UNIVERSITÉ DU BURUNDI
GRENIER DU SAVOIR DU BURUNDI
Dépôt institutionnel officiel
https://repository.ub.edu.bi

Politeness expression in socio-cultural context : A contrastive analysis of english and kirundi languages

Makobero, Arlette; Sous la direction de : Dr. Gregoire Njejimana

1999
UB, FLSH
https://repository.ub.edu.bi/handle/123456789/1609

Document téléchargé depuis le **Grenier du Savoir du Burundi** — https://repository.ub.edu.bi

UNIVERSITY OF BURUNDI

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

POLITENESS EXPRESSIONS IN SOCIO-CULTURAL CONTEXT : A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH AND KIRUNDI LANGUAGES

BY

Arlette MAKOBERO

SUPERVISOR :
Dr.Grégoire NJEJIMANA

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE *"Licence en Langue et Littérature Anglaises"*.

BUJUMBURA, JUNE 1999

To my dear parents,

My brothers and sister,

To my beloved Grand-mother,

This work is warmly dedicated.

ACKNOWLEGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr Grégoire NJEJIMANA, lecturer at the university of Burundi, for volunteering to supervise this work which will be among my greatest achievements. I express my sincere gratitude for helping me with helpful advice from the beginning of this work to its end.

I wish to extend my gratitude to the teachers of the English Department of the University of Burundi for the training we got from them.

Special thanks go to my friends : Aurore and Dick, Diane, Elisa, Gode, Joséphine, Kiki and Mireille.

I am grateful and indebted to Anita NZEYIMANA for her understanding, patience and the kind and considerable effort she made in sending me all the books and documentation from England. For this and her friendliness, I shall remain indebted.

Last but not least, we owe more than we can express to our family and relatives, especially my parents who made possible for me to complete the degree requirements.

CONTENTS

DEDICATION i
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS iii

CHAPTER I : THE PROBLEM 1
1.1. Background of the problem 1
1.2. Statement of the problem 3
1.3. Purpose and motivation 4
1.4. Significance of the study 4

CHAPTER II : LITERATURE REVIEW 6
2.1. Language, Culture and Society 6
2.2. Social Factors 6
2.3. Politeness 7
2.3.1. Routine Fomulas 8
a. Greeting 9
b. Thanking 9
c. Taking leave 9
d. Apologising 9
e. Congratulations 10
f. Condolences 10
2.3.2. Routine formulas and language learning 10
2.3.3. Function of routine formulas 12

2.4. Speech acts 13
2.4.1. Types of speech acts 15
a. Locutionary acts 15
b. Illocutionary acts 15
c. Perlocutionary acts 16
2.4.2. Taxonomy of illocutionary acts 16
2.5. Other studies on politeness and politeness expressions 17
2.6. Contrastive analysis approach 21

CHAPTER III : METHODOLOGY 25
3.0. Introduction 25
3.1. Data collection procedure 25
3.2. Data analysis procedure 26

CHAPTER IV : CONTRASTIVE APPROACH TO THE ANALYSIS OF POLITENESS FORMULAS 28
4.0. Introduction 28
4.1. Pragmatic analysis of routine formulas 29
4.1.1. Semantic content 30
4.1.2. Illocutionary force 31
4.1.3. Rules of speaking 33
4.1.3.1. Greeting politely 33
4.1.3.2. Thanking politely 37
4.1.3.3. Apologising politely 38
4.1.3.4. Saying goodbye politely 42
4.2. Lack of equivalence 44

4.3. Partial equivalence 48
4.3.1. Differences in propositional content 49
a. Taking leave 49
b. Congratulating 50
4.3.1.1. Formulas involving references to 'Religious Concept' 51
4.3.1.2. Formulas involving references to 'Peace' 52
4.3.2. Differences in situation of use 53
a. Gender 54
b. Age 55

CHAPTER V : CONCLUSION 59

APPENDIX 61

BIBLIOGRAPHY 68

CHAPTER I : THE PROBLEM

The use of interpersonal verbal routines such as greetings, apologies, thanks, wishes, congratulations is examined as a universal phenomenon of human languages.

All human speech communities have expressions such as *'Good morning', 'thank you', 'God bless you', 'excuse-me'*, although their character and the incidence of their use may vary enormously from one society to another. Societies everywhere, no matter their degree of isolation or their socio-economic complexity, show the universal principles of human interaction at work ; yet what counts as polite may differ from group to group, from situation to situation, or from individual to individual. These politeness expressions are, in the words of Erving Goffman (1971:90), among the most conventionalised and perfunctory doings we engage in.

1.1. BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Language is considered as a communication system. The concept of communication leads to a rhetorical approach to Pragmatics. The speaker is seen as trying to achieve his aim within constraints imposed by principles such as those of politeness of good communicative behaviour.

The formulaic expression is part of a society's protocol and is considered by members of that society to be the marker of politeness, a knowledge of which is indispensable to the acquisition of communicative competence in language. Formulaic politeness markers used in a speech community may be of particular usefulness to a learner of the language concerned.

The basic challenge in the study of politeness is understanding the differences of interpretation that different cultures make of certain kinds of behaviour. What counts as an apology in one culture may be seen as an expression of thanks in another, and what constitutes a proper request in one culture may be perceived very rude in another. The norms of polite speech in two languages vary a great deal or very little. There do seem to be norms that are shared and that are related to the universals of politeness suggested by Brown and Levinson (1978). Politeness has to be communicated, and the absence of communicated politeness may be taken as absence of the polite attitude.

Formulaic statements in one language do not have close translation in other languages. Some of these expressions are quite simple as the formula 'Bon appétit' said by French at the beginning of a meal but others are quite complex. The language specific speech acts require learners to become familiar with very new patterns of culture. It is safe to say that the more the two similar cultures are, the more learners will need

to make use of speech acts that appear in one speech community but not in the other.

1.2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Our initial problem derives from the observation that, across cultures, the nature of the transaction being conducted in a verbal interchange is often evident as much in the manner in which it is done as in any overt performative acts.

In other words, when we speak, we must constantly make choices of many different kinds : what we want to say, how we want to say it and the specific sentence types, words, and sounds that best unite the *what* with the *how*. One way of looking at this relationship is to examine a few specific aspects of communication for example, the employment of politeness markers.

Eg1: expressing gratitude when receiving a gift in English

A: Brad, the bracelet is beautiful, but really you shouldn't have.

B: You're welcome. I think it looks beautiful on you.

Eg2: expressing congratulations to a mother who has just given birth in Kirundi

A. Imana icane (Thank God you delivered)

Had God not intervened in her conjugal life, the expecting woman would not experience a mother's pride and satisfaction.

1. 3. PURPOSE AND MOTIVATION

The study is concerned with a contrastive analysis of politeness expressions in two different cultures, two different languages that are linguistically and geographically unrelated : English and Kirundi.

A major reason for this interest is that politeness is basic to the production of social order, and a precondition of human cooperation.

Moreover, many years of interaction with some foreigners have proved to me that many people have difficulties choosing the right expression for the right context because of the differences that exist between Burundi and English culture.

1.4. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

In general the structure of politeness expressions varies in constituency and intensity in correlation with a number of social dimensions.

It is important to understand how misunderstandings and negative evaluations among people from different cultures may learn what pitfalls to avoid. If perceived similarity contributes to positive evaluations of other people, it is plausible that perceived similarities contribute to negative impressions of people from cultures different from one's own.

In order to establish causes for making a wrong selection of politeness expressions, a contrastive analysis between Kirundi and English languages is to be undertaken. This is in line with the theoretical assumption that two languages which are spoken by very different speech communities may yield many interesting contrasts with regard to their politeness expressions.

CHAPTER II : LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. LANGUAGE, CULTURE AND SOCIETY

The notions of language, culture and society are closely interrelated. A language cannot exist if there are no people to speak it and people make up society of which each person is a member. Whenever one speaks, one is operating in a given culture. People need culture to regulate their behaviour in particular. This is why there are 'dos' and 'don'ts' in language in general and with regard to sociolinguistic appropriateness in particular.

2.2. SOCIAL FACTORS

When two people speak with one another, there is always more going on than just conveying a message. The language used by the participants is always influenced by a number of social factors, which define the relationship between the participants. Consider, for example, a person making a simple greeting to another person.

There are many ways this greeting can be made.

a . *Hello, Jane. how are you doing?.*

b . *Good morning, Jane. How are you today?*

c . *Hi, Jane. What's happening*?

The most appropriate routine formulae for the situation would be a and b. The greetings sound expected (formal) and mechanical. The utterance c is informal. Young people often use it.

When choosing an appropriate utterance for the situation, there are factors that you must consider in order to effectively convey the message to the other participant.

1. Participants- how well do they know each other?
2. Social setting- formal or informal
3. Who is talking- status relationship/social roles (child Vs adult)
4. Aim or purpose of conversation.
5. Topic

2.3. POLITENESS

La Bruyère defines it as :

> *Une certaine attention à faire que, par nos paroles et nos manières, les autres soient contents de nous.*

Translation:

A fair attention by which, our words and manners make people proud of us.

And Branchereau, determining more its character, states the following

Une application délicate et attentive à témoigner à tous, par notre conduite extérieure, notre estime et notre bienveillance.

Translation :

A sensitive and attentive application to show to all, our external behaviour, our esteem and our kindness.

Charity would then be the real one or at least the only legitimate reason.

2.3.1. Routine Formulas

Routine formulas are expressions whose occurrence is closely bound to specific social situations and which are, on the basis of an evaluation of such situations, highly predictable in a communicative course of events. Their usage is motivated by the relevant characteristics of such social situations.

a. Greeting

Whether a greeting is appropriate depends very much on the circumstances, on the time of day on which the people are, on how well they know one another.

b. Thanking

Thanks may be and usually are expressed for normal courtesies and relative and trivial services. They are also of course expressed, although in a different language, when more important services are rendered, substantial friendly advice given, a welcome present received, etc.

c. Taking leave

There are many ways to take leave, and most of them depend on the situation at hand. We seldom take leave abruptly.

d. Apologising

An apology indicates that we realise we've made a mistake, and we're sorry for it. It's a way of expressing our regret or sorrow for something. When we apologise, We admit our wrongdoing or discourtesy, usually offer a reason for it, and express regret.

e. Congratulations

People usually offer someone their congratulations when expressing one's pleasure, praise, admiration because of a happy event or something successfully done.

f. Condolences

It is one of the most difficult situations to know to handle. When someone dies, we often avoid using words such as death, dead, or died.

2.3.2. Routine formulas and language learning

Learners with a good mastery of pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary may nevertheless be extremely unsuccessful in interactions with native speakers of that language if they do not have some understanding of their norms of politeness. Indeed, as would seem to be the case with stylistic errors in general, it is likely that the more proficient learners are in the other respects, the greater will be the danger that their failure to use the appropriate strategies may be perceived. They do not show any evidence of lack of proficiency, but rather show a sign of disrespect, hostility, or other negative attitudes.

There are several reasons why a knowledge of the formulaic politeness markers in a speech community may be of particular usefulness

to a learner of the language concerned. In first place, since routine formulas can be learned as indivisible and invariable units, a familiarity with their form can be achieved simply through memorisation, with no great cognitive difficulty. Routines can be learned independently of their individual word meanings and internal structures. The usefulness of many routines is also intensified by the frequency with which they can be used. The learner who memorises some basic formulas: for greeting such as *How are you?*, *Urakomeye*; thanking such as *Thank you*, *Urakoze*; congratulating such as *Congratulations*, in Kirundi the formula varies according to the event *Ndagukeje* (I congratulate you) to someone who has achieved a task; apologising such as *Sorry*, *Mpore* (don't be hurt) and so on will find them well worth the effort of learning, because they can be used in so many common situations. The use of such routines 'may lead to an impression of fluency which the learner does not really have'.

Politeness formulas may thus seem an invaluable aid to language learners especially in the early stages of mastering a language. All they have to do, is memorised as few widely used phrases and trot them out on all the occasions on which the corresponding formulae in their first language would be appropriate. The problem is, of course, that a pair of similar formulas in two languages rarely turns out to be completely equivalent in all respects. Unfortunately, few courses provide detailed specifications of how, when, and where to use the formulas introduced.

The teaching of politeness routines is a task, which may benefit from the use of some explicit contrastive analysis in the classroom.

Whereas the grammatical contrasts between the patterning of routines in two languages more often involve tendencies and partial overlaps that absolute distinctions, so an explicit discussion of the differences can be helpful in making students aware of the subtle yet significant contrasts.

2.3.3. Functions of routine formulae

If we consider the functions of routine formulas, we can see that reducing them to instruments of 'phatic communion' cannot account for the manifold roles they play in social interaction. According to Malinowski (1923:316) this kind of communication 'serves to establish bonds of personal union between people brought together by the mere need of companionship and does not serve any purpose of communicating ideas'. If this observation hits an important point, it is, nevertheless, only partly true for many routine formulas and false for others. It covers only one aspect of their usage and disclaims many other important social functions. Consider such a common formula as 'I'm sorry'. It is true that, maybe as a consequence of the frequent usage of the expression, we do not always know whether he who stepped on our toe and then muttered the phrase really regrets this false step. However, this phrase can be used to communicate exactly the idea that one is sorry, and if so used, it has a better chance to be successful than almost any other phrase.

It was argued above that the chief function of routine formulas is to reduce the complexity of social interaction. In every given social

situation every participant has to decide whether he can and wants to achieve a change of that situation. Situations differ with respect of their continuation patterns and the significance of every communicative act is relative to that pattern, in so far as it conforms to or violates the pattern.

Specific functions are related to specific kinds of situation they may consist in furnishing appropriate verbal response, e.g. in the case of meeting someone unexpectedly; in the case of expressing gratitude; in the case of apologising, and in many other cases.

2.4. SPEECH ACTS

Speech acts theory originates in Austin (1962) observation. In uttering any sentence, a speaker could be seen to have performed some act, or, to be precise, an illocutionary.

In speech act analysis, the effect of utterances on the behaviour of speaker and hearer is studied, using a threefold distinction. First, we recognise the bare fact that a communicative act takes place: The locutionary act. Secondly we look at the act that is performed as a result of the speaker making an utterance -the cases where 'saying = doing'-, such as greeting, welcoming, congratulating: these known as illocutionary acts, are the core of any theory of speech acts. Thirdly, we look at the particular

effect speaker's utterance has on the listener, the bringing out of such effects is known as a perlocutionary act.

Many linguists including Searle (1969) have also dealt with this area of research, Levinson (1983), and Fraser (1984).

Fraser states that :

> *'The concept of speech acts is concerned with the acts that we perform through speaking and has been studied extensively in recent years and has constituted a topical focus for scholars from a great number of disciplines that we perform through speaking.'*

Searle (1969) states that : «All linguistic communication involves linguistic acts.».To mean that the speech acts in the utterance of a sentence are in general, a function of the meaning of the sentence.

In addition, the intent of any utterance embodies a contextual orientation since speech never occurs in isolation. It always occurs in a social context. Speech therefore encompasses a wide range of factors, which according to Hudson (1982:231) include :

> *'The social group or groups to which the speaker belongs and hear, the structure of their interaction and participants which will be both general and 'culture specific', i.e., concerning present interaction.'*

In this respect, it can be stated that everything that is said, is done in a particular situation for a particular purpose, in order to understand what is said and its purpose. Therefore, one must be aware of the situation around it.

When people speak, they do so in order to accomplish some specific purpose in the interactional situation in which they are involved. Therefore, we can say that all meaningful utterances performed in interactional situations are goal-oriented, that they are speech acts.

2.4.1. Types of speech acts

a. Locutionary acts

The utterance of a sentence with determinate sense and reference. That means that there is a recognition that a person wants to and does communicate.

b. Illocutionary acts

One would like to look at the intention of the performance on the speaker-the case where «saying=doing», such as swearing, promising.

Conventionally associated with each illocutionary act is the face of the utterance which can be expressed as a performative. If a hearer, through his or her knowledge of the conventions of language, grasps what

one is doing, there is uptake on his or her part of the illocutionary force of the utterance.

c. Perlocutionary acts

It is the bringing out of a statement, on the audience by means of uttering such effects being special to the circumstances of utterance. In other words, it is the result or effect that is produced by means of saying something. This means that one would like to look at the peculiar impact the speaker's performance may have on the hearer as a consequence of the performance.

2.4.2. Taxonomy of illocutionary acts

There are thousands of possible illocutionary acts, and several attempts have been made to classify them into a small number of types. One influential approach sets up five basic types (Searle, 1976). These types are : Representatives, Directives, Commissives, Expressives, and Declaratives.

The representatives which commit the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition, e.g. asserting, concluding.

The directives which are attempts by the speaker to get the addressee to do something, e.g. requesting, questioning.

The commissives which expresses a psychological state, e.g. promising, threatening.

The expressives are the appropriate class of speech act to talk about since my study is concerned with politeness expressions.
Within the expressives, the speaker expresses an attitude about a state of affairs, e.g. apologise, congratulate, thank, welcome.

The declaratives which affect immediate changes in the institutional state of affairs and which tend to rely on elaborate extra-linguistic institutions, e.g. excommunicate, declare war, hire from employment.

2.5. OTHER STUDIES ON POLITENESS AND POLITENESS EXPRESSIONS.

There has been a surge of interest in the notion of politeness, and as well as attempts very basic and possibly universal strategies of politeness. Most of the research that has been done in Linguistics, Anthropology, and Sociology on politeness has been done on adult first language performance.

Early work was done by Goffman (1967), who described politeness, or deference ; in the context of a general theory of action or behaviour, or restricted linguistic communication.
He called deference *«the appreciation an individual shows to another through avoidance or presentation of rituals»* (Goffman 1967:7).

In an elaborated extension of Goffman's ideas to linguistic aspects of politeness, Brown and Levinson (1978) proposed a detailed, cross-linguistic taxonomy of politeness strategies. In general terms, their model assumes that politeness is motivated by two kinds of face and two related kinds of politeness. Negative politeness is used by a speaker to satisfy a hearer's negative face; it functions to avoid or minimise the imposition of a face-threatening act on a hearer. Negative politeness is characterised by speaker self-effacement, formality and restraint, and conventionalised indirectness. Positive politeness is used by a speaker to satisfy a hearer's positive face; the speaker indicates solidarity with the hearer's positive self-image. Positive politeness functions more subtly than negative politeness. Negative face, with its derived formal politeness of non-imposition, is the usual notion that the term politeness conjures up. However, Brown and Levinson show that both types of politeness interact in complicated ways, according to the nature of the act and the status of the speaker and hearer.

Robin Lakoff's work on politeness (1972, 1973a, 1973b) is similar to that of Brown and Levinson, although less elaborated and less formal in presentation. Lakoff's rules for politeness, which dictate to the speaker how to act toward the hearer, are for example, 'don't impose', 'give options', and 'make the listener feel good'.

In addition there is a large subfield in the research of politeness which explores issues related to differences between male and

female, language and the commonly held view that women's speech is supposedly more polite than men's (Lakoff 1973b, Brown 1976).

Some of the research on child first language acquisition has also dealt with the acquisition of communicative competence in the use of politeness strategies.

Closely related interests are persuaded in extensive body of research on learning a second language. Here issues of cross language, cross-cultural interference are the prime concern, and on this work the focus on differences has tended to obscure cross-linguistic parallels in the construction of utterances.

Some research in this field has directly addressed the question of the transfer of politeness strategies from one language to the other. Studies of 'native/non native English speakers' judgements in direct speech (Scarcella and Brunak 1981) have demonstrated that politeness rankings of differently formulated requests, for example, are highly correlated for native and non-native speakers.

Leech (1983) offers a somewhat different model for cross-cultural comparison of politeness strategies. He distinguishes 'tact' (1983:109) from other modes of politeness on quite different lines, in terms of a maxim maximising the benefit, and limiting the cost, to the addressee. He then contrasts a maxim of tact (perhaps the most import kind of politeness in English speaking society, (1983:107)) to maxims of

generosity, modesty, agreement, and suggests that cross-cultural variability will lie in the relative importance give then one of these maxims vis à vis another (1983:80). Thus he suggests that Japanese mores make it impossible to agree with praise by others of oneself, indicating that the Maxim of modesty takes precedence in Japan over the maxim of agreement (1983:136).

Studies, which attempt comparative and general theory treatment of politeness formulas, are usually limited to discussion of greetings.

Goody (1972) explains greetings in terms of a three-fold function. He says that the three functions attached to greeting are to open a sequence of communicative acts, to define and affirm identity and rank, and to manipulate a relationship to achieve a specific result.

Another study has been done by Eliane Kambere (1994). It accounts for four strategies (Bald-on Record, Positive Politeness, Negative politeness and Off Record politeness) for politeness in the Kirundi language especially when making requests.

Thus, it is in action and interaction that we believe the most interrelations between language and society are to be found.

2.6. CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS APPROACH

Nothing seems of greater potential value to language teachers and learners than a comparative and contrastive description of the learner's mother tongue and the target language. All languages in the fact present an underlying structure and a surface one. The deep structure being similar to every language.

One of the most important tasks in acquiring English as second language is learning the appropriate use of the linguistic forms one is acquiring. Yet while many second language researchers and pedagogues agree on the importance of communicative competence in teaching ESL, research on the specific components of what makes up communicative competence is still in its infancy.

Every language has its own system and should be described independently from others. This is to say that although both Kirundi and English include politeness expressions in their respective systems, each languages is structured and formulated differently. The ways politeness expressions operate in different language may be similar though some of them are not identical. As Dinneen (1969:219) said, it is important to underline the differences among languages but not to such an extent as to suggest that they have nothing similar.

Some linguists, namely Ferguson (1941:141), Afolayan (1971:228), have long felt that a contrastive study of two languages is of

value in predicting the problems the speaker of one language will have in learning the other.

Ferguson (1941:141) says that every language presents a unique structure which has to be studied on its own terms. In order to discover similarities and dissimilarities which give each language its distinctiveness, it is necessary to contrast the structure of different languages in detail.

Pit Corder (1973:231) mentioned that two languages cannot be totally similar with regard to a certain point, they can be just partially similar. He said :

> *Similarities between languages may be very general or abstract on the one hand, or superficial and trivial on the other; they are generally only partial, rarely complete.*

That is true for Kirundi and English.

Palmer as quoted by Afolayan (1971:221), on the contrary, seems to deny the possibility of a contrastive analysis between two languages from different language families. He said :

> *I am not myself in favour, as many people are, of making comparison of English with some African or Asian language, because it seems that the two are not comparable. But it is important that we should be able to describe the sort of English that result from the African or the Asian learning English.*

After having quoted the above opposed views concerning contrastive analysis, Afolayan (1971:221) suggested their union in order to make contrastive analysis a more powerful tool for the effective teaching of English as a second or foreign language.

Personally speaking, we think that contrastive analysis is of great value in the teaching of a foreign language because it helps the teacher to predict difficulties that learners will come across while learning the foreign language.

The importance of contrastive analysis in the teaching of languages is also affirmed by Richards (1971:204) when he quotes Politzer:

> *Perhaps the least questioned and least questionable application of linguistics is the contribution of contrastive analysis. Especially if the teaching experience is available, contrastive analysis can highlight and predict the difficulties of the pupils.*

Contrastive analysis has much to offer to translation theory, the description of particular languages, language typology and the study of language universals.

This study which developed out of our respective interests in speech acts is an attempt to contribute to the presently but small growing body of politeness features.

The purpose of our study is to fill the gap by investigating and comparing politeness judgements of native speakers of Kirundi and non native ESL learners on a set of politeness strategies in English which varies systematically in their pragmatic and semantic properties.

In fact looking at recurrent situations is one way to approach the problem of cross-cultural misunderstanding between social actions are differently defined in different social systems. Whether or not sneezing, yawning, is accompanied by some kind of routinized speech behaviour depends on the respective history of the respective culture.

So as far as we are concerned with contrasting Kirundi and English particularly about their politeness systems, these languages present both similarities and differences.

CHAPTER III : METHODOLOGY

3. 0. INTRODUCTION

No systematic research is possible without an appropriate methodology and this chapter is entitled for that purpose. As it has been pointed out in the introduction, this paper purports a contrastive analysis of politeness formulas in Kirundi and English languages. That is the reason why the methodology has necessarily to accord with the purpose of the study. This chapter is divided into two main sections : Data collection procedure and data analysis procedure.

3.1. DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURE

There are many ways of conducting research and every researcher has his own way of collecting data. The fact is that a researcher has to choose the most appropriate way of collecting data, so as to arrive to a successful result. Therefore, before we choose the method in accordance with the present study, we tried many methods among various existing methods. These are interviews, questionnaires, direct observation, tape-recording, and so on.

Brown and Yule (1983) assert that the discourse analyst can take his data either from written material as its source. It is then directed to

the contrastive description and analysis of routine formulas through a written data: London corpus of spoken English (Aijmer1990).

We adopted the driven data method, i.e., collecting data from existing written materials. Hence the data employed in this study are constituted by a set of several polite formulas transcribed from Rodegem (1963) and Zuure (1932) in Kirundi, and, a set of routine formulas elicited from 'Conversational Routines in English' by Karin Aijmer (1990). It is worth mentioning that, for practical purposes, we will provide in the appendix an English translation of the Kirundi expressions.

3.2. DATA ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

This section shows how the analysis of the collected data was carried out. Following the data gathered from books, we are able to classify and identify the politeness expressions and their area of use. We will try to show the similarities and differences of these expressions as far as Kirundi and English cultural backgrounds are concerned.

The analysis of the collected data will be based on the theory of speech acts which originated in Austin's (1962) observation which has already been mentioned above. As a matter of fact the speech act analysis is the effect of utterances on the behaviour of the speaker and the hearer.

We will have a close look at the collected expressions of routine formulas in English and Kirundi and try to find out what contrast is between them by means of their illocutionary act, the semantic content and the pragmatic content.

For e.g., a case where the semantic content is different and the pragmatic content is similar.

A comparison of frame may manifest a number of differences between the condition of use for two routine formulas. The differences give us the conceptual means for demonstrating where they overlap and where they differ.

CHAPTER IV : CONTRASTIVE APPROACH TO THE ANALYSIS OF POLITENESS FORMULAS

4.0. INTRODUCTION

It is surprising how much of everyday conversation consists of repetitive expressions such as *Thank you, sorry, Ndagize bwakeye(I say good morning to you), Urakoze (Thank you)* and their many variants. However common they may be, they do have important functions in communication.

Terms such as 'formulaic expressions', 'conversational routine', and others, though frequently used have often been somewhat vaguely defined, with considerable variation among authors. To take an example, Tannen and Ötztek's (1981:37) 'combinations of words which have become associated in everyone's mind and are often repeated in sequence'. There are also obvious difficulties in drawing a clear line between what is formulaic and what is not.

However, the occurrence of the politeness formulas is closely tied to types of repetitive social situations. In providing the verbal means for mastering such situations in a generally accepted manner. They carry a

great deal of social meaning. It is argued in the present paper that the practical conditions for their communicative function can only be explicated in terms of norms and values. It is demonstrated that a proper analysis can only be reached on the basis of a contrastive analysis of politeness formulas. Indeed, some of these expressions pose practical difficulties for second-language learners.

4.1.PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF ROUTINE FORMULAS

From a cross-cultural perspective, speech acts may differ both with regard to strategies and the social and cultural rules for their use. The problems for foreign learners caused by speech acts are therefore considerable. In comparing native and non native speakers, some advanced learners of English as a second language have problems with thanking, apologising due to the idiomatic nature of the phrase, and the socio-pragmatic constraints on their use.

When one compares Kirundi with English, there are differences as well as similarities. I f we describe and compare routine formulas it is useful to distinguish between the semantic content of a formula and its illocutionary force. It is also interesting to show how the polite formula are used.

4.1.1.Semantic content

The semantic content of a phrase may be defined as the descriptive content that a phrase has irrespective of the context or situation of the utterance. Assuming that the semantic content of a phrase is it literal meaning, this section provides the reader with the semantic meaning. Considering the apologetic form, English as well as Kirundi differ in their propositional content.

In English,

.-***I'm sorry***, *I'm late.*

-I'm afraid I smashed up your car. Can you ***forgive me****?*

By *I'm sorry*, the speaker is asking for excuse. It is rather used as *I regret.* It expresses regret. The speaker's attitude towards the state affair is presupposed to be true.

By *Forgive me* , here the speaker is requesting for forgiveness.

In Kirundi,

-***Murantunga*** *kubona ndabaciriye mw'ijambo.*(Sorry for interrupting you)

Murantunga is a very polite way for interrupting a person when he is talking. The speaker means bear with me.

Murantunga is a manner of expressing modesty.

4.1.2. Illocutionary force

In addition to the semantic content of polite routine formula, the illocutionary force is described by means of specifying the force of an utterance is to mean its status as apologising, thanking.
Furthermore, some politeness formulas may not be said to possess an illocutionary force in themselves, but function as part of a larger utterance which does possess a force.

This is the case in English.

-Please.

-Please sit down.

Please sit down as a whole could be said to constitute a request or an invitation, but *Please* itself here would not constitute a separate illocutionary act.

English as well as in Kirundi, thanking and apologising have much in common, which is the result that both are expressives speech acts, i.e. they express the speaker's psychological state towards a state of affairs or a person (Searle 1976:12).

Since *Thank you* in English and *Urakoze* (you have done) in Kirundi are expressives, their propositional content expresses some property to the speaker or the hearer (a past act done by the hearer which

benefits the speaker).The speaker feels gratitude for the act, (or behaves as if he does), and the illocutionary force counts as an expression of gratitude. In order to understand why thanking is considered as polite, we must go beyond the illocutionary point. Thanking coincides with a convivial function (Leech 1983:104). Here it consists of maximising politeness.

Utterances that contain the performative verb, as in apologies, are the ones to be used performing explicit illocutionary acts. A performative verb helps the speaker in performing illocutionary acts explicitly.

In English,
I apologise *for knocking over your cup.*

The performative verb 'to apologise' is described by a set of felicity conditions (Searle 1969: Chapter 3), that is the sincerity condition. It is polite way of apologising. The speaker is sorry for causing damage.

In Kirundi,
Urambabarira *vyashitse ndamena ikirahuri* (Excuse me for having broke the glass.)

The performative verb 'kubabarira' names the illocutionary act performed, namely the apology. The illocutionary act is explicitly expressed. The speaker asks for forgiveness because he caused damage.

4.1.3. Rules of speaking

Besides the distinction between semantic content and illocutionary force potential, an analysis of politeness formulas needs to incorporate a further level of description. It is concerned with the set of rules and conventions governing the situations in which they can be used. The successful language learner must know not only which formulas can be used for the performance of a particular illocutionary act, such as greeting, thanking, apologising; but also the kinds of contexts where such acts can be appropriately performed.

4.1.3.1. Greeting politely

All greetings are given when meeting or passing somebody in the street or when visiting somebody. People do not meet without greeting each other. In fact, greetings are almost formulas. They are correct ways to use greetings. In the English culture, people greet each other when they know each other. Often when people say 'Hi!' How are you doing?', the greeting sounds expected and mechanical; it doesn't convey a genuine interest in knowing the person's state of health or being . And just as the greeting may seem rather automatic, often so is the response 'fine' with a quick 'How are you?' added, is perhaps the most common response to a greeting. Shorter expressions are used to save time of speaking such as *Hi and Hello.*

In less mechanical greetings we show concern for a person by asking about something specific.

*-**Hello**, Jack. How's your new job working out.*

In this example an interest or concern is shown. We give a greeting and then ask about something we know is important to that hearer.

If you are talking to some one much older than you or someone with a high rank or position, you need to be more formal than if you are talking to your best friend or your brother.

In English,

*-**Good evening, Mr Jackson**. How are you?*

Here, the English speaker can use the surname preceded by Mr, Mrs, Miss. This is a polite way of showing respect to the hearer who evidently would not be expecting.

An appropriate greeting depends very much on the circumstances –on the time of the day,

*A-**Good morning***

*B-**Good afternoon***

*C-**Good evening***

A is used before midday
B is used after midday
C is used after the sunset

These greetings are formal. They express a wish that the hearer to spend a nice morning/afternoon/evening.
A and B are usually used only as greetings whereas C is used as a greeting and also as a closing.

In English, *Good morning* can be used metaphorically or by displacement, on a wrong occasion to point out a particular aspect of the encounter. So we can say sarcastically to someone who oversleeps and wakes up in the middle of the afternoon, or to someone who comes at home at 2:00AM when expected the previous evening. If you are talking you need to take into account the nature of the addressee, and the relationship between speaker and addressee (one is unlikely to use it in very informal situations, to a small child, or to one's spouse). All these appropriateness conditions must some how cause problems for the Kirundi learner of English as a second language.

***'Morning**, Joe. How are you?*

'Morning is an informal reduction of good morning. It is often omitted in casual conversation.

Burundians, in contrast, do have greeting formulas. Their rules governing use vary considerably. Formulaic statements in Kirundi such as the usual greeting depending on the time and of the day are very different in meaning. But still they share the same characteristic as for the English ones, related to the moment of the day.

Bwakeye (It is morning)
Mwaramutse (Did you wake up well?)
Mwiriwe (Did you spend well your day?)

Bwakeye from the verb 'Guca' which means that the sun has rise . It is a general terminology as Good morning.
Mwaramutse deriving from the verb 'Kuramuka' which means to wake up. It refers to somebody's life and well being .
Mwiriwe derives from 'Kwirirwa' which means have you spent well your day (either the morning or the afternoon). In contrast to English where you have a specific greeting for the afternoon and the evening, in Kirundi you have *Mwirire* which is used after midday and after the sunset.

Traditionally our society express respect through various manners. Let's take an example where we use ba (plural form)to show respect to the hearer. 'Ba' is the equivalent of the french 'vous'. It is much meaningful.

*Tura**ba**haye bwakeye/mwiriwe (we give you good morning)*

This shows that the speaker considers more respect he owes to the listener. It is a very polite way in Kirundi when greeting someone.

4.1.3.2. Thanking politely

Thanking people is an important part of English culture and Burundian culture. Thanking is expressed for normal courtesies relative trivial services. It is also, expressed when more important services are rendered. Thanking is part of ways of being polite.
English people express their gratitude in many ways from the very simple Thanks or thank you to a more elaborated or formal *thank you* with an intensifier.

*-**Thank you/ Thanks** for all your help. I think I can find my way now.*
*-**Thank you very much/ Thanks very much** for the beautiful roses, Jess. It was very nice of you to remember my birthday.*
*-It is a very nice diner Jane. **Thank you very much indeed/Thanks very much indeed.***
*-I **thank you so much** for the map directions. You have no idea what a tremendous help you've been.*
*-**Many thanks** for inviting me to your dinner party, Mrs White, but I'm afraid I won't be able to come because of a previous commitment.*

The intensifiers added to the stem *Thank you* , show how deeply is perceived the act of thanking. It is as if you would use *I am grateful.*

-I'm grateful *you didn't tell me about this.*

The speaker feels and show thanks to the hearer.

Saying thanks is a common and expected courtesy after receiving help or favours (gifts, services, well wishing or a compliment). English speaking people express thanks both for small services and for a big favour, causing trouble or inconvenience for the benefactor.

In Kirundi, similar expressions to the English ones are:

Urakoze *(You have done)*

Urakoze cane *(You have done very much)*

When saying *Urakoze,* the speaker acknowledges the act which has been done. *Cane* is an intensifier added to the stem to mean very much. The sense of being polite is raised here.

4.1.3.3. <u>Apologising politely</u>

In every society here are polite rituals, such as apologising. According to Goffman, the ritual work of apologising allows the participants to go on their way, if not with satisfaction that matters are

closed, then at least with the right to act as if they feel that ritual equilibrium has been restored. (Goffman 1976:68).

An apology is a speech act addressed to the learners face-needs and intended to remedy an offence for which the speaker takes responsibility, and thus to restore the equilibrium between speaker and hearer (Where the speaker is the apologiser, and the hearer is the person offended).

In English, apologies are generally made up of small repertoire of relatively fixed expressions representing verbs(*apologise, excuse, pardon*), adjectives(*sorry, afraid*)and nouns(*pardon*) and their expansions, modifications etc... *I'm sorry* is rather used as *I regret*

-expressions representing verbs

e.g: ***I apologise*** *for knocking over your cut. I didn't see it*
Excuse me *for being late. I forgot about the time.*
Pardon me*, please for steeping over your foot.*

The strategy of using a perfomative verb as in *I apologise* is limited to formal contexts.

Excuse me is used to apologise for minor offence involving social etiquette rather than for genuine apologies (linked to talk or inconvenience offences).
Pardon me occurs in situation where a person ha s accidentally touch or push someone.

-expressions representing adjectives,
e.g: ***I'm afraid*** *I was rude with Joe.*

I'm afraid expresses the speaker's intention to remedy an offence.

-expressions representing nouns
e.g: I beg your ***pardon*** *sir. I didn't realise you were speaking to me.*
Pardon is said when one does something that could be offensive to another person. I beg your pardon involves talk offence and is used primarily in face conversation. It is not worthy that the simple pardon has been conventionalised as a request for repetition and clarification.

Regarding to Kirundi, the most frequent type of offence associated with an apology is 'the inconvenience offence'.

-Someone arrives in an office. The staff is talking and do not notice his presence. So he tries to catch their attention to him and he says **Murantunga** hari ico nshaka kubaza *(Excuse me , can you help?)*

-Someone is holding a meeting. He is developing an idea which is

not shared by the audience. The latter starts to create an uproar which makes him look ridiculous. He can then say ***Murantunga...Murantunga*** (Please let me express myself).

In this case he wants to catch again the audience attention.
The speaker asks very politely if he is allowed to keep on speaking and extend his ideas.

Murantunga is a manner to express humility when speaking with more respectable people.
The following example the speaker takes on responsibility and admits the offence for personal inadequacies.

e.g: In a supermarket someone accidentally knocks down someone else's basket and over turns . He says: ***Murambabarira*** *sinabibonye.*(I'm awfully sorry ,it wasn't on purpose)

It is difficult to write rules that tell exactly when you should apologise, but it is not difficult to learn *how*. If we have done something to hurt someone's feelings, or if we have been impolite or rude, we should apologise.

The apology act is social. It is to express regret, the intended perlocutionary effect is to get the addressee to believe that one is sorry, but the social function may be to show good manners

In English, the word *goodbye* is not the only word that can be used. In fact, *goodbye* sometimes has such a final feeling about it that other words and expressions are often substituted for it (*take care, so long, take it easy*). Lets take a look to the following dialogs which are examples of various ways of ending conversations and saying goodbye in different settings.

4.1.3.4. Saying goodbye politely

In English the word *goodbye* is not the only word that can be used. In fact, goodbye has such a final feeling about it that other words and expressions are often substituted for it (take care, so long, take care, it easy). Lets take a look at the following dialogs which are examples of various ways of ending conversations and saying *goodbye* in various ways.

- Diane and Elisa have just been to the movie together, and Elisa is dropping Diane off at her house.

  Diane- *Thanks for driving tonight, Elisa. I had a great time.*

  Elisa- *Me, too. Let's plan to go together and see the new James Bond movie when it starts.*

  Diane- *Sure! You know I wouldn't miss it.*

  Elisa- ***Goodbye***

- Paul sees John at the bus stop. They are discussing.

  Paul- *I wish I could stay and talk, but here comes my bus. Why don't we go out sometime?*

John- *I'd like that. Call me soon.*

Paul- *Ok! See you.*

J- *Bye, Paul.* ***Take care.***

- Henry has been talking to Maria about his vacation in the Bahamas. Maria is getting bored, and she has to go to class.

  Maria- Henry that sounds wonderful, but I'm afraid I have to go. My next class starts in a few minutes.

  Henry- *Oh, is it that late? Sorry. I didn't mean to hold you up.*

  Maria- *Well, Have a nice day, and I'll see you around.*

  Henry- ***So long!***

- Kate and Kathy have been talking outside the post office where they met by accident. Kate glances at her watch and realises that she is late.

  Kate- *Oh god! I'm going to miss the subway if I don't hurry!*

  Kathy- *Nice talking to you, Kate.*

  Kate- *Ok, bye.* ***Take it easy.***

However in English, it is necessary to prepare a person for your departure. They lead into farewell by saying some pleasant expressions like,

I' ve enjoyed meeting you (said at a first encounter)

It's been good seeing you

Similarly in Kirundi people have various ways of saying goodbye,

Ni agasaga (see you)

Ndakwikebanuye (I am saying goodbye to you)

Ni agahindukira (Safe journey back)

Urugendo rwiza (Safe journey)

The speaker sometimes adds a wish of staying in touch.

e.g.: *Tuzobatubonana* (we will meet again)

Ni ah'ejo (see you tomorrow)

Ni akagaruka (Come back again)

4.2. LACK OF EQUIVALENCE

Perhaps the simplest type of contrast is that where there is no equivalence on the formality of the situation, the nature of the addressee and the relationship between speaker and addressee. Instead one language can possess a formula for which no counterpart at all can be found in the other language. Such cases may present the learner with a considerable learning task, and the problems they pose are discussed in section below ; but the evidence of the contrast in such cases will probably lead the teacher to ensure that learners are made aware of this.

The view that politeness or other formulas are more common in some languages than in others may seem intuitively plausible. It seems

necessary to distinguish between comparisons based on the total number of formulas felt to exist in a language (if this could ever be established), and those based on the numbers of formulas occurring in actual samples of the language concerned. Fortunately, our concern here is only with individual formulas.

The most obvious potential source of mistakes is the complete lack of an L2 equivalent to an L1 Routine Formula or vice versa. The failure to use a routine where it is conventionally required may be a consequence of misjudgement of its application conditions.

There are instances were a fixed formula in one language is not readily paired with any corresponding formula in the other what ever the quantity, the frequency or degree of fixedness of formulas in a pair of languages.

One possibility is where a situation requires a formula in one language while in the other language the same message would be appropriate, but it would not be conveyed by means of fixed formula.

In English does contain the formula *Get well soon*, which serves the same purpose, this is usable only in writing on the get-well cards named after this formula. In speech, however, something less fixed would be used ; any of the wide range of utterances could be used to express the wish that the addressee soon recover.

In contrast to English, Kirundi, for instance, has the following formulas which are used to wish a sick person a good recovery.

Imisuhuko (get well ; you have recovered)
Urarwara ukiza (I wish you good recovery) *said to the sick person.*

Imisuhuko is told to the person who was ill and has recovered. It is used by the speaker *B* who was told that *A* was ill but *B* didn't get time or the opportunity to look after *A*.
Urware ukira is a wish addressed to the one who is ill for a quick and good recovery.

Moreover in English, When any visitor enters the house, they say *Welcome*. Any remark expressing the speakers pleasure seeing the visitor would be appropriate. Whereas it is conventional in Burundi society there is an exchange and delaying formulas made between the host and the visitor.

e.g:	***Visitor***	***Host***
	Emwe, muraduha.	*Twahaye abandi*
	(You give us something)	(We gave to others)
	Mutugire nk'abandi,	
	(Do for us as you did for others)	
	None ntatwo? ,	
	(So is there something)	

Duhe utwomwirije
(Give us what you left for the day)

Turiko turarondera
(We are looking for it)

Hagarara turondere
(Wait until we prepare something)

Umushitsi arondererwa ashitse
(We prepare something for the visitor when he arrives)

These expressions are used one after another till the end. This kind of exchange is mostly used up country. The host makes the visitor wait until he finds something to give. If the visitor is not welcomed no exchange would be made. He would just say that there is nothing.

It may also happen that a formula is required in one language whereas in the other no remark is required at all in the corresponding situation. In Burundian culture , after a loss, during the condolences visits, people sit in one corner of the house and keep quiet. The silence is broken by some *Abandi barafa* (Other people die too). They must avoid mentioning the dead person This kind of behaviour which does not make any specific comment in English.

Such cases of non equivalence may pose various problems for the language learner. If learners attempt to translate and use their first-language, the result may be a fairly appropriate contribution to the conversation, one which seems exaggerated or stylistically odd, or one

which seems to make no sense at all. Learners whose first language lacks a formula, on the other hand, risk being perceived as abrupt or impolite if they omit what is felt to be essential in the other language.

4.3. PARTIAL EQUIVALENCE

There is perhaps more risks of misunderstanding an inappropriate usage in some cases. For example where two formulas appear to be equivalent at one or even two of the three levels, but where there is a contrast at another level. The danger here, of course, is that the partial equivalence may be mistaken for a total one. For instance, a teacher may often find it convenient to draw parallels between a pair of formulas which are equivalent at the semantic and sociopragmatic levels as well; or a learner, noting a semantic parallel between formulas in two languages, may jump to the conclusion that they may be used with the same illocutionary force and in the same range of situations.

It is very common to find a pair of formulas which are functionally similar but quite different in their meaning. Another kind of contrast arises when two languages contain routines with the meaning but differ in the functions they can fulfil. Other distributional contrasts, however , may be traced not to differences of force but to particular restrictions on where formulas may be used.

4.3.1. Differences in propositional content

It is very common to find a pair of formulas which are functionally similar but quite different in their semantic content ; indeed, cases where two languages share formulas with identical content and function seem to be relatively rare.

a. Taking leave

The performance of leave-taking, has come to be highly ritualized. This speech act performance depends to a large extend on the use of routine formula's. In evening, English speakers simply say *Goodnight.* Whereas a Kirundi speaker might use for instance;

Rara aharyana (sleep where it stings) *to mean sleep well*

This example states that if you spend a night where the fleas bite, that the next morning you will still be alive; if you feel the fleas, it means that you are not dead then. .

However in both cases, the same communicative purpose of politeness in wishing a pleasant night when leaving friends late in the evening, is achieved.

b. Congratulating

A congratulation can only refer to a non future event. It may be motivated by various kinds of reasons. The cultural specificity of this kind of activity becomes particularly obvious. What is to be regarded as a personal achievement is by no means self-evident. Whatever the reason maybe, it is assumed to be a happy event for B. The same event may be interpreted different if viewed from different perspectives or with regard to different participants to that event.

An English speaker, for instance might say *Congratulations* to a woman who has just had a baby; a Kirundi speaker would probably use,

e.g: *Uribaruka* (that you deliver)
Uvyare uheke (may your child grow up to adulthood)
Niwonkwe! (May you breast feed)

These expressions are more specific in content. When a woman is pregnant she is worried since she doesn't know or cannot predict how the childbirth will be. The pregnancy itself is a danger. Nine months or so of pregnancy are real burden bringing about at times despair and uncertainty of life. Because she has overcome physical, physiological and psychological problems, a mother who has just delivered deserves congratulations. These congratulations are rather considered as wishes.

Though kirundi and English have different ways of expressing congratulations they both have the same communicative purpose.

4.3.1.1 Formulas involving references to 'Religious Concept'

In Burundi culture *Imana* (God) is believed and represents wisdom for everybody. It is *Imana* which gives us life and blessings. *Imana* is the mighty , the creator and is the One which does only good things.
The religious behaviour of English people is not shared by Burundians because the latter utter freely the word 'Imana' (God) .

One of the most striking contrasts between the content of Kirundi and English routines is that many Kirundi formulas involve references to religious concepts, where the corresponding English ones do not.

a) taking leave

Horana Imana (May God always be with you)

Sigara n'Imana (Stay with God)

Genda n'Imana (Go with God)

b) thanking someone and hoping that he will do the same another time

Urakahabwa n'Imana (May God give you everything)

Imana iguhezagire (God bless you) Thank you very much

c) to someone who has achieved a task or done something well

Imana igume ibaja imbere (May God always be with you)

d) to a woman who has just given birth

Imana icane (Thank God you delivered)

Imana represent the blessings of God and the good luck..

4.3.1.2. Formulas involving references to 'Peace'

Burundi people believe in peace. Peace is the basis of everything in life: security, prosperity and good relationship in the neighbourhood. They use *Amohoro* in politeness expressions especially when they wish that the person to whom they are speaking to is in a good heath. Peace is very important to Burundian because if it is destabilised so is their well being.

Kirundi formulas also involve reference to peace. For example,

a) when greeting someone that you have not seen for a while (more than two days)

Uri amahoro? (Are you in peace?)

N'amahoro? (Is there peace?)

N'amahoro se? (Is there peace?)

Amahoro neza? (Are you peaceful)

b) from a host to a visitor who is taking leave

Genda amahoro uze ugaruke n'ayandi (Go in peace and may you come back in peace)

Shika n'amahoro (arrive in peace)

c) from a visitor to his host

Sigara amahoro/Sigara amarembe (stay in peace)

d) congratulating new married couple .

Genda mwubake n'amahoro (build your home in peace)

The belief of *Imana* and *Amahoro* is a very sacred thing to Burundi people. That is the reason why we find them in some politeness expression .

In most cases, the existence of formulas which are functionally similar but different in meaning need not pose any particular problem for the learner. Indeed, since in the early stages of learning a language such formulas are often learnt by heart, in terms of their functions, the learner may remain unaware of the literal meaning, and thus obvious to any such contrast.

The question of the extent to which learners of a language should also learn to adopt the socio-cultural conventions of its speakers is a delicate one. The degree of which English-speaking learners adopt cultural specific formulas in speaking Kirundi will ultimately depend on such factors as the extent of their integrative motivation, and the kinds of situation and people they have to deal with in the language.

4.3.2. Differences in situation of use

Other distributional contrasts, however, may be traced not to differences of forces but to particular conditions where formulas may be used, relating to any of a large number of possible situational variables.

Formulas may be conditioned with regard to the kind of speaker who may use them, the kind of addressee to whom they may be used and various aspects of the setting in which they are used.

Languages users often talk according to the gender and according to age. It is often reflected in their 'ways of speaking'. Learners may have to recognize that although a target-language formula has the same illocutionary force as their first language, it nevertheless does not have the same range of applicability.

a. Gender

The formulation is very impressive between two women greeting each other. Of course the degree of formality will depend on the relationship between the women concerned. If a woman meet another woman or an adult girl they will hold each other and exchange wonderful words of wishes for the well being.

Gira so (have a father)
Gira umugabo (have a husband)
Gira abana (have children)
Gira urugo (have a family)
Gira iyo uva niyo uva (come from somewhere and have where to go)
Uracariho (are you still alive?)
Wari ugikomeye (were you still strong?)
Amahoro neza (are you peaceful?)

These wonderful expressionS were wonderfully expressed through AKAZEHE. Now disappearing slowly. It was a kind of exchange of wishes using lovely songs.

b. <u>Age</u>

The following example, when thanking and in response to it, is used by a young person addressing to an elder one, and from an adult to a child.

	<u>Adult----Child</u>	<u>Child----Adult</u>
e.g:	*Urakoze*	*Murakoze ko mushimye*
	(You have worked)	(Thank you for acknowledging)
	N'uko mwana	*Murakoze bavyeyi*
	(That's good my child)	(Thank you parents)
	Urakoze mwiza	
	(Thank you my beautiful)	

Here the child and the adult use he term 'Urakoze but they differ in the use of the pronouns <u>*U*</u> (1st person singular)and <u>*Mu*</u> (2nd person singular)

Difficulties may arise for learners whose first language has a formula which can be used in a wide range of situations, whereas this same

range of contexts calls for several different and more restricted formulas in the target language.

Yet another kind of correspondence may arise where, although the function and general situation of use of two formulas are equivalent, there are differences in the exact circumstances felt to motivate their use; so that in a situation where the use of one would be polite, the other would not be acceptable. For example, while both Kirundi speakers and British English speakers recognise the act of thanking, acknowledging gifts, services, or concern as a polite way of responding to certain kinds of behaviour on the part of their addressee, they nevertheless differ in their views of where exactly an expression of thanks is needed. The British tend to utter *'thank you'* in response to the smallest service-to one who has passed the salt across the table, closed the door, or pick up something the speaker has dropped-and the formula may be used to complete a stranger or a close relative, to a superior or inferior. In Kirundi, however, such small gestures will typically not warrant thanks at all, and to use a formula such as *'urakoze'*, to such trivial service might seem ironical or sarcastic instead of polite.

There is a risk that learners of English whose first language is Kirundi, where no specific response seems to be laid down to answer to wishes, may offend their English interlocutors if they fail to provide the precise formula required in response to an English wish. In other case even though both languages require a response, one may allow more choice in how to respond than the other.

In attempting to assess the degree to which different formulas are felt to be obligatory, one might perhaps take into account the way in which they are taught to children (for it is interesting to note that politeness formulas represent one of the few components of a language which parents frequently attempt to train their children to use, evidently because of their importance, in acceptance in social behaviour). It is likely that in any speech community, certain formulas are felt to be a basic part of everyday politeness that even quite small children are expected to show, whereas others, may be acquired much later and without the insistent teaching by parents which so often seems to be used to elicit the first formulas a child uses. British parents for example seem to lay great stress on the need of three-, four-, five year old children to use please and thank you appropriately ; but for the Burundian parents much stress is put on the way of greeting elder people and how to thank someone for something.

A full comparison of the order in which formulas are presented to the child in the two communities would require an extensive investigation, but might yield very interesting information about the relative primacy of certain formulas and people's attitudes to their use. We cannot necessarily conclude, however, that the formulas first imposed on children also be those which foreign learners should attempt to master first; for the norms expected of adults often differ from those expected from children. Indeed, the behaviour expected from foreigners may also be different from that expected from native members of a speech community ; the latter are somewhat disconcerted if a foreign learner of their language

adopts something too close to what is felt to be their own personal language behaviour. In the end the decision as to which formulas learners should master, and in what order of priority, will depend on their own particular goals and the contexts in which they need to use the language.

CHAPTER V : CONCLUSION

One of the basic challenges in the study of politeness is understanding the differences of interpretation that different cultures make of certain kinds of behaviour. What counts as an apology in one culture may be seen as an expression of thanks in another, and what constitutes a proper request in one culture may seem very rude in another.

The above discussion has, we hope, illustrated the variety of levels at which formulas in two languages may contrast, and ways in which two formulas who seem to be similar may obscure quite complex differences. Learners who are not conscious of these differences may get into many difficulties. They may make quite inappropriate and unjustified assumptions about their attitudes, intentions, and personality if they fail to grasp the true significance of the formulas they hear.

We suggest that the learner be helped considerably by an explicit discussion and illustration of kinds of contrasts which may arise and we tried to provide a framework for the description of such differences. Through such comparison the learner can be helped not only to identify and understand any contrasts, but also to recognise that the very different politeness strategies adopted in two languages nevertheless represent manifestations of a common concern to show goodwill and cooperation.

This work has revealed a very interesting field of research. And we do not pretend to have exhausted all dimensions related to the topic. We hope that there will be many studies under other aspects to extend the topic.

APPENDIX

English Politeness Formulas (Cfr . Aijmer 1990)

APOLOGIES

I'm sorry

I am awfully sorry.

forgive me

Excuse me.

I apologise

Pardon me.

I beg your pardon.

CONGRATULATIONS

Congratulations!

GREETINGS

Hi

Hello, how are you doing?

Good morning,

Good afternoon.

Good evening, Mr/Mrs/Miss/Sir

TAKING LEAVE/ SAYING GOODBYE

Good night

Goodbye

Take care.

So long!

Take it easy.

I' ve enjoyed meeting you

It's been good seeing you

I'd better be going. It's almost 6 O'clock

Well it is getting late. I've got to hurry/go

THANKING

Thank you/Thanks

Thank you very much/Thanks very much.

Thank you very much indeed/Thanks very much indeed.

I thank you so much

Many thanks

I am grateful.

WELCOMING

Welcome!

Kirundi politeness expressions (Cfr. Rodegem(1963)& Zuure(1932))

APOLOGIES

Murantunga *kubona ndabaciriye mw'ijambo.*	(Sorry for interrupting you)
Murantunga *hari ico nshaka kubaza*	(Excuse me , can you help?)
Murantunga...Murantnunga	(Please let me express myself).
Murambabarira *sinabibonye.*	(I'm awfully sorry ,it wasn't on purpose)
Urambabarira *vyashitse ndamena ikirahuri.*	(Excuse me for having broke the glass)

CONGRATULATIONS

Genda mwubake n'amahoro	(build your home in peace)
Imana icane	(Thank God you delivered)
Uribaruka	(that you deliver)
Uvyare uheke	(may your child grow up

	to adulthood)
Niwonkwe	
Imana igume ibaja imbere	(May God be with you)

GREETINGS

Bwakeye	(Good morning)
Mwaramutse	(Did you sleep well)
Mwiriwe	(Did you spend well your day) (Good afternoon; Good evening)
Turabahaye bwakeye/mwiriwe	(I say good morning to you)
Uri amahoro?	(Are you in peace?)
N'amahoro?	(Is there peace?)
N'amahoro se?	(Is there peace?)
Amahoro neza?	(Are you peaceful)
Gira so	(have a father)
Gira umugabo	(have a husband)
Gira abana	(have children)
Gira urugo	(have a family)
Gira iyo uva niyo uva	(come from somewhere and have where to go)

Uracariho	(are you still alive?)
Wari ugikomeye	(were you still strong?)
Amahoro neza	(are you peaceful?)

TAKING LEAVE/SAYING GOODBYE

Rara aharyana	(sleep where it bites)
Ndakwikebanuye	(I am saying goodbye to you)
Ni agahindukira	(Safe journey back)
Ni agasaga	(see you)
Ni ah'ejo	(see you tomorrow)
Ni akagaruka	(Come back again)
Turagiye rero	(we then go)
Tuzobatubonana	(we will meet again)
Urugendo rwiza	(Safe journey)
Genda amahoro uze ugaruke n'ayandi	(Go in peace and may you come back in peace)
Shika n'amahoro	(arrive in peace)
Sigara amahoro/Sigara amarembe	(stay in peace)
Horana Imana	(May God always be with you)
Sigara n'Imana	(Stay with God)
Genda n'Imana	(Go with God)

THANKING

Urakoze	(You have worked)
Urakoze cane	(You have worked hard or a lot)
Ndakushimiye	(I am grateful to you)
Urakoze ko ushimye	(Thank you for acknowledging)
N'uko mwana	(That's good my child)
Urakoze mwiza	(Thank you my beautiful)
Murakoze bavyeyi	(Thank you parents)
Urakahabwa n'Imana	(May God give you everything)
Imana iguhezagire	(God bless you) Thank you very much
Imana igume ibaja imbere	(May God always be with you)

WELCOMING

Visitor	***Host***
Emwe, muraduha.	***Twahaye abandi***
(You give us something)	(We gave to others)
Mutugire nk'abandi,	

(Do for us as you did for others)

None ntatwo? ,

(So is there something)

Duhe utwomwirije

(Give us what you left for the day)

Turiko turarondera

(We are looking for it)

Hagarara turondere

(Wait until we prepare something)

Umushitsi arondererwa ashitse

(We prepare something for the visitor when he arrives)

OTHER FORMULAS

Imisuhuko

(get well ; you have *recovered)*

Abandi barafa

(Other people die too)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Austin, J.L., (1962). How to do things with words. Oxford University Press.

2. Aijmer, K., (1990). Conversational routines in English. Ed. City.

3. Barakamfityiye, T., (1987). Ugukeza abavyeyi: Une approche formelle. Université du Burundi mémoire 1987.

4. Bikorihoma, N., (1989). Une approche de signification des salutations traditionnelles d'après une enquête menée en zone MUHANGA (KAYANZA) 1989.

5. Brown, P. , (1976). Women and politeness a new perspective on language and society. Reviews in Anthropology. 3 (3) : 240-9.

6. Brown, P. , and Levinson, S., (1978). Politeness: Some universals in language use. Cambrige. Cambridge University Press.

7. Brown G. , and Yule G., (1983). Discourse analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

8. Corder, P., (1973) . Introducing applied linguistics. London. Penguins Books.

9. Coulmas, F., (1981). Conversational routine: explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech. The Hague.

10. Crystal, D., (1985). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Langauge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

11. Goffman, E., (1967). Interaction rituals. New York: Pantheon Books.
(1971). Relation in public: microstudies of public. New York: Pantheon Books.

13. Goody, E.N., (1972). 'Greeting', 'Begging' and the presntation of respect. In The interpretation of ritual essays in honour of Richards A.I., ed. Lafontaine J.S. London.

14. Gust, F., (1982). Life with two languages. Havard: Havard University Press.

15. Hudson, R.A., (1982). Sociolinguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

16. James, C., (1980). Contrastive Analysis. Longman.

17. Kambere, E., (1994). Politeness in verbal interaction : the case of Requesting Expressions. B.A. Thesis : University of Burundi.

18. La Bruyère, J., (1963). Les caractères ou les mœurs de ce siècle. Paris, Union Général d'Editions.

19. Lakoff, R., (1973 a). The logic of politeness; or minding your p's and q's. In papers from the ninth regional meeting of the Chicago linguistic society. Chicago.

(1973 b). Questionable answers and answerable questions. In Kachru et al., eds. 1973.

20. Leech, G.N., (1983). Principles of Pragmatics. London : Longman.

21. Malmkjaer, K., (1991). The Linguistics Encyclopedia.

22. Malinowski, B., (1923). The problem of meaning in primitive languages. In the meaning of meaning, eds. Ck.Ogden & I.R. Richards. London.

23. Nitereka, T.,(1992). A Pragmatic analysis of some kirundi refusals. B.A.Thesis. University of Burundi.

24. Nkundwanabake, E. (1987). An Analysis of Kirundi speech acts : MaternityCongratulations. B.A. Thesis. University of Burundi.

25. Nzorijana, G.(1990).. A Pragmatic Analysis of some Kirundi insulting Expressions. B.A. Thesis. University of Burundi.

26. Oldin, T, (1989).Language Transfer. Cambridge University Press.

27. Recarnati, F., (1987). Meaning and Force : The pragmatic performative utterances. Cambridge University press.

28. Richards, J.C., and Schmidt, R.W., (1983). Language and communication. London. Longman.

29. Rodegem, F.M., (1965). Patrimoine Culturel Rundi. Savoir -Vivre : Tome 3. Vie sociale individuelle : Bujumbura : Centre de Langue.

30. Scarcella, R.,& Brunak,J., (1981). On speaking politely in a second language. Journal of the sociology of language 27:59-75. In Walters,ed.1981.

31. Searle, J.R., (1969), Speech Acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

(1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. Language in society, 5,1-23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

32. Tannen, D.,& Öztek, P.C.,(1981). Health to our mouths : Formulaic expressions in Greek and Turkish in Coulmas (ed.) 1981a.

33. Zuure (1932). L'Ame du Murundi. Paris : Beauchesne et ses fils.