

THE SPEECH ACT OF ADVICE IN EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS IN SETSWANA

BY

EMILY PHUTI MOGASE

**Assignment submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of Arts at the University of Stellenbosch**



Study Leader: Dr M Dlali

APRIL 2004

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this study 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 examines data from advice-giving in Setswana relating to pragmatic theorists' argument that every human interaction, to a large extent carries with it an element of threatening one or both participants' face. The speech act of politeness has been identified as one of the most effective speech acts to be employed in giving as well as soliciting advice. Every speech act is influenced by contextual, cultural and many other background factors associated to age, gender and rank to mention a few, which contribute towards how the speech is composed.

The issues relating to the theory of politeness prompted this study on the extent to which politeness plays a role in giving advice in an educational context of Setswana speaking students. The study has evaluated Brown and Levinsons' theory of politeness as a universal phenomenon against the findings of my data, in that the universality of these theorists does not quite fit with this study. The variable percentages in this data, especially in giving advice, indicate that politeness does not always exist in terms of positive and negative face in the participants' mind but other considerations related to the goal of the speech act are the main source of the speech act.

In this study, politeness in the Setswana school context has demonstrated that politeness has been employed as a strategy for encoding distance between the speaker and the solicitor. The purpose of advising teachers and students through politeness behavior is to mitigate face and to create a favorable context anticipated by the solicitor.

OPSOMMING

Hierdie studie ondersoek data oor advies-gee in Setswana wat verband hou met pragmatiekteoretici se argument dat elke menslike interaksie tot 'n groot mate 'n element het dat een, of beide, deelnemers se gesig bedreig word. Die spraakhandeling van beleefdheid is geïdentifiseer as een van die mees effektiewe spraakhandelinge wat ingespan word in die gee, sowel as die vra van advies. Elke spraakhandeling word beïnvloed deur kontekstuele, kulturele en talle ander agtergrondfaktore wat verband hou met onder andere ouderdom, gender en rang, wat bydra tot die wyse waarop die spraakhandeling saamgestel word.

Die vraagstukke rakende die beleefdheidsteorie het aanleiding gegee tot hierdie studie oor die mate waartoe beleefdheid 'n rol speel in advies-gee in opvoedkundige kontekste deur Setswana-sprekende persone. Die studie evalueer Brown en Levinson se teorie van die Universele beginsels wat dit stel teenoor die bevindinge van die data verkry in die navorsing oor Setswana-sprekende studente en daar word afgelei dat Brown en Levinson se universalie nie volledig bevestig word nie. Die varieerbaarheid waargeneem in die data oor advies-gee dui aan dat beleefdheid nie altyd manifesteer in terme van negatiewe gesig in die deelnemers se oorwegings nie, maar dat ander oorwegings rakende die doelstelling van die spraakhandeling die hoofbron vorm van die spraakhandeling.

In hierdie studie, het beleefdheid in die Setswana opvoedkundige konteks aangetoon dat beleefdheid ingespan word as 'n strategie om afstand te vestig tussen die spreker en die hoorder. Die doel van advies-gee aan onderwysers en studente deur beleefdheidsgedrag is om 'n gunstige konteks te vestig, wat verwag word deur die hoorder.

TSHOSOBANYO

Thuto e e tlhatlhoba kgang ka go gakololana ga batho mo puong ya Setswana, e e tsamelanang le ikatso ya bo prakmatiki. Kgang eno e lekola gore tshabo e tshameka karolo e kana kang mo bobeding jo bo buisanang. Mokgwa wa puo ya boingotlo le boikokobetso o bonagaditswe e le mongwe wa mekgwa e e atlegileng ya go kopa le go neela ka dikgakololo. Mokgwa mongwe le mongwe wa puisano o tlhotlhelediwa ke maemo, setso le mabaka a mangwe a a akaretsang mengwaga, bong, le maemo ba mmui. Puo e ikaega ka dingwe le bontsi jwa dintlha tse di fa godimo.

Mabaka a a tsamaisanang le monagano wa boingotlo le boikokobetso ke ona a a sosomeditse thuto eno, e le go sekaseka gore monagano wa Brown le Levinsons wa gore tsela e le nngwe ya go ikokobetsa e ba e fitlhetseng ke yona fela e e siametseng go dirisiwa ke batho ba merafe yotlhe go bontsha tlhompho, ga se yone. Thuto ya me e rata go bonthsa gore seno ga se nnete fa go tla mo puong ya Setswana. Pharologano e e bontshiwang ke dipersente tse di kwa godimo le tse di kwa tlase e supa gore fa batho ba buisana, tshabo ya go atlholelwa bobele le bontle jwa botho jwa bone, ga e amege ka sepe mo puisanong ya bona fa e se fela mosola kgotsa maikaelelo a puo ya bona.

Mo thutong eno, boitshwaro jo bontle ka go bontsha maitseo, mo sekolong ka puo ya Setswana, ke bona bo kgonang go tseraganya bosula mo go kopeng le go neyeng kgakololo. Maikaeleo a go gakolola barutabana le baithuti ka maitshwaro le boikokobetso ke go rotloetsa kutlwano le katlego e mokopi wa thuso a e solofetseng.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my late mom, dad and loving husband – mostly to my children who are a constant motivation in everything I do. To friends whose support I mostly needed and who believed in me, as well as members of the Mowbray Baptist Church who kept me in their prayers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my supervisor Dr M Dlali, for his consistent support in getting this work completed, and mostly for believing in me. Thank you for the model you are in my life!

I appreciate all the hard work my niece Phakisho Marishane has done in this paper, and standing by my side in tough times, without giving up on me. To her I say “Modimo a go okeletse”.

Gloria Cube, you have really been great support and counselor to me and I can never pay you enough for your input in my life.

To Bini MG, the tables would have been a nightmare for me without you and I thank you for all the time, efforts and dedication you have put in my work – ‘Yekenyeley’, God bless you!

My greatest and warmest gratitude goes to my children Mamedupi and Mapaseka, who persevered all those many hours and days of neglect while studying. You are a source of inspiration and motivation in my life.

‘To the only one God the Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power both now and forever, Amen!’ ‘In you Lord I live and move and have my being’. – Unknown. “Ke a go leboga Modimo wa ka!”

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Abstract	i
Opsomming	ii
Tshosobanyo	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
 Chapter 1: Introduction	
1.1 Aim	1
1.2 Organisation of the study	2
 Chapter 2: Speech Acts and Politeness Theory	
2.1 Speech Acts.....	3
2.1.1 Mey (2000)	3
2.2 Politeness Theory	18
2.2.1 Grundy (2000)	18
2.2.2 Reiter (2000)	22
 Chapter 3: The Speech Act Advice	
3.1 Strategies in requesting and giving advice DeCapua and Dunham (1993).....	27
3.2 Advice and Politeness	28
3.2.1 Hernandez-Flores (1999)	28
3.2.2 Goldsmith and MacGerge (2000)	32
3.2.3 Goldsmith and Fitch (1997)	35
3.3 Advice about trouble	38
3.3.1 Goldsmith (1999).....	38
3.4 Seeking advice and advice sequences.....	41
3.4.1 Goldsmith (2000).....	41
 Chapter 4: Advice Topics in Setswana	
4.1 Aim	46
4.2 Advice Situations	46
4.3 Questionnaire	47

4.3.1	Copy of the questionnaire	47	
4.3.2	Completion of the questionnaire	56	
4.4	Analysis of advice topics	56	
4.4.1	The major situations	57	
4.4.2	The sub-situations	58	
4.5	Advice topics in sub-situations	60	
4.5.1	Situation 1: Student – Teacher	61	
4.5.2	Situation 2: Teacher – Student	63	
4.5.3	Situation 3: Student – Student	65	
4.6	Individual advice topics in major situations	67	
4.6.1	Advice situation 1: Student – Teacher	68	
4.6.2	Advice situation 2: Teacher – Student	69	
4.6.3	Advice situation 3: Student – Student	70	
4.7	Individual advice topics	71	
 Chapter 5			
5.1	Aim	72	
5.2	Task 1: Patterns of Advice Solicitation	72	
5.3	Task 2: Student – Teacher	73	
5.4	Task 3: Patterns of Advice Solicitation in Major Situations	80	
5.5	Task 4: Individual Patterns of Advice Solicitation	81	
 Chapter 6: Conclusion			82
 Bibliography			86
 Appendix			88

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 AIM

The study aim of this study is to look into details certain operations related to a learning setup. I will look at advice topic and focus will be placed on patterns of advice solicitation. The reason why people interact is to convey a message but the goal is to have a specific response or reaction based on that message. It is therefore crucial to know how one should use language towards the anticipated goal. In this study further helps to analyze how advices are solicited and given in major and sub-situations, in order to label or identify the most common style of response to problems presented.

The value of analyzing how people, especially students in this study, is in showing that in Setswana, complaints are not just conversations about unpleasant issues or environment but are technically used for a purpose. Accompanying the purpose, is the strategy applied, which in this paper is 'politeness'. In using politeness strategies, the participants make the situation acceptable and encouraging. The adviser's politeness shows sympathy not only in listening to the solicitor or advice seeker but also in the manner in which s/he advises.

The findings of the study reveal that giving advice carries with it a level of accountability and responsibility. Advisers are adults who assumably can be trusted to be aware of the consequences born out of their suggestions, proposals or instructions. The frequent use of some topic reveals a trend in patterns of advising, which can be included towards interpreting how politeness can be encountered in a learning situation, which adds to the value of analyzing the effect of giving advice in a learning situation.

1.2 ORGANISATION OF THE STUDY

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

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

Chapter 2: In this chapter, the speech act theory of Thomas (1995), Mey (2000) and Grundy (2000), against Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness are dealt with at length. These theories serve as a basis of this study.

Chapter 3: A detailed look at the advice topics in Setswana will be looked at in this chapter. Theorists' advice strategies and dynamics will be presented in argument about advice and politeness in the speech act of advice.

Chapter 4: This chapter aims to scrutinize and analyze approaches to advice situations in Setswana by means of a questionnaire. Advice topics are analyzed in major situations and sub-situations in order to get a complete interpretation of its applications.

Chapter 5: The chapter focuses on patterns of advice solicitation. It looks at how advices are solicited and possible influences to the purposes of the pattern.

Chapter 6: This chapter looks at the findings of the study by comparing the frequent use of certain advice topic to averagely or not used topic.

CHAPTER 2

SPEECH ACTS AND POLITENESS THEORY

2.1 SPEECH ACTS

2.1.1 Mey (2000)

On discussing Austin and Searle, May mentions that many linguists including Thomas have criticised Austin's original theory of classifying speech acts. Searle revised the loopholes in Austin's work to improve his system, which May discusses in this article. Mey comments that in the 1950-60s, philosophers of language whose interests have been more on semantics have made it difficult for syntactic and scientific linguists to feature in this area of study.

The semantic philosophers of language concentrated more on the 'truth functional' definitions of semantics. In the sixties to early seventies, their studies were based on the 'Carnapian tradition'. These linguists, joined by other philosophers, united with the formal syntactics traditionalists like Richard Montague, to develop a study in 'intensional semantics'.

On the other hand, in Britain, a philosophy originating on thinking about language called "Ordinary Language Philosophy", driven by J.L. Austin was developed. Austin's work on 'How to do things with words' caught the linguists' attention, especially those with a pragmatic interest. Austin's study, later called 'speech act theory' was further taken to greater depth by American philosopher, JR Searle, whose work I will discuss in this paper.

The emergence of pragmatic tradition was confronted by limitations from semantics, based on truth conditions by linguistic thinking. Philosophers working on this tradition 'restricted themselves to 'propositions' presenting one particular class of sentences, the so-called declaratives that test the true or false proposition. These propositions are questionable because in a case where one states a wish, i.e. 'Happy birthday', it becomes a speech act and not a proposition, but 'words with which to do things', according to Mey (2000:93)

Commenting on language in use, Mey states that language is generally taken to involve social and meaning or an ordering of correct sentences. This view underlooks the value of speech acts, 'the basic or minimal units of linguistic communication', Searle (1969:16).

Speech acts do not relate to utterances but to language use of what is in one's mind. Mey uses an analogy of 'produce'- speaker and 'consumer' – hearer, in the transference of intention, one to another. Each communicative culture holds conditions within which a speech act can be permitted or restricted.

Speech acts are '...dependant on the context of the situation in which such acts are produced'. A speech act is a reflection of the activity and situation with which it is produced or uttered. Speech acts intend to bring a change in the situation it occurs. They are verbal actions of intention, and thinking as well. Speech acts have different functional aspects outlined by Mey as:

- i) Locutionary - the act of saying something
- ii) Illocutionary force – making a statement, as in wishing, stating and promising
- iii) Perlocutionary effect - possible resultant action produced by a speech

The perlocutionary effect is mostly dependent on the illocutionary force and conditions under which the acting exists.

Speech acts can create confusion in the use of speech act verbs to perform a speech act. Mey uses the word 'promise' to explicate the complexity of the nature of a promise with uttering the word. 'Something counts as something only within a specified set of rules' Mey (2000:98). As in the case of promise, there are many ways to make one in different cultures, but 'it is only the context which determine whether a particular expression counts as a promise', (98)

There are various ways in which speech acting is dealt with in different languages. Mey 2000 uses the word 'promise' as an example to explore conditions and rules governing the use of this word. He deals with questions on:-

- How to determine a speech act
- How are speech acts expressed and how many are there in a language?
- What is the relationship between speech and pragmatic acts?
- Are there speech acts or pragmatic acts found across languages?

Mey investigates conditions, which qualifies speech as a promise and the rules that govern its use. He lists nine conditions and five rules which count towards successful promising. A linguistic tool to use is an order, to characterize the act under the 'illocutionary force indicating device' (IFID). The IFID can be extracted from the five rules guarding the use of promising 'act'. The first four rules are regulative and the fifth one is constitutive.

1. The rules cover the promisory use in the future content rule.
2. Use only when actually to happen to the promised
- 3 Use only in preparatory rule when content of promise does not concern the occurrence of an already scheduled, self-justifying or natural happening.
- 4 Use only if you intend '...to carry out the promise-sincerity'
- 5 Use only if promise is recognized as obligatory to promise-essential rule.

The fifth (constitutive) rule creates an obligation of the promiser to the promisee despite the fact that promises are sometimes broken and renewable. Mey states that the IFIDs of the speech act theory indicate the illocutionary force but do not make it functionally active. In this manner, the speech act becomes a pragmatic act, which addresses the conditions of interaction. In every practical situation, it is somehow difficult to separate regulative and the constitutive rules because the regulatory rule defines and imposes on the constitutive rule.

The reality of the situation is that the speech act theory is actually anchored on propositions than action. The illocutionary element of 'force' of the speech act is dependent on the speaker and embedded in an abstract content. Unlike the abstract view, the pragmatics argue that there are different linguistic uses within a single language as well. Mey suggests that speech acts should be considered as 'pragmatic devices for human activity, or pragmatic acts' (2000:104).

In addressing the question of how many speech acts there are, Mey categorizes speech act investigators into 'lumpers' and 'splitters'. Lumpers put together their speech acts under one big category, while splitters, split the acts into many classes. There is no single suitable answer for the number of existing speech acts (SA) but there are preferences to certain species and expressions, characterized as speech act verbs.

With reference to the performability of speech acts and speech act verbs, Mey states that most languages link activity to a verb in a sentence. The verb seems to be the main focus of action and carries the meaning and sense of a sentence. There are verbs that describe situations, and stating verbs called 'constitutives', verbs denoting 'real' speech act by showing action are called 'performatives'. The asymmetric relationship between speech acts and speech act verbs is created by the fact that speech acts can be represented by more than one-speech act verbs.

Based on the point discussed above, the order of the SA will be influenced by the ordering or normal verb. Secondly, the symmetry is fostered by the notion that not every SA has its own corresponding SAV. This indicates that not all SAs are of the same status with SAVs'. Another point to look at is the fact that performative verbs also called 'explicit performatives' do not always have an explicit performance but can be implicit in function as well. This case is illustrated by May's use of the term 'promise' in three differing instances. He brings to awareness that 'explicit performatives' are the most extreme cases of SAVs, in that they can perform ...certain. SAs for which they are designated...' Mey, (2000:107).

Mey cautions against the assumption that all verbs could be considered SAVs, because of their performativity. There are standard SAVs that do not indicate performance. Mey states that the two SAV categories mentioned above sometimes do not even coincide. The last category mentioned by Mey is that which denies its intention or performance. He finalizes the investigation on performativity of SAVs by saying that this area of focus is a 'continuum' from the formal and institutionalized verbs such as 'to baptise' to the everyday common verbs which can be performative such as 'threaten', 'bother' or 'insult'.

According to Mey, it may seem that performability trails along verbal issues, therefore there is no need for SAV to perform an act, but there are two points to ponder upon before consenting to such. The first one is that of the 'speech act formulae' (SAF), which address verbal expressions, which behave like SAV while not being regular verbs. These verbal expressions are stylistic or variations of a common semantic notion. The second case about the SAV is the aspect of a verbless expression.

This situation indicates that SA and SAVs need to be used in a proper context to make their function adequate. Mey comments that 'The 'surface' form of a particular linguistic

expression (such as an SAV or SAF) does not always and necessarily tell the truth about what it is doing' (2000:111). Meaning more than form is more important in determining the kind of speech act in consideration. SAV and SAF can substitute each other, and can be used in situations they do not really 'stand for', as in indirect SAs, addressed below.

Mey (2000) singles out two ways of categorizing indirect SAs. The first is the 'philosophical-semantic one', which is derived out of logic and expression. The second pragmatic way is based on 'what people say and 'do with their words"' (2000:112). The use of indirect SAs is not mostly preferred as 'imperatives are rarely used to command or request,' Levinson (1983:275). Generally speaking 'the way we recognize indirect speech acts, and process them properly, has to do with the way we are 'set up' for recognition and action by the context:' Mey (2000:113)

Mey looks at Searle's (1975) ten steps of reasoning, in order to conclude on the logical reasoning based on indirect speech acting. He points out that indirect speech acting according to Searle, is a combination of the primary illocutionary act as in rejecting a proposal, and secondary illocutionary act, as in making a statement. The primary act functions through the secondary force, leading to a quiz on how the listener makes sense of the non-literal primary illocutionary act from the second literal act.

The ten steps below, address the quiz above, on understanding. Searle builds a ten-step model to analyze reasoning and understanding. In addressing the pragmatic view, Mey mentions that indirect speech acts are most common 'direct' realizations of 'illocutionary force'. He points out that a truly pragmatic approach would concentrate on what users do and the usage of language in members of speech community.

Language goes beyond historical boundaries and symbolizes human life by standardizing and codifying it. We therefore realize how restricted some speech acts are, such as 'I baptise thee', because it is very specified and reformative only in a particular social function.

Another interesting function of the conversational force is in a doctor-patient scene where the asymmetrical and mutual elements drive interaction to a successful encounter, based on power and status. The power of speech acts is not in the words or how the words are used but in how pragmatic acts are mediated, negotiated and institutionalized in a particular setting. The indirect speech acts are not abnormal cases but depend on the

verbalization of an utterance to normalize them, in a rather more effective way than the regular SA.

The power and effects of speech acting in a real social situation compels Mey's study to classify speech acts based on the contexts. Mey says that Searle is upset with Austin's former study on classifications of illocutionary acts. Searle feels that Austin does not differentiate between speech acts and speech act verbs. Leech criticizes Austin for corresponding categories of speech acts, showing confusion of speech acts and speech act verbs. It is apparent that classifying speech acts carries inevitable problems. Mey follows Searle's warning that 'Differences in illocutionary verbs are a good guide, but by no means a sure guide to differences in illocutionary acts'(1977:288)

Searle lists twelve ways of classifying speech acts, and a few guides to a definite typology of SA. Mey focuses on only four and hopes that his criteria will play a better classification procedure. Below are the four classifications of SAs: -

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

To these, Mey (2000) adds two points being: -

- Reference
- Contextual conditions of speech acting—based on societal framework under which a SA is performed.

The power and effects of speech acting in a real social situation compels May to classify speech acts based on contexts. Mey mentions that Searle is upset with Austin's former study on classification of illocutionary acts. Searle feels that Austin does not differentiate between speech acts and speech act verbs. Leech criticizes Austin for corresponding categories of speech acts, showing confusion of speech acts and speech act verbs. It is apparent that classifying speech acts carries inevitable problems. Mey follows Searle's warning that 'Differences in illocutionary verbs are a good guide, but by no means a sure guide to differences in illocutionary acts' (1977:28).

Searle (1975) lists 12 ways of classifying speech acts, and a few guides to a definite typology of speech acts, but focuses on four of the acts. His criteria hopes to lay a better classification procedure. Below are the four classifications of speech acts:

- Illocutionary point
- Direction of fit
- Expressed psychological state
- Content
- Reference (Mey's addition)
- Contextual conditions of speech acting - based on societal framework under which a speech act is performed.

In discussing Searle's (1975) classifications, May explains them as follows:

- Representatives - speech acts are assertive and have to fit on the world order to be true. They 'represent a subjective state of mind' (p120), which may have a degree of force. An example of a complaint was used, where its content would be truthful but not making it true.
- Directives - carry an element of getting the hearer to do something, according to the speaker's wishes, 'at extreme end of this category we have the classical imperatives, (p120).
- The third category involves the commissives, which operate almost the same as directives but carry an obligatory character with them. In this category, the obligation is created in the speaker and not the hearer, e.g. a request would be a directive, while a promise would be a commissive. These two can only be separated by direction, force and cultural reference.
- The expressive informs of the speaker's 'inner state', and nothing of the world. The expressives have subjective character, limitations and changes based on different understanding of 'social behavior'. The expressive speech act has an element of 'truth', which has to be addressed as an 'embedded proposition', as it is based on the actuality of the vents and the reality of the speaker's feelings or thought.
- Declaratives are Mey's addition of Austin's 'original' category. Declaratives change the state of issues and affairs into a new state. They are dividers in speech act theory between locutioary and illocutionary acts. Once a state has been declared, it has to follow the conditions put forth, usually by authority.

Mey (2000) says that Searle is just in criticizing Austin's work, because Austin himself was not happy with his classification of speech acts, such as the performatives, and there was confusion between speech acts and speech act verbs, as well as the wide description of terms. Despite all the criticism of Austin's study, Mey still appreciates Austin's contribution to the discovery that 'language is an instrument of action (p124).

Searle builds his classifications like Austin's. He lists 5 classes of speech acts. Searle also discusses 'commissives' which Austin defined. The criterion for truthfulness is unsure but does not fully address assertives. Mey says that Searle's taxonomy is superior to Austin's because 'it is more orientated toward the real world,..' (p124). Austin argues that people perform speech acts in speaking since it performs something in the world. This point hints on the performative and illocutionary character of speech acts.

Austin and Searle both operate on the 'one sentence, one case principle', (p125), and use sentences that are characteristic of speech acts. The two authors both focus on the speech act of promising in an isolated utterance, and the impact of its context as well as its status. Mey stresses that 'we should pay serious attention to contextual conditions when describing speech acts, and in general, people's use of language.

On discussing Austin (1969) and Searle(1975), Mey mentions that many linguists including Thomas (1995) have criticised Austin's original theory of classifying speech acts. Searle revised the loopholes in Austin's work to improve his system, which Mey discusses in this article. Mey comments that in the 1950-60s, philosophers of language whose interests have been more on semantics have made it difficult for syntactic and scientific linguists to feature in this area of study.

The semantic philosophers of language concentrated more on the 'truth functional' definitions of semantics. In the sixties to early seventies, their studies were based on the 'Carnapian tradition'. These linguists, joined by other philosophers, united with the formal syntactics traditionalists like Richard Montague, to develop a study in 'intensional semantics'.

On the other hand, in Britain, a philosophy originating on thinking about language called "Ordinary Language Philosophy", driven by J.L.Austin (1969) was developed. Austin's work on 'How to do things with words' caught the linguists' attention, especially those with

a pragmatic interest. Austin's study, later called 'speech act theory' was further taken to greater depth by American philosopher, JR Searle, whose work I will discuss in this paper. The emergence of pragmatic tradition was confronted by limitations from semantics, based on truth conditions by linguistic thinking. Philosophers working on this tradition 'restricted themselves to 'propositions' presenting one particular class of sentences, the so-called declaratives that test the true or false proposition. These propositions are questionable because in a case where one states a wish, i.e. 'Happy birthday', it becomes a speech act and not a proposition, but 'words with which to do things', according to Mey (2000:93)

Commenting on language in use, Mey states that language is generally taken to involve social and meaning or an ordering of correct sentences. This view underlooks the value of speech acts, 'the basic or minimal units of linguistic communication', Searle (1969:16). Speech acts do not relate to utterances but to language use of what is in one's mind. Mey uses an analogy of 'produce'- speaker and 'consumer' – hearer, in the transference of intention, one to another. Each communicative culture holds conditions within which a speech act can be permitted or restricted.

Speech acts are '...dependant on the context of the situation in which such acts are produced'. A speech act is a reflection of the activity and situation with which it is produced or uttered. Speech acts intend to bring a change in the situation it occurs. They are verbal actions of intention, and thinking as well. Speech acts have different functional aspects outlined by Mey as:

- iv) Locutionary - the act of saying something
- v) Illocutionary force – making a statement, as in wishing, stating and promising
- vi) Perlocutionary effect - possible resultant action produced by a speech

The perlocutionary effect is mostly dependent on the illocutionary force and conditions under which the acting exists.

Speech acts can create confusion in the use of speech act verbs to perform a speech act. Mey uses the word 'promise' to explicate the complexity of the nature of a promise with uttering the word. 'Something counts as something only within a specified set of rules' Mey (2000:98). As in the case of promise, there are many ways to make one in different

cultures, but 'it is only the context which determine whether a particular expression counts as a promise', (p. 98)

There are various ways in which speech acting is dealt with in different languages. Mey (2000) uses the word 'promise' as an example to explore conditions and rules governing the use of this word. He deals with questions on:-

- How to determine a speech act
- How are speech acts expressed and how many are there in a language?
- What is the relationship between speech and pragmatic acts?
- Are there speech acts or pragmatic acts found across languages?

Mey (2000) investigates conditions, which qualifies speech as a promise and the rules that govern its use. He lists nine conditions and five rules which count towards successful promising. A linguistic tool to use is an order, to characterize the act under the 'illocutionary force indicating device' (IFID). The IFID can be extracted from the five rules guarding the use of promising 'act'. The first four rules are regulative and the fifth one is constitutive.

3. The rules cover the promisory use in the future content rule.
4. Use only when actually to happen to the promised
- 6 Use only in preparatory rule when content of promise does not concern the occurrence of an already scheduled, self-justifying or natural happening.
- 7 Use only if you intend '...to carry out the promise-sincerity'
- 8 Use only if promise is recognized as obligatory to promise-essential rule.

The fifth (constitutive) rule creates an obligation of the promiser to the promisee despite the fact that promises are sometimes broken and renewable. Mey states that the IFIDs of the speech act theory indicate the illocutionary force but do not make it functionally active. In this manner, the speech act becomes a pragmatic act, which addresses the conditions of interaction. In every practical situation, it is somehow difficult to separate regulative and the constitutive rules because the regulatory rule defines and imposes on the constitutive rule.

The reality of the situation is that the speech act theory is actually anchored on propositions than action. The illocutionary element of 'force' of the speech act is dependent on the speaker and embedded in an abstract content. Unlike the abstract view, the pragmatics argue that there are different linguistic uses within a single language as well. Mey suggests that speech acts should be considered as 'pragmatic devices for human activity, or pragmatic acts' (2000:104).

In addressing the question of how many speech acts there are, Mey categorizes speech act investigators into 'lumpers' and 'splitters'. Lumpers put together their speech acts under one big category, while splitters, split the acts into many classes. There is no single suitable answer for the number of existing speech acts (SA) but there are preferences to certain species and expressions, characterized as speech act verbs.

With reference to the performability of speech acts and speech act verbs, Mey states that most languages link activity to a verb in a sentence. The verb seems to be the main focus of action and carries the meaning and sense of a sentence. There are verbs that describe situations, and stating verbs called 'constitatives', verbs denoting 'real' speech act by showing action are called 'performatives'. The asymmetric relationship between speech acts and speech act verbs is created by the fact that speech acts can be represented by more than one-speech act verbs.

Based on the point discussed above, the order of the SA will be influenced by the ordering or normal verb. Secondly, the symmetry is fostered by the notion that not every SA has its own corresponding SAV. This indicates that not all SAs are of the same status with SAVs'. Another point to look at is the fact that performative verbs also called 'explicit performatives' do not always have an explicit performance but can be implicit in function as well. This case is illustrated by May's use of the term 'promise' in three differing instances. He brings to awareness that 'explicit performatives' are the most extreme cases of SAVs, in that they can perform ...certain. SAs for which they are designated...' Mey, (2000:107).

Mey (2000) cautions against the assumption that all verbs could be considered SAVs, because of their performativity. There are standard SAVs that do not indicate performance. Mey states that the two SAV categories mentioned above sometimes do not even coincide. The last category mentioned by Mey is that which denies its intention

or performance. He finalizes the investigation on performativity of SAVs by saying that this area of focus is a 'continuum' from the formal and institutionalized verbs such as 'to baptise' to the everyday common verbs which can be performative such as 'threaten', 'bother' or 'insult'.

According to Mey (2000), it may seem that performativity trails along verbal issues, therefore there is no need for SAV to perform an act, but there are two points to ponder upon before consenting to such. The first one is that of the 'speech act formulae' (SAF), which address verbal expressions, which behave like SAV while not being regular verbs. These verbal expressions are stylistic or variations of a common semantic notion. The second case about the SAV is the aspect of a verbless expression.

This situation indicates that SA and SAVs need to be used in a proper context to make their function adequate. Mey comments that 'The 'surface' form of a particular linguistic expression (such as an SAV or SAF) does not always and necessarily tell the truth about what it is doing' (2000:111). Meaning more than form is more important in determining the kind of speech act in consideration. SAV and SAF can substitute each other, and can be used in situations they do not really 'stand for', as in indirect SAs, addressed below.

Mey singles out two ways of categorizing indirect SAs. The first is the 'philosophical-semantic one', which is derived out of logic and expression. The second pragmatic way is based on 'what people say and 'do with their words''(2000:112). The use of indirect SAs is not mostly preferred as 'imperatives are rarely used to command or request,' Levinson (1983:275). Generally speaking 'the way we recognize indirect speech acts, and process them properly, has to do with the way we are 'set up' for recognition and action by the context:' Mey (2000:113)

Mey looks at Searle's (1975) ten steps of reasoning, in order to conclude on the logical reasoning based on indirect speech acting. He points out that indirect speech acting according to Searle, is a combination of the primary illocutionary act as in rejecting a proposal, and secondary illocutionary act, as in making a statement. The primary act functions through the secondary force, leading to a quiz on how the listener makes sense of the non-literal primary illocutionary act from the second literal act.

The ten steps below, address the quiz above, on understanding. Searle (1975) builds a ten-step model to analyze reasoning and understanding. In addressing the pragmatic view, Mey mentions that indirect speech acts are most common 'direct' realizations of 'illocutionary force'. He points out that a truly pragmatic approach would concentrate on what users do and the usage of language in members of speech community.

Language goes beyond historical boundaries and symbolizes human life by standardizing and codifying it. We therefore realize how restricted some speech acts are, such as 'I baptise thee', because it is very specified and reformative only in a particular social function.

Another interesting function of the conversational force is in a doctor-patient scene where the asymmetrical and mutual elements drive interaction to a successful encounter, based on power and status. The power of speech acts is not in the words or how the words are used but in how pragmatic acts are mediated, negotiated and institutionalized in a particular setting. The indirect speech acts are not abnormal cases but depend on the verbalization of an utterance to normalize them, in a rather more effective way than the regular SA.

The power and effects of speech acting in a real social situation compels Mey's study to classify speech acts based on the contexts. Mey says that Searle is upset with Austin's former study on classifications of illocutionary acts. Searle feels that Austin does not differentiate between speech acts and speech act verbs. Leech criticizes Austin for corresponding categories of speech acts, showing confusion of speech acts and speech act verbs. It is apparent that classifying speech acts carries inevitable problems. Mey follows Searle's warning that 'Differences in illocutionary verbs are a good guide, but by no means a sure guide to differences in illocutionary acts'(1977:288)

Searle lists twelve ways of classifying speech acts, and a few guides to a definite typology of SA. Mey focuses on only four and hopes that his criteria will play a better classification procedure. Below are the four classifications of SAs: -

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

To these, Mey adds two points being: -

- Reference
- Contextual conditions of speech acting – based on societal framework under which a SA is performed.

The power and effects of speech acting in a real social situation compels Mey to classify speech acts based on contexts. May mentions that Searle is upset with Austin's former study on classification of illocutionary acts. Searle feels that Austin does not differentiate between speech acts and speech act verbs. Leech criticizes Austin for corresponding categories of speech acts, showing confusion of speech acts and speech act verbs. It is apparent that classifying speech acts carries inevitable problems. Mey follows Searle's warning that 'Differences in illocutionary verbs are a good guide, but by no means a sure guide to differences in illocutionary acts' (1977:28).

Searle lists 12 ways of classifying speech acts, and a few guides to a definite typology of speech acts, but focuses on four of the acts. His criteria hopes to lay a better classification procedure. Below are the four classifications of speech acts:

- Illocutionary point
- Direction of fit
- Expressed psychological state
- Content
- Reference (Mey's addition)
- Contextual conditions of speech acting - based on societal framework under which a speech act is performed.

In discussing Searle's classifications, May explains them as follows:

- Representatives - speech acts are assertive and have to fit on the world order to be true. They 'represent a subjective state of mind' (p120), which may have a degree of force. An example of a complaint was used, where its content would be truthful but not making it true.

- Directives - carry an element of getting the hearer to do something, according to the speaker's wishes, 'at extreme end of this category we have the classical imperatives, (p120).
- The third category involves the commissives, which operate almost the same as directives but carry an obligatory character with them. In this category, the obligation is created in the speaker and not the hearer, e.g. a request would be a directive, while a promise would be a commissive. These two can only be separated by direction, force and cultural reference.
- The expressive informs of the speaker's 'inner state', and nothing of the world. The expressives have subjective character, limitations and changes based on different understanding of 'social behavior'. The expressive speech act has an element of 'truth', which has to be addressed as an 'embedded proposition', as it is based on the actuality of the vents and the reality of the speaker's feelings or thought.
- Declaratives are Mey's addition of Austin's 'original' category. Declaratives change the state of issues and affairs into a new state. They are dividers in speech act theory between locutioary and illocutionary acts. Once a state has been declared, it has to follow the conditions put forth, usually by authority.

Mey says that Searle(1977) is just in criticizing Austin's(1962) work, because Austin himself was not happy with his classification of speech acts, such as the behabitives and there was confusion between speech acts and speech acts verbs, as well as the wide description of terms. Despite all the criticism of Austin's study, Mey still appreciates Austin's contribution to the discovery that 'language is an instrument of action,' (p124).

Searle builds his classifications like Austin's. He lists 5 classes of speech acts. Searle also discusses 'commissives' which Austin defined. The criterion for truthfulness is unsure but does not fully address assertives. Mey says that Searle's taxonomy is superior to Austin's because 'it is more orientated toward the real world,..' (p124). Austin argues that people perform speech acts in speaking since it performs something in the world. This point hints on the performative and illocutionary character of speech acts.

Austin and Searle both operate on the 'one sentence, one case principle', (p125), and use sentences that are characteristic of speech acts. The two authors both focus on the speech act of promising in an isolated utterance, and the impact of its context as well as its

status. Mey stresses that 'we should pay serious attention to contextual conditions when describing speech acts, and in general, people's use of language.'

2.2 POLITENESS THEORY

2.2.1 Grundy (2000)

Grundy mentions that politeness is 'an exercise of language choice to create a context intended to match the addressee's notion of how s/he should be addressed' (2000:144). This theory of politeness highlights politeness as a means of encoding distance between the speaker and the addressee.

This view already contradicts with Brown and Levinson's(1987) statement on the universal linguistic and pragmatic applicability of the encoders, do not categorically fall into 'negative and positive' face. Grundy and other scholars, state that every spoken word is specifically structured for a specific audience, situation and purpose. Using strategic positive or negative politeness constructions, including the assumed or expected context of how to be addressed, can do this.

Grundy (2000) states that power-distance relationship of the interactants and the type of transaction involved, determine the choice of the language to be used and relate strongly to the politeness phenomenon. A speaker tries to create an 'implicated context' that suits or is expected by the addressee, by means of applying politeness etiquettes or behavior.

Politeness strategies encode distance between interactants, derived from the nature of the relationship. The speaker-addressee relationship is highly dependant on the displays, the effect of politeness, to which Grundy adds that 'the purpose of linguistic politeness is to imply the most appropriate speaker-addressee relationship' (2000:146).

The politeness phenomenon can sometimes impact on the principle of maximal economy of utterance. This principle operate in the format of 'uttering only the proposition to be conveyed' and 'not allowing shared propositions to be taken for granted without being stated,' (Grundy 2000:146)

Grundy also visits Brown and Levinson's (1987) model of politeness. This model assumes to be capable of accounting for any instance of politeness encounters. This model accepts that there are local differences, which are persuaded by cultural influences but fails to notice that its applicability is not universal. Brown and Levinson again deal with Goffman's idea of 'face', which is compared to self-esteem, in broad terms.

Brown and Levinson's theory of face, has a negative and positive code attached to them. A positive face relates to a person wanting to be approved of by others while the negative refers to the wish to be unimpeded upon by others. Grundy says in this regard, speech can be orientated to the effect of negative or positive faces of those we interact with.

Grundy illustrates positive politeness with the statement, 'Got the time mate?' which he says shows that the addressee is given a friendly and equal recognition. He illustrates negative politeness in 'could I just borrow a tiny bit of paper', which play down the imposition and potential loss of face.

'Negative politeness' and 'positive politeness' are indicated as having a relation to potential loss of 'face', following Brown and Levinson, which exposes a person to three choices. These super ordinate choices are; 'do the act on-record', 'off record' or not doing it at all.

There are three more strategies available to performing a face threatening act expositing from the 'on-record' act. These are according to Grundy (2000:157), a total of five strategies, followed by Brown and Levinson are listed below, seemingly ranked according to compensation of face threat.

Five Strategies:

1. Do the act on record –
 - (a) Badly, without redress
 - (b) With positive politeness redress
 - (c) With negative politeness redress
2. Do the act off record
3. Don't do the act

Politeness strategies co-act with distance differential, power differential and imposition that counter towards its effectiveness to being face sensitive. Grundy (2000:158) therefore formularize the above thus:

Social Distance & Power Distance + Degree of Imposition =

Degree of face threat to be compensated by appropriate linguistic strategy

A speaker will only choose a highly ranked strategy where the face threat is felt to be high, since being 'too polite' implies that one is asking a lot of someone' (Grundy 2000:159). This relates to the degree of imposition, which includes rationalization. Grundy states that 'the most important point about Brown and Levinson's five strategies is that they are ranked from Do the act record boldly, which has no linguistically encoded compensation, though a sequence of escalating politeness strategies to Don't do the act, where the face threat is too great to be compensated by any languages formula so that the most appropriate politeness strategy is not to do the act', (2000:159)

Grundy (2000) mentions that another strategy of politeness is humor as non-canonical politeness phenomena, transcending Power, Distance and Imposition. Humor can be used to ignore power differential as a way of marking incongruous politeness status. In using humor or jokes, the speaker uses positive politeness strategy in a situation that did not allow positive politeness.

In checking understanding, Grundy points out that over-classes favor distance encoding negative politeness while under-classes favor solidarity encoding positive politeness strategy. This 'over' and 'under' class communication found in intra-societal politeness behavior, contradicts Brown and Levinsons' universal applicability of politeness phenomena.

In Chinese, as an example, the use of negative politeness strategy does not exist, as it constitutes a social register. The politeness strategy is used to 'separate culturally variable estimate of power, distance and imposition...from strategies and linguistic manifestations of strategies which a universal account of politeness would need to capture' Grundy, (2000:162)

Brown and Levinson's (1987) approach does not account for deference as manifested in Japanese honorifics. Matsumoto (1988) questions whether deference can be treated as a politeness strategy, in the way Brown and Levinson does. Matsumoto (1988) thus distinguishes two uses of deference in:

- Given expectably and unexceptionally, in honorific cultural reinforcement and
- Given expectably but exceptionally – as a redressive strategy.

Grundy follows up with an argument that apparent deference shows or proves that some notion of social order or societal interdependence rather than positive and negative face underlies politeness. Brown and Levinson's contribution is their observation that politeness is not equally distributed, but rather a calculation of 'what is expected in each social and situational context that arises', (Grundy 2000:164).

In redefining the term 'politeness, from folk term, Grundy states that the term is not a speech style of the 'over-classes'. Pragmaticists view 'politeness' as a description of a relationship between 'how something is said to an addressee and that addressee's judgment as to how it should be said' (2000:164). This therefore means that the politeness theory can be confused with 'a prescriptive approach to linguistic etiquette', according to Grundy (2000:164)

Grundy exemplifies the descriptions of prescriptions than prescriptions of context-creating politeness phenomenon, by using address modes 'grandpa' or 'aunt' as a mark of respect in Chinese. According to Grundy, politeness is more of a bolt-on-redressive element found in interactional discourse than transactional. Conversational behavior meets transactional discourse requirements by observing the Cooperative Principle. Interactional discourse anchors on the establishment and maintenance of social relationships, according to Kasper (1990:205)

Kasper (1990) hereby shows that 'observing maxims of Quality and Manner will have priority over satisfying face-wants in transactional discourse while the opposite will obtain in interactional discourse' (Grundy: 2000:165). Grundy points out that Kasper's observation that face-wants are simply satisfied by prioritizing veracity and clarity as in some transactional situations is a valuable contribution to study.

Kasper (1990) suggests that a linguistic politeness theory, which can match pragmatic usage, needs to be formulated. This theory will account for the extent to which things are said to suit the addressee's perceptions and expectations.

2.2.2 Reiter (2000)

Politeness: Social or Individual Entity?

Reiter (2000) provides a background on the social dynamics of politeness by finding its origin or derivation. She affirms that politeness is not an individual, personal entity but a product of process socialization. It is a part of norms and values agreed upon as a way of behaving. Politeness is not solely the behaviour or manner of act or doing certain things but is based on an interpersonal relationship. According to Reiter, politeness acts as a mediator between people and structure and social interaction.

Lakoff's rules of politeness.

Reiter looks at principles of conversation in pragmatics, to explain the theory of politeness. She singles out Grice's (1975) Co-operative Principle and Maxims of Conversation. These two formulations assume that the verbal interaction aims at exchanging information effectively. Grice primarily focuses on 'the rationality and /or irrationality of conversational behaviour rather than any other general characteristics of conversation.' (Reiter: 2000 p6)

Lakoff (1973) followed Grice's view of conversational principles to explain the nature of politeness phenomena. Lakoff (1973) contests fact that 'grammars should not only specify the applicability of grammatical rules but also include pragmatic factors', Reiter 2000:7.

According to Lakoff the rules of politeness are:

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

Lakoff did not go into details explaining the impacts of the rules above but assumes that politeness is obviously associated with making the addressee feel good by avoiding conflict.

Lakoff associates Grice's maxims with her pragmatic rules, which concentrate on the clarity of the conversation. Lakoff's first rule of conversation is to communicate the message in the shortest time possible with the least difficulty, without imposing on the addressee. Inherent in this statement is the fact that politeness forms a major part of conversing. It seems that since Lakoff follows Grice's claim that his rules are universal, her type of politeness is of universal applicability as well. This claim is complicated since Lakoff does not explain her rules; it does not prove applicability, in any way.

Brown states that Lakoff's analysis does not provide a unifying theory, which relates it to social relationship and expectations in human interactions. Frank (1980) criticises that Lakoff equates pragmatic rules with linguistic ones, which then disqualifies the intention or duty of distinguishing the meaning of a sentence and communicative function.

Leech's principles and maxims of interaction

Leech (1983) portrays politeness as a regulative element of communication. Same as Lakoff, he bases his construction on Grice's principles of conversation. Leech tries to account to the reason why people resort to the CP and communicate a meaning indirectly. Leech sees politeness as 'the key pragmatic phenomenon for indirectness and one of the reasons why people deviate from the CP' Reiter 2000:08. Leech distinguishes between the illocutionary and a speaker's social goals. He uses two pragmatic frameworks, which have set of principles relating to the textual rhetoric and the interpersonal rhetoric.

According to Leech, there are 3 sets of principles found in the domain of interpersonal rhetoric being:

- a) Grice's Co-operative Principle (CP)
- b) The politeness Principle (PP)
- c) The Ironic Principle (IP)

The latter can be manipulated by the speaker to appear polite while actually being impolite.

Leech's PP has the same stand as Grice's CP, as they both have the same format and analysed in terms of maxims which are immeasurable such as tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement and sympathy. Leech explains that CP and PP interact in a way that the CP and its maxims, '...are used to explain how the utterance may be interpreted to convey indirect messages and the PP and its maxims are used to explain why such indirectness might be used'. Leech and Lakoff agree that these two principles can clash and that the speaker will have to sacrifice the PP for the CP, in which case the speaker will be risking the maintenance of cooperation.

Leech outlines five (5) pragmatic scales which help identify the appropriate extent of tact or generosity in a particular speech:

1. The cost /benefit scale
2. The optionality scale
3. The indirectness scale
4. The authority scale
5. The social distance scale

These scales provide the speaker with options and need for directness to the hearer. Other scholars see the scales as defective because politeness and indirectness 'do not co-vary', (Reiter 2000:10). Leech agrees that the maxims do not have the same importance or status and that each maxim is made up of two maxims. The tact maxim for instance, consists of:

- i) Minimise cost to the other and
- ii) Maximise benefit to the other,

These last two points vary according to cultural assessment. Leech distinguishes between 'absolute and relative politeness. Leech looks at positive politeness as a '...way of maximizing the politeness of polite illocutions and the negative politeness as a way of minimizing the impoliteness of impolite illocutions', Reiter (2000:10). This distinction will also vary depending on the cultural operations between the CP and the PP.

Fraser raises the point that Leech's approach is problematic because it looks at illocutions as either polite or impolite, without accounting for the cultural and situational contexts. The second problem with Leech's account is that it does not address the question of how many

principles and maxims account for the politeness phenomena. Theoretically, the number of the maxims can be endless, without a clear indicator in question.

Brown and Levinson's Theory of Politeness

Brown and Levinson as well as Grice made a comparative study in unrelated languages such as English, Tamil and Tzeltal to observe the conversational maxims for motives of politeness. Brown and Levinson(1987) noticed that the linguistic strategies were the same and employed in these different languages in a similar manner. This observation or outcome led these scholars into assuming that politeness can be regarded as a universal regulative factor in conversations. '...one powerful and pervasive motive for not taking Maxim-wise, is the desire to give some attention to face... Politeness is then a major source of deviation from such rational efficiency, and is communicated precisely by that deviation, (1978:100)

Brown and Levinson(1987) uses 'Model Person' (MP) notion, which consists of a fluent speaker of a language who can meet/, is aware of 'face' needs. The MP is used to support for linguistic similarities mentioned in the above paragraph, as well as to understand communication as a purposeful and rational activity. When addressing politeness strategies, Reiter comments that brown and Levinson assume that all competent speakers of a community are aware and concerned about 'face' issues.

Brown and Levinson highlight two aspects two aspects of 'face', which are universal desires in human interaction, being negative and positive face. Negative face is associated with an individual's desire to be free of imposition while positive face appreciates and recognizes cultural values, which may vary, on one's personality. 'Face is something that is emotionally invested, and can be lost, maintained or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction', (1978:68). Brown and Levinson claim that everybody aims at maintaining and sustaining their face by co-operating.

Brown and Levinson again state that adults are 'rational agents' who choose certain behaviour to satisfy their goals as effectively as possible. These scholars, unlike Leech who proposes that some interactions may be polite or impolite, they suggest that certain acts are a threat to the face. The 'theoretic framework' used to explain the phenomena for politeness determines the main difference between these scholars. FTA's are regarded

by Brown and Levinson as acts which contradict the hearer/speaker's negative /positive face. They propose for a scale to evaluate the level of politeness in a specific encounter. Reiter mentions that Brown and Levinson elicit three (3) universal culturally sensitive variables:

- Social distance (D)
- Relative power (P)
- Absolute ranking (R)

These variables are minimized and minimised according to rationality of participating agents.

Five strategies which help avoid or mitigate FTA, are outlined as follows:

1. Same as Grice's maxim, operates in the absence of threat to face
2. Used in a redressive encounter – positive or negative politeness
3. 2 and 3 together

Brown and Levinson's fourth strategy aligns with Grice's maxims where the 'meaning is to some degree negotiable by means of conventional implicatures', Reiter 2000:14. This strategy is used when the loss of face is great and complicated by ambiguity. In most cases the fifth strategy, nothing is said because the risk is too high, should something be said.

There are acts which show the speaker's distance and involvement in an interaction. This relates Brown and Levinson's positive and negative politeness to Goffman's (1967) concept of 'avoidance/presentational rituals'. Reiter states that the above scholars 'see these two ways of expressing politeness as mutually exclusive since, 'positive politeness is characterized by the expression of approval and appreciation... by making him/her feel part of the group' Reiter (2000:15). Brown and Levinson claim that when dealing with the topic on politeness, negative politeness as a said formal politeness, comes to mind. 'Although Brown and Levinson acknowledge the possibility of having both forms of politeness in certain societies, they seem to regard 'negative' politeness as a more important consideration than 'positive' politeness, Reiter (2000:15).

CHAPTER 3

THE SPEECH ACT ADVICE

3.1 STRATEGIES IN REQUESTING AND GIVING ADVICE DECAPUA AND DUNHAM (1993)

DeCapua and Dunham (1993) mention that there are three strategies in the discourse of advice which are explanation, elaboration and narration. They demonstrate their findings through two advice programs, from two radio stations; Sally Jessy Raphael and Bernard Meltzer's programs. DeCapua and Dunham found out that the telephone advice calls can be separated into the diagnostic stage and the direction stage.

The discourse of advice is said to be an interactive communicative process. As in Hernandez-Flores (1998), we realize that advice is often not asked for but follows the discussion of a problem. The perceived credibility or trustworthiness of the hearer to the advice seeker usually triggers this communication process. DeCapua and Dunham define advice as 'opinions or counsel given by people who perceive themselves as knowledgeable, and /or who the advice seeker may think are credible, trustworthy, and reliable', (1993:519).

The first stage of the advice process, which is diagnostic, is identified by the request for advice, filled with vague requests or explanation/ description of the situation. From their observation, DeCapua and Dunham noticed that sometimes callers to the radio show expect the problem they seek advice for; to be evident in the description they supply. There is no specific format or formula of presenting or stating of problem. The radio program host has it as his /her task to restate, probe direct and formulate the nature of the problem before giving advice. In stating a problem the above mentioned role of clearing transitional topics help the seeker get the core of the problem.

Meltzer's year focusing strategies, help clear the long process of clarification and exploration. His interaction skills help him elicit confirmation of the problem, unclearly stated, as in Caddie's case. The role of the advice-giver is not only to listen to the advice-seekers, clarify their problem and then advice, but involves more than that. In the case of the radio program and in general, the advice-giver 'has to determine what the problem is,

what the options are for solving the problems, and what action, if any, should be taken in the future' (p526). This happens especially when the problem has not been clarified.

The advice-giver's role is also to give reassurance and support. In some instances, the advice-seeker may need support and a second voice in what he/she has decided to do. DeCapua and Dunham mention that the process of giving advice is complex because the advisor's part of solving the problem is helping the person in need to reach their own decision on how to solve the problem. Another part of solving the problem is to offer global or general advice that can suit listeners who may be in the same situation, as in Sally Jessy Raphael's case.

In this article, the issues of negative and positive face do not play a big role as assumed by Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory, in advisory sessions. When someone calls the advice show, they already risk their faces by going public about some private matters. The adviser tries to employ face saving strategies but cannot always assure this as he/she does not always take cultural background issues into consideration when advising. The show hosts, use face mitigating strategies, including multi-applicable messages, to this effect, as indicated by Goldsmith and MacGeorge, (2000).

3.2 ADVICE AND POLITENESS

3.2.1 Hernandez-Flores (1999)

Meier (1995:387) as quoted by Hernandez-Flores (1999) points out that "politeness is socially acceptable." There is a concern raised about what constitutes the standards of 'being social'. As a lead, Hernandez-Flores makes us observe that politeness is based on a social ideology, which is 'a set of ideas about behavior', which are shared by a community and, are recognized as appropriate in the community. It is hence important to discover what 'sociability' requirements are, in order for one to ascribe by this set of ideas.

Hernandez-Flores' (1999) main concern is the application of positive and negative face as a general terminology. He brings out different culturally based labels of politeness quantum as a means of understanding politeness. He also describes politeness as phenomena, identifies certain features from people of different cultures associated with the concept of 'sociable' and 'politeness'. Mao as quoted by Hernandez-Flores mentions 'mianzi' and 'lian', for a Chinese social code of politeness; Ecuadorian politeness as well

as 'Hlonipa' by De Kadt. By referring to the above features, Hernandez-Flores differs with Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness.

'Face' is what Brown and Levinson refers to as 'the public self-image, that every member of community wants to claim for him/herself' (1987:61). Hernandez-Flores has a problem with what constitutes the theory of face as a general term. The term face encompasses universality wants of a positive and negative face. A positive face- a derivative of wanting to be approved of, a negative face- a resultant of a want to be 'unimpeded in one's actions'. This theory of face does not fit description in all communities. The negative face associated with individualism is typical of Anglo Saxon communities but is not necessarily prevalent in other communities.

The face wants differ from community to community according to social expectations, as it may not have the same quantum of similarity as a positive face. As an example, Hernandez-Flores argues that Mao's notion of 'mianzi' and negative face have in their centre 'respect behavior' but differ in reference. Negative refers to the individual's territorial integrity while mianzi 'refers to the individual's dependence on society recognition'. Mao's 'Lian, has association to a positive face, as a behavior linked to being liked and accepted by community members, differs from Brown and Levinson's (1987) positive face by anchoring on non-flexible moral sense.

Hernandez-flores sees Brown and Levinson's concept of positive and negative face as a 'restrictive cultural feature'. Being outstanding as an individual among the group does not necessary imply negatively as in Brown and Levinson's general terms. Hernandez-Flores' article tries to look at the contents of face in Spanish culture as a way of clarifying the concept of politeness in conjunction to Brown and Levinson's theory. Brown and Levinson use the terms autonomy and affiliation in dealing with face wants of Spaniards and Swedes. Autonomy and affiliation deal with ego and alter which operates at different levels and in reference.

According to Hernandez-Flores (1999) autonomy and affiliation can be separated in a category of being seen as an individual within a group and in the second category, being seen as an integrated member of a group. Autonomy and affiliation are however not the same as negative and positive but are dependent on culture background and

interpretation. This then means that the contents of face autonomy and affiliation have to be culturally defined and applied.

Hernandez-Flores tries to prove contents of face through brown's application of the concept in Spanish business communication. Brown and Levinson quantifies autonomy as an individual's self awareness as an original person with positive social quantities/behaviour, by showing self-confidence, through assertive behaviour. This links with Hernandez-Flores that 'in a Spanish setting, conversation is seen as a pleasant activity where controversy and the utterance of original ideas from the participants are appreciated (in verbal ways by the use of assertions, f.ex.)'.

This motion is supported by Thuren (1988) who mentions that persuasive communication with strong non-verbal cues, forcefully demonstrate logic, which is carried by emotions. Hernandez-Flores argues that an individual stands out in the group, when s/he is self-affirmed to stress his/her social qualities, as in Spanish colloquial conversation.

Brown and Levinson as opposed to Thuren (1998) view the contents of affiliation in Spanish conversation as *confianza*, which refers to the manner and style of communication. *Confianza* allows a speaker to openly speak or act in social settings. Thuren interprets *confianza* differently as 'closeness or a sense of deep familiarity' (1998:222). Hernandez-Flores consolidates the term *confianza* as an active element of familiarity. By that then the absence of *confianza* relates to distance, which is not approved of in a familiar background of people close to each other, such as family, relative's and friends, in Spain.

To clarify this ideological polarity, Hernandez-Flores takes a stand and states her view on *confianza*. She mentions that *confianza* does not only exist because of familiar background but is process, which develops identity in to a state of recognition. *Confianza* is something a speaker works for or interacts to achieve even with strangers and spreads beyond family etc. it aims at developing a family-like closeness and involves emotional and decisive assertions.

Confianza is seen here as a fulfilment of an individual to a need for affiliation through or by convincing the group by winning their *confianza* in return. At this point, one would realize the fusion between self-affirmation and *confianza*. 'The individual has the right to be self-

affirmative because s/he has the group *confianza*' in return. Therefore, autonomy and affiliation in the context of Spanish face does not repel but are agreeable.

According to Hernandez-Flores (1999), self-affiliation which is positive depends on how the group sees the individual while individuals, independence from the group would yield a negative face. In this terminological strife, *confianza* does not relate to positive or negative but to achieving closeness and creating familiarity. This therefore, interprets that self-affiliation related to *confianza*, is about the group's acceptance of an individual as member and also as a rightful individual, single unit.

Through the conceptual debates on Brown and Levinson's (1987) positive and negative face, Hernandez-Flores tries to convince the readers that in deed some factors, and face contents do not fit in all cultures. She goes on to apply it in a Spanish cultural context, which according to her does not fit Brown and Levinson's descriptive outlines.

Advice and Politeness

Brown and Levinson (1987) politeness in advice giving occurrence as it highlights the potential threat to the negative face of the recipient because, it somehow imposes the hearer to follow it. Since an individual would like to be free of pressures, the language of advice has a coercive trend/ inclination of perturbing the hearer's freedom of deciding and acting freely. If self-affirmation is part of autonomy, meaning that an individual has a right to his/her social qualities and individuality, then an individual would not feel imposed upon by an advice. In giving advice the speaker expresses personal opinion and ideas on an issue. Whether to accept or reject advice would show competence in making a decision by making a choice. *Confianza* in the Spanish content is an integral element, which creates closeness that allows the speaker and hearer to interact freely, in a friendly background.

In discussing the role of politeness in advice, Hernandez-Flores points out that "politeness is not always used because of conflict reasons, as a way of avoiding or mitigating a threat to the other's face" (1999:42). Politeness promotes a friendly and pleasant interaction, which are in the line with cultural values of the Spanish people. In this case, politeness brings about harmony between the communicators' wishes of autonomy and affiliation.

In his/her analysis of politeness, Hernandez-Flores (1999) realize that in the first recorded speech the unsolicited advice on having swans on the farm, in case of Spaniards conversion, does not threaten the face of the hearer. The reader is made to realize here, that the guest's unsolicited advice is offered because of being involved in the communication (creating closeness) and not because the absence of swans is an issue. This shows that the advisor wishes to be seen as an autonomous person, full of ideas, while searching *confianza*, that she is a welcome and acceptable guest. The host's reject to advice also shows that she is not imposed or threatened and thus also claims her autonomy. In this example, one notices that there is no category for positive and negative face features.

In the first example conversation provided, all participants claim their autonomy through communication in a polite manner. 'Politeness is the way of stressing the hearer's face at the same time that the speaker keeps his/her face in a good position', Hernandez-Flores (1999:42). Politeness makes the advice giver concerned about the hearer's face. In this example, politeness is indicated by a series of speech acts, which fall under the politeness ritual of Spaniards. Politeness with *confianza* in this instance searches for a balance of faces by the interactors provided by cultural knowledge as a resource.

In the second situation the speaker and their roles, politeness is used to show solidarity In this situation, the hostess declines advice twice with a negative response and by using another speech act, thus showing autonomy. The attention the host gets from the guest confirms her affiliation. In this instance, politeness appears again as a face equalizer which strengthens their relationship.

3.2.2 Goldsmith and MacGeorge (2000)

In their article, Goldsmith and MacGeorge, (2000) focus on the perceived quality of advice. They argue that offering advice to someone who has a problem is not an answer or help as the giver thinks. Offering advice may spring negative reaction to the supposed receiver. It threatens the face of the person in problem, by subtly suggesting that the person have no potential to think or decide for him/herself. Offering advice challenges the hearer's 'identity as a competent and autonomous social actor' (p235).

There are three areas that Goldsmith and MacGeorge explore in addressing politeness theory which are perceived regard for face, perceive regard for face and perceived effectiveness and their linkages. Following Goffman's definition, Goldsmith and MacGeorge describe 'face' as a seeking for social approval. He mentions that in every interaction, face can either be threatened or honoured. To protect and prevent a threat to face, the speaker can strengthen the relationship with the hearer by using politeness linguistic forms and cues.

Depending on situational and cultural directives, the less face threatening acts depend on the status of the speaker, the social distance and the rank of the threatening act between the speaker and the hearer. In order to prevent bald and direct, which are the least polite acts, a thoughtful speaker can use different strategies to mitigate face threats. One way of redressing the threat to the hearer is by using material that lessens it. Such material will attempt to reduce the degree of criticism and rejection. Minimizing the imposition of advice by using a multi-applicable message makes the threat less personal. Most face threatening acts are implied, and the negative redress seems more polite than the positive redress.

Goldsmith and MacGeorge's (2000) study claims to prove the first systematic test of the relationship among politeness, relational power and distance, perceived regard to face, and advice effectiveness, they wish to discover why the use of politeness theory seems effective in some situations and ineffective in others, with regard to advice. They also go to an extent of testing some interaction episodes.

Explaining helpful and unhelpful advice

There are about three ways of reacting to advice to problems. The first way is the variability in the recipients' reactions, depends on whether it is interpreted as threatening to the face. Again by suggesting that the hearer would not make a good advice on their own, challenges their autonomy, acceptance and approval. Secondly, politeness theory predicts that advice can be problematic in some situations in terms of relation, expertise. Advice is well received from closed others who are perceived as skilful or knowledgeable in the problem area. The third way is that politeness theory predicts that by using certain strategies and levels, the threat will be mitigated. This judgement of effectiveness will be a function of the interaction of politeness and the speaker-hearer relationship.

The authors address three specific aspects of Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of face wants, they use a more modest approach to specify three aspects of the theory's scope. The authors look at advice rather than requests; they provide an extensive comparative test of how polite forms are related to perceived regard for face and to perceived message effectiveness, which much emphasizes the use of language forms. They also approach the study as means of finding similarity and generalizing people, situation and messages based on the effectiveness of the politeness, differently from Brown and Levinson. This test aims to show whether linguistic forms identified by Brown and Levinson (1987) are used to show regard for face or whether regard for face impacts on the evaluation of the effectiveness of messages.

In their discussion, Goldsmith and MacGeorge mention that they found 'perceived regard for face was a significant predictor of the perceived effectiveness of advice given to a distressed other' (2000; 249). They admit that their research could not support politeness theory of what factors influence perceived regard for face. The authors' outcome on advice and threat to face indicated that advice was more threatening to positive than negative face. This is strongly implicated by the fact that interpretation of face-threatening actions is based on shared understanding and knowledge of the receiver. The assumptions the hearer assumes of the speaker, depending on the situation and context, also impact on the reception and effectiveness of the advice.

Interpretation of politeness in Goldsmith and MacGeorge's (2000) tests depended on who said what and how. The authors of the article could not find a consistent politeness form in relation to face. There was no difference in request but in replies, meaning that different forms of politeness were more acceptable in varying relations and type of situations. Similarly, we found that some messages are better than others, regardless of who says them, and that a few of the polite messages were actually seen as less effective than their bald-on-record counterparts.

Goldsmith and MacGeorge (2000) warn that a politeness form does not count as a general way of giving any advice with the hope of making it acceptable by employing these strategies. In the author's findings, they realized that the relational power and closeness could offer threat to face through politeness. Individual's interpretation and reception of polite forms vary from person to person, creating inconsistency in the outcomes of the test. Goldsmith and MacGeorge admit that their test and survey had limitations, as they are not a

true reflection of the real situation. A proposal for further research on relational power, distance and politeness' rule in judgments of regard to face, was put forward.

3.2.3 Goldsmith and Fitch (1997)

Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) examine how a community of speaker reacts to advice, based on the agreed cultural background influences. The recipient's reaction to advice depends on certain features and dynamics that are contextually drawn or linked to its interpretation

The symbolic and rhetorical dimensions of giving and receiving advice that are put into focus more than the amount of support given. The author's, Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) mention that most research have focused on associations between effective outcomes and the frequency of support given, without looking at the acceptability of the support. The oversight on the quality and reception of support offered to a distressed other, neglects features of situations and interactions, which can improve or worsen, regard to face.

Researchers are now trying to examine how support is communicated, what features and strategies should be used to make support less threatening to the recipient's face.

Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) look at symbolic, rhetorical and quality of seeking, giving and accepting advice. In explaining the terms, the authors explain that by symbolic they mean that 'the effects of received support do not come about mechanistically through mere issuance of a supportive act (e.g., advice) but rather through participants' interpretation of acts and their implication's, Goldsmith and Fitch, (1997:455).

Rhetoric means that 'situations in which social support is communicated involve multiple goals and outcomes and effective interactants are those who deploy discursive resources in ways that are adapted to these demands' (Goldsmith and Fitch, (1997:455)). This means that useful advice is not embodied in the message or information only, but has to show concern for participants' face as well as relationships. The rhetorical process of support as impacted upon by situational context and conversational context. These contexts are highly associated with interpretation and judgment of support as being intrusive, involved, caring or 'butting in'.

The effectiveness of supportive acts relies not on quantity but on the quality of the act. Quality refers to the extent to which an utterance is adaptive desired outcomes' (Goldsmith and Fitch, (1997:455)). Effective support can adapt to multiple demands and contexts, but needs to be used in particular occasions or situations. In cases where an expert offers support such as advice, the resources used follow certain specific methods, which will affirm their definition of the situation. Goldsmith and Fitch list three requirements for offering social support:

1. Support should not be single functional but multi goal orientated
2. Evaluation of supportive acts i.e. Advice should not be seen as static but as elements of appeal to the effectiveness of such support.
3. Features of support should be identified and discussed in order to explain variation in achieving multiple goals.

Goldsmith and Fitch are also concerned that many other researchers view support mostly as a threat to face. Support has a positive effect of showing care and assurance to the distressed other. This helps them to see the problem as manageable, lighter and easier to deal with. Questions dealt with in this article ask about the goals pursued when people ask or give advice. The last question is on situational, conversational and cultural influences that guide the recipient's evaluation of advice.

Goldsmith and Fitch, (1997) address these questions by running a research among the U.S Americans. They claim to have run an ethnographic study of how advice is sought, provided and accepted because of the primacy to respondent's uses and meanings of naturally occurring instance to advice', (p 458). Secondly the study is claimed to be ethnographic because it recognizes the belief systems within which support is analyzed. According to Goldsmith and Fitch, speech community is not location or group membership based, but also a system of rules and premises for speaking. The data provided affirms that there is commonality in meaning and understanding based on group membership.

There are three dilemmas of advice episodes identified in this article. Goldsmith and Fitch, (1997) state that advice could provide expert opinion on how to solve a problem, another point of view in making a decision, and assistance in laying out options. Advice carries a lot of information within it, which does not only reveal itself just as information. The first dilemma associated with giving advice, is that it can assume that the giver/

speaker has some expertise and has a closer relation with the recipient. Offers advice especially if unsolicited can be interpreted as intrusion as well as criticism to the hearer for being incompetent.

The second dilemma is on how advice is balanced conflicts in the relational partners' honesty, caring and supportiveness. A third dilemma relates to the receiver's conflicting motivations' for asking for advice and how he/she responds to it. The polarity between the threat to being incompetent and the ungratefulness of rejecting advice is tricky to the recipient. Goldsmith and Fitch, (1997) found that multiple and also conflicting outcomes could not be separated or removed from dealing with advice topics.

As with previous research work, participants recognized that advice acts as support for seekers in problems, stress and deciding on everyday issues. The negative part of the advice scenario, is address in point out the positive part thereof being honesty and caring, as emotional as informational support. Depending on the seeker's expectations, in some cases honesty was valued while in others, supportive agreement was sought. Goldsmith and Fitch (1997) finally mention that advice enacted identity and relational characteristics, including closeness, caring, intrusion, control, respect, gratitude, autonomy, equality and competence.

In order to find out how and why advice benefits seekers; it should recognize the emotional and informational value thereof. Account should also be taken on the negative and positive face and outcomes. Goldsmith and Fitch's (1997) study 'demonstrates that supportive acts may be associated with a variety of functions and the linkage between an act and the functions it is seen by participants to serve is a communicative process rather than a mechanical one' (p473). Participants in an act of support use features such as situational, creative, selective and self-serving features to interpret certain instances of supportive communication, which are based or derived from symbolic and rhetoric dimensions.

3.3 ADVICE ABOUT TROUBLE

3.3.1 Goldsmith (1999)

Goldsmith and Fitch's (1997) article looked at the normative context of advice as social support. In this article, I will look at conditions under which an individual's integrity is honored or threatened through the act of giving advice. Goldsmith's (1999) article conducts two studies on how the sequencing of acts affects the type and extent of face threat.

Interpersonal relations and messages vary according to content and context, which impacts on why some messages become more effective and relevant than others. Since giving and receiving advice brings about conflicts as identified in Goldsmith and Fitch's (1997) article, it is important to get a guide on how to give a face-sensitive advice.

This article explores and demonstrates how sequential use of face-sensitive linguistic forms succeeds in achieving these outcomes. The author talks about face-threatening acts, which shape perceptions of face-threat, in association to politeness theory of Brown and Levinson (1987). These authors acknowledge that face implications do not only depend on conventional understanding of individual acts but also on "reconstruction of levels of intent beyond and above integrative of those that lie behind particular utterances or sentences" (Brown and Levinson 1987 (p233)) in (Goldsmith 2000:2). Brown and Levinson concentrated on politeness theory for their study ignoring the analysis of a speech act as a unit.

Brown and Levinson's (1987) study produces two limitations. The first limitation is of locating face threat in the inferences about goals than in the conventional rules of issuing speech acts. The second limitation is that it does not address the ways in which goals in an interaction rely on the sequential ordering of acts. In supporting Goldsmith (2002:p2), Wilson et al. (1991/92,1998) show that 'giving advice, asking a favor, and enforcing an obligation are all influence goals that may be pursued by issuing directive, with corresponding threats to negative face'.

It has already been indicated that advice does not solve a problem but may threaten negative face when interpreted as intruding. Positive face can be threatened when

speaker's advice is interpreted as criticism on hearer's acts. This means then that threats to face originate not only from illocutionary intentions conventionally associated with particular speech acts, but from inferences about the goals of which face-threatening acts are a part and the identity implication of those longer lines of action, according to Goldsmith (2000:p3).

Advice is seen as a threat, but Sanders (1995) states that consonances and dissonances with the face wants of the receiver produce two implications below. The first is that a sequence of acts makes some goals relevant to the interaction. The second implication is the consonance and dissonance relevance to desired identities. Wilson et al (1991/92, 1998) and Sander (1995) mention that a face-threatening act is impacted by the larger goal or plan it is part of.

Goldsmith (2000) tries to prove that face threatening acts implication in conversations vary according to sequential placement of these acts. The nature and degree of the face threatening acts may also vary as a function of the sequence, in which advice occurs. In an event where the advice is solicited, reception of support is more tolerable and viewed more cooperatively. Goldsmith separates two studies in which she focuses on the patterns of interpretation familiar with white, middle class, college-educated adults.

In the first study, Goldsmith (2000) focuses and identifies the type of sequences and the features of solicited and unsolicited advice. He suggests that advice-givers need to use pre-sequences prior to offering advice. The advice-seeker can also threaten his/her own face when imposing on the other to offer support. This study was directed by finding some common patterns in which advice comes about in problem situations and the features of these patterns to the interpretation of advice judgment.

Goldsmith (2000) examined six cases. The face cases look at an episode in which:

1. An advice is solicited. The advice seeker may ask if she/he should do something. This tells that the seeker is definitely asking for help e.g. ' I need your advice or tell me what to do', (p6)
2. Where the advice seeker asks for information or opinion, what do you think about such and such? This question is used for evaluation of a course of action. Sometimes asking or information does not clarify the need of advice. Asking for

some opinion or information is more of problem solving than needing emotional support.

3. Recipient discloses a problem. Upon disclosing a problem, the listener may automatically offer advice, even though it may not necessary be asked.
4. The fourth episode is in which a recipient announces a plan of action. This follows such as in 'I'm going to...' and then telling the plan. The listener gets promoted to respond in a manner that offers advice, which can be nasty but resourceful.
5. Advisor identifies problems. Sometimes the advise-giver would introduce the problem in an 'advisor volunteer advice' manner e.g.

Dory: You look like you're allergic

Katy: Yes, it's been awful. I've never have allergies before.

6. The last category is one in which the advisor volunteers advice. When an individual views a situation as problematic and then offers advice.

Looking at dimensions that differentiate the six types of sequences indicate the extent in which advice is requested. Goldsmith states that advice qualifies as solicited, when the recipient explicitly ask for advice, acknowledges the problem, and introduces the problem topic. Advice is least likely to be seen as solicited when none of these conditions are met, as in episode 1. According to the author anything that does not meet these conditions falls between solicited and unsolicited advice. This study focuses on bold-record advices between friends and not strangers. Taking it a step further, Goldsmith states that if a request for advice has been explicitly stated, then the recipient's interpretation, threat to face and assumptions of intrusion as well as intended goals are viewed more cooperatively.

In study 2, Goldsmith (1999) follows interpretation common to a sub-group of the large community of the first study group and looks at testing perceived face threat associated with forms of advice solicitation. Study 2 tries to test hypothesis in study 1, to show 'some common and general implications of sequential placement of advice, for interpretation of solicitation on face threat' (p10). The hypothesis shows that face-threatening acts are not based on the offering of advice, but on the sequence thereof.

The method used in study 2, looking at participant's rooms a wide variety of academic background. The evaluation procedure followed a seven point scale from 'strongly agree to strongly disagree', everything between solicited and unsolicited. Realism of scenarios and measurement of dependent variables were used in this part of the test.

Among the findings, perceived solicitation was a link in advice sequences and differences to negative faces. There was also variable with effects on perceived regard for negative face, as there was for positive face, which was viewed as less threatened in episodes following the recipient's disclosure of a problem or plan. Discussing problems before offering advice was more favorable than just advancing. Accepting contributed to inferences about identities and face.

In concluding her study, Goldsmith (1999) mentions that her findings reveal that different speech communities introduce advice topics in various sequences. For advice act in episode of talking about problems, certain common features saved as resources for increasing or decreasing face threat. Finding indicated that offering advice to a close other is common but not always appreciated. Caution in all categories and interaction is therefore suggested, in order to prevent face-threats.

The limitations on this study are that it was assumed that the recipients wanted advice. This advice offered is speech community orientated and may vary according to different social-cultural groups as in Goldsmith and Fitch's (1997) article. 'Exploration of socio-cultural variable in advice sequences and their implications for face is warranted' according to Goldsmith (2000:16).

3.4 SEEKING ADVICE AND ADVICE SEQUENCES

3.4.1 Goldsmith (2000)

This article looks at how content accompanying advice may have impact on face. The way a person presents the act on support is of paramount importance according to Goldsmith (1999). She separates her work in two studies. In the first study she addresses common types of topics in trouble episodes. In the second study, she focused on the perception that in some cases, the advice-giver does not regard to face into consideration.

Giving advice is a common reaction in problem situations, but little attention has been given as how to advice should be give. Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory centralizes threats to face in the 'defining features of speech acts' instead of their variability in content of what is said. Different to the above view, Goldsmith looks at face threat originating in speech community members' understanding of a speech event and resources that come from particular topics in relation to face work.

Goldsmith (2000) mentions that according to Wilson et al, (1998) Wilson, Kim and Meischke, (1991/92) a traditional threat to face is in the goal the speaker has, in offering support. This is exemplified by the extent in which positive as well as negative face is threatened by the mere implication that hearer could be incompetent in making a good and effective decision.

It is true that Brown and Levinson (1987) listed option of how to offer face-honoring support or advice, but neglected to mention what precisely should be said in an episode. Goldsmith emphasizes that the analysis for face work should not be episode-based as it cannot provide direction to what those contents could be. Implications for face are not revealed in speech and linguistic features but context relevant to the situation.

Addressing content-based resources for face-sensitive advice in trouble talk, Goldsmith (2000) mentions that her approach is a general view on 'message production' as a medium of beliefs and knowledge in conjunction with the selection of what kind of expression to use. She states that activation, selection and expression are all guided by a speaker's model of the communicative activity, in which he or she is engaged (p309). It takes skill to learn to present face-relevant expressions or face-sensitive participants.

Goldsmith (2000) states that her study does not cover the relevance of face saving politeness forms such as redress and indirectness. She examines how the content forms vary in style, since it is so situation specific. Looking at episodes within which face-threatening advice occurs makes activities such as goals, identities and activities relevant. Face-threats arise not only from the speech-act a speaker select, but from the identities and activities that act implies within a particular type of episode, (p309).

Talking about face issues, Goldsmith (2000) highlights topics dealt with by Goldsmith and Fitch (1997). She raised three points of potential sources of face threat:

1. Whether when talking about problems, the speaker needs/requests the hearer's support/advice
2. The second source is the freedom on whether to accept or reject the advice.
3. The third source of face threat arises from whether the recipient or hearer is viewed as being capable of following a good course of action.

Lastly on the face issues, Goldsmith (2000) adds that the choice to talk about optional solutions than other situational faces, should not limit the hearer's self-presentation or conversational moves.

It is difficult to pin down common types of topics because all speech episodes are individualistic and relationally based on the problem. Goldsmith (2000) outlines five topics:

1. Talk about the other's emotion, including comments that deny emotion and discourage emotional expression and comments that acknowledge emotions-emotional support.
2. Talk about the problem itself, including characterizations of cause, valence, severity, controllability and duration-appraisal support
3. Talk about actions to solve the problem, including both actions the individual could take and action the speaker might undertake on his or her behalf, informational support
4. Talk about the hearer's worth, including descriptions of his or her abilities and coping effects, esteem support
5. Talk about the speaker-hearer relationship and opportunities or inclusion in social activities. 'Network support'.

As indicated in the former article, support is not just in information provided but on the elaboration about effects of such utterances on face. On analyzing the results of the three exemplary messages, Goldsmith follows a five-step procedure. A computerized method, which identifies contents, used:

Step 1: Utilizing message into thought units

Step 2: Computerized clustering of thought units expressing similar content.

Step 3: Manual refinement of clusters.

Step 4: Identifying content categories in each situation.

Step 5: Developing a typology of topics in troubles talk.

The result of Goldsmith's first study starts off by showing that it is important to understand how topics can be used as resources for formulating face-saving identities for a distressed friend. She indicates that topics from previous research were prevented in this study including comments on problems, emotions, attributes and inclusion in social activities. Topics not addressed in previous studies were included in the typology.

Some speakers participated in 'metacommunicative commentaries' on the conversation, identified with the speaker's problems, emotion and situation. Goldsmith(2000) found that speakers also talked about the problems as being common. While former works offered a functional method of characterizing emotional talk, the author on page 319 work results, show the topics on which the distinction can be based.

In Goldsmith's (2000) study, some topics and content categories appear in more than one situation. The typology indicates that there are common ways of representing responses to a participant's/hearer's problem. Included in the representation would be emotions, actions, problems, hearer relationship, speaker and the conversation. Study 2 looks at how topics can be employed as resources for face work in giving advice episodes. It is interesting to notice that advice can also threaten face (positive + negative) if it implies that the speaker should stop discussing the problems.

Some, such, as threat are not indicated to be negative. To examine the importance of content accompanying advice depends not only on the existence of content in a message but also on the extent in which a certain type of content is displayed in the message, such as those expressing a particular category. Goldsmith exemplifies this attempt by explaining that if the speaker says 'it's not a big deal' but does not go back to the problem episode; it appears to be a brush off of someone who is unconcerned and uninterested. This episode is different from a response like 'you know the world's not gonna come to an end if you goof on a word or something like that. It's no big deal, man. It's just speech. (p323).

Now the big question here is how elaboration of contents that accompany advice relates to perceived regard for positive and negative face interacts with the episode itself. Specific contents in a particular problem situation (e.g. 'I can't believe you're nervous') are used as example of the common topical resources that are available in trouble-talk conversation (e.g. 'Emotion is inappropriate'). Goldsmith's (2000) study hopes to have proved that content-based resources in content of a particular kind of episode can replace politeness theory.

She claims that Brown and Levinson's politeness strategies have limitations because they focus on form and style, which not really showing regard to face. According to Goldsmith, content categories could be assumed to be face honoring while it can just be knowledge of what the hearer needs, depending on the message. Her study concentrates on the content of messages, in a content categorization format. 'Content can affect perceptions of face threat and face work', (Goldsmith 1999:331).

CHAPTER 4

ADVICE TOPICS IN SETSWANA

4.1 AIM

In this chapter, advice situations will be selected together with sub-situations. From these situations a questionnaire will be drawn up, which will be completed by students. An analysis of advice expressions within these completed questionnaires in Setswana will be made in accordance with a list of advice applications, i.e. emotion topics, problem topics and relationship topics etc.

4.2 ADVICE SITUATIONS

Firstly, there are 15 advice sub-situations in this section dealing with Advice Topic in Setswana. The categories have been labeled according to their relevance to the school situation, especially senior students of a high school. These students were in Grade 11, of Fezeka High School, in Gugulethu (Township outside Cape Town). The school and students were chosen because they speak Setswana language, which Fezeka High School offers as a subject.

Secondly, the 15 sub-situations have been grouped into 3 categories viz: I Student-Teacher, II Teacher-Student and III Student-Student. Each major situation contains 5 sub-situation, with 15 examples or responses of parent or adult advice topic. These situations address specific and relevant problem areas pertaining to the students' real life experiences. Problem areas do not necessarily confine themselves in school curriculum or educational matters but do somehow have an overlapping influence or consequence on the students' situation or performance at school.

Student –Teacher

The Student-Teacher situation looks at the relationship between the student and the teacher. It hopes to bring forth some relationship dynamics between the two parties. This major situation has strength in certain occurrences as will be reflected in tables below. This shows how the student sees the teacher, and in giving advice, one has to be careful with the sensitivity around this issue. The adviser acts as a mediator, trying to create an agreement between the student and the other student.

Teacher-Student

It is imperative to know how to advise a teacher, especially in a manner that alleviates the situation. The teachers' position has changed with the new educational system and where the teacher had more power over students, it seems as though the teacher has lost it. How adults and other teachers advice in this section is completely different to situation '1' above. The language use and topic appearing in this section differs from others' as it gives more support to the teacher in a sympathetic manner.

Student-Student

This section highlights issues among students/students and how they deal with everyday concerns and problems emanating from other students. In this section, the adviser acts as a counselor but with less control over the circumstances, but with k influence on how the student can affect the consequences. This situation helps the student to cope with the school situation and to develop some survival skills. These skills will contribute in improving the student/student's reactions towards fellow students. In this section, problems are mostly individualistic and not group or class based. The advices therefore are of utmost relevance and necessity in improving the student/student's life and learning.

4.3 QUESTIONNAIRE

4.3.1 Copy of the questionnaire

ADVICE SITUATIONS

I. Student – Teacher

a) Teacher attitude

Morutabana ga a go tseye tsiya gone o le bokoa mo dithutong tsa gagwe. Fa o botsa dipotso o go fella pelo. Nako nngwe o a tle a re o senyetsa baithuti ba bangwe nako ka dipotso tsa gago.

(A certain teacher does not like you because you are weak in his/her subject. When you ask questions trying to understand, he/she gets impatient with you, and sometimes says that you delay the progress of other students with your questions.)

Ngongorego: Ngongorega ka kang eno.

(Complaint: Complain about this situation)

Kgakololo: Gakolola moithuti yo ka bothata jo.

(Advice: Advise a student on what to do about the situation)

b) Teacher wastes time

Morutabana o nna kwa kamoreng ya barutabana ka nako ya dithuto ka makgetlho a le mantsi. Seno, se dirile gore tiro ya gago e boele kwa morago thata. O tshwenyegile gonne o tsile go kwala ditthatlhobo tsa makgaola-kgang gautshwane mme ga o a rutiwa.

(A certain teacher does not come to class regularly. He/she sits in the staff room most of the time. You are worried about the soon-to-be written final exams in his/her subject, because you were not taught at all.)

Ngongorego: Ngongorega ka morutabana yo.

(Complaint: Complain about this teacher:)

Kgakololo: Gakolola moithuti gore a dire jang ka bothata jo.

(Advice: Advise the student on what to do about this problem)

c) Teacher not understanding students' problems

Fa o dirile phoso mme o leka go tlhalosetsa morutabana maemo a a go gapeleditseng go fosa, morutabana ga a amogele dintlha tsa gago. O tsaya tlhaloso ya gago jaaka maaka a go itshireletsa fela mme a gane go go utlwelela.

(A certain teacher does not want to understand reasons that lead you to mistakes. He/she does not accept your reasons as valid excuses but assumes that you made it all up as lies. He/she always refuses to listen to you.)

Ngongorego: Ngongorega ka morutabana yo.

(Complaint: Complain about this teacher.)

Kgakololo: Gakolola moithuti ka maemo a bothata jwa gagwe.

(Advice: Advice the learner about the situation.)

d) Teacher does not accept fault

Ka nako tsotlhe fa morutabana a dirile phoso, o a galefa a be a go tlhapaole fa o mo tshwaolola. Seno, se sulafatsa maemo magareng a lona, gone a go lwantsha.

(Every time a certain teacher makes a mistake, he/she gets furious with you if you show him/her the mistake. This causes friction between him/her and you because he/she always fights you.)

Ngongorego: Ngongorega ka morutabana yo, o ntshe maikutlo a gago.

(Complaint: Complain about this teacher, explain your feelings.)

Kgakololo: Gakolola moithuti yo gore a dire jang ka bothata jo.

(Advise: Advice the student about the situation.)

e) Teacher incompetence

Morutabana o lebega a sa itse dithuto tsa gagwe sentle gonne, o retelwa ke go tlhalosa ka mokgwa o o tlhologanyegang mme e bile ga a kgone go araba dipotso tsa gago ka nako tsotlhe.

(A certain teacher seems not to know the subject he/she teaches. He/she cannot explain concepts and cannot answer your questions at all times.)

Ngongorego: Ngongorega ka morutabana

(Complaint: Complain about this teacher)

Kgakololo: Gakolola moithuti gore a dire jang ka bothata jo

(Advice: Advice the students on what to do about the situation)

II. Teacher – Student

a) Lazy student

Moithuti yo mongwe yo o motlapa, o gana go dira tiro-ya-gae gonne a re o na le ditiro tsa lelapa tseo a thusang ka tsona kwa gae, ka jalo ga a fitlhele nako ya go buisa.

(A certain lazy student does not want to do homework because he/she says there are house chores to do at home)

Ngongorego: Ngongorega ka bothata jwa gago ka moithuti yo.

(Complain: Complain about your problem with this student.)

Kgakololo: Gakolola morutabana yo gore a dire eng.

(Advice: Advice the teacher on what to do about this problem.)

b) Disrespectful student

Moithuti ga a go tlhomphe, jaaka morutabana. Fa o ruta, o a bua e bile ga a go utlwelele fa o mo kgalema.

(A certain student does not respect you as a teacher. He/She talks while you teach and does not listen when you give him/her orders.)

Ngongorego: Ngongorega ka moithuti.

(Complaint: Complain about the student.)

Kgakololo: Gakolola morutabana gore a dire jang ka kgang eno.

(Advice: Advise the teacher about the situation.)

c) Absence from school

Go moithuti mongwe yo o sa tleng sekolong malatsi otlhe fa o kwadisa tthatlhobo.

(A certain student always misses school when you give a test.)

Ngongorego: Ngongorega ka moithuti.

(Complaint: Complain about the student.)

Kgakololo: Gakolola morutabana gore a siamise jang maemo ano..

(Advice: Advice the teacher on how to handle this problem)

d) A threatening student

Moithuti mongwe o ne a go tshosetsa ka gore fa a ka se falole ditlhatlhobo tsa mafelo-a-ngwaga o tla ipolaya.

(A certain student threatened you that, if he/she does not pass the end of the year exams, he/she will commit suicide.)

.Ngongorego: Ngongorega ka bothata ba gago le moithuti.

(Complaint: Complain about your problem with the student.)

Kgakololo: Gakolola morutabana ka moithuti.

(Advise: Advice the teacher about the student.)

e) Student dissatisfied about lessons.

Moithuti o ngongnorega ka gore ga o rute sentle gonne o sa tlhalose thuto yotlhe mme o neya tiro-ya-gae e ntsi ka dilo tse o sa di rutang.

(A student complains that you do not teach well because you do not go into details and finish a chapter but still give him/her a lot of homework.)

Ngongorego: Ngongorega ka moithuti.

(Complaint: Complain about the student.)

Kgakololo: Gakolola morutabana gore a dira jang.

(Advise: Advice the teacher on what to do.)

III. Student - Student

a) Students attitudes

Moithuti yo mongwe o go tshwara makgwakgwa gone a sa tlhaloganye gore ga o tshwane le ene ka setso le maemo a selegae.

(A certain student does not accommodate your different background to his/hers even domestic-wise)

Ngongorego: Ngongorega ka moithuti yo.

(Complaint: Complain about the student.)

Kgakololo: Gakolola moithuti gore a ka rarabolola jang kang eno.

(Advice: Advice the student on how to resolve this issue.)

b) Refuse to help

Fa o kopa moithuti mongwe gore a go thuse ka bothata mo dithutong o a gana, e tswe e le wena o mo thusang fa a na le mathata ka dithuto.

(When you have a problem with your studies, if you ask a certain student to help you, he/she refuses, even though you always help him/her)

Ngongorego: Ngongorega ka moithuti yo.

(Complaint: Complain about this student.)

Kgakololo: Gakolola moithuti yo gore a dire jang ka maemo ano.

(Advice: Advice the student on what to do about the situation.)

c) Insults

Moithuti mongwe fa a bua dithuto di tsweletse mme o sa kgone go utlwa morutabana, a re o tlogele go itira yo o botoka, fa o mmolelela gore a didimale.

(When you tell a certain student to be quiet when a lesson is on, and you cannot hear what the teacher says, he/she says you should stop trying to be smart.

Ngongorego: Ngongorega ka moithuti yo le mekgwa ya gagwe

(Complaint: Complain about this student and his/her behavior)

Kgakololo: Gakolola moithuti ka bothata jo.

(Advice: Advice the student about this situation.)

d) Theft in the classroom

Moithuti mongwe o ne a utswa buka ya gago, mme o gana go e busa le go e duela.

(A certain student stole your book in the classroom and refuses to return it or pay for it.)

Ngongorego: Ngongorega ka moithuti yo.

(Complaint: Complain about this student)

Kgakololo: Gakolola moithuti ka bothata jo.

(Advice: Advice the student about the problem.)

e) Threats of assault

Moithuti mongwe o ne a go tshosetsa ka gore fa o sa batle go tlhanogela dithuto, o tla go latelela kwa gaeno, go go otlala.

(Certain students threatened you that if you do not want to strike he/she will follow you home and assault you there.)

Ngongorego: Ngongorega ka moithuti.

(Complaint: Complain about the student.)

Kgakololo: Gakolola moithuti gore a dire eng ka maemo ano.

(Advice: Advice the student on what to do about the situation.)

4.3.2 Completion of the questionnaire

The questionnaires' 'Patterns of advice solicitation', was completed by student/students from Fezeka High School. There were 20 questionnaires distributed in a classroom sitting on a one-day session with the students. 5 questionnaires were disqualified and only 15 utilized. In order to facilitate accuracy, I explained how the questions were to be answered, and the once off sitting was ideal for this purpose.

Setswana speaking teachers at the school, parents of the school students who completed the advice solicitation section and a few community members filled the advice-giving section. The advice –offering section could not be highly monitored, as it was impossible to gather all advisers together. This section was a hurdle as there are few Setswana speakers in Gugulethu and the Peninsular at large. I had few capable and literate speakers who could understand and engage with the questionnaire.

4.4 ANALYSIS OF ADVICE TOPICS

The fifteen questionnaires, which have been completed as indicated in paragraph 4.3.2 above, have been analyzed with regard to the various topics, which appear in Goldsmith (1999:319). These advice topics have been numbered from 1-7 and together with various sub-topics, a total number of 21 advice topics have been used in analyzing the 15 questionnaires, i.e. the purpose was to establish whether these 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	Numbers	Percentage
Student-Teacher	100	23.6%
1.1 Teacher attitude	20	20.0%
1.2 Wastes time	7	7.0%
1.3 Not understand	26	26.0%
1.4 Not accept fault	34	34.0%
1.5 Incompetent	13	13.0%
Teacher-Student	154	36.3%
2.1 Lazy student	47	30.5%
2.2 Disrespectful student	25	16.2%
2.3 Absence from school	17	11.0%
2.4 Suicidal	41	26.6%
2.5 Dissatisfied about lessons	24	15.6%

Situation	Numbers	Percentage
Student-Student	170	40.1%
3.1 Background	74	43.5%
3.2 Refuse to help	41	24.1%
3.3 Insults	21	12.4%
3.4 Theft	14	8.2%
3.5 Assault	20	11.8%
Total	424	

In table 1 above, the various advice situations have been listed in a vertical order from situation 1 to 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 (student-teacher), a total number of **100** strategies have been used i.e. **23.6%** of the total number of strategies.

4.4.1 The Major Situations

Situation	Total
1. Student - Teacher	23.6%
2. Teacher – Student	36.3%
3. Student – Student	40.1%

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

1. Situation 3: 40.1%
2. Situation 2: 36.3%
3. Situation 1: 23.6%

Situation 3 ‘Student – Student’ has a higher percentage to all other situations of advice topics than other situations. It seems as though students have more problems at school with other students than with other school related issues. Students find it easier to give each other advices than to other people, as other people are not likely to understand the situation better. In this manner, the adviser then, has an interactive and dual role. Students approach each other at the same level and the **distance** is bridged in a way that allows

openness. This situation allows the adviser to use bold-on-record with less threat to positive **face**.

Situation 2 ‘Teacher – Student’, has the second highest number than 3 above. In this situation, as discussed in ‘Strategies in the discourse of advice’- (DeCapua & Dunham 1992:519), the adviser could either clarify the problem, help to sort options or confirm choice or straight-forwardly offer advice. These roles interchange in this situation of the teacher – student. It is threatening for a teacher to be found wanting on the student’s scales and it affects his/her status as a leader.

Situation 1 ‘Student – Teacher’ has the least number of advice topic compared to situations 2 ‘Teacher – Student’ and 3 ‘ Student-Student’. It appears that advices for students and teachers are less traumatic than in other cases above and are to a large extent relationship oriented, based on perceptions than reality. The school situation seems to create tension between students and fellow students than with other parties involved as indicated by this table which has the lowest number compared to situation 3 above.

4.4.2 The sub-situations

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

Student-Teacher

Sub-situation	Percentage
1.1 Teacher attitude	20.0%
1.2 Teacher wastes time	7.0%
1.3 Teacher does not understand	26.0%
1.4 Not accept fault	34.0%
1.5 Incompetent teacher	13.0%

The first advice situation **STUDENT-TEACHER** has 100 advice topics. Of these 100 topics, 20% have been used in giving advice to students with the problem of teacher attitude, 7% to students with a teacher that wastes time, 26% have been used with a teacher that does not understand the student's problem, 34% for a teacher who does not accept his/her fault and 13% to a teacher found incompetent. It is therefore clear that there is a big difference in the number of advice topics in these five advice situations.

The situation above indicates that power relations create situations demanding more advices. 1.4 has the highest figure compared to 1.2, which shows that the manner in which teachers treat students or behave, does not correspond with the student's expectations.

Teacher-Student

Sub-situation	Percentage %
2.1 Lazy student	30.5%
2.2 Disrespectful student	16.2%
2.3 Absence from school	11.0%
2.4 Suicidal/Threats	26.6%
2.5 Dissatisfied	15.6%

In the second sub-situation '**TEACHER – STUDENT**', 154 advice topics were found. Of the 154, 30.5% have been used for the lazy student, 16.2% have been used for the disrespectful student, 11.0% for absence from school, and 26.6% for suicidal/threats and 15.6% have been used for a dissatisfied student. The figures suggest that more advice was given to the teacher to help with a lazy student and the second most occurring, dissatisfied about lessons. This appears to demand more attention than students being absent from school. This is a common problem in schools and the advice given can have a universal appeal. Unlike in the major situation 1 Student –Teacher, advice related to relationship issues do not take precedence as indicated by 16.2% in disrespectful student. Suicidal/threats is the second highest in this sub-situation, indicating that majority of students tend to threaten teachers in relation to failure in performance. It therefore shows that students do not take responsibility for their working and still not want to be accountable for failure, burden teachers.

Advice topics	No	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
3.1. Actions you can take	7	35.0%	2	28.6%	11	42.3%	8	23.5%	3	23.1%
3.2. Joint action we can take							1	2.9%		
4. Hearer topics										
5. Relationship topics	5	25.0%	2	28.6%	2	7.7%	9	26.5%	3	23.1%
6. Speaker topics										
7. Conversation topics	1	5.0%			1	3.8%				
TOTAL	20		7	100.0%	26	100.0%	34	100.0%	13	100.0%

According to the table above 14 from the 21 advice topics have been used in giving advice in the 5 sub-situations above.

- (a) Advice topic 1: with emotion topic
- (b) Advice topic 2: Problem topics with
 - 2.1 Problem uncontrollable
 - 2.2 Problem controllable
 - 2.3 Problem has positive aspects
 - 2.4 Problem is common
 - 2.5 Problem is temporary
 - 2.6 Problem cause
 - 2.7 Problem is severe
- (c) Advice topic 3: Action topics, with
 - 3.1 Actions you can take
 - 3.2 Joint actions we can take
- (d) Advice topic 4: Hearer topics
- (e) Advice topic 5: Relationship topics
- (f) Advice topic 6: Speaker topics
- (g) Advice topic 7: Conversation topics

The distribution of advice topics in table 4.5.1 is uneven according to the frequency of the advice topic. In sub-situation **1.1 Teacher attitude**, topic **3.1 Actions you can take** has 35.0%. It appears that the situation is workable and the adviser seems to know what actions could be taken.

In topic 5. **Relationship topics** have 25.0% percentages, indicating that the situation is of relationship nature, prompted by the teacher's attitude.

Sub-situation 1.2 – Teacher wastes time: **Emotion topics** are at 28.6% and while **actions you can take** as well as **relationship topics** are both at 28.6%. The perfect tie in the use of advice topics emotions and actions the student can take shows the lateral level of concern from students. In this instance, students are equally justified in the emotional display as they notice the outcome of the teacher's waste of time upon their studies. It is an act of responsibility to make the teacher aware that they wish to do well in their studies but cannot do so without the teacher's involvement. While the percentages are higher than in other situations, this area has a higher frequency.

Sub-situation 1.3 – Not understand student's problem, 3.1 **Actions you can take** at 42.3%. This single high figure in this sub-situation, directs the student to be matured enough to address the situation either through referral to someone with authority at school or to politely confront the teacher and inform the teacher on how s/he feels about the situation. Actions you can take in this sub-situation shows that this matter has to be dealt with as a serious issue and emphasizes that the student should not relent till the problem is handled.

Sub-situation 1.4 – Does not accept fault. 3.1 **Actions you can take** has 23.5% has a lower frequency to topic 5, **Relationship topics** - 26.5%. The adviser focuses less on actions the student can take in order to provide a profitable solution. The adviser realizes that the nature of the problem requires some interpersonal skills and has to direct the student to those appropriate skills that will benefit the student in trying to bargain in negotiating for a better relationship with the teacher. Since every interaction carries with it a risk to one's humanity, identifying relation dimensions is of paramount necessity in addressing this situation.

Sub-situation 1.5 – Incompetent teacher. 2.2 **Problem is controllable** contains 38.5%. This is an indication that sometimes what student view as a crisis may not necessarily be so. Age, experience and perhaps also level of authority contribute to hoe the adviser views a problem, which in this case, can easily be put under control. 3.1 **Actions you can take** 23.1%, the student is allowed or given levy to go ahead and do certain things that will help to solve the complaint of the incompetent teacher. The adviser trusts the student's

level of maturity, and since the participators were Grade eleven students, encouraging a student at this level to take actions, seems to be a supportive way of leading him/her into responsibility and confidence. **Relationship topics** - 23.1% of topic used showing that students often become affective when dealing with teachers especially when they know that something is wrong and that it needs to be dealt with but feel the situation is beyond their handling capabilities. The frequency as reflected by the percentage reveals that it is a recurrent situation that led to the way the student relate to the teacher and the teacher to the student to be damaged.

4.5.2 Situation 2: Teacher – Student

Advice topics	2.1 Lazy Student		2.2 Disrespectful student		2.3 Absence from school		2.4 Suicidal		2.5 Dissatisfied about lessons	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Emotion topics	4	8.5%	4	16.0%	1	5.9%	12	29.3%	2	8.3%
2. Problem topics										
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable			1	4.0%						
2.2. Problem is controllable	7	14.9%	1	4.0%	2	11.8%	6	14.6%	3	12.5%
2.3. Problem has positive aspects	6	12.8%			1	5.9%	1	2.4%	2	8.3%
2.4. Problem is common	6	12.8%			2	11.8%			3	12.5%
2.5. Problem is temporary					1	5.9%	1	2.4%		
2.6. Problem is not temporary										
2.7. Problem cause	5	10.6%	4	16.0%	5	29.4%	3	7.3%		
2.8. Problem is severe	1	2.1%					1	2.4%	1	4.2%
2.9. Problem is not severe										
3. Action topics										
3.1. Actions you can take	11	23.4%	6	24.0%	3	17.6%	10	24.4%	8	33.3%
3.2. Joint action we can take									3	12.5%
4. Hearer topics										
5. Relationship topics	4	8.5%	9	36.0%	2	11.8%	6	14.6%	1	4.2%
6. Speaker topics										
7. Conversation topics	3	6.4%					1	2.4%	1	4.2%
TOTAL	47	100.0%	25	100.0%	17	100.0%	41	100.0%	24	100.0%

- Sub-situation 2.1 Lazy learner -Topic 3.1 Actions you can take 23.4%. From adult to adult it seems appropriate for the adviser to suggest an action to take because the teacher has more authority over the situation than students. The teacher can also be frustrated by the fact that the control s/he has is over the situation more than the individual. With a lazy student, the teacher can take actions to encourage or penalize the students for being lazy but can not force the student because it is the students will and decision to do so.
- Sub-situation 2.2 – Disrespectful learner – 3.1 Actions you can take – 24.0%. Actions a teacher can take with regard to a disrespectful learner are linked to discipline which has changed in modern terms where new and different disciplinary measures have been introduced. It can be difficult for the teacher to negotiate respect from learners when students feel they have freedom to say and do as they wish. Politeness etiquettes are highly important in dealing with this situation where the teacher has to win or gain respect of the students.
5. Relationship topics – 36.0%. This topic is indeed a relationship problem needing an advice suitable to mend the relationship.
- Sub-situation 2.3 Absence from school – 2.7 Problem causes 29.4%. it is always important to notice the background prompting a problem in order to solve it. In this manner the adviser identifies the problem cause in order to advice properly. In the teacher's solicitation the adviser gathers information related to the cause the problem. This topic does not necessarily direct the speaker on what to do but helps the teacher understand the situation by analyzing the problem cause.
- Sub-situation 2.4 Suicidal – 1. Emotion topics 29.3%. With regard to a suicidal student, the percentage indicates that the adviser is aware of the real problem and will therefore hopefully advice accordingly being aware of the nature of the problem. 3.1. Actions you can take = 24.4%, have been used in this topic because it is a sensitive area needing action or assistance and support in order to stop it from recurring. How the teacher address the student in this situation depends on the politeness skills employed, to achieve a win-win situation
- Sub-situation 2.5 Dissatisfied about lessons - 3.1 Actions you can take = 33.3%. The percentage means that when the adviser evaluates all options, the most suitable approach is to direct the solicitor to take action in order to get positive results. It is a difficult position for the teacher when found wanting in performance and the adviser has to be careful of the actions suggested, since the adviser's role some how aims at neutralizing the encounter.

4.5.3 Situation 3: Student – Student

Advice topics	3.1 Background		3.2 Refuse to help		3.3 Insults		3.4 Theft in the classroom		3.5 Assault	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1. Emotion topics	5	6.8%	5	12.2%	1	4.8%	1	7.1%		
2. Problem topics										
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable	2	2.7%					1	7.1%	1	5.0%
2.2. Problem is controllable	15	20.3%	5	12.2%	9	42.9%	2	14.3%	1	5.0%
2.3. Problem has positive aspects	1	1.4%			4	19.0%	1	7.1%		
2.4. Problem is common	5	6.8%	3	7.3%						
2.5. Problem is temporary	5	6.8%							2	10.0%
2.6. Problem is not temporary										
2.7. Problem cause	9	12.2%	4	9.8%			3	21.4%	1	5.0%
2.8. Problem is severe			1	2.4%						
2.9. Problem is not severe										
3. Action topics										
3.1. Actions you can take	14	18.9%	11	26.8%			6	42.9%	10	50.0%
3.2. Joint action we can take	1	1.4%								
4. Hearer topics	1	1.4%			2	9.5%				
5. Relationship topics	13	17.6%	12	29.3%	2	9.5%			5	25.0%
6. Speaker topics					3	14.3%				
7. Conversation topics	3	4.1%								
TOTAL	74	100.0%	41	100.0%	21	100.0%	14	100.0%		

- Sub-situation 3.1 Background – 2.2 Problem is controllable 20.3%. Background problems among students are easier for adults to handle. The adviser seemingly being wiser and experienced in background related issues would be able to inform the complainant on how to handle the stressful environment.

- Sub-situation 3.2 Refuse to help – 3.1 Actions you can take = 26.8%, many students get frustrated by fellow students who refuse to help while expecting a help in needy situations. The adviser being aware of the school atmosphere tells the student to take fruitful steps than can benefit the student. 5. Relationship topics = 29.3%, this topic stems from relation behaviors. The percentage of used topics regards that the behavior of refusing to help is common in schools. How students perceive each others behavior can be disturbing if there is no cooperation from other students, and continues to make the learning environment unfriendly.
- Sub-situation 3.3 Insults – 2.2 Problem is controllable 42.9, the situation with insults correlates with fact that positive attributes in 2.3 Problem has positive aspects = 19.0%, contribute towards it being controllable. It seems as though the adviser wishes to exploit the flexibility in controlling the problem towards a positive effect. The situation is promising and positive in that it can be solved by introducing mechanisms of turning it around to benefit the student.
- Sub-situation 3.4 Theft – 2.7 Problem cause = 21.4%, of such topics utilized in helping in a theft related case. The adviser investigates cause of the problem in addressing the situation as a way of introducing his or her opinion on the solution. 3.1 Actions you can take = 42.9%, suggests that it comes to theft, comments on how and what to do highly available. Since this is not an emotional topic, it requires reporting or other obvious measures to solve. The percentage indicates that theft is also a common problem in schools and involving teachers in solving it is one of the best first steps to take.
- Sub-situation 3.5 Assault – 3.1 Actions you can take has 50.0% of topics used. Guided by the sensitivity of this topic, threat to life, directing a student to take specific immediate action is appropriate. 5. Relationship topics 25.0%. How students interact, relate and behave towards one another is an origin for relationship complexities. The adviser has to understand the nature of the relationship in order to give relevant support and advice. This will stop the situation from deteriorating.

4.6 INDIVIDUAL ADVICE TOPICS IN MAJOR SITUATIONS

Topic	1. Student-Teacher		2. Teacher-Student		3. Student-Student		
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	
1.1	7	7.0%	23	14.9%	12	7.1%	42
2.1	1	1.0%	1	0.6%	4	2.4%	6
2.2	16	16.0%	19	12.3%	32	18.8%	67
2.3	5	5.0%	10	6.5%	6	3.5%	21
2.4	5	5.0%	11	7.1%	8	4.7%	24
2.5	3	3.0%	2	1.3%	7	4.1%	12
2.6							
2.7	6	6.0%	17	11.0%	17	10.0%	40
2.8	2	2.0%	3	1.9%	1	0.6%	6
2.9							
3.1	31	31.0%	38	24.7%	41	24.1%	110
3.2	1	1.0%	3	1.9%	1	0.6%	5
4					3	1.8%	3
5	21	21.0%	22	14.3%	32	18.8%	75
6					3	1.8%	3
7	2	2.0%	5	3.2%	3	1.8%	10
	100	100.0%	154	100.0%	170	100.0%	424

- 1. Student – Teacher.** 3.2 actions you can take have 31.0% referring to high number of what students are advised to do. Students try to find their own individuality and ways of doing things, mostly in different ways from others'. Due to this fact it is common to find relationship topics used to the percentage of 21.0% surfacing in the process, contradictory to the teacher's expectation.
- 2. Teacher – Student.** 3.1 actions you can take have 24.7% topics used conforming that in terms of the situation the adult teacher has to take action to save the situation. The teacher has to be confident and responsible enough to be held accountable for the action taken. Based on the assumption that a teacher would have received pedagogy instruction and training, s/he has to show consent for the learners. Given this background the adviser would take it in good faith that action will be taken intuitively.
- 3. Student – Student.** 3.1 actions you can take equals 24.1%. in desperate circumstances the adviser gives direction to rescue the situation, believing that the advice will be carried out in a way that profits both parties but mostly trying to relieve the complainant.

4.6.1 Advice situation 1: Student - Teacher

Advice Topics	1. Student-Teacher	
	Number	%
1. Emotion topics		
1.1. Don't have emotion	7	7.0%
1.2. Emotion is inappropriate		
1.3. You his emotion		
1.4. I share your emotion		
1.5. Your emotion is common		
1.6. Your emotion is temporary		
2. Problem topics		
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable	1	1.0%
2.2. Problem is controllable	16	16.0%
2.3. Problem has positive aspects	5	5.0%
2.4. Problem is common	5	5.0%
2.5. Problem is temporary	3	3.0%
2.6. Problem is not temporary		
2.7. Problem cause	6	6.0%
2.8. Problem is severe	2	2.0%
2.9. Problem is not severe		
3. Action topics		
3.1. Action you can take	31	31.0%
3.2. Joint action we can take	1	1.0%
4. Hearer topics		
5. Relationship topics	21	21.0%
6. Speaker topics		
7. Conversation topics	2	2.0%
Total	100	100.0%

4.6.2 Advice Situation 2: Teacher – Student

Advice Topic	2. Teacher-Student	
	Number	%
1. Emotion topics		
1.1. Don't have emotion	23	14.9%
1.2. Emotion is inappropriate		
1.3. You his emotion		
1.4. I share your emotion		
1.5. Your emotion is common		
1.6. Your emotion is temporary		
2. Problem topics		
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable	1	0.6%
2.2. Problem is controllable	19	12.3%
2.3. Problem has positive aspects	10	6.5%
2.4. Problem is common	11	7.1%
2.5. Problem is temporary	2	1.3%
2.6. Problem is not temporary		
2.7. Problem cause	17	11.0%
2.8. Problem is severe	3	1.9%
2.9. Problem is not severe		
3. Action topics		
3.1. Action you can take	38	24.7%
3.2. Joint action we can take	3	1.9%
4. Hearer topics		
5. Relationship topics	22	14.3%
6. Speaker topics		
7. Conversation topics	5	3.2%
Total	154	100.0%

4.6.3 Advice Situation 3: Student – Student

Advice Topic	3. Student-Student		
	Number	%	
1. Emotion topics			
1. Emotion topics	12	7.1%	42
1.1. Don't have emotion			
1.2. Emotion is inappropriate			
1.3. You his emotion			
1.4. I share your emotion			
1.5. Your emotion is common			
2. Problem topics			
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable	4	2.4%	6
2.2. Problem is controllable	32	18.8%	67
2.3. Problem has positive aspects	6	3.5%	21
2.4. Problem is common	8	4.7%	24
2.5. Problem is temporary	7	4.1%	12
2.6. Problem is not temporary			
2.7. Problem cause	17	10.0%	40
2.8. Problem is severe	1	0.6%	6
2.9. Problem is not severe			
3. Action topics			
3.1. Action you can take	41	24.1%	110
3.2. Joint action we can take	1	0.6%	5
4. Hearer topics	3	1.8%	3
5. Relationship topics	32	18.8%	75
6. Speaker topics	3	1.8%	3
7. Conversation topics	3	1.8%	10
Total	170	100.0%	424

4.7 INDIVIDUAL ADVICE TOPICS

Task 4: Individual Advice Topics

ADVICE TOPIC	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
	42	9.9%
1. Emotion topics		
1.1 Don't have emotion		
1.2 Emotion is inappropriate		
1.3 You have this emotion		
1.4 I share your emotion		
1.5 Your emotion is common		
1.6 Your emotion is temporary		
2. Problem Topics		
2.1 Problem is uncontrollable	6	1.4%
2.2 Problem is controllable	67*	15.8%
2.3 Problem has positive aspects	21	5.0%
2.4 Problem is common	24	5.7%
2.5 Problem is temporary	12	2.8%
2.6 Problem is not temporary		
2.7 Problem cause	40	9.4%
2.8 Problem is severe	6	1.4%
2.9 Problem is not severe		
3. Action topics		
3.1 Actions you can take	110*	25.9%
3.2 Joint action we can take	5	1.2%
4. Hearer topics	3	0.7%
5. Relationship topics	75*	17.7%
6. Speaker topics	3	0.7%
7. Conversation topics	10	2.4%
Total	424	100.0%

It is worth noting that in the table above the highest percentage of advice topics used was in 2.2 **Problem is controllable** 67%, 3.1 **Actions you can take** – 25.9%, 5 **Relationship topics** – 75%. These percentages indicate that most advices are towards relationship problems. 2.2 indicate that advice is given to problems that are controllable, which could need the adviser's approval or confirmation on how to deal with them. This suggests that the complainant could know the solution but not sure whether it is suitable to the situation or as with the case of interaction strategies in DeCapua and Dunham (1992), need second opinion.

CHAPTER 5

5.1 Aim

The purpose of this chapter is to investigate how students solicit advice and to classify the solicitation acts according to Goldsmith's (2000) patterns. There are various methods or ways of asking for advice. Classifications serve the purpose of identifying the most commonly and less frequently used patterns. The patterns indicate a trend students and possibly people in general, use in soliciting advice

5.2 Task 1: Patterns of Advice Solicitation

Situation	Number	Percentage
1. STUDENT-TEACHER	160	35.6%
1.1 Attitude	34	21.3%
1.2 Teacher waste time	29	18.1%
1.3 Teachers does not understand	31	19.4%
1.4 Not accept fault	32	20.0%
1.5 Incompetent teacher	34	21.3%
2. TEACHER-STUDENT	144	32.1%
2.1 Lazy learner	30	20.8%
2.2 disrespectful	34	23.6%
2.3 Absence from school	30	20.8%
2.4 Suicidal	21	14.6%
2.5 Dissatisfied about lessons	29	20.1%
3. STUDENT-STUDENT	145	32.3%

In the above tables, ordered as follows:

1. Student-teacher – 35.6%
 2. Student-student – 32.3%
 3. Teacher-student -32.1%
- 1. **Student-teacher:** The majority of advice situations were exhausted from the **student-teacher** situation. This translates that students have a lot issues with their teachers and that this could invariably affect and impact on their studies.
 - 2. **Student-student:** Situation also indicates that students complain a lot about their fellow students. The age aspects seem to affect students as they compete as the same issues from the same level. Since there is no distance or rank of authority, how students interact with other out of the teacher or elder's supervision seems to lead to chaos. The stable situation is disrupted and perpetuated by the fact that

some students would want to dominate fellow students of the same age who would intend resist such behavior.

- **3. Teacher-student:** In this section the teacher has fewer complaints about students, 32.1% than in the other two situations above. It would seem that teachers have less expectation of students and or have accepted the hurdles of the learning environment. The situation as it is especially in the school where the questionnaire was completed could imply that sometimes teachers lose hope in the students and therefore affect their (students) performance in studies. The situation is a give and take where the teacher feels appreciated and motivated when students are industrious and the students benefit from the teacher's dedication and support. The two participants need each other to make it work.

5.3 TASK 2: 1. Student-Teacher

Situation 1.1 Attitude

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	4	11.8%
2. Ask for an opinion	7	20.6%
3. Disclose problem	16	47.1%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	1	2.9%
4. Announce plan of action	1	2.9%
5. Identify problem	5	14.7%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	34	100.0%

In situation 1.1, the percentage 20.6 displays that students actually ask for opinion while meaning to ask for advice. In 3. Disclose problem has 47.1 % of solicitation examples. In this instance most people effectively disclose their problems when soliciting for advice.

Situation 1.2 Teacher waste time

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	6	20.7%
2. Ask for an opinion	1	3.4%
3. Disclose problem	12	41.4%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	3	10.3%
4. Announce plan of action	5	17.2%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
7. Ask for information	2	6.9%
Total	29	100.0%

1. Ask for advice, 20.7% is the second highest in percentage. It appears that students are not always comfortable to ask for help directly but would rather present it differently by disclosing it. Disclosing problem has 41.4%, indicating that in this sub-situation advice solicitation highly centers on talking about the problem than asking for advice. In the situation with the Setswana speakers the solicitor seems to give the hearer choice to advice or not.

Situation 1.3 Teacher does not understand

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	5	16.1%
2. Ask for an opinion	9	29.0%
3. Disclose problem	15	48.4%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	0	0.0%
4. Announce plan of action	2	6.5%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	31	100.0%

The 29.0% for 2. Ask for opinion represents that students are not at ease to lay down their problems in a manner that makes solicitation of advice simpler for the giver by not channeling to a definite advice. In 3. Disclosing problem 48.4% has been used in advice solicitation. This confirms that students are not comfortable to complain about their teachers, to the elders because of the different expectation related to age and respect.

*

Situation 1.4 Not accept fault

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	6	18.8%
2. Ask for an opinion	9	28.1%
3. Disclose problem	15	46.9%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	0	0.0%
4. Announce plan of action	2	6.3%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	32	100.0%

2. Ask for opinion 28.1% gives the adviser freedom to state what s/he thinks of the teacher who does not accept fault, without feeling responsible for the outcomes by stating what s/he thinks more than instructing the student on what to do. A teacher not accepting fault is a sensitive issue which a student would not comfortably confront an elder with, but would rather ask for a strategic manner of finding out how one would handle the situation.

Situation 1.5 Incompetent teacher

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	10	29.4%
2. Ask for an opinion	5	14.7%
3. Disclose problem	14	41.2%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	4	11.8%
4. Announce plan of action	1	2.9%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	34	100.0%

The emotional aspects of frustration of the students in 1.5 Incompetent teacher with 29.4% inform that there could be desperacy in the solicitor's situation. 3. Disclose problem 41.2% shows that students prefer to talk about their problems that ask for advice directly. This could link with the notion that every interaction imposes a risk to face. This could reflect that students feel very helpless and about the situation that they would rather talk about it than decide on a specific action plan.

Teacher-Student

*

2. TEACHER-STUDENT**Situation 2.1 Lazy learner**

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	10	33.3%
2. Ask for an opinion	3	10.0%
3. Disclose problem	15	50.0%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	0	0.0%
4. Announce plan of action	2	6.7%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	30	100.0%

The sub-situation 1. Ask for advice sends a message of urgency in the teacher's situation needing intervention. It is as though the situation has gone extremes, beyond the teacher's ability to cope. 3. Disclose problem has 50% of solicitation topic used. It appears that this sub-situation also signals an element of lack of control over the lazy learner, implicating that the teacher could have tried to do much to help but with no good results.

Situation 2.2 Disrespectful learner

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	8	23.5%
2. Ask for an opinion	4	11.8%
3. Disclose problem	14	41.2%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	4	11.8%
4. Announce plan of action	4	11.8%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	34	100.0%

Sub-situation 1. Disrespectful learner, 23.5% of examples used suggest that the advice would be most appropriate act to take. The teacher needs a proper solution on how to work out his/her own problem. 3.1 Disclose problem – 41.2% indicates that a high number of advice solicitors find it comfortable to talk about the problem than knowing how to deal with it, as the teacher would have tried some advices previously without being productive.

Situation 2.3 Absence from School

Advice Situation	Numbers	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	9	30.0%
2. Ask for an opinion	4	13.3%
3. Disclose problem	13	43.3%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	1	3.3%
4. Announce plan of action	3	10.0%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	30	100.0%

1. Ask for advice – 30.0%. In this sub-situation the teacher demonstrates concern in trying to redeem the situation, probably because of knowing the consequences of such behavior.

3. Disclose problem – 43.3%. In disclosing the problem the teacher attempts to alert other teachers of elders about the situation at hand, indicating the extent at which the situation has gone out of control.

Situation 2.4 Suicidal

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	6	28.6%
2. Ask for an opinion	2	9.5%
3. Disclose problem	8	38.1%
3.1 Statement of facts	1	4.8%
3.2 Consequences	3	14.3%
4. Announce plan of action	1	4.8%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	21	100.0%

In sub-situation 1. Ask for advice – 28.6%, demands direct intervention through advice from the adviser. In this instance solicitation is for a positive step to take, in order to know what to do. 3.1 Disclose problem 38.1% of this topic has been used. It appears that the teacher is not confident to ask for help but camouflages it by disclosing it, probably hoping the adviser to say something specifically addressing the situation.

*

Situation 2.5 Dissatisfied about lessons

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	3	10.3%
2. Ask for an opinion	9	31.0%
3. Disclose problem	15	51.7%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	1	3.4%
4. Announce plan of action	1	3.4%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	29	100.0%

2. Ask for opinion – 31.0% of this topic has been used indicating that the teacher is trying to find out or check if other teachers are or have the same experience as his /hers, with the dissatisfied learner.

3. Disclose problem suggest that the teacher could have an idea in mind on how to deal with the situation but discloses the problem as a way of finding out what the hearer would say. The teacher would then compare his/her view or approach as against the adviser's.

Student-student**3 STUDENT-STUDENT****Situation 3.1 Background**

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	3	12.0%
2. Ask for an opinion	5	20.0%
3. Disclose problem	14	56.0%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	1	4.0%
4. Announce plan of action	2	8.0%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	25	100.0%

The solicitor asks for opinion instances are 20.0%. in this case it is not only enough to instruct what to or not to do but ask for opinion, suggesting a brainstorming exercise where both can share ideas on how to handle the situation. 3. Disclose problem, 56.0% is descriptive. It is apparent that it was a most favored approach in this sub-situation, probably because in describing a problem, the adviser has full details of the situation. This avails room for questions and elaborate discussion on the situation at hand.

Situation 3.2 Refuse to help

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	12	35.3%
2. Ask for an opinion	9	26.5%
3. Disclose problem	0	0.0%
3.1 Statement of facts	7	20.6%
3.2 Consequences	6	17.6%
4. Announce plan of action	0	0.0%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	34	100.0%

In situation 1. Ask for advice 35.3%, the student projects frustration in being refused help indicating selfishness associated with students at school level, who still harbor immature tendencies. 26.5% of 2. Ask for opinion examples were solicited as a polite etiquette of asking for help in a situation where the speaker and hearer have no direct control of the opponent. 3.1 Statement of fact has 20.6% of topics used, emphasizing the relation of this problem to real life incidences and the universality of this common problem.

Situation 3.3 Insults

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	8	30.8%
2. Ask for an opinion	2	7.7%
3. Disclose problem	15	57.7%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	1	3.8%
4. Announce plan of action	0	0.0%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	26	100.0%

Students can sometimes become desperate if the situation is deteriorating as indicated by 30.8% of 1. Ask for advice. In cases where it appears that the student will want to compel the adviser to advice, the student might want to follow the advice without evaluating flaws and validity in it. The student falls in to a trap of following a bad advice by being in a haste to solve a problem. 3. Disclose problem – 57.7% has a high recurring frequency in results as an indication that results are highly common in schools and many students are defenselessly exposed to them and could have accepted their use even though not happy, thus disclosing a problem as a report.

Situation 3.4 Theft

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	6	18.8%
2. Ask for an opinion	1	3.1%
3. Disclose problem	14	43.8%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	4	12.5%
4. Announce plan of action	6	18.8%
5. Identify problem	1	3.1%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	32	100.0%

3.1 Disclose problem – 43.8% insinuates that fear of the students complained about or not being sure of how to bring the topic about, leads students to talk about a problem than addressing it head on.

Situation 3.5 Assault

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	1	3.6%
2. Ask for an opinion	7	25.0%
3. Disclose problem	10	35.7%
3.1 Statement of facts	2	7.1%
3.2 Consequences	2	7.1%
4. Announce plan of action	4	14.3%
5. Identify problem	1	3.6%
6. Volunteer advice	1	3.6%
Total	28	100.0%

3. Disclose problem – 35.7% relates to the point that assault complaints are presented in a pattern of indirect request for help. 2. Ask for opinion at 25.0% is a polite solicitation of advice where a direct response of “do this” or “don’t do this”, well not fit the situation as it would be upon the complainant to follow the advice or not to.

5.4 Task 3: Patterns of Advice Solicitation in Major Situations

Solicitation	1. Student-Teacher		2. Teacher-Student		3. Student-Student	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1. Ask for advice	31	19.4%	36	25.0%	30	20.7%
2. Ask for an opinion	31	19.4%	22	15.3%	24	16.6%
3. Disclose problem	72	45.0%	65	45.1%	53	36.6%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%	1	0.7%	9	6.2%
3.2 Consequences	8	5.0%	9	6.3%	14	9.7%
4. Announce plan of action	11	6.9%	11	7.6%	12	8.3%
5. Identify problem	5	3.1%	0	0.0%	2	1.4%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.7%
7. Ask for information	2	1.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	160	100.0%	144	100.0%	145	100.0%

In all three major advice solicitations the first three topic: 1. Ask for advice, 2. Ask for opinion, 3. Disclose problem, have a higher recurrence or frequency than other topic. It therefore interprets that the Setswana students' solicitation strategies anchored more on asking for advice and opinion but most of all referred disclosing problems. This approach has an element of allowing the adviser freedom to advice or not. This could mean that the learners would be willing to follow the advice because there would be no element of obligation or of being compelled to do or say something, from both sides.

5.5 Task 4: Individual Patterns of Advice Solicitation

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	97	21.6%
2. Ask for an opinion	77	17.1%
3. Disclose problem	190	42.3%
3.1 Statement of facts	10	2.2%
3.2 Consequences	31	6.9%
4. Announce plan of action	34	7.6%
5. Identify problem	7	1.6%
6. Volunteer advice	1	0.2%
7. Ask for information	2	0.4%
Total	449	100.0%

3.1 Disclose problem 42.3%. From this summary, it appears that majority of advice solicitors usually talk about their problems. In this regard the solicitor places her/him self under the novice or expert knowledge of the advisor without asking but expecting a response. Technically speaking, the Setswana speaking students would disclose their problems as a polite request for intervention. 1. Ask for advice – 21.6% is the second highest in the table indicating that soliciting students were brave and confident to face advisers for advices clearly without an indication of fear of being compromised or threatened. This indicates the level of trust the student put in the advisor by clearly and openly confronting them for advices.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

The study of the language of politeness in giving advice, illustrates certain language aspects as found in the advice and solicitation strategies of Setswana speakers. The responses to advice solicitation salutations as indicated by percentages, reveal that a polite strategy of soliciting is mostly not a direct approach, among the speakers. A polite approach is generally considered as disclosing a problem, talking about it, in the hope that the hearers will volunteer advice or opinion.

The major situations of solicitations indicate that in this specific set-up, students have more complications with fellow students than with teachers. One gets a closer look to investigate the reason for the complexity. Students at Grade eleven, being teenagers, experience psychological and physiological changes and difficulties as they try to find their own place in the world. Cultural differences play a role in the situation in that Setswana speakers are a minority in the school and therefore extenuate the intensity of the situation. The cultural dimension overshadows the advice-giving section, by revealing the level at which politeness is emphasized and encouraged.

According to the presentation on the outcomes of this study, most problems leading to advice situations or eliciting advice topics are derived from inter-personal relationships and consequences thereof. As in 3.Student-Student situation, 3.2. **Refuse to help** at 23.4% suggests student's frustration when denied help from fellow learners, which is the most common of all situations. Students appear to wish to know how handle or behave towards others in stressful situations. The study does not focus on gender differences the intensity of these issues spread beyond gender but anchors on age and maturity. Practical multi-cultural influences prompted students from Fezeka High School, to participate genuinely in the solicitation section because the topic were close to heart and of utmost relevance to them and their learning environment.

The manner of solicitation depended on maturity ass related on age and probably on background. In the school setup, the students' approach to the hearer would differ to those in

primary or tertiary education. The study reveals that the senior years of school do not represent maturity and or specific learnt behaviour, which students can apply in controlling the situation, as in theft for an example. Theft is a common problem in schools but no precise tact or mechanism can be put in place to make the school theft-proof. In most other situations, it appears that students behave helplessly desperate, as junior school learners would be.

The first highest frequency of solicitation is disrespectful learner in situation 2.2. – 23.6%. The current educational system seems to require that some serious politeness strategies should be applied when dealing with nowadays students. Distance between students and teachers as elders, has been bridged by contemptuous disregard for age and leadership. Soliciting advice in some situations gave a notion that s/he did not wish to be found undeserving of the students' respect.

The teacher also discloses a problem as a way of introducing it to the adviser, suggesting to create ground for talk and advice while still maintaining dignity and trying to protect or reduce threat to self – esteem. To the teacher it appears to be a step-down from authority in 'failing' to control students, therefore not earning their respect. This situation can only be redeemed by the polite manner in which an advice is to be given to the distressed solicitor.

Advices.

The most frequently used advice topic in this section of the study, is in the Student-Teacher situation, where 3.1 Actions you can take ranks at 31.0%. As mentioned earlier in the paper, students have high expectations of their teachers and tend to get disappointed if these expectations are not met.

Teachers play a role of guiding, instructing, giving or refusing permission etc. that frames them in the student's mind as those requiring a good following sometimes as role models. Students tend to assume that teachers are or should at least be superior in all operations this view dehumanizes teachers and denies them rights to exist as humans than programmed machines. Once a student can learn to use certain speech acts properly, the situation could be easily neutralized.

Teachers do feel threatened by students if they become too demanding, complaining or dependant. How the teacher conveys a message to the student is of paramount importance as it may enhance or damage the relationship. The manner in which another advises an adult is important in that it impacts on the acceptability of the advice. For a teacher to openly discuss his/her problems without threat of being judged and be received by the hearer, depends on the method the teacher uses to solicit advice. As seen in the situation 2, 3.1 Actions you can take scores 24.7% reflecting the level of confidentiality between the two adults participating or interacting.

Advising a teacher and to have the advice accepted indicates that the teacher usually solicits from a knowledgeable, experienced, reliable adviser. In this case a teacher would not solicit advice from someone who is not as familiar to the situation for validity and relevance's sake. This means then there is a high percentage of confidence in the teacher without misleading, despise, or ignorance to the seriousness of the situation at hand.

Some frequently used topics are

2.2 Problem is controllable – 15.8%, 2.7 Problem cause – 9.4, 5. Relationship topics – 17.7%. These topics appeared less frequently. Unlike in 3.1 Actions you can take, these topics have fewer percentages. Some features of these topics especially topic 5.Relationship topic, reveals that most problems are related to personal relations. It has been interesting to find that the adviser often identifies advices to be used as related to relationships, signifying that if students and teachers can learn to improve how they how they relate, then there will be less hassles, especially by exploiting politeness strategies to neutralize ground for confrontation.

More advice topics were not frequently used in giving advice especially in:

- 2.3 Problem has positive effects - 5.0%
- 2.4 Problem is common – 5.7%
- 2.5 Problem is temporary – 2.8%
- 2.8 Problem is severe – 1.4%
- 3.2 Joint action we can take – 1.2%
- 4. Hearer topics – 0.7%
- 6. Speaker topics – 0.7%
- 7. Conversation topics – 2.4%

The nature of problems in schools did not find much use for the above topics, which were minimally used. In categorizing problem advices, advisers did not associate the above topics with the situations reported or complained about. In this case, the use of these topics has no significance to the study because the topics do not carry much weight in proving or driving any specific point home.

The following topics were never used:

- 1.1 Don't have emotion
- 1.2 Emotion is inappropriate
- 1.3 You have this emotion
- 1.4 I share your emotion
- 1.5 Your emotion is common
- 1.6 Your emotion is temporary

Emotion topics 1.1 – 1.6 have been grouped together. The distinctive difference of emotional input contained in these topics, does not impart much value and effect in the outcomes. These have thus been grouped into 1. Emotion topics.

2.9 – Problem not severe

In a school situation, one realizes that the intensity of issues or cases reported is such that all problems are severe to the students and teachers. A problem in this regard cannot be graded according to strength as the environment itself is not a relaxed place but to serve a specific purpose of learning. Students become affected by everything around them and this impacts on their performance in studies, therefore to them, all problems carry with them element of severity.

2.6 Problem is not temporary. Due to the high number of recurring cases such as in situation 3.3 Insults and 3.4 Theft, renders this topic unusable because even though the case for one individual student may be solved in a present situation, the possibility of it happening again is possible due to the nature of the environment. Since these are common incidences in schools, it is not a temporal but an everyday occurrence for the incidence to occur turning it into a common problem not to go away, therefore making it not temporary.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Austin J. 1960. **How to do things with words**. Harvard and Oxford: University Press.
- Blum – Kulka S. et al. 1993. **Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies**. Ablex Publishing Corporation, New Jersey.
- Brown P, & Levinson S.C. 1987. **Politeness: Some Universals in language usage**. Cambridge University Press.
- Decapua, A. & Dunham, J.F. 1992. **Strategies in the discourse of advice**.
- Goffman E. 1967. **'Interaction Ritual.'** **Essay of Face- to –Face Behavior**. New York: Doubleday.
- Goldsmith, D.J. Fitch K. 1997, **The Normative Context of Advice as Social Support**, Master of Human Communication Research Vol.23, N0.4,
- Goldsmith, D.J. & Macgeorge, E.L. **The Impact of Politeness and Relationship on Perceived Quality of Advice about a Problem**, Human Communication Research Vol.26, N0.2.
- Goldsmith, D.J. 1999. **Content-Based Resources for giving Face Sensitive Advice in Troubles Talk Episode**.
- Goldsmith, D.J. 2000 **Communication monographs** , Vol.67, No 1.
- Grice H.P. 1975. 'Logic and Conversation'. William James Lectures. Harvard University 1967. Published in Cole and Morgan (eds.), **Syntax and Semantics**, Vol. III Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press.
- Grundy P. 2000. **Doing Pragmatics**. London: England: Edward Arnold.
- Hernandez-Flores N. 1999. **Politeness ideology in Spanish colloquial conversation: the case of advice**, Pragmatics Vol.9, N0.1

Holtgraves T. 1992. The Realistic realisation of Face Management: Implications for Language Production and Comprehension, Person Perception, and Cross-Cultural Communications. **Social Psychology Quarterly** 55, 141 – 159.

Ide S. 1993. Preface: The Research for Integrated Universals of Linguistic Politeness. **Multilingual** 12(1). 7 – 11.

Lakoff R. 1975. Some of my favourite writers are literate: The mingling of oral and literate strategies in written communication. In D. Tannen (ed). **Spoken and written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy** (pp. 239 – 260). Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corp.

Leech G.N. 1983. **Principles of pragmatics**. London and New York: Longman

Lim T.C. & Bowers W. 1991. Facework: Solidarity, Approbation, and Tact. **Human Communication Research** 17, 415 – 450.

Reiter, R.M. 2000. **Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Uruguay**.

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

Searle J.R. 1971. **A classification of Illocutionary Acts**. *Language in Society* 5. 1 – 23.

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

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

APPENDIX

TASK 1. TOTAL NUMBER OF ADVICE TOPICS

Table 1.

Situation	Numbers	Percentage
Student-Teacher	100	23.6%
1.1 Teacher attitude	20	20.0%
1.2 Wastes time	7	7.0%
1.3 Not understand	26	26.0%
1.4 Not accept fault	34	34.0%
1.5 Incompetent	13	13.0%
		100.0%
Teacher-Student	154	36.3%
2.1 Lazy learner	47	30.5%
2.2 Disrespectful learner	25	16.2%
2.3 Absence from school	17	11.0%
2.4 Suicidal	41	26.6%
2.5 Dissatisfied about lessons	24	15.6%
		100.0%
Student-Student	170	40.1%
3.1 Background	74	43.5%
3.2 Refuse to help	41	24.1%
3.3 Insults	21	12.4%
3.4 Theft	14	8.2%
3.5 Assault	20	11.8%
		100.0%
Total	424	100.0%

TASK 2: Advice topic in each sub-situation**Situation: 1.1 Teacher Attitude.**

Advice topics	Number	Percentage
1. Emotion topics		
1.1. Don't have emotion		
1.2. Emotion is inappropriate		
1.3. You have his emotion		
1.4. I share your emotion		
1.5. Your emotion is common		
1.6. Your emotion is temporary		
2. Problem topics		
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable	1	5.0%
2.2. Problem is controllable	1	5.0%
2.3. Problem has positive aspects	1	5.0%
2.4. Problem is common	1	5.0%
2.5. Problem is temporary	1	5.0%
2.6. Problem is not temporary		
2.7. Problem cause	1	5.0%
2.8. Problem is severe	1	5.0%
2.9. Problem is not severe		
3. Action topics		
3.1. Actions you can take	7	35.0%
3.2. Joint action we can take		
4. Hearer topics		
5. Relationship topics	5	25.0%
6. Speaker topics		
7. Conversation topics	1	5.0%
TOTAL	20	100.0%

TASK 2: Advice topic in each sub-situation**Situation: Attitude: 1.2 Teacher Wastes time**

Advice topics	Number	Percentage
1. Emotion topics	2	28.6%
1.1. Don't have emotion		
1.2. Emotion is inappropriate		
1.3. You have his emotion		
1.4. I share your emotion		
1.5. Your emotion is common		
1.6. Your emotion is temporary		
2. Problem topics		
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable		
2.2. Problem is controllable		
2.3. Problem has positive aspects		
2.4. Problem is common	1	14.3%
2.5. Problem is temporary		
2.6. Problem is not temporary		
2.7. Problem cause		
2.8. Problem is severe		
2.9. Problem is not severe		
3. Action topics		
3.1. Actions you can take	2	28.6%
3.2. Joint action we can take		
4. Hearer topics		
5. Relationship topics	2	28.6%
6. Speaker topics		
7. Conversation topics		
TOTAL	7	100.0%

TASK 2: Advice topic in each sub-situation**Situation 2.3: Teacher does not understand**

Advice topics	Number	Percentage
1. Emotion topics	2	7.7%
1.1. Don't have emotion		
1.2. Emotion is inappropriate		
1.3. You have his emotion		
1.4. I share your emotion		
1.5. Your emotion is common		
1.6. Your emotion is temporary		
2. Problem topics		
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable		
2.2. Problem is controllable	5	19.2%
2.3. Problem has positive aspects	1	3.8%
2.4. Problem is common		
2.5. Problem is temporary	2	7.7%
2.6. Problem is not temporary		
2.7. Problem cause	2	7.7%
2.8. Problem is severe		
2.9. Problem is not severe		
3. Action topics		
3.1. Actions you can take	11	42.3%
3.2. Joint action we can take		
4. Hearer topics		
5. Relationship topics	2	7.7%
6. Speaker topics		
7. Conversation topics	1	3.8%
TOTAL	26	100.0%

TASK 2: Advice topic in each sub-situation**Situation 1.4 Teacher does not accept fault**

Advice topics	Number	Percentage
1. Emotion topics	2	5.9%
1.1. Don't have emotion		
1.2. Emotion is inappropriate		
1.3. You have his emotion		
1.4. I share your emotion		
1.5. Your emotion is common		
1.6. Your emotion is temporary		
2. Problem topics		
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable		
2.2. Problem is controllable	5	14.7%
2.3. Problem has positive aspects	3	8.8%
2.4. Problem is common	3	8.8%
2.5. Problem is temporary		
2.6. Problem is not temporary		
2.7. Problem cause	2	5.9%
2.8. Problem is severe	1	2.9%
2.9. Problem is not severe		
3. Action topics		
3.1. Actions you can take	8	23.5%
3.2. Joint action we can take	1	2.9%
4. Hearer topics		
5. Relationship topics	9	26.5%
6. Speaker topics		
7. Conversation topics		
TOTAL	34	100.0%

TASK 2: Advice topic in each sub-situation**Situation 1.5 Incompetent Teacher**

Advice topics	Number	Percentage
1. Emotion topics	1	7.7%
1.1. Don't have emotion		
1.2. Emotion is inappropriate		
1.3. You have his emotion		
1.4. I share your emotion		
1.5. Your emotion is common		
1.6. Your emotion is temporary		
2. Problem topics		
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable		
2.2. Problem is controllable	5	38.5%
2.3. Problem has positive aspects		
2.4. Problem is common		
2.5. Problem is temporary		
2.6. Problem is not temporary		
2.7. Problem cause	1	7.7%
2.8. Problem is severe		
2.9. Problem is not severe		
3. Action topics		
3.1. Actions you can take	3	23.1%
3.2. Joint action we can take		
4. Hearer topics		
5. Relationship topics	3	23.1%
6. Speaker topics		
7. Conversation topics		
TOTAL	13	100.0%

TASK 2: Advice topic in each sub-situation**Situation 2.1 Lazy learner**

Advice topics	Number	Percentage
1. Emotion topics	4	8.5%
1.1. Don't have emotion		
1.2. Emotion is inappropriate		
1.3. You have his emotion		
1.4. I share your emotion		
1.5. Your emotion is common		
1.6. Your emotion is temporary		
2. Problem topics		
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable		
2.2. Problem is controllable	7	14.9%
2.3. Problem has positive aspects	6	12.8%
2.4. Problem is common	6	12.8%
2.5. Problem is temporary		
2.6. Problem is not temporary		
2.7. Problem cause	5	10.6%
2.8. Problem is severe	1	2.1%
2.9. Problem is not severe		
3. Action topics		
3.1. Actions you can take	11	23.4%
3.2. Joint action we can take		
4. Hearer topics		
5. Relationship topics	4	8.5%
6. Speaker topics		
7. Conversation topics	3	6.4%
TOTAL	47	100.0%

TASK 2: Advice topic in each sub-situation**Situation 2.2 Disrespectful learner**

Advice topics	Number	Percentage
1. Emotion topics	4	16.0%
1.1. Don't have emotion		
1.2. Emotion is inappropriate		
1.3. You have his emotion		
1.4. I share your emotion		
1.5. Your emotion is common		
1.6. Your emotion is temporary		
2. Problem topics		
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable	1	4.0%
2.2. Problem is controllable	1	4.0%
2.3. Problem has positive aspects		
2.4. Problem is common		
2.5. Problem is temporary		
2.6. Problem is not temporary		
2.7. Problem cause	4	16.0%
2.8. Problem is severe		
2.9. Problem is not severe		
3. Action topics		
3.1. Actions you can take	6	24.0%
3.2. Joint action we can take		
4. Hearer topics		
5. Relationship topics	9	36.0%
6. Speaker topics		
7. Conversation topics		
TOTAL	25	100.0%

TASK 2: Advice topic in each sub-situation**Situation: 2.3 Absence from school**

Advice topics	Number	Percentage
1. Emotion topics	1	5.9%
2. Problem topics		
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable		
2.2. Problem is controllable	2	11.8%
2.3. Problem has positive aspects	1	5.9%
2.4. Problem is common	2	11.8%
2.5. Problem is temporary	1	5.9%
2.6. Problem is not temporary		
2.7. Problem cause	5	29.4%
2.8. Problem is severe		
2.9. Problem is not severe		
3. Action topics		
3.1. Actions you can take	3	17.6%
3.2. Joint action we can take		
4. Hearer topics		
5. Relationship topics	2	11.8%
6. Speaker topics		
7. Conversation topics		
TOTAL	17	100.0%

TASK 2: Advice topic in each sub-situation**Situation 2.4 Suicidal/Feeling**

Advice topics	Number	Percentage
1. Emotion topics	12	29.3%
2. Problem topics		
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable		
2.2. Problem is controllable	6	14.6%
2.3. Problem has positive aspects	1	2.4%
2.4. Problem is common		
2.5. Problem is temporary	1	2.4%
2.6. Problem is not temporary		
2.7. Problem cause	3	7.3%
2.8. Problem is severe	1	2.4%
2.9. Problem is not severe		
3. Action topics		
3.1. Actions you can take	10	24.4%
3.2. Joint action we can take		
4. Hearer topics		
5. Relationship topics	6	14.6%
6. Speaker topics		
7. Conversation topics	1	2.4%
TOTAL	41	100.0%

TASK 2: Advice topic in each sub-situation**Situation 2.5 Dissatisfied about lessons**

Advice topics	Number	Percentage
1. Emotion topics	2	8.3%
1.1. Don't have emotion		
1.2. Emotion is inappropriate		
1.3. You have his emotion		
1.4. I share your emotion		
1.5. Your emotion is common		
1.6. Your emotion is temporary		
2. Problem topics		
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable		
2.2. Problem is controllable	3	12.5%
2.3. Problem has positive aspects	2	8.3%
2.4. Problem is common	3	12.5%
2.5. Problem is temporary		
2.6. Problem is not temporary		
2.7. Problem cause		
2.8. Problem is severe	1	4.2%
2.9. Problem is not severe		
3. Action topics		
3.1. Actions you can take	8	33.3%
3.2. Joint action we can take	3	12.5%
4. Hearer topics		
5. Relationship topics	1	4.2%
6. Speaker topics		
7. Conversation topics	1	4.2%
TOTAL	24	100.0%

TASK 2: Advice topic in each sub-situation**Situation 3.1 Background**

Advice topics	Number	Percentage
1. Emotion topics	5	6.8%
1.1. Don't have emotion		
1.2. Emotion is inappropriate		
1.3. You have his emotion		
1.4. I share your emotion		
1.5. Your emotion is common		
1.6. Your emotion is temporary		
2. Problem topics		
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable	2	2.7%
2.2. Problem is controllable	15	20.3%
2.3. Problem has positive aspects	1	1.4%
2.4. Problem is common	5	6.8%
2.5. Problem is temporary	5	6.8%
2.6. Problem is not temporary		
2.7. Problem cause	9	12.2%
2.8. Problem is severe		
2.9. Problem is not severe		
3. Action topics		
3.1. Actions you can take	14	18.9%
3.2. Joint action we can take	1	1.4%
4. Hearer topics	1	1.4%
5. Relationship topics	13	17.6%
6. Speaker topics		
7. Conversation topics	3	4.1%
TOTAL	74	100.0%

Situation 3.2 Refuse to help

Advice topics	Number	Percentage
1. Emotion topics	5	12.2%
1.1. Don't have emotion		
1.2. Emotion is inappropriate		
1.3. You have his emotion		
1.4. I share your emotion		
1.5. Your emotion is common		
1.6. Your emotion is temporary		
2. Problem topics		
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable		
2.2. Problem is controllable	5	12.2%
2.3. Problem has positive aspects		
2.4. Problem is common	3	7.3%
2.5. Problem is temporary		
2.6. Problem is not temporary		
2.7. Problem cause	4	9.8%
2.8. Problem is severe	1	2.4%
2.9. Problem is not severe		
3. Action topics		
3.1. Actions you can take	11	26.8%
3.2. Joint action we can take		
4. Hearer topics		
5. Relationship topics	12	29.3%
6. Speaker topics		
7. Conversation topics		
TOTAL	41	100.0%

TASK 2: Advice topic in each sub-situation**Situation 3.3: Insults**

Advice topics	Number	Percentage
1. Emotion topics	1	4.8%
1.1. Don't have emotion		
1.2. Emotion is inappropriate		
1.3. You have his emotion		
1.4. I share your emotion		
1.5. Your emotion is common		
1.6. Your emotion is temporary		
2. Problem topics		
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable		
2.2. Problem is controllable	9	42.9%
2.3. Problem has positive aspects	4	19.0%
2.4. Problem is common		
2.5. Problem is temporary		
2.6. Problem is not temporary		
2.7. Problem cause		
2.8. Problem is severe		
2.9. Problem is not severe		
3. Action topics		
3.1. Actions you can take		
3.2. Joint action we can take		
4. Hearer topics	2	9.5%
5. Relationship topics	2	9.5%
6. Speaker topics	3	14.3%
7. Conversation topics		
TOTAL	21	100.0%

TASK 2: Advice topic in each sub-situation**Situation 3.4 Theft**

Advice topics	Number	Percentage
1. Emotion topics	1	7.1%
1.1. Don't have emotion		
1.2. Emotion is inappropriate		
1.3. You have his emotion		
1.4. I share your emotion		
1.5. Your emotion is common		
1.6. Your emotion is temporary		
2. Problem topics		
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable	1	7.1%
2.2. Problem is controllable	2	14.3%
2.3. Problem has positive aspects	1	7.1%
2.4. Problem is common		
2.5. Problem is temporary		
2.6. Problem is not temporary		
2.7. Problem cause	3	21.4%
2.8. Problem is severe		
2.9. Problem is not severe		
3. Action topics		
3.1. Actions you can take	6	42.9%
3.2. Joint action we can take		
4. Hearer topics		
5. Relationship topics		
6. Speaker topics		
7. Conversation topics		
TOTAL	14	100.0%

TASK 2: Advice topic in each sub-situation**Situation 3.5 Assault**

Advice topics	Number	Percentage
1. Emotion topics		
1.1. Don't have emotion		
1.2. Emotion is inappropriate		
1.3. You have his emotion		
1.4. I share your emotion		
1.5. Your emotion is common		
1.6. Your emotion is temporary		
2. Problem topics		
2.1. Problem is uncontrollable	1	5.0%
2.2. Problem is controllable	1	5.0%
2.3. Problem has positive aspects		
2.4. Problem is common		
2.5. Problem is temporary	2	10.0%
2.6. Problem is not temporary		
2.7. Problem cause	1	5.0%
2.8. Problem is severe		
2.9. Problem is not severe		
3. Action Topics		
3.1 Actions you can take	10	50.0%
3.2 Joint action we can take		
4. Hearer topics		
5. Relationship topics	5	25.0%
6. Speaker topics		
7. Conversation topics		
TOTAL	20	100.0%

Task 3.

Topic	1. Student-Teacher		2. Teacher-Student		3. Student-Student	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
1.1	7	7.0%	23	14.9%	12	7.1%
2.1	1	1.0%	1	0.6%	4	2.4%
2.2	16	16.0%	19	12.3%	32	18.8%
2.3	5	5.0%	10	6.5%	6	3.5%
2.4	5	5.0%	11	7.1%	8	4.7%
2.5	3	3.0%	2	1.3%	7	4.1%
2.6						
2.7	6	6.0%	17	11.0%	17	10.0%
2.8	2	2.0%	3	1.9%	1	0.6%
2.9						
3.1	31	31.0%	38	24.7%	41	24.1%
3.2	1	1.0%	3	1.9%	1	0.6%
4					3	1.8%
5	21	21.0%	22	14.3%	32	18.8%
6					3	1.8%
7	2	2.0%	5	3.2%	3	1.8%
	100	100.0%	154	100.0%	170	100.0%

Task 4: Individual Advice Topics

Advice topic	Number	Percentage
	42	9.9%
1. Emotion topics		
1.1 Don't have emotion		
1.2 Emotion is inappropriate		
1.3 You have this emotion		
1.4 I share your emotion		
1.5 Your emotion is common		
1.6 Your emotion is temporary		
2. Problem Topics		
2.1 Problem is uncontrollable	6	1.4%
2.2 Problem is controllable	67	15.8%
2.3 Problem has positive aspects	21	5.0%
2.4 Problem is common	24	5.7%
2.5 Problem is temporary	12	2.8%
2.6 Problem is not temporary		
2.7 Problem cause	40	9.4%
2.8 Problem is severe	6	1.4%
2.9 Problem is not severe		
3. Action topics		
3.1 Actions you can take	110	25.9%
3.2 Joint action we can take	5	1.2%
4. Hearer topics	3	0.7%
5. Relationship topics	75	17.7%
6. Speaker topics	3	0.7%
7. Conversation topics	10	2.4%
Total	424	100.0%

Task 2: Patterns of advice solicitation in each Sub-situation**1. STUDENT-TEACHER****Situation 1.1 Attitude**

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	4	11.8%
2. Ask for an opinion	7	20.6%
3. Disclose problem	16	47.1%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	1	2.9%
4. Announce plan of action	1	2.9%
5. Identify problem	5	14.7%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	34	100.0%

Situation 1.2 Teacher waste time

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	6	20.7%
2. Ask for an opinion	1	3.4%
3. Disclose problem	12	41.4%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	3	10.3%
4. Announce plan of action	5	17.2%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
7. Ask for information	2	6.9%
Total	29	100.0%

Situation 1.3 Teacher does not understand

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	5	16.1%
2. Ask for an opinion	9	29.0%
3. Disclose problem	15	48.4%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	0	0.0%
4. Announce plan of action	2	6.5%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	31	100.0%

Situation 1.4 Not accept fault

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	6	18.8%
2. Ask for an opinion	9	28.1%
3. Disclose problem	15	46.9%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	0	0.0%
4. Announce plan of action	2	6.3%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	32	100.0%

Situation 1.5 Incompetent teacher

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	10	29.4%
2. Ask for an opinion	5	14.7%
3. Disclose problem	14	41.2%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	4	11.8%
4. Announce plan of action	1	2.9%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	34	100.0%

2. TEACHER-STUDENT**Situation 2.1 Lazy learner**

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	10	33.3%
2. Ask for an opinion	3	10.0%
3. Disclose problem	15	50.0%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	0	0.0%
4. Announce plan of action	2	6.7%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	30	100.0%

Situation 2.2 Disrespectful learner

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	8	23.5%
2. Ask for an opinion	4	11.8%
3. Disclose problem	14	41.2%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	4	11.8%
4. Announce plan of action	4	11.8%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	34	100.0%

Situation 2.3 Absence from School

Advice Situation	Numbers	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	9	30.0%
2. Ask for an opinion	4	13.3%
3. Disclose problem	13	43.3%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	1	3.3%
4. Announce plan of action	3	10.0%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	30	100.0%

Situation 2.4 Suicidal

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	6	28.6%
2. Ask for an opinion	2	9.5%
3. Disclose problem	8	38.1%
3.1 Statement of facts	1	4.8%
3.2 Consequences	3	14.3%
4. Announce plan of action	1	4.8%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	21	100.0%

Situation 2.5 Dissatisfied about lessons

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	3	10.3%
2. Ask for an opinion	9	31.0%
3. Disclose problem	15	51.7%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	1	3.4%
4. Announce plan of action	1	3.4%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	29	100.0%

3 STUDENT-STUDENT**Situation 3.1 Background**

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	3	12.0%
2. Ask for an opinion	5	20.0%
3. Disclose problem	14	56.0%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	1	4.0%
4. Announce plan of action	2	8.0%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	25	100.0%

Situation 3.2 Refuse to help

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	12	35.3%
2. Ask for an opinion	9	26.5%
3. Disclose problem	0	0.0%
3.1 Statement of facts	7	20.6%
3.2 Consequences	6	17.6%
4. Announce plan of action	0	0.0%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	34	100.0%

Situation 3.3 Insults

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	8	30.8%
2. Ask for an opinion	2	7.7%
3. Disclose problem	15	57.7%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	1	3.8%
4. Announce plan of action	0	0.0%
5. Identify problem	0	0.0%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	26	100.0%

Situation 3.4 Theft

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	6	18.8%
2. Ask for an opinion	1	3.1%
3. Disclose problem	14	43.8%
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%
3.2 Consequences	4	12.5%
4. Announce plan of action	6	18.8%
5. Identify problem	1	3.1%
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%
Total	32	100.0%

Situation 3.5 Assault

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	1	3.6%
2. Ask for an opinion	7	25.0%
3. Disclose problem	10	35.7%
3.1 Statement of facts	2	7.1%
3.2 Consequences	2	7.1%
4. Announce plan of action	4	14.3%
5. Identify problem	1	3.6%
6. Volunteer advice	1	3.6%
Total	28	100.0%

Task 4: Individual Patterns of Advice Solicitation

Advice Situation	Number	Percentage
1. Ask for advice	97	21.6%
2. Ask for an opinion	77	17.1%
3. Disclose problem	190	42.3%
3.1 Statement of facts	10	2.2%
3.2 Consequences	31	6.9%
4. Announce plan of action	34	7.6%
5. Identify problem	7	1.6%
6. Volunteer advice	1	0.2%
7. Ask for information	2	0.4%
Total	449	100.0%

Task 3: Patterns of Advice Solicitation in Major Situations

Solicitation	1. Student-Teacher		2. Teacher-Student		3. Student-Student		
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	
1. Ask for advice	31	19.4%	36	25.0%	30	20.7%	97
2. Ask for an opinion	31	19.4%	22	15.3%	24	16.6%	77
3. Disclose problem	72	45.0%	65	45.1%	53	36.6%	190
3.1 Statement of facts	0	0.0%	1	0.7%	9	6.2%	10
3.2 Consequences	8	5.0%	9	6.3%	14	9.7%	31
4. Announce plan of action	11	6.9%	11	7.6%	12	8.3%	34
5. Identify problem	5	3.1%	0	0.0%	2	1.4%	7
6. Volunteer advice	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.7%	1
7. Ask for information	2	1.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2
Total	160	100.0%	144	100.0%	145	100.0%	449

Task 1: Patterns of Advice Solicitation

Situation	Number	Percentage	
1. STUDENT-TEACHER	160	35.6%	
1.1 Attitude	34	21.3%	
1.2 Teacher waste time	29	18.1%	
1.3 Teachers does not understand	31	19.4%	
1.4 Not accept fault	32	20.0%	
1.5 Incompetent teacher	34	21.3%	100.0%
2. TEACHER-STUDENT	144	32.1%	
2.1 Lazy learner	30	20.8%	
2.2 disrespectful	34	23.6%	
2.3 Absence from school	30	20.8%	
2.4 Suicidal	21	14.6%	
2.5 Dissatisfied about lessons	29	20.1%	100.0%
3. STUDENT-STUDENT	145	32.3%	
3.1 Background	25	17.2%	
3.2 Refuse to help	34	23.4%	
3.3 Insults	26	17.9%	
3.4 Theft	32	22.1%	
3.5 Assault	28	19.3%	100.0%
Total	449	100.0%	