

THE SPEECH ACT OF COMPLAINING IN ISIXHOSA

BY

MONELWA PRECIOUS MANJIYA



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

Study leader: Prof JA du Plessis

DECEMBER 2001

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this thesis 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 investigates the speech act of complaining in Xhosa. It is organized into six chapters.

Chapter 1 states the aim of the study. The method, design and the organization of the study are also presented.

In Chapter 2 the speech acts and politeness theories are presented as the basic framework of this study. It is clear that people do not only produce utterances, which contain grammatical structures and words when attempting to express themselves, but they always perform actions via those utterances. The actions people perform via their utterances are done in accordance within a certain area of linguistic pragmatics.

Chapter 3 deals with the speech act of complaining as discussed by various theorists.

Chapter 4 is concerned with complaints strategies. Here it is revealed that one must be able to voice one's annoyance or anger while at the same time it is important to avoid embarrassment by creating a situation in which it becomes impossible for him/her to face the aversiveness of taking the blame.

Chapter 5 deals with complaint situations in Xhosa. In order to make sense of what is said during an interaction, various factors have been examined, which relate to social distance and closeness. The relative status of the participants is based on social values. Complaint situations are divided into three social groups: power relations, friendship and strangers. Power relations involve people of superior and low status. This group is divided into two subgroups: people with superior status to people with low status and vice versa; those speakers with a lower status in a Xhosa speaking context tend to mark social distance between themselves and higher status speakers.

Among friends, there is no social distance because people tend to treat one another as equals. The same is true of strangers, although they don't know each other; they tend to treat one another with mutual respect.

Most of the time complaints in Xhosa express disapproval or negative feelings towards the source of the complaint. Complaints sometimes can be impolite. They can lead to conflict as they are sometimes very threatening, accusing and cursing. That is why a number of strategies have been introduced to a complainant who wants to avoid direct confrontation with the complaine. The indirect accusation strategy is the number one tool, which is always used by the complainers to avoid conflict, unlike annoyance, direct accusation and explicit blame of the accused's action or of the accused as a person.

People who use indirect accusations do not want to run the risk of losing face, unlike the direct accusation, which is face-threatening. Responding to a complaint is also an important factor as it promotes further interaction. Response serves as a way of displaying interest in what the speaker is saying. It has been noticed that response gives the speakers the opportunity to voice their feelings.

Finally, Chapter 6 presents the conclusions of the investigation and the main findings of the study are summarized.

OPSOMMING

Hierdie studie ondersoek die spraakhandeling van klagte in Xhosa. Dit is georganiseer in ses hoofstukke.

Hoofstuk 1 bied die doelstelling van die studie. Die metode, ontwerp en organisasie van die studie word ook bespreek.

In Hoofstuk 2 word die spraakhandelinge en beleefdheidsteorieë bespreek as die raamwerk van die studie. Dit word duidelik gemaak dat mense nie slegs uitinge produseer wat grammatikale strukture en woorde bevat nie, maar hulle voer altyd aksies uit via die uitinge. Hierdie aksies wat mense uitvoer via hulle uitinge word gedoen in ooreenstemming in bepaalde area van linguistiese pragmatiek.

Hoofstuk 3 behandel in die besonder die spraakhandeling van klagte soos ondersoek deur verskillende navorsers.

Hoofstuk 4 behandel klagte-strategieë. Hier word aangedui dat 'n spreker in staat moet wees om hy/sy se ontevredenheid of woede te lug terwyl dit terselfdertyd belangrik is om verleentheid te vermy deur die skep van 'n situasie waar dit vir hom/haar onmoontlik maak om te staan te kom voor die neem van die blaam.

Hoofstuk 5 ondersoek klagte-situasies in Xhosa. Ten einde sin te maak oor wat gesê word en 'n interaksie, is verskeie faktore ondersoek wat verband hou met sosiale opstand en nabyheid. Die reeltiewe status van die deelnemers word gebaseer op sosiale waardes. Klagte-situasies kan verdeel word in terme van drie sosiale groepe: magsverhoudinge, vriendskap en vreemdelingskap. Magsverhoudinge hou verband met die verhoudinge tussen mense met hoë en lae status. Hierdie groep word verdeel in twee sub-groepe: mense met superieure status en mense met lae status en omgekeerd. Persone met 'n laer status in 'n Xhosaspreekende konteks is geneig om sosiale afstand te markeer tussen hulleself en hoër status sprekers.

Daar is geen sosiale opstand tussen vriende nie, omdat sulke persone geneig is om mekaar as gelykes te behandel. Dieselfde is waar van vreemdelinge, want alhoewel hulle mekaar nie ken nie, is hulle geneig om mekaar met respek te behandel.

Die meeste van die klagtes oor tyd in Xhosa gee druk misnoeë of negatiewe gevoelens uit met betrekking tot die bron van die klagte. Klagtes kan soms onbeleefd wees. Hulle kan lei tot konflik, aangesien hulle soms baie bedreigend aantygend en beledigend kan wees. Daarom is 'n aantal strategieë beskikbaar vir 'n klaer wat direkte konfrontasie wil vermy teenoor die persoon waarteen gekla word. Die indirekte aantying strategie is die voorkeur strategie wat deur die klaers gebruik word om konflik te vermy, in teenstelling met kwaad word direkte aantying en eksplisiete blaam van die aangetygte persoon se aksie of die persoon self.

Persone wat indirekte aantygings gebruik, wil nie die risiko loop om "gesig" (face) te verloor nie, in teenstelling met die direkte aantying, wat gesig-bedreiging is. Om te reageer op 'n klagte, is ook 'n belangrike faktor, aangesien dit verdere interaksie aanmoedig. Die gee van 'n reaksie is 'n wyse om aan te toon dat daar belangstelling is in wat die spreker sê. Daar is aangetoon dat 'n reaksie vir sprekers die geleentheid gee om hulle gevoelens te lug.

Laastens, gee Hoofstuk 6 die gevolgtrekkings van die ondersoek, en die belangrikste bevindinge van die studie word opgesom.

ISISHWANKATHELO

Esi sifundo siphanda ngesenzo sentetho sokukhalaza esiXhoseni. Siqulunqwe saba zizahluko ezintandathu.

Isahluko 1 sichaza injongo yesifundo. Ucwangciso nendlela esimiselwe ngayo esi sifundo nayo ijongiwe.

Isahluko 2 izenzo zentetho kunye nethiyori yenkcubeko zisetyenzisiwe njengesiseko kwesi sifundo. Icacile into yokuba abantu abanelanga nje kuphela ukuvelisa iintetho ezinesakhiwo segrama namagama xa bezama ukuphuhlisa intetho yabo. Kodwa basoloko besenza isenzo ngendlela edlula kwezo ntetho zabo. Isenzo abathi abantu basenze bedlula kwezo ntetho senziwa ngokuvumelana okanye ngokungqinelana nomnye umda wenzululwazi ngeelwimi zepragmatiki.

Isahluko 3 siqulathe isenzo sentetho sokukhalaza njengoko kuxoxwa zingcali ezininzi.

Isahluko 4 sibhekisele kubuchule bezikhalazo. Apha kuthi kuvele into yokuba kufuneke abe umntu uyakwazi ukuba enze omnye umntu acaphuke okanye abe nomsindo nangona ngexeshanye kubalulekile ukuba umntu azame kangangoko ukuphepha ihlazo ngokuthi adale imo apho kungenakwenzeka ukuba ajongane nokuzisola okanye ukuzibeka ityala.

Isahluko 5 sibhekiselele kwiimeko zokukhalaza esiXhoseni. Ukuze ukwazi ukwenza ukuba into ethethwayo iqondakale okanye ibe nentsingiselo eyiyo xa kuthethwa, kufuneka sijongene neemeko ezininzi ezithi zinxulumelane nomgama kunye nokusondelelana kwabantu. Ukuthelekiswa komgangatho wabantu kuxhomekeke kwixabiso lobuhlobo.

limeko zezikhalazo zahlula-hlulwe zazi ndidi ezintathu: - Unxulumano ngokwegunya, ubuhlobo, abantu abangazaniyo. Unxulumano ngokwegunya kudibanisa abantu abakumgangatho ophezulu nabo bakumgangatho osezantsi. Olu didi lwahlulwe lwazindidi ezimbini, lolwabantu abakumgangatho ophezulu ukuya kwabo bakumgangatho osezantsi, nabakumgangatho osezantsi ukuya kophezulu. Abo bakumgangatho osezantsi esiXhoseni bathi bawuphawule ngezinto ezithile umgama phakathi kwabo nabo basemagunyeni.

Kubahlobo awukho lo mgama kuba basoloko bezibona belingana. Kwenzeka into enye nakubantu abangazaniyo, nangona bengazani basoloko bethathana ngembeko nangentlonipho engummangaliso.

Amaxesha amaninzi izikhalazo esiXhoseni ibonisa ukungavumelani okanye ukungahambisani ngezimvo ngesikhalazo eso. Izikhalazo ziyakwazi ukungabi nambeko. Ziyakwazi ukuba ziqhubelele empixanweni njengoko zikwazi ngamanye ukutyhola, zithuke nokusongela omnye umntu.

Yiyo le nto kuthe kwaveliswa iindidi zobuchule bokuthomalalisa izikhalazo kulowo ufuna ukuphepha ukujongana ngqo ngobutshaba nomntu lowo ukhalazelwayo. Ubuchule bokutyhola umntu ngendlela engathanga ngqo yiyona ihamba phambili nesoloko isetyenziswa ngabantu ukuphepha imbambano, ayifani nemeko apho athi umntu acaphuke, ukutyholwa ngendlela ethe ngqo naleyo yokubeka umntu ityala phandle ngenxa yezenzo zakhe.

Abantu abasebenzise indlela engathanga ngqo yokutyhola umntu ngabo bangafuni kuphulukana nobuhlobo, akufani nabo bathetha ngqo bengathengi buso bamntu.

Ukuphendula xa umntu ekhalaza kubalulekile kuba kuthi kwenze incoko ibheke phambili. Ukuphendula yindlela nje ebonisa ukuba unomdla kulowo uthethayo nakuloo nto ayithethayo. Iqatshelwe into yokuba impendulo yiyona nto ethi inike izithethi ezo ithuba lokuba ziveze izimvo zazo.

Okokugqibela, Isahluko 6 sesokugqibela kwesi sifundo. Ithi inike isigqibo esiphambili athe umntu wafikelela kuso nezinto athe umntu wafikelela kuzo kwesi sifundo.

This work is dedicated to:

- My mother: *Grace Noba Thembu Manjiya*
- My husband: *Zamuxolo Mboma* and
- My son: *Ntsika*

Without your support and motivation, I would not have
made a dream come true!!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT FOR NRF REPORT

The financial assistance of National Research Foundation (NRF) towards this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed and conclusions arrived at, are those of the author and are not necessarily to be attributed to the National Research Foundation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my promotor, Prof JA du Plessis, for his commitment to this work, his guidance, encouragement, the efforts, the sacrifices he made and useful comments from the beginning up to the completion of this study. “May the Lord, God, bless you!”

A lot of gratitude also goes to Dr Mawande Dlali for his support and courage throughout the course of this study. To you I say: “Ukwanda kwaliwa ngumthakathi!”

I owe a lot of gratitude to Dr Nomsa Satyo for her untiring support. She is my inspiration. She was always there when I need a shoulder to cry on. She encouraged me to go on during those moments of despair. I will always appreciate the support and courage you gave me. If it weren't for you girl, I wouldn't have finished my studies.

I also wish to thank my friends: Sizwe Bottoman, Nomangwevu “Shy” Adonis and Mncedi Mbambo in the Department of African Languages at the University of Stellenbosch for their moral support and willingness to help in various ways.

A special thanks also goes to Prof Marianna Visser and Mr Mhlobo Jadezweni for their warm welcoming smiles in the Department of African Languages at the University of Stellenbosch.

I also want to convey my gratitude to our lovely lady, Karin, who helped me a lot in typing this thesis. She is a warm, wonderful person. To you Karin, I say: “You are a star.”

Most significantly I want to express a special gratitude to my husband, Zamuxolo Mboma, for encouraging me to come to the University to do this study and for being there for me in moments of despair and for being a dedicated father to my son during my absence. His tender loving care, patience and dedication to me made it much easier for me to write and finish my thesis. To him I say: “Ndiyambulela uThixo ngokundinika umyeni ofana nawe, Mhaga, Jola, Mpondomise Sabe, Mangqikwa, Qengeba.”

I cannot forget my dear mother, NobaThembu Grace Manjiya, who has sacrificed a lot and afforded me basic education that laid the foundation for this stride, to her I say: "Maz'enethole".

To my son, Ntsika, my mother-in-law, Nophakamile Mboma, my grandmother, Notshizini Elizabeth Manjiya and to both the Manjiya and Mboma families, I thank you for all your support and help you gave me when I was struggling. You all deserve special thanks.

Above all, to the Lord Almighty without Whom I could not have survived the pressures of making this research a success. I thank Him for the gift of insight He gave me, the strength to carry through and the love everyone has showered on me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
OPSOMMING	iii
XHOSA	v
DEDICATION	viii
NRF ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ix
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	x
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Aims of this study	1
1.2 Method and design of study	1
1.3 Organisation of study	2
CHAPTER 2: SPEECH ACTS AND POLITENESS THEORY	
2.1 Aims	4
2.2 Trosborg (1995)	4
2.2.1 Communicative functions	4
2.2.2 A Classification of illocutionary acts	4
2.2.3 The decomposition of speech act	6
2.3 Thomas (1995)	10
2.3.1 Ordinary Language Philosophy	10
2.3.2 The performative hypothesis	11
2.3.3 Collaborative performatives	15
2.3.4 Group performatives	15
2.3.5 Collapse of Austin's performative hypothesis	16
2.3.6 Illocutionary force	17
2.3.7 JR Searle	18
2.4 Yule (1996)	21
2.4.1 Speech acts and events	21
2.4.2 Speech acts	21
2.4.3 Illocutionary force indicating device (IFID)	22
2.4.4 Felicity conditions	22
2.4.5 The performative hypothesis	23
2.4.6 Speech act classification	23
2.4.7 Direct and indirect speech acts	24
2.4.8 Speech events	25

2.5	Politeness theory	25
2.5.1	Trosborg (1995)	25
2.5.2	Thomas (1995)	29

CHAPTER 3: THE SPEECH ACT OF COMPLAINING

3.1	Aim	35
3.2	The complaint	35
3.2.1	Trosborg (1995)	35
3.2.2	Drew (1998)	37
3.3	Directness level of complaints	38
3.3.1	Trosborg (1995)	38
3.3.2	Boxer (1993 a)	39
3.3.3	Boxer (1993 b)	39

CHAPTER 4: COMPLAINT STRATEGIES

4.1	Aim	41
4.2	Complaint strategies	41
4.3	Directive acts/commiserations	44
4.3.1	Trosborg (1995)	44
4.3.2	Boxer (1993 a)	45
4.3.3	Boxer (1993 b)	48
4.4	Complaint perspective	48
4.4.1	Focalising reference to the complainer (Speaker-Perspective-1)	49
4.4.2	Defocalising reference to the complainer (Speaker-Perspective-We)	49
4.4.3	Focalising reference to the complainees (Hearer-Perspective-You)	50
4.4.4	Defocalising reference to the complainees (Hearer-Perspective-It)	50
4.5	Internal modification	51
4.5.1	Downgraders	51
4.5.2	Upgraders	52
4.6	External modification	53
4.6.1	Supportive moves	53

CHAPTER 5: COMPLAINT SITUATIONS

5.1	Aim	56
5.2	Complaint situations	56

5.3	Complaint questionnaire	57
5.3.1	Introduction	57
5.4	The method of answering the questionnaire	71
5.5	Strategies in complaints.....	72
5.5.1	Aim	72
5.6	Total number and percentages of each strategy.....	72
5.6.1	List of strategies	72
5.6.2	Number and percentage of strategies	72
5.6.3	Strategies within the situations.....	73
5.6.4	Strategies within the situation of complaints with a person of superior status.....	75
5.6.5	Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status	76
5.6.6	Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person with low status to a person of superior status	77
5.6.7	Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status where the teacher complains to a learner for not wearing a school uniform	78
5.6.8	Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status where the parents complain to their child for arriving home late at night	79
5.6.9	Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status whereby parents complain to their child for not doing his/her homework.....	80
5.6.10	Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status where the priest complains to the children playing around the church during the service	81
5.6.11	Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status in which the priest complains to the child for not attending the choir practice.....	82
5.6.12	Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status where the shopkeeper complains to the casual worker for arriving late at work	84
5.6.13	Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status whereby the learner complains to the teacher about obtaining very low marks in a test	84

5.6.14	Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person with low status to a person with superior status where a child complains to his/her parents for not giving him/her enough money	85
5.6.15	Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person with low status to a person with superior status where a casual worker complains to the shopkeeper for the small salary that he/she receives	86
5.6.16	Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person with low status to a person with superior status where a member of the public complains to the police for taking a long time on the case of the thief	87
5.6.17	Strategies within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status.....	88
5.6.18	Strategies within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to your friend for wearing your new shirt without your permission.....	89
5.6.19	Strategies within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to your friend for making noise while you study.....	90
5.6.20	Strategies within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to your friend for not honouring the time of your appointment.....	91
5.6.21	Strategies within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to your friend for gossiping about you	92
5.6.22	Strategies within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to your friend for not helping you on a project	93
5.6.23	Strategies within the situation of complaints to strangers.....	93
5.6.24	Strategies within the situation of complaints to strangers where you complain to a stranger for spilling a drink on your dress	94
5.6.25	Strategies within the situation of complaints to strangers where you complain to a taxi driver for the fare that is too high.....	95
5.6.26	Strategies within the situation of complaints to strangers where you complain to a taxi driver for the high speed which he is driving.....	96
5.6.27	Strategies within the situation of complaints to strangers where you complain to a person who is jumping the queue at a till in a shop.....	97
5.6.28	Strategies within the situation of complaints to strangers where you complain to the cashier at the till for the wrong amount they charged you	98

5.7	Summary	99
5.8	Strategy 2: Annoyance	99
5.8.1	Frequency of recurrence in all situations	99
5.8.2	Expression of strategy in the selected situations for the research project	99
5.8.3	Other possible expressions which are not within the selected situations	100
5.8.4	Expression of annoyance	101
5.9	Strategy 4: Indirect accusation.....	101
5.9.1	Negative statements with verbs indicating disapproval	102
5.9.2	Negative statements with verbs indicating uncertainty	103
5.9.3	Negative statements with verbs indicating dissatisfaction	103
5.9.4	Indirect requests.....	104
5.9.5	With copulative clause.....	105
5.9.6	Other expressions which are not within the selected situations	105
5.10	Strategy 5: Direct accusation	107
5.10.1	Questions with the verb THI followed by the interrogative NI	107
5.10.2	Questions with the verb –bangela	108
5.10.3	Questions with the interrogative –njani.....	109
5.10.4	Copulative clauses with NA.....	110
5.10.5	Other possible expressions which are not within the selected situation.....	111
5.11	Strategy 6: Modified blame	112
5.11.1	Other possible expressions which are not within the selected situations	113
5.12	Strategy 7: Explicit condemnation of the accused's action	114
5.12.1	Explicit blame (behaviour)	114
5.12.2	Actions taking a long time	115
5.12.3	Other possible expressions which are not within the selected situations	116
5.13	Strategy 8: Explicit condemnation of the accused as a person.....	117
5.13.1	Explicit blame (person).....	117
5.14	Responses to complaint situations	117
5.14.1	Number and percentage of responses	117
5.14.2	Responses within the situations	118

5.14.3	Responses within the situation of complaints with a person of superior status.....	119
5.14.4	Responses within the situation of complaints with a person of superior status to a person with low status.....	120
5.14.5	Responses within the situation of complaints with a person of low status to a person of superior status	121
5.14.6	Responses within the situation of complaints with a person of superior status to a person with low status where the teacher complains to a learner who is not wearing a school uniform	122
5.14.7	Responses within the situation of complaints with a person of superior status to a person with low status where the parents complain to their child for arriving home late at night	122
5.14.8	Responses within the situation of complaints with a person of superior status to a person with low status where the parents complain to their child for not doing his/her homework.....	123
5.14.9	Responses within the situation of complaints with a person of superior status to a person with low status where the priest complain to the children playing around the church during the service.....	124
5.14.10	Responses within the situation of complaints with a person of superior status to a person with low status in which the priest complains to the child for not attending the choir practice.....	125
5.14.11	Responses within the situation of complaints with a person of superior status to a person with low status where the shopkeeper complain to the casual worker for arriving late at work.....	126
5.14.12	Responses within the situation of complaints with a person of low status to a person with superior status where the learner complain to the teacher about obtaining very low marks in a test	126
5.14.13	Responses within the situation of complaints with a person of low status to a person with superior status where a child complains to his/her parents for not giving him/her enough money.....	127
5.14.14	Responses within the situation of complaints with a person of low status to a person with superior status where a casual worker complains to the shopkeeper for the small salary that he/she receives	128
5.14.15	Responses within the situation of complaints with a person of low status to a person with superior status where a member of the public complains to the police for taking a long time on the case of a thief	129

5.14.16 Responses within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status.....	129
5.14.17 Responses within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to your friend for wearing your new shirt without permission.....	130
5.14.18 Responses within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to your friend for making noise while you study.....	131
5.14.19 Responses within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to your friend for not honouring the time of your appointment	132
5.14.20 Responses within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to your friend for gossiping about you	133
5.14.21 Responses within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to your friend for not helping you on a project	134
5.14.22 Responses within the situation of complaints between strangers	134
5.14.23 Responses within the situation of complaints between strangers where you complain to a stranger for spilling a drink on your dress.....	135
5.14.24 Responses within the situation of complaints between strangers where you complain to a taxi driver for the fare that is too high	136
5.14.25 Responses within the situation of complaints between strangers where you complain to a taxi driver for the high speed which he is driving	137
5.14.26 Responses within the situation of complaints between strangers where you complain to a person who is jumping the queue at a till in a shop .	138
5.14.27 Responses within the situation of complaints between strangers where you complain to the cashier at the till for the wrong amount they charged you	139
5.15 Summary	139
5.16 Responses in Xhosa	141

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION..... 146

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 151

APPENDIX A

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 AIMS OF THIS STUDY

The aim of this study is to establish the various ways in which the speech act of complaining appears in Xhosa. The approach to the analysis will emphasize the complaints within the theory of speech acts and the theory of politeness. I will also look at how complaints can be expressed at varying levels of directness from the range of disapproval to the severe challenge whereby the complainer is explicitly seen as irresponsible as a social member. The study will also look at strategies that are found within the complaints. Once the complaint strategies have been classified according to directness level, it is important to also examine the complainer's use of internal and external modification where the focus is on upgrading and downgrading of a complaint to avoid conflict.

In the case of complaints in Xhosa, the following aspects will be dealt with:

Complaint situations in Xhosa will be established in various ways; they will be divided into three social groups where one may find groups with power relations, which deal with complaints with people of superior status. This situation is divided into two sub-categories: I will look at complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status and vice versa. Within the groups of friends and strangers, complaints between friends of equal status and between strangers will also be looked at. The number and the percentages of these complaints will be taken into account.

The way in which the complainer responds to the complainer can significantly promote further interaction. That is why the response to the complaint situations will also be considered.

1.2 METHOD AND DESIGN OF STUDY

The method that has been designed to establish the data in this study will be a questionnaire, which will be devised and distributed to certain schools that are situated in

the Western Cape. Complaints situations will be grouped into three types of social groups; power relations, strangers and friends. Complaints with a person of superior status, complaints between strangers and complaints between friends of equal status. The questionnaire will therefore consist of a situation such as the following:

Situation: **Abazali bakhazela umntwana wabo othe wafumana amanqaku aphantsi kwiZibalo**

Parents complain to their child for obtaining low marks in Mathematics.

Complaint: **Kutheni aphantsi ngolu hlobo amanqaku akho, ingaba kukho ingxaki onayo esingayiqondiyo thina?**

Why your marks are so low, is there any problem in which we don't know?

Response: **Ikho ingxaki, utitshala wethu weZibalo uyakhawulezisa xa ethetha ndisuke ndingamva ke mna.**

Yes, there is a problem; our Maths teacher is very fast when he teaches us, so I don't understand him.

Learners of different school in the Western Cape will complete the questionnaire. What is expected of learners is to give a complaint and a response to that particular complaint.

1.3 ORGANISATION OF STUDY

This study consists of six chapters dealing with the following aspects:

Chapter 1: The Aim

Method and design of study

Chapter 2: Various theories of speech acts and politeness are discussed:

(a) Trosborg (1995)

(b) Thomas (1995)

(c) Yule (1996)

The speech acts and the politeness theory of the above authors serve as a theoretical basis of this study.

Chapter 3: This chapter deals with the speech act of complaining which includes the moral judgments, which express the speaker's approval as well as the disapproval of this behaviour. Theories from these authors will be considered:

- (a) Trosborg (1995)
- (b) Drew (1998)
- (c) Boxer (1993 a+b)

Chapter 4: This chapter deals with the complaint strategies.

Chapter 5: This chapter focuses on various ways in which complaints are expressed in Xhosa.

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

CHAPTER 2

SPEECH ACTS AND POLITENESS THEORY

2.1 AIMS

The aim of this chapter is to examine the theoretical aspects of speech acts and politeness theory by Trosborg (1995); Thomas (1995) and Yule (1996). A classification of illocutionary acts will be examined. Communicative functions of speech acts are reducible to five major classes; the above authors will also discuss representatives, directives, expressive, commissives and declarations.

2.2 TROSBORG (1995)

2.2.1 Communicative functions

The data to be presented in this book will be analysed within a theory of communicative functions. A speech act model will be used. This model is an extension of the theories of illocutionary acts originally introduced by Austin (1962) and further developed by Searle (1969). Austin and Searle's theories of illocutionary acts combined with notions of politeness of Leech (1983), Brown-Levinson (1978,1987) form the basis for the development of the descriptive framework utilized as an instrument for analysing aspects of foreign language learner's communicative competence and their potential success in achieving intended perlocutionary effect.

2.2.2 A Classification of illocutionary acts

Austin and Searle's theories are based on the hypothesis that speaking a language is engaging in a rule governed form of behaviour but Chomsky conceived of language as a set of sentences that assume that language can be regarded as a form of verbal acting. Trosborg (1995) mentions that in a classification of illocutionary acts, Searle makes a consistent classification of functions of language usage by dividing illocutionary acts into a limited number of major categories. He takes as the chief criterion of classification the speaker's communicative intention manifested in the illocutionary purpose or point of the act. He finds that communicative functions are reducible to five major classes, namely representatives, directives, expressive, commissives and declarations.

Representative

The purpose of the speaker in performing representatives is to commit him/herself to the belief that the propositional content of the utterance is true. The speaker says how something is or tries to make 'the words match the world'.

Directives

When performing directives, the speaker tries to get the hearer to commit him/herself to some future course of action either verbally or non-verbally. Opposing representative, directives are attempts to make 'the world match the words'.

Commissives

The speaker commits him/herself in varying degrees to some future course of action. Like in directives, the direction of fit is 'world to word'.

Expressives

The purpose here is to express the speaker's psychological state of mind about or attitude to some prior action or state of affairs. There is no direction of fit since its intention is neither to describe the world nor to exert an influence on future events rather the truth of the propositional content is taken for granted. Expressives vary with regard to propositional content. When thanking, the speaker expresses gratitude for the hearer's participation in a prior action, which was beneficial to the speaker. In a complaint, the speaker communicates his/her negative feelings towards the hearer, who is made responsible for a prior action, which was against the speaker's interests. An apology serves to express regret on the part of the speaker at having performed or failed to perform a prior action, which had negative consequences for the hearer.

Declarations

Declarations require extra linguistic institutions for their performance. The direction of fit is both 'words to world' and 'world to words'. The actual expression of the declaration brings

about a change in reality. Searle has made it clear that he considers language as fulfilling a finite and determinate number of functions.

2.2.3 The decomposition of speech act

Researchers adopted the term speech act as a minimal unit of discourse upon which to focus their investigations. Austin and Searle are pioneers in this work.

Locutions, Illocutions and Perlocutions

When uttering a sentence, a speaker is characteristically performing several acts. Searle distinguishes three distinct acts:

- (a) An utterance act, it brings forth of certain speech sounds, words and sentences.
- (b) A prepositional act refers to something or someone and predication some properties of that thing or person.
- (c) An illocutionary act invests the utterance with a communicative force of promise, statement of fact.

Searle stresses that the utterance act, the prepositional act and illocutionary act are not spatio-temporally discrete and independent acts but mutually interdependent sub-acts of the complete act, which are performed simultaneously. When one performs an illocutionary act, one characteristically performs prepositional act and utterance acts. Austin includes understanding in the 'happiness conditions' of illocutionary acts. An illocutionary act will not have been 'happily or successfully performed' unless a certain effect is achieved. An illocutionary act is 'happy' if in making his/her utterance the speaker achieves the effect that the listener understands the prepositional content of the utterance and the illocutionary force involved. When making an utterance the speaker can also bring about certain effects on the hearer, which is referred to as a perlocutionary act. As examples of perlocutionary acts Austin includes alarming, persuading, convincing deterring, misleading but also effects such as gratefulness, boredom, surprise, shock.

When Austin distinguishes between two types of acts, he states that whereas illocutionary acts can be achieved solely by conventional means, perlocutionary acts can be achieved by non-conventionalised means. He concludes by saying the characteristics of the

difference between illocutionary acts and perlocutionary acts lies in the speaker's hopes to achieve different sort of effects. Although he claims that a perlocutionary acts is 'happy' only if the desired effect on the listener is brought about. His main concern was the clarification of illocutionary acts and he left the notion of perlocutionary acts as a denominator to cover the most disparate and dissimilar consequences of the language.

Searle's distinction between the intended message and its intended goal reflects Austin's distinction between 'illocutionary' and perlocutionary acts and effects respectively. Illocutionary acts are conventionalised messages, which are intended to be understood or taken up by the listener if he considers them valid. According to Searle, a speaker performs illocutionary acts by expressing his/her intentions to promise something, to get somebody to do something, to assert something in such a way that the listener can recognize the speaker's intention. Perlocutionary acts, are not conventionalised in the same way. Whether the hearer is convinced, persuaded, insulted, deceived is recognisable only from his/her action pursuant to comprehension.

Criticism of Searle's Theory of Illocutionary Acts

Searle's theory of speech act has a great influence in pragmatics. Although Searle's theory of illocutionary acts is based on functional criteria, he takes 'the complete sentence' as the characteristic grammatical form of the illocutionary act. A speech act is a pragmatic unit referring to a stretch of speech with a communicative function and the speech act is considered the minimal unit of communication. There's been a distinction between sentence and utterance in order to distinguish between linguistic elements, which are context independent abstract notions, and structures actually produced in speech situations. Sentences are linguistic units consisting of formal elements while utterance are situated sentences.

The strength of Searle's speech act theory lies primarily in his success in establishing a taxonomy, at one time economical and finite, which successfully associates illocutionary types with typical functions. Searle builds his theory on logic of obligation and authority, which is not a universal social process. The speaker should have an authority over the hearer and the hearer should be under obligation to the speaker for the command to be performed in a felicitous way. Criticism has been directed at the claim that the conditions are universal. Conditions have been observed to vary with culture. Matsumoto (1988) as

quoted by Trosborg (1995) made an example of Japanese cultures, volition is reported to play a much less important role than in Western cultures instead status is the overriding factor and deceive importance is attached to 'discernment'.

It has been claimed by Reiss (1985) as quoted by Trosborg that a model of competence for producing and understanding speech act functions does not depend on an axiomatic definition of felicity conditions. He suggests that what Searle defines as felicity conditions are better accounted for as situational manifestations of a more global aspect of cognitive competence for perceiving action and interpersonal causality. As an argument in support of replacing felicity conditions with instrumental rationality Reiss puts forward the claim that when speakers communicate, they do not pay attention, they are not conscious of the felicity condition pertaining to the speech act in question instead they are concerned with obtaining their social goals. Recent criticism has been launched at Searle for failure to develop Austin's notion of perlocutionary and research has been directed at clarifying and developing the notion of these acts. Searle has also been criticised for neglecting the listener's role in the interaction. According to Searle, the conversation is reduced to flow of one-way traffic, in which the performance of perlocutionary acts always consists of using illocutions to bring about effects on the actions, thoughts, beliefs of the listener. The listener is deemed to play a purely passive role and no account is taken of the interactional aspect of language.

Communicative/ Interactive Purpose

"A theory of communicative acts should be able to account for the speaker's intentions and tacit assumptions on which a particular communicative act is based, just as it should describe the linguistic realization of these intentions" Trosborg (1995;21). He continues by saying the notion of perlocutionary acts has been largely disregarded by Searle, it has been some of concern to later researchers. The theory of perlocutions have been developed further by Eemeren-Grootendorst (1984) as quoted by Trosborg (1995). They agree on the fact that language users do not perform speech acts with the sole intention of making the listener to understand the speech acts they are performing, rather they attempt to elicit from the listener a particular response. They draw an important distinction between communicative and interactional aspects of language . Illocutions and perlocutions are regarded as two distinct aspects of the complete speech act, with the illocutionary act relating to the communicative aspect expressed in the attempt to achieve understanding

and the perlocutionary act relating to the interactional aspect expressed in the attempt to achieve acceptance.

Eemeren-Grootendorst (1984) as quoted by Trosborg (1995) introduces a terminological and conceptual distinction between inherent perlocutionary effects and consecutive perlocutionary consequences. Inherent perlocutionary effects consist exclusively of the acceptance of the speech act by the listener and consecutive perlocutionary consequences comprise all other consequences of the speech act. Inherent perlocutionary effects can be termed minimal effects while consecutive perlocutionary consequences are considered optimal effects. Consecutive perlocutionary consequences refer only to the consequences intended by the speaker. The point that Eemeren-Grootendorst is trying to make is that it is necessary to distinguish further between consequences, which occur accidentally, and effects that are intended by the speaker.

Towards An Interactional Framework of Illocutionary Acts

Trosborg (1995:22) says that if we accept perlocutionary effect as part of the speaker's intention when he/she performs a speech act, it means that the speaker not only want his/her act to be understood but he/she also wants to achieve the intended effect. Eemeren-Grootendorst involves the distinction between 'communicative aspects' and 'interactive aspects', the former covers 'illocution', illocutionary effect' and the latter 'perlocution', inherent perlocutionary effect and consecutive perlocutionary consequences. Illocutionary effect captures the distinction of securing the hearer's understanding and illocutionary acts are seen as communicative devices, which express an intended environmental effect beyond comprehension of the speech act.

Inherent perlocutionary effect refers to acceptance of the speech act attempting a subsequent action performed by the hearer. Consequent perlocutionary consequences refer to intended subsequent acts. The suggested framework outlined for requesting complaining and apologizing illustrating 'happy' illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. . When operating with intended perlocutionary effects, it becomes possible to regard these as part of speaker meaning, regardless of whether this effect is actually achieved. The speaker may express his/her desire for the hearer to leave without the hearer complying with the speaker's wishes, that is, regardless of the outcome of the request.

2.3 THOMAS (1995)

J.L. Austin is the person who is usually credited with generating interest in what has since come to be known as pragmatics. The most influential collection of his papers 'How to do things with words' was published after his death in 1962. There are four factors, which may explain why the influence of Austin's work has been so great. Firstly, coinciding as it did with a growing frustration within linguistics with the limitations of truth conditional semantics.

Secondly, Austin's writing is admirably clear and accessible. Thirdly, although over the years he refined and modified his ideas considerably, his work represents a consistent line thought. Finally, what continues to make the study of Austin's work so rewarding is that it foreshadows many of the issues, which are of major importance in pragmatics today.

2.3.1 Ordinary Language Philosophy

Austin means when he speaks of 'ordinary language philosophy' that ordinary people manage to communicate extremely effectively and relatively unproblematically with language just the way it is. He argued further by saying instead of striving to rid everyday language of its imperfections, we should try to understand how it is that people manage with it as well as they do. Truth conditional semantics are principally concerned with the properties of sentences, which could be evaluated in terms of truth or falsity. In order to know that the sentence is true or not you need to have a proof if you can. Unless a sentence can be proved, it cannot be judged to be true or false, but merely meaningless. For example:

Imoto engabonakaliyo yathi gqi esithubeni, yagila imoto yam yaza yaphela emehlweni.

An invisible car came out of nowhere, hit my car and vanished.

The above statement is false because there is no such thing, no car can come out from nowhere, more especially an invisible one.

Wonke umntu uyamcaphukela uKarabo kuba uyaziwa kakhulu.

Everyone hates Karabo because she is popular.

This statement is also false because there is no proof that everyone hates Karabo unless it is proved.

Ndilala ngalo lonke ixesha, gqirha.

I sleep all the time, doctor.

This statement is false because the person says to the doctor he/she sleeps all the time but by the time he/she is speaking to the doctor he/she is awake.

2.3.2 The Performative Hypothesis

It shows how Austin's ideas develop and it demonstrates neatly the distinction between a truth conditional approach to meaning and Austin's view of 'words as actions'. Performatives constitutes a very interesting subset of illocutionary verbs. Austin's first step in his book shows that some utterances have no truth conditions. He claims that they are not statements or questions but actions, a conclusion he reached through an analysis of what he termed 'performative verbs'.

Ndiqhuba imoto emhlophe.

I drive a white car.

Ndiyaxengxeza.

I apologize.

Le nqanawa ndiyibiza ngokuba yi-The Albatross.

I name this ship The Albatross.

Ndidlala nge-R5 kuza kunetha.

I bet you R5 it will rain.

Four above sentences are similar in the sense that in the first person, declarative rather than interrogative. They are Indicative, active rather than passive and they are all simple

present tense. The first sentence is different from the other three. It is a statement, it is a simple matter to establish empirically whether or not the statement is true. The contradiction came when the person claim by saying he is driving a white car.

Other sentences, it is not easy to say they are true because their verbs do not make statements that can be judged as true or false but they belong to performatives in which according to Austin cannot be judged true or false but are understood as 'performing an action'.

One useful test for a performative verb is to see whether you can meaningfully insert the adverb 'hereby' between subject and verb. For example:

Ngenxa yoko ndiyangxengxeza.

I hereby apologize.

Ngenxa yoko le nqanawa ndiyibiza ngokuba yi-The Albatross.

I hereby name this ship The Albatross.

but not : **Ngenxa yoko ndiqhuba imoto emhlophe.**

I hereby drive a white car.

There are four performative of Austin:

Metalinguistic Performatives

They are self-referential like all performatives. This means that the verb refers to what the speaker of the utterance is doing. they are self-verifying, that is, they contain their own truth conditions and non-falsifiable, they can never be untrue. For example:

(a) **Ndithi Ndiyasirhoxisa isikhalazo sam.**

I say I withdraw my complaint.

(b) **Ndiyasirhoxisa isikhalazo sam.**

I withdraw my complaint.

Sentence a) is different from sentence b). The first sentence has truth conditions. The second sentence is self-verifying, all the speaker is doing is making a statement about what is he/she is saying. All performatives are self-verifying, there is no difference between metalinguistic performatives and the rest. Metalinguistic performative as well as always being true are always felicitous or successful. They do not depend on any external conditions for their success.

Ritual Performatives including Felicity Condition

The same automatic of successful does not apply to ritual performatives or to collaborative performatives. Austin observed that although it would make no sense to respond to such an act of renaming by saying 'That's not true', it would be perfectly reasonable to say 'you have no right to do that'. Austin observes that although performatives are not subject to truth conditions, they can go wrong. Therefore, if the 'felicity conditions' are not observed, the performative may be infelicitous, that means they will be unsuccessful. Felicity conditions apply particularly to performatives associated with various rituals or very formal events. Ritual performatives are highly cultural dependent.

Ndikugweba iminyaka elishumi.

I sentence you to ten years.

Ndiyakubhabhatiza egameni

I baptize you in the name.....

All these sentences can only be appropriate and successful if they are uttered by a specified person in a specified situation for examples; by law courts or by priest.

Felicity Conditions

Austin stated his felicity conditions like this;

CONDITION A

- (i) There must be a conventional procedure having a conventional effect. In a given culture there will be a conventional procedure for a couple to get married looking in the first sentence above. The couple should undergo through specified form of

marriage, two witnesses in an authorised place should accompany them. If that procedure is not followed, the marriage is invalid unless certain declarations are made and certain words are spoken. It would be seen as invalid if the minister is not properly authorised.

- (ii) The circumstances and persons must be appropriate. If the person performs a ceremony of which is not authorised to do or time and place are not appropriate, therefore that performative fails or may be unsuccessful.

CONDITION B

- i) The procedure must be executed. For example:

Umfundisi: Uyamthatha na lo mfazi ukuba abe ngumfazi wakho omtshatileyo ngokusemthethweni?

Priest: Will you take this woman to be your lawful wedded wife?

Umyeni: Ngokuqinisekileyo!! Gxebe, ndiyakwenjenjalo.

Groom: Absolutely!! I mean, I will.

Words are supposed to be said correctly the way they should be, not something which means the same as 'I will'.

- ii) The procedure must be executed completely. The couple must sign immediately after they got married so that the procedure will be complete. If it is not finished the marriage will be seen as illegal.

CONDITION C

- i) This is one of the more problematic of Austin's felicity conditions and one about which people tend to disagree.

The persons must have the requisite thoughts, feelings and intentions. It applies to cases where one party has been forced to marry or sign under duress. Then may be after some time a person may come into senses and claim that he was under duress.

- ii) If consequent conduct is specified, then the relevant parties must do it.

It is hard to find many convincing examples where subsequent conduct is specified. 'Subsequent Conduct' in the case of marriage would be that the marriage must be perfect. If the condition is not met, therefore, marriage will be legally ended.

Explicit Reference to Felicity Conditions

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

2.3.3 Collaborative Performatives

Some writers especially Hancher 1979 as quoted by Thomas (1995) have observed that some performatives do not have felicity conditions in the sense that a specified person must utter the words in particular circumstances but their success is not guaranteed. Their success required, the 'collaboration' or particular uptake of another person. For example:

USipho wathembisa ukudlala ngemali engama-R200 no Themba kuba esithi uMzantsi Afrika uza kuyiphumelela indebe yehlabathi, kodwa isilumko esinguThemba asizange sivume ukudlala ngemali.

Sipho bet with the amount of R200 to Themba saying that South Africa will win the World Cup but Themba refuses to bet with money.

It is clear that a successfulness of a bet depends on the other person if he accepts the challenge.

2.3.4 Group Performatives

It is a situation where more than one person performs it. For example, a report from a summit conference. Group performatives fall into any of the three preceding categories, that is, group metalinguistic, ritual and collaborative performative. In-group performatives, you do things as a group. You also speak on behalf of the group. For example:

Asikufumani unetyala lokuziphatha kakubi emsebenzini.

We do not judge you to be guilty of professional misconduct.

2.3.5 Collapse of Austin's Performative hypothesis

The grammatical distinctiveness of performatives. Austin discovered that the grammatical basis on which he had initially tried to distinguish between performatives and other sorts of utterances could be sustained. Performatives can be plural as well spoken. For example:

Ngenxa yoko ndiyarhoxa njengentloko yabasebenzi kuMongameli waseMzansti Afrika, Ngembeko Owakho, M.Manjiya

I hereby resign as a chief of workers to the President of South Africa. Respectfully,
Yours, M.Manjiya.

Do performatives always Performs Actions?

Ndiyathembisa ukuba ndiyakufika apho ndikubethe ukuba akuthuli!

I promise, I'll come over there and hit you if you don't shut up!

The utterance certainly performs an action but not the one specified by the performative verb. If it is out of context, it is difficult to see how this could be taken.

How to do things without performative verbs?

The most important reason for the collapse of Austin's performative hypothesis was the realization that Austin had equated 'doing things with words' with the existence of a corresponding performative verb. This is a mistake because there is many acts performed using language where it would be impossible to use a performative verb. It is said that English has no performative verbs, it performs action by means of language.

Austin briefly introduced a distinction between explicit performatives and implicit performatives. An explicit performative allows the speaker to remove any possibility of misunderstanding the force behind an utterance. For example:

Notice on the door of a second-hand furniture shop. The last element had been added in handwriting in very large letters;

BARGAIN TRADE SHOP

SERIOUS ENQUIRIES ONLY

PLEASE RING THE BELL FOR SERVICES

The performatives form would only seem to be necessary in a situation where there seems to be a degree of doubt in the mind of the other person. A speaker will first try an implicit performative and move onto an explicit performative if the first attempt is successful.

2.3.6 Illocutionary Force

Austin made a three-fold distinction;

Locution: the actual words uttered.

Illocutionary: the force or intention behind the words.

Perlocution: the effect of the allocution on the hearer.

It's very stuffy here (locution), meaning: I want some fresh air! (illocution) and the perlocutionary effect might be that someone opens the window.

Speech Act

Austin used the term 'speech act' to refer to an utterance and the total situation in which the utterance is issued. But now the term is used to mean the same as 'illocutionary act'. You will find the terms speech acts, illocutionary act, illocutionary force, pragmatic force or just force, all used to mean the same thing although the use of one rather than another may imply different theoretical positions. Some words can be used to perform different speech acts, so different words can be used to perform the same speech acts. Look at the following utterances, which show different ways of performing the speech act of requesting someone to close the door:

Vala ucango!

Close the door!

Awunakuvala ucango?

Could you shut the door?

Ulilibele na ucango?

Have you forget the door?

2.3.7 J.R. Searle

John Searle distinguishes between 'prepositional content' and 'illocutionary force'. He proposes a detailed classification of the major categories of speech acts. He points out the necessity of taking into account in the analysis of a speech act the social institution within which it was produced. Thomas' concern in the aspects of Searle's work is two of his early contributions to work in pragmatics: Theory of Indirect speech acts.

Indirect Speech Acts

According to Searle's terms, an indirect speech act is one performed by means of another. However, all speech acts except explicit performatives are, as Austin and Grice demonstrated, indirect to some degree and are performed by means of another speech act. Searle's (1979) as quoted by Thomas (1995) account of how to calculate the meaning of indirect speech acts is so similar to Grice's method for getting from 'what is said' to 'what is meant' that it would be tedious to rehearse the argument here.

Searle's conditions of speech acts

Where Grice put forward a series of maxims and principles to explain how a speech act 'works', Searle establishes a set of rules. Searle attempted to systematize and formalize Austin's work. For example:

Ndiyakuthembisa ukuba ukhe washukuma ndakuchith'ubuchopho!

I promise if you move I'll shoot you!

Although this utterance contains a performative verb and which performs action, the action it performs is not the one specified by the speech act verb (promise); instead it is a threat. Searle set out a series of conditions, which should exclude such anomalous utterances from the category of promising. Searle's rules for promising are as follows:

Prepositional act

Preparatory Condition

Sincerity Condition

Essential Condition

He offers further eight examples of rules for speech acts: requesting, asserting, questioning, thanking, advising, warning, greeting and congratulating. Four interrelated sets of problems arises from this work;

- It is not always possible to distinguish fully between one speech act to another.
- If we attempt to plug all the gaps in Searle's rules we end up with a hopelessly complex collection of ad hoc conditions.
- The conditions specified by Searle may exclude perfectly normal instances of a speech act but permit anomalous uses.
- The same speech act verb may cover a ranger of slightly different phenomena and some speech acts 'overlap' Searle's rule take no account of this (p.95).

Distinguishing Speech Acts

Thomas points out clearly that it is not always possible to use Searle's rules to distinguish among speech acts, which although in some sense 'related' to one another are by no means interchangeable. Thomas refers to some speech acts as being 'related' in the sense that they share certain key features. For example, ask, request, order, command, suggest are all typically involve an attempt by the speaker to bring about an action on the part of the hearer. Searle notes that in order to distinguish order or command from request it is necessary to introduce some additional preparatory rules.

Searle's additional preparatory rule in fact applies to many other speech acts; an understanding of the nature of the power relationship which obtain between speaker and hearer in order to interpret the illocutionary force of many utterances. Even with the additional preparatory condition, Searle 's rules can only cope with the most stereotypical uses of order and command, where the power relationship between the interacts is contested, there is no guarantee that the order/command will be successful. Many of Searle's sets of conditions could apply to any number of speech acts and it is difficult to see what additional preparatory could be introduced to distinguish request unproblematically from invite, demand, many uses of ask or question from examine, inquire or quiz or task even though most native speakers intuitively recognize that these speech act are different from one another in important respects.

In the case of other speech acts, it is only the essential condition which distinguishes one speech act from another, totally unrelated one. Congratulate could only be distinguished from complement by modifying the essential condition. There were some criticisms that come out of Searle's rules;

Searle's rules fail to distinguish between the speech acts and that they cover only paradigm cases of speech acts. The fact that Searle's rules fail to capture the nuances of even the commonest of speech acts does not in itself provide grounds for dismissing a rule-governed approach: it could simply be an argument for improving those rules. Searle claims to be setting out rules for speech acts, but all he is doing is describing the semantics of speech acts verbs. The question, which concerns us here, is whether it is possible to extend Searle's conditions to cover at least some of the subtleties of a speech act. Thomas (1995;99).

Searle's formal approach to the categorization of Speech Acts

In real-time interaction we take account of more than just formal criteria. If we look at one example whereby one participant fails to tell the whole truth and consider whether or not we would wish to classify the key speech act a slaying on what basis such a judgement would be made. There are certain contexts in which we do not expect the truth to be told: satirical comedy and funeral oration are two context in which we do not generally expect to hear the whole, unvarnished truth. There are some culturally specific situations in which the whole truth is not expected. Lastly, there are times when the speaker does not tell the whole truth in order to avoid hurting the hearer's feelings.

Coleman and Kay (1981) as quoted by Thomas (1995) show that people's reasons for classifying something as a lie or not a lie are extremely complex. We take account of formal considerations but also of functional, psychological and effective factors. Sometimes the way in which we classify a speech act may be influenced by considerations, which are culturally specific, or context-specific or which relate to the speaker's goal in speaking in a particular way. We see then that a whole constellation of features contributes to the way in which participants in interaction classify a speech act. Searle's rules are capable of coping only with the most typical or central instances of a speech act and fail to distinguish adequately between one speech act and another.

In reality, the reason for classifying a speech act in a particular way is complex and it is impossible to assign a speech act to a clear-cut category. Thomas argues that it is extremely difficult if not impossible to devise rules which capture satisfactorily the complexity of speech acts: too many different criteria and different types of criteria are involved. Thomas also argues on the fact that it is necessary to recognise that speech acts can never be satisfactorily characterised in terms of rules but are better described in terms of principles.

2.4 YULE (1996)

2.4.1 Speech acts and events

People do not produce utterances containing grammatical structures and words in attempting to express themselves, they perform actions via those utterances. Actions that are being performed via utterances are called speech acts in English and they are commonly known as apology, complaint, complement, invitation, promise or request. These different kinds of speech acts apply to the speaker's communicative intention in producing an utterance. The speaker expects that his/her communicative intention will be recognised by the hearer. Both speaker and hearer are usually helped in this process by the circumstances surrounding the utterance. These circumstances are called the speech event. It is the nature of the speech event that determines the interpretation of an utterance as performing a particular speech act.

2.4.2 Speech Acts

The action performed by producing an utterance will consist of three related acts. The first one is the Locutionary act, which is the basic of utterance or producing a meaningful linguistic expression. If a person has difficulty with actually forming the sounds and words to create a meaningful utterance in a language then that particular person fail to produce a locutionary act. The second dimension is the illocutionary act, which is performed via the communicative force of an utterance. This is also generally known as illocutionary force. The third dimension is the perlocutionary act, which simply creates an utterance with a function without intending it to have an effect. This is also known as the perlocutionary effect. Out of these three dimensions, the most discussed is illocutionary force. The term 'speech act' is generally interpreted quite narrowly to mean only the illocutionary force of an utterance. The illocutionary force of an utterance is what it 'counts as'.

2.4.3 Illocutionary force indicating device (IFID)

It is an expression where there is a slot for a verb that explicitly names the illocutionary act being performed. This verb can be called a performative verb (Vp). Speakers do not always 'perform' their speech acts so explicitly but they sometimes describe the speech act being performed. Other IFIDs, which can be identified, are word order, stress and intonation. While other devices such as lowered voice quality for warning or a threat might be used to indicate illocutionary force, the utterance also has to be produced under certain conventional conditions to count as having the intended illocutionary force.

2.4.4 Felicity conditions

There are certain expected or appropriate circumstances, technically known as felicity conditions for the performance of a speech act to be recognised as intended. The performance will be infelicitous if the speaker is not a specific person in a special context. There are also preconditions on speech acts. There are general conditions on the participants that they can understand the language being used and that they are not play-acting or being nonsensical.

Content Conditions, for both promise and warning, the content of the utterance must be about a future event. A further content condition for promise requires that the future event will be a future act of the speaker.

The Preparatory Conditions for the promise are significantly different from those for a warning. For a promise, there are two preparatory; first, the event will not happen by itself. Second, the event will have a beneficial effect. For a warning, it is not clear that the hearer knows the event will occur, the speaker does think the event will occur and the event will not have a beneficial effect.

Sincerity Condition, for a promise, the speaker intends to carry out the future action. For a warning, the speaker genuinely believes that the future event will not have a beneficial effect.

Essential Condition which covers the fact that the act of uttering a promise Yule (1996) intends to create an obligation to carry out the action as promised. This means that the

utterance changes his state from non-obligation to obligation. For warning, the utterance changes his state from non-informing to a bad future event to informing.

Essential condition combines with a specification of what must be in the utterance content, the context and the speaker's intentions in order for a specific speech act to be appropriately performed.

2.4.5 The performative hypothesis

Performative hypothesis is one way to think about the speech acts being performed via utterances is to assume that underlying every utterance (u) there is a clause containing a performative verb (Vp), which makes the illocutionary force explicit. In this clause, the subject must be first person singular (I) followed by the adverb 'hereby', indicating that the utterance 'count as' and action by being uttered. The underlying clause will make explicit. The performative verb (Vp) will be in the present tense and an indirect object in second person singular.

The advantage of this type of analysis is that it makes clear just what elements are involved in the production and interpretation of utterances. Another advantage is to show that some adverbs such as 'honestly' or adverbial clauses such as 'because I may be late'. There are some technical disadvantages to the performative version of a command has much more serious impact than uttering the implicit version. It is also difficult to know exactly what the performative verb or verbs might be for some utterances.

2.4.6 Speech act classification

There are five types of general functions performed by speech acts; declarations, representatives, expressives, directives and commissives. Declarations are those kinds of speech acts that change the world via their utterance. The speaker has to have a special institutional role in a specific context, in order to perform a declaration appropriately. The speaker changes the world via words.

Representatives are those kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker believes to be the case or not. Statements of fact, assertions, conclusions and descriptions are all

examples of the speaker representing the world as he/she believes it is. The speaker makes words fit the world of belief.

Expressives are those kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker feels. They express psychological state and can be statements of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy or sorrow. In using an expressive, the speaker makes words fit the world of feeling.

Directives are those kinds of speech acts that speakers use to get someone else to do something. They express what the speaker wants. They are commands, orders, requests, suggestions and they can be positive or negative. Using a directive, the speaker attempts to make the world fit the words (via the hearer).

Commissives are those kinds of speech acts that speakers use to commit themselves to some future action. They express what the speaker intends. They are promise, the speaker can perform threats, refusals, pledges and them alone or by the speaker as a member of a group. Using a commissive, the speaker undertakes to make the world fit the words via the speaker.

2.4.7 Direct and indirect speech acts

A different approach to distinguishing types of speech acts can be made on the basis of structure, There is a recognised relationship between the three structural forms which are declarative, interrogative and imperative and the three general communicative functions (statement, question and a command/ request).

Examples: a) Close the door please. (declarative)
b) Will you close the door please. (question)
c) Close the door!! (imperative)

Whenever there is a relationship between a structure and a function, we have a direct speech act. Whenever there is an indirect relationship between a structure and a function therefore, we have an indirect speech acts.

A declarative that is used to make a statement is a direct speech act but when a declarative used to make a request is known to be an indirect speech act. Indirect speech

acts are generally associated with greater politeness in English and even in Xhosa than direct speech acts.

2.4.8 Speech events

A speech event is an activity in which participants interact via language in some conventional way to arrive at some outcome. It includes an obvious central speech act such as 'I don't really like this' as in a speech event of 'complaining' but it will also include other utterances leading up to and subsequently reacting to that central action. The analysis of speech events is clearly another way of studying how more gets communicated than is said.

The usefulness of speech act analysis is in illustrating the kinds of things we can do with words and identifying some of the conventional utterance forms we use to perform specific actions.

2.5 POLITENESS THEORY

2.5.1 Trosborg (1995)

According to Trosborg (1995,24), politeness is a pragmatic mechanism in which a variety of structures including non-verbal and prosodic features work together according to the speaker's intention of achieving smooth communication. Politeness has been of concern to a number of linguists and principles of politeness have been presented notably by Lakoff (1975), quoted by Trosborg (1995). It is said that Grice's maxims of conversation and Searle's theory of speech acts are based on Western philosophical tradition. An issue in question is the balancing of rules of clarity and rules of politeness. When Grice is formulating his 'cooperative principle' pointed to four Kantian maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner as being particularly important for the purpose of conversational exchanges.

Lakoff sees politeness as being in conflict with the Gricean conversational maxims. She points to politeness as having been developed in societies in order to reduce friction in personal interaction. Mitigation strategies are incorporated for the sake of politeness even though they may be opposition to less polite clarity processes. Leech also developed his theory to compensate for what he thinks is an important missing link between the Gricean

cooperative principle and the problem of how to relate sense of force. Leech accepts the cooperative principle unuttered but adds a politeness principle with six sub-maxims as a necessary compliment, which rescues the cooperative principle from serious trouble. Leech felt it was necessary to set up his principle of politeness to account for language usage in which the maxims of Grice's cooperative principle are flouted for reasons of social interaction. Both Grice and Leech's theories have been criticized for neglecting certain types of verbal interaction. Uncooperativeness as well as lack of politeness must be accounted for.

Sperber, as quoted by Trosborg (1995), introduces the principle of relevance, which they claim to be at one time more explicit and more general in its applicability than the cooperative principle as formulated by Grice. The advantage of their model is that they make no claim to speakers being cooperative, polite, and optimally relevant. Relevance theory does not make predictions as to whether more polite or less polite behaviour is more likely in a given situation but it can explain a less direct formulation may be more relevant than a direct one. The strength of relevance theory seems to lie in its simplicity of adhering to a single principle governed by a process of logical reasoning.

The notion of face

Brown and Levinson based their claims on 'face' and 'rationality' and presents their theory of linguistic politeness in terms of two major categories of positive politeness and negative politeness. Goffman introduced the notion of face and Brown-Levinson further developed it. The notion ties in with the English folk term of 'losing face' in the sense of being embarrassed or humiliated, it acknowledges politeness as ritual and maintaining 'face' in interaction is the central element in commonly accepted notions of politeness.

Negative face: the want of every 'competent adult member' that his actions be unimpeded by others.

Positive face: the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others.

Goffman points out that a speaker is oriented towards both his/her own and his/her interlocutor's face exhibiting a defensive orientation towards saving his/her own face and a

protective orientation towards saving that of the interlocutor's. Face is emotionally determined and can be lost, maintained or enhanced and must be constantly attended to in interaction. People can be expected to defend their faces and when defending their own faces they are likely to threaten other people's faces in turn.

Some speech acts intrinsically threaten face, these acts are referred to as 'face threatening acts'. The notion of face and the idea of 'face-work' have been used by Brown and Levinson to set up a basic model for the linguistic description of verbal politeness. Politeness can then be defined as a desire to protect self-images. A speaker must show awareness of the hearer's face and self-image and of his or her own and exhibit a desire to protect those self-images through various strategies. In order to achieve smooth and successful communication, the participants in an interaction should be concerned continually with maintaining each other's face. Politeness has typically been conceived of as a polarity system attending to the addressee's positive or negative face. Negative politeness strategies are often given priority in research resulting in a view of politeness close to fuzziness and indirectness.

Criticism of Brown-Levinson's theory

Brown and Levinson has been criticized for being unable to avoid an ethnocentric bias towards Western languages and the Western perspective. It has been pointed out that the notion of face is much more complicated and culture dependent than claimed by Brown and Levinson. The concept of face plays a much smaller role in their cultures besides it is different. The use of formal forms is inherently dependent upon the speaker's observation of the social conventions of the society of which he/she is a member. Utterances, which are not face threatening, the speaker is forced to make a choice among the variants with or without honorific, according to the formality of the setting and the relationship between the participants. It is important to broaden our perspective beyond the Western linguistic tradition in order to achieve a theory of politeness, which can be claimed to be truly universal. A number of researchers are working on this issue.

Politeness and illocutionary functions

Leech (1993) as quoted by Trosborg (1995) proposes a classification of illocutionary functions according to the notion of politeness. He points out that different types of

situation call for different degree of politeness and attempts a classification according to how illocutionary functions relate to the social goal of maintaining comity. He distinguishes the following four types: the competitive, the convivial, the collaborative and the conflictive functions. The competitive type of functions involves acts in which the illocutionary goal competes with the social goal. For example, ordering, asking, demanding, begging. Politeness is demanded to reduce the discord, which lies implicitly in the competition between the speaker's desire and what is considered 'good manners'. Negative politeness as specified by Brown and Levinson, is demanded to mitigate the intrinsic discourtesy of the goal. This corresponds to Searle's category of directive functions. The convivial class of functions involves acts in which the illocutionary goal coincides with the social group. For example, offering, inviting, greeting, thanking, congratulating. These acts are intrinsically polite and take the form of positive politeness seeking opportunities for comity. This category relates to part of Searle's class of expressives. The collaborative function involves acts where the illocutionary goal is indifferent to the social goal, for example, asserting, reporting, announcing, and instructing. These acts are considered neutral with regard to politeness. The class of declarations are also neutral with regard to politeness. The final category of conflictive functions refers to acts in which the illocutionary goal conflicts with the social goal. For example, threatening, accusing, cursing, reprimanding. These acts are intrinsically impolite as by their very nature they are designed to cause offence.

The above classification refers to the inherent politeness level in a given communicative act and has been referred to as 'absolute politeness'. Haverkate (1988) as quoted by Trosborg (1995) proposed similar classification as the above. He distinguishes between polite and non-polite acts, the latter involve acts, which can be characterized as neutral, non-polite and impolite speech acts. Polite speech acts largely correspond to Leech's category of convivial functions and the neutral category corresponding to the collaborative function described by Leech. Directives are considered non-polite acts whereas expressives relating to the addressee in a negative way are classified as being intrinsically impolite. Lakoff classified three-fold of politeness; polite, non-polite and rude. Non-polite behaviour is behaviour that does not conform to politeness rules and it occurs appropriately in situations in which politeness is not expected. Behaviour is considered rude if it does not utilize politeness strategy where these would be expected and the utterance can plausibly be interpreted as intentionally and negatively confrontational. Polite are those utterances, which adhere to rules of politeness whether or not these are

expected in a particular type of discourse. Lakoff seems to base her three-fold distinction on behaviour patterns. That is, the way a communicative act is realised in a given situation. It is argued that both ways of classifying seem necessary in that intrinsically polite act like the act of thanking can be realized in a impolite act such as complaining can be softened to diminish discord in discourse.

Temporal and personal deixis

Fraser (1978), as quoted by Trosborg (1995) define politeness in terms of the parties rights and obligations based on their social relationship which are negotiated in a 'conventional contract' between speaker and hearer who must adjust and readjust the conversation to adapt to the ongoing perception of those rights and obligations. This is Koike's view as quoted by Trosborg. Koike (1989) has taken up Rauh's suggestion that shifting from the deictic center of orientation may account for varying pragmatic effects such as the expression of degrees of politeness.

The greater the distance from the deictic center, be it temporal or personal dimensions, the greater the degree of politeness and the lesser the degree of illocutionary force. Politeness can be traced to the formulation of the request in such a way as to distance the proposition of the utterance in verb tense and second-person reference from the speaker's deistic center. Use of the conditional form in polite requests is explained in relation to the present tense frame of the speaker's moment of speaking. In conclusion, all languages must be seen as operating within politeness parameters. The importance is the realization of the illocutionary force of a given speech act adjusted to the appropriate level of politeness when taking into account the context of the situation and the given sender/ receiver role constellation.

2.5.2 THOMAS (1995)

It is said that within pragmatics there has been a great deal of interest in 'politeness', to such an extent that politeness theory could almost be seen as a sub-discipline of pragmatics. People are using the same terms in very different ways, they are operating with different definitions of 'politeness' and are talking at cross-purposes.

Delimiting the concept of politeness

Thomas says that within the vast literature on politeness, which has built up since the late 1970 is some tremendous confusion. Thomas highlighted that the confusion begins with the very term 'politeness', which like cooperation has caused much misunderstanding. Under the heading of politeness, five separate though they are related, sets of phenomena have been discussed;

Politeness as a Real-World Goal

Politeness as a real-world goal has no place within pragmatics. We can have no access to speaker's real motivation for speaking as they do, and discussions as to whether one group of people is 'politer' than another in the sense of genuinely behaving better to other people than do other groups, are ultimately futile. Politeness is frequently confused with deference/register.

Deference vs. Politeness

Deference is frequently equated with politeness, particularly in discussions of Japanese. (Thomas 1995;150).

Thomas continues by saying deference is connected with politeness but is a distinct phenomenon. It is the opposite of familiarity. It refers to the respect we show to other people by virtue of their higher status, greater age and so on. Politeness is a more general matter of showing consideration to others rather than giving the appearance of showing. Both deference and politeness can be manifested through general social behaviour in which we can show deference by standing up when a person of superior status, for example, a Judge in Court enter the room or show politeness by holding a door open to allow someone to pass through as well as by linguistic means.

Register

Lyons (1977) as quoted by Thomas says the register refers to 'systematic variation in relation to social context' or the way in which the language we speak or write varies according to the type of situation, this is Halliday's view. Thomas says register has little to

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

Politeness as an Utterance Level Phenomenon

In this section politeness cannot be assess reliably out of context. it is not the linguistic form, alone which renders the speech act polite or impolite but the linguistic form, the context of utterance and the relationship between the speaker and the hearer.

Politeness as a Pragmatic Phenomenon

Quoted by Thomas (1995), Leech, Brown and Levinson has focused on politeness as a pragmatic phenomenon. In theses writings politeness is interpreted as a strategy employed by a speaker to achieve a variety of goals such as promoting or maintaining harmonious relations. These strategies may include the strategic use of the conventional politeness strategies discussed but also include a range of other strategies including many forms of conventional and non-conventional indirectness.

Politeness and the management of face

Brown-Levinson (1978), as quoted by Thomas (1995) put forward the most influential theory of politeness, which is central to the concept of 'face'. The term 'face' in the sense of 'reputation' seems to have been first used in English in 1876 as a translation of the Chinese. Since then it has been used widely in phrases such as 'loosing face' or 'saving face'. Goffman (1967;5) as quoted by Thomas (1995) defines face as an image of self-delineated in terms of approved social attributes-albeit an image that others may share, as when a person makes a good showing for his profession or religion by making a good showing for himself. Thomas points out clearly that within politeness theory, face is best understood as every individual's feeling of self-worth or self-image. This image can be damaged, maintained or enhanced through interaction with others. He further says 'face'

has two aspects, 'positive and negative aspects'. An individual's positive face is reflected in his/her desire to be liked, approved of, respected and appreciated by others. An individual's negative face is reflected in the desire not to be impeded or put upon to have the freedom to act as one chooses.(p.169)

Face-threatening acts

Certain illocutionary acts according to Brown and Levinson are liable to damage or threaten another person's face: those acts are known as 'face-threatening acts'(FTA's). An illocutionary act according to Thomas (1995) has the potential to damage the hearer's positive face or a hearer's negative face. Sometimes the illocutionary act may potentially damage the speaker's own positive face or speaker's negative face. In order to reduce the possibility of damage to the hearer or the speaker's own face, he/she may adopt certain strategies.

Superstrategies For Performing Face-Threatening Acts

The first decision to be made by Brown and Levinson is whether to perform the FTA or not. If the speaker does not decide to perform the FTA, there are four possibilities: three sets of 'on-record' superstrategies. If the speaker decides that the degree of face threat is too great, he/she may decide to avoid the FTA altogether.

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

There are occasion when external factors constrain an individual to speak very directly. Like for instance, when there is an emergency or where there is a major time constraint like making an international telephone call or where there is some form of channel limitation like speaking on a field telephone.

Performing an FTA with redress (Positive Politeness)

In Brown and Levinson's theory, when you speak to someone you may orient yourself towards that individual's positive face and employ positive politeness. Brown and Levinson has a list of fifteen positive politeness strategies giving copious illustrations from many different languages. Thomas discusses that a number of Brown and Levinson's positive

politeness principles; 'seek agreement', 'avoid disagreement', 'be optimistic', 'give sympathy'.

Performing an FTA with redress (Negative Politeness)

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

Performing an FTA using off-record politeness

There are fifteen strategies for performing off-record politeness that have been listed by Brown and Levinson. These include; 'give hints', 'use metaphors', 'be ambiguous or vague'.

Do Not Perform FTA

This final strategy appears to be self-explanatory because there are times when something is potentially so face threatening and that you don't say it. Thomas says Brown-Levinson did not discuss this strategy but there is a lot to say about saying nothing. Tanaka also quoted by Thomas discusses two sorts of 'saying nothing'. She uses the term 'opting out choice'(OOC-genuine) and 'opting out choice'(OOC-Strategic). In OOC-genuine the speaker does not perform a speech act and genuinely intends to let the matter remain closed. She/he does not intend to achieve the perlocutionary effect. In OOC-Strategic: the speaker does not perform a speech act but expects A to infer his/her wish to achieve the perlocutionary effect. The third situation is where there is a strong expectation that something will be said that saying nothing is in itself a massive FTA.

Criticism of Brown and Levinson

Brown and Levinson's theory has been very widely discussed and influential. But there is a number of criticism that had been made of their model of politeness. The description of the FTA implies that an act is threatening to the face of either the speaker or the hearer but in many acts can be seen to threaten the face of both speaker and the hearer

simultaneously. An example of an apology has been presented whereby it threatens the speaker's face in an obvious way but it can also be the source of considerable embarrassment to the hearer. Brown and Levinson claim that positive and negative politeness is mutually exclusive. A single utterance can be oriented to both positive and negative face simultaneously. Brown and Levinson's model appears to predict that the greater the degree of face-threat the greater will be the degree of indirectness. They also argue that some speech acts are inherently face threatening. From these two observations it might be concluded that some utterances pose no face threats at all.

Politeness is viewed as a conversational contract. Conversational contract (CC) is defined by Fraser (1990) as quoted by Thomas (1995) as the understanding which people bring to an interaction of the norms obtaining within that interaction and of their rights and obligations within it. Fraser takes a more sociolinguistic approach to politeness than Leech or Brown and Levinson do. People employ the degree of politeness required by the event or situation in which they find themselves. He finds model of politeness very sketchy and it is difficult to judge how it might operate in practice. Politeness measured along pragmatic scales Spencer-Oatey also quoted by Thomas (1995) argues that the way Brown and Levinson and Leech formulated their theories of politeness left them open to being criticized on the grounds that they are culturally biased. Spencer-Oatey proposes sets of dimension in order to overcome the problem of cultural specificity. She suggests that all research on politeness can be summarised in terms of these three sets of dimension: individuals will select the point on scale according to their cultural values and the situation within which they are operating Spencer-Oatey's scales are as follows;

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------|
| (a) Need for consideration: | autonomy | - | imposition |
| (b) Need to be Valued: | approbation | - | criticism |
| | interest/concern | - | disinterest |
| (c) Need for Relational Identity: | inclusion | - | exclusion |
| | equality | - | superordination |
| | | | subordination |

CHAPTER 3

THE SPEECH ACT OF COMPLAINING

3.1 AIM

The aim of this chapter is to establish the speech act of complaining and directness levels of complaints, which are being discussed by Trosborg (1995); Drew (1998) and Boxer (1993 a+b).

3.2 THE COMPLAINT

3.2.1 Trosborg (1995)

The speech act complaint belongs to the category expressive functions, which includes moral judgements, which express the speaker's approval as well as disapproval of the behaviour in the judgement. Moral censure or blame are also involved in the communicative act of complaining. In a complaint, the events described in the proposition took place in the past. The act of complaining is in essence retrospective in that a speaker passes a moral judgement on something, which he/she believes the complainer has already done or failed to do, or is in the process of doing.

The complaint as an abusive act

Trosborg (1995:311) defines a complaint as an illocutionary act in which the speaker expresses his/her disapproval or negative feelings towards the state of affairs described in the proposition, that is, the complainable (something that one complains about) and for which he/she holds the hearer responsible either directly or indirectly.

Leech as quoted by Trosborg defines complaint, as a representative of the conflictive function, which includes acts of threatening, accusing, cursing and reprimanding. These acts are designed to cause offence and they are also highly threatening to the social relationship between the speaker and the hearer.

The complaint as a face-threatening act

Brown-Levinson (1978:19) as quoted by Trosborg (1975:312) states that a complaint is a 'face-threatening'. Place (1986) also quoted by Trosborg (1975) points out that the act of moral censure or blame is an act of social rejection – an act whereby the accuser breaks ties of affection, mutual support and co-operation.

Edmondson-House (1981,145) also quoted by Trosborg (1975) states that in making a complaint a speaker potentially disputes, challenges or bluntly denies social competence of the complainer. He continues by saying the complaint is justified in so far as the complainer has already flouted this maxim in committing a social offence, which constitutes grounds for the complaint. The complainer must also accept that he/she in his/her behaviour has damaged or denied the social standing of the complainer.

The non-politeness of complaints

Complaints are non-polite by definition; causing offence is part of the conflictive functions. As quoted by Trosborg, Leech argues that 'politeness is out of the question' and to threaten or curse someone in a polite manner is virtually a contradiction in terms.

Mitigating devices

A number of strategies are available to a complainer who wants to avoid a direct confrontation with the complainer. The degree of involvement of the complainer and the complainer specified in an act of moral censure is decisive in establishing a scale of indirectness levels of complaints. A complainer may focus on the undesirable event and the ill consequences in which according to his/her point of view follow from the complainable and leave out the agent.

Certain types of internal modifiers 'downgraders' play down the impact a complaint is likely to have on the accused and by including these in a complaint, it is possible to make it sound more polite.

The inclusion of 'upgraders' has the opposite effect: it increases the impact of a complaint on the hearer. When complaining, it is important to supply supportive statements to justify

the act of moral censure. If a complaint is convincingly supported, it is difficult to overturn or dispute it. Another possibility is to replace conflicting functions by other types of communication. It is possible to avoid a direct confrontation that arises from a direct accusation by formulating a complaint indirectly as a piece of information or a request for information.

3.2.2 Drew (1998)

Complaint sequences are bounded sequences

They might be characterized as complaint sequences as they are clearly bounded sequences. In each case the complaint is a quite distinct topic, the beginning and ending of which is relatively easily identifiable. These sequences tend to begin through a specific sort of topic such as story introduction or an announcement and they end in a topically disjunctive fashion through the introduction of a quite different topic rather than being gradually disengaged in a stepwise move to subsequent topics. This is Jefferson's view (1984) as quoted by Drew (1998:304).

This clear boundedness of the openings of complaint sequences, opening with announcements and story introductions and their termination followed by the initiation of a quite new and unconnected topic is some evidence that participants treat complaints as distinct topics, the sensitivities of which inhibit the development of topical connections that are not directly associated with the matter of the complaint.

Explicit formulations of the transgressions

The complaint refers quite explicitly to the nature of the transgression that another has committed. The possible transgression that the speaker is trying to guard against or implicitly defend him or herself against is recognizable only through our cultural and interactional knowledge.

Expressions of moral indignation

At some point the complainant overtly expresses moral indignation about what the other has done. Imprecations and other expressions of indignation serve as overt manifestations

of the complainant's condemnation of someone's conduct. By reporting their emotional response in this way, their sense of grievance enables complainants to characterize how far the other's behaviour has caused offence.

3.3 DIRECTNESS LEVEL OF COMPLAINTS

3.3.1 Trosborg (1995)

Trosborg (1995:314) postulates that complaints can be expressed at varying levels of directness ranging from hints and mild disapprovals to severe challenges in which the complainer is explicitly declared incompetent and irresponsible as a social member. In a complaint, the utterance may only indirectly express the complainer's ill feelings towards the complainer. The complainer has to perform an inference process to establish a link between what is said and what is really intended on the basis of the situational context.

Assignment of illocutionary force

Complaints are state but this characteristic distinguishes complaints from other indicative sentences. Therefore, we cannot point out to particular modal verbs as indicators of abusive force. The directness scale of complaints is formulated according to a semantic scale, which expresses the severity of the offence. The criteria that are used for establishing the scale of directness are as follows:

Prepositional content (complainable)

Complainer

Accused (complainer)

There are five factors that determine the directness level of a complaint:

- a) The complainable is or is not expressed directly in the prepositional content.
- b) The complainer's negative evaluation of the prepositional content is implicitly or expressed.
- c) The agentive involvement of the complainer is implicitly or explicitly expressed.
- d) The complainer's negative evaluation of the complainer as a person is implicitly or explicitly expressed.

- e) The complainer's negative evaluation of the complainer's behaviour is implicitly or explicitly expressed.

3.3.2 Boxer (1993 a)

Boxer (1993:280) defines indirect complaint as the expression of dissatisfaction to an addressee about oneself or someone/something that is not present. According to Boxer (1993) indirect complaint is different from a direct complaint in the sense the addressee is neither held responsible nor capable of remedying the perceived offence. Both direct and indirect complaint have the potential of leading to lengthy interactions between speaker and addressee, it is generally only in the indirect complaint that one finds conversational material upon which shared beliefs and attitudes may be expressed.

Direct complaints that confront the party that is either responsible for or capable of remedying the perceived offence, are typically face threatening acts according to Brown-Levinson's terms. There are so many studies that had been done in complaints but few of them have the opportunity to be published. These studies focused on direct complaining and on the complaints themselves rather than on the responses to them and the entire troubles-sharing speech event of which indirect complaints are a part. Studies of indirect complaints as a confrontational speech act have been carried out both on native-English speaker and other languages and cross-cultural interactions. It is now believe that communicative competence should be the goal of language learning and teaching. Learning to perform speech acts and to appropriately respond in the flow of discourse is an important part of achieving communicative competence.

3.3.3 Boxer (1993 b)

The present research is a study of a type of negative evaluation that will be referred to here as the indirect complaint (IC). Indirect complaint is taken from the work of D'Amico-Reisner (1985) on disapproval exchanges. Indirect disapproval is placed side by side with instances of direct complaint or disapproval. Indirect complaints differ from instances of direct in that the addressee is not held responsible for a perceived offence. Other sociolinguistic studies referred to a speech event termed 'trouble telling' or 'trouble talk'. Indirect complaint can be considered a component of the trouble telling (talk) speech event in that it is often the initiating speech act of such an event. Indirect complaint is defined as

the expression of dissatisfaction to an interlocutor about a speaker himself/herself or someone /something that is not present. Indirect complaints are placed side by side to direct complaints in that in an indirect complaint exchange the addressee is not held responsible for a perceived offence. According to Brown and Levinson, direct complaints are face-threatening acts. Indirect complaint exchanges are frequently the opposite in that they are often employed in an attempt to establish understanding between interlocutors.

Indirect complaint themes

There are three types of indirect complaint themes:

Self

Other

Situation

The focus of an indirect complaint could be self-denigration, on another person or persons or any personal or impersonal situation. This last category is further divided into two sub-groups:

- a) Type A situations refer to situation IC's in which the complaint has personal focus.
- b) Type B situations refer to those of impersonal focus.

SELF-IC are complaints in which speakers uttered negative evaluation about themselves. This category consists of only those complaints herself/himself by complaining about his/her own ability, behaviour, actions or physical appearance.

TYPE A (PERSONAL) SITUATION IC

The complaint is about a situation rather than a personal shortcoming or characteristic.

TYPE B (IMPERSONAL) SITUATION IC

The focus is more on global significance than personal.

OTHER

Indirect complaints focus on talk about another person/people as in what is commonly known as 'group'.

CHAPTER 4

COMPLAINT STRATEGIES

4.1 AIM

The aim of this chapter is to examine strategies that are found in complaints. Eight complaint strategies are discussed in this chapter by Trosborg (1995). Directive acts or commiserations, complaint perspective, internal and external modification are also discussed by Trosborg (1995) and Boxer (1993).

4.2 COMPLAINT STRATEGIES

There are four main categories comprising a number of sub-categories, which are going to be outlined below: No explicit reproach, expression of annoyance or disapproval, accusation and blame.

Category 1: No explicit reproach

Strategy 1: Hints

A complainer should have recourse to hinting strategies in order to avoid a conflict in which case the complainable is not mentioned in the proposition. In making the assertion in the presence of the complaine, the complainer implies that he/she knows about the offence and holds the complaine indirectly responsible. The complainer does not state in a direct manner that something is bad or something is not right, also the complaine does not know whether an offence is referred to or not. For example:

Eli gumbi lokuphekela belicocekile yonke into imi ngendlela ukuhamba kwam.

This kitchen was clean and orderly when I left it last.

Category 2: Expression of annoyance or disapproval

Strategy 2: Annoyance

A complainer expresses his/her annoyance, dislikes, and disapproval concerning a certain state of affairs he/she considers bad for him/her. By asserting a deplorable state of affairs

explicitly in the presence of the complaine, the complainer implies that he/she holds the complaine responsible but avoids mentioning him/her as the guilty person. For example:

Jonga ezi zinto zigcwele yonke indawo.

Look at this mess all over the place.

Strategy 3: Consequences

Example:

Sele ndichithe imizuzu elishumi, oh, isiqingatha seyure xa ndicinga, ndicoca eli gumbi lokuhlambela

I have already spent ten minutes, oh, quarter of an hour I think it was, cleaning up the bathroom itself.

Category 3: Accusations

Accusations seek to establish the agent of a complainable. There are two levels of directness that have been distinguished; indirect and Direct Accusation. In an indirect accusation, the complainer can ask the hearer questions about the situation or assert that he/she was in some way connected with the offence and then try to establish the hearer as a potential agent of the complainable. While on the other hand in direct accusation, the complainer can directly accuse the complaine of having committed the offence.

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Khangela oku kungcola, kuyacaca ukuba akukhange kucocwe ukusukela kule veki iphelileyo.

Look at this mess; it is clear that this have never been cleaned since last week.

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Kuqhubeka ntoni ngala mpahla endiyifumene ekhabhathini ngale ntsasa, uzihlohle nje ngaphezulu zimdaka zonke.

What about these clothes I found in the cupboard this morning, you must have stuffed them in all of them are dirty.

Category 4: Blaming

An act of blame presupposes that the accused is guilty of the offence. The complainer passes a value judgement on the complainee. It may appear as a modified expression of blame. It may be expressed as an explicit condemnation either of the complainer's action or of the complainee as a person.

Strategy 6: Modified Blame

The complainer expresses modified disapproval of an action for which the accused is responsible.

Kuyakruqula ukuhlala apha, ndiyayicaphukela into yokuhlala ekungcoleni, kufuneka ucoce apho usebenza khona.

It's boring to stay here and I hate living in a mess, anyway you ought to clean up after you.

Strategy 7: Explicit Condemnation of the accused' action

The complainer explicitly states that an action for which the accused is held responsible is bad.

Andizange nemini enye ndikubone ucoce apho usebenza khona kwaye mna ndidiniwe, ndidikiwe yiloo nto.

You never clean up after you; I am sick and tired of it

Strategy 8: Explicit condemnation of the Accused as a person

The complainer states explicitly what is implicit at all other levels. For instance, a complainer may find the accused a non-responsible social member.

Akukho mntu unokuze akuthembe wena.

One can never trust you a damn.

4.3 DIRECTIVE ACTS/COMMISSERATIONS

4.3.1 Trosborg (1995)

When a complaint is issued, a directive act may be implied or added. This involves an attempt to make the complaine repair the damages he/she has caused and an attempt to prevent a repetition of the deplorable act. Moral judgement has the force of an imperative. It orders or commands the individual to whom it is addressed to do or refrain from doing the action mentioned in the judgement. Place (1986) as quoted by Trosborg (1995) points out that moral judgement carry with them their own incentive as reinforces in the case of moral praise and as punishers in the case of moral blame. A complaint implies an attempt on the part of the complainer to prevent the complaine from repeating the condemned action.

Request for Repair

A complaint is not made for the purpose of passing moral judgement; it also carries the implication that the complainer expects the dispreferred state of affairs described in the complainable to stop. It also functions as an incentive for the complaine to repair the complainable. A complainer can choose to issue an explicit formulation of a request for repair, if the complaine has not already presented an offer of repair on his/her own accord.

Threat

A complainer may choose to attack the complainer's face openly by threatening him/her, instead of issuing a polite request.

Situation: A person is making noise

I'll come over there and hit you if you don't shut your mouth.

Threats may be used is a request has been refused.

Request for Forbearance

A complainer can request that the complainer never performs the offence in question again or that he/she improves his/her behaviour in a number of ways. The request is intended as a negative reinforce relative to the subsequent repetition by the complaine of the specified behaviour and may result in a promise of forbearance on the part of the complaine.

As long as it does not happen again

Olshtain-Weinbach (1985; 1987) as quoted by Trosborg (1995; 322) points out that requests and threats are treated as part of the speech act set of complaining while requests for forbearance are not mentioned. According to Trosborg (1995; 322) directive acts in question are excluded as complaint strategies but treated as additional acts. In connection with the act of complaining, requests for repair occurred with some frequency in all groups while group III learners had the highest number of requests for forbearance. Threats were hardly ever used by any of the five groups of respondents.

4.3.2 Boxer (1993 a)

Indirect complaint responses

There are six types of indirect complaint responses that are emerged as major categories to indirect complaints:

Response or topic switch

This category consists of several related types of responses or non-responses; rhetorical ICs that call for no response deliberate or non-deliberate topic switches or minimal responses that do little or nothing to encourage the speaker to elaborate.

Questions

They do much the opposite. Questions encourage a complaining speaker to elaborate on the complaint. Secondly, they were often interim responses that eventually led to other

final responses. They served as a way of displaying interest in the speaker by drawing out the complaint in a more elaborated version thus giving speakers more opportunity to vent their feelings.

Contradiction

One way for the addressee to tell the speaker that the complaint is not accepted or approved of is to contradict the speaker or take the part of the object of the complaint through some kind of defence on its (his/her) part. The majority of the sequences containing contradiction responses occurred among intimates.

Joking and Teasing

These are most frequent among strangers and in such situations served as a method of self-presentation.

Advice/Lecture

The manner in which advice is offered depended heavily on both relative social status and social distance. For example, a mother can give advice to her child. The relationship between parents and children is such that advice is a very typical response and one which may well persist even after the children are adults and themselves parents.

Commiseration

All responses that showed either agreement or reassurance are included in this category. Responses in the form of exclamations having an embedded commiseration and any other response having embedded agreement such as a one-syllable utterance in which some prosodic feature indicated commiseration. Commiseration could be any type of response in which the illocutionary force was an attempt to make the speaker feel better. The most common type of commiseration response is in the form of straightforward agreement with the speaker, elaboration of the speaker's complaint or confirmation of the validity of the complaint.

Commiseration Sequences a conversational openers

It is among strangers as well as friends and acquaintances that we can clearly see how commiseration sequences are used to open and sustain interactions. Among strangers those people who already have some commonality such as status equality, age, social class or a combination of these variables are included. All types of agreements, reassurances and commiserations occurred in the data among interlocutors who were strangers as well as friends and acquaintances. Commiserations occurred almost as much among strangers as it did among friends and acquaintances. Commiserations functioned with strangers to support interactions through an exchange of shared negative sentiments.

IC Openers among travellers

Fellow travellers have a built-in solidarity if they share a common flight or destination. The space constraint factor may play a role in the propensity for travellers to initiate a sequence of talk with fellow travellers.

Responses as a function of social distance

IC responses function strongly an social distance relationship. A major finding presented here is that some kind of agreement or commiseration is the most frequent response to indirect complaints. This finding is important in that it indicates the functions of the ICs in social conversation. Commiseration is the IC response that characterizes an indirect complaint sequences as a rapport inspiring activity. Commiseration is a high frequency category for friends; it was almost as frequent as a response for stranger. Commiseration exceeded commiseration response for intimates. Contradiction is a rare response among people who are not well acquainted. Boxer (1993; 120) mentions the 'Bulge' theory, which indicates that the freedom to disagree/contradict or give advice would be as strong for strangers as for intimates. Therefore, IC data indicates that the Bulge theory is skewed; that there is a much greater degree of agreeability between strangers than between intimates.

4.3.3 Boxer (1998b)

This article goes hand in hand with the prior one, there is nothing different. They both highlight the manner in which the addressee responds to an IC can significantly promote further interaction. Depending on the type of response elicited, the complaint sequence can affirm or reaffirm solidarity among the interlocutors or alienate them from each other. The addressee will need to know how to respond to ICs when they are used as conversational openers and supporters.

The six categories of responses to ICs in this study demonstrate the extreme variation in the possibility of responding. Joking/Teasing responses serve to make light of a situation. Non-substantive responses include null response, nonverbal back channels and verbal back channels in repeated succession without an ultimate response of another category. This response type indicates that the addressee is unwilling to express mutual concern. The question includes questions that request elaboration of the IC as well as questions that challenge a speaker to defend his/her IC. Advice/Lecture incorporates responses that moralise as well as give simple advice on how to solve the problem.

Contradiction include disagreements and often to defend the object of the complaint. Commiseration may lead to discussions of shared concern and that may therefore be considered among those strategies that establish or reaffirm solidarity and in turn promote successful sequencing. Commiserative response show agreement or reassurance, tell a speaker that the addressee knows the feeling through a mutual complaint or sometimes merely commiserate through a sort exclamation such as oh, no!!

4.4 COMPLAINT PERSPECTIVE

In a discussion of speaker and hearer reference, Haverkate (1984) as quoted by Trosborg (1995) mentions an important distinction between focalisation and devocalisation expressions. Speakers selecting focalising expressions have the intention of bringing into prominence the role of the referent in the state of affairs described while the opposite holds for devocalising expressions. Speakers make use of the latter to avoid articulating the role of the referent in the state of affairs described.

4.4.1 Focalising Reference To The Complainer (Speaker-Perspective-I)

Focalising reference according to Trosborg (1995) can be made either to the speaker or to the hearer for the purpose of expressing contractive or emphatic reference. Specific reference to the speaker involves the first-person singular pronoun I. Non-pronominal reference may be used as well and both proper and common nouns are possible. A speaker who chooses a focalising reference to the complainer when expressing his/her annoyance, moral judgement identifies him/herself as the complainer and takes personal responsibility for issuing the blame.

4.4.2 Devocalising Reference To The Complainer (Speaker-Perspective-We)

Reference to the complainer can be devocalised if the complainer wants to minimize his/her role of complainer. The first-person plural pronoun 'we' is often employed when a speaker wants to involve his/her hearer(s) and other persons by making them share the responsibility for issuing a blame.

Class-Inclusive Reference

A speaker in this category presents his/her points of view, assumptions, beliefs as an opinion shared and accepted by the corresponding class. A class-inclusive reference serves as an important tool for a complainer who wants to avoid attacking the complaineé personally. The complainer is able to devocalise his/her personal points of view by attributing them to a specified class rather than to him/herself. By doing so, the complainer can protect his/her face in addition to that of the complaineé.

All-inclusive reference

This category involves reference to the speaker, hearer and to an undefined set of other persons. In contrast to class-inclusive reference, all-inclusive reference is not bound to any particular class of persons except that it is a kind of generalizing reference found in generic statements.

Pseudo-Inclusive Reference

This type of category is used in academic and argumentative types of texts; an author, writer, discussion leader may successfully employ the first person plural pronoun 'we', supposing that his/her readers or hearers share the point of view they put forward. In complaint situations, persons of superior social statuses that are exerting influence on subordinates frequently use this type of reference. The first person plural pronoun 'we' is used with reference to the speaker but it may also be used with reference to the hearer.

4.4.3 Focalising Reference To The Complainee (Hearer-Perspective -You)

The complainer explicitly establishes the hearer as the agent of the complainable. Specific reference typically involves the second person pronoun 'you', either on vocation expressions but reference may be expressed by common nouns as well. Nominal reference serves the purpose of creating social distance between the speaker and the hearer. Alternately, it is used in order to make a favourable impression on an interlocutor or with the intention of debasing or humiliating him/her.

4.4.4 Devocalising Reference To The Complainee (Hearer-Perspective-It)

This category is concerned with implicit or non-specific reference to the agent of the complainable. Any person may be intended referent. This kind of reference is useful for the strategic purpose of suppressing information concerning the identity of the agent responsible for the undesirable state of affairs, which is described in the proposition. In connection with complaints, it is more likely that the speaker suppresses the identity of the agent for the strategic purpose of avoiding direct accusation or blame of the hearer.

Another reason for leaving out the agent would be the presupposition that the identity of the agent is supposed to be known already by both parties. The blame is clearly directed at the complainee even though no reference has been made to him/her. The categories involved are agentless passives, constructions with neutral agents and constructions in which the undesired state of affairs has been the focus of attention. A generalization may be used successfully in order to avoid personal confrontation as it protects both the speaker and hearer's face.

4.5 INTERNAL MODIFICATION

After classifying complaint strategies according to directness level, it is also useful to analyse the complainer's use of internal modification. It makes a difference in terms of politeness. The difference is achieved through the co-occurrence of directness levels and internal modifiers referred to as 'modality markers'. Trosborg (1995).

Modality markers can be distinguished into two main categories:

Downgraders

Downgraders serve to mitigate the circumstances under which an offence was committed and consequently reduce the blame, which can be put on the complainee.

Upgraders

They increase the impact a complaint is likely to have on the complainee by aggravating the complainable. A complaint may be soften or weakened by the inclusion of downgraders and aggravated by the inclusion of upgraders. The same directness level of a complaint may involve disparate face-threats dependent on the inclusion of modifiers in terms of modality markers. Indirect complaints may be further soften by mitigation and direct complaints may be made even more face threatening if the offence is upgraded. It is interesting when both downgraders and upgraders are being combined simultaneously.

Major categories of downgraders and upgraders relevant to the mitigation or aggravation of complaints are presented below:

4.5.1 Downgraders

Downtones

These are adverbial sentences modifiers such as just, simply and adverbials expressing tentativeness, for example: perhaps, may be, possibly and so on.

Understaters

These are modifiers that under represent the state of affairs denoted in the complainable, for example: a little bit, a second, not very much and so on.

Hedges

These are adverbials by means of which the complaine avoids a precise prepositional specification, for example: kind of, sort of, somehow.

Subjectivizers

These are modifiers that characterize the proposition as the speaker's personal opinion or indicate the speaker's attitude towards the proposition. For example: I think, I suppose, I'm afraid, in my opinion.

Cajole

Gambits functioning at the interpersonal level of discourse with the function of restoring harmony between two interlocutors, for example you know, I mean, you see.

Appealers

These are discourse elements intended to elicit a response from the complainer, appealing to his/her understanding, for example: okay, right, don't you think.

4.5.2 Upgraders

These are intensifiers, which modify part of a proposition, sentence modifiers and lexical intensification.

Intensifiers

Intensifiers or adjectives intensifying part of a proposition, for example: such, so, very.

Commitment upgraders

Sentence modifiers expressing a special commitment towards the proposition. For example: I'm sure, I'm certain and the corresponding adverbials; surely, certainly, positively.

Lexical intensification

Lexical choice is another way of revealing an attitude, for example: you've ruined my carpet.

4.6 EXTERNAL MODIFICATION

A low level of directness is an important means of avoiding conflict when expressing moral censure. Another important aspect is the complainer's ability to justify his/her accusation or reprimand so that it appears convincing. A complainer him/herself runs the risk of losing face (Trosborg 1995).

4.6.1 Supportive moves

Supportive strategies serve to justify the complainer's 'right' to place the blame for something on the complaine. They serve to provide face-saving arguments. The category of supportive moves obtained in the data function at the structural level of discourse (preparators), at the interpersonal level (disarmers) as well as the content level.

Preparators

Preparators are important with regard to the successful organisation in which a complaint is issued. It is important to 'prepare' the speech act by means of utterances that break the ground or warn the complaine that a complaint is forthcoming.

Disarmers

An important task for a complainer is to avoid producing an act that is too face threatening to the complaine. A complainer must save the complaine's face. Therefore, it is of great importance for a complainer to employ 'disarming strategies'.

Providing Evidence

A complainer must be able to show that the complaine has in fact performed the deplorable action. If a complaine cannot be proven guilty, the complaine him/herself is guilty of having accused someone unjustly.

Substantiation

It is important for a complainer to be able to provide substantiating moves in the form of facts or arguments to the effect that 'p' is bad, that is, the complainer must 'prove' that he/she is justified in interpreting P as bad for him/her.

Aggravating the offence

A minor offence may be easily excused whereas it becomes more difficult to excuse behaviour for which the severity of the offence has been stressed.

Repeated Action

If an offence is committed over and over again, the severity is thereby increased.

- i) Lack of consideration
- ii) No excuse
- iii) A general nuisance
- iv) A breach of contract or promise
- v) Deceived expectations
- vi) Appeal to the complaine's moral consciousness.

Supportive reasons may be uttered in support of a complaint. Sometimes similar utterances may appear alone and they are complaints in their own right, just as a 'felicity condition' for making a request may in itself be uttered as a request.

CHAPTER 5

COMPLAINT SITUATIONS

5.1 AIM

The aim of this chapter is to establish various ways in which complaint situations are found in Xhosa. A questionnaire has been drawn to determine the number of complaint situations that are available. Various strategies that are found within the complaint situations will also be examined. These strategies are divided into four main categories. The number and percentages of complaint strategies within the complaint situations will also be examined. The response to each complaint situation is recognized. Also the number and percentage of each response will be considered.

5.2 COMPLAINT SITUATIONS

Complaint situations are divided into three types of social groups. These groups are of power relations, strangers and friends. Within the group of power relations, there is a situation of:

(a) Complaints with a person of superior status

This situation is divided into two:

i) A complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status

For example:

A teacher complains to a child

Parents complain to the child for arriving late

Parents complain to the child for not doing homework

A priest complains to the child for not attending practices

The shopkeeper complains to the casual worker for arriving late at work

ii) A complaints from a person with low status to a person with superior status

For example:

The learner complains to the teacher for obtaining low marks

A child complains to the parents for not having enough money

A casual worker complains to the shopkeeper
A member of the community complains to the police

(b) Complaints between strangers

For example: People who do not know each other
A complaint to a stranger for spilling a drink on your dress.
A complaint to a taxi driver for the high fare
A complaint to a taxi driver for the high speed
A complaint to a person in the till for the wrong amount they charged you

(c) Complaints to a person of equal status

For example: Friends
Complaints to a friend for wearing your new shirt
Complaint to a friend for making noise while you study
Complaint to a friend for not honouring the time of your appointment
Complaint to a friend for gossiping about you
Complaint to a friend for not helping you on the project

5.3 QUESTIONNAIRE

5.3.1 Introduction

1. Kwimeko yezikhalazo, abafundi kufuneka benze ezi zinto zilandelayo:

In the case of complaint, the learner should do the following two things:

i) umfundi kufuneka achaze isikhalazo

The learner should give the complaint

ii) achaze nempendulo yesikhalazo eso

And the response to that particular complaint

Umzekelo/ For example:

IMEKO/ SITUATION:

Abazali bakhalazela umntwana wabo othe wafumana amanqaku asezantsi kakhulu kwiZibalo.

Parents are complaining to their child for obtaining low-marks in Mathematics.

ISIKHALAZO/COMPLAINT.....

IMPENDULO/RESPONSE:.....

IIMEKO ZEZIKHALAZO/ COMPLAINT SITUATIONS

1. **ISIKHALAZO KUMNTU OSEMAGUNYENI APHEZULU**
COMPLAINT TO A PERSON OF SUPERIOR STATUS

1.1 **UTITSHALA/TEACHER**

a) **Utitshala ukhalazela umntwana onganxibanga yunifom yesikolo**

A teacher complains to a child who is not wearing a school uniform.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response:

- b) **Umfundi ukhalaza kutitshala ngenxa yamanqaku aphantsi kakhulu awafumeneyo kuvavanyo**

The learner is complaining to the teacher about the low marks he obtains in the test.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response:

1.2 **ABAZALI/PARENTS**

- a) **Abazali bakhalazela umntwana wabo obuya ngobusuku**

Parents complain to the child for arriving late at night.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response:

- b) **Abazali bakhalazela umntwana wabo ongawenziyo umsebenzi wakhe wesikolo ekhaya**

Parents complain to the child for not doing his homework.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response:

- c) **Umntwana ukhalaza kubazali bakhe malunga nemali abamnika yona engonelanga**

A child complains to the parents for not having enough money for lunch.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response:

1.3 **UMFUNDISI/PRIEST**

- a) **Umfundisi ukhalazela abantwana abadlalayo ecaweni ngexesha lenkonzo**

A priest complains to the children when they are playing around the church during the service.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response:

b) **Umfundisi ukhalazela umntwana ongayihambiyo ipraktizi yomculo**

A priest complains to the child for not attending the choir practices.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response:

1.4 UNOVENKILE/SHOPKEEPER

- a) **Unovenkile ukhalazela umsebenzi wakhe ongafiki kwangethuba emsebenzini**
Shopkeeper complains to the casual worker for arriving late at work.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response:

- b) **Umsebenzi ukhalaza kumphathi wakhe ngenxa yemali encinane amhlawula yona**

Casual worker complains to the shopkeeper for giving him a small salary.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response:

1.5 IPOLISA/POLICE

Isikhalazo kumapolisa ngokuthi athathe ixesha ukuphanda ityala lesela ebelibe impahla yakho

Complaint to the police for taking so long on the case of the thief who took your clothes.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response:

2. IZIKHALAZO KUMNTU OKWINQANABA ELINYE NAYE
COMPLAINTS TO A PERSON OF EQUAL STATUS

- a) **Isikhalazo kumhlobo wakho ngokuthi anxibe ihempe yakho entsha ngaphandle kwemvume yakho**

Complaint to a friend for wearing your new shirt without your permission.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response:

- b) **Isikhalazo kumhlobo wakho ngokwenza ingxolo ufunda**

Complaint to a friend for making noise while you study.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response:

- c) **Isikhalazo kwisihlobo sakho ngokuthi angalibambi ixesha ledinga lenu ebenilibekile**

Complaint to a friend for not honouring the time of your appointment.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response:

d) **Ukukhalaza kumhlobo wakho othe wahleba ngawe**

Complaint to a friend for gossiping about you.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response:

e) **Ukhalaza kumhlobo wakho othe akakwazi ukukuncedisa kumsebenzi obuwenza**

Complaint to a friend for not helping you on the project.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response:

3. IZIKHALAZO KUMNTU ONGAMAZIYO/ COMPLAINTS TO STRANGERS

- a) **Khalaza kumntu othe wakuchithela ngesiselo elokhweni yakho**
Complaint to a stranger for spilling a drink on your dress.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response:

- b) **Khalaza kumqhubi we-taxi malunga nexabiso lokukhwela itaxi eliphezulu**
Complaint to a taxi driver for the fare that is too high.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response:

- c) **Khalaza kumqhubi we-taxi malunga nesantya esiphezulu aqhuba ngaso**
Complaint to a taxi driver for the high speed at which he is driving.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response:

- d) **Khalaza kumntu othe watsiba umgca wangenelela phambili kumngcelele wokubhatala evenkileni**

Complaint to a person who is jumping a queue at a till of a shop.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response

- e) **Khalaza kumntu osemthshinini ngenxa yemali engeyiyo abakutsalele yona**
Complaint to a person in the till for the wrong amount they charged you.

Isikhalazo/Complaint:

Impendulo/Response:

5.4 THE METHOD OF ANSWERING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The data in this study has been collected using the questionnaires, which were distributed to the students of three Senior Secondary School in the Western Cape. These schools were Hector Peterson High in Kraaifontein, Dr Nelson Mandela High at Crossroads and Joe Slovo High in Khayelitsha. Eighty questionnaires were distributed. Fifty questionnaires were distributed at Hector Peterson High to Grade 11 students, fifteen questionnaires were distributed at Dr Nelson Mandela and at Joe Slovo also to Grade 11 pupils.

Although eighty questionnaires were distributed in these schools only twenty have been selected as a sample for the study. The learner has been given a questionnaire with the complaint situations. What is expected of the learner is to give the complaint together with the response of the particular complaint.

5.5 STRATEGIES IN COMPLAINTS

5.5.1 Aim

The aim of this section is to establish the number and percentages of each complaint strategy.

5.6 TOTAL NUMBER AND PERCENTAGES OF EACH STRATEGY

5.6.1 List of strategies

Category 1: No explicit reproach

Strategy 1: Hints

Category 2: Expression of disapproval

Strategy 2: Annoyance

Strategy 3: Ill consequences

Category 3: Accusation

Strategy 4: Indirect accusation

Strategy 5: Direct accusation

Category 4: Blame

Strategy 6: Modified blame

Strategy 7: Explicit blame (behaviour)

Strategy 8: Explicit blame (person)

5.6.2 Number and percentage of strategies

The total number of all strategies, which were found in the questionnaire, amounted to 389 strategies. These strategies are divided as follows within the three major situations:

SITUATION 1: COMPLAINTS WITH A PERSON OF SUPERIOR STATUS

Number of strategies: 195

$$\text{Percentage of strategies: } \frac{195}{389} \times \frac{100}{1} = 50.1\%$$

SITUATION 2: COMPLAINTS TO A PERSON OF EQUAL STATUS

Number of strategies: 97

$$\text{Percentage of strategies: } \frac{97}{389} \times \frac{100}{1} = 24.9\%$$

SITUATION 3: COMPLAINTS BETWEEN STRANGERS

Number of strategies: 97

$$\text{Percentage of strategies: } \frac{97}{389} \times \frac{100}{1} = 24.9\%$$

5.6.3 Strategies within the situations

In this section the number and percentages of each of the 8 strategies will be established with regard to the questionnaire as a whole.

Strategy 1: Hints

This strategy has not been used at all in the questionnaire.

Strategy 2: Annoyance

Number: 19

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{19}{389} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.9\%$$

Strategy 3: Ill consequences

This strategy also has not been used at all in the questionnaire.

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 39

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{39}{389} \times \frac{100}{1} = 10\%$$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 262

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{262}{389} \times \frac{100}{1} = 67.4\%$$

Strategy 6: Modified Blame

Number: 18

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{18}{389} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.6\%$$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 50

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{50}{389} \times \frac{100}{1} = 12.9\%$$

Strategy 8: Explicit Blame (Person)

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{389} \times \frac{100}{1} = 0.3\%$$

5.6.4 Strategies within the situation of complaints with a person of superior status

There are 195 strategies in this situation. These strategies appear with the following number and percentage.

Strategy 1: Hints

This strategy has not been used at all in the questionnaire.

Strategy 2: Annoyance

Number: 4

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{4}{195} \times \frac{100}{1} = 2.1\%$$

Strategy 3: Ill consequences

This strategy also has also not been used at all in the questionnaire.

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 23

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{23}{195} \times \frac{100}{1} = 11.8\%$$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 126

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{126}{195} \times \frac{100}{1} = 64.6\%$$

Strategy 6: Modified Blame

Number: 9

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{9}{195} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.6\%$$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 32

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{32}{195} \times \frac{100}{1} = 16.4\%$$

Strategy 8: Explicit Blame (Person)

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{195} \times \frac{100}{1} = 0.3\%$$

5.6.5 Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status

In this situation, there are about 121 strategies in which they appear as follows;

Strategy 1: Hints

This strategy has not been used at all in the questionnaire.

Strategy 2: Annoyance

Number: 4

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{4}{121} \times \frac{100}{1} = 3.3\%$$

Strategy 3: Ill consequences

This strategy also has not been used at all in the questionnaire.

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 17

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{17}{121} \times \frac{100}{1} = 14\%$$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 65

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{65}{121} \times \frac{100}{1} = 53.7\%$$

Strategy 6: Modified Blame

Number: 3

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{3}{121} \times \frac{100}{1} = 2.5\%$$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 31

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{31}{121} \times \frac{100}{1} = 25.6\%$$

Strategy 8: Explicit Blame (Person)

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{121} \times \frac{100}{1} = 0.8\%$$

5.6.6 Strategy within the situation of complaints from a person with low status to a person of superior status

74 Strategies had been found in this situation. They appear with the following number and percentage;

Strategy 1; Hints, Strategy 2; Annoyance, and Strategy 3; Ill consequences has not been used at all in this situation.

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 6

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{6}{74} \times \frac{100}{1} = 8.1\%$$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 61

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{61}{74} \times \frac{100}{1} = 82.4\%$$

Strategy 6: Modified Blame

Number: 6

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{6}{74} \times \frac{100}{1} = 8.1\%$$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{74} \times \frac{100}{1} = 1.4\%$$

Strategy 8: Explicit Blame (Person)

This strategy has not been used in this situation.

5.6.7 Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status where the teacher complains to a learner for not wearing a school uniform

The total number of strategies in this situation is 20. These Strategies will appear as follows together with the number and percentage:

Strategy 1; Hints, Strategy 2; Annoyance, Strategy 3; Ill consequences; Strategy 6: Modified Blame and Strategy 8; Explicit Blame (Person) has not been used in this situation.

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 2

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{2}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 10\%$$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 11

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{11}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 55\%$$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 7

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{7}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 35\%$$

5.6.8 Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status where the parents complain to their child for arriving home late at night

There are 20 strategies that had been found in this situation. These strategies will appear with number and percentages as follows:

Strategy 1; Hints, Strategy 3; Ill consequences, Strategies 6; Modified Blame and Strategy 8; Explicit Blame (person) all these strategies mentioned above have not been used in this situation at all.

Strategy 2: Annoyance

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5\%$$

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 3

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{3}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 15\%$$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 9

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{9}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 45\%$$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 7

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{7}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 35\%$$

5.6.9 Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status whereby parents complain to their child for not doing his/her homework

There are 19 strategies in this situation, which will appear as follows with the number and percentage:

Strategy 1; Hints, Strategy 3; Ill consequences, Strategy 6; Modified Blame and Strategy 8; Explicit Blame (person) had not been used at all in this situation.

Strategy 2: Annoyance

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5.3\%$$

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5.3\%$$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 11

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{11}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 57.9\%$$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 6

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{6}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 31.6\%$$

5.6.10 Strategies within the situation of complains from a person with superior status to a person with low status where the priest complains to the children playing around the church during the service

There are 20 strategies that had been found in this situation in which they will appear as follows:

Strategy 1; Hints, Strategy 3; Ill consequences, Strategies 6; Modified Blame, Strategy 8; Explicit Blame (person) had not been used in this situation.

Strategy 2: Annoyance

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5\%$$

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 8

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{8}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 40\%$$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 8

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{8}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 40\%$$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 3

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{3}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 15\%$$

5.6.11 Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status in which the priest complains to the child for not attending the choir practice

There are 22 strategy in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

Strategy 1; Hints and Strategy 3; Ill Consequences had not been used in this situation.

Strategy 2: Annoyance

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{22} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.5\%$$

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 3

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{3}{22} \times \frac{100}{1} = 13.6\%$$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 15

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{15}{22} \times \frac{100}{1} = 68.2\%$$

Strategy 6: Modified Blame

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{22} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.5\%$$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{22} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.5\%$$

Strategy 8: Explicit Blame (Person)

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{22} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.5\%$$

5.6.12 Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status where the shopkeeper complains to the casual worker for arriving late at work

There are 20 strategies in this situation in which they appear with the following number and percentage:

Strategy 1; Hints, Strategy 2; Annoyance, Strategy 3; Ill consequences, Strategy 4; Indirect Accusation and Strategy 8; Explicit Blame, have not been used.

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 11

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{11}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 55\%$$

Strategy 6: Modified Blame

Number: 2

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{2}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 10\%$$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 7

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{7}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 35\%$$

5.6.13 Strategies within the situation of complains to a person with superior status from a person with low status whereby the learner complains to the teacher about obtaining very low marks in a test

There are 21 strategies in this situation in which they will look as follows with the number and percentage:

Strategy 1; Hints , Strategy 2; Annoyance, Strategy 3; Ill consequences, Strategy 4; Indirect Accusation and Strategy 8; Explicit Blame (Person) were not used in the situation.

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 18

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{18}{21} \times \frac{100}{1} = 85.7\%$$

Strategy 6: Modified Blame

Number: 2

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{2}{21} \times \frac{100}{1} = 9.5\%$$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{21} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.8\%$$

5.6.14 Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person with low status to a person with superior status where a child complains to his/her parents for not giving him/her enough money

There are 19 strategies in this situation in which they will appear as follows with the number and percentage:

Strategy 1; Hints, Strategy 2; Annoyance, Strategy 3; Ill consequences, Strategy 7; Explicit Blame (Behaviour) and Strategy 8; Explicit Blame (Person) were all not used in this situation.

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5.3\%$$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 17

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{17}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 89.5\%$$

Strategy 6: Modified Blame

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5.3\%$$

5.6.15 Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person of low status to a person with superior status where a casual worker complains to the shopkeeper for the small salary that he/she receives

18 Strategies have been found in this situation. These strategies will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

Strategy 1; Hints, Strategy 2; Annoyance, Strategy 3; Ill consequences, Strategy 7; Explicit Blame (Behaviour) and Strategy 8; Explicit Blame (Person) were not used in this situation.

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{18} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5.6\%$$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 17

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{17}{18} \times \frac{100}{1} = 94.4\%$$

Strategy 6: Modified Blame

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{18} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5.6\%$$

5.6.16 Strategies within the situation of complaints from a person of low status to a person with superior status where member of the public complains to the police for taking a long time on the case of the thief

There are 16 strategies in the situation and they will appear with the number and percentage.

Strategy 1; Hints, Strategy 2; Annoyance, Strategy 3; Ill consequences, Strategy 7; Explicit Blame (Behaviour) and Strategy 8; Explicit Blame (Person) were not used in this situation.

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 4

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{4}{16} \times \frac{100}{1} = 25\%$$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 9

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{9}{16} \times \frac{100}{1} = 56\%$$

Strategy 6: Modified Blame

Number: 3

Percentage: $\frac{3}{16} \times \frac{100}{1} = 18.8\%$

5.6.17 Strategies within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status

There are 97 strategies that have been found in this situation. These strategies will appear with the number and percentage as the following:

Strategy 1: Hints; Strategy 3: Ill consequences and Strategy 8: Explicit Blame (person), all these strategies were not used in this situation.

Strategy 2: Annoyance

Number: 5

Percentage: $\frac{5}{97} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5.2\%$

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 4

Percentage: $\frac{4}{97} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.1\%$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 71

Percentage: $\frac{71}{97} \times \frac{100}{1} = 73.2\%$

Strategy 6: Modified Blame

Number: 5

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{5}{97} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5.2\%$$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 12

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{12}{97} \times \frac{100}{1} = 12.3\%$$

5.6.18 Strategies within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to your friend for wearing your new shirt without your permission.

There are 19 strategies in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

Strategy 1: Hints; Strategy 3: Ill consequences; Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation and Strategy 8: Explicit Blame (person), all these strategies were not used in this situation.

Strategy 2: Annoyance

Number: 3

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{3}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 15.8\%$$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 14

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{14}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 73.7\%$$

Strategy 6: Modified Blame

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5.3\%$$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5.3\%$$

5.6.19 Strategies within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to your friend for making noise while you study

There are 20 strategies in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

Strategy 1: Hints; Strategy 2: Annoyance; Strategy 3: Ill consequences; Strategy 6: Modified Blame and Strategy 8: Explicit Blame (person), all these strategies were not used in this situation.

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5\%$$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 16

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{16}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 80\%$$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 3

Percentage: $\frac{3}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 15\%$

5.6.20 Strategies within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to your friend for not honouring the time of your appointment

There are 20 strategies in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

Strategy 1: Hints; Strategy 3: Ill consequences; Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation and Strategy 8: Explicit Blame (person), all these strategies were not used in this situation.

Strategy 2: Annoyance

Number: 2

Percentage: $\frac{2}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 10\%$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 12

Percentage: $\frac{12}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 60\%$

Strategy 6: Modified Blame

Number: 3

Percentage: $\frac{3}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 15\%$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 3

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{3}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 15\%$$

5.6.21 Strategies within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to your friend for gossiping about you

There are 20 strategies in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

Strategy 1: Hints; Strategy 2: Annoyance; Strategy 3: Ill consequences; Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation and Strategy 8: Explicit Blame (person), all these strategies were not used in this situation.

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 14

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{14}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 70\%$$

Strategy 6: Modified Blame

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5\%$$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 5

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{5}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 25\%$$

5.6.22 Strategies within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to your friend for not helping you on a project

There are 18 strategies in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

Strategy 1: Hints; Strategy 2: Annoyance; Strategy 3: Ill consequences; Strategy 6: Modified Blame; Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour) and Strategy 8: Explicit Blame (person), all these strategies were not used in this situation.

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 3

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{3}{18} \times \frac{100}{1} = 16.7\%$$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 15

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{15}{18} \times \frac{100}{1} = 83.3\%$$

5.6.23 Strategies within the situation of complaints to strangers

There are 97 strategies in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

Strategy 1: Hints; Strategy 3: Ill consequences; and Strategy 8: Explicit Blame (person), all these strategies were not used in this situation.

Strategy 2: Annoyance

Number: 10

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{10}{97} \times \frac{100}{1} = 10.3\%$$

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 12

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{12}{97} \times \frac{100}{1} = 12.3\%$$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 65

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{65}{97} \times \frac{100}{1} = 67\%$$

Strategy 6: Modified Blame

Number: 4

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{4}{97} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.1\%$$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 6

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{6}{97} \times \frac{100}{1} = 6.1\%$$

5.6.24 Strategies within the situation of complaints to strangers where you complain to a stranger for spilling a drink on your dress

There are 20 strategies in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

Strategy 1: Hints; Strategy 3: Ill consequences; and Strategy 8: Explicit Blame (person), all these strategies were not used in this situation.

Strategy 2: Annoyance

Number: 10

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{10}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 50\%$$

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5\%$$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 6

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{6}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 30\%$$

Strategy 6: Modified Blame

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5\%$$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 2

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{2}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 10\%$$

5.6.25 Strategies within the situation of complaints to strangers where you complain to a taxi driver for the fare that is too high

There are 19 strategies in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

Strategy 1: Hints; Strategy 2: Annoyance; Strategy 3: Ill consequences; Strategy 6: Modified Blame; Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour) and Strategy 8: Explicit Blame (person), all these strategies were not used in this situation.

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 6

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{6}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 31.6\%$$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 13

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{13}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 68.4\%$$

5.6.26 Strategies within the situation of complaints to strangers where you complain to a taxi driver for the high speed which he is driving

There are 20 strategies in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

Strategy 1: Hints; Strategy 2: Annoyance; Strategy 3: Ill consequences; Strategy 6: Modified Blame and Strategy 8: Explicit Blame (person), all these strategies were not used in this situation.

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 3

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{3}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 15\%$$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 15

Percentage: $\frac{15}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 75\%$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 2

Percentage: $\frac{2}{20} \times \frac{100}{1} = 10\%$

5.6.27 Strategies within the situation of complaints to strangers where you complain to a person who is jumping the queue at a till in a shop

There are 19 strategies in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

Strategy 1: Hints; Strategy 2: Annoyance; Strategy 3: Ill consequences; and Strategy 8: Explicit Blame (person), all these strategies were not used in this situation.

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation

Number: 2

Percentage: $\frac{2}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 10.5\%$

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 13

Percentage: $\frac{13}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 68.4\%$

Strategy 6: Modified Blame

Number: 2

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{2}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 10.5\%$$

Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour)

Number: 2

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{2}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 10.5\%$$

5.6.28 Strategies within the situation of complaints to strangers where you complain to the cashier at the till for the wrong amount they charged you

There are 19 strategies in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

Strategy 1: Hints; Strategy 2: Annoyance; Strategy 3: Ill consequences; Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation; Strategy 7: Explicit Blame (Behaviour) and Strategy 8: Explicit Blame (person), all these strategies were not used in this situation.

Strategy 5: Direct Accusation

Number: 18

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{18}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 94.7\%$$

Strategy 6: Modified Blame

Number: 1

$$\text{Percentage: } \frac{1}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5.3\%$$

5.7 SUMMARY

It is clear that the most common strategy is the direct accusation whereby the complainer directly accuses the complainee of having committed the offence. The high number of direct accusation shows this, which are 262 out of 289 strategies. This clearly means that people frequently use direct accusation when they are complaining.

The second common strategy that is also used by people is the explicit condemnation of the accuser's action, which states that certain action of which the accused is responsible is bad. It has the total number of 50 followed by the indirect accusation, which has the total number of 39.

Modified Blame has the total number of 18 and Annoyance has the total number of 19. They both express disapproval of an action for which the accused is responsible for and they are not frequently used. Their total number proves this.

5.8 STRATEGY 2: ANNOYANCE

5.8.1 Frequency of recurrence in all situations

$$\text{Frequency: } \frac{19}{389} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.9\%$$

A complainer can express his/her annoyance, dislike, and disapproval concerning a certain state of affairs he/she considers bad for him/her. The complainer implies that he/she holds the complainee responsible but avoids mentioning him/her as the guilty person.

5.8.2 Expression of strategy in the selected situations for the research project

Such expressions of annoyance may be expressed in different ways in Xhosa.

With the adjective [-bi]

Yintoni le imbi kangaka yokusoloko ubuya ngobusuku.

What a bad habit of always coming home late at night.

Yintoni le imbi kangaka yokuba undichithele ngesiselo.

What a bad thing for spilling a drink over me.

With verbs indicating disparagement:

Negative of –Xabisa:

Aniyixabisanga icawe, ningathini ukudlala apha?

You don't respect a church, why are you playing here?

Passive of Jonga:

Wandichithela ngesiselo ndisiya enkonzweni, ndakujongwa njani?

You spill a drink over me and I'm going to church, how will people look at me?

Expression of deliberateness**Wandichithela ngesiselo, ngathi wenza ngabom.**

You spill a drink over me, it's like you did it purposely.

With nouns indicating disparagement

Imfama:

Andazi nokuba uyimfama na, ungathini ukundigalela ngesiselo?

I don't know whether you are blind, why are you spilling a drink over me?

Isidenge:

Udenza isidenge sakho, kudala ndikulindile apha.

You make me your fool, I've been here for a long time.

5.8.3 Other possible expressions which are not within the selected situationsExpressions with [-ndini] with a pejorative meaning:**Mntwanandini ongamameliyo, uwenza nini umsebenzi wesikolo?**

Hey you child who does not want to listen, when are you going to do your homework?

Negative verbs [-qonda]**Andiqondi ukuba iza kuphinda ihlambeke le lokhwe xa inje.**

I don't think this dress will ever be washable, if it's like this.

Awuqondi ukuba uza kuyikrazula ihempe yam?

Don't you think you are going to tear my shirt?

Warning**Le talentana uzidla ngayo uyakuyoxutha uThixo.**

God will take this talent if you don't want to use it.

5.8.4 Expression of annoyance**Yhu!! Into ayenzileyo sokuze ndiyilibale into yokundichithela ngesiselo elokhweni yam, sokuze isuke le nto uyenzileyo.**

Hey, I will never forget what you have done to me, spilling a drink over my dress, this stain will never disappear.

Verbs of annoyance: khathaza**Yhini!! Ukundikhathaza kangaka undigalela ngesiselo elokhweni yam ndisiya kwi-Fairwell.**

Oh! Why are you upsetting me like this, spilling a drink over my dress. I'm on my way to the Fairwell.

5.9 STRATEGY 4: INDIRECT ACCUSATION

$$\text{Frequency: } \frac{39}{389} \times \frac{100}{1} = 10\%$$

A complainer can ask the hearer questions about the situation or assert that he/she was in some way connect with the offence and thereby try to establish the hearer as a potential agent of the complainable.

Indirect Accusations in Xhosa are mostly expressed by means of negative statements or indirect requests.

5.9.1 Negative statements with verbs indicating disapproval

With the verb “Thanda”

Andiyithandi le nto yokubuya kwakho ebusuku.

I don't like your style of arriving late at night.

Andiyithandi le nto uyenzayo yokwenza ingxolo.

I don't like what you are doing of making noise.

Andiyithandi into yokuba nidlale apha.

I don't like you to play here.

Andiyithandi le nto nisenza yona imbi kangaka.

I don't like this bad thing you are doing to us.

With the verb –funa

Andikufuni ukunganxibi kwakho iyunifom yesikolo.

I don't want your style of not wearing school uniform.

With the verb –qhela

Andiyiqhelanga itaxi enxabiso eliphezulu kangaka.

I'm not familiar with the taxi with such a high fare.

5.9.2 Negative statements with verbs indicating uncertainty

With the verb –azi

Abantwana bayadlala andiyazi ukuba ngumkhuba abawuthathe phi lowo.

The children are playing I don't know where they did get this habit.

Andiyazi nokuba kutheni engayihambi ipraktizi.

I don't know why he doesn't attend the practice.

Andiyazi into ebangela nithathe ixesha elide kangaka ukuphanda eli tyala.

I don't know why you took so long in investigating this case.

With the verb –qiniseka

Andiqinisekanga ukuba kutheni ufike leyiti.

I'm not sure why you arrive late at work.

With the verb –thandabuza

Ndiyathandabuza ukuba uzakufika ngethuba apha.

I doubt if you will get here in time.

5.9.3 Negative statements with verbs indicating dissatisfaction

With the verb –anela

Imali enandinika yona ayindoneli.

The money you gave me is not enough.

Abazali bam abandiniki imali eyoneleyo.

My parents do not give me enough money.

With the verb –hamba**Lo mntwana akayihambi tu ipraktizi.**

This child is not attending the practice.

Aba bantwana abayihambi ipraktizi yomculo.

These children do not attend the choir practice.

Undiyishiya apha endlwini uhambe uyokuthetha ngam kwabanye abantu.

You left me here in the house and talk about me to other people.

Unmtwana wam akawenzi umsebenzi wesikolo ufika atye ahambe.

My child is not doing his homework, he only eat and then disappears.

With the verb –enza**Yintoni le yenziwayo esikolweni kude kutshone ilanga.**

What is it that you are doing at school until sunset?

Umntwana wam akawenzi umsebenzi wesikolo.

My child is not doing his homework.

5.9.4 Indirect requestsWith the verb –cela**Ndiyacela ukuba nibokubajonga abantwana benu kuba bayandiphazamisa.**

I ask you to look after your children because they are disturbing me.

Ndiyacela abantwana nibaxelele ukuba mabazole.

I would like to ask you to tell your children to be quite.

Bendicela into yokuba imali uzame ukuyonyusa.

I would like to ask you at least try to increase my salary.

With the verb –funeka**Akufuneki abantwana badlale ngexesha lenkonzo.**

Children should not play here during the service.

With the hortative**Mabayeke abantwana ukufika badlale apha enkonzweni.**

Children should stop playing here in church.

With the imperative**Nqandani abantwana kuba bayandiphazamisa.**

Stop the children because they are disturbing me.

5.9.5 With copulative clauseAdjective with –ncinci**Imali enindinika yona incinci/incinane.**

The money you gave me is too small.

Copulative with NA**Abantwana abanalungelo lokudlala apha.**

Children do not have the right to play here.

5.9.6 Other expressions which are not within the selected situations

Extension of existing categories:

Statement with the verb –phazamisa**Aba bantwana badlalayo apha enkonzweni bayaphazamisa.**

These children playing in the church during the service are disturbing me.

With the verb –khalaza

Ndikhalaza ngamapolisa ethu athatha exesha ukuphanda amatyala.

I am complaining about the police who took a long time when investigating cases.

With the verb –ngxola

UPhumza xa sifunda uyangxola apha eklasini.

Phuma is making noise while we are studying in class.

With the verb –nceda

Umhlobo wam akancedisani nam xa ndixakekile.

My friend doesn't help me when I am busy.

With the verb –thatha

Amapolisa athetha ixesha ukuphanda ityala.

The police took a long time investigating a case.

With the verb –ngenelela

Kukha abantu abangenelelayo.

There are people jumping the queue.

With the verb –buya

Umntwana wam ubuya ngobusuku esikolweni.

My child arrives late at night from school.

With the verb –nyathela

Isantya sale-taxi sinyathelela phezulu gqitha.

The speed of this taxi is too high.

With the verb –nyuka

Noko le mali yokuya edolophini inyuke kakhulu.

The fare that we pay to town is too high.

Expression of time

Ndalifaka kudala ityala lam emapoliseni kodwa ukukabanjwa mntu.

It's been a long time now my case is in the police but no one is arrested.

5.10. STRATEGY 5: DIRECT ACCUSATION

$$\text{Frequency: } \frac{262}{389} \times \frac{100}{1} = 67.4\%$$

The complainer can directly accuse the complainee of having committed the offence.

Direct Accusations are frequently expressed by means of questions in Xhosa.

5.10.1 Questions with the verb THI followed by the interrogative NI

kutheni

Kutheni umganxibanga uniform yesikolo?

Why are you not wearing school uniform?

Kutheni ubuya ebusuku kwezi ntsuku?

Why are you arriving late at night these days?

Kutheni le nto

Kutheni le nto unganxibanga uniform yesikolo?

Why are you not wearing a school uniform?

Kutheni le nto ubuya ebusuku?

Why are you arriving late at night?

Kutheni le nto ungawenziyo umsebenzi wesikolo?

Why are you not doing your homework?

Kutheni le nto nithanda ukudlala apha?

Why do you like to play here?

Kutheni le nto nidlala ngexesha lecawe?

Why are you playing during the service?

Kutheni le nto ungayihambi ipraktizi?

Why are you not attending the practice?

Kutheni le nto ufika leyiti emsebenzini?

Why do you arrive late at work?

Kutheni le nto ungxola kodwa ndiyafunda?

Why are you making noise while I am studying?

thi

Ungathini ukunxiba ihempe yam intsha?

How can you wear my new shirt?

Ungathini ukukhalisa unomathotholo kodwa ndiyafunda?

How can you switch on the radio while I'm studying?

Ungathini ukuhleba ngam?

How can you gossip about me?

5.10.2 Questions with the verb –bangela

Yintoni ebangela into yokuba ungawenzi umsebenzi wakho?

What makes you not to do your homework?

Yintoni ebangela into yokuba undichithele ngesiselo?

What makes you spill a drink over me?

5.10.3 Questions with the interrogative -njani

Njani

Njani ukuba undinike amanqaku aphantsi kangaka?

How can you give me such a low mark?

Enza njani

Kwenzeka ujani ukuba amanqaku am abe phantsi kangaka?

What causes my marks to become so low?

Ingenzeka njani into yokuba ndifumane amanqaka angaka?

How can it happen that my marks become so low?

Ungayenza njani into yokuba unxibe ihempe yam?

How can you wear my shirt?

Statements with the verb –khalaza

Ndize kukhalaza apha kuwe malunga namanqaku am.

I came here to complain about my marks.

Ndiyakhalaza malunga nemali encinci enindinika yona.

I am complaining about the money that you gave me.

Ndizokufaka isikhalazo ngamanqaku am.

I am submitting a complaint about my marks.

Ndiyakhalaza ngomvuzo andihlawulisa wona.

I am complaining about the salary you gave me.

Applicative verbs**Uyinxibela ntoni ihempe yam ungakhange ugqithe kum?**

Why do you wear my shirt without my permission?

Uyandingxolela ngale ngxolo yakho.

You are disturbing me with the noise of yours.

Niyasicinezela ngale nto yokunyusa imali yokukhwela.

You are suppressing us by increasing the fare.

5.10.4 Copulative clauses with NAWith isikhalo**Ndinesikhalo anizi epraktizini.**

I've got a complaint that you don't attend practice.

Ndinesikhalazo sokuba amanqaku am ephantsi.

I've got a complaint about my marks that are too low.

Ndinesikhalazo sokuba nandinika imali encinci.

I've got a complaint about the small money that you gave me.

With ingxaki**Ndinengxaki yokuba lingaphandwa ngokukhawuleza ityala lam lokubelwa impahla.**

I've got a problem about the slow process of investigation of my case.

Negative imperatives**Musa ukuyenza into yokubuya ngobusuku.**

Do not arrive late at night.

Sanukudlala apha ngexesha lecawe.

Do not play here during the service.

Sanukube nidlala nisenza ingxolo apha ecaweni.

Do not play and make noise here during the service.

Musani ukudlala ecaweni.

Do not play in church.

Sukuqhuba kangaka imoto uzakusilimaza.

Don't drive a care like this you will get us in trouble.

Musa ukuqhuba ngesantya esingaka.

Do not drive in such a high speed.

Sanukungenelela nathi siyafuna futhi singxame njengani.

Do not jump the queue because we are all in a hurry.

5.10.5 Other possible expressions which are not within the selected situation

Statement with the adjective –ncinci/ncinane

Imali enandinika yona incinane

The money you gave me is very small.

Le mali nandinika yona incinci

This money you gave me is very small.

Ninzi

Ininzi le mali niyibizayo.

This is a lot of money.

With the verb –ndlandlatheka

Sibhatele apha wayindlandlathekisa kangaka imoto?

We paid our money here, why are you speeding up the car?

Imperative

Misa le taxi kube iyabaleka ndifuna ukuhla uza kusibulala!

Stop this taxi, because it's moving too fast, I want to get off, you are going to kill us!

5.11 STRATEGY 6: MODIFIED BLAME

$$\text{Frequency: } \frac{18}{389} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.6\%$$

The complainer expresses modified disapproval of an action for which the accused is responsible.

In Xhosa such expressions are usually found with specific verbs.

The verb –phazamisa

Uyandiphazamisa ngokungxola.

You disturb me by making noise.

Bayaphazamisa abantwana abadlalayo apha.

Children who are playing here are disturbing.

The verb –bhideka

Ukhuphe izinto ongakhange usifundise ngoku ndiye ndabhideka.

You didn't teach us these things that is why I became confused.

The verb –mangala

Andiniqondi ngokuba kudala ndamangala anide nize neli tyala lam.

I don't understand you because I reported a case long ago you didn't come up with it.

The verb –phoxa

Yintoni ukundiphoxa kangaka ngokuthi unxibe ihempe yam?

Why do you disappoint me by wearing my shirt?

The verb –khalazisa

Iyandikhalazisa into yakho yokungafiki ngethuba.

I am complaining about you for not coming on time.

Negative verbs

Zikhona izinto ongazenzanga kakuhle zibe zilungile.

There are things that you made the wrong while they right.

5.11.1 Other possible expressions which are not with the selected situationsStatement with the passive –phanda

Amapolisa awuthatha kade umsebenzi wawo ityala ebelingene kudala alikaphandwa.

The police took a long time when doing their work, the case that have been reported long ago is not yet investigated.

With the verb –bambisa

Amapolisa awaliphandi kakuhle eli tyala kunini lo mntu ndambambisa.

The police are not investigating this case properly. I've laid some charges on this person long time ago.

5.12 STRATEGY 7: EXPLICIT CONDEMNATION OF THE ACCUSED'S ACTION

$$\text{Frequency: } \frac{50}{389} \times \frac{100}{1} = 12.9\%$$

5.12.1 Explicit blame (behaviour)

The complainer explicitly states that an action for which the accused is held responsible is bad.

Expression of explicit condemnation of the accused's action may be expressed in different ways in Xhosa.

Expressions with –bona ukuba

Uthetha ukuba awuboni ukuba undichithela ngesiselo?

Do you mean you don't see that you spill a drink over me?

Okoko wafunda zange ndikubone usenza umsebenzi wesikolo.

Since you are at school I've never seen you doing your schoolwork.

Zange ndikubone nemini enye uphathe iincwadi.

I've never seen you even a single day reading your book.

With the verb –hleba

Umhlobo wam uyandihleba, akathethi ngam ndikhona.

My friend gossip about me, she does not talk about me in my presence.

With the deficient verb –soloko

Usoloko uzixelela into yokuba akusoze uyinxibe iyuniform yesikolo.

You always tell yourself that you won't wear school uniform.

Wasoloko unganxibanga yunifom.

You always never wore school uniform.

Awufiki ngethuba wasoloko ufika leyiti.

You don't arrive in time, you always late.

5.12.2 Actions taking a long timekudala**Kudala ndikubona ungayinxibi iyunifom.**

I've seen you long ago that you don't wear a school uniform.

Kudala ndikuxelela ukuba ungalali apha

I told you long ago that you do not play here.

Kunini**Kunini ndikuxelela ukuba akulunganga ukubuya ngobusuku.**

I told you several times that it's not good arriving late at night.

Kulithuba elide**Kulithuba elide ndikubona unyawenzi umsebenzi wesikolo.**

It's been along time that I've noticed you that you don't do your homework.

Okoko**Okoko uqalile unyaka, awuyinxibi iyunifom.**

Since the beginning of the year, you don't wear uniform.

Unyaka uyaphela okoko ungayinxibi iyunifom.

The year is coming to an end, but still you are not wearing a uniform.

Negative verbs

Asilali sakungakuboni kuba kubi phandle apha.

We don't sleep if we don't see you, it's bad outside there.

Ixesha ofika ngalo andilithandi.

I don't like the time of your arrival.

5.12.3 Other possible expressions which are not within the selected situations

Extension of existing categories as above.

Statement with the verb –caca

Xa unxibe ngolu hlobo awucaci nokuba ungumntwana wesikolo.

If you wear like this, you don't look like a school child.

With the verb –bamba

Ixesha awulibambi ufika ixesha ebesilibekile selidlulile.

You don't keep the time of our appointment.

With the verb –buya

Xa ubuya esikolweni ufika ulahle iincwadi uhambe ubuye ngokulala.

When you arrive from school, you put your book and go and arrive at night.

Imperative

Goduka uykunxiba iyunifom ukuze ubonakale ukuba ungumntwana wesikolo.

Go home and wear school uniform so that everyone can see that you are a student.

5.13 STRATEGY 8 : EXPLICIT CONDEMNATION OF THE ACCUSED AS A PERSON

$$\text{Frequency: } \frac{1}{389} \times \frac{100}{1} = 0.3\%$$

5.13.1 Explicit blame (person)

The complainer states explicitly what is implicit at all other levels. A complainer may find the accused a non-responsible social member.

Expression of explicit condemnation of the accused as a person may be expressed in this way in Xhosa.

Unomkhuba ombi wokungezi apha.

You have a bad habit of not coming here.

5.14 RESPONSES TO COMPLAINT SITUATIONS

5.14.1 Number and percentage of responses

The total number of responses that were found in the questionnaire was 490. These responses will also be divided into three major situations.

Situation 1: Complaints with a person of superior status

Number of responses: 245

$$\text{Percentage of response: } \frac{245}{490} \times \frac{100}{1} = 50\%$$

Situation 2: Complaints to a person of equal status

Number of responses: 125

$$\text{Percentage of response: } \frac{125}{490} \times \frac{100}{1} = 25.5\%$$

Situation 3: Complaints between strangers

Number of responses: 120

$$\text{Percentage of response: } \frac{120}{490} \times \frac{100}{1} = 24.5\%$$

5.14.2 Responses within the situations

This section deals with the number and percentage of each response with regard to the questionnaire as a whole.

$$(a) \quad \text{Acceptance: } \frac{86}{490} \times \frac{100}{1} = 17.5\%$$

$$(b) \quad \text{Apology: } \frac{126}{490} \times \frac{100}{1} = 25.7\%$$

$$(c) \quad \text{Give reason: } \frac{225}{490} \times \frac{100}{1} = 45.9\%$$

$$(d) \quad \text{No Acceptance: } \frac{34}{490} \times \frac{100}{1} = 6.9\%$$

$$(e) \quad \text{Excuse: } \frac{3}{490} \times \frac{100}{1} = 0.6\%$$

$$(f) \quad \text{Blame: } \frac{3}{490} \times \frac{100}{1} = 0.6\%$$

- (g) Explanation: $\frac{1}{490} \times \frac{100}{1} = 0.2\%$
- (h) Threat: $\frac{1}{490} \times \frac{100}{1} = 0.2\%$
- (i) Accusation: $\frac{1}{490} \times \frac{100}{1} = 0.2\%$
- (j) No Response: $\frac{10}{490} \times \frac{100}{1} = 2\%$

5.14.3 Responses within the situation of complaints with a person of superior status

There are 245 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 50
Percentage: $\frac{50}{245} \times \frac{100}{1} = 20.4\%$
- (b) Apology: Number: 40
Percentage: $\frac{40}{245} \times \frac{100}{1} = 16.3\%$
- (c) Give reason: Number: 135
Percentage: $\frac{135}{245} \times \frac{100}{1} = 55.1\%$
- (d) No Acceptance: Number: 14
Percentage: $\frac{14}{245} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5.7\%$

Excuse and Explanation has never been used in this situation.

- (e) Blame: Number: 1
 Percentage: $\frac{1}{245} \times \frac{100}{1} = 0.4\%$
- (f) Threat: Number: 1
 Percentage: $\frac{1}{245} \times \frac{100}{1} = 0.4\%$
- (g) Accusation: Number: 1
 Percentage: $\frac{1}{245} \times \frac{100}{1} = 0.4\%$
- (h) No Response: Number: 3
 Percentage: $\frac{3}{245} \times \frac{100}{1} = 1.2\%$

5.14.4 Responses within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status

There are 159 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 22
 Percentage: $\frac{22}{159} \times \frac{100}{1} = 13.8\%$
- (b) Apology: Number: 35
 Percentage: $\frac{35}{159} \times \frac{100}{1} = 22\%$
- (c) Give reason: Number: 92
 Percentage: $\frac{92}{159} \times \frac{100}{1} = 57.9\%$

- (d) No Acceptance: Number: 6
 Percentage: $\frac{6}{159} \times \frac{100}{1} = 3.8\%$
- (e) Blame: Number: 1
 Percentage: $\frac{1}{159} \times \frac{100}{1} = 0.6\%$
- (f) No Response: Number: 3
 Percentage: $\frac{3}{159} \times \frac{100}{1} = 1.9\%$

Excuse, Explanation, Threat and Accusation were not used in this situation.

5.14.5 Responses within the situation of complaints from a person with low status to a person of superior status

There are 86 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 28
 Percentage: $\frac{28}{86} \times \frac{100}{1} = 32.6\%$
- (b) Apology: Number: 5
 Percentage: $\frac{5}{86} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5.8\%$
- (c) Give reason: Number: 43
 Percentage: $\frac{43}{86} \times \frac{100}{1} = 50\%$
- (d) Threat: Number: 1
 Percentage: $\frac{1}{86} \times \frac{100}{1} = 1.2\%$

- (e) Accusation: Number: 1
 Percentage: $\frac{1}{86} \times \frac{100}{1} = 1.2\%$

Excuse, Blame, Explanation, Accusation and No Response were not available in this situation.

5.14.6 Responses within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status where the teacher complains to a learner who is not wearing a school uniform

There are 29 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 4
 Percentage: $\frac{4}{29} \times \frac{100}{1} = 13.8\%$
- (b) Apology: Number: 6
 Percentage: $\frac{6}{29} \times \frac{100}{1} = 20.7\%$
- (c) Give reason: Number: 19
 Percentage: $\frac{19}{29} \times \frac{100}{1} = 65.5\%$

No Acceptance, Excuse, Blame, Explanation, Threat, Accusation and No Response were totally not used in this situation.

5.14.7 Responses within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status where the parents complain to their child for arriving home late at night

There are 27 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 3
Percentage: $\frac{3}{27} \times \frac{100}{1} = 11.1\%$
- (b) Apology: Number: 7
Percentage: $\frac{7}{27} \times \frac{100}{1} = 25.9\%$
- (c) Give reason: Number: 16
Percentage: $\frac{16}{27} \times \frac{100}{1} = 59.3\%$
- (d) No Acceptance: Number: 1
Percentage: $\frac{1}{27} \times \frac{100}{1} = 3.1\%$

Excuse, Explanation, Threat, Accusation, Blame and No Response were not used in this situation.

5.14.8 Responses within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status whereby parents complain to their child for not doing his/her homework

There are 25 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 3
Percentage: $\frac{3}{25} \times \frac{100}{1} = 12\%$
- (b) Apology: Number: 3
Percentage: $\frac{3}{25} \times \frac{100}{1} = 12\%$

- (c) Give reason: Number: 15
 Percentage: $\frac{15}{25} \times \frac{100}{1} = 60\%$
- (d) No Acceptance: Number: 1
 Percentage: $\frac{1}{25} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4\%$
- (e) Blame: Number: 1
 Percentage: $\frac{1}{25} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4\%$
- (f) No Response: Number: 3
 Percentage: $\frac{3}{25} \times \frac{100}{1} = 12\%$

Excuse, Threat and Accusation were not used in this situation.

5.14.9 Responses within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status where the priest complains to the children playing around the church during the service

There are 25 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 7
 Percentage: $\frac{7}{25} \times \frac{100}{1} = 28\%$
- (b) Apology: Number: 7
 Percentage: $\frac{7}{25} \times \frac{100}{1} = 28\%$

(c) Give reason: Number: 7
 Percentage: $\frac{7}{25} \times \frac{100}{1} = 28\%$

(d) No Acceptance: Number: 4
 Percentage: $\frac{4}{25} \times \frac{100}{1} = 16\%$

Excuse, Blame, Explanation, Threat, Accusation and No Response were not used in this situation.

5.14.10 Responses within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status in which the priest complains to the child for not attending the choir practice

There are 27 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

(a) Acceptance: Number: 4
 Percentage: $\frac{4}{27} \times \frac{100}{1} = 14.8\%$

(b) Apology: Number: 5
 Percentage: $\frac{5}{27} \times \frac{100}{1} = 18.5\%$

(c) Give reason: Number: 18
 Percentage: $\frac{18}{27} \times \frac{100}{1} = 66.7\%$

No Acceptance, Excuse, Blame, Explanation, Threat, Accusation and No Response were not available in this situation.

5.14.11 Responses within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status where the shopkeeper complains to the casual worker for arriving late at work

There are 25 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 1
Percentage: $\frac{1}{25} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4\%$
- (b) Apology: Number: 7
Percentage: $\frac{7}{25} \times \frac{100}{1} = 28\%$
- (c) Give reason: Number: 17
Percentage: $\frac{17}{25} \times \frac{100}{1} = 68\%$

No Acceptance, Excuse, Blame, Explanation, Threat, Accusation and No Response were totally not used in this situation.

5.14.12 Responses within the situation of complaints from a person of low status to a person of superior status where the learner complains to the teacher about obtaining very low marks in a test

There are 27 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 6
Percentage: $\frac{6}{27} \times \frac{100}{1} = 22.2\%$

- (b) Apology: Number: 4
 Percentage: $\frac{4}{27} \times \frac{100}{1} = 14.8\%$
- (c) Give reason: Number: 12
 Percentage: $\frac{12}{27} \times \frac{100}{1} = 44.4\%$
- (d) No Acceptance: Number: 4
 Percentage: $\frac{4}{27} \times \frac{100}{1} = 14.8\%$
- (e) Threat: Number: 1
 Percentage: $\frac{1}{27} \times \frac{100}{1} = 3.7\%$

Excuse, Blame, Explanation, Accusation and No Response were not used in this situation.

5.14.13 Responses within the situation of complaints from a person of low status to a person of superior status where a child complains to his/her parents for not giving him/her enough money

There are 21 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 7
 Percentage: $\frac{7}{21} \times \frac{100}{1} = 33.3\%$
- (b) Give reason: Number: 13
 Percentage: $\frac{13}{21} \times \frac{100}{1} = 61.9\%$
- (c) No Acceptance: Number: 1
 Percentage: $\frac{1}{21} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.8\%$

Apology, Excuse, Blame, Explanation, Threat, Accusation and No Response were not available in this situation.

5.14.14 Responses within the situation of complaints from a person of low status to a person of superior status where a casual worker complains to the shopkeeper for the small salary that he/she receives

There are 21 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 13
Percentage: $\frac{13}{21} \times \frac{100}{1} = 61.9\%$
- (b) Apology: Number: 1
Percentage: $\frac{1}{21} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.8\%$
- (c) Give reason: Number: 6
Percentage: $\frac{6}{21} \times \frac{100}{1} = 28.6\%$
- (d) No Acceptance: Number: 1
Percentage: $\frac{1}{21} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.8\%$
- (e) Accusation: Number: 1
Percentage: $\frac{1}{21} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.8\%$

Excuse, Blame, Explanation, Threat and No Response were not used in this situation.

5.14.15 Responses within the situation of complaints from a person of low status to a person of superior status where a member of the public complains to the police for taking a long time on the case of a theft

There are 16 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 2
 Percentage: $\frac{2}{16} \times \frac{100}{1} = 12.5\%$
- (b) Give reason: Number: 12
 Percentage: $\frac{12}{16} \times \frac{100}{1} = 75\%$
- (c) No Acceptance: Number: 2
 Percentage: $\frac{2}{16} \times \frac{100}{1} = 12.5\%$

Apology, Excuse, Blame, Explanation, Threat, Accusation and No Response were not used in this situation.

5.14.16 Responses within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status

There are 125 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 22
 Percentage: $\frac{22}{125} \times \frac{100}{1} = 17.6\%$
- (b) Apology: Number: 38
 Percentage: $\frac{38}{125} \times \frac{100}{1} = 30.4\%$

- (c) Give reason: Number: 45
 Percentage: $\frac{45}{125} \times \frac{100}{1} = 36\%$
- (d) No Acceptance: Number: 13
 Percentage: $\frac{13}{125} \times \frac{100}{1} = 10.4\%$
- (e) Excuse: Number: 3
 Percentage: $\frac{3}{125} \times \frac{100}{1} = 2.4\%$
- (f) Blame: Number: 1
 Percentage: $\frac{1}{125} \times \frac{100}{1} = 0.8\%$
- (g) No Response: Number: 3
 Percentage: $\frac{3}{125} \times \frac{100}{1} = 2.4\%$

Explanation, Threat and Accusation were not used in this situation at all.

5.14.17 Responses within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to your friend for wearing your new shirt without permission

There are 26 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 1
 Percentage: $\frac{1}{26} \times \frac{100}{1} = 3.8\%$

- (b) Apology: Number: 12
Percentage: $\frac{12}{26} \times \frac{100}{1} = 46.2\%$
- (c) Give reason: Number: 11
Percentage: $\frac{11}{26} \times \frac{100}{1} = 42.3\%$
- (d) Excuse: Number: 1
Percentage: $\frac{1}{26} \times \frac{100}{1} = 3.8\%$
- (e) No Response: Number: 1
Percentage: $\frac{1}{26} \times \frac{100}{1} = 3.8\%$

No Acceptance, Blame, Explanation, Threat and Accusation were not used in this situation.

5.14.18 Responses within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to your friend for making noise while you study

There are 26 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 9
Percentage: $\frac{9}{26} \times \frac{100}{1} = 34.6\%$
- (b) Apology: Number: 10
Percentage: $\frac{10}{26} \times \frac{100}{1} = 38.5\%$

- (c) Give reason: Number: 2
Percentage: $\frac{2}{26} \times \frac{100}{1} = 7.7\%$
- (d) No Acceptance: Number: 3
Percentage: $\frac{3}{26} \times \frac{100}{1} = 11.5\%$
- (e) Excuse: Number: 1
Percentage: $\frac{1}{26} \times \frac{100}{1} = 3.8\%$
- (f) No Response: Number: 1
Percentage: $\frac{1}{26} \times \frac{100}{1} = 3.8\%$

Blame, Explanation, Threat and Accusation was not used in this situation.

5.14.19 Responses within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to a friend for not honouring the time of your appointment

There are 28 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 3
Percentage: $\frac{3}{28} \times \frac{100}{1} = 10.7\%$
- (b) Apology: Number: 8
Percentage: $\frac{8}{26} \times \frac{100}{1} = 28.6\%$

- (c) Give reason: Number: 14
Percentage: $\frac{14}{26} \times \frac{100}{1} = 50\%$
- (d) No Acceptance: Number: 2
Percentage: $\frac{2}{26} \times \frac{100}{1} = 7.1\%$
- (e) No Response: Number: 1
Percentage: $\frac{1}{26} \times \frac{100}{1} = 3.6\%$

Excuse, Blame, Explanation, Threat and Accusation were not used in this situation.

5.14.20 Responses within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to a friend for gossiping about you

There are 26 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 8
Percentage: $\frac{8}{26} \times \frac{100}{1} = 30.8\%$
- (b) Apology: Number: 5
Percentage: $\frac{5}{26} \times \frac{100}{1} = 19.2\%$
- (c) Give reason: Number: 5
Percentage: $\frac{5}{26} \times \frac{100}{1} = 19.2\%$
- (d) No Acceptance: Number: 8
Percentage: $\frac{8}{26} \times \frac{100}{1} = 30.8\%$

Excuse, Blame, No Response, Explanation, Threat and Accusation were not used in this situation.

5.14.21 Responses within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status where you complain to a friend for not helping you on a project

There are 19 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 1
Percentage: $\frac{1}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5.3\%$
- (b) Apology: Number: 3
Percentage: $\frac{3}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 15.8\%$
- (c) Give reason: Number: 13
Percentage: $\frac{13}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 68.4\%$
- (d) Excuse: Number: 1
Percentage: $\frac{1}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5.3\%$
- (e) Blame: Number: 1
Percentage: $\frac{1}{19} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5.3\%$

No Acceptance, Explanation, Threat, Accusation and No Response were not used in this situation.

5.14.22 Responses within the situation of complaints between strangers

There are 120 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

(a)	Acceptance:	Number:	14		
		Percentage:	$\frac{14}{120}$	x	$\frac{100}{1}$ = 16.7%
(b)	Apology:	Number:	48		
		Percentage:	$\frac{48}{120}$	x	$\frac{100}{1}$ = 40%
(c)	Give reason:	Number:	45		
		Percentage:	$\frac{45}{120}$	x	$\frac{100}{1}$ = 37.5%
(d)	No Acceptance:	Number:	7		
		Percentage:	$\frac{7}{120}$	x	$\frac{100}{1}$ = 5.8%
(e)	Blame:	Number:	1		
		Percentage:	$\frac{1}{120}$	x	$\frac{100}{1}$ = 0.8%
(f)	Explanation:	Number:	1		
		Percentage:	$\frac{1}{120}$	x	$\frac{100}{1}$ = 0.8%
(g)	No Response:	Number:	4		
		Percentage:	$\frac{4}{120}$	x	$\frac{100}{1}$ = 3.3%

Excuse, Threat and Accusation were not used in this situation.

5.14.23 Responses within the situation of complaints between strangers where you complain to a stranger for spilling a drink on your dress

There are 23 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 2
Percentage: $\frac{2}{23} \times \frac{100}{1} = 8.7\%$
- (b) Apology: Number: 18
Percentage: $\frac{18}{23} \times \frac{100}{1} = 78.3\%$
- (c) Give reason: Number: 1
Percentage: $\frac{1}{23} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.3\%$
- (d) No Acceptance: Number: 1
Percentage: $\frac{1}{23} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.3\%$
- (e) No Response: Number: 1
Percentage: $\frac{1}{23} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.3\%$

Excuse, Blame, Explanation, Threat and Accusation were not used in this situation.

5.14.24 Responses within the situation of complaints between strangers where you complain to a taxi driver for the fare that is too high

There are 18 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 2
Percentage: $\frac{2}{18} \times \frac{100}{1} = 11.1\%$
- (b) Give reason: Number: 15
Percentage: $\frac{15}{18} \times \frac{100}{1} = 83.3\%$

- (d) Explanation: Number: 1
 Percentage: $\frac{1}{18} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5.6\%$
- (g) No Response: Number: 1
 Percentage: $\frac{1}{18} \times \frac{100}{1} = 5.6\%$

Apology, No Acceptance, Excuse, Blame, Threat and Accusation were not used in this situation.

5.14.25 Responses within the situation of complaints between strangers where you complain to a taxi driver for the high speed which he is driving

There are 24 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 4
 Percentage: $\frac{4}{24} \times \frac{100}{1} = 16.7\%$
- (b) Apology: Number: 4
 Percentage: $\frac{4}{24} \times \frac{100}{1} = 16.7\%$
- (c) Give reason: Number: 13
 Percentage: $\frac{13}{24} \times \frac{100}{1} = 54.2\%$
- (d) No Acceptance: Number: 2
 Percentage: $\frac{2}{24} \times \frac{100}{1} = 8.3\%$

- (e) No Response: Number: 1
 Percentage: $\frac{1}{24} \times \frac{100}{1} = 4.2\%$

Excuse, Blame, Explanation, Threat and Accusation were not used in this situation.

5.14.26 Responses within the situation of complaints between strangers where you complain to a person who is jumping the queue at a till in a shop

There are 27 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 1
 Percentage: $\frac{1}{27} \times \frac{100}{1} = 3.7\%$
- (b) Apology: Number: 10
 Percentage: $\frac{10}{27} \times \frac{100}{1} = 37\%$
- (c) Give reason: Number: 13
 Percentage: $\frac{13}{27} \times \frac{100}{1} = 48.1\%$
- (d) No Acceptance: Number: 2
 Percentage: $\frac{2}{27} \times \frac{100}{1} = 7.4\%$
- (e) No Response: Number: 1
 Percentage: $\frac{1}{27} \times \frac{100}{1} = 3.7\%$

Excuse, Blame, Explanation, No Acceptance, Threat and Accusation were not used in this situation.

5.14.27 Responses within the situation of complaints between strangers where you complain to the cashier at the till for the wrong amount they charged you

There are 28 responses in this situation in which they will appear with the number and percentage as follows:

- (a) Acceptance: Number: 6
 Percentage: $\frac{6}{28} \times \frac{100}{1} = 21.4\%$
- (b) Apology: Number: 16
 Percentage: $\frac{16}{28} \times \frac{100}{1} = 57.1\%$
- (c) Give reason: Number: 3
 Percentage: $\frac{3}{28} \times \frac{100}{1} = 10.7\%$
- (d) Blame: Number: 1
 Percentage: $\frac{1}{28} \times \frac{100}{1} = 3.6\%$

Excuse, Explanation, No Acceptance, Threat, Accusation and No Response were not used in this situation.

5.15 SUMMARY

In the case of response, there are 10 possible responses to a complaint.

Frequency of appearance

Only three have an acceptable percentage:

Highest percentage:	Give reason:	45.9%
Second highest percentage:	Apology:	25.7%
Third highest percentage:	Acceptance:	17.5%

The other 7 have a negligible percentage.

This type of frequency of response can also be found within the specific situations.

Complaints with a person of superior status:

Highest percentage:	Give reason:	55.1%
Second highest percentage:	Acceptance:	20.4%
Third highest percentage:	Apology:	16.3%

Responses within the situation of complaints from a person with superior status to a person with low status:

Highest percentage:	Give reason:	57.9%
Second highest percentage:	Apology:	22%
Third highest percentage:	Acceptance:	13.8%

Responses within the situation of complaints from a person with low status to a person of superior status:

Highest percentage:	Give reason:	50%
Second highest percentage:	Acceptance:	32.6%
Third highest percentage:	Apology:	5.8%

Responses within the situation of complaints to a person of equal status

Highest percentage:	Give reason:	36%
Second highest percentage:	Apology:	30.4%
Third highest percentage:	Acceptance:	17.6%

Responses within the situation of complaints between strangers

Highest percentage:	Apology:	40%
Second highest percentage:	Give reason:	37.5%
Third highest percentage:	Acceptance:	16.7%

5.16 RESPONSES IN XHOSA**(a) Acceptance**

In accepting a complaint, the addressee indicates that he/she receives the complaint as satisfactory or reasonable.

Example 1

The teacher complains to the learner about her/him not wearing a school uniform. After the teacher has complained, the learner gave the following response:

Asukuba andifuni kuyinxiba iyunifom.

It's not that I don't want to wear school uniform.

Example 2

Parents are complaining to their child for arriving home late at night. The child admits that he is wrong by giving this response:

Ngempazamo endiyenzileyo ndiyayiqonda le nto uyithethayo kuba ngenye imini ndakufumana ingxaki.

It is my mistake, I am aware of what you are saying because one day I will get into trouble.

Example 3

When the priest complains to the children playing around the church during the service, the children gave the following response to the priest:

Khange siyiqonde ukuba ngoku sidlalayo niyayiva loo nto.

We were not aware that you heard us when we play.

(b) Apology

In giving an apology, the addressee wants to say that he/she is sorry, for example, for having done something wrong, or for causing pain or trouble.

Example 1

The shopkeeper complains to the casual worker about arriving late at work. The casual worker gave this response to the shopkeeper so as to apologize:

Ndicela uxolo ngokusoloko ndifika kade emsebenzini.

I'm apologizing for always arrive late at work.

Example 2

A learner complains to the teacher about obtaining very low mark in a test. The teacher accepts that he/she is the one responsible for the complaint and he gave this response:

Owu! Uxolo mntwanam ndi, lo ukubalele ngokungendlela

Oh! I'm sorry my child, it's all my fault.

Example 3

You are complaining to your friend for wearing your new shirt without permission. Your friend gave you this response:

Uxolo akhange ndiqonde ukuba izakukakhathaza into yokuba ndinxibe ihempe yakho.

I'm sorry I didn't notice that wearing your new shirt will upset you.

(c) Give reason

The addressee gives a reason for the cause of an event or situation, that is, a fact, event or statement that provides an explanation or excuse for something.

Example 1

In the case of a child complaining to his/her parents for not giving him/her enough money, the parent responded as follows:

Utata wakho incinci imali ayifumanayo, ngaphezulu mna andiphangeli.

Your father is earning very little and more over I'm not working.

Example 2

A casual worker complains to the shopkeeper about the small salary that he/she receives.

The shopkeeper gave the following response:

Kaloku wena awufundanga ifanele imali yakho ibencinci.

You are uneducated that is why your salary is so small.

Example 3

A member of the public complains to the police for taking a long time on the case of the thief. The police responded this way to this member of the community:

Asikafumani bungqina babubo obaneleyo beli tyala.

We have not yet found enough witnesses on this case.

(d) No Acceptance of the complaint

A complainees does not want to accept the fact that he/she is wrong, that is, the addressee doesn't receive the complaint as satisfactory or reasonable.

Example 1

You complain to your friend for gossiping about you. Your friend does not want to accept that she/he is responsible for that action, and she responded as follows:

Leyo into andiyazi, ndiza kukhe ndiyokubuzisa kulo mntu ebekuxelela.

I don't know about that but I am going to ask the person who told you this.

Example 2

You complain to a stranger for spilling a drink on your dress. After you have complained to this person, the response he gave to the complaint is the following:

Nawe usuke weza apha kum waza kengoku wazigalela.

You came to me and the drink spill over you.

Example 3

You complain to a cashier at the till for the wrong amount they charged you. The person at the till does not want to accept that he charged you the wrong amount. He responded as follows:

Loo mali iphelele nguwe lo ungaphelelanga.

That money is enough it's you who is not complete.

(e) Excuse

Instead of accepting the fact that you are responsible of a certain action, you just make an excuse, that is, you give a reason whether true or false when asking to be forgiven.

Example

You complain to your friend for not helping you on a project. When you complain to your friend, this is the response that she gave:

Ngendikuncedisa qha umama uthi andisebenzi ekhaya ndisebenza kule mizi.

I wanted to help you but my mom says I don't do work at home I only work in these houses.

(f) Blame

In this case, the addressee considers someone or something responsible for something bad, that is, the addressee does not accept responsibilities.

Example

When you complain to the cashier at the till for the wrong amount they charged you, he responded as follows:

Ngulo matshini uyakuthanda ukubala into engekhooyo

It's this machine, it likes to calculate wrongly.

(g) Explanation

By giving an explanation, the addressee makes something clear or easy to understand.

Example

You complain to a taxi driver for the fare that is too high. The taxi driver responded as follows:

Sibhalile ukuba iitaxi zonyukile.

We have written that the taxi fare is up.

(h) Threat

In the case of a threat, an expression of an intention to hurt, punish or cause pain is given especially if one's instructions or demands are not obeyed.

Example

When the learner complains to the teacher about the low marks he/she obtained, the teacher threatens the child:

Uyakuphuma ngaphaya kwala masango esi sikolo kunjalo nje ungaphindi ungene.

I will throw you out of the school gates and I will make sure you don't come back.

(i) Accusation

An accusation is a statement accusing someone of doing wrong or breaking the law.

Example

A casual worker complains to the shopkeeper for the small salary that he/she receives. The shopkeeper responded as follows:

Imali yam apha evenkileni ibancinane kodwa impahla iyaphela umthengisi walapha evenkileni nguwe.

My money that we make is very small in the shop but the clothes are being sold and the only seller in this shop is you.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

With regard to the table of strategies, which appear as an appendix to these conclusions, Strategy 5: Direct Accusation is the most frequent strategy that is commonly used by people. This is shown by the high number of complaints in this strategy, which amounted to 262 with the percentage of 67,4%. The number and the percentage of complaints with superior status is 64.6%. Complaints from a person of superior status to a person of low status are 53.7%, which is not much different from 64.6% to persons of superior status. The complaint whereby a teacher complains to the learner for not wearing school uniform is 55%. Parents complain to their children for not doing their homework: 57.9% compare the average 64.6%. This shows that parents are serious about their children's future. The shopkeeper's complaint to his casual worker for arriving late at work is 55%. The priest's complaint to a child who is not attending the choir practice amounted to 68.2%. It is very high, this simply means that the priest takes this choir practice very serious such that he cannot stand the fact that this child does not attend the choir without any reasons.

Parents complain to their child for arriving home late at night; the percentage is 45%. This is a very low percentage. Maybe it is because parents are afraid of their children these days. Children are so much involved in gangs and they arrive any time they like at home. Parents have to keep quiet because if they say something they will lose their children to these gangsters or they are afraid their own children will hurt them.

The priest's complaint to the children for playing around the church during the service is 40%, which is also very low. The priest does not want to complain too much to these children because he is afraid they will not attend the service again. They will see themselves as unwelcome in the church. At the same time, he does not want the children to see him as a cruel and bad person.

Complaint situations from a person of low status to that of superior status: the number is 61 and the percentage amounts to 82.4%. The complaint from the learner where he complains to the teacher for obtaining very low marks is 85.7%. This is above the average, 82.4%. This clearly means that students like to complain to teachers especially when it comes to their marks, although they know that they were not prepared for the examination.

Students like to complain when they obtain low marks because most of the time they are afraid their parents would ask why they got such low marks.

A child complains to his/her parents for giving him/her not enough money: the percentage is very high: 89.5%. The reason why children always complain about money to their parents is because they compete too much with one another about the money their parents gave them. So, if the child is not complaining so that his/her parents can give him more, others will laugh at him/her for not having enough money for lunch.

A complaint where the casual worker is complaining for the small salary is extremely high: 94.4%. Workers like to complain especially when it comes to the issue of money because workers are suffering and the employers are using them. People are working overtime without being paid. Sometimes they work in one area for years without getting any increase. That is why they always complain and demand increases.

A complaint where the member of the public complains to the police for taking a long time in investigating a case of a thief is 56%, which is extremely low from the average. The reason for this is that people are scared of the police, that is why they don't want to complain too much to them.

The average percentage of the complaint between friends of equal status is 73.2%. A complaint to a friend for wearing your new shirt is 73.7%. A complaint in which you complain to your friend for making noise while you study is 80%, which is very high. This clearly means people of equal status do not always give each other the respect they deserve. For instance, making noise while the other is studying is very irritating that is why the percentage of complaining amounted to 80%. A complaint whereby a friend does not honour the time for your appointment is 60%, which is very low. Friends do not want to complain too much when it comes to time keeping, maybe they don't want to loose their friendship. Friends like to confront each other if they heard gossip about themselves. A complaint to a friend for gossiping about you is 70%. A complaint to a friend for not helping you on a project is 83.3%, which is extremely higher than the average. Most of the time, friends helped each other in everything they do, but the fact that the other friend is not helping leave us with a question mark. That is why the other friend complains like this.

A complaint between strangers amounted to 67%. A complaint to a person for spilling a drink on your dress is 30%. This clearly shows that people do not like to complain to anyone they met even if he/she did something bad, like spilling a drink on the dress.

A complaint in which you complain to a taxi driver for the high fare is 68.4%. Passengers like to complain especially when it comes to the increase of the fare although they know that petrol increases everyday. A complaint to a taxi driver for driving at a high speed is also very high: 75%. The reason is that taxi drivers do not care about people they do whatever they like with their taxis.

A complaint to a person for jumping the queue is 68.4%. It is not that far from the average, which is 67%. A complaint to a cashier for charging you wrong amount is extremely high. It amounted to 94.7%. This clearly shows that people do not want to make a mistake of leaving their money in the shop. Maybe they don't want to be cheated.

Strategy 7: Explicit condemnation of the accused's action is the second highest strategy in which the number of complaints is 50 and the percentage is 12.9%.

Complaints with a person of superior status are 16.4% and the complaints from a person of superior status to a person of low status are 25.6%, which is very high from the average percentage of 16.4%.

A complaint where a teacher complains to the learner and that of parents complaining to their child for arriving late at night is extremely high: 35%. This means that teachers and parents like to complain if they are not satisfied with some action.

Parents complain to their children for not doing their homework is 31.6%, which is also extremely high. This clearly means that parents are very much concerned about the future of their children. The priest's complaint to children's action of playing around the church is 15%. This is not far from the average 16.4%. This shows that the priest does not want to complain too much to the children because he does not want to lose them in church. Also the complaint where a priest complains to a child who is not attending the choir practice (4.5%), which is low. The issue of a shopkeeper who complains to the casual worker is also high, because it amounted to 35%. The shopkeeper does not want to be taken for granted.

The complaints from a person of low status to a person of superior status are 1.4%. The complaint of a learner to the teacher for obtaining low marks is 4.8%. This means that the learner does not like the teacher's action.

In the case of complaint to friend of equal status, the average percentage is 12.3%. A complaint to a friend for wearing your new shirt is 5.3%, which is very low. A complaint to a friend for making noise while you study and that of not honouring an appointment is 15%, which is not that far from the average percentage. A complaint of a friend gossiping about you is extremely high, 25%. As I have said before, friends do not like to hear gossip about themselves especially if the gossip comes from the one you trust. That is why they can't resist to confront each other.

A complaint between strangers is 6.1%. Strangers do not complain too much especially when you have just met. A complaint to a person for spilling a drink on your dress is 10%. It is the same as that of a taxi driver who is driving at a high speed and that of a person jumping the queue that is also 10%.

Strategy 4: Indirect Accusation is the third highest strategy in the questionnaire. The number is 39 and the percentage is 10%. Complaints to people of superior status are 11.8%. The complaints from a person of superior status to a person of low status are 14%. A complaint where a teacher complains to a learner for not wearing school uniform is 10%, which is not far from the average. Parents complaining to their child for arriving late at night are 15%, which is also not bad. Parents complaining about their children's homework are 5.3%. This is very low. It is very low, not because parents are scared of their children, but they don't want to complain directly, they prefer complaining indirectly to save face from their children. The complaint of a priest to a child who is not attending choir practice is 13.6%. But the complaint of a priest to the children who play around the church is 40%, which is extremely high. The reason for this is because the priest wants the children to take the church seriously and not as a place to play.

Complaints from a person of low status to a person of superior status, is 8.1%. A complaint of a child who does not get enough money from his parents is 5.3% and that of a casual worker complaining about his salary is 5.6%, which is low compared with the average. Maybe both a child and casual worker do not want to complain too much. People prefer to complain indirectly to the police, may be they don't have the guts to face

them directly, but the percentage of a complaint to the police is 25%, which is extremely high as compared to the other situations.

Complaints to friends of equal status are 4.1%. A complaint to a friend who is wearing your new shirt is 5% and the complaint of friends who didn't help each other in a project is 16.7%, which is now extremely high as compared to the other. Friends do not want to confront each other directly because they also do not want to lose this friendship.

Complaints to strangers are 12.3%. A complaint to a person for spilling a drink on your dress is 5%, which is very low. People don't want to complain too much to strangers. But the complaint of a taxi driver for the fare that is too high is extremely high because it amounted to 31.6%.

A complaint to a taxi driver for speeding is 15%. People are concerned about their life. A complaint to a person jumping the queue is 10.5%, which is also low from the average.

The number of Strategy 2: Annoyance, Strategy 6: Modified Blame and Strategy 8: Explicit condemnation of the accused's person is negligible. No clear conclusions concerning its use can be obtained from such a low number.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Boxer, D. 1993a. Complaints as Positive Strategies: What the Learner Needs to Know. University of Florida.
- Boxer, D. 1993b. Social Distance and Speech Behaviour: The case of Indirect Complaints. **Journal of Pragmatics** 19:103-125.
- Drew, P. 1998. Complaint Sequences. Department of Sociology, University of New York.
- Thomas, J. 1995. Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics. London and New York: Longman.
- Trosborg, A. 1995. Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yule, G. 1996. Pragmatics. Oxford University Press.

APPENDIX A

STRATEGIES

Situations	1	2		3	4		5		6		7		8	
		No	%		No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
All Situations	1	19	4.9	-	39	10	262	67.4	18	4.6	50	12.9	1	0.3
A. Superior status	-	4	2.1	-	23	11.8	126	64.6	9	4.6	32	16.4	1	0.5
A.1 Superior to low	-	4	3.3	-	17	14	65	53.7	3	2.5	31	25.6	1	0.8
A.1.1 Teacher: Dress	-	-	-	-	2	10	11	55	-	-	7	35	-	-
A.1.2 Parents: Late	-	1	5	-	3	15	9	45	-	-	7	35	-	-
A.1.3 Parents: Homework	-	1	5.3	-	1	5.3	11	57.9	-	-	6	31.6	-	-
A.1.4 Priest: Noise	-	1	5	-	8	40	8	40	-	-	3	15	-	-
A.1.5 Priest: Choir	-	1	4.5	-	3	13.6	15	68.2	1	4.5	1	4.5	-	-
A.1.6 Shop: Late	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	55	2	10	7	35	-	-
A.2 Low to Superior	-	-	-	-	6	8.1	61	82.4	6	8.1	1	1.4	-	-
A.2.1 Learner: Marks	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	85.7	2	9.5	1	4.8	-	-
A.2.2 Child: Money	-	-	-	-	1	5.3	17	89.5	1	5.3	-	-	-	-
A.2.3 Worker: Salary	-	-	-	-	1	5.6	17	94.4	1	5.6	-	-	-	-
A.2.4 Public: Police	-	-	-	-	4	25	9	56	3	18.8	-	-	-	-
B. Equal status	-	5	5.2	-	4	4.1	71	73.2	5	5.2	12	12.3	-	-
B.1 New Shirt	-	3	15.8	-	-	-	14	73.7	1	5.3	1	5.3	-	-
B.2 Noise	-	-	-	-	1	5	16	80	-	-	3	15	-	-
B.3 Appointment	-	2	10	-	-	-	12	60	3	15	3	15	-	-
B.4 Gossip	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	70	1	5	5	25	-	-
B.5 No help	-	-	-	-	3	16.7	15	83.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
C. Strangers	-	10	10.3	-	12	12.3	65	67	4	4.1	6	6.1	-	-
C.1 Stained dress	-	10	50	-	1	5	6	30	1	5	2	10	-	-
C.2 High fare	-	-	-	-	6	31.6	13	68.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
C.3 High Speed	-	-	-	-	3	15	15	75	-	-	2	10	-	-
C.4 Queue	-	-	-	-	2	10.5	13	68.4	2	10.5	2	10	-	-
C.5 Cashier	-	-	-	-	-	-	18	94.7	1	5.3	-	-	-	-

1.	COMPLAINTS WITH A PERSON OF SUPERIOR STATUS												COMPLAINTS TO A PERSON OF EQUAL STATUS						COMPLAINTS BETWEEN STRANGERS						
	1.1							1.2					2.						3.						
	1.1.1	1.1.2	1.1.3	1.1.4	1.1.5	1.1.6	Total	1.2.1	1.2.2	1.2.3	1.2.4	Total	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	Total	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	Total	
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	0
2	-	1	1	1	1	-	4	-	-	-	-	0	3	-	2	-	-	5	10	-	-	-	-	10	19
3	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	0
4	2	3	1	8	3	-	17	-	1	1	4	6	-	1	-	-	3	4	1	6	3	2	-	12	39
5	11	9	11	8	15	11	65	18	17	17	9	61	14	16	12	14	15	71	6	13	15	13	18	65	262
6	-	-	-	-	1	2	3	2	1	-	3	6	1	-	3	1	-	5	1	-	-	2	1	4	18
7	7	7	6	3	1	7	31	1	-	-	-	1	1	3	3	5	-	12	2	-	2	2	-	6	50
8	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	0	1
Total							121					74						97						97	389

RESPONSES

2.	SUPERIOR STATUS												PERSON OF EQUAL STATUS						BETWEEN STRANGERS						
	1.1							1.2					2.						3.						
	1.1.1	1.1.2	1.1.3	1.1.4	1.1.5	1.1.6	Total	1.2.1	1.2.2	1.2.3	1.2.4	Total	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.4	2.5	Total	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	Total	
Acceptance	4	3	3	7	4	1	22	6	7	13	2	28	1	9	3	3	1	22	2	1	4	1	6	14	86
Apology	6	7	3	7	5	7	35	4	-	1	-	5	12	10	8	5	3	38	18	-	4	10	16	48	126
Give Reason	19	16	15	7	18	17	92	12	13	6	12	43	11	2	14	5	13	45	1	15	13	13	3	45	225
No Acceptance	-	1	1	4	-	-	6	4	1	1	2	8	-	3	2	8		13	1	-	2	2	2	7	34
Excuse	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
Blame	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	3
Explanation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	1
Threat	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Accusation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
No Response	-	-	3	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	3	1	1	1	1	-	4	10
Total							159					86						125						120	