THE SPEECH ACT OF ADVICE IN EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS IN ISIZULU

BY

LAZARUS NGCOBO

Thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts at the University of Stellenbosch.

STUDY LEADER: DR M DLALI

DECEMBER 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.

Signature   Date

ABSTRACT

This study focuses on the communicative processes of advice in isiZulu through which people aid each other with problems and stresses of daily life, including ways in which support is communicated. When friends or family members attempt to help one another with stress and problems, they frequently give advice.

Within the field of pragmatics, advice is a common but potentially face-threatening response to a friend or a loved one who is upset about a problem. Consequently it is useful to identify ways a speaker may show regard for face in this kind of episode. Advice can threaten the hearer's autonomy by imposing the speaker's authority and solutions on the hearer and it can also imply criticism of the hearer's emotional reaction or handling of the problem.

In this study, twenty-one advice topics, by Goldsmith (2000) that can be used in various troubles talk episodes in isiZulu have been examined. It has been found that some advice situations have more topics than others. The situation with more advice topics is the one referred to as personal. This is because people are always very keen to give more advice to people with personal problems than to people with other problems. The situations with the least number of topics are abuse and teachers, because they are very sensitive in nature. The study found that the sensitivity comes from the fact that third parties are involved. People tend to be reluctant to give advice which might lead to confrontation between the parties that are involved. In this research, the parties that are involved are learners on the one side and the parents/teachers on the other side. The other factor is that people do not want to see a parent who is abusing his/her child going to jail or a teacher who does not like a particular child losing his/her job because of the advice they gave to the learners.

OPSOMMING

Hierdie studie fokus op die kommunikatiewe prosesse van advies in isiZulu waardeur mense mekaar help met die probleme van die alledaagse lewe, insluitende die wyses waarop steun gekommunikeer word. Wanneer vriende en familielede poog om mekaar te help met probleme, gee hulle dikwels advies.

Binne die veld van die pragmatiek, is advies 'n algemene, maar potensiële gesigs-bedreigende ('face-threatening') respons teenoor 'n vriend of geliefde wat 'n probleem het. Gevolglik is dit nuttig om wyses te identifiseer waarop 'n spreker ontsag mag toon vir gesig ('face') in hierdie soort episode. Advies kan die spreker se outonomiteit bedreig deur die spreker se outoriteit en oplossings neer te druk op die hoorder en dit kan ook kritiek impliseer van die hoorder se emosionele reaksie op hantering van die probleem.

In hierdie studie word een-en-twintig advies episodes van Goldsmith (2000) wat gebruik kan word in verskillende moeilikheidsgesprekke ('trouble talk') in isiZulu ondersoek. Daar is bevind dat sommige advies situasies meer onderwerpe as ander het. Die situasie met meer advies onderwerpe, is die persoonlike situasie. Die rede hiervoor is dat mense altyd meer gretig is om advies te gee aan ander mense met persoonlike probleme as aan mense met ander tipes probleme. Die situasies met die minste getal onderwerpe is 'mishandeling' en 'onderwysers' omdat dit baie sensitiewe onderwerpe is. Die studie bevind dat sensitiwiteit spruit uit die teenwoordigheid van 'n derde party se betrokkenheid. Mense blyk onwillig te wees om advies te gee wat mag lei tot konfrontasie tussen die partye betrokke. In hierdie navorsing, is die betrokke partye leerders, enersyds, en ouers of onderwysers, andersyds. 'n Verdere faktor is dat mense nie wil sien dat 'n ouer wat 'n kind mishandel na die gevangenis gaan nie, of dat 'n onderwyser wat nie van 'n spesifieke kind hou sy/haar werk verloor, weens die advies wat hulle aan die leerders gee nie.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank the Grade 12 learners (2002) at Bantfwabetfu High School and the teachers/members of the Elukwatini Community who made my research a success. I really do appreciate their contribution. This work would not be possible without the assistance of the friendly staff at Stellenbosch University. I owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Dlali (my study leader), Professor Visser (the head of the Department of African Languages) and Miss Vergeer (the course coordinator). They made my study at Stellenbosch University a wonderful experience. Thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1　Aim

The main aim here is to inviestigate in detail the manner in which advice is sought and given in different troubles talk situations. The expression of advice is commonly used and in most cases is influenced by the relationship between the giver and the receiver. The language function of expressing advice is used frequently and openly in a wide range of interpersonal relationships, i.e. among intimates, friends, strangers and with superiors and subordinates. If properly used, the expression of advice can engender feelings of warmth and solidarity. Inappropriate expression of advice can have negative social consequences, sometimes resulting in severing the relationship of speaker and hearer.

Situations in which advice is given in response to a request will be investigated. The investigation here thus will analyse a range of advice expressions in isiZulu. Presentation of a socio-linguistic analysis of the usage of advice expressions in various languages will be made to help achieve a substantial degree of predictability about the usage of advice expressions in isiZulu.

1.2　Method

In this study, five major situations will be selected in which advice is expressed. Such major situations are the following: abuse, teachers, learners, personal and discipline. The following sub-situations in each major situation will be selected:

Major situations		Sub-situations	
1.	Abuse	(a)	Ceating
		(b)	Work
2.	Teachers	(a)	Lazy
		(b)	Prejudiced
3.	Learners	(a)	Nervousness
		(b)	Arrive late

4.	Personal	(a)	Relationship
		(b)	Theft
5.	Discipline	(a)	Strict parents
		(b)	New school

From these situations, a questionnaire will be drawn up which will be answered by 20 students from Bantfwabetfu High School in the Elukwatini Community. The answers in these questionnaires will then be analysed by means of a list of advice functions within the sub-situations, the major situations separately, and lastly with an overview of all situations.

1.3 Organisation of the study

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

Chapter 1: Introduction

This chapter deals with the aims of the study, the method of research and the organisation of the study.

Chapter 2: Speech acts and Politeness theory

In this chapter the works of different pragmaticists on speech acts and the politeness theory will be explored. These pragmaticists are: J. L. Mey (2000), P. Grundy (2000), Rosina Marques Reiter (2000) and J. Thomas (1995). They provide different opinions on how speech acts, including advice, are performed. They also examine the level of politeness which is involved when speech acts are performed. Mey (2000) and Thomas (1995) use A. J. R Searle's (1969) speech act theory as a point of departure in their investigation of speech acts. As far as the politeness theory is concerned, the pragmaticists like Grundy (2000), Reiter (2000) and Thomas (1995), give a lot of attention to Brown and Levinson's (1977, 1980, 1983) works on politeness.

Chapter 3: The speech act of advice

In this chapter, the focus will be on the works of pragmaticists like Hernandez – Flores (1999), De Capua & Dunham (1993), Goldsmith (1999, 2000) and Goldsmith & McGeorge (2000). These pragmaticists investigate the speech act of advice in detail. They look into how advice

is solicited or given. They all conducted research on this, and then came up with data which put them in a position to make informed conclusions about the speech act of advice.

Chapter 4: Advice topics in IsiZulu

The main focus of this chapter will be the research which was conducted for the purpose of this study. Details about the research will be provided, viz. the participants, the questionnaire, etc. The findings of the research will then be analysed, including an in depth analysis of different advice topics which were used in various advice situations. The frequency of advice topics in these situations will be determined and an account for those with high frequency will be given.

Chapter 5: Patterns of advice solicitation in IsiZulu

The first subsection in this chapter will be the aims of the chapter. Thereafter, there will be a detailed examination of Goldsmith's (2000) six patterns of advice solicitation, including a definition of each pattern. The subsections 4 – 6 will focus on the ten advice situations which have been mentioned in the previous chapter, and the frequency of advice solicitations in these situations will be determined, followed by an explanation of why some solicitations were used more frequently than others.

Chapter 6: Conclusions

This chapter will provide a summary of the findings in Chapters 4 and 5. These findings show that there were advice topics and advice solicitations which:

  (a) Had the highest frequency
  (b) Had been used only a few times
  (c) Had never been used at all

An explanation of why the use of advice topics and advice solicitations varied like this will then be provided.

Bibliography

This will be the last section of the study. All references, i.e. books and journals, which were used in this study, will be listed here.

CHAPTER 2

SPEECH ACTS AND POLITENESS THEORY

Aim

This chapter explores the work which has been written by various pragmaticits on speech acts and the politeness theory. These pragmaticists are: J. Thomas (1995), P. Grundy (2000), R. M. Reiter (2000) and J. L. Mey (2000). They did a lot of investigation about speech acts and the politeness theory, which was used as a point of departure for this thesis.

2.1 THOMAS

2.1.1 A. J. R Searle

Concerning Searle's contribution to pragmatics, Thomas (1995) points out that she is only interested in the theory of indirect speech acts. These are briefly discussed in the following paragraphs.

2.1.1.1 Indirect speech acts

Thomas (1995) points out that Searle defines an indirect speech act as the one that is performed by means of another. To illustrate this the following example is given: A notice which is displayed in the changing rooms at the swimming pool at the University of Warwick says: *Would users please refrain from spitting.* Thomas (1995) feels that this is a directive : *Don't spit* is being given here, however it is performed by means of an interrogative.

2.1.1.2 Searle's conditions for speech acts

According to Thomas (1995), Searle established a set of rules in order to explain how a speech act works. For instance, there are rules which explain the speech act of promising, i.e.:

Propositional act: Speaker (S) predicates a future act (A) of (S).

Preparatory condition: S believes that doing A is in Hearer's (H) best interest and S can do A.

Sincerity condition: S intends to do A.

Essential condition: S undertakes an obligation to do A.

To illustrate this point in practice Thomas (1995) gives an example of an utterance by Francis to Helen: *I'll cook you a curry for dinner tonight.*

Propositional act: Francis (S) refers to a future act (A) (cooking a curry), to be performed by S himself.

Preparatory condition: Francis thinks that cooking curry will be to Helen's benefit, because she'll enjoy it.

Sincerity condition: Francis really intends to make a curry for Helen.

Essential condition: Through the words: *I'll cook you a curry,* Francis undertakes an obligation to make the curry.

Thomas (1995) states that Searle believes that the issues raised about promising are of general application and therefore, it should be possible to establish rules like this for every speech act. Thomas (1995) claims that Searle's work has four interrelated sets of problems:

(a) It is not always possible to distinguish between speech acts.

(b) An attempt to plug all the gaps in his rules leads to a complex collection of ad hoc conditions.

(c) Searle's conditions may exclude some perfectly normal instances of a speech act, but permit anomalous use.

(d) Searle's rules do not consider the fact that the same speech act verb may cover a range of slightly different phenomena and that some speech acts *overlap*.

2.1.1.3 Distinguishing speech acts

Thomas (1995) feels that Searle's rules do not always distinguish clearly among speech acts which, although they may be related, are not interchangeable at all. Thomas (1995) claims that some speech acts are related because they share some key features, e.g. *ask, request, order, command, suggest:* all share an attempt by the speaker (S) to bring about action (A) on the part of the hearer (H).

Thomas (1995) points out that in cases where the power relationship between the interactants is contested, there is no guarantee that the order/command will be successful. To illustrate this an example is given. This is an interaction between the Mother Superior and Commander Dalgliesh at a convent in connection with an interview between a nun and the commander:

". . . with a little nod, she said: " I'll send Sister Agnes to you. It's a lovely day, perhaps you would care to walk together in the rose garden." It was, Dalgliesh recognised, a command not a suggestion. According to Thomas, (1995) both these interactants have a lot of authority due to their positions. Even though the commander does recognise that the utterance is intended to be a command he does not necessarily accept that the Mother Superior has any authority over him, however he decides not to assert his own authority (he can interview a witness when and where he wants) and does as she wishes.

According to Thomas (1995), it is difficult to see what additional preparatory conditions could be introduced to distinguish "request" unproblematically from "invite" or "demand". Thomas (1995) feels that it is only the essential condition which can distinguish one speech act from another, totally unrelated one, e.g. "congratulate" can only be distinguished from "compliment" by modifying the essential condition:

Propositional act – some event (E) related to (H).
Preparatory condition – (E) is in (H's) interest and (S) believes (E) is in (H's) interest.
Sincerity condition – (S) is pleased at (E).
Essential condition – Counts as an expression of pleasure at (E) (Congratulate)
                                   - Counts as a commendation of (E) or tribute to (H) (Compliment)

2.1.1.4 Plugging the gaps in Searle's rules

Thomas (1995) levels a lot of criticisms at Searle's rules because she claims that they fail to distinguish between speech acts and they cover only paradigm cases of speech acts. Thomas (1995) feels, however that these shortcomings in Searle's rules should provide an argument for improving the rules than simply dismissing a rule – governed approach altogether.

Thomas (1995) asks whether it is possible to extend Searle's conditions to cover some of the subtleties of a speech act. In the following section, Thomas (1995) establishes a set of Searlian conditions for the speech act of apologising.

2.1.1.5 The speech act of apologising: a case study

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 – (S) regrets A
Essential condition – Counts as an apology for (A), e.g.:

Pat to Michael – " I'm sorry I broke your nose"
Propositional act – S (Pat) expresses regret for a past act (breaking Michael's nose)
Preparatory condition – Pat believes that breaking Michael's nose was not in Michael's best interest.
Sincerity condition – Pat is sorry she broke Michael's nose.
Essential condition – In saying: "I'm sorry I broke your nose", Pat apologises to Michael.

Thomas (1995) points out that Searlian rules can cope well with the simple example above; however, there are many examples of apologies that don't fit the Searlian rules. To illustrate this Thomas (1995) examines one condition at a time.

2.1.1.5.1 Propositional act

Thomas (1995) feels that the act of apologising does not necessarily have to be performed by the speaker because there are many cases where people apologise on behalf of those close to them, like relatives, children, associates, etc. Some people even apologise for things they can't control, such as the behaviour of others, the weather, etc. According to Thomas, (1995) the act does not necessarily have to be a past act because some people do apologise for a present or a future act. Thomas (1995) asks whether the speaker must always express regret explicitly. She cites cases whereby an apology is not done formally, but the hearer decides to accept an utterance as such. Thomas (1995) illustrates her points with the following example.

Tucker was served with a paternity suit by another woman, which made Tucker's wife decide to leave him. Later on she changes her mind and goes back to Tucker. The blood tests also prove that Tucker is not the father.

Tucker: "It's not my baby, Donna"

Donna:" Is that *sorry*?"

According to Thomas (1995) Tucker's words have only the potential to act as an apology, and become one when Donna chooses to take them as such.

2.1.1.5.2 Preparatory condition

Thomas (1995) points out that there are cases when the speaker does not believe that the act is to the hearer's disadvantage but apologises, anyway.

2.1.1.5.3 Sincerity condition

According to Thomas (1995), people say sorry sometimes even when they are not, and she does not think that one can deny that they did apologise.

2.1.1.5.4 Essential condition

Thomas (1995) feels that it is not always necessary to utter specific words to apologise. Some people become extra nice to those they have disappointed. Some send flowers, chocolates, etc. Thomas (1995) regards an attempt to expand Searle's rules to reflect the operation of the act of apologising in everyday life as too complex, vague and unworkable. Thomas (1995) feels that formal rules are so general in their specification that they fail to eliminate anomalous use.

2.1.1.6 Over – generality of rules

To illustrate the over – generality of Searle's rules Thomas (1995) gives the following anomalous example which can't be eliminated by these rules: *Before the British General*

Elections in 1983 Neil Kinnock, the leader of the Labour Party at that time, issued a series of explicit warnings – "If Margareth Thatcher wins on Thursday, I warn you not to be ordinary. I warn you not to be young, I warn you not to be ordinary. I warn you not to fall ill, and I warn you not to grow old" Thomas (1995) points out that although these warnings are extremely peculiar they do observe all Searle's conditions of "warning".

Propositional act – Future event or state, (E)
Preparatory condition – H has reason to believe E will occur and is not in H's interest.
Sincerity condition – S believes E is not in H's best interest.
Essential condition – Counts as an undertaking to the effect that E is not in H's best interest.

Thomas (1995) notes that the conditions specified for warning could also apply to other related speech acts (informing, advising, cautioning, counselling) and also to unrelated speech acts, e.g. putting a curse on someone. Thomas (1995) criticizes Searle for being over – specific and over – general, and that the conditions exclude valid instances of a speech act and include invalid or anomalous ones. Thomas (1995) sees the reason for this as the fact that Searle treats speech acts as if they were clearly – defined categories with clear – cut boundaries, whereas boundaries between "commanding, ordering, requesting, asking and inviting" are blurred, overlapping fluid: the same speech act verb may cover a range of slightly different phenomena. To illustrate this Thomas (1995) gives the following mini – case study of "warning".

2.1.1.7 The speech act of warning – a case study

Thomas (1995) points out that Searle fails to mention the fact that there are two different types of "warning", with different grammatical forms and different conditions. There are type 1 "warnings" where one can't avoid an event itself, e.g. *Dennis Healy, Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Labour Government: "I warn you there will be howls of anguish from 80,000 people who are rich enough to pay over 75% on the last slice of their income".* Thomas (1995) states that type 1 warnings take grammatical form of either declarative or imperative.

According to Thomas (1995) type 2 warnings are designed to stop an unpleasant event from happening, e.g. ". . . told him to go immediately to wherever it was this boy lived and warn him

that if he did not stop the police would be informed. Type 2 warnings often appear either as negative imperative (e.g. Don't lean out of the train window – danger of decapitation!) Type 2 warnings have an additional preparatory condition, viz. It is within the power of those warned to avoid future event.

Thomas (1995) points out that in English there are interesting cases where the two variants of the verb "to warn" appear to overlap, e.g. *When stuffing himself with cakes at tea, Sylvia warned him, "You'll be sick tomorrow", "I'll be sick tonight", replied Jack cheekily.* Here it is not clear whether Jack has already eaten so many cakes that the result is inescapable (Type 1), or whether, if he stopped guzzling now, he could avoid being sick (Type 2).

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

Thomas (1995) states that the reasons for categorizing a particular locution as performing one speech act rather than another are complex, and this was clear when the speech act of "apologising" was dealt with.

To illustrate the complexity of the categorization of speech acts, Thomas (1995) uses the speech act of "lying" as an example. She mentions a case of Alice where she withholds important information from her husband in connection with their relationship. Although Alice does not say anything that is untrue, Thomas (1995) feels that she has lied because her goal was to deceive her husband, and to Thomas (1995) when it comes to intimate relationships, anything other than the whole truth functions as a lie.

Thomas (1995) then mentions a case where an official of the England athletics team also withheld vital information from the public concerning a British athlete who was sent home from the Commonwealth Games for failing a drugs test. The official only mentioned a family bereavement, which was true, but was not the main reason why the athlete was sent home. Thomas (1995) feels that the official can't be condemned for lying in this case since she had nothing to gain form her utterance, and it is also her job to protect the interests of team members.

Thomas (1995) claims that emotional (affective) factors also play a role when it comes to the categorization of speech acts. She points out that it is less likely for people to classify in a negative way the behaviour of people they like or respect.

Thomas (1995) feels that there are contexts in which people don't actually expect the whole truth to be told. She gives satirical comedy and funeral orations as examples. Thomas (1995) points out that people tend not to tell the whole truth when they are trying to avoid hurting the hearer's feelings or to avoid revealing something learned in confidence.

According to Thomas (1995), Searle's rules are able to cope only with the most typical instances of a speech act and fail to distinguish adequately between one speech act and another. Thomas (1995) argues that the whole approach to describing speech acts in terms of rules was misconceived, as different types of criteria are involved.

2.2 Speech Acts – J. L. Mey (2000)

2.2.1 History and introduction

2.2.1.1 Why speech acts?

In this section, Mey (2000) focuses on philosopher J. L. Austin's "Ordinary Language Philosophy", which is also known as the "speech act theory". This theory was later on further developed and codified by another philosopher known as J. R. Searle.

During the period of the two philosophers mentioned above researchers were faced with problems of the limitations imposed on linguistic thinking by a semantics, which was based on truth conditions. Philosophers were mainly concerned about propositions called declaratives. The truth and falsity of these declaratives had to be testable, e.g. If a person says: "Its cold outside", the truth or the falsity thereof can be tested immediately by going outside. However, there are other utterances whose truth or falsity can't be tested easily, e.g. "Wishes" like: "Good luck, Well done," etc. These are not propositions but they are speech acts.

2.2.1.2 Language in use

According to Mey (2000), many linguistic theories describe languages as combinations of sound and meaning. This description is not good enough as it ignores the fact that language is an activity that produces speech acts which can be described as "the basic units of linguistic communication" (Searle 1969)

Mey (2000) also mentions the fact that speech acts are produced in actual situations of language use by people who have something in mind. This means that there are human agents who are "producers" and "consumers" whose intentions are relevant and indispensable to the correct understanding and description of their utterances.

Mey (2000) thinks it is important to ask how speech acts function in society. This presupposes the examination of the conditions that hold for communication in that society. Speech acts which are used depend on the context of the situation in which such acts are produced, which implies that circumstances surrounding the individual utterances as well as the incorporation of the general conditions which allow a particular act of speaking, should be taken into account.

Intentionality should take into account the relationships between individuals to whom the intentions are ascribed and of the ways they perceive the others as "intentional" beings in great societal context. Though speech is a component of individual and social life, it should always be remembered that it is part of larger context.

2.2.1.3 How speech acts function

Mey (2000) describes speech acts as verbal actions that take place in the world, and an utterance of such acts is a performance of an activity that will bring about change in the status quo.

According to Mey (2000), Austin (1962) made the first distinction between different aspects of speech acting. First, there is the locutionary aspect which is just the activity that one engages in when one says something, e.g. "It is cold in here". The fact that the above utterance is only

a statement and not a wish, promise or judgement gives the utterance an illocutionary force. The utterance may also have a perlocutionary aspect which happens when someone is pushed into action because of the utterance, e.g. If someone closes the door.

When one re – examines illocutionary force one realises that there are certain conditions that must exist, before a speech act is said. These conditions are referred to as felicity conditions, e.g. *Uttering the words: " I hereby pronounce this person dead ".* The conditions for this speech act are that the person who utters the words does have the power to do so, and the words should be uttered in the appropriate circumstances. For instance, the person is a doctor who must determine whether the person who was injured in a car accident is dead or alive.

2.2.2 Promises

Mey (2000) states that the wording in speech acts can be very problematic due to the fact they can cause misunderstanding, e.g. "I promise". Mey (2000) asks whether the word "promise" is necessary in the speech act "promise". Can one trust people to keep a promise even when they have not said the word "promise"?

According to Mey (2000), there are many ways to make a promise. It is only the context which can determine whether a particular expression is a promise or not.

2.2.2.1 A speech act's physiognomy: promising

2.2.2.1.1 Introduction: the problem

In speech acts the following questions are usually asked:
- How can a speech act be determined?
- How many speech acts are there?
- What is the relationship between a speech act and a pragmatic act?
- Are there speech acts that are found across languages?

To deal with the first question a model speech act "the promise" will be chosen and the conditions governing its use will be explored below.

2.2.2.1.2 Promises: conditions and rules

The first problem is: What are the conditions for a speech act to count as a promise? The second problem is: What rules govern a successful use of this speech act? Mey (2000) points out that Searle (1969) names the following nine conditions:

Condition 1: Speakers must know how to deal with their languages. They must not have any handicaps. They must refrain from making jokes or some kind of "acting".

Condition 2: The promise should have content.

Condition 3: The content of a promise must have something to do with a future, possible action of the speaker.

Condition 4: What is being promised should be to the advantage of the "promisee".

Condition 5: The content should not be something that will clearly happen anyway.

Condition 6: The promiser should be sincere in carrying out the act of promising.

Condition 7: The promiser intends to put himself/herself under obligation of carrying out the promised act. (essential condition)

Conditions 8 and 9: The language used must be the normal one. The conventions for using that language should be pragmatically correct.

Mey (2000) points out that Searle (1969) names the following rules governing the use of promissory 'illocutionary force indicating device' (IFID):

Rule 1: This rule states that promissory IFIDs should only be used when the content of the utterance concerns something which will happen in future. (content rule)

Rule 2: Only use the IFIDs when the promise contains something that the promiser wants to happen to him/her. (preparatory rule)

Rule 3: Only use an IFID when the content does not concern the occurrence of an already scheduled, self – justifying or natural happening. (preparatory rule)

Rule 4: Only use the IFID if the promise is uttered and recognised as creating an obligation from the promiser to the promisee. (essential rule)

2.2.2.1.3 The pragmatics of rules

Mey (2000) points out that the first four rules are "regulative", whereas the fifth one is "constitutive". Taking the game of chess as an example, a constitutive rule is the one that makes the game of chess as that particular game and no other. In contrast, a regulative rule regulates the behaviour of the players in the game.

Mey (2000) agrees with the fact that promises can be broken despite the presence of rules. Therefore, it is important to focus on the promisee rather than the promise itself.

Mey (2000) argues that regulative and constitutive rules are not easily separable as the regulative rules define what the constitutive rules say they do; but the constitutive rules determine the weight that is given to those rules in the daily exercise of them.

2.2.3 Speech act verbs

2.2.3.1 The number of speech acts

Of the questions mentioned by Mey (2000) in the previous section the second one is: How many speech acts are there, and how are they expressed in a language? There have been many suggestions offered as to the number of principal speech acts in a particular language.

This is because of various classificatory criteria. There are classifiers called "lumpers" i.e. those that lump together their speech acts in a few, large categories. The second group is the "splitters", i.e. those that split up their speech acts in a great number of classes.

2.2.3.2 Speech acts, speech act verbs and performativity

Mey (2000) feels that it seems natural to look for expressions of linguistic activity among the numbers of the verb category, and thus call those that denote speech acts (SA) "speech act verbs (SAV). These verbs are also called "performatives" because they deal with doing something. According to Mey (2000), there is a certain asymmetry in the relationship between SAVs and SAs because not all SAs are represented by specific SAV. Thus the SA of "ordering" may be expressed in various ways by a direct "ordering" verb or by a "normal" verb in the imperative or even by a circumlocution:" *I order you to shut the door"/"Shut the door"/"You will shut the door":* All these utterances express the same order.

According to Mey (2000), the asymmetry could also be caused by the fact that not every SA has a corresponding custom – made SAV of its own, e.g. The jury is said to be rendering a "verdict", but there is no SAV in "verdict".

Mey (2000) discovered that among the more standard SAVs there are such verbs as "to announce", "to declare", etc. The question then is: Are these always performative?, e.g. If someone says: "I hereby declare this bridge open", there is some kind of performance, however, if the person says: : "He declared himself to be innocent", it is difficult to accept such words as containing a performative verb.

According to Mey (2000), some verbal expressions tend to deny what they are doing, or they do what they are explicitly denying, e.g. " I don't want to bother you, but could you please have a look at my program?

2.2.3.3 Speech acts without SAVs

According to Mey (2000), there is an assumption that SAVs are not necessary as a special category of verbs since performativity is all over the verbal spectrum. There are verbal

expressions that behave like SAVs but are stylistic or are other variations on a common semantic theme, e.g. Saying: "I want to express my gratitude for your valuable assistance" or with the same effect "I want to thank you for your help"

There are also locutions like "to express one's intentions", "to utter a warning", etc. where a simple verb could do the same as "notifying", "warning", etc. Mey (2000) also mentions the fact that individual languages handle the same semantic units in entirely different ways when it comes to expressing them verbally, e.g. "to study" = Danish "at studere" vs. French "faire ses e'tudes" (to do one's study).

Mey (2000) also states that there are "verbless expressions like Thanks" and it is doubtful whether such utterances are verbs, let alone SAV. Mey (2000) feels that speech acts and SAVs only make sense when they are used in their proper contexts. As isolated lexical items, or members of a set they seem to tell very little. Even if one observes an SAV in some linguistic connection, one should not believe a speech act to be taking place before one has created the appropriate context.

Mey (2000) further states that the "surface" form of a particular linguistic expression does not necessarily tell the truth about what it is doing. Sometimes when attempting to find out the type of speech act, one is confronted with, one may have to disregard that form, and instead examine the "deeper" or "implied" meaning.

2.2.4 Indirect speech acts

2.2.4.1 Recognising indirect speech acts

According to Mey (2000), if one says: "Could you move over a bit?", one does not expect an answer with "yes" then not followed by even a slight movement. That would be a very inappropriate answer. If the person did not move but did not give an answer that would be acceptable. The question asked above was simply an indirect order to move hence it is called an "indirect speech act". Mey (2000) then asks how such indirect expressions are recognisable, e.g. IF someone says : "Lets go to the movies tonight" and the friend replies: " I have to study for an exam", how can it be known whether the second utterance is a rejection

of the proposal contained in the first, while seeming to be completely unrelated to it and not containing an overt or hidden expression of negation.

Mey (2000) points out that the first way of dealing with the above problem is the philosophical – semantic one; which is based on strict reasoning and certain basic principles of logic. The second way is the pragmatic way of looking at the problem which takes its point of departure in what people actually say and do with their words. These two approaches will be dealt with below:

2.2.4.2 The ten steps of Searle

Searle sees indirect speech acting as a combination of two acts viz. primary illocutionary act and secondary illocutionary; where the primary act operates through and in force of the secondary one. The second illocutionary act is literal whereas the primary act is not. The question now is: How does the listener understand the non – literal primary act from the literal secondary act? To answer this a ten step pyramid of reasoning was built. In these steps A is the proposer and B is the rejecter.

Step 1: A utters a suggestion (going to movies) and B utters a statement (studying for exam). These are bare facts.

Step 2: A assumes B to be co – operative because his answer is relevant.

Step 3: Relevant answers are found among: acceptance, rejection, etc.

Step 4: None of the relevant answers in step 3 matches the actual answer given, so that the latter must be said to be one of these.

Step 5: It must therefore be assumed that B means more by uttering his statement than what it says at face value.

Step 6: It is known that one needs time to study for an exam, and going to movies may result in loss of study time.

Step 7: There is a possibility that B can't combine the two things, i.e. studying and going out.

Step 8: Preparatory conditions for any speech act have something to do with the ability and willingness to do what is proposed.

Step 9: It can be inferred that B's utterance means he can't accept the proposal

Step 10: It should be concluded that B's primary intention has been to reject A's proposal.

2.2.4.3 The pragmatic way

Mey (2000) states that as indirect speech acts direct realisations of the illocutionary force one could ask whether it would not be wiser to concentrate on the pragmatic aspects of that force rather than try to establish semantic and syntactic criteria for speech acts and SAVs. However, there are drawbacks in such an approach, i.e. loss of the original insights about speech acts. Mey (2000) sees such a drawback as unreal, as a truly pragmatic approach would concentrate on what users do. Users would be seen as part of world usage.

Mey (2000) notes that the real performative value of a linguistic prime such as the SAV "to baptize" is restricted. The performance of the act of "baptizing" is closely bound with the utterance of precisely the words "I baptize thee". This language guarantees and vouchsafes the exercise of a highly specific speech act; however, it can only achieve this performance as the legalized embodiment of a highly institutionalised social function. In less fossilised situations language use relies heavily on interaction in order to be effective: surroundings like a physician's office provide a lot of evidence.

A situation like a medical interview depends on two facts: first, the power that "one brings with one", in virtue of one's status, e.g. as a physician or a patient; second, successful negotiation in the course of the interview. This relation is both asymmetrical and mutual: the doctor relies on the patient for obtaining important information just as much as the patient depends on the doctor for obtaining the remedy he/she seeks for his/her ailments.

According to Mey (2000), the criterion of strict performativity is inadequate. The only decent characterisation of good answer to a question is: one which all the participants in a particular context of question asking and answering find acceptable.

Mey (200) concludes that indirect speech acts are not abnormal cases, but the problem cases are those that were earlier thought of as "normal" because they seemed to conform to the standard set for speaking with the proper illocutionary force. The "normalcy" of speech acting does not strictly depend on a particular verbalisation; in fact indirect speech can be a much more effective way of getting one's act together using a regular SA.

2.2. 5 Classifying speech act

2.2.5.1 The illocutionary verb fallacy

According to Mey (2000), Searle seems to be satisfied about Austin's original classification of speech acts. Searle is not happy about the fact that Austin does not pay attention to the difference between speech acts and SAVs; the existence or the non – existence of the latter can't be a criterion for the existence or non - existence of a particular speech act.

Mey (2000) states that Leech also criticises Austin for committing the mistake of supposing that verbs correspond one to one with categories thus confusing speech acts and SAVs.

Concerning the problem of different kinds of speech acting and their relationships to illocutionary verbs, Searle issues a general warning: Differences in illocutionary verbs are a good guide, but by no means a sure guide to differences in the illocutionary acts. Searle enumerates twelve dimensions along which speech acts can be different, such as illocutionary point, etc.

2.2.5.2 Searle's classification of speech acts

Mey (2000) points out that out of his twelve criteria Searle only uses four which lay the foundation for a better classificatory procedure:
- Illocutionary point (the force of speech acts in Austin's terminology)
- Direction of fit (the way the speech fits the world)
- Expressed, psychological state (a belief may be expressed as a statement)
- Content (what the speech is about)

The fifth criterion which could be mentioned is that of "reference" (to both hearer and speaker) since speakers and hearers are the principal actors on the speech acting scene.

The sixth criterion is: contextual conditions of speech acting (the societal frame – work in which a speech act has to be performed in order to be valid)

According to Mey (2000), Searle ends up establishing the following five speech act categories:

- Representatives
- Directives
- Commissives
- Expressives
- Declaratives

2.2.5.2.1 Representatives

Mey (2000) describes speech acts of representatives as assertions about the state of affairs in the world and thus carry the values "true or false". Assertions may represent a subjective state of mind: the speaker who asserts to a proposition as true does so in force of his or her belief. As a result there are many statements for which the "true/false" criterion does not hold. Is a complaint true or false? Mey (2000) states that a complaint is justified if only the content of the complaint is truthful, i.e. represents the world in a true manner; but that is not the same as saying the complaint is true.

2.2.5.2.2 Directives

Mey (2000) says that these speech acts embody an effort on the part of the speaker to get the hearer to do something or to reach some goal which is the illocutionary point. At the extreme end of this category, there are the classical imperatives. Imperatives change the world because they make things happen according to one's wishes.

2.2.5.2.3 Commissives

Mey (2000) sees commissives as operating a change in the world by means of creating an obligation. This obligation is created in the speaker not in the hearer. A promise is a commissive. Directives and commissives both fall under the category of obligatives.

2.2.5.2.4 Expressives

According to Mey (2000), expressives express the inner state of the speaker. This expression is subjective and it says nothing about the world. An expression like "excuse me" does not really change anything. The criterion of "fit" is not applicable here. Expressives do show a truth of some kind. For instance, being congratulated on an exam, does mean that one did pass the exam.

2.2.5.2.5 Declaratives

According to Mey (2000), declaratives do change the world, e.g. "I declare this bridge open". The bridge which was not an opened bridge before is now an opened bridge. Declarative do have to obey some conditions, for instance the person who issues a declaration must have the power to do so.

2.2.6 Austin and Searle

In spite of all criticism towards Austin, Mey (2000) still believes that Austin did make an important discovery when he stated that language is an instrument of action, not just speaking. This discovery has not diminished over time.

Mey (2000) feels that in one respect Searle's taxonomy is superior to Austin's as it is more oriented towards the real world because it takes its point of departure in what actually is the case viz. that people perform a speech act whenever they use language, irrespective of the performative criterion.

As a criticism to Searle, Mey (2000) points out that both Austin and Searle had certain objectives in describing language, which did not always seem relevant. They operate on the "one sentence, one case principle", i.e. they use sentences that are characteristic of the case under discussion, e.g. a particular speech act. This case approach has over years, with the development of pragmatic linguistics, been proved to have many shortcomings. For instance, when discussing "promises" both Searle and Austin limit themselves to one single instance, i.e. one isolated utterance of promising. Examining promises from a different

perspective one notices that the context in which a promise is made is very important for its status as a promise and for its binding effects.

Mey (2000) concludes by stating that pragmaticists should pay more attention to contextual conditions when describing speech acts and also in people's use of language. Mey (2000) further states that if contextual conditions for a particular speech act being realised are not met, then there is simple no speech act no matter what is said or written.

2.3 Politeness theory

2.3.1 Grundy (2000)

2.3.1.1 Politeness phenomena

Grundy (2000) points out that according to linguists like Lakoff (1972) politeness principles have wide descriptive power about language use. Leech (1983) considers these principles to be major determinants of linguistic behaviour. Brown and Levinson (1987) believe such principles have universal status. Grundy (2000) considers all these claims, whether true or false, as the starting point for his study.

Grundy (2000) considers politeness phenomena as a paradigm example of pragmatic usage. Grundy (2000) also sees these phenomena as one manifestation of wider concept of etiquette, or appropriate behaviour.

2.3.1.2 The effects of politeness

Grundy (2000) believes that politeness does not affect people in the same manner because polite utterances encode the relationship between speaker and addressee. Strategies employed by people to address one another will always differ, depending on their relationship. Utterance by strangers will have different effects to those of friends or relatives.

Grundy (2000) states that politeness is the term used to describe the extent to which actions, including the way things are said, match addressee's perceptions of how they should be performed.

2.3.1.2.1 Dealing with compliments

Grundy (2000) feels that men and women deal with compliments differently, as men tend to see compliments as threatening whereas women see them as means of expressing rapport or solidarity. Grundy (2000) illustrates this point by giving an example of a conversation between himself and a tea – lady at work. The tea – lady compliments him on his politeness but instead of thanking the lady he demurs and says: "It is not what they say at home".

2.3.1.2.2 Unequal encounters

Grundy (2000) illustrates these encounters using the following conversation between himself and a superior colleague about a new photocopier.

Peter: It is brilliant this machine, is n't it?
Dean: Yes it has a mind of its own.
Peter: That's also true.

Grundy (2000) takes a positive view of the world with the utterance: :It's brilliant this machine" to convey some respect to Dean and attaches the tag, is n't it? To allow Dean to give a second opinion if he wishes, which he does because he found the machine more complex than brilliant. As a further sign of showing respect to his superior colleague, Grundy speaks first when he meets Dean in the corridor.

2.3.1.2.3 The preference for agreement

Grundy (2000) points out that even though in the conversation with the Dean they had different opinion, their utterances show an attempt to avoid disagreeing with each other. Grundy (2000) considers this fact to be a strong motivation in polite exchanges.

2.3.1.2.4 Minimizing face loss

Grundy (2000) believes that speakers tend to offer each other something they have not asked for by way of redress rather than tell each other they can't satisfy each other's needs. In this manner they minimise face loss, for example, a conversation in a coffee shop goes like this:

Peter: Are there any bacon buns?
Assistant: Only sausage.

In this exchange, the offer itself as well as the implicit apology show politeness. Grundy (2000) also thinks that politeness very often occurs where there is a difficult of some kind.

2.3.1.3 Brown and Levinson's model of politeness

Grundy (2000) considers Brown and Levinson's (1978, 1987) work as the most fully elaborated on linguistic politeness phenomena used to support an explanatory model capable of accounting for any instance of politeness.

Grundy (2000) further states that Brown and Levinson work with Goffman's notion of "face" which is broadly comparable to self – esteem. There are many utterances which threaten the face of the person to whom they are directed, as a result speakers tend to use redressive language to compensate for the threat to face and thus satisfy the face wants of the hearer, e.g. Someone can make a joke out of a serious complaint. Brown and Levinson divide face into two, i.e. "positive" face and "negative" face. Positive face is described as a person's wish to be well thought of whereas negative face is a person's wish not to be imposed on by others.

Grundy (2000) states that according to Brown and Levinson's model a face – threatening act can be performed in three superordinate strategies viz. *Do the act on record, do the act off record and don't do the act at all.* Performing the act on record seems to be the most usual, and it has three subordinate strategies of its own, i.e. Do the act on record (a) Baldly (b) With positive redress (c) With negative redress.

Grundy (2000) illustrates the use of these strategies by using a conversation between himself and his neighbour who always parked his old, oil spilling car outside Grundy's gate. Grundy (2000) decided against using the bald on record strategy like saying: "Don't park your leaky old banger outside our house anymore". He decided to combine positive and negative strategies in his approach by saying: "I'm sorry to ask, Bill, but do you want us to have the pleasure of admiring your new car from our front room forever? It's just that we've nowhere to park when it's outside our home"

Grundy (2000) uses an apology (negative politeness). "I'm sorry to ask" followed by a joke (positive politeness), which included admiration of his "new" car (positive politeness), minimized by "just" (negative politeness).

2.3.1.3.1 Non – canonical politeness phenomena

According to Grundy, one 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. This is rare in real life. Laughter in sit – coms is one way of marking the incongruous politeness status of an utterance.

Brown and Levinson lists some of positive and negative politeness strategies:

Positive	Negative
Attend to hearer's wants	Be conventionally indirect
Exaggerate interest	Question, hedge
Seek agreement	Give deference
Joke	Apologise
Be optimistic	Be pessimistic

2.3.1.3.2 The universal character of politeness

At the beginning of this section Grundy (2000) did mention the fact that Brown and Levinson believe that politeness phenomena are universal. Grundy believes that if this is true there should be a possibility of extrapolating the intra – societal politeness behaviour in over - and under – class communication to the whole societies.

Grundy (2000) also mentions the criticism levelled against Brown and Levinson's belief that politeness phenomena are universal. Grundy (2000) mentions arguments by Matsumoto (1988) and Gu (1990). Matsumoto (1988) argues that in Japanese the structures associated with negative politeness strategies in Brown and Levinson's model don't have a negative politeness function but instead constitute a social register. Gu (1990) says that the model does not suit Chinese usage because politeness phenomena still reflect to some degree the etymology of the word for politeness, one of whose constituent morphemes (li) denotes social order.

2.3.1.3.3 Redefining the folk term

Grundy (2000) states that from the point of view of pragmaticists politeness is the term used to describe the relationship between how something is said to an addressee and that addresse's judgement as to how it should be said. The theory of politeness is capable of accounting for pragmatic uses of language, but will always be liable to being confused with a prescriptive approach to linguistic etiquette.

2.3.1.3.4 Politeness as merely redressive

According to Grundy (2000), face – wants are satisfied by giving priority to veracity and clarity in certain situations. Thus in casual conversation it is preferred to begin with a safe topic such as weather. Grundy (2000) believes that redressive strategies should be adapted to particular contexts including taking into account the addressee's expectations of how talk should be directed at them. Therefore, an adequately formulated theory of politeness which can account

for the extent to which the things which are said to match the addressee's perceptions of how they should be said would be a strong candidate theory of pragmatic usage.

2.3.2 Thomas (1995)

2.3.2.1 Introduction

Thomas (1995) points out that much has been written about "politeness" and different theories and paradigms have emerged, though very little of this work is based on empirical research. Thomas (1995) feels that this has led to a lot of misunderstandings; the aim of this section is therefore to try and clear up some of the most common misunderstandings.

2.3.2.2 Delimiting the concept of politeness

In attempt to clear up the confusion concerning "politeness", Thomas examines the following five sets of phenomena.

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

2.3.2.2.1 Politeness as a real – world goal

According to Thomas (1995), politeness as a real – world goal has no place within pragmatics because one can't really determine the speaker's motivation of speaking the way he/she does and discussing whether one group is politer than the other is a futile exercise.

2.3.2.2.2 Deference vs. politeness

Thomas (1995) states that although deference is connected with politeness, it is a distinct phenomenon. Deference refers to the respect to people by virtue of their higher status

whereas politeness is a more general matter of showing consideration to others. Thomas (1995) states that ever since present day English was standardised, ceasing to make the T/V distinction (thou/you), virtually no deference forms remain. Deference can still be found in languages like French, German and Russian because they have a T/V system. Exceptions of deference in English are address forms (Doctor, Professor) and "honorifics" like "Sir /Madam".

Thomas (1995) argues that deference has little to do with pragmatics because the speaker has no choice as whether to use the deferent form or not unless he/she deliberately wishes to flout the behavioural norms of a given society. For instance, a soldier has no choice about addressing a superior officer as Sir/Ma'am because in accordance with military discipline it is obligatory to use such forms. Thomas (1995) states that the use of deferent or non – deferent forms has some significance pragmatically only when there is a choice to use such forms.

2.3.2.2.3 Register

Thomas (1995) defines the term register as a systematic variation in relation to social context or the way in which written or spoken language varies according to the type of situation. Thomas (1995) states that certain situations or types of language use, as well as certain social relationships, require more formal language use. As a result, there is little connection between pragmatics and register. Thomas (1995) argues that the 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.

2.3.2.2.4 Politeness as an utterance level phenomena

According to Thomas (1995), much early work in the area of politeness focussed on utterance level realisations. Such work was written by Rintell, Walters and Fraser. Walters (1979) claimed that he was investigating how much politeness could be extracted from a speech act alone. Fraser (1978) asked informants to rate for politeness in various forms of request (Would you X?, Could you X?, Do X!, etc, where X is some request) for which no context was supplied. These studies found that people showed a high level of agreement about which linguistic forms were most polite, and it was discovered that the more grammatically complex

or elaborate the strategy, the more highly it was rated for politeness. For instance, "I wonder if I might ask you X?", would be counted as more polite than "Please X !", which in turn was ranked as more polite than the imperative "Do X !"

Thomas (1995) feels that the first issue which arises from such studies relates to the pragmatics/socio - linguistic divide: listing linguistic forms has significance to pragmatics only when those forms in a particular language are used strategically in order to achieve the speaker's goal, otherwise they are just socio - linguistic phenomena.

According to Thomas (1995), doing pragmatics requires context, which leads one to the second issue which arises from the afore – mentioned studies. As soon as one puts a speech act in context one can see that there is no necessary connection between the linguistic form and the perceived form of a speech act. Thomas (1995) mentions three reasons for this, which she illustrates in examples. The first reason is illustrated in the following example: *A married couple is trying to decide on a restaurant. The husband says: :You choose".* This is a direct imperative, which would normally be seen as perfectly polite because it is beneficial to the hearer.

The second reason is illustrated is here: *Wife to husband – "Will you be kind enough to tell me what time it is," and later: "If you'll be kind enough to speed up a little".* Taken out of context these forms are more polite than: *"What's the time?" and "Hurry up!",* however in context of an intimate relationship they show irritation and some anger between the two parties.

The third reason why it is unsafe to equate surface linguistic form with politeness is that speech acts seem almost inherently impolite, e.g. There is no polite way of asking someone to stop picking their nose. It is always going to be offensive no matter how one puts it, e.g. *I wonder if I might respectfully request you to stop picking your nose* or *Stop picking your nose!*

Thomas (1995) points out that she does not claim that there is no relationship between surface linguistic form and politeness, e.g. (i) I'm afraid I must ask you to leave.
(ii) Go away !
(iii) Bugger off !

According to Thomas (1995) (i) is likely to be judged as more polite than (ii) or (iii), however, it is debatable whether the utterer of (i) is more motivated by consideration for H than the utterer of (iii), and whether (i) is less hurtful for the hearer than (iii). Thomas (1995) further argues that it is not the linguistic form alone, which renders the speech act polite or impolite, but the linguistic form plus the context of utterance plus the relationship between the speaker and the hearer.

2.3.2.2.5 Politeness as a pragmatic phenomenon

According to Thomas (1995), politeness as a pragmatic phenomenon has been given a lot of attention in recent works by Leech (1980,1977 and 1983) and Brown and Levinson (1978,1987). These works interpret politeness as a strategy used by a speaker to achieve a variety of goals like promoting or maintaining harmonious relations. These strategies include the strategic use of many forms of conventional and non – conventional indirectness. Thomas (1995) has grouped the pragmatic approaches to politeness under four headings: *the "conversational – maxim" view (exemplified by Leech), the "face – management" view (exemplified by Brown and Levinson), the "conversational – contract view (exemplified by Fraser) and the "pragmatic – scales view (exemplified by Spencer – Oatey – 1992)*

2.3.2.3 Politeness explained in terms of principles and maxims

Thomas (1995) states that Leech views politeness as important in explaining why people are often so indirect in conveying what they mean. Leech introduces two concepts which are relevant to the present discussion, i.e. ambivalence and pragmatic principles.

2.3.2.3.1 Ambivalence and politeness

Thomas (1995) describes an ambivalent utterance as the one which has more than one potential pragmatic force. She feels that using such an utterance can help the speaker to convey a message which the hearer is liable to find disagreeable without causing undue offence. Thomas (1995) illustrates this through an example of an ambivalent message. The core of the message is potentially offensive because it requests people not to steal. But

because the pragmatic force in it is ambivalent, it is left to the readers to decide (a) on the precise force of the message, and (b) whether or not it applies to them - This is the message: *Notice in the Junior Common Room, Queens College, Cambridge: "These newspapers are for all students, not the privileged few who arrive first"*

2.3.2.3.2 Pragmatic principles

Under the topic of pragmatic principles, Thomas (1995) examines Leech's Politeness Principle (PP) which runs as follows:" Minimise the expression of impolite beliefs; maximise the expression of polite beliefs". Leech equates the PP to Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP), which it "rescues" by explaining why speakers don't always observe the Gricean maxims. People do respond to considerations of politeness, for instance, people will often explicitly "mark" the fact that they can't or don't intend to observe politeness norms, as in the following example: "Look, there's no polite way of putting this. Your husband and I are lovers and he's leaving you for me".

Thomas (1995) also points out that Leech (1983) introduces a number of maxims which stand in the same relationship to the PP as Grice's maxims (Quantity, Quality, Relationship and Manner) stand to the CP. According to Thomas (1995), Leech argues that these maxims are necessary 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, however, they are not rules for good behaviour. Leech claims that they are just statements of norms which speakers can be observed to follow.

2.3.2.3.2.1 The Tact Maxim

According to Thomas (1995), the Tact maxim states: "Minimise the expression of beliefs which imply cost to the other; maximise the expression of beliefs which imply benefit to the other. Thomas (1995) says that one aspect of the Tact maxim relates to the pragmatic parameter: "size of imposition' where minimisers are used to reduce the implied cost to the hearer, e.g. *Just pop upstairs and. . . ; Hang on a second !; I've got a bit of a problem.*

The second aspect of the Tact maxim is the mitigation of the effect of a request by giving the hearers some options. The two aspects mentioned above may be culture – specific since they may be regarded as polite in one community and as not polite in another community.

The third component of the Tact maxim is the cost/benefit scale: if something is to the hearer's benefit, X can be expressed politely without using indirectness, e.g. Have a chocolate! However if X is costly to the hearer, greater indirectness may be required, e.g. Could I have one of your sandwiches?

2.3.2.3.2.2 The Generosity Maxim

Thomas (1995) points out that Leech's Generosity maxim states: "Minimise the expression of benefit to self; maximise the expression of cost to self". According to this maxim a direct, unmodified imperative like, "Help yourself!" may be regarded as polite whereas when one declares that one is going to help oneself, one may require some degree of indirectness. The extent to which this maxim may be applied may sometimes be language or culture – specific.

2.3.2.3.2.3 The Approbation Maxim

According to Thomas, (1995) this maxim states: "minimise the expression of the beliefs which express dispraise of the other; maximise the expression of beliefs which express approval of the other". One should praise the other and if one can't do that, one should sidestep the issue, give some sort of minimal response e.g. "Well… " or just remain silent. Sometimes the other may not be the hearer but someone or something dear to him or her. Thomas (1995) points out that in most societies it is unacceptable to ask: "Are these talent less children yours"

2.3.2.3.2.4 The Modesty Maxim

The Modesty maxim states: 'Minimise the expression of praise to oneself; maximise the expression of dispraise of self'. Thomas (1995) emphasizes the fact that the application of this maxim is culture – specific. For instance, Leech states that in Japan the Modesty maxim is stronger than in English – speaking societies, where it would be more polite to accept a

compliment by thanking the speaker for it then to go on and deny it. English speakers try to find some compromise between violating the Modesty maxim and violating the Agreement maxim.

2.3.2.3.2.5 The Agreement Maxim

The Agreement maxim states: 'Minimise the expression of disagreement between self and other and maximise the expression of agreement between self and other'. Thomas (1995) points out that it is not being claimed that people avoid disagreeing with one another; however, an observation is that people are more direct in expressing their agreement, than disagreement. For instance, a person who opposes a view which has just been expressed might begin a counter – argument by saying: 'Yes, but…' e.g. Mr. Sharma (Speaker A) to Mrs Green (Speaker B – deputy head teacher of a school).

A:… I don't want my daughter to do CSE, I want her to do 'O' level.

B: Yes, but Mr. Sharma, I thought we resolved this on your last visit.

2.3.2.3.2.6 The Pollyana Principle

According to Thomas, the Pollyana Principle requires people to put the best possible gloss on what they have to say. This may refer to the use of minimisers such as 'bit', e.g. 'This essay is a bit short'; when in fact it is too short. Another aspect of this principle is relexicalisation where an unpleasant term is replaced with less unpleasant one, e.g. 'body – snatcher' can be replaced with 'resurrectionist'. In interpersonal pragmatics, Thomas (1995) managed only to find few examples which made her to conclude that the Pollyana Principle is not widely observed by speakers:

Example 1: The speaker had just lost two hour's work on the word – processor: "Ah, well, I'll probably write it better the second time around"

Example 2: The two speakers were discussing the bad impression, which visitors would gain because of the appalling weather on a University Open Day.

A: They are not exactly seeing the place at its best!

B: Well, at least it's not snowing.

2.3.2.3.3 Problems with Leech's approach

According to Thomas (1995), a major flaw in Leech's approach to politeness is that there is no motivated way of restricting the number of maxims. Thomas (1995) claims that it would be possible to produce a new maxim to explain every tiny perceived regularity in language use, which makes the theory inelegant and at worst virtually unfalsifiable.

2.3.2.4 Politeness and the management of face

Thomas (1995) states that within the politeness theory 'face' can be defined as a person's feelings of self – worth or self – image. This image can be damaged, maintained or enhanced through interaction with others. Thomas (1995) points out that face has two aspects, viz. 'positive' and 'negative'. A person's negative face is reflected in the desire not to be impeded, to have the freedom to act as one wishes. A person's 'positive' face is reflected in his/her desire to be liked, approved of, respected and appreciated by others.

2.3.2.4.1 Face – threatening acts

Thomas (1995) points out that according to Brown and Levinson, certain illocutionary acts are referred to as 'face – threatening acts' (FTAs). An FTA can damage the hearer's positive face, e.g. expressing disapproval of something which H holds dear, or negative face, e.g. impinging up H's freedom of action. FTAs can also damage the speaker's own positive face, e.g. if the speaker (S) has to admit to having botched a job or S's negative face, e.g. if S is cornered into making an offer of help. A speaker can reduce the damage to H's face or to the speaker's own face by using certain strategies. The size of the FTA determines the choice of the strategy to be adopted. S can calculate the size of FTA on the basis of the parameters of power (P), Distance (D) and rating of imposition (R).

2.3.2.4.1.1 Super strategies for performing an FTA

Thomas (1995) states that Brown and Levinson came up with four strategies on how to perform an FTA. The speaker may perform an FTA: bald on record (without any redressive action); on record using positive politeness; on record using negative politeness or off record.

Thomas (1995) also points out that if the speaker decides that the degree of face threat is too great, he or she may decide to avoid the FTA altogether by simply saying nothing.

2.3.2.4.1.2 Performing an FTA without any redress

Thomas (1995) mentions various occasions when FTAs are performed bald on record. One such occasion is when there is an emergency, e.g. The speaker knows that there is a bomb I his racecourse. His nephew is hiding in the stands: "…Toby get off the stands. The stands are not safe. Toby, for Christ's sake do what I say. This is not a game. Come on, you little bugger … for once in your life, be told".

Another occasion when an FTA can be performed bald on record is when the speaker is performing a highly task – oriented situation, like teaching someone to drive.
Thomas also mentions a case where the speaker regards the overall weightiness of the FTA as very small, e.g. An utterance by Thomas's mother to Thomas: "Shut the window, Jen".
An FTA can also be performed bald on record when an act is seen as being in the hearer's interest, e.g. 'Have a chocolate".

According to Thomas (1995) differential can also play a role when it comes to performance of FTAs without redress, e.g. A senior rating officer at a naval detention centre to a prisoner of lower rank: "You are to stand to attention in the centre of your room every time the door is opened. You are to obey all orders given to you by any member of the remand wing staff at all times"

2.3.2.4.1.3 Performing an FTA with redress (positive politeness)

Thomas (1995) also points out in accordance with Brown and Levinson's theory, that a speaker may orient himself towards a hearer's positive face and employ positive politeness (which appeals to H's desire to be liked and approved of),e, g, A male first – year student to a female first – year student in their college bar during "Fresher's Week": "Hey, blondie what are you studying? French and Italian? Join the club!" According to Thomas (1995), the man employs three of Brown and Levinson's positive politeness strategies: 'use in – group identity

markers (blondie)', 'express interest in H' (asking her what she's studying)', 'claim common ground (Join the club)'

2.3.2.4.1.4 Performing an FTA with redress (negative politeness)

According to Thomas (1995) negative politeness is oriented towards a hearer's negative face, which appeals to the hearer's desire not to be impeded, to be left free to act as they choose. Negative politeness manifests itself in the use of conventional politeness markers, deference markers, minimising imposition, etc. Brown and Levinson list a number of negative politeness strategies. The following is one such example of those strategies: Cartoon character Daffy Duck employs the strategy – state FTA as a general rule, to get Sylvester the cat to part with some of his food: 'Friends always share'

2.3.2.4.1.5 Performing an FTA using off – record politeness

Thomas (1995) points out that Brown and Levinson list fifteen strategies for performing off – record politeness, which include giving 'hints', 'using metaphors' and being ambiguous or vague, e.g. One student to another: "That is not a crème egg I can see you eating, is it?

2.3.2.4.1.6 Do not perform an FTA

Sometimes something is potentially so face – threatening that one does not say it at all. Thomas (1995) points out that Tanaka (1993) discusses two sorts of 'saying nothing', termed: the opting out choice" (OOC). Sometimes a speaker says nothing and wishes to let the matter drop, however there are also occasions when one decides to say nothing but still wishes to achieve the effect which the speech act would have achieved had it been uttered. These out of choice strategies are the OOC – genuine and OOC – strategic.

OOC – genuine: S does not perform a speech act, and genuinely intends to let   the matter drop. He/she does not intend to achieve the perlocutionary effect.

OOC – strategic: S does not perform a speech act, but expects A to infer his/her wish to achieve the perlocutionary effect.

2.3.2.4.2 Criticism of Brown and Levinson

The major criticism concerning Brown and Levinson's theory is the fact that they claim that positive and negative politeness are mutually exclusive. Thomas (1995) argues against this claim because she feels that a single utterance can be oriented to both positive and negative face simultaneously, e.g. Woman addressing importunate man: Do me a favour – piss off!"

Thomas (1995) points out that Brown and Levinson predict that the greater the degree of face – threat, the greater will be the degree of indirectness, however, there are many counter – examples that one can find, e.g. Bob Champion, the champion jockey, referring to women jockeys: "I'm dead against them! They are a mistake and get in the way. Women are not strong enough or big enough"

Thomas (1995) also criticises Brown and Levinson for arguing that some speech acts are inherently face – threatening, which leads to the conclusion that there are some utterances which pose no face – threat at all. Thomas (1995) argues against this because she believes that by simply speaking, people trespass on one another's space. Saying anything at all (or simply saying nothing) is potentially face – threatening.

2.3.2.5 Politeness viewed as a conversational contract

Thomas (1995) points out that Fraser (!990) believes that there is a 'conversational contract' (CC) which constrains people in interaction. The CC is the understanding brought by people to an interaction of the norms obtaining within that interaction and of their rights and obligations within it. Thomas (1995) also mentions the fact that Fraser points out that norms of politeness are renegotiable, depending on facts like the status, power and the role of each speaker and the nature of the circumstances.

2.3.2.6 Politeness measured along pragmatic scales

Thomas (1995) points out that Spencer – Oatey (1992) argues that the manner in which Brown and Levinson (1987) and Leech (1983) formulated their politeness theories left them open to being criticised for being culturally biased, e.g. "autonomy" is highly valued in

Western society, but not always within Oriental cultures. Spencer – Oatey (1992) proposes three sets of dimensions to overcome the problems of cultural – specificity. According to these dimensions, people will select the point on the scale according to their cultural values and the situation within which they are operational.

Here are the scales:

1. Need for consideration;   autonomy – imposition

2. Need to be valued: approbation - criticism

                                Interest – disinterest

3. Need for Relational Identity: inclusion – exclusion

                                Equality – superordination/subordination

2.3.2.7 Conclusion

According to Thomas (1995), people define 'politeness' as a pragmatic/communicative phenomenon and do not equate it with any moral/psychological disposition towards being nice to one's interlocutor. Thomas (1995), however, believes that outside pragmatics this specialised conception of politeness is misinterpreted. Pragmaticists are accused of having a vision of society where everyone is nice and kind to everyone else. Thomas (1995) argues that all that is being claimed is that people use certain strategies for reasons of expediency. Thomas (1995) points out that she prefers terminology that does not commit the analyst to any view of the psychological disposition of the speaker, but instead relates pragmatic choice to discourse goals. Thomas (1995) mentions Pyle (1995) as the one who proposed such an approach, putting forward an argument that people use indirectness when their communicative goals conflict, for instance, when their desire to avoid hurting someone's feelings conflicts with their obligation to tell the truth. To illustrate this Thomas (1995) gives the following examples:

A: A notice displayed in a four – star London hotel: "Dear Guests, we have found it necessary to introduce an anti – theft alarm system on our colour televisions. We would therefore ask you not to disconnect this set. Thank you for your cooperation.

B: Interview by Ann Cadwalida

Asked if Libya had supplied weapons to the IRA, Colonel Gadaffie did n't reply directly: "I am obliged to support the Irish cause, a just cause"

In the first example, the hotel wants to warn guests not to steal the TV, but they use indirectness due to the fear of offending their law – abiding guests. The politeness theory can explain this indirectness convincingly. However, the indirectness in the second example is less readily explained by politeness, but it seems to be a case of clash of goals. Gadaffie conveys the message that he did supply weapons to the IRA, without going on record, because he might perhaps have to deny it in future.

2.3.3 Rosina Marques Reiter (2000)

2.3.3.1 Politeness: social or individual entity?

According to Reiter (2000), politeness refers directly or indirect to society. Even though the act of being polite is performed by an individual it is socially determined and geared towards restructuring of social interaction. The act of politeness is set upon a standard which is based on collective values or norms acquired by the individual early in his life.

Reiter (2000) states that politeness is not a characteristic inherent to the action itself but is constituted by an interactional relationship which is based upon a standard shared, developed and reproduced by individuals within a social group.

To Reiter (2000) politeness is a form of social interaction, a form that mediates between the individual and the social.

2.3.3.2 Lakoff's rules of politeness

Reiter (2000) feels that before examining the linguistic politeness theory it is necessary to mention some of the principles of conversation that are the starting point for some of the explanation of politeness phenomena.

Reiter (2000) also mentions a pragmaticist called Grice (1975) who made an important contribution to the study of pragmatics through his Co – operative Principle (CP) and his maxims of conversation which were formulated on the assumption that the main purpose of conversation is "the effective exchange of information'.

According to Reiter (2000), Lakoff (1973) 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 follows:

1.   Formality: keep aloof
2.   Deference: give options
3.   Camaraderie: show sympathy

Reiter (2000) points out that according to Lakoff Grice's maxims fall under her first rule as they mainly concentrate on the clarity of the conversation. Lakoff does not define the terms she uses. She equates formality with aloofness, camaraderie with showing sympathy without stating how these should work in a particular society. Reiter (2000) feels that this makes it difficult to see how politeness can be expressed in a particular group and thus one can't make claims for the universality of the concept.

According to Reiter (2000), Brown (1976) criticises Lakoff's analysis because she does not offer an integrating theory which places her rules of politeness in a framework explaining their form in terms of social relationships and expectations about humans as interactants.

Reiter (2000) states that Franck (1980) also criticises the fact that Lakoff puts pragmatic rules on a level with other linguistic rules thus losing the distinction between sentence meaning and communicative function.

2.3.3.3 Leech's Principles and Maxims of Interaction

According to Reiter (2000), Leech extends Grice's framework by trying to explain why people usually convey meaning indirectly. He also makes a distinction between a speaker's illocutionary goal and speaker's social goal. He further elaborates a pragmatic framework that

consists of two parts, i.e. textual rhetoric and interpersonal rhetoric. Politeness is treated within the domain of interpersonal rhetoric consisting of three sets of principles, viz. Grice's Co – operative Principle (CP), his own Politeness Principle (PP) and his 'Irony' Principle (IP). The IP allows the speaker to be impolite while seeming to be polite.

According to Reiter (2000) leech regards his PP as having the same status as the CP, and he also sees it as the reason for the non – observance of Grice's Maxims. Like the CP, the PP is analysed in terms of maxims: tact, generosity, modesty, sympathy, agreement, etc.

Reiter (2000) points out that Leech's maxims have a set of pragmatic scales which are considered by the hearer to determine the degree of tact or generosity appropriate in a given a speech situation:

1. cost/benefit scale – describes the cost and benefit of action
2. optionality scale – describes the extent to which the action is performed at the choice of the addressee.
3. Indirect scale – describes how much inference is involved in the action
4. authority scale – describes   the degree of distance between the speakers in terms of power over each other
5. Social distance scale – describes the degree of solidarity between the participants

According to Reiter (2000), Leech does note that not all his maxims are of equal importance, for instance the tact maxim is more powerful than the generosity maxim, whereas the approbation maxim is more powerful than the modesty maxim.

According to Reiter (2000), Leech further points out that each maxim comprises of two sub – maxims, e.g. the tact maxim consists of: (a) minimise cost to the other (b) maximise benefit to the other. Leech states that the sub – maxim (b) is less important than (a).

Reiter (2000) states that Leech offers a distinction between absolute and relative politeness. Absolute politeness has a positive and a negative pole since some speech acts are intrinsically polite and other are intrinsically impolite, e.g. offer vs. order. Relative politeness

depends on the context and the situation since the CP and the PP operate differently in different cultures.

2.3.3.4 Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness

According to Reiter (2000), politeness as a linguistic theory was first systematised by Brown and Levinson (1978) through their comparative study of how English, Tamil and Tzeltal speakers departed from the observance of the conversational maxims for motives of politeness. Due to many similarities in the linguistic strategies employed by speakers of these languages, Brown and Levinson ended up assuming the universality of politeness as a regulative factor in conversational exchanges.

2.3.3.4.1 Politeness strategies

Reiter (2000) points out that Brown and Levinson consider all competent adults to have concerns about their face, i.e. the self – image the present to others. They identify two aspects of face, i.e. positive and negative face. Negative face is a person's desire to be unimpeded by others whereas positive face is the person's wish to be desirable to others. Brown and Levinson believe that competent adult members are rational agents. They choose the means of satisfying their goals as efficiently as possible. Brown and Levinson also suggest that certain acts are inherently threatening to the face needs of one or both participants, meaning that they do agree that there is a threat to specific face wants.

Reiter (2000) states that Brown and Levinson also mention the fact that there are face threatening acts (FTAs), which are those acts that run contrary to the addressee's or the speaker's positive or negative face. Acts like requests, orders, advice, etc. can threaten one's negative face whereas acts like apologies and accepting compliments can threaten positive face.

According to Reiter (2000), Brown and Levinson also propose a scale to evaluate the degree of politeness required in a specific situation. Here three "universal", independent and culturally – sensitive social variables, viz. social distance between speaker and hearer (D); relative

power between participants (P); Absolute Ranking of imposition which varies according to culture (R).

Reiter (2000) points out that according to Brown and Levinson, participants as rational agents can choose a set of five possible strategies to either avoid or mitigate FTAs:

1.   Do FTA bald on record
2.   Do FTA with positive politeness
3.   Do FTA with negative politeness
4.   Do FTA off record
5.   Don't do FTA

These strategies are ordered according to the degree of politeness involved. The risk of face loss increases as one moves up the scale from 1 to 5; the greater the risk the more polite the strategy employed.

The first strategy is employed when there is no risk of face loss. The second and third strategies involve redressive action. The fourth strategy is used where the risk of face loss is huge and the communicative act is ambiguous. The fifth strategy includes cases where nothing is said because the risk is too big.

According to Reiter (2000), Brown and Levinson see positive and negative politeness as mutually exclusive since positive politeness is characterised by the expression of approval and appreciation of the addressee's personality by making him/her feel as part of an in – group. Negative politeness on the other hand concentrates on those aspects of the addressee's face wants, which are concerned with the desire not to be imposed upon and is characterised by self – effacement and formality.

CHAPTER 3

THE SPEECH ACT OF ADVICE

3.1 Aim

A lot of research has been conducted on the speech act of advice. The studies of various researchers will be explored in this chapter. Those researchers are: De Capua and Dunham (1993), Goldsmith and Fitch (1997), Goldsmith and McGeorge (2000), Hernandez – Flores (1999), Goldsmith (1999) and Goldsmith (2000). The research by these pragmaticists served as a starting point for the research which was conducted before this thesis was written. The research which was conducted by Goldsmith (19999/2000) was very helpful because it provided the advice topics and advice solicitations which were used to explore different troubles talk situations in people who speak IsiZulu.

3.2 De Capua and Dunham (1993)

3.2.1 Introduction

According to De Capua and Dunham (1993), the word advice refers to opinions or counsel given by people who see themselves as knowledgeable in the specific fields, and / or who are perceived by those seeking advice to be having some credibility, trustworthiness and reliability. The above - mentioned authors try to identify and analyse strategies which are used by speakers when requesting and giving advice. They identify these strategies as being: (a) explanation (b) elaboration (c) narration. They conducted a research on this. The data, which they collected here, deals specifically with sought advice of two radio advice programs on WOR radio in New York City.

3.2.2 Method of collection

DeCapua and Dunham (1993) tape - recorded and transcribed data from two separate radio advice programs hosted by Dr B. Meltzer ("What's your problem ") and Sally Jerry Raphael 'the Sally Jerry Raphael Program). Conversations in a total of ten telephone calls were

analysed. Six calls were to Meltzer [three male callers and three female callers] and four call were to Raphael [two females and two males] These callers, who were given false names to protect their true identity, had a variety of problems ranging from financial and legal problems to personal problems.

3.2.3 Findings

DeCapua and Dunham (1993) divided their findings into two sub-sections viz.

1. Request for the advice.
2. The role of narration.

3.2.3.1 Request for advice

Requests for advice varied from caller to caller. Some requests seemed to be vague and they were not specific enough to help the advice giver to identify the gist of the request at once. In such cases, the request was suggested rather than said directly. However, there are some few cases which were noted whereby the caller made specific requests for advice and also mentioned all options available to them .For instance, one caller named as 'Alice' asks for advice on whether or not to attend a job interview when, on one hand she doesn't like the job and on the other hand she does want to know what the experience of being interviewed feels like.

3.2.3.1.1 Statement of problem

When advice seekers make their calls; they have to start by describing the situation which made them call to request advice. The manner in which some callers state their problems does not give the advice giver enough facts which will clarify the gist of the problem immediately. Therefore, it becomes necessary for the advice giver to do some probing and ask as many question as possible to understand the problem clearly and then give proper advice. This probing is important because in some case the real problem tends to hide behind what appears to be a problem at first, only to find that it goes far deeper than that .

To illustrate the argument above, De Capua and Dunham (1993) mention the conversation which took place between Meltezer (host) and Susan (a caller). Susan has a problem with her neighbour who claims that Susan's premises (where she used to store gasoline) are smelly. To solve this problem Susan fills the gasoline tanks with sand. Susan's problem now is that even after doing this the neighbour is still complaining and harassing her. As Meltzer asks more questions he eventually discovers the real problem from Susan i.e. the fact that the neighbour has also been bothering Susan by wanting to buy her place which is the real cause of the harassment, not the smell as initially suggested by Susan.

3.2.3.2 The role of narration

For the advice giver to understand the problem clearly it is necessary for the advice seeker to give a narration of the background information which led to the problem. Here the events leading to the problem should be vividly described. For instance, in the conversation between Susan and Meltzer which has been mentioned above, Susan clearly narrates what events preceded the problem of smelly tanks.

3.2.3.2.1 Interaction strategies

Interaction strategies play a vital role in the process of requesting and giving advice. Advice givers and advice seekers use these strategies to maintain and develop the conversation with each other. The major strategies which are worth mentioning here are: explanation, elaboration and narration. The use of these strategies become evident in the conversation between Raphael (host) and Caddie (caller) whereby Raphael continues to probe until Caddie has narrated, explained and elaborated all the facts, which end up giving Raphael the clear picture of the problem i.e. the fact that Caddies' husband is abusive towards Caddie.

3.2.4 Role of advice givers

According to De Capua and Dunham (1993), the role of the advice giver is to find out what the real problem is, to explore all the options available to solve the problem and to help the advice - seeker to decide on what action to take in solving the problem should it arise again in future. In certain situations, the advice seeker calls for advice after having already decided on what

to do. In that case, the role of the advice giver is to give reassurance to the advice seeker that the decision taken is the correct decision. It is also the duty of the advice giver not only to help one person but all the other listeners who might be having the same problem.

3.2.5 Conclusion

DeCapua and Dunham (1993) put more emphasis on the strategies employed by those seeking advice, which are narration, elaboration and explanation; they also emphasize the fact that the advice giver's role is to help clarify the problem, explore the problem - solving options available and to support the advice seekers on their choices or to give them proper advice.

3.3 Hernadez – Flores (1999)

3.3.1 Politeness ideology in Spanish colloquial conversation: The case of advice

3.3.1.1 Introduction

Hernandez – Flores (1999) examines the question of politeness when it comes to the Spanish social context .The role played by politeness in the act of giving advice in the Spanish community is investigated in detail.

Hernandez- Flores (1999) believes that the use of politeness in conversations will always vary in accordance to the social ideologies of different communities. This shows that politeness strategies used in the different social situations will always be different because what is regarded as polite in one society might be perceived differently in another society, depending on the cultural values of that particular society.

3.3.1.2 The notion of face and politeness in Brown and Levinson's theory

The issue of face plays an important part in Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory. They divide face wants into two i.e. negative face (the individual's territorial integrity) and positive face (the individual's desire to be liked) These face wants are said to be universally acceptable.

Hernandez – Flores (1999) disagrees with this belief that face wants are universal. He believes that assumption could be problematic because certain approaches of different cultures to face show that some cultural values have problems fitting the definitions of negative and positive face. To prove this Hernandez – Flores (1999) quotes a number of scholars who have done research in different communities e.g. Wierzbieka (1991) (Anglo - Saxon community), Mao (1994) (Chinese community) and Placencia (1996) (Ecuadoncia Spanish community). The research by these scholars shows that the approach of different communities to the question of face varies according to each community's cultural values.

3.3.1.3 The contents of the face in Spanish culture

Hernandez - Flores's(1999) research also focuses on a scholar called Bravo (1996) who developed a critical approach to Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory. Bravo (1996) talks about the concepts of autonomy and affiliation. Autonomy refers to being perceived as having one's own surroundings inside a group, whereas affiliation refers to being seen as an integrated part of a group. In terms of Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory, autonomy could be understood as "being unimpeded " whereas affiliation could be "being approved of ". This is really not the case as the concept autonomy and affiliation are open to different cultural interpretations, they are not universal at all.

Bravo (1996) sees autonomy and culture as "empty "methodological categories to be filled with "contents" depicting a group's unique socio -cultural identity, thus changing from one community to another. One of the contents of autonomy could be a feature called "self - affirmation ", which gives the speaker the right to stress his positive social qualities, thus making him to stand out in a particular group. Bravo (1996) also considers one of the contents of affiliation in the Spanish contexts to be the notion of confianza (closeness or a sense of deep familiarity to one's group). Speakers with confianza are given the right to speak openly about their feelings.

Hernandez – Flores (1999) does not seem to like the comparison between Brown and Levinson's (1987) notion of positive and negative face on one hand, and   self - affirmation and confiaza on the other hand as he feels that the two author's theory is too restrictive on the

issue of cultural diversity.

3.3.1.4 Advice and politeness

Brown and Levinson (1987) see politeness as an attempt to mitigate the threat to the negative face of the hearer, but when one looks at self - affirmation one does not always find this threat. This happens in cases whereby the advice hearer exercises his own self - affirmation by either accepting or rejecting advice. The question now is: Why is politeness necessary? Bravo (1996) believes that politeness brings about a friendly interaction and enhances a relationship according to cultural values in a particular social group.

3.3.1.5 Analysis of Hernandez - Flores's data

The data come from the conversation between friends and relatives in Spain. The speakers are Pili and Gabriel (hosts), Maria and Julia (host's daughter and her boyfriend), and Juan and Elsa (the guests)

The hosts have ducks on their property. Elsa complements the hosts about how pretty their ducks are and then gives them unsolicited advice to also bring swans on their property. In terms of negative and positive face, giving unsought advice could threaten the hearers face. However, according to the notion of self- affirmation and confianza, by giving this advice Elsa shows confianza because she wants her guests to show her that she is accepted in their home .The advice also shows the wish for autonomy on the part of Elsa as she wants to be seen as a person with ideas. Things like greetings and complements also show politeness on the part of Elsa.

Maria on the other hand exercises her autonomy by not giving a positive response to the advice. She just asks "swans?" and then laughs. She protects her on autonomy and affiliation by not accepting the advice but she also protects Elsa's autonomy and affiliation by being polite i.e. by not declining the advice directly. Looking at both Elsa and Maria's comments one sees an attempt to show a balance of "face" which leads to a presence of politeness in the conversation.

Hernandez –Flores (1999) also gives data from another conversation, which is between Pili (host) and Belinda (guest).They are at Pili's home. Pili's children, her brother and brother -in-law are also there. They are seated at a table and Pili is being serving them. Belinda asks Pili whether she would like to sit down. She replies by saying "yes" but then says "no" she prefers to stand. Belinda then asks why she does not let the people at the table serve themselves.

Belinda, the advice giver, through her advice shows concern and solidarity to Pili's. She also claims her right to be invited to eat in Pili's home. Here Belinda achieves self - affirmation and confianza. On the other hand Pili claims her autonomy by rejecting the advice, but also sees her affiliation as being confirmed through Belinda interest in her. Both speakers use politeness strategies to achieve balance between their faces. This happens to help her, because she knows that serving people is a big task and on the other hand Pili confirms the advice - givers face by mitigating her rejection to advice (by being hesitant at first and then playing down the task). In this case, the advice enhances the relationship between the two rather than pose any threat to their faces.

3.3.1.6 Conclusion

Hernandez –Flores (1999) concludes by pointing out that the issue of politeness is closely linked to the question of cultural values. He states that in Spanish colloquial conversation politeness is not only always used to mitigate a threat to face, but it could also be used to enhance the relationship between the advice - giver and the advice - receiver. With regard to autonomy and affiliation in Spanish context, Hernandez – Flores (1999) is able to prove the absence of threat of face in the act of giving advice. This confirms that advice could be used to flatter or help as shown in the two conversations used by Hernandez –Flores (1999).

3.3.2 Goldsmith & MacGeorge (2000)

3.3.2.1 Introduction

According to Goldsmith and MacGeorge (2000), the act of giving advice in attempt to solve someone's problem can sometimes be problematic. To prove this, the two authors refer to a number of studies which have been conducted by different researchers. Some studies show a

positive response to advice by the recipients because they expect advice and are happy about being advised. However there are also recipients who feel that the advice giver does not regard them as competent and independent enough to be able to solve their own problems.

3.3.2.2 Face, politeness and advice to the distressed

Politeness theory

According to Goffman (1967), face refers "to the positive social values a person effectively claims for himself by the line other assume he has taken during a particular contact. Face plays an important role in the act of giving advice. According to Brown and Levinson (1987) there are two face wants viz. positive face (desire to be accepted /be liked by other people) and negative face (the desire to have one's independence respected). Advice can sometimes fall under what is referred to as FTAs or face - threatening acts. This differs from one situation to another depending on things like culture and relationship between speakers. For instance, receiving advice from a friend or a relative can be seen as less face - threatening than receiving it from a stranger.

Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory looks at speech acts which are FTAs and act how successful the politeness of a message can be to mitigate the threat to face of an individual. Some FTAs are committed directly (bald on record), particularly in situations where the impact won't be regarded as seriously face threatening e.g. In a boss and worker situation. This is the least polite option of committing an FTA.

The more polite form of committing an FTA is called negative face redress which lessens the imposition on the hearers independence through acts like making an action seem smaller or depersonalising the message.

Another way of committing an FTA is negative face redress whereby an FTA is done off the record or indirectly. This could be done by describing one's personal experience. This is the most polite form because the hearer might either regard the message just as a description of an experience or as a suggestion on what he/she should do. There are also cases where one

might refuse to commit an FTA in attempt to avoid threat to someone's face.

3.3.2.3 Explaining helpful and unhelpful advice

The politeness theory explains a couple of findings regarding the helpfulness or the unhelpfulness of advice. Though advice is meant to benefit the hearer, reactions by the various hearers can vary according to certain situations. Firstly, the extent to which advice threatens face plays an important role in the acceptance of advice. Advice can threaten face either positively or negatively.

Secondly, issues like relationship, rank, social standing can play a role in the perception of advice as being helpful or unhelpful. For instance, in a study by Dakof and Taylor (1990), cancer patients seemed to regard advice from doctors as being more helpful to them compared to advice from friends or family members.

Thirdly, it is generally accepted that a certain degree of politeness can help to mitigate some threats to face and thus rendering advice to be more acceptable.

Based on the above points Goldsmith and McGeorge (2000) make some predictions and expectations regarding a study to be conducted on the effectiveness of advice.

H 1: Perceived regard for face will be low, moderate or greater depending on the power and closeness between the speaker and the receiver.

H 2: Perceived regard for face will be greater for polite forms of advice compared to that one for bald - on record advice.

H 3: There will be a positive correlation between perceived regard for face and perceived advice effectiveness.

H 4: The effects of politeness on perceived advice effectiveness will vary by type of relationship.

3.3.2.4 Testing politeness theory

In the study, Goldsmith and MacGeorge (2000) intend to test the effectiveness of Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory in a number of situations. They intend to test whether the theory may be regarded as a general account of how politeness can be associated with regard for

face. They intend comparing a wide range of polite forms. Goldsmith and MacGeorge's (2000) study looks at the effects of politeness across people, situations and messages, unlike other researchers who focused only on people. They also examine advice instead of requests. They test the effectiveness of Brown and Levinson's linguistic forms.

_3.3.2.5 Method

3.3.2.5.1 Participants and procedure

407 undergraduate volunteers were given identical questionnaires

- Incomplete questionnaires were discarded

-43.2% were seniors   -32.3% were juniors

-Two thirds were Euro - Americans

-15.1% African Americans

-6.8% Asians

-5.5% Hispanic

-Majority majored in communication studies

-384 questionnaires had to be completed

3.3.2.5.2 Questionnaire

Participants were given a hypothetical situation whereby "Chris"
had to be given advice by another person. They were then asked to rate the effectiveness of the advice message on a 7 - point semantic differential scale: effective - ineffective, helpful - unhelpful, appropriate - inappropriate, sensitive -insensitive. Participants then had to rate the message on a 7 - point Likert - type scale (whether they are agreed or not with the message that "Chris" would feel liked, criticized, identified with, told what to do or imposed upon.
They were also asked to complete another 7-point Likert - type scales measuring the degree of agreement with the statements about the advice giver's power relative to "Chris" and about how close their relationship was.

Below, the results of Goldsmith and MacGeorge's will be compared to the predictions they made, i.e. H 1 – H 3

In H 1 Goldsmith and MacGeorge (2000) expected the face threats related to advice to vary depending on the speaker - hearer relationship. In the study, it was discovered that they had an important effect on perceived regard for negative face.

In H 2 they expected direct advice to be more face threatening than advice given indirectly. However, this was not always the case as the findings of the study show that polite forms showed more regard for face than bald - on -record forms only in few messages, not in each and every message. There were even examples showing polite advice to be having less regard for face than direct advice.

Concerning H3, whereby Goldsmith and MacGeorge (2000) expected a positive correlation between perceived regard for face and negative face and perceived message effectiveness, the study revealed the perceived regard for positive face to have a stronger relationship to message effectiveness than did perceived for negative face.

The results of the study show clearly that politeness does not always mitigate the impact of a threatening message. The study also shows that things like power, rank and relationship will not always make one message better than the other message. This proves that the politeness theory can not be relied upon each and every time when it comes to the question of giving advice.

3.4 Goldsmith and Fitch 1997

Introduction: 3.4.1

Goldsmith and Fitch (19997) feel that present research on advice and support has put too much emphasis only on the associations between beneficial outcomes and the frequency with which different kinds of support are received. Therefore, in this paper they focus on the other dimensions of giving and receiving support i.e. symbolic and rhetorical dimensions.

3.4.2 Assumptions of communicative approach to social support

Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) state that any communicative approach to the study of social support should be able to recognize that the process of seeking, offering and receiving of support is symbolic and rhetorical in nature. By symbolic it is meant that the effects of receiving support come through the participants' interpretation of supportive acts and their implications. They don't just come about mechanistically through the mere giving of a supportive act. The rhetoric part refers to the fact that situations of social support have many goals and outcomes and to be effective interact ants should deploy discursive resources in ways that are adapted to these demands. All this means that an account of the effects of a supportive act should also consider effects of the identities and relationships of the participating individuals. It must also be noted that utility of social support is not just a matter of quantity but a matter of quality.

The rhetorical process also includes realization that interpretations of support and evaluation of quality are shaped by three different contexts i.e. situation, conversational and cultural contexts. According to the situational context, the perceived helpfulness of advice depends on the knowledge of the advice giver with reference to a particular problem. This perceived helpfulness may vary depending on whether advice is given after the advisor has listened and responded sympathetically or it follows immediately after the announcement of a problem. This is a case of conversational context. The cultural context comes about in situations whereby the supportive act is evaluated in relation to broader cultural premises about personhood, relationships and communication in a particular community.

It must also be born in mind that effective support is not only a matter of matching an utterance form to a set of situational, conversational and cultural parameters. General expectations for a speech act have to be invoked and employed on particular occasions. Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) further state that even though participants in an interaction are aware that experts are permitted to give advice, they have to assume or display that in this particular interaction about a specific problem, the advice – giver is an expert.

Goldsmith and Fitch's (1997) assumptions therefore suggest the following requirements from a conceptualisation of communication of social support.

1. Different types of goals and outcomes associated with a certain supportive act should be identified instead of coding supportive acts into a single function.
2. There is a need to identify all salient features of situational, conversational and cultural contexts that shape evaluations of supportive acts.
3. Discursive features which produce expected effects of supportive acts while invoking and adapting to conflict demands and episodic expectations should be identified.

A number of studies have been conducted concerning advice. However, Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) feel that these studies have ignored the symbolic and rhetorical nature of seeking , giving and receiving advice. Therefore, they focus mainly on these symbolic and rhetorical features, by asking three questions

1. What goals are pursued as people ask for and give advice?
2. What identity and relational implications of advice shape giver's and receiver's reactions to advice?
3. What situational, conversational and cultural constraints are relevant to participants' evaluation of advice?

This ethnographic study of how advice is sought, given and received among U. S Americans involved interviews to a selected group of white, middle-class individuals.

3.4.2.1 Method

Data was collected by five women and one man. They were aged between 20 and 38. Two kinds of data had to be collected i.e. a) Field notes of advice episodes observed.
b) Notes from ethnographic interviews conducted with friends, family members and colleagues. Observers had to discuss things like the setting, participants, relationships, perceived purpose and outcomes of interaction, mood of conversation, channel in which it took place, background knowledge, etc. 112 episodes were recorded.

Interviews took between 60 and 90 minutes. Participants were asked about any involvement in advice process, whether seeking or giving advice. Who were the participants, the nature of advice, circumstances under which advice was given and received. They were also asked

about the best or worst advice they gave or received recently and why they feel it was bad or good.

Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) searched through the data for themes, patterns and premises, giving special attention to advice with explicit claims about intentions, interpretations and evaluations of participants. A number of recurring themes in the purposes and outcomes of advice were noted. Claims which were not collaborated by others were individually discussed in detail.

A second wave of interviews with 5 women and 4 men were then conducted to find out whether themes denied from the initial analysis were substantiated. Two types of evidence were scanned:
a) Inconsistencies that would suggest modification or qualifications to the earlier claims.
b) Examples consistent with earlier claims that could elaborate the original findings. Three dilemmas were discovered concerning the process of seeking, giving and receiving advice.

3.4.3 Three dilemmas of advice episodes

Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) discovered three dilemmas, which revealed that although advice has an informational component, information is however just information. Firstly, there is a dilemma between being helpful and caring on one hand and being seen as butting in on the other hand. Secondly, there is a dilemma between showing gratitude or respect and making one's own decisions.

3.4.3.1 Being helpful and caring vs. butting in

Most participants viewed advice as very helpful. They felt that it helped them to make informed decisions and to solve problems. Others felt that being given advice shows that the advisor cares. To illustrate this two examples are given .The first one is "Tony's" example who feels that friends should be helpful to each other by giving advice, which also shows that they care for each other. The second example is by "Kathy" who needs advice from her parents. The father gives a detailed advice to her, which shows that he does not like what "Kathy "is

thinking of doing. The mother does not give any advice. "Kathy" feels that the mother's actions show lack of caring.

Some participants saw advice as some kind of intrusion into their lives. These were mainly post adolescents who wanted autonomy, and viewed advice from parents, in particular, as butting in. Some participants did not like advice from their spouses, friends or siblings. There were participants who saw relational closeness as important in the process of receiving advice. They accepted advice from people close to them easily. However, advice from people who were not close to them was unacceptable. For example, "Jill" regards advice from her roommate as unacceptable because she is not that close to her.

The conversational context of advice also plays an important role. Advice which is not asked for can be seen as some kind of intrusion. Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) illustrate this point by giving an example of "Julie" who does not like her roommate's unsolicited advice. Unsolicitation of advice can, however lead to the withholding of important advice for fear of being seen as "butting in".

3.4.3.2 Being supportive vs. being honest

Some advice seekers ask for advice after having made clear decisions about what plan of action to take. This brings about a dilemma for advisors because the advice seekers are only seeking for support not the advisor's honest opinion.

For example, in a conversation between Nell and Christy, Nell asks what Christy thinks about a dare party after having already decided that the party will take place on Friday. Christy, who at first was not aware of this decision, gives an honest opinion whereby she says that such parties tend to go out of hand. She later tries to give Nell some support to Nell who has already planned the party, saying the party should not be cancelled but they have to be careful.

All this shows that even though honesty is a valued attribute of advice givers, it could be unclear whether an advice seeker desires honesty from the giver or just approval.

3.4.3.3 Showing gratitude and respect vs. making one's own decisions

Though advice giving can show helpfulness and that someone cares, the   advice –receiver can be in a dilemma because not taking advice from someone who is caring can be interpreted as disrespect to the giver or lack of gratitude. On the other hand, if the advice is taken it could be interpreted as lack of autonomy and competence on the part of the receiver.

In the study, some participants did mention that they requested advice as a sign of respect to givers' point of view. Some formulas, which convey respect, were noted on a number of episodes. These included "all right", "you are right", "sounds good", "I will do that" and "thanks". In the example by "Rhoda", she claims that offering advice is offering friendship, thus rejecting advice is not only a sign of disrespect but also a sign of lack of gratitude for the giver's concern.

Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) feel that to protest their autonomy advice recipients should reserve the right to reject advice after having shown respect and gratitude to the giver by listening carefully to the advice. "Richard and Ginger" say they expect their sister and friend respectively to listen to what they have to say even though they might not accept their advice.

3.4.4 Discussion

In their study, Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) discovered that multiple and often conflicting goals and outcomes were associated with advice. Their study also revealed that advice does serve as informational support for the stress, problems, and decisions of everyday life. Advice can also provide emotional support in the form of "caring and closeness".

The study showed some conflicting attributes when it comes to what is referred to as "informative". This happened particularly in cases whereby honesty advice was appreciated on one hand, and on the other hand supportive agreement was sought.

Advice also enacted some identity and relational characteristics, including closeness, caring, intrusion, control, respect, gratitude, autonomy, equality and competence. The findings of this

study show that research on the benefits of research to individuals should account for emotional as well as informational value, relational, and identity implications as well as individual social support functions, and negative as well as positive outcomes.

Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) state that future research could explore why respondents identify an act as advice rather than some other kind of speech act. The first dilemma suggests that advice that is regarded as butting in may reveal advisors' ulterior motives for control or intimacy rather than primarily benefiting the hearer. On the other hand, the hearer's concerns for appearing disrespectful or ungrateful suggest that the element of recipients' choice that differentiates advice from a directive may sometimes be illusory. Honest, unsupportive advice resembles the speech act of criticism and disagreement.

The three dilemmas raise implications for theoretical formulations of the ways in which seeking and providing support can threaten face. Some participant's fear for 'butting in' shows a desire to avoid intruding on the recipient's autonomy (a threat to negative face). The dilemma between being honest or approving reflects unwillingness to criticize the recipient (threat to positive face). The dilemmas of showing respect and gratitude while reserving the right to decide whether to accept or reject advice reflects concerns for the receipts own demeanour and for giving face to the advice giver.

The study shows that the expertise of the advisor was relevant to satisfaction with the advice given. The evaluation of the advisor also took into consideration things like closeness and similarity with the recipient. There is a contrast between Goldsmith an Fitch's (1997) study and previous research in that their findings show that expertise, closeness, and similarity are not just static inputs to the interpretation of advice, rather, participant's pre-existing assessment of these attributes may be invoked, affirmed or changed in the process of seeking, giving, and receiving advice.

Whether advice was solicited or unsolicited played a role in advice being seen as butting in, explicitly forecasting, honest attempts to clarify that goal and showing respect and gratitude for advice is correctly enacted in some of the most common phrases that concluded advice episodes (e.g. thanks, you are right, etc.

According to Goldsmith and Fitch (1997), previous explanation of the relationships between enacted support and positive outcomes emphasizes the match between the expertise of the provider and the support offered. However, Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) suspect that predicting the utility of advice on the basis of pre-existing characteristics may be less informative than examining how, and how well provider and relational characteristics are displayed and negotiated in conversation.

Goldsmith and Fitch's (1997) research reveal the normative constraints to which effective and appropriate advice episode must be adapted. The data in this research also shows a number of general classes of message and conversation features that may be of interest, including features that accomplish face work, features that evoke or construct an appropriate situational context for advice, and features that clarify the intent to advice.

Some of the dilemma in Goldsmith and Fitch's (1997) research shows some similarities with other research in other demographic groups. Carbaugh's (1988) research emphasizes the adults' right to make his/her own choices and also his/ her desire for both honesty and support. Rawlins (1983) talks about the conflict between freedom and dependence. Tracy and colleagues (1990 &1993) mention the individual's desire to an honest advice and the need for support.

According to Goldsmith and Fitch (1997), the use of comparative research is very useful in revealing the nature and extent of cultural variability of dilemmas. In Colombian and Israel Sabra communities, advice is not seen as an act of 'intruding' in someone else's life, whereas in the German community advice is only the responsibility of close friends. In British communities, there were cases that were regarded as "butting in" even if advisors were experts in their fields.

Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) feel that in future research more men than women should be participants. In contrast to other research Goldsmith and Fitch's (1997) research shows that supportive acts may be associated with different functions and the link between an act and the functions that is seen by participants to serve is a communicative process, rather than a mechanical one.

3.5 Goldsmith (1999)

3.5.1 Introduction

In the introduction, Goldsmith (1999) states that advice is normally used by friends, family members or romantic partners to try and solve one another's problems. The advice which is given might threaten the recipient's face. The recipient might view advice as some forms of criticism or as a threat to his/ her autonomy. Goldsmith (1999) feels that previous research on advice has not concentrated enough on how face –sensitive advice could be given. Goldsmith's (1994) and Goldsmith and MacGeorge's (2000) research only concentrated on how variation in politeness strategies may affect how advice is seen by those who have disclosed a problem. In this article, Goldsmith (1999) looks at how the content of messages in which advice is given bring about more or less face –threatening identities for participants.

3.5.2 Accounting for face threat and face – work

Goldsmith (1999) defines 'face' as the socially situated identities people claim or attribute to others, whereas "face work" is defined as communicative strategies that enact, support, or challenge these situated identities. In their politeness theory Brown and Levinson (1987) state that certain speech acts may threaten either negative face or positive face. The extent of the face threat differs in accordance with the speaker's power, and the closeness of the relationship between speaker and hearer. This extends across cultural lines. Brown and Levinson (1987) describe a number of ways of reducing face threat, including redress and indirectness.

According to Goldsmith (1999), Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory seems to be too general and it does not consider things like cultural diversity. In this theory, threats to face are located in the defining features of speech acts rather than in the uses to which acts are put. Brown and Levinson (1987) include formal variations in how speech acts are committed rather than variability in the actual context of what is said by speakers. Goldsmith's article looks at face threats that come out of speech community member's tacit understanding of a speech episode including resources for face work that arise from particular topics considered relevant in this type of episode.

3.5.3 Sources of Face Threat

In Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory the location of face threats was seen to be in the constitutive rules for various speech acts. They stated that the nature of some speech acts could be in conflict with the face wants of the addressee and/ or of the speaker. For example, directives include predicating a future act and indicating the speaker thinks the hearer ought to do it, which is an intrinsic threat to negative face.

Wilson and colleagues (1998) feel that face threats could come from types of goals the speaker may have when prescribing a particular type of directive. For example, giving advice may be more face threatening to the hearer's autonomy than enforcing an obligation because the latter implies the hearer has some legitimate responsibility to act. In both cases, the positive and negative face may be threatened because of the implication that the hearer does not have the necessary capacity to act responsible.

Giving advice may also have various implications for identities in the context of various speech events. For example, face threats arising from advice given by a superior in the context of a performance evaluation may be different from face threats arising from the same advice given by a friend in the same context. The former's advice may suggest employee's failure to take some useful action. This advice may not be seen as butting in and if hints on how to improve are given, that could be seen as face honouring. The friend's advice on the other hand might be seen as "butting in" because the friend lacks the authority to advice about work – related issues, and the friend will be seen as condoning the superior's criticism instead of standing by his /her own friend.

Goldsmith (1999) feels that the episode – specific face threats should be understood within a community of speakers and the kinds of identities that are relevant within these types of episodes. Therefore, an analysis which is different to Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory is desirable.

3.5.4 Resource for Face Work

Goldsmith (1999) points out that Brown and Levinson's (1987) analysis of face work is general and cross - situational. The respect for positive face comes from the general ways used in language to show intimacy. The negative redress strategies are all forms which are useful in general for social distancing. Off –record strategies use indirect speech. Many of the strategies and example focus on variation in linguistic and paralinguistic form. Some strategies include a combination of other speech acts and face threatening acts.

According to Goldsmith (1999), Brown and Levinson prescribed how a speaker may speak but did not offer much guidance about what should be said. Some strategies on the topic of talk are generic. One example of the positive redress strategy is to speak about safe topics and it involves talking about aspects the hearer approves of. To honour face the speaker should give reasons for committing a face – threatening act and reasons for the hearer to comply. The analysis of face work does not derive from particular episodes and identities within them and as a result cannot provide direction as to what these relevant contents might be.

 Goldsmith (1999) further states that the substantive content of a speaker's utterance have implications for face. To illustrate this point, the following examples are given (about a worker who fears being retrenched)

1. 'Man you gotta talk to the boss about this. Otherwise you are just gonna keep worrying. Hey, I saw your car in the lot this morning. The body work and paint job really made a difference.

2. Man, you gotta talk to the boss about this. If you get laid off you won't find a job this good without having to move your family someplace else and I know you don't wanna do that.

3. Man, you gotta talk to the boss about this. I'd be worried too but this is probably a rumour and the boss is the only one who can tell you for sure. You have done a lot for this company and you have a right to get a straight answer.

Using Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness strategies to analyse this message one can find similarities in the positive redress strategies used. The language is informal. Reasons are given for advice and some aspects of the hearer's opinion are agreed with. The first message honours an identity distinct from the problem under discussion thus implying that the hearer's problem is an inappropriate topic for discussion, as a result showing constraint on the hearer's autonomy. The second message underscores the hearer's vulnerability. Despite the fact it is sympathetic it damages the hearer's identity by limiting his/her self-determination and competence. The third message on the other hand confirms the hearer's ability to control some aspects of the problem. It offers a more likeable, competent and autonomous identity for the hearer in the context of talk about this problem. Goldsmith (1999) feels that Brown and Levinson's theory does not guide a speaker to the discovery of situationally relevant contents and identities.

3.5.5 Content - based Resources for Face – Sensitive Advice in Troubles talk

Goldsmith (1999) believes that activation, selection and expression are guided by the communicative activity in which the speaker takes part. Expert speakers reveal face – related thoughts in their representation of a situation and they also show an advanced understanding of how to choose face – relevant. These speakers express content in a face – sensitive manner. Goldsmith's (1999) perspective on message production does agree that politeness forms are relevant to face, however the focus is not on presuming a given content and on looking at how messages differ in form or style used to express that content, but it is on how the contents speakers express vary and on how the variability represent different identities and activities.

Goldsmith (1999) also feels that it could be difficult to specify face – sensitive content as content is situation specific. Goldsmith (1999) then goes on and asks a number of questions. She asks whether it is possible to make any generalizable statement about content – based resources for doing face work; whether any suggestions can be given to would - be advisors on what to say and not say; whether far more than a post hoc explanation of what was said could be given; whether specific knowledge about another person's behaviour and of a situation can be helpful in showing sensitivity to face; and finally to ask whether it is possible

to make statement about topics that are relevant to face and thus could be helpful for offering advice.

To answer the above – mentioned questions Goldsmith (1999) prescribes an analysis of the episode within which face – threatening acts occur. According to Goldsmith's (1999) approach, there is a presumption that there are recognizable episodes that make certain goals, identities and activities potentially relevant. Besides the speech act selected by a speaker, face threats can also arise from identities and activities implied by an act within a particular episode. In some complex communicative tasks, there may also be many ways of carrying out the same episode, with varying implications for the identities of participants. These varying orientations to identity and activity result from the other ideas speakers express in conversation. They are not just the result of speakers making various choices about how to express the same advisory content.

For certain goals, in some episodes it is possible to identify some of the forms which may be taken by face threats and some types of the forms which could be appropriate for comment. A hypothesis can be made on how some topics may suggest a more or less face threatening manner of understanding identities and activities. This general approach is illustrated with reference to giving advice in episodes of talk about problems.

3.5.5.1 Features of the episodes

According to Goldsmith (1999), troubles talk is a recognizable type of episode in which advice is given. Goldsmith and Baxter (1996) did a study among American college students in which troubles talk was regarded as an important episode in which close relational partners attempted to help one another with their problems. Jefferson (1980,84, 88) discovered a number of common structural feature that mark troubles talk episode among adult English speakers. Research in the U.S reveals that people go to close relational partners whenever they have problems. Their partners give them advice, sympathy, information, approval, etc After solving the problem they return to other "ordinary" topics.

3.5.5.2 Face Issues

Goldsmith (1999) states that the main aim of troubles talk is to help the person with a problem. This may lead to various face threats arising from identities and activities that are implied in troubles talk.

Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) mention a potential source of contention about identities as being whether advice benefits the hearer or it is just" butting in"

The lack of expertise on the giver's part about a problem may be face threatening to the hearer. The lack of enough closeness between the advisor and the hearer may also seen like an attempt to control instead of giving help to the hearer.

The second source of face threat comes from the question whether the hearer can reject advice. Sometimes the hearer is forced to comply with directives because of the advisor's authority. Rejecting advice can also be face threatening to the advisor because it means he/she was wrong in assessing the hearer's benefit. Rejecting advice could also be seen a lack of gratitude by the hearer.

According to Wilson et al (1998), advising the hearer to act in that particular way implies that the hearer would not have acted in that particular way had he/she not been advised to do so, because he/she lacked the capacity or the motivation to act. Goldsmith (1994) states that in troubles talk the hearer can't save threat to positive face by disagreeing that he/she has a problem, because he/she has already acknowledged that a problem does exist. According to Goldsmith and Fitch (1997), if the advice giver suggests a course of action which is different from that of the hearer, it could imply blame or disagreement.

Goldsmith (1999) further states that face threats may also arise from the choice to speak about possible solutions instead of some other facets of the situation. Troubles talk episode allow for many types of responses. By asserting that problem – solving could give the necessary help, advice may implicitly criticize the other's self-presentation and constrain his/her conversational moves.

3.5.5.3 Types of topics

Goldsmith (1999) identifies five types of topics relevant to troubles – talk:

1. The first topic mentioned is about " emotional support". This topic involves   comforting, sympathising and reassuring the distressed.

2. The second topic is "approval support" In this topic the participants talk about the problem itself. The speaker helps the distressed to cognitively reassess a stressful situation.

3. The third topic involves actions to be taken to solve the problem. Here information and instrumental support are given, advising the hearer about possible solutions and offering tangible resources/intervention respectively.

4. The fourth topic is about the hearer's worth. This involves giving "esteem support" which conveys caring and reassesses the distressed individual of his/her worth and abilities.

5. The fifth topic involves talk about the relationship between the speaker and hearer. Here " network support" is given, whereby an attempt to buffer the negative effects of stress is made, by offering opportunities for social interaction and belonging.

Goldsmith (1999) carried out two exploratory studies attempting to further develop a content-based approach to face work. Goldsmith's (1999) first study further develops the taxonomy of the types of topics that occur in responses to another's disclosure of a problem.

3.5.6 Study 1: What are common topics in troubles talk episodes?

Rationale

Goldsmith (1999) feels that it is sometimes difficult to see common topics in troubles talk episode because the content in a conversation is idiosyncratic to individuals, their relationship

and the problem. To develop a typology of topics one should involve as many individuals as possible responding to a hypothetical situation. To see what is common across individuals and their problem contents that are specific to a particular individual and his/her problem is constrained.

3.5.6.1 Method

119 undergraduate students were involved in this study. Each student had to respond to nine hypothetical situations. Three of the situations were: a friend who failed an exam, a friend who is nervous about giving a speech in class and a friend "dumped" by her boyfriend.

3.5.6.2 Analyses and result

To construct a typology of types of troubles talk topics from the messages Goldsmith (1999) used a five step procedure that utilized a computerized method of identifying similar contents followed by "manual" refinement of the results.

Step 1: Unitising message into units
A thought unit corresponds to a complete thought and is expressed as a simple sentence.

Step 2: Computerized clustering of thought units expressing similar content
 Thought units expressing similar content were clustered together on the basis of co-occurring words using a computer program called "the theme machine".

Step 3: Manual refinement of clusters
This step was important because thought units that share similar words do not necessarily share the same meaning. Each cluster was examined to determine whether it was coherent or incoherent. Incoherent clusters were set aside for later reanalysis. Each individual unit in the cluster was examined to determine whether it expressed the same or a different idea than the rest of the units in the cluster.

Step 4: Identifying content categories in each situation.

Here clusters that express the same content were grouped together. Later focus was then shifted to the thought units which had been set aside for later reanalysis.

Step 5 Developing a typology of topics in troubles talk
 This step involved examining the situation specific categories to see what types of topics might be common to troubles talk responses in all situations. Goldsmith (1999) took into account some troubles talk topics which had been suggested by previous research.

3.5.6.3 Discussion

Goldsmith's (1999) study identified different types of topics that are potentially relevant in troubles talk. Topics from previous research were present in a number of situations, including comments of various aspects of the emotion, the problem, action to solve the problem, the hearer's abilities and attributes and inclusion in social activities.

New topics were also included in the study. Speakers talked about their knowledge of the hearer's problem and engaged in metacommunicative commentary on the conversation itself. The study also identified certain ways in which speakers talked about some of the problems and emotions. Some speakers talked about some of the problems as being common to more than one situation.

Most topics were represented by content in all three situations; however there were a few topics which occurred in only one or two situations. In addition to topics that were common, there were also content categories within topics that were similar across situations. Several contents appeared in two of the three situations. There were also contents that could be regarded as generic. "Fill in the blank" topics including "I've experienced [fill in the problem]", "Is it your fault or [fill in the other actor]'s fault". Goldsmith (1999) discovered that even unique ideas from individual speakers were woven into common contents in some similar ways.

Goldsmith's (1999) study reveals that there are common topics of representing emotions, problems actions, hearer – speaker relationship and conversation in response to another person's problem. These topics can help the speaker to formulate relevant comments in a particular troubles talk situation.

3.5.7 Study 2: How topics related to perceived regard for face

Rationale

Goldsmith's (1999) study 2 concentrated on some of the types of topics, which were dealt with in study 1 and might lead to a more or less face – threatening context for advice. In the first study, Goldsmith (1999) examined different face issues. Study 1 paved way for Goldsmith (1999) to start exploring the face implications of contents expressed in one particular problem situation e.g. the speech anxiety situation. This means knowing how advice can be face – threatening in troubles – talk episode and how it provides a basis for expectations about how specific contents in a specific troubles – talk scenario would be associated with perceived regard for face.

Goldsmith (1999) points out that the hearer's negative face could be threatened by whether he/she has the right to reject advice and from whether there are any benefits from being advised. As advice from someone without experience could be seen as "butting in" commenting on the speaker's experience should be positively associated with regard for negative face. In contrast, comments that explicitly identify one's message as good advice should be negatively associated with regard for negative face because they give the hearer a problem on how to reject advice without offending the speaker.

According to Goldsmith (1999), threats to positive face could result from the implication given by the advice on the hearer's competence. A combination of advice and comments about the hearer's in appropriate emotion could be very face threatening to the hearer, e.g. saying. "I can't believe you are nervous". Giving advice and saying "there is nothing you can do about it " could also imply the speaker's lack of faith on the hearer changing the situation. In contrast a combination of advice and comments about the seriousness of the problem might serve to honour positive face by accepting that the speaker has good reason to be concerned and at the same time portraying the hearer as capable of acting appropriately e.g. ("It's your grade and They are watching you"). Comments that the problem is controllable can give a competent identity to the hearer. Statement on joint actions should show liking and acceptance of the others concern (e.g. "come over and I will help you". Statements on the

hearer abilities and positive attributes may show that advice is not meant to be criticism. Commenting on how common the problem and emotions are also shows that advice is not intended as reproach for the problem.

Advice may also threaten both negative and positive face if it gives an implication that the hearer should not discuss the problem anymore or display negative effect.

Goldsmith (1999) feels that when examining the content accompanying advice it is useful to also to look at the degree to which a particular type of content is emphasized or elaborated in a message.

Goldsmith's (1999) second study asks the following question: How is elaboration of contents that accompany advice related to perceived regard for positive and negative face? In a particular troubles talk situation specific contents are used as examples of the common topical resources that are available in troubles talk conversations. (e.g. Emotion is "inappropriate") Goldsmith (1999) asked many individuals to respond to a hypothetical situation in order to look at common patterns in how topics are perceived. Goldsmith (1999) also used the messages produced in study 1 as the material evaluated by respondent in study 2, in order to maintain some degree of natural variability in the way contents are elaborated and combined.

3.5.7.1 Method

2.3.3 students completed a questionnaire. They had to read a narrative about a student named Pat, who was either male or female depending on the respondent's sex. The woman's narrative read like this: Pat has to give a speech in class tomorrow and she is very nervous about it while studying in the library she runs into a friend. Pat mentions being nervous about the speech and they talk about that.

Students were asked to complete Likert – type rating scales to indicate their agreement with a variety of statements about the message. Goldsmith's (1999) second study focuses on the student's rating of perceived regard for positive and negative face.

3.5.7.2 Results

There were three items to measure every respondents perception of the degree to which a message showed regard for negative face, viz. Whether the message would make Pat feel that the other person was imposing on him/her/, whether the messages left him/her with a choice to agree or not to agree with the message and lastly whether he/she felt as if he/she was told what to do or how to feel.

Another three items measured perceived regard for positive face, viz. whether the message let Pat know that the advisor identified with him/her, whether he/she felt criticized. And lastly, whether he/she felt accepted and liked. These messages served as dependent variables.

Each respondent had a score for each of the content categories, a score for perceived regard for negative face, and a score for the perceived regard for positive face.

3.5.7.3 Discussion

Goldsmith's (1999) study revealed that content – based resource were most influential in perception of positive face regard. Contents that assert that the hearer's problem is not serious, that his/her emotions are not appropriate and that the problem can't be controlled were negatively associated with regard for positive face. The contents positively associated with regard for positive face were unexpected. Used alone, comment on inappropriate emotions was face threatening, however when they were used with a solution to a problem it seemed to be reassuming to the hearer. The assertion that the hearer problem was " not a big deal" was face threatening, however when used with a less –threatening appraisal of the problem (e. g view the audience as friends) it seemed to be face honouring.

According to Goldsmith (1999), content – based resources did n't have much impact on perceived regard for negative face. It is the elaboration on perceived regard for negative face. It is the elaboration of the idea that the other's emotion was inappropriate which did have some significant effect. This content was elaborated in 7.6% of message examined.

There were also some topics which were not associated with regard for face. Explicit agreement between speaker and hearer about a problematic situation was not seen as honouring to positive face: describing the negative emotion, stating that the problem and emotion were common, and saying the problem was serious did not have any regular effects on perception of positive face regard. Comments on the problem, offers to help the other, and comments on the desirable qualities were also unrelated to perceived face regard.

3.5.7.4 General discussion

Goldsmith's (1999) two studies provide an alternative to politeness – based approaches to studying face threat and face. This is because they examine content – based resources for face work in context of particular types of episodes. This alternative approach puts more emphasis on the manner in which face threat and face work arise from the constitutive rules of a speech as well as social actors' tacit knowledge and situation reasoning about their identities and activities. This approach also emphasizes the significances of variability in the ideas speakers express and not just variability in forms speakers use to express similar content.

Goldsmith (1999) feels that there is still a need for future research on the issue of comparing form and content since her own research proved the content to be strongly associated with perceived regard for positive face than negative face. In their research, Brown and Levinson (1987) did mention threats to negative face and negative politeness strategies as being specific to the imposition implied by a particular face – threatening act. However, in contrast, threats to positive face and positive politeness strategies are more "free – ranging," including appreciation of alter's wants in general or to expression of similarity between ego's and alter's wants. Goldsmith (1999) feels that maybe politeness strategies that focus on the form of a face – threatening act are very useful for mitigating threat to negative face, whereas content is most useful in addressing threat to positive face.

The findings of Goldsmith (1999) study show some limitations in Brown and Levinson's (1987) few content –oriented politeness strategies. Most of politeness strategies focus on form and style, however there are a few strategies that give an implication that the speaker would add substantive content as redress (e.g. expressing sympathy) Some content categories in the

present study were not seen as showing regard for face (e.g. explicitly commenting on the hearer abilities and positive attributes was not seen as honouring positive face. These comments frequently happened together with statements that the hearer emotion was not appropriate and when combined with advice such comments seemed to threaten the hearer positive face. Explicit comments of sympathy like "I get nervous and giving reassurance that the problem would pass did seem to honour face.

Goldsmith's (1999) findings reveal that contents work in combination and prove that different combinations of the same contents could project different identities. These findings also help to explain why some content categories in Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory which are said to be face – honouring don't have any systematic relation to perceived regard for face. These contents might be face honouring or threatening depending on what else is expressed in the message.

Goldsmith's (1999) studies also have some implications for further understanding of common types of topics available to speakers in troubles talk episodes. Responses to the hypothetical situation showed commonality in the topics expressed. All topics in previous research also showed up in the hypothetical message in Goldsmith's (1999) study and some new topics were revealed, which suggests that data from a hypothetical situation did not preclude discovery of a variety of topics. The common topics, which were identified, give some insight into some of the ways these resources are structured. There are some topics which were expressed in situation – specific ways as well as some content categories that were expressed in identical ways in different situations. There were common contents that had effects on face in the speech situation. Goldsmith (1999) feels that future research should look at the relative frequency of common contents in naturally occurring talk and should explore how the "common –ness" of a speaker's content may affect perception of face sensitivity.

Goldsmith's (1999) findings also have practical and theoretical implications for the study of social support. The findings suggest to advisors that even if they are surprised by the hearer's negative affect, they should not say so and should not tell the hearer that "There's nothing you can do", "It's no big deal". These responses seemed to be expressed frequently in all three of the hypothetical situations in study 1. These responses are particularly problematic

when accompanying advice. In contrast, telling the other "Don't worry "can be face honouring when it accompanies advice. When the advisor wants to tell the hearer that the problem is not that serious, it might be less face threatening to suggest a specific alternative appraisal than to simply assert that the problem is not serious. Mentioning that the distress is temporary can be face –honouring.

Some of Goldsmith (1999) findings are in line with other research on social support and comforting (e. g Burlesons '94) research demonstrated that responses that deny another persons problem and emotions are seen as less sensitive and effective than responses that explicitly acknowledge the problem and emotions.

Some topics in this study that seem to deny feelings seemed not to be insensitive when they accompanied advice and other topics that appeared to acknowledge feelings did not have any impact on perceptions of face threat. Goldsmith's (1999) findings also suggest a need for examination of how speakers combined different types of contents in attempt to help someone with a problem. Social support research should rather examine how the combination of the functional types of support may effect how a message is perceived, than to only differentiate between them,

Goldsmith's (1999) studies show a method for studying the content of messages. According to O'Keefe and Lambert (1995), much of the work on the production and impact of interpersonal messages, focuses on the functional categorizations of message strategies. Though content is used to place message in a typology of inferred intention or effect, the relation between message content and its perceived or actual effects are not usually made explicitly. In contrast, the procedure used in these studies show the predicted contents to have effects and the reasoning on which these predictions are made. The present studies show the significance of computer assisted document clustering and also model a procedure for refining the result of these automated methods of content analysis. The typology developed in this researched serves as a basis for coding both participants' comments in troubles talk conversations thus opening up the possibility of examining how the advice recipient may also play a role in forming a face –honouring identity. These methods could be useful to researchers because they present an effective and reliable tool for processing large volumes of text.

According to Goldsmith (1999), the two studies have limitations that require continued development of this approach. In addition to further work with conversational data, the typology of topics and the patterns of effects shown here should be examined in a bigger variety of situations and in a more varied sample of respondents. Besides the fact that Goldsmith's (1999) studies examine a few situations among college students, the results are important in illustrating a conceptual and mythological approach to the study of episode specific face threats and content – based face work and for demonstrating that content can affect perceptions of face threat and face work.

3.6 Goldsmith (2000)

3.6.1 Mitigating Face Threat

In their politeness theory, Brown and Levinson (1997) put more emphasis on face threats arising from defining features of speech acts. In contrast, Goldsmith's (2000) two studies show how the sequencing of acts affects type and degree of face threat. These studies also elaborate on how to give face – sensitive advice.

Goldsmith (2000) feels that the understanding of circumstances in which individuals threaten or honour face explains why interpersonal messages differ in form and content and why some messages are more appropriate and effective than others. There are many researchers who have looked at face threats and face work in different types of interpersonal communication. Studies by these researchers on face work and advice reveal that giving advice is a common but potentially problematic type of interpersonal objective and that face threat and face work are important considerations in participants evaluation of how effective and appropriate advice is.

The Brown and Levinson's politeness theory (1987) puts an emphasis on the speech act as the unit of analysis and linguistic form as the primary resource of saving face. Goldsmith's (2000) paper therefore looks at the limitations of a speech act – based analysis of face and demonstrates how sequential placement of face threatening acts (FTA) shapes perceptions of face threat. Present studies provide a systematic demonstration of the role of sequential

placement in shaping of face threat. These studies further develop an account for why advice – giving can be seen by participants as effective and appropriate or as ineffective and inappropriate.

3.6.2 Sources of politeness

Goldsmith (2000) defines face as socially situated identities people claim or attribute to others and face work is seen as being inclusive of communicative strategies that enact, support or challenge these situated identities. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), many speech acts threaten either negative face or positive face, as a result these acts are called " face threatening acts" (FTA). The magnitude of FTA's depends on the speaker's power, hearer – speaker closeness and on culturally defined understandings of costs and benefits entailed by particular speech acts. Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory mentions a number of ways to reduce face threat (e.g. indirectness)

Brown and Levinson (1987) claim that some acts, run contrary to face wants of the addressee and /or of speakers because of their nature, thus enabling them to categorize acts as threatening to either the speaker's or the hearer's positive or negative face. Towards the end of their monograph Brown and Levinson (1987) do acknowledge that face implications of an interaction depend not only on conversational understandings of individual acts but also on " reconstruction of levels of intent beyond and above and integrative of those that lie behind particular utterances or sentences.

The fact that Brown and Levinson's (1987) politeness theory remained firmly grounded in the speech act as units of analysis, is limiting in two ways. Firstly, it locates face threats in the conversational rules for issuing speech acts rather than in participants' interferences about goals. Secondly, it overlooks the ways in which inferences about goals rely on the sequential placement of acts in an interaction. To prove the first limit Wilson and colleagues ('91, '92) reveal that face threats arise not just from the defining feature of in issuing an act. They prove that giving advice, requesting a favour, and enforcing an obligation are all influence goals that may be pursued by issuing directives, with corresponding threats to negative face. Advice may also pose threats to negative face if it is interpreted as "nosy" and may threaten positive face when interpreted as part of the speaker's plan to criticize the hearer's action. This

means that threats not only arise from illocutionary intentions associated with particular speech acts but from inferences about the goals of which FTAs are a part and the identity implications of those larger lines of actions.

Wilson and colleagues (1998) contrast the kinds of threats that may arise from different influence goals. (e.g. giving advice vs. enforcing an obligation vs. asking for a favour). Goal – specific threats to face differ not only between kinds of influence goals but also within a particular kind of influence goals such as giving advice. Goldsmith (2000) feels that although Brown and Levinson (1987) are correct in identifying some threats to face that derive from intrinsic properties of speech acts, there are many other context - dependent threats to face that derive from participants' inferences about one another's intentions and the implications of these intentions for participants' situated identities. To understand these context - dependent threats to face the following questions must be asked: What features of the context shape these inferences about goals, identities and threats to face? (e.g. When is advice likely to be seen as unwarranted control rather than caring friendship?)

One likely factor is the sequential placement of FTA's in episodes. Sanders (1995) proposed two principles to account for the identity implications of action sequence. First, sequences of actions make some kinds of goals more or less relevant to the ongoing interaction. Second, sequences of action presume various rights and responsibilities for participants that may be consonant or dissonant with desired identities.

Research by Wilson and colleagues (1991,1992.1998) and by Sanders (1995) suggest the following reformulation of politeness theory's account for how acts can be face threatening. An act can threaten face by virtue of large goal or plan of which it is part. The degree to which an act is face threatening, and the nature of these threats depend in the inferences participants draw about these intended courses of action and the type of identities that these plans presuppose. These inferences unfold sequentially as succeeding acts constrain what plans and identities are relevant. As a result, face implications of an FTA may differ in accordance with the sequential placement of the FTA in conversation. One objective of present studies is to present evidence that this is likely that Goldsmith's (2000) two studies examine the solicitation of advice as one example of how common sequence for doing an act provide a basis for shared inferences about face –threatening intentions associated with an FTA.

3.6.3 Solicitation of advice

According to Cutrona and Suhr (1994), advice is a common type of FTA in personal relationships One reason for negative reactions to advice is face threats. Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) discovered that the degree to which advice was seen as face – threatening and the nature of the face threat might differ as a function of the sequence in which the advice occurred. One aspect of sequence considered by respondents was whether or not advice was solicited. Advisors who respond to a request for advice are not likely to be seen as "butting in" or exercising unwarranted control, and in this case even criticism may be viewed cooperatively and constructively. On the other hand refusing to give advice when advice has been requested may be interpreted a lack of caring and concern.

3.6.4 The Present studies

Goldsmith (2000) did studies to explore how sequential placement of an FTA affects interpretations of face threat and to explain why some cases of advice are focused on identifying the kinds of sequence in which advice occurs and features of these sequences that are relevant to conclusions that the advice was solicited or unsolicited. The second study tests whether the sequences identified in the first sequence are perceived to differ in the degree to which advice is solicited and face threatened or honoured.

3.6.4.1 Study 1: Identifying patterns of advice solicitation

3.6.4.1.1 Rationale

According to Goldsmith (2000), people seek or give advice in a variety of episodes. The present study examines advice in the context of troubles talk conversations. Previous research has proven that advice given in troubles talk is both common and consequential, and that advice in this context is potentially face – threatening. Advice is mainly solicited or unsolicited, however there is advice that also shows indirect patterns as well. If advice is face threatening for the recipient, advice givers may be expected to utilize pre – sequences, such as coming to an agreement that something is problematic, before offering a solution to the

problem. The recipient who explicitly asks for advice may threaten his/her own face and impose on the other to render an opinion, thus prompting indirect means of seeking advice. Two questions were asked in study 1:a) What are some common patterns in the way in which advice is introduced into troubles talk conversations?

b) What are distinguishing features of these patterns that might be relevant to judgment that advice is solicited and face sensitive?.

3.6.2.1.2 Method

Goldsmith's (2000) analysis was based on observation and interview data on advice among white middle class Americans. This data was collected by five women and one man. Team members observed 93 advice – giving episodes related to troubles talk. Goldsmith (2000) developed a summary gloss of the utterances that immediately preceded the introduction of advice including whether the advice giver or recipients committed each act. Goldsmith (2000) then developed categories of advice preceding sequences according to observed similarities and potential implications for perceived solicitation and face. The method used by Goldsmith (2000) in study 1 was inductive and interpretive, with the goal of identifying potentially meaningful variations in advice sequence.

3.6.4.1.3 Findings

Goldsmith (2000) identified six patterns through which advice was introduced:

1.   Recipient asks for advice

 Recipients asked for advice in three explicit ways, of which the most explicit was " I need your advice", which even expresses some degree of urgency. The request for advice was followed by the description of a problem. The other ways were: "What should I do?" And " Should I do X?"

2.   Recipient asks for opinion or information

Recipients also asked the question: 'What do you think of X?' which is in fact a request for opinion. This question cast the speaker as a "consultant". Both opinions and information might be useful in evaluating some course of actions. When information is requested, it is not clear

whether advice is also required. Asking for opinion is an ambiguous indicator that a person wants problem –solving rather than emotional support: Asking for an opinion could be a means of establishing that one's feelings are justified or a means of gauging the other's willingness to be a listener.

3.   Recipient discloses problem

Advice may follow disclosure of a problem. However, some researchers feel that sometimes the distressed individual only wants a sympathetic shoulder to cry on rather than advice. In Goldsmith's (2000) analysis interpretations of participants and participant observers suggest that announcing a problem may be heard as a request for advice even if advice is not given. The way in which a problem is announced may influence its hearer in a form of solicitation of advice (e.g. some problem announcements include a confession of 'ignorance or uncertainty')

4.   Recipient announces plan of action

At times advice comes after a recipient's statement that they have decided or are strongly considering undertaking some action. Though announcing action might not be seem as request for advice, it can be followed by some kind of comment.

3.6.4.1.4 Discussion

Goldsmith's (2000) analysis revealed common patterns in the way in which advice is introduced into troubles talk episodes. Advice sequences that seem to differ along three dimensions may be relevant to judgments to solicitation and to references about face threat. Firstly, inferences about an advisor's face threatening intention could be affected by the explicitness with which a recipient asks for advice. Secondly, an on - record admission of a problem by a recipient ,could make advice seem as a desire to help rather than criticism. Thirdly, for an advisor to introduce the problem may compound the threats associated with advice.

3.6.4.2 Study 2: Testing perceived Face Threat associated with forms of advice solicitation

3.6.4.2.1 Rationale

According to Goldsmith (2000), study 2 tests whether the sequences identified in study 1 are perceived to differ in the degree to which advice is solicited and face is threatened or honoured .The following hypotheses (H) were tested:

H 1: Forms in which the recipient explicitly asks for advice, introduces the topic, and acknowledges a problem will be seen as more solicitous of advice than forms which possess fewer of these characteristics.

H 2: The perception that an advice recipient of solicited advice will be positively associated with the perception that an advice giver shows regard for the recipient's positive and negative face.

H 3:(a) Differences in perceived regard for face will correspond to differences in perceived advice solicitation. (b) Perceived solicitation will mediate the relationship between the six sequences and perceived regard for positive and negative face.

3.6.4.2.2 Method

Participants

Undergraduates at a mid western university, aged between 17 and 29.

Procedures

Each participant had to read one of 60 dialogues, representing one of the six ways of introducing advice message scenarios. Participants then had to respond to a number of statements about the conversation and the feelings of interlocutors. Each statement was then follower by a seven - point scale anchored by "strongly disagree and strong agree" This could reveal to which degree the advice recipient was seen to have solicited advice and also to which degree the advisor was perceived to show regard for the recipient's positive and

negative face.

3.6.4.2.3 Results

Sequence and perception of solicitation

The first hypothesis gave a prediction of relationship between the six advice sequences and respondent's perceptions that the recipient solicited advice .The perception that advice was solicited varied significantly, depending on how advice was introduced into a dialogue. Goldsmith (2000) used the Student - Newman - Keuls tests to examine differences in mean perceiving solicitation for the six sequences.

Hypothesis 2 gave a prediction for a positive association between perception that the recipient solicited advice and perceptions of the degree to which the advisor showed regard for the recipient's face. This hypothesis was supported by significant zero - order correlations between perceived solicitation and perceived regard for positive face.

The third hypothesis looked at the relationship between the different advice sequences and perceived regard for the recipient's face. Hypothesis 3(a) predicted a correspondence between differences in perceived regard for face across the types of advice sequences and difference in perceived solicitation. This hypothesis was tested by mixed model analyses of variance, parallel to that conducted for the effects of sequence on perceived solicitation.

According to Goldsmith (2000) the analysis of how types sequences were related to perception that advice was solicited suggested four groupings: recipient asks for advice, opinion or information, recipient discloses a problem or announces a plan; advisor identifies a problem; and advisor volunteers advice.

For perceived regard for positive face, contrast analysis's indicated that in sequences in which the recipient discloses a problem or announces a plan, the advisor showed more regard for the recipients' positive face than in sequences in which the recipient requests advice, opinion, or information or sequence in which the advisor identifies or volunteers advice. For perceived negative face, contrast analysis indicated that in sequences in which the recipient requests

advice, opinion or information or in which the recipient discloses a problem or a announces a plan, the advice giver showed greater regard for the recipient's negative face than in sequences in which the advisor identifies a problem or volunteers advice. To add to that in, sequence in which the advisor identifies a problem, the advisor shows greater regard for negative face than the sequence in which the advisor volunteers advice.

Hypothesis 3b gave a prediction that perceived solicitation would mediate the effects of sequence on perceived regard for face. Goldsmith (2000) tested this hypothesis using mixed model analyses of covariance in which perceived solicitation was inconclusive. For perceived regard for positive face, the assumption of homogeneity of regression coefficient was violated. Analysis of covariance was appropriate for perceived regard for negative face.

3.6.4.2.4 Discussion

Goldsmith (2000) feels that advice is seen as most solicited when a recipient explicitly asks for it. Sequences in which the advisor identifies a problem are seen as unsolicited; they are seen as less unsolicited than sequences in which the advisor just volunteers advice without the recipient's acknowledgement of problem.

The degree to which advice threatens and negative face is associated with the different forms of advice sequences and the perception that a recipient solicited advice. No advice sequence showed high regard for the recipient's face. Goldsmith (2000) discovered that bald – on - record advice was less threatening to negative face when the advice recipient initiated the sequence than when the advisor volunteered advice.

Goldsmith (2000) also discovered that perceived solicitation mediates between differences in advice sequences and differences in perceived regard for negative face. The recipients' positive face was threatened in sequences in which advice followed the recipient's disclosure of a problem or announcement of a plan.

A respondent's perception that advice was solicited seemed to mediate judgments about the regard to positive face that is shown in a certain kind of advice sequence. Goldsmith's (2000) findings can be interpreted by saying that a judgment about the degree to which advice was

solicited is one factor that contributes to inferences about regard for positive face, and that this factor is most influential when discursive cues are mixed.

3.6.4.2.5 Conclusions

Goldsmith's (2000) findings reveal that there are common sequences that may serve as resources for aggravating or mitigating face threat for certain types of acts in recognizable episodes. The findings also suggest cautiousness about volunteering advice is one general principle for face sensitive advice – giving. Advice was seen as least face -threatening when the advice recipient initiated discussion of the topic.

Goldsmith (2000) feels that there is need for future research to examine how the sequential placement of advice may affect face threat in conjunction with variability in polite forms and in speaker - hearer relationships.

There are also limitations in present study. A reaction to a dialogue in which advice was given might have biased respondents thinking that advice was what the recipient wanted. These findings have to be understood as particular to communities studied because face implications of advice may differ in various socio-cultural groups.

CHAPTER 4
ADVICE TOPICS IN ISIZULU

INTRODUCTION

4.1 Aim

The main aim of this chapter is to identify and examine a number of common advice topics that are relevant to troubles talk episodes. The chapter will be divided into three subsections, i.e. Advice situations, Questionnaire and Analysis of the advice topics.

In the research, which was conducted for the purpose of this study, ten advice situations were identified. These advice situations will be discussed in detail and an attempt will be made to explain why such situations were deemed relevant to those who participated in the research. The method which was used in conducting the research will be examined, i.e. participants were asked to complete questionnaires. Some details about the advice seekers and advice givers will also be provided, including the place where this research took place.

The twenty-one advice topics which were used in analysing the questionnaires will then be examined. The purpose for the use of those advice topics will also be explained in this subsection. The analysis of the questionnaires will reveal that some advice situations have more advice topics than others, therefore it will be necessary to give an explanation as to why that happens. In total, there are five major situations, i.e. **Abuse, Teachers, Learners, Personal and Discipline,** which will be discussed. All these major situations have two sub situations each.

4.2   Advice situations

Firstly, 10 situations have been identified. These advice situations have been selected because they are applicable to the target group, i.e. Learners in grade 12 at school. Secondly, these situations have been divided into five major situations which each have two sub situations. These situations are considered relevant to various problems, which learners who are still at school may encounter, either at school, at home, or with their friends.

4.2.1   Abuse

The problem of abuse of children by adults unfortunately still exists in our community. In the research, the situation of "**Abuse**" has two subsections, i.e. **Beating** and **Work**. In the first sub situation, i.e. **Beating**, the learner has a problem about his /her father who is a drunkard and whenever he is drunk he beats him/her without any reason. In the sub situation **Work** the learner is given too many chores to do by his/her parents. These two sub situations are relevant to learners because they sometimes affect the learners' schoolwork negatively. When learners are beaten or given too many chores at home, the situation at home becomes tense, hostile and unbearable, which is not conducive for studying.

4.2.2   Teachers

Teachers play a very important role in the lives of learners. Without dedicated, hard working, caring teachers, it would almost be impossible for learners to achieve anything positive in life. The situation **Teachers** has been divided into two sub situations, i.e. **Laziness** and **Prejudiced**. In the sub situation **Laziness** the learner is worried about a teacher who does not take his/her work seriously, instead of teaching he/she tells the class about sports and the learner is afraid that he/she might fail his/her examination at the end of the year because of this lazy teacher. In the sub situation **Prejudiced** the learner has a problem about a teacher who he/she feels does not like him/her because he ignores him/her in class. Laziness and prejudice on the part of the teacher can have a negative impact on the learner because the learner can end up performing poorly in the subject which is taught by that particular teacher.

4.2.3   Learners

In the research, this situation was divided into two sub situations, i.e. **Nervousness** and **Arrive late**. In the sub situation **Nervousness** the learner is worried because he/she must deliver a speech in class and he/she has never ever done this before. The problem of nervousness on the part of the learner can affect the learner's progress in class if it is not addressed accordingly. Nervous learners tend to be shy and tense, which could destroy the relaxed atmosphere, which is a prerequisite for learning. In the sub situation **Arrive late** the

learner is experiencing transport problems, as a result he/she always arrive late at school and gets punished almost daily for this. Being late for school can also have a negative impact on the learner's progress, because he/she misses some important morning classes.

4.2.4 Personal

The sub situations which fall under the situation **Personal** are **Relationships** and **Theft**. In the sub situation **Relationships,** the learner has been dumped by his/her girlfriend/boyfriend; he/she is always thinking about this even in class, as a result he/she can't concentrate on his/her studies. In the sub situation **Theft** the learner has a problem in connection with his/her pocket money which has been stolen in class and he/she is hungry because he wanted to use that money to buy food. Problematic love relationships or having items stolen by other learners could also affect certain learners negatively, because such nasty incidents could distract the attention of those learners from their studies.

4.2.5 Discipline

The situation **Discipline** has two sub situations. Those are **Strict parents** and **New school**. In the sub situation **Strict parents** the learner has a problem about parents who are too strict; they do not want him to go out with friends. All they want him/her to do is to study all the time. In the sub situation **New school** the learner is worried by the fact that his/her parents want him to leave the township school to go and attend a private school in town, because they think that the teachers at the township school are lazy. The child does not want to go to the new school. It is the duty of parents to discipline their children, however most Grade 12 learners claim that they are fully grown up and would therefore wish to be given the independence to make their own decisions. To avoid any confrontation between the learners and their parents, it is advisable for parents to be sympathetic and to exercise caution when dealing with thorny issues between themselves and their teenage daughters/sons, and try to convince the children to be rational, and to think carefully before making decisions.

4.3   Questionnaire

4.3.1 Copy of the questionnaire

QUESTIONNAIRE

IZINKINGA ZABAFANA NABANTOMBAZANE

PROBLEMS OF BOTH BOYS AND GIRLS

A: INKINGA: UMFUNDI UYAHLUKUNYEZWA EKHAYA.

Ubaba womfundi uyisidakwa futhi unomkhuba wokushaya umfundi ngaphandle kwesizathu. Umfundi unezibazi ngenxa yokushaywa.

(Problem: Abusive situation at home.

The learner is in an abusive situation at home. The father, who is an   alcoholic, has a habit of beating the learner without a reason. The learner has some marks on his/her body because of the beating.)

 ISIKHALO/COMPLAINT: Umfundi ukhala ngokuhlukunyezwa ekhaya.

_____

_____

ISELULEKO/ADVICE: Luleka umfundi ngalokho okufanele akwenze.

_____

_____

_____

B. INKINGA: UMSEBENZI WASEKHAYA.

Umfundi unikwa umsebenzi omningi kakhulu ekhaya. Kufanele enze konke endlini, ngakho – ke akasitholi isikhathi sokwenza umsebenzi wesikole.

(Problem: Household work.

The learner is given too much household work at home. He/She is expected to do everything, as a result he/she does n't get a chance to do his/her homework.)

ISIKHALO/COMPLAINT: Umfundi ukhala ngomsebenzi omningi ekhaya.

_____

_____

_____

ISELULEKO/ADVICE: Luleka umfundi ngalokho okufanele akwenze.

_____

_____

_____

C. INKINGA/COMPLAINT: UTHISHA OVILAPHAYO
Umfundi ukhathazekile ngothisha ongawenzi umsebenzi wakhe ngendlela. Ekilasini ubaxoxela ngezemidlalo esikhundleni sokufundisa. Umfundi unovalo lokuthi ngeke aphumelele ekuhlolweni kukamatikuletsheni.
(Problem: Lazy teacher
The learner is worried about a lazy teacher who does not do his/her work properly. In class, he/she always tells the about sport instead of teaching. The learner is afraid that he/she is going to fail the matric examination)
ISIKHALO/COMPLAINT: Umfundi ukhala ngothisha ovilaphayo.

_____

_____

_____

ISELULEKO/ADVICE: Luleka umfundi ngalokho okufanele akwenze.

_____

_____

_____

D. INKINGA : UTHISHA AKAMTHANDI UMFUNDI.
Umfundi ubona sengathi uthisha othile akamthandi. Lothisha akamnaki umfundi ekilasini.
(Problem: The teacher does not like the learner.
The learner feels that a certain teacher does not like him/her. The teacher ignores him/her in class.)
ISIKHALO/COMPLAINT: Umfundi ukhala ngothisha ongamthandi.

_____

_____

_____

ISELULEKO/ADVICE: Luleka umfundi ngalokho okufanele akwenze.

_____

_____

_____

E. INKINGA: INKULUMO EKILASINI
Umfundi kufanele ethule inkulumo ekilasini njengesivivinyo sokukhuluma. Akakaze ethule inkulumo ekilasini. Unovalo.
(Problem: Speech in class
The learner is supposed to deliver a speech in class as an oral assessment. He/She is nervous.)
ISIKHALO/COMPLAINT: Umfundi unovalo lokwethula inkulumo ekilasini.

_____

_____

_____

ISELULEKO/ADVICE: Luleka umfundi ngalokho okufanele akwenze.

_____

_____

_____

F. INKINGA: UKWALIWA KOMFUNDI YISOKA/INTOMBI
Umfundi waliwe yisoka/intombi yakhe ayithandayo kakhulu. Umsebenzi womfundi wesikole uyaphazamiseka ngoba uhlala ecabangana nalelisoka nalentombi.
(Problem: A failed relationship
The learner has been dumped by a boyfriend/girlfriend who she/he loves so much. His/Her schoolwork is affected by this because he/she is always thinking about the girlfriend/boyfriend in class.)

_____
_____

ISIKHALO/COMPLAINT: Umfundi ukhala ngokwaliwa yisoka/intombi.

_____
_____
_____

ISELULEKO/ADVICE: Luleka umfundi ngalokho okufanele akwenze.

_____
_____
_____

G. INKINGA : ABAZALI ABANESANDLA ESIQINILE.
Abazali bomfundi banesandla esiqine kakhulu. Abamvumeli ukuthi akhulume nabafana/namantombazane. Uma efika ephuma esikoleni bafuna abhekane nomsebenzi wakhe wesikole kuphela.
(Problem: Strict parents
The learner's parents are too strict. They do not allow him/her to go out with friends. Whenever he/she comes home from school, they insist that he/she does his/her schoolwork all the time.)
  ISIKHALO/COMPLAINT: Umfundi ukhala ngabazali abanesandla esiqinile.

_____
_____
_____

ISELULEKO/ADVICE: Luleka umfundi ngalokho okufanele akwenze.

_____
_____
_____

H. INKINGA: UKUNGABIKHONA KWAMATEKISI OKUHAMBISA ABAFUNDI ESIKOLENI.
Umfundi unenkinga yamatekisi afika emuva kwesikhathi; ngenxa yalokhu ufika sesingenile isikole., sezidlulile nezifundo zasekuseni futhi ujeziswa zonke izinsuku ngalokufika emva kwesikhathi.
(Problem: Lack of transport to take learners to school on time
The learner has a problem about taxis which are always late, as a result he/she arrives late at school, thus missing the morning lessons and gets punished daily for late – coming.)

ISIKHALO/COMPLAINT: Umfundi ukhala ngokungabikhona kwamatekisi
_____
_____

ISELULEKO/ADVICE: Luleka umfundi ngalokho okufanele akwenze.
_____
_____
_____

I. INKINGA: UKUNTSHONTSHWA KWEMALI
Umfundi ufike neshumi lamarandi lokuzithengela ukudla esikoleni, kodwa lemali isintshontshiwe.
(Problem: Theft of money
The learner brought R10 to class to buy some food, but the money has been stolen.)
ISIKHALO/COMPLAINT: Umfundi ukhala ngemali entshontshiwe.
_____
_____
_____

ADVICE/ISELULEKO: Luleka umfundi ngalokho okufanele akwenze.
_____
_____
_____

J. INKINGA: ABAZALI BAFUNA UKUKHIPHA UMFUNDI ESIKOLENI SASELOKISHINI.
Abazali bafuna ukuthumela umfundi esikoleni sangasese esisedolobheni. Umfundi akafuni ukuya kulesikole.
(Problem: Parents want to remove the learner from the township school.
The learner's parents want to send him/her to a private school in town. He/She does not want to go to that school.)
ISIKHALO/COMPLAINT: Umfundi ukhala ngokukhishwa esikoleni saselokishini.
_____
_____
_____

ISELULEKO/ADVICE: Luleka umfundi ngalokho okufanele akwenze.
_____
_____

4.3.2   Completion of the questionnaire

The questionnaire that was drawn up for this research has two sections, i.e. the "complaint" section and the "advice" section. The "complaint" section was completed by a group of twenty learners at Bantfwabetfu High school (Mpumalanga Province). In total, twenty questionnaires were completed. Boys completed 51% of the questionnaires and girls completed 49%. The "advice" section of the questionnaire was completed by teachers at Bantfwabetfu High School

and some citizens from the Elukwatini Community. Teachers completed 60% of the questionnaires and the other members of the Elukwatini Community completed 40%.

4.4 Analysis of the advice topics

4.4.1 Advice situations and advice topics

The twenty questionnaires which were completed as indicated in paragraph 3 above were analysed with regard to the various advice topics which appear in Goldsmith (1999:319). Those advice topics were numbered from 1 – 7 and together with various sub topics; a total number of 21 advice topics were used in analysing the 20 questionnaires, i.e. the purpose was to establish whether the advice topics do appear in the data, and secondly, in what possible frequency may they occur in the advice situations.

Table 1: Total number of advice topics

	SITUATION	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
1.	**ABUSE**	**43**	**17.6**
1.1	BEATING (A)	22	51.1
1.2	WORK (B)	21	48.8
2.	**TEACHERS**	**44**	**I8.1**
2.1	LAZY (C)	21	47.7
2.2	PREJUDICED (D)	23	52.2
3.	**LEARNERS**	**52**	**21.3**
3.1	NERVOUSNESS (E)	30	57.6
3.2	ARRIVE LATE (H)	22	42.3
4.	**PERSONAL**	**57**	**23.4**
4.1	RELATIONSHIP (F)	36	63.1
4.2	THEFT (I)	21	36.8
5.	**DISCIPLINE**	**47**	**19.3**
5.1	STRICT PARENTS (G)	24	51
5.2	NEW SCHOOL (J)	23	48.9
	TOTAL	**243**	

In table 1 above, the various situations have been listed in a vertical order from situation 1 to situation 5. These situations refer to those which have been listed in the questionnaire above. The numbers which appear next to these situations in a horizontal order reflect the total number of advice topics which have been used in each situation as well as in each sub situation, e.g. in situation 1 **Abuse** a total number of **43** strategies have been used, i.e. 17.6% of the total number of strategies.

4.4.1.1 Major situations

SITUATION	TOTAL
1. Abuse	17.6%
2. Teachers	18.1%
3. Learners	21.3%
4. Personal	23.4%
5. Discipline	19.3%

According to the table above, the advice topics which have been used in each situation, may be classified into four groups:

1. Situation 4: 23.4%
2. Situation 3: 21.3%
3. Situation 5: 19.3%
4. Situation 1, 2: 17.6%, 18,1%

Looking at the data on this table, it is obvious that some advice situations have more advice topics than others. For instance, situation 4 **Personal** has the most advice topics (23.4%) whereas situation 1 **Abuse** and situation 2 **Teachers** have the least number of topics (17.6% and 18.1% respectively). It looks like people are always very keen to give more advice to people with personal problems than to people with other problems. One possible reason for this could be the fact that the personal problems in this research, i.e. "relationships" and "theft of money" are not that serious in nature. They really do not have far reaching consequences. Therefore, it is easier to tell a learner "who has been dumped" to just forget

about relationships and fully concentrate on his/her studies because that should have been his /her priority in the first place instead of engaging in fruitless relationships. Situation 1 **Abuse** and situation 2 **Teachers** have the least number of advice topics because they are very sensitive in nature. The sensitivity comes from the fact that third parties are involved. People tend to be reluctant to give advice, which might lead to confrontation between the parties who are involved. In this research, the parties who are involved are learners on one side and the parents/teachers on the other side. The other factor is that people do not want to see a parent who is abusing his /her child going to jail or a teacher who does not like a particular child losing his/her job because of the advice they gave to the learner. All the reasons mentioned above are also applicable to situation 5 **Discipline.** Situation 3 **Learners** has a higher number of advice topics because it is easier to deal with due to its nature, which is not that sensitive. Looking at the pattern in which advice topics have been used, it becomes obvious that advice giving can be a very face – threatening exercise. Advisors tend to shy away from giving advice in situations which appear to be sensitive because they want to protect their own face. The children they are advising here are not their own children, therefore, they don't want to be accused of 'butting in' or for having destroyed the 'good' relationship between children and their parents; and between teachers and their learners.

4.4.1.2 The Sub situations

The five major situations in Table 1 above have each two sub situations, i.e. a total number of ten sub situations. The aim of this section is to establish the difference in number of advice topics in the sub situations and also to find reasons for the big differences in these advice topics.

4.4.1.2.1 Abuse

SUB SITUATION	PERCENTAGE
1.1 Beating	51.1%
1.2 Work	48.8%

The first advice situation, i.e. **Abuse** has 43 advice topics. Of these 43 topics, 51.1% have been used in giving advice to people with the problem of **Beating**, and 48.8% to those with

the problem of **Work**. It is clear that there is no difference in the number of advice topics in these two advice situations. The reason for this small difference could the fact that both situations are very serious situations, and the advice giver views them as equally sensitive (None of the two situations seem to be less sensitive than the other)

4.4.1.2.2 Teachers

SUB SITUATION	PERCENTAGE
2.1 Lazy	47.7%
2.2 Prejudiced	52.2%

The advice situation **Teachers** has 44 advice topics. 47.7% of these topics **have** been used in giving advice to people with the problem of **Laziness**, and 52.2% to those with the problem of **Prejudice**. The difference in the number of advice topics in these two sub situations is small, which could possibly be caused by the fact that both sub situations carry the same weight when it comes to sensitivity and seriousness.

4.4.1.2.3 Learners

SUB SITUATION	PERCENTAGE
3.1 Nervousness	57.6%
3.2 Arrive late	42.3%

The advice situation **Learners** has 52 advice topics. Of these 52 topics 57.6% have been used in giving advice to people with the problem of **Nervousness**, and 42.3% to those with the problem **Arriving late**. There is a big difference in the number of advice topics in these two sub situations. The possible reason for this wider margin could be the fact that advice givers regard the problem of **Arriving late** as a problem which could be addressed easily within a short space of time, which explains the fewer number of topics dedicated to this situation. The problem of **Nervousness** on the other hand is a more complicated problem, which might take longer to solve, thus resulting in the need for a wider variety of advice topics.

4.4.1.2.4. Personal

SUB SITUATION	PERCENTAGE
4.1 Relationship	63.1%
4.2 Theft	36.8%

The advice situation **Personal** is the most interesting in comparison to the other situations because of the huge difference in the number of advice topics in the two sub situations. In total, there are 57 topics and 63.1% of those topics have been used in giving advice to people with the problem of **Relationship**, and 36.8% to those with the problem of **Theft**. The reason why the sub situation **Theft** has a low number of topics could be the fact that advice givers do realise that it is only a temporary situation and not much could be done to remedy the situation. However, the sub situation **Relationship** on the other hand could impact negatively on the learner, thus affecting even his /her progress at school. This could be the reason why advisors see the need for lengthy advice in this situation.

4.4.1.2.5 Discipline

SUB SITUATION	PERCENTAGE
5.1 Strict parents	51%
5.2 New school	48.9%

The advice situation **Discipline** has 47 advice topics. 51% of these topics have been used in giving advice to the learners who have the problem of **Strict parents**, and 48.9% to those learners with the problem of **New School**. There is no big difference in the number of advice topics in these two sub situations because they are regarded as of equal significance by advisors

4.4.2 Advice topics in sub situations

4.4.2.1 Situation 1: Abuse

| Advice topic | 1.1 Beating | | 1.2 Work | |
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
2.2	2	9%	10	47.6%
2.3	-	-	1	4.7%
2.4	-	-	1	4.7%
2.8	-	-	1	4.7%
3.1	17	77.2%	7	33.3%
3.2	1	4.5%	1	4.7%
5	2	9%	-	-

According to the table above, only seven from the 21 advice topics have been used in giving advice in the two sub situations above:

(a) Advice topic 2: Problem topics, with 2.2 Problem is controllable, 2.3 Problem has positive aspects, 2.4 Problem is common, 2.8 Problem is severe.

(b) Advice topic 3: Action topics, with 3.1 Actions you can take, 3.1 Joint actions we can take.

(c) Advice topics 5: Relationship topics

The distribution of advice topics in the sub situation above is very uneven. In sub situation 1.1 **Beating** only topic 3.1 **Actions you can take**, has a percentage which is worth mentioning, i.e. 77.2%. The reason for this high percentage could be the fact that advisors regard this type of abuse as a very serious offence. Therefore, they feel that drastic action should be taken with immediate effect. The issue of 'face' plays a role in the frequent use of this topic. To save their own face, advisors come up with different actions which can be taken to solve the learner's problem because they don't want to be seen as being 'unhelpful, unsupportive or less knowledgeable. This very same reason also serves to explain the high percentage of

advice topic 3.1 **Actions you can take** in sub situation 1.2 **Work**, where the percentage is 33.3%. In sub situation 1.2 **Work** the advice topic 2.2 **Problem is controllable** has also been used frequently (47.6%). Advisors seem to believe that a lot could be done by the learner to control this problem. They want to honour the learner' positive face by offering a competent identity to the learner.

4.4.2.2 Situation 2: Teacher

Advice topic	2.1 Lazy		2.2 Prejudiced	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
2.2	1	4.7%	2	8.6%
2.7	-	-	1	4.3%
3.1	7	33.3%	15	65.2%
3.2	12	57.1%	-	-
5	1	4.7%	5	21.7%

In the topic above, only five of the 21 advice topics have been used in giving advice in the two sub situations:

(a) Advice topic 2: Problem topics, with 2.2 Problem is controllable, 2.7 Problem cause.
(b) Advice topic 3: Action topics, with 3.1 Actions you can take, 3.2 Joint actions you can take
(c) Advice topic 5: Relationship topics

The advice topics which have been used frequently in sub situation 2.1 **Lazy** are: 3.1 **Actions you can take** (33.3%) and 3.3 **Joint actions we can take** (57.1%). The high percentage of 3.2 **Joint actions we can take**, could be the fact that advisors want to honour the learners' positive face by showing liking and acceptance of the learners' concern, and to show their willingness to lend a hand in solving the problem. The 33.3% in 3.1 **Actions you can take** shows that advisors believe that some action could be taken to solve the problem successfully, and also to protect their own face by not appearing to be 'unhelpful'. In sub situation 2.2 **Prejudiced** the advice topics which have been used frequently are: 3.1 **Actions**

you can take (65.2%) and topic 5 Relationship topics (21.7%0. The possible reason for the frequent use of 3.1 **Actions you can take** could be the fact that advisors view prejudice as a very sensitive and serious matter, which deserves drastic action to have it resolved once and for all, because if it is not attended to properly it could have a negative impact on the learner, i.e. the learner could fail his/her examinations. The 21.7% in topic **5: Relationship topics** could be caused by the fact that advisors do believe that the learner has to do something to improve his/her relationship with the teacher. These topics appeal to the learner's positive face because they show the learner that the advisor does 'care' for him/her.

4.4.2.3 Situation 3: Learners

Advice topic	3.1 Nervousness		3.2 Arrive late	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1.1	8	26.6%	-	-
1.5	3	10%	-	-
2.2	6	20%	5	22.7%
2.3	2	6.6%	-	-
2.4	3	10%	-	-
2.5	1	3.3%	-	-
2.7	-	-	1	4.5%
2.9	3	10%	-	-
3.1	2	6.6%	7	31.8%
3.2	2	6.6%	9	40.9%

According to the table above, ten of the 21 advice topics have been used in giving advice in the sub sections above:

(a) Advice topic 1: Emotion topics, with 1.1 Don't have the emotion, 1.5 Your emotion is common.

(b) Advice topic 2: Problem topics, with 2.2 Problem is controllable, 2.3 Problem has positive aspects, 2.4 Problem is common, 2.5 Problem is temporary, 2.7 Problem cause, 2.9 Problem is severe.

(c) Advice topic 3: Action topics, with 3.1 Actions you can take, 3.2 Joint actions we can take.

In sub situation 3.1 **Nervousness** only 1.1 **Don't have the emotion** (26.6%) and 2.2 **Problem is controllable** (20%) are worth mentioning because they have been used frequently. The frequent use of these two advice topics suggests that the majority of advisors don't regard the problem of **Nervousness** as a serious problem. It seems as if they believe that the learner can overcome this problem easily, which appeals to the learner's positive face because he/she realises that the advisor thinks that he/she does have the ability to solve the problem. The topic 1.1 **Don't have the emotion** can be face – threatening on its own, however, in this research the face threat to the learner was mitigated by the fact that the advisor did provide a solution to the problem. In sub situation 3.2 **Arrive late** the significant advice topics are: 3.2 **Joint actions we can take** (40.9) and 3.1 **Actions you can take** (31.8%). The high percentage in 3.2 **Joint actions we can take** suggests that the advisor wants to honour the learner's positive face by being actively involved in the attempt to solve the problem, which shows the learner that the advisor 'likes' him/her. The frequent use of 3.1 **Actions you can take** suggests that there is a wide variety of actions that can solve the problem. The advisor suggests all these actions because he wants to protect his/her own face. He/she does not want to be accused of being 'Unsupportive or unhelpful'

4.4.2.4 Situation 4: Personal

Advice topic	4.1 Relationship		4.2 Theft	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1.1	1	2.7%	-	-
1.2	1	2.7%	-	-
1.5	1	2.7%	-	-
1.6	2	5.5%	-	-
2.1	-	-	2	9.5%
2.2	5	13.8%	4	19%
2.3	5	13.8%	-	-
2.5	1	2.7%	-	-
2.7	1	2.7%	1	4.7%
2.8	1	2.7%	1	4.7%
2.9	13	36.1%	-	-
3.1	5	13.8%	11	52%
5	-	-	2	9.5%

In the sub situations above, the highest number of advice topics have been used, compare to the other eight sub situations. In total, 13 advice topics have been used:

(a) Advice topic 1: Emotion topics, with 1.1 Don't have the emotion, 1.2 Emotion is inappropriate, 1.5 Your emotion is common, 1.6 Your emotion is temporary
(b) Advice topic 2: Problem topics, with 2.1 Problem is uncontrollable, 2.2 Problem is controllable, 2.3 Problem has positive aspects, 2.5 Problem is temporary, 2.7 Problem cause, 2.8 Problem is severe, 2.9 Problem is not severe.
(c) Advice topic 3: Action topics, with 3.1 Actions you can take
(d) Advice topic 5: Relationship topics

The high number of advice topics, which have been used for situation 4: **Personal** makes it clear that it is a situation, which is somehow very complicated for advisors. In sub situation 4.1 **Relationships** only 2.9 **Problem is not severe** has been used frequently. This could be

because advisors do not really regard the problem of **Relationships** as a serious problem. They feel that the learners have to concentrate on their studies, rather than getting involved in unnecessary love relationships, which could distract their attention. In sub situation 4.2 **Theft** only 3.1 **Actions you can take** has a high percentage. Advisors feel that taking some kind of action can solve the problem and they also want to appear as being 'helpful', to save their own face.

4.4.2.5 Situation 5: Discipline

Advice topic	5.1 Strict parents		5.2 New school	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
2.2	3	12.5%	2	8.6%
2.3	5	20.8%	7	30.4%
2.7	1	4.1%	2	8.6%
3.1	10	41.6%	8	34.7%
3.2	1	4.1%	1	4.3%
5	4	16.6%	3	13%

In this table only six advice topics have been used:

(a) Advice topic 2: Problem topics, with 2.2 Problem is controllable, 2.3 Problem has positive aspects, 2.7 Problem cause
(b) Advice topic 3: Action topics, with 3.1 Actions you can take, 3.2 Joint actions we can take
(c) Advice topic 5: Relationship topics

In both sub situations above, similar advice topics have been used frequently. These topics are 3.1 **Actions you can take** with 41.6% for 5.1 **Strict parents** and 34.7% for 5.2 **New school**; and 2.3 **Problem has positive aspects**, with 20.8% for 5.1 **Strict parents** and 30.4% for 5.2 **New school**. Looking at the figures above, one realises that situation 5 **Discipline** is a sensitive matter for the advisors. They want to keep their interference to the minimum in this matter. This could be because they are also parents, and would not really

want to come between other parents and their children. Although some of them feel that some kind of action must be taken (41.6% and 34.7%), others feel that the parents are doing the best they can do for the learner, and whatever they do, will benefit the learner at a later stage. The frequent use of 2.3 **Problem has positive aspects**, shows an attempt on the part of the advisor to protect his/her own face because he/she does not want to come between the parent and the learner. It is also an attempt to appeal to the learner's positive face because it claims that whatever is being done by the parents is to the benefit of the learner. (The learner is being 'liked')

4.4.3 Individual advice topics in major situations

In this section, the individual advice topics which have been used in giving advice within the five major situations will be considered.

4.4.3.1 Advice situation 1: Abuse

Advice topic	Number	Percentage
2.2	12	27.9%
2.3	1	2.3%
2.4	1	2.3%
2.8	1	2.3%
3.1	24	55.8%
3.2	2	4.6%
5	2	4.6%
Total	**43**	

The significant advice topics for **Abuse** are obviously 2.2 **Problem is controllable** (27.9%) and 3.1 **Actions you can take** (55.8%). The higher percentage in 3.1 **Actions you can take** could be attributed to the fact that advisors regard **Abuse** as a serious offence, which deserves drastic action. The reason for the frequent use of 2.2 **Problem is controllable** could be that advisors think that there are some things which could be done to solve the problem because it is not an uncontrollable problem. These topics honour the 'faces' of both

the advisor and the advice recipient because the advisor appears as being 'helpful' and the recipient appears as being 'competent' enough to solve the problem.

4.4.3.2 Advice situation 2: Teachers

Advice topics	Number	Percentage
2.2	3	6.8%
2.7	1	2.2%
3.1	22	50%
3.2	12	27.2%
5	6	13.6%
Total	**44**	

The advice topics which have been used frequently in situation 2 **Teachers** are 3.1 **Actions you can take** (50%) and 3.2 **Joint actions we can take** (27.2%). The frequent use of 3.1 **Actions you can take** shows that advisors believe that there is a wide variety of actions which the learners may take to address the problem of Teachers, and this saves the advisor's face because he/she won't be seen as being 'unhelpful' The higher percentage in 3.2 **Joint actions we can take** shows an attempt by the advisor to honour the learner's positive face by getting actively involved in the attempt to solve the learner's problem.

4.4.3.3 Advice situation 3: Learners

Advice topic	Number	Percentage
1.1	8	15.3%
1.5	3	5.7%
2.2	11	21.1%
2.3	2	3.8%
2.4	3	5.7%
2.5	1	1.9%
2.7	1	1.9%
2.9	3	5.7%
3.1	9	17.3%
3.2	11	21.1%
Total	**52**	

The significant advice topics for situation 3 **Learners** are 2.2 **Problem is controllable** (21.1%) and 3.2 **Joint actions we can take** (21.1%). The frequent use of 2.2 **Problem is controllable** suggests that advice givers are convinced that there is much that the learner can do to bring the problem under control. It is up to the learner whether he/she wants to solve the problem or not. This definitely appeals to the learner's positive face because his/her ability to solve the problem is recognised. The higher percentage of 3.2 **Joint actions we can take** indicates the advisor's willingness to be actively involved in solving the learner's problem, which shows the learner that he/she is being 'liked' thus honouring his/her positive face.

4.4.3.4 Advice situation 4: Personal

Advice topic	Number	Percentage
1.1	1	1.7%
1.2	1	1.7%
1.5	1	1.7%
1.6	2	3.5%
2.1	2	3.5%
2.2	9	15.7%
2.3	5	8.7%
2.5	1	1.7%
2.7	2	3.5%
2.8	2	3.5%
2.9	13	22.8%
3.1	16	28%
5	2	3.5%
Total	**57**	

The advice topics which have been used frequently in the advice situation **Personal** are: 3.1 **Actions you can take** (28%) and 2.9 **Problem is not severe** (22.8%). The 28% in 3.1 **Action you can take** could be attributed to the fact that advisors believe that the learners have a wide choice of actions they can take to solve the problem. The 22.8% in 2.9 **Problem is not severe** shows that some advisors do not really see personal problems as problems which are too sensitive in nature. They do not regard such problems as problems which have to be taken seriously, and they feel that the learners must just forget about such problems and concentrate on important things, i.e. their studies. Although the use of this topic can be face – threatening to the learner, advisor seem to be less concerned about that because they don't think that this is a serious situation.

4.4.3.5 Advice situation 5: Discipline

Advice topic	Number	Percentage
2.2	5	10.6%
2.3	12	25.5%
2.7	3	6.3%
3.1	18	38.2%
3.2	2	4.2%
5	7	14.8%
Total	**47**	

In the advice situation 5: **Discipline**, two advice topics have been used frequently, i.e. 3.1 **Actions you can take** (38.2%) and 2.3 **Problem has positive aspects**. The frequent use of 3.1 **Actions you can take** shows that most advisors feel that the learner can do something in order to solve the problem. However, the frequent use of 2.3 **Problem has positive aspects** on the other hand, shows that there are some advisors who regard the treatment the learner is getting from his/her parents as beneficial to the learner. With these topics advisors want to save their own 'faces', i.e. they do not want to appear as being 'less knowledgeable' by not suggesting any action, and they also want to appeal to the learner's positive face by showing him/her that he is being 'liked' because whatever is being done will benefit him/her.

4.4.4 Individual advice topics

In this section, all advice topics which have been used will be examined, and an   explanation will be provided as to why some topics are more significant than others.

Advice topic	Number	Percentage
1.1	9	3.7%
1.2	1	0.4%
1.5	4	1.6%
1.6	2	0.8%
2.1	2	0.8%
2.2	40	16.4%
2.3	20	8.2%
2.4	4	1.6%
2.5	2	0.8%
2.7	7	2.8%
2.8	3	1.2%
2.9	16	6.5%
3.1	89	36.6%
3.2	27	11.1%
5	17	6.9%
Total	**243**	

When one looks at the table above, one realises that there are six advice topics which are significant. In position 1 there is 3.1 **Actions you can take**, with 36.6%; in position 2 there is 2.2 **Problem is controllable**, with 16.4%; in position 3 there is 3.2 **Joint actions we can take**, with 11.1%; in position 4 there is 2.3 **Problem has positive aspects**, with 8.2%; in position five there is **5: Relationships**, with 6.9% and in position six there is 2.9 **Problem is not severe**, with 6.5%. The other advice topics are not worth mentioning since their frequency is too low.

The big question now is: Why is there such a big margin between advice **topic 3.1 Actions you can take and the rest of the topics?** One possible answer for this question is the fact

that adults and children are involved here. The advice seekers are the children and the advice givers are the adults. No proud adult would really want to appear as being "less helpful" to the learner. Most adults claim to be more experienced and to be knowledgeable about life in general. This is why some adults suggest some actions to the learner knowing very well that such actions would not be of much help in solving the problem, just because all they are interested in, is to impress the learner by having a solution to any problem, no matter how complicated it appears to be. This clearly shows an attempt by the advisor to save his/her own face.

In this research, very few advisors were prepared to use the "harsher" advice topics like 2.7 **Problem cause** (because it would mean they were blaming the learner for the problem, thus threatening the learner's face) or 2.1 **Problem is uncontrollable** (Because they would appear as being "less helpful" to the learner, thus threatening their own face). The advice givers decided to use the advice topics which are "friendlier" like 2.2 **Problem is controllable**, 3.2 **Joint actions we can take**, 2.3 **Problem has positive aspects**, etc. The reluctance of the advisors to hold the parent responsible for the problem was obvious in the frequent use of the advice topic 2.3 **Problem has positive aspects**. Instead of blaming the parent for being too strict or for transferring the learner to a new school without having discussed the matter with the learner first, they simply suggest to the learner that such actions will benefit the learner in the near future in attempt to appeal to the learner's positive face, however, this could be threatening to the learner's negative face because he/she wants to make his/her own decisions. This explanation applies also to the frequent use of advice topic 2.9 **Problem is not severe**, for instance instead of blaming the learner for having a serious love affair whilst he/she is still at school, some advisors simply tell the learner not to worry because he/she will meet another girlfriend/boyfriend. All this shows an effort on the part of the advisors not to let the learner down, which was sometimes done to the detriment of providing good, sincere and honest advice.

CHAPTER 5

PATTERNS OF ADVICE SOLICITATION IN ISIZULU

INTRODUCTION

5.1 Aim

Solicited advice can be defined as advice which is given after it has been requested by the advice recipient. This means that the advice recipient seeks the advice from the advisor. This is the type of advice that will be examined and investigated in this chapter. Analysis will be done to determine the frequency of advice solicitations in specific troubles talk situations.

The common patterns of advice solicitations, as identified by Goldsmith (2000:6), will be provided. Each pattern will be examined individually and then a definition thereof will be given. These are the patterns which have been used in the analysis of advice solicitation in the same questionnaires which were used in the previous chapter. (Chapter 4)

The five advice situations in the questionnaire will be examined and the frequency of advice solicitations will be determined. This will be followed by an explanation as to why the distribution of the patterns of advice solicitations is uneven among the advice situations. The advice situations are: 1. Abuse 2. Teachers 3. Learners 4. Personal and 5. Discipline.

The advice situations mentioned above have each two sub situations. All the sub situations will be examined, focussing on the various patterns of advice solicitations used and the frequency of individual advice solicitations. An explanation will then be given as to why some advice solicitations are used more frequently than others.

The individual patterns of advice solicitation will then be investigated in relation to how frequently they are used in major advice situations. An account for the significant advice solicitations will then be provided.

In the last subsection, all the patterns of advice solicitation will be considered. The significance of these advice solicitations will also be examined. Thereafter, an explanation will be provided as to why some advice solicitations seem to be more significant than others.

5.2 Patterns of advice solicitations

Goldsmith (2000) identifies six patterns of advice solicitation which are used in different advice situations. These six patterns are:

5.2.1 Recipient asks for advice

Goldsmith (2000) describes this pattern as the pattern in which advice is asked explicitly. Goldsmith identifies three ways in which this can be done. The most explicit statement is "I need your advice". The other two statements are "What should I do" and "Should I do X?"

5.2.2 Recipient asks for opinion or information

In this pattern, the person who receives advice asks for an opinion. The statement which can be used here is "What do you think of X?"

5.2.3 Recipient discloses a problem

According to Goldsmith (2000), advice may directly follow disclosure of a problem, which means that announcing a problem can be regarded as a way of asking for advice.

5.2.4 Recipient announces a plan of action

In this pattern, advice is given after a recipient's statement that they have decided or are strongly considering to take some action.

5.2.5 Advisor identifies problem

Here the problem topic is introduced into conversation by the advisor, rather than the recipient. This is followed by the recipient's assent to the problem, which provides a basis for offering advice in the next turn.

5.2.6 Advisor volunteers advice

This happens when advice immediately follows the advisor's observation of an action he/she views as problematic. The advisor identifies the problem and gives advice in the same turn.

5.3 Advice situations and patterns of advice solicitation

	Situation	Number	Percentage
1.	**Abuse**	**83**	**19.9%**
1.1	Beating (A)	43	51.8%
1.2	Work (B)	40	48.1%
2.	**Teachers**	**82**	**19.7%**
2.1	Lazy (C)	41	50%
2.2	Prejudiced (D)	41	50%
3.	**Learners**	**80**	**19.2%**
3.1	Nervousness (E)	37	46.2%
3.2	Arrive late (H)	43	53.7%
4.	**Personal**	**94**	**22.5%**
4.1	Relationship (F)	49	52.1%
4.2	Theft (I)	45	47.8%
5.	**Discipline**	**77**	**18.5%**
5.1	Strict parents (G)	39	50.6%
5.2	New school (J)	38	49.3%
	Total	**416**	

In the table above, the various advice situations have been listed in a vertical order from situation 1 to situation 5. These situations refer to those, which have been listed in the questionnaire. The numbers that appear next to these situations in a horizontal order reflect the total number of advice solicitations which have been used in each situation as well as in each sub situation e.g. in situation 1 **(Abuse)** a total number of 83 advice solicitations have been used, i.e. 19.9% of the total number of advice solicitations. Of these 83, 43 (51.8%) have been for **Beating** and 49 (48.1%) have been for too much **Work**.

Situation	Percentage
1. Abuse	19.9%
2. Teachers	19.7%
3. Learners	19.2%
4. Personal	22.5%
5. Discipline	18.5%

According to the table above, the advice solicitations which have been used in each situation may be classified as follows:

1. Situation 4: 22.5%
2. Situation 1, 2, 3: 19.9%, 19.7%, 19.2%
3. Situation 5: 18.5%

When one examines the frequency of advice solicitations in these five situations one notices that the difference is not big at all. The difference between the situation which has the lowest number of advice solicitations and the one with the highest number is only 4%. The advice situations are spread evenly among the situations, with the exception of situation 4: **Personal** (22.5%), which has more advice solicitations than the other situations. The reason for this could be the fact that the advice seekers are teenagers. Sometimes teenagers tend to be irrational when it comes to personal problems like **Relationships**. Adults might not regard such problems as serious problems but to teenagers it is a different ball game all together. To them a small problem like being dumped is a "disaster", which explains the highest number of advice solicitations in situation 4: **Personal**. It shows that they are very desperate. Situation 5:

Discipline has the lowest number of advice solicitations with 18.5%, the reason for this could be the fact that the learners do realise that nothing much could be done to change the situation. If parents are strict, it is extremely difficult to change their attitude. Learners also do realise that their parents are sending them to another school because they are not getting good education at their current school, which means that they are doing this for the benefit of the learners.

5.4 Patterns of advice solicitations in sub situations

In this section, patterns of advice solicitation that have been used in different sub situations will be considered.

5.4.1 Situation 1: Abuse

Advice solicitation	1.1 Beating		1.2 Work	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1.	10	23.2%	2	5%
2.	4	9.3%	11	27.5%
3.1	20	46.5%	19	47.5%
3.2	9	20.9%	8	20%
4.				
5.				
6.				

When one looks at all ten sub situations one observes that solicitation 3.1 **Discloses a problem** is the most significant solicitation which has been used in asking for advice. The reason for this is that the participants in this research are learners and teachers/members of the community. These people do not necessarily spend time together. Therefore, it is vital for the advice seeker (learner) to first disclose the problem before the advisor (teacher/community member) can give advice. In the table above, situation 3.1 **Discloses a problem** stands at 46.5% for **Beating** and at 47.5% for **Work**. The second solicitation which has been used frequently for **Beating** is solicitation 1: **Asks for advice**. The reason for this

could be the fact that learners desperately want these beatings to stop, therefore, they explicitly ask for advice to show how serious they are trying to get out of that bad situation. For the sub situation **Work**, the second most frequent solicitation is **Asks for opinion**, which shows that the learners are less desperate than they were for **Beating**, however, they still do need some opinion on what to do to solve the problem of being given too much work at home.

5.4.2 Situation 2: Teachers

Advice solicitation	2.1 Lazy		2.2 Prejudiced	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1.	5	12.1%	6	14.6%
2.	12	29.2%	12	29.2%
3.1	20	48.7%	21	51.2%
3.2	4	9.7%	2	4.8%
4.				
5.				
6.				

Just like in situation 1: **Abuse**, the advice solicitation 3.1 **Discloses a problem** has also been used the most in situation 2: **Teachers**. The reason for this is still the fact that the relationship between the participants is not very close so the advisor might not be aware that the advice seeker has a problem. It is therefore necessary that the advisor be informed about the problem before giving advice. For sub situation 2.1: **Lazy** the advice solicitation 3.1 **Discloses a problem** has 48.7% whereas for 2.2 **Prejudiced** it has 51.2%. The second most advice solicitation for both sub situations is solicitation :2 **Asks for opinion** with 29.2% in each sub situation. This shows that even though the advice seekers do need to be advised, they are not that desperate, because they have not asked for advice explicitly.

5.4.3 Situation 3: Learners

Advice solicitation	3.1 Nervousness		3.2 Arrive late	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1.	5	13.5%	2	4.6%
2.	12	32.4%	8	18.6%
3.1	20	54%	20	46.5%
3.2			13	30.2%
4.				
5.				
6.				

In situation 3: **Learners** the number of advice solicitation : 2 **Discloses a problem stands** at 20 for both sub situations, 3.1 **Nervousness** and 3.2 **Arrive late**, The reason for the frequent use of 2: **Discloses a problem** is these two sub situations is the same reason which has been given in situations 1 and 2 above. For sub situation 3.1 **Nervousness** the second most significant solicitation is **2: Asks for opinion** (32.4%), which shows that less urgency and explicitness in the way the advice seeker requires advice. For sub situation 3.2 **Arrive late** the second most significant solicitation is **3.2 Consequence** (30.2%). This shows that the advice seeker is quite aware of all the disadvantages which are caused by the problem of arriving late, and thus wishes to have those disadvantages done away with urgently.

5.4.4 Situation 4: Personal

Advice solicitation	4.1 Relationship		4.2 Theft	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1.	4	8.1%	11	24.4%
2.	11	22.4%	4	8.8%
3.1	20	40.8%	20	44.4%
3.2	14	28.5%	10	22.2%
4.				
5.				
6.				

Advice solicitation 3.1 **Discloses a problem** is also the most significant advice solicitation in the two sub situations above, for the very same reason which has been mentioned in situation 1 **Abuse** and situation 2 **Teachers**. The second most frequent solicitation for sub situation 4.1 **Relationship** is **3.2 Consequences** (28.5%), which shows that the advice seekers are quiet aware of the negative impact the problem of involving themselves in relationships has for them, therefore, they need advice to bring the problem to an end. For sub situation 4.2 **Theft**, the second most significant advice solicitation is **1 Asks for advice,** which indicates some urgency in the manner in which advice is asked for. The advice seekers appear to be very desperate in this case, which shows that some learners see the issue of a problematic relationship as a priority.

5.4.5 Situation 5: Discipline

Advice solicitation	5.1 Strict parents		5.2 New school	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
1.	2	5.1%	7	18.4%
2.	17	43.5%	11	28.9%
3.1	20	51.2%	20	52.6%
3.2				
4.				
5.				
6.				

Advice solicitation 3.1 **Discloses a problem** is also the most frequent advice solicitation in situation 5: **Discipline**. For sub situation 5.1 **Strict parents** it stands at 51.2% whereas for sub situation 5.2 **New school** it stands at 52.6%. The reason for this frequency is the fact that the participants are not familiar with the problem which must be solved, therefore it is necessary that the advice seeker first discloses the problem before the advisor offers his/her advice. For 5.1 **Strict parents** the second most frequent advice solicitation is **2: Asks for opinion** with 43.5%, which indicates a lack of urgency in the way advice is needed. This explanation also applies to 5.1 **New school** (28.9%)

5.5 Individual patterns of advice solicitation in major situations

5.5.1 Situation 1: Abuse

In this subsection the individual pattern of advice solicitation which have been used in major advice situations will be considered:

Advice solicitation	Number	Percentage
1.	12	14.5%
2.	15	18%
3.1	39	46.9%
3.2	17	20.4%
4.		
5.		
6.		

When all the advice situations are examined, it becomes clear that the advice solicitation 3.1 **Discloses a problem** has the highest frequency when compared to the other solicitations. This is because the advice seeker and the advisor do not know each other very well. One person might not be aware of what goes on in the other person's life. It is therefore, necessary that the problem be fully disclosed before an attempt could be made to solve the problem. For situation 1 **Abuse**, solicitation 3.1 **Discloses a problem** is the most significant, with 46.9%. The second most frequent solicitation for **Abuse** is 3.2 **Consequence** which indicates that the advice seeker fully understands the implications of the problem, and would wish to have the problem addressed accordingly, to avoid any trouble which could come as a result of the problem.

5.5.2 Situation 2: Teachers

Advice solicitation	Number	Percentage
1.	11	13.4%
2.	24	29.2%
3.1	41	50%
3.2	6	7.3%
4.		
5.		
6.		

In situation 2: **Teachers** the most frequent solicitation is **3.1 Discloses a problem** (50%), due to the same reason which has been provided in 5.1 above. The second most frequent solicitation **2 Ask for opinion**, which indicates that the advice seeker is not desperate at all although he/she does need some guidance from the advisor.

5.5.3 Situation 3: Learners

Advice solicitation	Number	Percentage
1.	7	8.7%
2.	20	25%
3.1	40	50%
3.2	13	16.2%
4.		
5.		
6.		

The most frequent advice solicitation for situation 3: **Learners** is **3.1 Discloses a problem** (50%). The reason for this high frequency is the same as in 5.1 above. The second most frequent solicitation is **2: Asks for opinion** (25%), which indicates a lack of urgency in the manner in which the advice seeker asks for advice.

5.5.4 Solicitation 4: Personal

Advice solicitation	Number	Percentage
1.	15	15.9%
2.	15	15.9%
3.1	40	42.5%
3.3	4	25.5%
4.		
5.		
6.		

For situation 4: **Personal** the most frequent advice solicitation is also **3.1 Discloses a problem**, with the same reason as in 5.1 above. The second most frequent solicitation is **3.2 Consequence** (25.5%), which shows awareness on the part of the advice seeker of what the consequences are or could be if these personal problems are not attended to, without further delay.

5.5.5 Situation 5: Discipline

Advice solicitation	Number	Percentage
1.	9	11.6%
2.	28	36.3%
3.1	40	51.9%
3.2		
4.		
5.		
6.		

The advice solicitation **3.1 Discloses a problem** is the most frequent solicitation in situation 5: **Personal**, with 51.9%, due to the very same reason which has been mentioned in 5.1 above. The second most significant solicitation is **2: Asks for opinion** (36.3%), which shows a lack of urgency in the way the advice seeker requests advice.

5.6 Individual patterns of advice solicitation

In this subsection, all advice solicitations will be considered, and an explanation will be provided as to why some solicitations have been used more frequently than others.

Advice solicitation	Number	Percentage
1.	54	12.9%
2.	102	24.5%
3.1	200	48%
3.2	60	14.4%
4.		
5.		
6.		

In the table above the advice solicitations which have a high percentage when it comes to frequency are **3.1 Discloses a problem** (48%) and **2: Asks for opinion** (24.5%). The reason why **3.1 Discloses a problem** has been used so much has something to do with the relationship between the advisor and the advice seeker. As the two parties are not close friends, the advisor was not aware of the advice seeker's problem, therefore it was necessary for the advice seeker to explain what the problem was all about before advice could be provided by the advisor. The reason for the advice solicitation 2: **Asks for opinion** being used frequently is because the advice seeker was not desperate in the majority of the situations. Even though the advice seeker needed advice he/she did not seem to show any indications of an urgent need for guidance in the way advice he/she asked for advice

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

The main focus in **Chapters 4** and **5** was on the different advice topics and advice solicitations which were used in a wide variety of advice situations when the research was conducted. The frequency of advice topics and solicitations in different advice situations was investigated in detail. This investigation resulted in advice topics and solicitations being divided into three groups, i.e. (a) Those with the highest frequency (b) Those which were used only a few times (c) Those which were never used.

The advice topics which were used frequently can be arranged as follows:

Position 1: **3.1 Actions you can take** – 36.6%
Position 2: **2.2 Problem is controllable** – 16.4%
Position 3: **3.2 Joint actions we ca take** – 11.1%
Position 4: **2.3 Problem has positive aspects** – 8.2%
Position 5: **5 Relationship topics** – 6.9%
Position 6: **2.9 Problem is not severe** – 6.5%

These findings indicate clearly that advisors approached advice giving with a positive attitude. They were very optimistic that solutions to the problems could be found easily. This becomes evident when one looks at the high frequency of **3.1 Actions you can take**, which shows that a wide variety of possible solutions to the problems were suggested to the advice seekers. The advisors' positive attitude is also evident in the use of other advice topics like **2.2 Problem is controllable, 2.3 Problem has positive aspects** and **2.9 Problem is not severe**, which makes it clear that the advisors did all they could to assure the advice seekers that their problems could be solved. The advisors tried by all means to be "helpful" and ensured that the advice seekers did not panic by using the advice topics mentioned above. The frequent use of these topics indicate a serious attempt by the advisor to protect his/her own face because no advisor would want to appear as being 'unhelpful or less knowledgeable' to the learner. The advisor also tried to honour the positive face of the recipient by assuring him/her that he/she can solve the problem.

The advice solicitations that were used frequently in different advice situations were advice situations were: **3.1 Discloses a problem** (48%) and **2. Asks for opinion** (24.5%). The frequency of **3.1 Discloses a problem** was high because learners and teachers/community members were the participants in the research. These participants do not necessarily spend time together, so they were not familiar with each other's problems. Therefore, there was a necessity for the advice seeker (learner) to first describe the problem in order to enable the advisor (teacher/community member) to give appropriate advice. The frequent use of **2 Asks for opinion** indicates that in most advice situations the advice seekers were not desperate. It shows a lack of urgency in the manner in which advice seekers needed advice.

There were also some advice topics which were used only a few times. These can be arranged as follows:

Position 1: **1.2 Emotion is inappropriate** – 0.4%

Position 2: **2.8 Problem is severe, 2.1 Problem is uncontrollable, 2.5 Problem is temporary, 1.6 Your emotion is temporary** – 0.8%

Position 3: **1.5 Your emotion is common, 2.4 Problem is common** – 1.6%

Position 4: **2.7 Problem cause** – 2.8%

Position 5: **1.1 Don't have the emotion** – 3.7%

Most advice topics which were used only a few times were those which could be described as pessimistic in nature. Advice topics like **2.8 Problem is severe** and **2.1 Problem is uncontrollable** show some pessimism in the fact that they suggest that nothing much could be done to solve the problem, and this could the main reason why they were avoided by most advisors, because they did not want to agitate the advice seekers. The advisors also did not want to appear as 'unhelpful' by saying that nothing could be done to solve the problem, and this could also have been face – threatening to the advisors because they would appear as 'less knowledgeable' to the recipient.

Advice topics like **1.2 Emotion is inappropriate**, and **2.7 Problem cause** were also avoided by most advisors because they blamed the advice seeker for having inappropriate emotions or for having caused the problem in the first place. These advice topics were avoided because the advisors wanted to protect the advice seeker's positive self – image. (Thus

honouring his/her positive face) It is surprising that advice topics **1.5 Your emotion is common** and **2.4 Problem is common** were not used frequently, in view of the fact that some problems/emotions are common indeed. Almost everybody goes through such emotions at some stage. For instance, the emotion of being "nervous" is a common emotion, which is also temporary. The use frequent use of such advice topics could have gone a long way in re – assuring the learner that such emotions do happen to most people, however, they do not last long.

The advice solicitations that were only used a few times were: **3.2 Consequences** (14.4%) and **1 Asks for advice** (12.9%). The advice situations in which advice solicitation **1 Asks for advice** was used a lot were only **1.1 Beating** and **4.2 Theft**. In all the other situations it was not used that much. The reason for this could be that **Beating** is a very serious form of abuse and **Theft** is an unexpected occurrence, which made the learner very desperate, which explains why advice was asked for explicitly. The fact that **1 Asks for advice** was not used most of the time in the other situations indicates a lack of urgency on the part of the advice seeker in requesting advice. The same reason is also explains the less frequent use of **3.2 Consequences.** It shows that the advice seeker was not desperate.

There were also some advice topics which did not appear in any of the advice situations. These advice topics were:

- 1.3 You have this emotion
- 1.4 I share you emotion
- 2.6 Problem is not temporary
- 4 Hearer topics
- 6 Speaker topics
- Conversation topics

There are various reasons why these advice topics were not used. For instance, **1.3 You have this emotion** was not used because of the way in which the research was structured. In the research, the advice seeker was the one who was supposed to disclose his/her problem to the advisor, before advice could be given. Had the advisor been asked to first observe the

learner before giving advice, this advice topic would have been used. It is quite interesting why **1.4 I share your emotion** was not used because at times it is helpful in troubles talk episodes for the advice giver to show some sympathy/empathy to the advice seeker. The fact that **2.6 Problem is not temporary** was not used at all could have been caused by the advisor's desire not to disappoint the learner any further by telling him/her that there is nothing that can be done to solve the problem. This topic could have been used appropriately in the problem of **Relationships,** by making it clear to the learner that reconciliation with the boyfriend/girlfriend might not take place, so it would be better for the learner to forget about the relationship, however, this could have been face threatening to the advisor because he would appear as being 'unhelpful' even though he/she would have been telling the truth.

The reason for **6 Speaker topics** and **Conversation topics** not being used could be the fact that advisors could not really claim to be knowledgeable or to be experts in the field of giving advice, and would therefore not actually guarantee the type of advice they give as the best advice.

There are three advice solicitations which were not used in this research. Those were:
- 4: Recipient announces a plan of action
- Advisor identifies problem
- Advisor volunteers advice

The reasons why these advice solicitations were not used has something to do with the manner in which the research was structured, as explained in the previous paragraph, i.e. the fact that advice followed disclosure of a problem, and the advisor did not have time to first observe the advice seeker before giving advice. In the case of this research, advice came only because of the description of the problem by the advice seeker.

In conclusion, it is vital to mention the fact the question of face threat did play a role in the way advice was given, It has been mention that the participants in this research were adults (advisors) and learners (advice seekers). In certain cases the advisors suggested some actions just to save their own face. This is evident in the frequent use of **3.1 Actions you can take**. Some advisors suggested that some actions be taken by the advice seeker, even in cases where such actions would not be of much help. They only gave advice so as not to appear as being "less knowledgeable/unhelpful/unsupportive" to the learner. For instance,

one advisor suggested to a "nervous" learner not to look at the other learners whilst delivering his/her speech and just to ignore them if they laughed at him/her. It is almost impossible to ignore people who laugh at you when you are trying to do something serious, it is even worse in situations where one is nervous. The laughing learners would make the "nervous" learner even more nervous. Therefore, such an advice would really not be of any help. Some advisors were not honest when giving advice, which accounts for "negative" advice topics being used only a few times. Should they have been honest, they would not have been afraid to use topics like **2.7 Problem cause**. In case where the learner caused the problem it would have been fair for the advisor to tell him/her that he/she caused the problem, rather than say something else, just because the advisor did not want to hurt the learner's feelings, which would also have threatened the learner's face. Having said all this, it is noted with appreciation that the majority of advisors did the best they could in giving proper advice to the advice seeker. They gave whatever advice they thought was the best advice, without unnecessarily trying to placate the learner by using unnecessary politeness strategies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Austin, J.L. 1962. **How to do things with words**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Blum-Kulka, S. 1987. **Indirectness and Politeness in Requests: Same or Different?** Journal of Pragmatics 11(2), 131-146.

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

De Capua, A. & Dunham, J.F. 1993. **Strategies in the discourse of advice**. Journal of Pragmatics, 20, 519-531.

Goffman, E. 1967. **Interation ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior**. New York: Doubleday.

Goldsmith, D.J. 1999. **Context-based resources for giving face sensitive advice in trobles talk episodes**. Research on Language and Social Interaction, 303-336.

Goldsmith, D.J. 2000. **Soliciting advice: The role of sequential placement in mitigating face threat**. Communication Monographs, 67, 1-19.

Goldsmith, D.J. & Fitch, K. 1997. **The Normative Context of Advice as Social Support**. Human Communication Research, 23(4), 454-476.

Goldsmith, D.J. & McGeorge, E.L. 2000. **The impact of politeness and relationship on perceived quality of advice about a problem**. Human Communication Research, 26(2) 234-263.

Grundy, P. 2000. **Doing Pragmatics**. London: Arnold, 144-166.

Hernandez-Flores, N. 1999. **Politeness Ideology in Spanish Colloquial Conversation. The Case of Advice**. Pragmatics, 9(1), 37-49.

Mey, J.L. 2000. **Pragmatics**. Blackwell. 92-131.

Reiter, R.M. 2000. **Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Uruguay**. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1-15.

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

Wierzbicka, A. 1985. **Different Cultures, Different Languages, Different Speech Acts.** Journal of Pragmatics, 9, 145-161.

Yule, G. 1996. **Pragmatics.** Oxford: Oxford University Press