanga ukufundisa amabanga aphantsi awafundisayo. Ucela kwinqununu ukuba imtshintshele kumabanga abantwana abadala awafundeleyo.

ISICELO: Utitshala ucela intobelo kwinqununu ukuba imtshintshele kumabanga abantwana abadala awafundeleyo.

IMPENDULO: Inqununu iyaphendula.

(i) IYATHOBELA:

(ii) AYITHOBELI:

B. Utitshala unengxaki yakhe efunisa ukuba aye kuyilungisa ngengomso (imini yesikolo). Ucela kwinqununu ukungabikho esikolweni ngomso.

ISICELO: Utitshala ucela intobelo kwinqununu yokuba angezi esikolweni ngomso.

IMPENDULO: Inqununu iyaphendula.

(i) IYATHOBELA:

(ii) AYITHOBELI:

C.Utitshala usemva ekufundiseni abantwana iculo, kwaye ikhaka sele linkqonkqoza emnyango.Utitshala ucela kwinqununu ukufundisa iculo ngexesha lakusasa lesikolo.

ISICELO: Utitshala ucela intobelo kwinqununu ukuba afundise abantwana iculo ngexesha lakusasa lesikolo.

IMPENDULO: Utitshala uyaphendula.

(i) IYATHOBELA:

(ii) AYITHOBELI:

D.Utitshala uneencwadi azibonileyo kwivenkile yeencwadi acinga ukuba zinokumnceda ekutitsheni kwakhe abantwanwa. Ucela kwinqununu ukuba athengelwe ezo ncwadi.

ISICELO: Utitshala ucela intobelo yokuba athengelwa iincwadi zokufundisa abantwana.

IMPENDULO: Inqununu iyaphendula.

(i) IYATHOBELA:

(ii) AYITHOBELI:

E.Utitshala ucelela umntwana wesihlobo sakhe kwinqununu indawo yokufunda nokuya eqonda ukuba sele kugcwele apha esikolweni.

ISICELO: Utitshala ucela intobelo yokuba inqununu yamkele umntwana wesihlobo sakhe esikolweni.

IMPENDULO: Inqununu iyaphendula.

(i) IYATHOBELA:

(ii) AYITHOBELI:

4.3.2 Completion of the questionnaire

The questionnaire was focused on finding out the different request strategies that are used by education personnel in schools in their day- to- day interaction, given the challenges of the new changes that the whole education system is facing. The section on requests was distributed to the inspectors in offices, and schools (for principals, heads of departments, and teachers of Bizana and Mount frere districts in Eastern Cape) to interact withit. . Bizana people belong to the Pondo clan, while Mount frere people belong to the Bhaca clan. About five questionnaires were distributed to different schools. The principals, heads of departments and teachers of other schools of the same districts complied.

4.4 ANALYSIS OF REQUESTS

People make use of requests for many reasons and do so in a variety of different ways. The use of requests in the education contexts is not different to the requests that are used in other contexts. Within the education system, gaining compliance is the main goal for requesting and other concerns are secondary issues that shapes how a requester phrases his request. Appropriateness and efficiency are two critical and often conflicting concerns that determine the requester's choice of conversation strategies. That is why we have various request strategies that are used for various situations.

Kim and Wilson (1994) say that the ability to effectively get what one wants from other people is a highly important communicative skill, success at which has been viewed as an index of social competence. This is true if we look at how the requesters of the education system effectively delivered home their requests.

According to Brown and Levinson (1978), requests by definition are face-threatening. Hearers can interpret requests as intrusive on their freedom of action, and speakers may hesitate to make a request for fear of exposing a need or risking the hearer's loss of face. Therefore, high social stakes are involved for both speaker and hearer in the choice of specific request forms. This is also experienced in the education system where positive work relations should be maintained for effective education.

When making requests, people may also consider how their projected action will affect the hearer's feelings. Direct statements with a lack of mitigation may risk a higher chance of hurting the other's feelings than hints by conveying the implicit message that the speaker is not concerned about the relationship but only with accomplishing the outcome.

Within the education contexts, hints are used in situations where there is a likelihood of non-compliance. Depending on various situations more direct requests are also made when a situation demands it.

4.4.1 Comparison of the total number of request strategies in 4 situations

Situation no. 1 = 51, no. 2 = 44, no. 3 = 42, no. 4 = 46

The difference in the manner in which the requests were done in these four different situations indicates that the people who requested these requests are from different ranks. It seems the inspectors, as education officials who have some power over principals, had used more request strategies than the principals (situation no. 2), the HODs (situation no. 3), and teachers (situation no. 4). Since their job is to filter down departmental policies, they had to make requests more often than the school based educators to ensure that policies are well understood.

The principals, who supervise HODs, are assigned with responsibility and accountability of whatever that takes place at school so they have to use more request strategies to the heads of departments than the latter, to safeguard the departmental policies, because of the obligations that exist between them, and to ensure that effective teaching and learning takes place.

As the ranks lowers the request strategies used are also decreasing because the social distance is close. The teachers and HODs are working very close that formality is so minimal, hence less strategies had been used.

The social distance between the teacher and the principal is wider, hence more strategies had been used compared to those in situations no. 2 and 3. Various strategies had to be used to soften the principal.

4.4.2 Request strategies

Mild hint: Situation no. 1 = 6, no. 2 = 5, no. 3 = 1, no. 4 = 9

Mild hint strategy had been used differently in the four situations simply because these people are having different legitimate powers over their interlocutors. The teacher has mostly used mild hint in his / her requests. I agree with Thomas who says people tend to use a greater degree of indirectness with people who have some power or authority over them than to those who do not. This is evident in the manner in which requests were done by the teachers to the principals. The social distance is also a determining factor in this regard as in most cases teachers are usually socially distant from the principals. Of course, the teacher is not asking for favors, as the requests he / she made are mostly his / her rights.

Amongst many duties of a principal, he or she has to ensure that the education of the learners is promoted in a proper manner and in accordance with approved policies, hence he or she has to keep regular contacts with the head of department to execute this duty. Mild hint had been used less, compared to the teacher and the HOD, by the principals in making requests. The HOD knows what to do, so the principal simply hints mildly in certain situations just to remind the HOD of what is supposed to be done, thus maintaining the HOD's integrity.

The requests that were done by the inspectors to the principals indicate that the mild hint was moderately used. This means that although the inspector is the supervisor to the principal he/she does not want to be explicitly direct, and impose on him. The allowance for the principal to analyse the context, and activate the knowledge is given, which shows that the principal is being treated as an equal, but, the principal is still expected to comply. In this case no imposition is done. May be this is because of the fear of the teachers' union that most nowadays inspectors are faced with. The harassment that was experienced by the principals of the eighties is no longer tolerated by the teachers' union. The democracy in our country is also a vital factor in this regard as the inspector cannot automatically expect compliance, so he or she has to phrase his or her request in a manner that will save his or her face should the principal decide not to comply.

With the many situations that were given, the HODs only used the mild hint once. This shows that the contacts of HODs with teachers is so frequent that they no longer need to employ indirectness in their job related requests as their social distance is so close that they understand one another. The focus of HODs is in the classroom, so the nature of their job demand that they use directness.

Strong hint: Situation no. 1 = 7, no. 2 = 3, no. 3 = 10, no. 4 = 6

Strong hints were mostly used by the HODs because their job is mainly focused in the classroom, where there are also learners, who can not understand indirectness. For the effective functioning of the department the HOD need to engage directness in dealing with the teachers so that mistakes are corrected immediately and teaching and learning carries on without the teacher wandering what the head might have been meaning in his /her request.

With the nature of their job, inspectors cannot run away from using strong hints more often than other request strategies because at times they have to deal with different personalities of principals. As representatives of the government in a school, at times, they have to employ directness to communicate the Vision and goals of the Department. His / her leadership qualities need to be demonstrated every now and again. An inspector has to employ strong hints where departmental policies are violated.

The teachers had used strong hints more than the principals in the given situations. This means that although the principal has power over the teacher, the latter has to try to be explicit as to what his / her request is all about because the principal is a busy man. He does not have time to wander about teachers' requests. The teachers' requests need to be polite enough to mention partially the desired action. In most cases the teachers seem to be giving reasons for making requests which makes me agree with Trosborg who says in order to successfully perform a request the speaker must be able to motivate and justify his / her desire.

The principals had used strong hints at a lesser degree than other requestors. This is because HODs form part of the School Management Team (SMT), which means that they know what to do. The principal is only there to give guidance and support, hence he / she has to employ strong hints very rarely.

<u>Ability:</u> Situation no. 1 = 3, no. 2 = 3, no. 3 2, no. 4 = 1

As ability refers to the hearer's capacity to perform the desired act, it is rarely used by the requestors in the education system because the fact that they are educators means they do have the ability as they have undergone training to become teachers. Their ability is not doubted, the strategy is only used to address the external circumstances related to time, place, etc. The inspectors and the principals have at least tried to use this strategy in an attempt to show their subordinates that they acknowledge the fact that there are external factors that can hinder one's performance.

The HODs had used the ability strategy only twice. The understanding is still the same that whoever is in the classroom possesses the ability, which is not questionable. When one is physically or mentally unable, he or she has to leave the system as it does not cater for that. The teacher has to try his best so that even the external factors do no hinder his performance, thus leading to his supervisors doubting his abilities.

The teachers had used the ability strategy only once. The capacity of the principal is not doubted that he can comply to the requests, so I am sure even the one who used this strategy only used it as a form of politeness.

<u>Willingness:</u> Situation no. 1 = 2, no. 2 = 2, no 3 = 0, no. 4 = 1

Willingness refers to the hearer's desire to carry out the act as requested. The inspector and the principal (authorities in the education system) had used willingness strategy twice, each, in the four situations. This indicates that they are not authoritative as Trosborg puts it that when asserting the requestee's willingness to carry out the specified act, the requester exerts power over the requestee leaving him/her no option to make a voluntary commitment. I disagree with Trosborg on this notion because in this democratic South Africa if one requests for the requestee's willingness, the onus is entirely on the requestee to carry or not to carry out the task.

The HODs did not use this strategy in all the four situations, as their requests are mostly part of the educators' job descriptions which means therefore that willingness is out of question. The very fact that one applied for the job means that he or she is willing enough to execute the job duties.

As much as the teacher is a subordinate, but the requests he/she made were really a necessity to him that is why the willingness strategy was not much used; only used once. It takes guts for a subordinate to approach the senior.

<u>Permissions</u>: Situation no. 1 = 1, no. 2 = 0, no. 3 =0, no. 4 = 0

This strategy means that the shift of focus alludes explicitly to the requester as the beneficiary or recipient of an activity instead of mentioning the requestee as the agent of the action. The inspector was formal and civil enough to make this only one request pretending as if what the principal was requested to do was for the benefit of the inspector while in the actual fact it is part of the principal's duties.

The principal, the HOD, and the teacher did not use this strategy in their requests since their requests were not favor-asking, but were job related. It is acknowledged that this strategy is polite enough to be used by the professionals, but the contexts of requests did not call for them.

<u>Suggestory formulae:</u> Situation no. 1 = 1, no. 2 = 1, no. 3 = 3, no. 4 = 1

Trosborg says that with the suggestory formulae the requester does not question any particular hearer-based condition, rather he/she tests the hearer's cooperativeness in general by inquiring whether any conditions exist that might prevent the hearer from carrying out the action specified by the proposition. I agree with him, especially if we look at the fact that the HODs at least used this strategy thrice. Considering the type of job that is done by HODs at times they need to test the cooperativeness of their subordinates by requesting in a suggestory formulae approach to determine if there are any conditions that might prevent teachers not to comply. The teachers are also given a chance to bring forward the problems so that they can be solved if there are any. Since their work is always done on person to person basis they are expected to be as open as possible.

The inspector, and the principal used this strategy once respectively. The jobs of the inspector and the principal sometimes need them to identify the reasons for non-performance. This strategy should have been mostly used by them. As leaders they need to identify the problems of their subordinates in advance so that they are thrashed out before they hinder the whole education system.

The teacher used this strategy only once to make his or her request more tentative and to play down with his or her own interest as a beneficiary of the action.

<u>Wishes</u>: Situation no. 1 = 0, no. 2 = 2, no. 3 = 0, no. 4 = 0

The speaker's statement of his/her intention may be expressed politely as a wish. This strategy was only used by the principals in the given situations. The principal has a responsibility of ensuring that the school is functional. That needs him to be proactive at times. The principal had used this strategy twice, thus exercising his power as no one would undermine the head's wishes under normal circumstances.

<u>Desire</u>**:** Situation no. 1 = 0, no. 2 = 1, no. 3 = 0, no. 4 = 0

When a requester places his interests above the hearer's, the request becomes more direct in its demand. The principal is held responsible and accountable for whatever that takes place in the school, so, that puts him in a position to make his desires the focal point of the interaction when need arises, hence it was only the principal who could use this strategy in the given situations.

<u>Need:</u> Situation no. 1 = o, no. 2 = 2, no. 3 =0, no. 4 = 2

This is a speaker- oriented request. The principals had used this strategy twice in the given situations. As accountability lies with them in the schools, they sometimes have to phrase their requests in a manner that tells the requestees that they are the focal point of the interaction. By virtue of their positions, the principals' statements of their intentions may be expressed as a need.

The inspector and the HOD did not use this strategy. This might be due to the fact that they feel they do not have to put forward their needs more than putting those of the department. They are too professional in this regard.

The teachers had used the strategy twice. This is because the requests they made were self-centred, so at times they had to be frank about their needs depending on the situation.

Obligation: Situation no. 1 = 14, no. 2 = 5, no. 3 = 4, no. 4 = 4

Trosborg says when a speaker employs a statement of obligation or necessity, the speaker exerts either his/her own authority, or he/she refers to some authority outside the speaker. The inspectors had maximally used this strategy because their responsibility is to ensure that the departmental procedures and policies are adhered to at schools. In view of the inspectors' duty, I agree with Trosborg since the inspectors have to exert their authority in ensuring that the schools are well run; and, to refer principals to the educational laws and policy on regular basis - thus referring them to some authority outside the inspectors which is the employer (Department of Education). The inspectors have been entrusted with a responsibility of communicating the educational policy to principals. They also need to monitor the implementation hence their requests for compliance – gaining had to be authoritative enough to ensure proper implementation.

On the average, the principals had also used this strategy because they have also been entrusted with the accountability of what is taking place at schools. They sometimes have to exert their authority in their interactions with their subordinates to ensure proper implementation of departmental policies. They did not use the strategy much just because they had to maintain a friendly working situation within the schools so too many obligations may sometimes end up demoralizing some individuals – thus making them to live in a world of fear.

The HODs had also minimally used this strategy. With the nature of their job they had to pronounce some obligations in their requests, thus seeking compliance not because a person chooses to but, because the requests are departmental procedures, which makes them to be part of the reasons for requestees' employment.

The teachers had also used this request strategy because some of the requests they made are legally their rights. As much as the requests depend on the compliance by the principal, the teachers had decided to exert some authority in request pronounciation in some situations to show the principal that what they are asking is legally right.

<u>Unhedged performative:</u> Situation no. 1 = 11, no. 2 = 17, no. 3 = 16, no. 4 19

Blum Kulka says with the unhedged performative the illocutionary intent is explicitly named by the speaker by using a relevant illocutionary verb, which is similar to Trosborg who further says that the inclusion of a performative verb explicitly marks the utterance as an order, thus making the requests to be very direct and usually authoritative. This is true when we look at the frequency of the use of this strategy in the educational contexts where supervisors had to make requests to their subordinates. The teachers had used this strategy at the most because they needed to be explicit as to what their requests were about as Blum- Kulka puts it. Perhaps it is likely to disagree with Trosborg who sees this request strategy as an order and authoritative because a subordinate cannot give orders to the senior in this case. May be his only focus was based on the idea that the only person who would use this strategy should be the one in authority. Unless the authority of the teacher lies outside himself, ie. in the teacher organizations; which cannot be ruled out nowadays as the unionists are capitalizing with their rights and are on a fault finding mission to the supervisors. In that context I would then agree with Trosborg.

The principals had also used this strategy at the most as they also need to give orders to their subordinates and in so doing they need to be as explicitly as possible. In a school there is an authoritative element so the use of this strategy is not a problem as everyone knows that the principal is the head who should give orders that need to be adhered to.

The use of this strategy by HODs is also necessary as they are entrusted with a responsibility to ensure that the subject, learning area or phase and the education of the learners is promoted in a proper manner. The use of the strategy is not a problem as there is an authoritative element. Problems arise when this authority is misused to fight their personal issues.

The inspectors also need to exercise their authority by giving orders to the principals. Certain situations demand them to be explicit and direct especially in situations where the principal is violating the educational policy, ie. refusing to let a pregnant girl writes her exams, or refusing to let the teacher transfer to a school of his choice.

Hedged performative: Situation no. 1 = 2, no. 2 = 0, no. 3 =2, no. 4 = 3

The speaker decides to soften the utterance as an order by hedging the illocutionary force of the utterance by using modal verbs or verbs expressing intention. At times the inspectors had to soften their utterances so that they are not seen as too authoritative in certain situations, while in other cases they decide to modify their utterances to gain liking and popularity among the unionists.

The principals should have used this strategy for the same reasons as above. One has to protect his territory nowadays because in the true sense of the word people are working for their families. They do not need to be chased out of their work one day because people feel they are impolite.

To maintain a friendly working situation HODs had used this strategy in certain situations so as not to appear too authoritative or giving orders around.

The teachers too had to soften some of the requests they made to the principals so that they do not appear as giving directives and orders to their bosses. This is socially correct because good working relations are maintained when respect of authority is in place and vice versa. Even if one is asking for something that is rightfully belonging to him the choice of suitable words uplifts the integrity of the requester to the requestee.

Imperative: Situation no. 1 = 4, no. 2 = 3, no. 3 = 4,no. 4 = 0

This is a grammatical form directly signaling that the utterance is an order. Orders issued by authority figures must be obeyed. If the speaker has power over the hearer, the latter is obliged to carry out the order. The teachers could not use this strategy mainly because they do not have power over their principals.

The inspectors, as having power over the principals - thus representing the employer, had to give orders depending to the various situations that were given. For instance, at times, the inspector has to be authoritative enough to give orders when departmental procedures are at stake as it is his / her job to ensure adherence to them by principals in their schools, e.g. the non use of OBE approach of teaching as a new policy.

The principals as carriers of accountability had to give orders and to be authoritative enough in certain situations when HODs seem to lose the trend they have to follow.

The HODs have a responsibility of their subjects or phases so it is also their right to exercise authority and give orders when teachers are slacking in carrying out their duties, i.e. non – marking of learners' scripts or poor performance in subject teaching.

Total of request strategies used

1.1 Mild hints	21
1.2 Strong hints	26
2.1 Ability	9
2.2Willingness	5
2.3 Permissions	1
3 Suggestory formulae	6
4 Wishes	2
5.1 Desire	1
5.2 Need	4
6 Obligation	27
7.1 Unhedged performative	63
7.2 Hedged performative	7
8 Imperative	11

Comparison of different strategies

The thirteen request strategies as outlined in the table above clearly indicates the different levels of directness that are employed by education employees in various situations at school level. The above strategies range from the most indirect to the most direct request. Strategy 1.1 mild hint, is the most indirect strategy, while the last strategy, i.e. strategy 8 is the most direct one. For situations that might provoke defensiveness, e.g situation 1.1 - bad matric results, the inspector decides to use strategy 1.1 - mild hint; while he or she is bold enough to use strategy 7.1 unhedged performative or even strategy 8 – imperative, when the departmental policies are violated e.g. situation 1.2 - OBE teaching and 1.5 - School policy.

The various ranges of directness acknowledges the request as a face-threatening act demanding face-work for its polite realization. The request ranges from pragmatically transparent ways of performing the act to pragmatically opaque ways of doing it. Trosborg says if a speaker wants to carry out an act with maximum efficiency, he / she can perform an act "baldly on record", i.e.without face redress, as in direct request strategies, namely, strategy 6 obligation;7.1 unhedged performative; 7.2 hedged performative; and 8 imperative. Education needs to be guided so that it is done effectively and efficiently that is why directness has to be used in various situations. From the table above it is clear that within the education context direct requests, especially the unhedged performatives, are used more than indirect requests because of the nature of the education system which demands directness. The system has its own policies and procedures that need to be directly communicated to the people concerned.

At the lowest level of directness (strategy 1.1 mild hint) the requester's impositive intent is not made explicit and can easily be overlooked by a non-compliant listener. Within the education context it seems that this strategy is used to some situations that can provoke defensiveness, hence the requests are done in such a manner that will not threaten face should the requestee decides not to comply. The principal can choose to be particularly careful and modest to an HOD in dealing with situation 2.1 bad results in a subject, as this might hit back to the principal should the HOD decides to defend hi/herself, if there were not enough textbooks or there is a shortage in staffing. With the hints it is clear that there is no excuse needed should the hearer decides not to comply. Hence the requesters in the educational context did not use hint alone, instead they accompanied it with a hedged (strategy 7.2, or unhedged performative (strategy 7.1). They hinted (giving a background), before they gave their directives and orders in most situations.
Requests alluding to hearer-based preparatory conditions (Strategies 2.2 ability;2.2 willingness; 2.3 permissions; 4 suggestory formulae), are transparent requests and an excuse for non compliance is generally expected. They allow the requestee to respond as if acting voluntarily, not obeying orders. Within the education context such strategies are seldom used. In certain situations they use them for conversational exchange which could lead to a voluntary commitment e.g. in situation 3.2 Improvement of performance, e.g. an HOD, says,

" Ndifuna ukuqonda unobangela weziphumo ezibi, nokuba uza kuhlangabezana njani nale ngxaki, ndibe sele ndivelisa nawam amacebo". (I want to know the cause of bad results and how are you going to solve the problem , then I will give you my advice,) This HOD has opened a conversational exchange which will end up in the development of the teacher concerned, thus leading to voluntary commitment.

Suggestory formulae (strategy 3) express tentativeness.A requester who employs it does not feel obliged to question any particular pre-condition, rather he/she she asks whether the requestee might have any objections that would prevent him/her from carrying out the act. In an education system where there are rules this strategy is seldom used in certain situations as it lacks seriousness as the requestee is not obliged to question anything. Education system does not operate that way. Each and everyone is tasked with responsibilities that should be accounted for.

Requests that are speaker-based are statements that carry no immediate elicitative force. The requestee who responds in a non-cooperative way is bound to act in disagreement with the speaker's wishes and desires. Requesters employing strategies 5.1 desire, and 5.2 need are more difficult to refuse than requesters with a less demanding lexical meaning (str. 4 wishes). Since the education personnel is communicating the departmental policies it does not use much of this strategy as it does not request personal wants and desires.

CHAPTER 5

RESPONSES TO REQUESTS

5.1 AIM

A response to a request can either be positive or negative depending on various factors which will be discussed in this study. This study is intended to look into the various strategies of compliance and non-compliance utterances within the education system. Depending on various situations, and the request strategies used, the educators use a variety of compliance and non-compliance strategies in their everyday interaction. The various strategies identified in each type of responses will be compared with one another, and then analysed. Both types of responses will then be compared with one another.

5.2 COMPLIANCE STRATEGIES

When a requestee decides to comply with a request he can use various compliance strategies. The education system is having educators of different ranks with different job descriptions. The higher rank educators often make job-related requests to their subordinates in various situations. Even post level one educators often make such requests to their principals. They use various strategies to comply with the requests.

5.2.1 Comparison of the total number of compliance strategies used in four situations

Situation no. 1 = 48, no. 2 = 48, no. 3 = 45, no. 4 = 51

The fact that the interlocutors are from different ranks within an education system, and that the situations are not similar is a good reason for not having the same numbers of compliance strategies. But nevertheless if we look at the four situations, i.e. no. 1 (inspector to principal); no. 2 (principal to HOD); no.3 (HOD to the teacher); and no. 4 (teacher to principal), the number of the compliance strategies used is almost equal in each situation. The difference is very little, so we cannot capitalize with the difference altogether. All we can say is that the level of compliance by subordinates in the education contexts is very high.

5.2.2 Comparison of compliance strategies

1. *Willing to comply (Future Tense)*

Situation no. 1 = 11, no. 2 = 5, no. 3 = 10, no. 4 = 8

The use of this compliance strategy in similar situations differs depending on who is complying and from which school he/she is coming from. Within an education context, this compliance strategy had been used differently. In request situation no. 1 where the inspector, the interlocutors are willing to comply hence the compliance strategy was used more than the other three situations. The request situation no. 2 had used less than the other three and this shows that the principals might be stubborn at times, perceiving schools as theirs and tired of being ordered around.

2. *Apologise*

Situation no. 1 = 4, no. 2 = 4, no. 3 = 5, no. 4 = 0.

Among the four request situations, compliance strategy no. 2 was moderately used in request situations no. 1, 2, and 3. The personnel in these situations are apologetic when they are requested something which they should have done as it is part of their job description; and this shows that politeness prevails within the education system. In request situation no. 4 the interlocutors did not apologise altogether hence they did not use this compliance strategy.

This shows that principals can sometimes be too proud to come to the level of a teacher by apologizing. They do not want to lose face by apologizing to the subordinates under any circumstances.

3. *Promise to comply*

Situation no. 1 = 5, no. 2 = 5,no. 3 = 4, no. 4 = 3

This compliance strategy had been used in the four situations by the principals (situation no. 1), HODs (situation no. 2), the teachers (situation no.3), and the principals (situation no.4); although even for this strategy the principals had used less of it than the other interlocutors. The principals do not want to make much of promises as they do not want to be interrogated by juniors should they not keep their promises. For the first three situations the subordinates give promises to their seniors that they will comply, which is a normal practice in work situations.

4. Agree to request

Situation no. 1 = 9, no. 2 = 12, no. 3 = 10, no. 4 = 15

This is a formal way of agreeing to a request by saying the word *yes.* The clarities that usually follow are just supportive to the well- known compliance word 'yes'. This compliance strategy had been used maximally by all interlocutors of the four situations. The principals (in the fourth situation) had used more of them than the other interlocutors of the first three situations. Instead of being apologetic and giving too many promises, the higher rank person will choose to agree to one's requests, thus protecting his/her territory even if he knows that he ought to apologise in certain situations.

5. Give a reason

Situation no. 1 = 8, no. 2 = 10, no. 3 = 5, no. 4 = 3.

In educational contexts, the subordinates had seen it necessary that they give reasons to show the senior that they were also aware that something was wrong or they had another way of solving the problem. They do this to show that they are not ignorant. The principals in the fourth situation had used less because they do not deem it necessary to give much of reasons to their subordinates. They are kind of being aloof. Otherwise with the subordinates, this compliance strategy was maximally used in the first three situations.

6. Method of compliance

Situation no. 1 = 5, no. 2 = 7, no. 3 = 5, no. 4 = 13.

When agreeing to a request one has to give a method of compliance. This is evident in the four situations of education system where the interlocutors were giving methods of compliance to the work requests that were made to them by their seniors as well as their subordinates. In this instance the principals in the fourth situation are using much of this strategy. It seems they feel it is better to give more methods of compliance to a subordinate than being apologetic or giving reasons.

7. Give advice how to comply

Situation no. 1 = 0, no. 2 = 2, no. 3 = 2, no. 4 = 2.

An advice is sometimes given to assure the requester how a compliance is going to be carried out, thus showing their seniors how creative they can be. The principals in situation no. 1 did not use this strategy. This may be because of the social distance that exists between the inspectors and principals, which makes the principals to be reserved at times. With the HODs (situation no.2), the teachers (situation no. 3), and the principals (situation no. 4); this compliance strategy was only used twice in each situation. This means this strategy is not popular in the educational contexts.

8. Justify compliance

Situation no. 1 = 6, no. 2 = 3, no. 3 = 4, no. 4 = 7.

To assure the requester that one knows exactly what to do, one has to justify the compliance. It seems the principals like to justify their compliances because in the two situations that they were interlocutors i.e. no. 1 and no. 4 , they used more of this strategy than the other interlocutors of situations 2 and 3, which only used three and four respectively.

5.2.3 Comparison of compliance strategies

1. Willing to comply	34
2. Apologise	13
3. Promise to comply	17
4. Agree to request	46
5. Give a reason	26
6. Method of compliance	30

7. Give advice how to comply	6
8. Justify compliance	20

The eight compliance strategies as outlined in the table above gives a clear indication that the degree of politeness that is usually employed by people of differing ranks is not the same. The most popularly used strategy is the compliance strategy no. 4, which had been used about forty six times in the four situations, while the least used strategy is strategy no. 7 which had only been used six times in the four request situations. This shows that interlocutors do not have a problem with agreeing ,i.e. saying *"yes"*. But with giving advice on how to comply they are reserved probably because they do not want to give advices to their seniors. The compliance strategy no. 1 Willing to comply had been used in all the four situations to sum up to 34, which shows that the education employees of all ranks are willing to comply. They do not undermine their authorities, instead they acknowledge their assistance.

The compliance strategies no. 5 (Give a reason), and 6 Method of compliance, had been used enough in the education system as they have been used 26 and 30 times respectively.

The compliance strategies no. 2 (Apologise), no. 3 (Promise to comply), and no. 8 (Justify compliance) seems not to be popular, hence they had only been used less than the above mentioned ones in the four situations. But at least we have people in the education system who are polite enough to apologise, to promise to comply and to justify compliance when some issues are not done as they are supposed to be done.

5.3 ANALYSIS OF COMPLIANCE STRATEGIES

The eight request strategies as seen by Dr Dlali apply in the education contexts. Looking carefully at the use of compliance strategies in the education contexts it is clear that the educators at their various ranks at school level are willing to comply (strategy no. 1). This is shown by their frequent use of **[za ku**] in their compliance utterances. They are not just willing to comply, they go on to agree with certain requests, thus correctly using strategy no. 4 (agree to request).

I agree with Dr Dlali when he says the requestees usually agree with the request but in many times after the agreement, requestees frequently give a reason for the agreement or give a method of agreement. The use of these strategies in exactly the sequence seen by Dr Dlali is evident in the compliance strategies used by educators in the education contexts. For example, the compliance strategies used by principals, HODs, and teachers give this sequence of compliances.

The following compliance is an extract from the compliance strategies of HODs to the principal.

"Kulungile Mfundisi" [Strategy 4: agree to request]
"Ndizocela utitshala qho emva kwemini andinike amanani abantwana abangekhoyo esikolweni..........." [Strategy 6: method of compliance]

The requestee does not only agree to request but he also gives a method of compliance. There are many examples which prove Dr Dlali's point that an agreement is either followed by a reason or a method of compliance.

To show how humbly and cooperative the educators are in their compliances, they even apologise to be noticed by their superiors not to have carried out their tasks as they are supposedly expected. The following extract is a proof of this saying.

This extract is one of the compliances by principals to the inspectors:

"Ndixolisa kakhulu Mhlekazi wam ngokuba singafundisi ngohlobo lwe OBE". [Strategy 2: apologise]

"Ndiyathembisa siza kufundisa ngayo ukusukela ngoku" [Strategies 1: willing to comply, and 3: promise to comply]

This shows that they do not just apologise, they go on to give promises- utterances.

As people who are professionals in the field of education, the educators frequently justify their compliances, thus using strategy no. 8: justify compliance, to show that they clearly understand what they are supposed to be doing and that it is within their job description that they do it. Their understanding of their field lead the educators to even giving advices on how to comply in their compliance utterances, thus using strategy no. 7: give advice how to comply.

The eight compliance strategies as used in the education system clearly depicts the clear picture of education system. The system is being run by professionals, who are polite and willing to execute their duties.

5.4 NON-COMPLIANCE STRATEGIES

Situation no. 1 = 55, no. 2 = 45, no. 3 = 50, no. 4 = 57

The total number of non-compliance strategies used in the four situations differs. The fourth situation, where the principal is the interlocutor, had used most of the non-compliance strategies (fifty seven) than in the other three situations. This is probably because seniors are always ready with various answers to refuse. They do not want to be seen as complying with whatever request their subordinates come with, because once teachers notice that the principal is loose they will play him around with petty requests, and that would lead to the chaos in the school. At the same time principals do not just refuse, they had to convince teachers with various non-compliance strategies when they refuse so that principals do not face rebellious teachers one day. With their non-compliance strategies they need to win the trust and respect of teachers.

It seems principals are good at using various types of non-compliance strategies, because even when they were refusing the requests by the inspectors (non-compliance strategy no. 1), they used fifty five non-compliance strategies. When a principal refuses a request by a representative of his employer, he has to support the refusal enough to convince the inspector that he knows what he is doing. To convince the employer representative various strategies have to be used. At the same time the inspector must leave the school knowing that even though no-compliance is done, but the school is still functional.

The teachers in the situation no. 3 had used about fifty non-compliance strategies, which shows that they also need to convince their seniors with a number of non-compliance strategies when they do not comply.

The HODs in the second situation, (principal requests HOD), had used the least number of non-compliance strategies (forty five). This shows that the HODs are always on a mission to do as principals please because, for one to get an HOD post he/she has to be the principal's favorite, as they influence such appointments to a great extent. A principal chooses someone who will make it easy for him to work.

5.4.1 Comparison of non-compliance strategies

1. *Negate request*

Situation no. 1 = 10, no. 2 = 13, no. 3 = 7, no. 4 = 1.

When an interlocutor says "no", he is using the negate request strategy.
The difference in the number of the same non-compliance strategies used in the four situations is due to the fact that the situations are not similar. Different people from different ranks had responded. It seems the HODs (for situation no. 2), and the principals (for situation no. 4) had used more of "no" strategy than the principals (for situation no.1), and the teachers (for situation no. 3). For situation no. 4 principals had to use "no" to the teachers to shorten the interation. Principals and teachers for situations no. 1 and 3 also needed to shorten the interaction hence the number of strategy 1 used is not too low. But because of the respect they have to their requesters, it is not easy for them to say no.

2. *Negated ability*

Situation no. 1 = 13, no. 2 = 6, no. 3 = 9, no. 4 = 10.
When an interlocutor says he is unable to grant the request, he is using negated ability strategy. Looking at the situations above, the principals of situation no. 1 deemed it necessary that they refuse the requests done by inspectors by saying that they are unable to perform them. This non-compliance strategy had been used more than in situations 2, 3, and 4. The principals, as trustworthy employees, do not have a problem to say they lack the ability. This means that the inspectors have not yet developed them, that is why they do not have a problem in saying they are unable to perform.

But this strategy had been used for different reasons by the principals in situation no. 4, which used ten negated ability strategies to refuse requests by teachers. Here, the

strategy was used to show the teacher that what he was requesting for was not necessary, hence the strategy was accompanied by explanation as to why it could not be accepted.
In situations 2 and 3, the strategy had been used less than the above mentioned situations. May be it is because they had been capacitated enough to say they are unable to perform. The teachers had only used this strategy three times, this shows that OBE workshops had been held in Bizana and Mount Frere satisfactorily.

3. Indicate unwillingness

Situation no. 1 = 12, no. 2 = 9, no. 3 = 11, and no. 4 = 7.

Refusers may claim that they are not willing or not interested to grant the request. This is not an easy strategy to be used by a subordinate to his/her senior, but it seems within the education system this strategy is sometimes used, but at least an explanation for unwillingness is given. It may be because of the approaches used by the requesters which can lead to this type of response. Another factor may be that the requestee feels that the requester is interfering with his/her duties. The principals in situation no. 1 had used this strategy twelve times, which is one time more than situation no. 3, which used it eleven times. This shows that the strategy might have been used to bring to the attention of the requestee that his/her request is none of her business. In situation no. 2 the strategy had been used nine times, while the fourth situation used it seven times.

4. Performative refusal

Situation no. 1 = 0, no. 2 = 1, no. 3 = 1, and no. 4 = 1.

Refusers sometimes use a verb of negation other than ‘no’. in the education system this strategy is not popular. In situation no. 1 it was not used altogether, while in the rest of the situations it was only used once. This is probably because they do not have a problem of saying ‘no’ when need arises. They call a spade, “a spade:”

5. Identify impeding event/state

Situation no. 1 = 20, no. 2 = 16, no. 3 = 22, no. 4 = 27.

Refusers give excuses or justifications that in context pragmatically convey refusal of compliance. This strategy had been the most used strategy in the four situations. This shows that within the education cointexts people do not just refuse, but they are polite enough to justify their refusal by giving justifications. Politeness in education system prevails.

5.4.2 Comparison of non-compliance strategies

1. Negate request	42
2. Negated ability	38
3. Indicate unwillingness	39
4. Performative refusal	3
5. Identify impeding state/event	85

The number of times the non-compliance strategies were used in the education contexts differs from one another. Negate request was used 42 times, negated ability was used 38 times, indicate unwillingness was used 39 times, performative refusal used 3 times, and identify impeding state/event was used 85 times.

The first three strategies had been more or less equally used in the education contexts that were given. On the average, when the respondents say 'no', they go on to mention the reasons for saying 'no', that they are unable to perform.

5.5 ANALYSIS OF THE NON-COMPLIANCE STRATEGIES

Turnbull and Saxton regularly refer to refusals as face-threatening of which I agree with him especially in the education context where good social relations have a great impact on the performance of the personnel. One way to mitigate the face-threat of a refusal is to use external modifiers that are face-oriented, such as indicating interest in the requested activity, or making an excuse, e.g. one HOD refused the request by the principal that an explanation be given as to why the standard of work had dropped. In his refusal he showed interest in the issue by saying:

"Mfundisi kudala lo mntu ndizama ukumbonisa ukuba akuhambi kakuhle kwisifundo sakhe akeva."
(Sir, I have long been trying to let her notice that all is not well in her subject but she is stubborn.

Looking close now at the use of each of the non-compliance strategies, modal expressions were frequent and approximately equally so for all types of refusal strategies except *Identify impeding event/state*. Three different modal structures were evident in the data, each consistent with the view that speakers in the education contexts used these structures to do facework.

There were also modals of epistemic necessity, negated root necessity, either alone or in combination, e.g. when a teacher is requested to improve his performance in class teaching he responds thus:

"Mhlekazi xa ubona okokuba umsebenzi wam awukho mgangathweni, yithathe ngokwakho iclass uyenze ibekulo mgangatho uwunqwenelayo." (Sir, if you feel my work is not up to standard, take the class and put it to the standard you wish it for.)

The above statement is face-aggravating and I sense there was no sincerity and honesty on the part of this responder in answering the questionnaire. This type of statement is kind of rude to be used by a professional. But nevertheless the refusals with modal expressions were more frequent than those without modal expressions. The modal structure of *Negate request and Indicate unwillingness* is very similar, and they can be placed in one category. Turnbull and Saxton say Negated ability refusals are defined by modal expressions that in context encode root necessity, and they do facework by conveying that the speaker is obligated to refuse to comply because of the inability. Perhaps it is likely to agree with him as some refusals within education contexts proved that, e.g.

"Asinako ukufundisa ngohlobo lwe OBE kuba asiyazi".
(We cannot teach in OBE way because we do not know it.)
This refusal is face saving as the speaker does not just say he is unable to perform, but give reasons.

Turnbull and Saxton defined the RCp - Identify impeding event/state, as the descriptions of circumstances that prevent compliance, do facework by carrying out the refusal indirectly through the presentation of reasons. Throughout the education context situations that were given it was clear that Turnbull and Saxton were accurate in studying this refusal strategy.

5.6 COMPARISON OF COMPLIANCE AND NON-COMPLIANCE STRATEGIES IN THE FOUR SITUATIONS

1. Request situation no. 1

Compliance in situation no. 1 = 48

Non-compliance in situation no. 1 = 55

There are more non-compliance strategies than compliance strategies. The reason might be due to the face-threatening nature of non-compliance strategies that the principals, as requestees in the education system, feel that they have to give more justifications for their refusals. The principals had to be polite in turning down the inspectors requests. This shows that their concern was the requester's face, and anyway it is supposed to be like that. Inspectors should leave the schools with confidence that even though the request was turned down, the school is still under good hands.

2. Request situation no. 2

Compliance in situation no. 2 = 48

Non-compliance in situation no. 2 = 45

The number of compliance strategies used in this situation are less than the number of non-compliance strategies. This should be because of the loyalty that HODs should display to their bosses by giving quite a number of compliance strategies to assure them that the work is done properly, thus protecting the face of the requester. Another reason may be that the HODs in their refusals decided not to be too elaborate to minimize discussion.

3. Request situation no. 3

Compliance in situation no. 3 = 45

Non-compliance in situation no. 3 = 50

The teachers who responded to the requests in situation no. 3 had used non-compliance strategies more than compliance strategies. The reason for this might be because the requests were so much work related that non-compliance demanded various strategies for justification. The protection of face loss is taken care of too.

4.Request situation no. 4

Compliance in situation no. 4 = 51

Non-compliance in situation no. 4 = 57

The use of non-compliance strategies by principals in situation no. 4 is more than that of compliance strategies. One reason for this might be because the teachers requested what was legally theirs, so to refuse it demanded various strategies for justification and protecting face. Another reason might be due to the fact that in compliance there is no reason of using many strategies since there is no possibility of face loss.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

The use of request strategies in the education contexts has proved to be the most important tool in their everyday interaction. The most commonly used strategies are:

a) No.7.1 Unhedged performative – The education workplace situations demand that this strategy be used, probably because directness does not threaten much as there is generally a common understanding of what one is supposed to be doing. This strategy is usually used as a reminder.

b) No. 6 Obligation - which is also used quite often, just to remind educators of their duties, which they need not overlook.

c) No. 1 Hints (both mild and strong ones) – Depending on the situation, mild hints are used to save face, and strong hints are used when the situation demands that the request be more of a directive than being polite.

The request strategies that have been used few times are:

a) No. 8 Imperative – The nature of the request, which is very authoritative, is face threatening and it can spoil working relations. It is used rarely only to demanding situations.

b) No. 2.1 Ability – It is only used to situations where non-compliance is also expected.

c) No. 7.2 Hedged performative – The strategy is rarely used in the education contexts to soften the request utterance.

d) No. 3 Suggestory formulae – Such tentative requests are only used in testing the cooperativeness of the role players within the education system.

e) No. 2.2 Willingness – The higher rank educators rarely use this request strategy to exert power over the lower rank educator.

f) No. 5.2 Need – Rarely used by principals to exert their power, and post level one educators to seek leave for personal problems.

g) No. 4 Wishes – are seldom used by principals who sometimes play with other responsibilities as if they are his wish.

h) No. 2.3. Permissions – was only used once by an inspector to give the principal the status that he is the head of the school, so inspectors have to seek permission from him.

i) No. 5.1 Desire – The strategy was only used once by the principal to demand cooperativeness.

In complying with the above requests it goes without question that the educators from all ranks used mostly strategy no. 4 (Agree to request). Agreeing to a request is not a problem with them as authorities are given their respect. Another mostly used strategies are no. 1 (willing to comply),no. 6 (method of compliance), no. 5 (give a reason), and no. 8 (justify compliance). In the compliance strategies used in education the requestees are willing and so open that they elaborate on their compliances by giving reasons, methods, and justification. The working relations are good in education.

Strategies no. 2 (apologise), no. 3 (promise to comply), and no. 7 (Give advice how to comply) have been rarely used. This should be because the nature of education situations do not call for their use. And once again the good working relations as well as the closeness of social distance do not need apologies as such.

Non-compliance strategies are also used within the education system. The mostly commonly used at all ranks is strategy no. 5 (identify impeding state/event). Because the system is characterized by the employment of trained educators and regular workshops, non-compliance has to be supported by a description of circumstances that prevent compliance. This may partly be due to the fact that schools are not alike, so, what happens in school A is not a guarantee that it will happen in school B.

Negate request is used quite a lot, but, it is coupled with strategy no. 5 – identify impeding state (a description of circumstances as to why non-compliance is used). Strategies no. 2 (Negated ability) and no. 3 (indicate unwillingness) are also used in the education contexts when the situations demand them, but are seldom used to defy authority, instead they are used with strategy no. 5 to describe the circumstances that necessitate their use.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Austin, J.L. 1962. **How to do Things with Words. Oxford**. Oxford University Press.

Blum-Kulk et al. 1989. **Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and apo**logies. Norwood. New Jersey: Ablex.

Brown, P. & Levinson, S.C. 1987. **Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clark, H.H. & Schunk, D.H. 1981. Polite Responses to Polite Requests. **Cognition 8:** 111-143.

Craig, R.T., Tracy, K. & Spisak, F. 1986. The Discourse of Requests: Assessment of Politeness approach. **Human Communication Research, 12, 436-468.**

Ervin Tripp, S.M. et al. 1987. Understanding Requests. **Linguistics**, 25 (1) 107-143.

Fraser, B. 1990. Perspectives on Politeness. **Journal of Pragmatics**, 14(2), 219-236.

Goffman, E. 1967. **Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior**. New York: Doubleday

Grundy, P. 2000. **Doing Pragmatics. London**: England: Edward Arnold.

Kasper, G. 1990. Linguistic Politeness: Current Research Issues. **Journal of Peagmatics**, 14(2), 193-218.

Leech, G.N. 1983. **Principles of Pragmatic**s. London and New York: Longman. Lenneberg, Eric.

Lim, T.S. 1990. **Politeness Behavior in Social Influence Situations**. In. J. Dillard (ed.) Seeking Compliance: The production of Interpersonal Influence Messages. Scottsdale, AZ: Corsuch-Scarisbrick.

Mao, L.R. 1994. Beyond Politeness Theory: 'Face' Revisited and Renewed. **Journal of Pragmatics**, 21(5), 451-486.

Mey, J. 1983. **Pragmatics**. Oxford: Blackwell.

Searle, J.R. 1969. **Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J.R. 1975. A Classification of Illocutionary Acts. **Language in Society**, 5, 1-23.

Searle, J.R. 1975. **Indirect Speech Acts**. In: P. Cole, J.L. Morgan (eds.) Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts. New York. Academic Press.

Thomas, J. 1995. **Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics.** London and New York: Longman.

Trosborg, A. 1995. **Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies**. Berlin, Federal Republic of Germany: Mouton de Gruyter.