



**NAMIBIA UNIVERSITY
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

FACULTY OF COMMERCE, HUMAN SCIENCES AND EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SCIENCES, EDUCATION AND LANGUAGES

**A PRAGMATIC STYLISTICS INTERPRETATION OF PETRUS HAAKSKEEN'S '*THE ROTTEN
APPLES OF JABULA HIGH SCHOOL*' (2001) AND '*FINDERS KEEPERS LOSERS WEEPERS*' (2000)**

BY

JOSEPHINE ABIA DHIGININA IYAMBO

STUDENT NUMBER: 213100126


**THESIS PRESENTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTERS OF ENGLISH AND APPLIED LINGUISTICS AT THE NAMIBIA UNIVERSITY OF
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

SUPERVISOR: PROF HAILELEUL ZELEKE WOLDEMARIAM

20 APRIL 2022

DECLARATION OF ORIGINAL WORK

I, **Josephine Abia Dhiginina Iyambo**, hereby declare that the work contained in the thesis, entitled "**A pragmatic stylistics interpretation of Petrus Haakskeen's '*The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School*' (2001) and '*Finders Keepers Losers Weepers*' (2000)**", is my own original work and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it at any university or other higher education institution for the award of a degree.

Signature: ____  ____ Date: 20 April 2022 _____

AUTHENTICATION OF THE THESIS

I certify that this candidate has successfully completed all the research work for this degree and that:

1. the thesis conforms to NUST postgraduate rules as stipulated in the Yearbook 2021 and submission of theses for higher degrees;
2. the thesis includes a certificate indicating the extent to which the research has been conducted by the candidate;
3. the thesis is properly presented and is prima facie worthy of submission;
4. instances of inadequate presentation were pointed out to the candidate for correction before the thesis was bound;
5. the candidate has completed an approved programme of study and research as required;
6. an abstract of not more than 300 words has been included in the thesis;
7. both hard/bound and soft copies of the thesis have been submitted to NUST Library's open access digital archive.

Name of the supervisor : Prof Haileleul Zeleke Woldemariam

Signature : *Haileleul Zeleke Woldemariam*

Date : 20 April 2022

CERTIFICATION PAGE

It is Certified that the thesis titled '**A pragmatic stylistics interpretation of Petrus Haakskeen's 'The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School' (2001) and 'Finders Keepers Losers Weepers' (2000)**' submitted by Ms Josephine Abia Dhiginina Iyambo towards partial fulfilment of the Masters of English and Applied Linguistics degree, is based on the investigation carried out under our guidance. The thesis has therefore not been submitted for the award of any academic qualification at any other university or academic institution.

Haileleul Zeleke Woldemariam

Prof Haileleul Zeleke Woldemariam (Supervisor)

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to my family, especially my nieces and nephews. I sincerely hope that this study inspires you all, to continuously strive to improve yourselves in every area of life, especially education, because it remains the greatest equalizer.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to acknowledge my supervisor, Professor Haileleul Zeleke Woldemariam, for his professional guidance throughout the period of study, but most importantly for being patient with me. I am truly grateful.

I also want to thank my good friend Laz for sharing his knowledge and extending a helping hand when I needed it the most.

To, my parents 'meme' Martha and 'tate' Josef, your prayers, unconditional love and support kept me going throughout the study period. My sisters Martha and Elizabeth, words fail me when I think of how much you have done for me to ensure that I complete my study.

To my dear friend Aletta and fellow student, I do not know what I would have done without you on this journey. Your constant motivation and encouragement is unmatched. I love you always.

Last but not the least; I want to thank the Lord who made everything possible for me. Lord your love indeed surpasses all understandings. There can never be sufficient words to express how blessed I feel to have you as my redeemer. I give all glory to you.

Finally, thank you all for believing in me when at times I didn't believe in myself. God bless you all.

RETENTION AND USE OF THESIS

I, **Josephine Abia Dhiginina Iyambo**, being a candidate for the Masters of English and Applied Linguistics Degree, accept the requirements of the Namibia University of Science and Technology relating to the retention and use of theses deposited in the Library. In terms of these conditions, I agree that an original of my thesis be deposited in the library where it is accessible for the purposes of study and research, in accordance with the normal conditions established by the librarian for the care, loan or reproduction of theses.

Signature: _____  _____ Date: _20 April 2022

ABSTRACT

The study sought to interpret Petrus Haakskeen's plays titled '*The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School*' (2001) and '*Finders Keepers Losers Weepers*' (2000) through a pragmatic stylistics analysis. The study of pragmatic stylistics evaluates how language users interact, communicate and interpret linguistic behaviour. It was thus, the impetus of the present study to apply Politeness principle by (Leech, 1983) to the understanding of these two texts. Principles of politeness are also termed maxims. The principle of politeness assumes six maxims; tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy. A qualitative study approach was used for data collection and analysis. The findings of the study revealed that all the six principles were identified to be present in communicative events in the two texts. They have successfully been used in the two plays to project power struggles between characters. In the two separate texts, the characters engage in various exchanges of utterances that satisfy the politeness principles identified by the theory. The study findings also revealed that the proliferation of negative politeness principles as strategies were used in communication by the characters. Furthermore, the study found out that there were several occasions where the politeness principles were violated. The violated principles/maxims of politeness were the tact, approbation and modesty. These were used in manners that were in breach of the politeness theory. The findings assert that a violation of politeness principles is a condition that occurs when a speaker/hearer fails to avoid conflict, thereby breaching the principles of politeness (Leech, 2005). For this situation to occur, the speaker/hearer acts in the opposite manner from what is ordinarily expected of them. Based on the manner in which the subject of education is tackled in the play '*The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School*', lessons can be learnt on how to improve the education system in present day Namibia. The study concludes that impoliteness can be avoided if the people that use language in their daily life conversations in places such as the market place and so forth understand what it means to be polite.

Key words: Pragmatic stylistic, Maxims, Politeness principles, Namibia, South Africa, Colonisation

List of Tables

Table 3.1: Content analysis checklist in Applied Linguistics.....34

Table 4.1: Presentation of the six politeness principles identified in the two plays.....42

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION OF ORIGINAL WORK	ii
AUTHENTICATION OF THE THESIS	iii
CERTIFICATION PAGE	iv
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
RETENTION AND USE OF THESIS	vii
ABSTRACT	viii
List of Tables	ix
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the study	1
1.3 Research questions	6
1.4 Significance of the research	6
1.5 Delimitation of the research	6
1.6 Limitations of the study	7
1.7 Definition of technical terms	7
1.8 Chapter summary	8
CHAPTER TWO	9
LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	9
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 The concept of polite language	9
2.3 A review of previous related Namibian literature	10
2.4 Pragmatic Stylistics in a broad context	11
2.5 What are the significant types of politeness principles?	15
2.6 How have the politeness strategies been used to project power struggle?	20
2.7 How have the politeness maxims been violated?	24
2.8 Research gap/s	27
2.9 Theoretical Framework	27
2.9.1 Historical account of politeness principle	28
2.9.2 Lakoff's theory of politeness	30
2.9.3 Gricean cooperative principle	31

2.9.4 Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness	31
2.9.5 Leech's politeness principle	32
2.9.6 Literary criticism of the politeness theory	32
2.10 Theoretical application of the politeness principle to the present study	33
CHAPTER THREE	35
RESEARCH METHODS AND PROCEDURES	35
3.1 Introduction	35
3.2 Research design	35
3.3 Research paradigm	36
3.4 Qualitative research approach	36
3.5 Text selection criteria	36
3.6 Research Instrument(s)	37
3.7 Data analysis	38
3.8 Ethical Issues	39
3.9 Chapter summary	39
CHAPTER FOUR	40
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS	40
4.1 Introduction	40
4.2. Synopsis of ' <i>The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School</i> ' (Haakskeen, 2001)	40
4.3 Synopsis of <i>Finders Keepers Losers Weepers</i> (Haakskeen, 2000)	41
4.4 What are the significant types of politeness principles used in the plays?	41
4.5 How politeness strategies have been used to project power struggle between characters	44
4.5.1 Tact maxim in projecting power struggle	44
4.5.2 Generosity maxim obeyed	48
4.5.3 Negative approbation maxim	50
4.5.4 Negative modesty maxim apathy of self-praise	54
4.5.5 Agreement maxim	56
4.5.6 Sympathy maxim obeyed	62
4.6 Violation of the politeness principles	65
4.6.1 Violation of the tact maxim	66
4.6.2 Generosity of reconciliation	68

4.6.3 Violation of the approbation maxim	72
4.6.4 Violation of the modesty maxim	75
4.6.5 Agreement maxim	77
4.6.6 Expression of sympathy in a maxim	78
4.7 Discussions	79
4.7.1 What are the significant types of politeness principles used in the plays?	79
4.7.2 How have the politeness strategies been used to project power struggle between characters?	80
4.7.3 How have the politeness maxims been violated in the plays?	81
4.8 Chapter summary	82
CHAPTER FIVE	83
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	83
5.1 Introduction	83
5.2 Summary of the findings	83
5.2.1 What are the significant types of politeness principles used in the plays?	83
5.2.2 How have the politeness strategies been used to project power struggle between characters?	85
5.2.3 How have the politeness maxims been violated in the plays?	85
5.3 Conclusions	86
5.3.1 What are the significant types of politeness principles used in the plays?	87
5.3.2 How have the politeness strategies been used to project power struggle between characters?	87
5.3.3 How have the politeness maxims been violated in the plays?	87
5.4 Recommendations based on the findings	88
References:	89
ANNEXURES	95
Annex A: Content analysis checklist in Applied Linguistics	95

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

The study sought to interpret Petrus Haakskeen's plays, '*The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School*' (2001) and '*Finders Keepers Losers Weepers*' (2000) through a pragmatic stylistics analysis. The study of pragmatic stylistics evaluates how language users interact, communicate and interpret linguistic behaviour. It was thus, the impetus of the present study to apply the politeness principle (Leech, 1983) to the understanding of these two texts. As such, the study was conducted to examine the linguistic and sociolinguistic contexts of im/politeness in language use.

The linguistic history of Namibia is dominated by the German and South African colonial languages; German and Afrikaans respectively. The two colonial administrations imposed German and Afrikaans on Namibia as part of colonial domination and this had meant that Namibian literature is also characterised by the events of the colonial era. The body of literature also tackles and reflects on current political, social and economic problems affecting the livelihood of Namibians. It is historically and empirically established knowledge that Namibia, like many other African countries was colonised by European colonialists. Erichsen, (2022) postulates that, Namibia (formerly, South West Africa then), was colonised by Germany in the late nineteenth century between 1884 and 1914. It was later established as a territory of the League of Nations until the late 1920s when South Africa was granted a mandate by the United Nations to govern South West Africa. It was then under the apartheid government of South Africa up until 21 March 1990 when she gained her independence and was renamed Namibia. Considering the above, it is thus no surprise that both the colonial and apartheid systems have since greatly influenced the works of many Namibian authors, especially thematically, across many genres of the literary sphere.

Winterfeldt and Vale (2011) state that Namibian literature is made up of literary genres such as novel, drama, biography and poetry. While Chapman (1997) adds that, the three genres of poetry, prose and drama have been written revolving around major themes such as exile, home, resistance, liberation struggle and many others. Many of the literary works reveal that authors write in auto/biographical manners based chiefly on their personal life experiences

such as during the liberation struggle, family dynamics and the HIV and AIDS pandemic, to mention just a few.

Chapman (1997) further claims that Namibian literature can be said to have emerged from the classical period in the past when the way of life was recorded through songs, stories and fables of the indigenous people. Fundamentally, it is based on the experiences of its people, their cultures, values and beliefs then and now. An interesting observation which also resonates with Chapman's claim is by Winterfeldt and Vale (2011, p.89) who believe that aesthetic encoding in literature is an element of the social order of both the author and work written. The duo assert that, fiction is the 'play' that reflects a creative image of the real world which is perceived through the author's cognitive lens. Equally literature entails the production of a reality of its own, objectified by means of language in two respects – it entails the production of meaning and of a cultural commodity.

According to Krishnamurthy and Vale (2018) the themes in various Namibian literary texts in general are classified as pre and post-independence texts. They observe the themes of the economy, home, exile and the liberation struggle as some of those which many writers have written about before independence, while gender issues, nationalism and identity and critique of a post-independence society are some of the major themes that writers grapple with post-independence.

Krishnamurthy and Vale (2018) further argue that culture is particularly a valuable theme in Namibian literature before and after independence, as the setting of many literary works still vividly depicts the past – although engaged with present activities. This theme is apparent in autobiographies written before and after independence such as Marcus Schivute's *Go and Come Back Home: A Namibian's Journey into Exile and Back* (1997), Ellen Ndeshi Namhila's *The Price of Freedom* (1997), Rachel Valentina Nghiwete's *Valentina, The Exile Child: An Autobiography* by Rachel Valentina Nghiwete (2010) and Sam Nujoma's *Where Others Wavered* (2001). These personal stories relate on the authors' past experiences mostly during the liberation struggle.

Winterfeldt and Vale (2011) also confirm that Namibian literature across almost all literary genres produces various remarkable examples of cathartic analyses of the colonial past and of the liberation struggle. Their themes reveal societal contractions and conflict and their

power over the future of Namibia's society pre-independence and the painful repercussions of the individual's fate.

More recently, Namibian literature in English has gained momentum and growth. As a post-colonial entity within the African huge stream of African literature, Namibian authors have thus far produced several locally written and published orthographies in only 30 years after independence. Today the literature exists in forms of novels, collections of plays, poetry anthologies, auto/biographies, children's books, adventures, religious fictions, historical fictions and so forth.

Some of the themes vividly displayed from several publications today are centred on the authors' experiences during the liberation struggle, exile, unemployment, crime, love, health, economic crisis, education and many more. Prominent authors within the Namibian literary landscape include among others, Sifiso Nyati, Joseph Discho, Fredrick Philander, Neshani Andreas (late) and Ellen Ndeshi Namhila.

Inspired by the recent trend of stories and themes, the study explores the Namibian literary sphere, by examining two Namibian plays, Petrus Haakskeen's *'The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School'* (2001) and *'Finders Keepers Losers Weepers'* (2000) through the pragmatic stylistic theoretical lenses of Politeness principle. In the last three decades, Namibian authors have turned to various literary genres to air their views on several political and socio-economic matters such as gender-based violence, unemployment, education among others.

Pankaj (2011) as cited in litula (2018) believes that literature serves the role of a potent medium of communication which entails more responsibility than privilege to the writer. Also, published literary work is fundamentally an act of communication through which the writer validates his personality and vision of life on the society (Pankaj & Seetharaman, 2021). With the same thinking Holm and Londen, (2010) also assert that the reader is firmly linked to society, its ideologies and beliefs and therefore accordingly comprehends literature about the immediate society. One therefore concludes that literature is a powerful tool for communication and which transports a series of views and opinions about various societal concerns via the literary rocket-ship.

In order to unpack the concerns encapsulated within Namibian literary genres, this study adopts a pragmatics stylistics approach with a focus on politeness as evinced to have been applied in the two selected plays. Pragmatics stylistics as described by Crystal (1987) is an application which studies the factors that govern our choices of language in social interaction and the effects of our choices on others. Unlike pragmatics, pragmatics stylistics is not only chiefly concerned with what is said and meant, but also considers the reasons for producing certain utterances. It also investigates why the writer or speaker has chosen certain expressions or words at the expense of others (Grice, 1975).

Politeness (Leech, 2005), which is the key term in this research study, has for long been an occurrence of concern in many societies of which Namibia is no exception. According to Leech, (2005), politeness is a feature of language use that vividly reveals the nature of human society in speech interaction and considers the feelings of others. Kadar (2017, p.1) claims that,

...the [k]ey phenomena studied in politeness research includes, among others, impoliteness, intercultural interaction, cross-cultural similarities and differences of politeness, the gendered characteristics of politeness behaviour, and convention and ritual. Kadar further states that, politeness research is a multidisciplinary field that is engaged in the examination of a wide variety of data types.

Based on previous researches, one observes that linguistic stylistic and pragmatic stylistic analyses, especially utilising the theoretical explications of pragmatic theoretic concerns such as politeness from within a Namibian context appear to be lacking. This study therefore explores a relatively new phenomenon, focusing on the linguistic inequality resulting from socio-cultural issues, power struggle and social distance. The study looks at how various contexts influence different levels of politeness in conversations between fictional characters in the selected plays.

Traditionally, the notion of politeness has been studied mostly based on ordinary everyday conversation. However, recently it has been applied to various discourses such as drama, prose, poetry and movie scripts. It is in the same spirit that the current study undertakes a pragmatic stylistics interpretation of the two plays '*The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School*' (2001) and '*Finders Keepers Losers Weepers*' (2000) by Petrus Haakskeen. This is done in an

attempt to determine the manners in which Haakskeen occupies space in the selected plays to address contemporary issues in manners that evince issues related to language use. Such issues include politeness, context, socio-culture, social distance and/or power struggle.

The choice of these two texts is inspired by how a far reading of the texts evinces instances of impolite language usage within the plays. Moreover, the plays are also purposely selected on the basis they were written in the 20th century where most of the previously stated problems are observed on a day to day basis. Most importantly the texts feature discourses between male and female characters and this enables the researcher to analyse politeness maxims from a socio-cultural standpoint as stipulated in the specified research questions – with the ultimate aim of examining politeness, power struggle, and social distance in the plays.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Politeness is one of the major communication problems portrayed in literary texts. Equally, it is a social problem within human interactions, regulating the participants' communicative consideration of others' feelings. Because of individual and cultural differences, it is often misunderstood, as what is considered polite by one may not be polite to the other. Quite often, there is communication failure experienced among people in real life conversations resulting from impoliteness. Because literary mimics the real world, this is also often reflected through characters in conversations in literary texts such as drama and prose. In linguistics, communication failure in fiction is studied by analysing utterance exchanges between characters. The utterances are studied at different levels of the politeness maxims to determine which of these may be appropriate for effective communication purposes. Therefore, a pragmatic stylistics study is conducted to determine the levels of politeness that are effective for human communication as demonstrated by an interpretation of the speech patterns of the characters in Haakskeen's *'The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School'* (2001) and *'Finders Keepers Losers Weepers'* (2000). The study seeks to examine the politeness and impoliteness of the utterances made by the fictional characters in the two selected plays demonstrating the effects these have on the readers as well as on the communicative potential of the utterances.

1.3 Research questions

The general objective of this study is to conduct a pragmatic stylistics interpretation of the Haakskeen's *'The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School'* (2001) and *'Finders Keepers Losers Weepers'* (2000). The study is guided by the following specific questions:

- What are the significant types of politeness principles used in the plays?
- How have the politeness strategies been used to project power struggle between characters, and contribute to the communicative potential of the text?
- How, if at all, have the politeness maxims been violated in the plays?

1.4 Significance of the research

Pragmatic stylistics interpretations of fictional imaginaries are of utmost importance in understanding human communication speech patterns. They also assist reader understand better the nuanced meanings of texts – as they examine meanings beyond what is said at the surface realisation of language. On the other hand, examining the use of politeness principles is a reflection of the daily conversations between ordinary Namibians. For example, politeness can teach a person at a market place how to politely communicate with customers in order to profitably negotiate for sale without being rude to the customer. The study hopes to benefit researchers and readers at various learning institutions like school and universities where Namibian literature is prescribed as part of the learning content since the study principally analyses Namibian plays. Researchers can also use this study as a reference material for related research works. Moreover, the study further anticipates contributing to knowledge in the pragmatic subfield and specifically to Namibian literature. The study further gives an insight into Namibian literature and therefore, in the process answering to the call for concern over the observed poor teaching and study of Namibian literature, especially drama. The researcher hopes that the research findings will also encourage more research on pragmatic stylistics, specifically in the Namibian context.

1.5 Delimitation of the research

The study is exclusively a pragmatic stylistics one and thus cannot be generalised. A qualitative approach informs this study, in which a conversation analysis is carried out in the chosen plays. The analysis aims at identifying and evaluating different levels of politeness principle formulated by Leech Geoffrey (1983), in Haakskeen's *'The Rotten Apples of Jabula High*

School' (2001) and *'Keepers, Finders, Losers, Weepers'* (2000). Although related literature is at times referred to for review purposes, the findings presented are principally based on the selected plays.

1.6 Limitations of the study

There were a few limitations in this study. The major limitation was the lack of previous studies conducted in Namibia or on Namibian literature. This resulted in the literature review being quite limited as there was not much directly related previous scholarship to review. Another limitation was that of the lack of research experience. Time limitation was another constraint. The time allocated for this study is only one academic semester. It would be more beneficial if the research project part of the programme could be allowed to at least a one-year period.

1.7 Definition of technical terms

In order to have a clearer understanding of how the study develops, some of the key terms pertinent to such an understanding are here defined.

- **Conversational analysis** – is an approach within the social sciences that aims to “describe, analyse, and understand talk as a basic and constitutive feature of human social life” (Sidnell, 2010, p. 1).
- **Maxim** – is a strategy of politeness aimed at minimising impolite beliefs to others.
- **Pragmatics** – is the study of contextual meaning and involves the interpretation of what people mean in a context and how the context influences what is said (Kangira, 2009).
- **Pragmatics stylistics** – refers to the application of the findings and methodologies of theoretical pragmatics to the study of the concept of style.
- **Politeness** – refers to the ways in which language is employed in conversation to show consideration for the feelings and desires of interlocutors, to create and uphold interpersonal relationships (Van Olmen, 2017).
- **Politeness principle** – refers to minimising the expression of impolite beliefs, in the process maximising the expression of polite beliefs (Leech, 1983, p. 81).
- **Stylistics** – is the study of style or the study of distinctive linguistic expression (Verdonk, 2001, p.2).

1.8 Chapter summary

The chapter introduced the study. The study is a pragmatics stylistic interpretation of two Namibian plays by Petrus Haakskeen. The chapter explained the background of the study as well as the statement of the problem. Research questions were also presented. Furthermore, the significance of the study, delimitation and limitations of the research are also explicated. Lastly the technical terms which are considered critical in the study were defined. The next chapter reviews related literature and discusses the major explications of the theoretical framework used in the analysis and interpretation of data in the study.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses literature that has affinities to the current research. As such, it reviews scholarship on pragmatics stylistics as well as past studies that applied the politeness theory as a framework for analysis. The main purpose of conducting a literature review is for the researcher to gain a deeper understanding about the area of study within which they are researching. Another reason is for the researcher to identify theoretical and methodological gaps which their own research might also be able to fill. The literature review is organised simultaneously in response to the study research questions and as such, with a focus on pragmatics stylistics, Namibian literature, politeness, socio-cultural, power struggle and social distance. The literature review also identifies research gaps in the corpus of previous scholarship on pragmatic stylistics and then discusses the relevance of the principles of politeness as explicated by Leech (1983), the theoretical framework which informs this study.

2.2 The concept of polite language

In simple terms, the politeness principle is a type of communication that seeks to avoid conflict during a conversational exchange of utterances between the speaker and the hearer (Leech, 2005). Since this study investigates the proliferation of im/polite language in two plays through pragmatics stylistics framework, the researcher deems it necessary to first problematise what constitutes polite language. Generally speaking, politeness is a global phenomenal among social groups that is greatly influenced by cultural differences. According to Mills (2003, p. 6) “politeness is the expression of the speakers’ intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face threatening acts toward another”. Maharani, (2017) also confirms politeness to be an important aspect in society. It is an integral part in human interaction and thus regarded as some form of social norm which is determined by the convention of the community. The politeness principles follow a series of six maxims which are significant for this study, particularly because they guide the analysis as the theoretical framework within which such analysis is couched. These six maxims are; tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy (Leech, 2005).

2.3 A review of previous related Namibian literature

This section of the study reviews previous scholarship within the Namibian context. There are several Namibian plays that have been the subject of stylistic analyses theoretical concerns related to pragmatism and through which analyses sharing affinities to the politeness theory have been conducted. Some of the Namibian plays include Sifiso Nyati's famous plays *God of Women* and *The Oracle of Cidino* and Frederick Philanders' *The Porridge Queen*. Below is a summary and review of these prominent plays. The review gives a summary of the plays and looks into how they bring out pertinent issues pertaining to politeness, such as power and powerlessness and gender.

Nyati's popular play *God of Women* (2012) is a tale of the polygamous Chief Lewanika. The play is set in the Northern part of Namibia and deals with themes such as polygamy, Gender Based Violence (GBV), forced (arranged) marriages, child abuse, incest, and women oppression. The chief has four wives and none of them could bear him a customary male heir. He is vividly displayed as an abusive husband, while his wives as submissive and ignorant. Lewanika verbally and physically abuses his wives especially Nsala, his third wife. She is the one mostly at the receiving end of his insults because she is barren. After a seer prophesies that he would conceive a son with a woman, Lewanika is puzzled and thus goes on a mission to discover which of his wives had a child before they married. In her confession to Joyce (youngest wife) Ma Inonge (first wife) reveals that she had a son with the chief before he got married to her, and that he was unaware of this. Ma Inonge had kept their son a secret in order for the chief not to forfeit his chieftaincy. This son (John) ended up impregnating his youngest wife Joyce. In a dramatic twist of events resulting from the revelations Lewanika commits suicide and out of agony Ma Inonge also dies. *God of Women* is pregnant with impolite language which is in violation of most politeness maxims and equally exposes the women's lack of power and voices in the play. Men have absolute power over women as portrayed through Lewanika, whose chieftaincy accord him the power that he abuses in many regards. He has no respect for women, especially for his wives, whom he insults and physically abuses with loads of home chores.

The Oracle of Cidino (2003) is a play that confronts western ways of life at the expense of the African cultures. Lewanika, the main character plays the role of a king. The play examines modern societal problems such as lesbianism and land ownership. Typical of Nyati's work, this

play epitomizes a world in which men have all the power and upper social statuses compared to women. By extension, this style of writing reflects on and exposes the many levels of impoliteness in the text. The play uses vulgar language and lack of empathy especially, for women and young girls in general thus, violating the sympathy maxim.

The Porridge Queen (2010) is a play by Frederick Philander. It is a satiric play about a street vendor named Handjievool. She sells porridge, meat and other commodities on the streets of Windhoek to earn a living. While on the job, she meets a sea of people on a daily basis. Many come to her stall to indulge in the porridge and variety of food she sells whilst others come to chat and kill time. Some also attempt to sell stolen goods like watches and cell phones. The conversations between Handjievool - the porridge queen and the customers at her stall allow the audience a glimpse of the social reality of both Handjievool and the people she interacts with daily. Through these interactions Handjievool still does not comprehend the meaning of life as a typical street vendor and the benefits brought about by independence, because she and most people still struggle to make ends meet. The play addresses social, economic and political injustices in an independent Namibia. It is to a large extent a critique of the Namibian government and questions the true meaning of independence. This satire to a large extent exemplifies a violation of politeness principle through vulgar language and its criticism of the government.

The above reviewed literature helps in this study to shed light on the applicability of the politeness principles to socially constructed texts. In addition to that, it also allows us to navigate the social realities of the relationships between individuals when it comes to sharing the power struggle in social space. For instance, a member of society can conceal the real biological identity of their child's other parent, and this breaches the politeness principle of avoiding the possibility of conflict eruption when the truth is revealed. In the event that conflict erupts, the politeness principles are violated.

2.4 Pragmatic Stylistics in a broad context

The two terms Pragmatics and Stylistics reference the studying of distinctive styles found in particular literary texts of individual writers in which language is used in the contexts that it is used (Leech, 2016). The context includes conversational techniques, text organisation, presupposition, and implicature. This section of the study reviews literature related to the context of language use and its distinctive styles. In the context of the present study,

pragmatics is relevant to the analysis of texts in regards to instances in which language is used in establishable contexts in order to become meaningful. Jucker (2013) explicates that pragmatics is still a relatively young branch of linguistics. It was only in the early 1970s that an increasing number of language experts started to focus their attention to this field. Liu (n.d) states that although generally believed to be a new branch in linguistics research study, this branch can be dated back to ancient Greek and Rome.

The aforementioned study agrees with Yule (1996) who defines pragmatics as the study of speaker meaning and reckons that it is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by the speaker or writer, and how it is interpreted by the listener or reader. Yule (1996) asserts that pragmatics is purely concerned with the analysis of what people mean by their very utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances mean by themselves.

The term “stylistics” it is also critical to our better understanding of the subject and object of reach in so far as the current review is concerned. As the concept may suggest ‘pragmatics-stylistics’ also known as ‘pragmatic stylistics’ is basically stylistics with an added component of pragmatics. According to Waheeb, (2017), pragmatics stylistics is part of the manifestation of linguistic stylistics. This distinct variety of stylistics clearly shows the merging point of these two branches of linguistics. Historically, pragmatics stylistics is a branch of stylistics which emerged in the 1960s but came to be a focal approach to text analysis only during the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s (Waheeb, 2017). A significant number of researches have been conducted in the field within the explications of the following principles and theories; Politeness Principle, Cooperative Principle, Speech Act Theory, Relevance Theory and Deixis among others. The theories are employed for context interpretation. Some of the renowned scholars who significantly contributed to pragmatics stylistics as a discipline include, Leech Geoffrey, Paul Grice, John Austin, John Searle and Wilson and Sperber. These scholars propounded the above theories and principles which in recent times have informed a significant number of pragmatics stylistics studies.

Woldemariam (2015) evaluated the relevance of pragmatics stylistics (PS) in the development of the pragmatic competence (PC) of students through the teaching local poetry in English in tertiary institutions contexts. The study reasoned that the pragmatics stylistics model,

pragmalinguistic features such as speech act verbs, deixis, modal verbs and hedging expressions were interlaced with the sociopragmatic features such as politeness and cooperativeness principles during the poetic conversation situation. The pragmatics stylistics model, based interpretation of contexts and addressor and addressee relations in poetic texts, were assumed to be transferable skills so that students could analyse other poems independently. The research was carried out on the basis of an experimental research design following a mixed research method. A total of 190 students (63.3%) were selected from the population of 300 students in various programs of the Department of English and Other Languages at Adama University, Ethiopia, through a systematic random sampling procedure. These students were again classified into experimental groups (95) and control groups (95). The students in the experimental group took a pragmatics stylistics module through five stylistics methods which included PS. However, the students in the comparison group took the same content with a traditional teaching method which was dominated by the lecture method.

A summary of the total mean gain score out of 20 showed an interesting result. As the mean pre-test score showed, both the control and experimental groups performed almost similarly in their pragmatics stylistics pre-test which was calculated out of 20. The experimental mean score for the pre-test, which was 11.01, was a little higher than the control mean score of 10.95. Similarly, the t-test showed that the p-value of the pre-test was 0.852, which was higher than 0.05. It also showed that the t-value of the pretest was 0.187, which was less than the t-critical value of 1.960. In both cases, it meant the result was not statistically significant. Therefore, there was no significance difference between the mean pre-test scores of the two groups. The t-test results for both pre- and post-tests for the pragmatics stylistics module showed that the t-value of the pragmatics stylistics post-test was 8.293. On the other hand, the table value of t-critical was 1.960 with 188 degree of freedom and at a significance level of 0.05. Because the t-value of 8.293 exceeded the t-critical value of 1.960 for the two-tailed test at 0.05 level of significance for 188 degree of freedom, the null hypothesis was rejected. Similarly, the t-test showed that the p-value of the post-test was 0.000, which was less than 0.05. The difference was statistically significant. Therefore, it was concluded that a pragmatics stylistics method of teaching poetry does contribute to the development of the pragmatic competence of students under an EFL context. It was strongly recommended that the growth

of the pragmatic competence (PC) of EFL learners could be extended through indigenous literature in English using a pragmatics stylistics approach.

Another study, Shankule & Woldemariam (2015), attempts an evaluation of the pragmatic competence of high school students in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context in Ethiopia. Learners in an EFL scenario often find the area of language use difficult. Teachers are advised to explicitly teach the pragmatic features of language and make use of authentic models of language to help learners practice using appropriate language in social contexts. In spite of this, data about the pragmatic aspect of language and pragmatic-focused instruction are lacking in an EFL (Ethiopian) context. Textbooks and teachers are integral part of language teaching generally, especially so within EFL settings where there are no opportunities to learn the language informally outside of the classroom.

Textbooks seldom provide adequate pragmatic information for students to successfully develop their pragmatic competence as the findings of this research indicate. Most of the metalanguage explanations are simple and inadequate as well. The research followed an entirely qualitative design, except that some simple statistical calculations were used to compute the frequency, mean and percentage of the numerical data. The data were drawn from the content analysis of two student textbooks (grade 11 and 12), responses of four teachers teaching grades 9-12 and self-perceived competence and pragmatic awareness test results of 183 students. The findings of this study also presented the implications for teaching pragmatics to EFL learners, the development of pragmatic-focused materials, future research and well-designed teacher training.

The results of this study also showed that teachers seldom use pragmatic instruction in classrooms, and in most times, the students have to spend time alone by themselves developing pragmatic competence skills without explicit instruction. Overall, the students' pragmatics instruction was not fully formed and needed to be developed, and the teachers were also observed to be in need of professional training in order to become alert to how to teach pragmatics effectively. Although the learners' self-perceived competence mean score was high, their multiple choice discourse completion test (MDCT) result was low. This confirms that self-perceived competence and the actual performance never matched. This is why according to Dewaele (2007) higher levels of self-perceived competence are linked to

lower levels of communication which in fact is a situation that warrants further investigation within the Ethiopian context.

Another pragmatic related study was conducted by Tujuba and Woldemariam (2018) and sought to explore the impacts of pragmatic knowledge on the effectiveness of oral communication at Adama Science and Technology University in Ethiopia. The study applied a mixed methods research design. A total of 33 English language teachers were studied using purposive sampling for data collection. The data were collected using multiple Choice Questionnaire, Discourse Completion Test, Interview and Communication Quiz. All the data collection instruments were developed after the necessary literature were reviewed. The data gathered through the Multiple Choices Questionnaire and Communication Quiz were analysed based on percentages while the data collected through Discourse Completion Test and the Interviews were analysed descriptively. The findings of the study revealed that the majority of the English language teachers at Adama Science and Technology University have lower pragmatic competence. It was observed that the majority of the teachers have problems of communication. The collected data revealed that poor pragmatic competence has greatly affected the effectiveness of oral communication.

The above reviewed literature related to pragmatic studies in a broader sense assists the researcher to have an understanding of other scholars' perspectives with regards to the broader discipline. This view is supported by the literature which believes that pragmatics can also be applied to the classroom context of teaching. However, the present study remains focused consistently on reviewing literature that responds to the three specific research objectives of the study as demonstrated in the next sections below.

2.5 What are the significant types of politeness principles?

This section of the study reviews literature related to scholarship that explains the varied types of politeness principles. The review responds to the first research question of the study. The review is thus undertaken from a multiplicity of viewpoints in order for the researcher to gain a deeper understanding on the types of politeness principles. This literature review assists in the identification of the research gap for the current study.

Pasaribu and Manik (2019) identify and establish four of the six types of politeness principles in a study of directive and expressive speech acts to communicate with students. This study

sought to analyse conversations between staff members at Medan University in Indonesia and students. The politeness principles observed to be largely proliferate were the tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim and agreement maxim. The dominant type of politeness principles used by the staff members was the tact maxim. The study notes that staff members need to learn the ability to communicate politely. On the other hand, students did not comply with all the staff utterances although they acted in a polite way. The study further observes that the staff gave polite response to some of the students' utterances or commands. In other instances, however, students were observed to ignore utterances from staff and this was observed to be as a result of the influence of positive emotions which was caused by their poor pragmatic competence.

Another separate study that attempted to examine mock politeness was conducted by Yin and Zhou (2019). This is a type of politeness that can be classified as negative politeness. The study neglected the area of (im)politeness studies and tried to redefine mock politeness as a superficially polite speech act which challenges or attacks the communication participant's face or sociality rights in a particular context. The study explains Geoffrey Leech's Politeness Theory and Helen Spencer-Oatey's Rapport Management Theory. These two models can be used to explain mock politeness. The study analyses 4 conversations possessing most representative characters of mock politeness using the qualitative method. The study submits that this model has effective explanatory power with regards to explaining the characters' option and the use of mock politeness and thus can also be adapted to the pragmatic analysis of other texts. The study concludes that mock politeness helps people understand the communicative value of mock politeness in avoiding direct conflicts and maintaining superficially harmonious interpersonal relationships, which contributes to the improvement of people's communicative skills and competence (Yin and Zhou, 2019).

Мамбетова (2019) examines how different people hold different views about politeness. The study reiterates that for one to be polite, one should follow "Politeness Principles" while Levinson suggests paying attention to the others' "Face Wants" (Мамбетова, 2019). The study emphasises on how the Chinese society addresses politeness. Sometimes what the Chinese people consider to be polite may not be true within establishable western cultures. In order to adequately provide an educated answer to this heartfelt question, this study attempts to shed light on some of the important differences on politeness between Chinese

and western cultures and their values. The study reveals the differences between the Chinese and the western cultures conceptualisations of what is politeness.

In yet another study Al-Duleimi, Rashid and Abdullah (2016) evaluates the role that politeness plays in all cultures and societies in maintaining relationships and for face saving. Although politeness is common to all cultures and languages, how it functions and is realised varies from one culture to another. Different theories have been proposed to examine the strategies with which politeness is expressed. Each theory has its weaknesses and strengths which may make it appropriate to one culture but not to another. The most widely used of these theories are Brown and Levinson's (1978) Politeness Theory and its modified version (1987), Lakoff's (1973), and Leech's (1983, 2005) theories of politeness. This study sought to provide a critical review of these theories to ascertain the weaknesses and strengths of the theoretical approaches. Accordingly, it examines the applicability of these theories to the East and West cultures. A review of these theories indicates that they have weaknesses and strengths. Furthermore, they might not be suitable for all cultures. This confirms the observation that politeness is a social behaviour not specific to one culture or language. The study concludes that Leech's (2005) Grand Strategy of Politeness might be the most applicable theory that could invariably cater for aspects of Eastern and Western cultures.

Another related study conducted by Mayamasita (2016) focuses on maxims of politeness principle found in the movie, *"The Karate Kid"* using Leech's (2005) theory. The purpose of the study was to establish and examine the maxims of politeness principle used by the characters in the movie, *"The Karate Kid"* and to examine how and what purposes the characters in the movie *"The Karate Kid"* use such maxims of politeness principle. This study used a qualitative methodology. The findings of the study indicate that there are six maxims of politeness principle used in the movie *"The Karate Kid"* and these are tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy. The dominant maxim used is the sympathy maxim. The study concludes that the characters in the movie *"The Karate Kid"* follow measurements of several pragmatic scales to express their politeness. Those pragmatic scales are the cost-benefit scale, the optionality scale, the indirectness scale, the power/authority scale, and the social distance scale.

The methodology adopted by Mayamasita (2016) can be considered also applicable for the present study which is also aimed at identifying the types of politeness principles present in

a text. These maxims can also be analysed in the same manner since, as is the case in the movie, the two plays under study also present characters engaging in a conversation. Similar to the above study, a content analysis checklist in Applied Linguistics can also be developed for the current study to act as a tool for exhaustively identifying themes related to politeness principles. As established in the above study, the six types of maxims can also be possibly identified and analysed in the same way, as and is they also evince themselves in the plays.

Olaniyi (2017) examines greetings as one of the elements of politeness in a Nigerian community and how it influences the cultural characteristics of the people. The study applied the Speech Act Theory (Austin, 1952) and Politeness Principle (Brown & Levinson, 1978) and also considers the pragmatic context in analysing different types of greetings such as condolences, departure and arrival, rejoicing, daily greetings, casual greetings, and seasonal or festivity greetings. The study observes among other findings that 'greeting' is part of the culture of the Ilorin people, and the failure to comply is an aberration. A greeting, in this context, does not only create warmth, but establishes relationships which go a long way in cementing communality. The paper concludes that Ilorin greetings are embedded in and constrained by cognition, social principles of communication and the contexts of use. Little wonder why Ilorin greetings may come as carefully chosen, catchy, and precise words which are not without religious colorations (Olaniyi, 2017).

Mulyono (2016) examines the use of politeness principles in the cartoon movie "*Stand by Me Doraemon*" with the goal of describing the use of the politeness principle in the movie. The data were collected by a note taking technique and then analyzed descriptively. After analyzing the data, the researcher describes the use of politeness principle in the movie script. There are observed utterances of the use of the politeness principle covering the kinds a host of maxims within the principle. The utterances evince the use of the tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim, and sympathy maxim. The study further focuses on the examination with regards to the measurement of politeness scales such as the formality scale, hesitancy scale and equality scale. The notes that there are 25 politeness principles observed in the cartoon movie "*Stand by Me Doraemon*" – 1 instances of the tact maxim, 3 of the generosity maxim, 6 of the approbation maxim, 1 of the modesty maxim, 2 of the agreement maxim, 3 of the sympathy maxim, 2 of the formality scale, 4 of the hesitancy scale, and 3 of the equality scale. The approbation maxim is the maxim with the

highest number of occurrences in the movie. This is because the characters in this film seek to avoid conflict and create an environment that is comfortable in communication. While the study discussed above sought to numerically account for all the types of maxims in the movie and grouping them, the present study intends to thematically group the maxims according to the study objectives, specifically examining their communicative potentials as well.

Another related study was conducted by Al-Khatib (2012). The study investigates politeness in the Holy Quran from a socio-pragmatic perspective. Drawing on the Politeness Theory, the study examines the text-building mechanisms and functions of a large number of chapters and verses that were selected from the Holy Quran. The data were analysed in terms of both Brown and Levinson's (1978; 1987) Theory of Politeness and Leech's (2005) Maxims of Politeness. The explications of these two theoretical frameworks have been, as so far established in the foregoing discussion, tested against data collected from various sources. The data in Al-Khatib (2012) were analysed in two main parts: The first included the verses that are concerned with the God-man relationship and the second with the man-man (i.e., interpersonal) relationship.

By analyzing the structural and functional features of the verses, the study observes a range of various politeness strategies employed for conveying a huge number of divine ethical messages. The study concludes that such a variety of politeness strategies relate strongly to the type of information being conveyed to the addressees. From a theoretical perspective, the study contributes to the discussions of God-man communication and man-man communication in relation to the negotiation of politeness meaning in the context of religion. The findings presented bear on orientations toward the importance of studying politeness as a socio-pragmatic phenomenon in relation to religion and morality. The relevance of the above study to the current enquiry is how the current study seeks to adopt Leech's (1983) Politeness principle in almost a similar manner. Although some of Brown and Levinson's (1978; 1987) concepts of the politeness principles may be applied, they will only be used as complementary and not the main theoretical groundings. The concept of conversation between two individuals conforms to the concerns of the present study in that the two plays studied are conversational.

2.6 How have the politeness strategies been used to project power struggle?

This section of the chapter reviews literature related to the second objective. Human dialogue and discourses are always characterised by power struggles. This means that when two individuals enter into a conversation, they exchange utterances which may end up in the difference of opinion. And often than not, the person with authority over the other will have their opinion prevail. Dialogue is a common method of communicating between two people who are socially interacting. Because of the differences in culture and opinion too, conversations may fail to achieve the intended avoidance of conflict, thus in the process violating the politeness principles. When this happens negative politeness or impoliteness occurs and a power struggle ensues.

Sugianto (2021) examines politeness between Javanese and Western cultures and argues that politeness, as a universal phenomenon in society, is a reflection of specific cultural values, which can be observed in all languages and cultures. The expression is used in cross cultural communication require background knowledge of the other culture to avoid conflict and in this regard, set up the best platform and circumstances for effective communication. The study attempts a comparative examination of politeness behaviours between Javanese and Western on linguistic communicative situations such as addressing and refusing. Due to different cultural beliefs and values as well as different cultural backgrounds that often militate against effective communication, knowledge of these cultural differences, especially those of politeness is of great importance in cross-cultural communication. This study directs the present study with regards to understanding the differences in politeness between cultures and how this influence communication. When people from different cultures engage in an exchange of utterances, it is important that they try to first understand each other's cultures to avoid conflict.

Locher (2015) discusses how communicative norms differ from one culture to another through a comparative analysis of Ukrainian and Mexican Spanish that applied the cooperative principle, the politeness principle and a concept of face as a guideline. Participants of the study were language learners who spoke Spanish as a Foreign Language. The study revealed that the learners lacked the knowledge of Spanish as a Foreign Language. The study also established a socio-pragmatic failure in the language use and also observes that socio-pragmatic failure can often lead to a breakdown in communication.

In the context of the aforementioned Mexican study above where the data used was retrieved from the author's personal experiences of intercultural interactions, the data for the present study is extracted from the conversations in the text.

Wiryomartono, (2020) determines that politeness is one of the cultural efforts that matter for the evolution of the patrimonial practice. The main focus of the study was to examine the concept and practice of politeness with reference to ethnic groups in Indonesia with a strong patrimonial practice. It further investigates and explores the sense and practice of politeness based on the relationship between the spatial layout of the house and sociocultural values in various Indonesian communities. The data of the study were extracted from the author's observation in the archipelago from 1993 to 2014. The study concluded that politeness is a major part of the human social fabric.

Eshghinejad and Moini (2016) examine aspects of the short message service (SMS) communication of cell phones and the use of politeness strategies. The study sought to describe the strategies used by two groups of participants to examine whether there is any significant difference between male and female English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners in the use of positive and negative politeness strategies in sending SMS to their professors, considering that there is an asymmetric power relation and social distance between them. The study observes that females are politer language users. The study compiled a corpus of 300 L1 (Persian) and L2 (English) request messages. The results of qualitative and quantitative data analyses indicate that there was no significant difference between the two groups. The results of the study have implication in politeness research. The above study used two data analysis methods; that is qualitative and quantitative, the present study adopts the qualitative approach as a method for data analysis.

Kaguda (2015) analyses the language that the Shona speaking people in Zimbabwe use in naming death and dying, describing the dead, and consoling the bereaved. The research derives its linguistic analysis from the Shona socio-cultural-religious perspective. Related to this perspective is the concept of saving face and easing the tension caused by death and this notion can be understood in the light of the politeness principle that guides human communication. Interviews and participatory observations were employed as data collection techniques in order to establish whether the Shona people use their language ordinarily or

they adapt it to suit specific situations, particularly the unpalatable social situations like death and dying (language for specific purpose). Undergirded by these theoretical frameworks and methods, the study establishes that the Shona people have the tendency of creating, packaging and re-packaging their language use in relation to the social dilemma confronting them. Indirect ways of referring to tabooed matters such as death are in tandem with the Shona semantic philosophy in which by 'indirection they find direction.' In this regard, reference to death and dying often take the form of some blunt and euphemistic words or phrases, idiomatic and metaphorical expressions as a way of coping with death and dying. Euphemistic words and expressions allow the Shona people to talk about unpleasant notions and neutralise the unpleasantness, for example, the subjects of death and dying.

Borris and Zecho (2018) examined linguistic politeness and postulate that positive politeness strategies seek to minimise the threat to the hearer's positive face. These strategies are used to make the hearer feel good about themselves, their interests or possessions, and are most usually used in situations where the audience knows each other fairly well. In sociolinguistics and conversation analysis (CA), politeness strategies are speech acts that express concern for others and minimise threats to self-esteem ("face") in particular social contexts. Being polite means being aware of and respecting the feelings of other people. Politeness can and will improve your relationships with others, help to build respect and rapport, boost your self-esteem and confidence, and improve your communication skills.

Politeness is a great virtue, but a polite person will always please others with his polite behaviour and good manners. Politeness means consideration for the feelings of others. Politeness is one of the central features of human communication. The study reveals that positive politeness is a human phenomenon, yet expressed differently in different cultures. The study concludes that positive politeness refers to an atmosphere of inclusion and mutuality created by linguistic means such as compliments, encouragement, joking, even the use of "white lies." The present study adopts the concept of positive politeness to analyse some of the politeness principles, when and if it becomes applicable.

Matley (2018) views social media as "sites of self-presentation and identity negotiation" whose affordances facilitate the production and promotion of both individual and collective identities. From a pragmatic perspective, self-promotion and self-praise are interactionally risky acts. While some studies have shed light on self-praise in online communities, little

attention has been paid to the pragmatic function of the affordances of digital media such as hash tagging and multimodality in self-praising discourse. This article contributes to filling this research gap by examining the ways in which posters of “bragging” Instagram photos do face work by using the hashtags #brag and #humblebrag in interaction with positive (im-) politeness strategies. It presents the results of both a small-scale quantitative study of face work in Instagram posts labelled #fitness, #brag and #humblebrag, as well as a qualitative analysis of the mitigation and aggravation strategies used in explicitly self-praising posts. The article argues that the hashtags #brag and #humblebrag have a clear metalinguistic function as a reference to the illocution of the speech act. It also shows that they are used in a balancing act of face mitigation and aggravation strategies. Overall, the study suggests that the hashtags #brag and #humblebrag function as part of a strategy that negotiates an appropriate level of self-praise and positive self-presentation. The study adds to an understanding of the pragmatics of self-presentation on social media, and raises questions regarding the new literacies that digital media require.

In another study, Ningsih, Boeriswati and Muliastuti (2020) sought the discovery of students and teachers at SMAN Logas Tanah Darat, Kuantan Singingi, Riau, in Indonesia, who spoke impolitely. The study suggests that people working in the world of education, students and teachers must pay attention to politeness in language. For this reason, the study needs to be conducted to examine the extent of the politeness of students and teachers in communicating in the realm of education. The study also investigates the factors that cause impoliteness of students and teachers in conversations. The study applied a qualitative approach coupled with ethnographic methods. The data in this study were the speech of students and teachers which were also observing to be containing six maxims of politeness as propounded by Leech (2005). The study findings indicate that the students and teachers at SMAN Logas Tanah Darat, Kuantan Singingi Riau can already be categorised as polite in their speech. The evidence was present in the 101 utterances which evinces that only 38 utterances were categorised as impolite or violated the six maxims of the politeness principle.

In another separate study, Mahmud, (2019) states that politeness was still becoming a major concern in English language teaching as it is considered as one way of maintaining effective classroom interaction. Therefore, as important actors in the class, teachers and students need to practice politeness as a way to create effective classroom interaction. This study explores

the politeness strategies of English students at one of the universities in Makassar. The researcher applied a descriptive qualitative research method to explore the politeness phenomena in EFL classroom interaction. The participants of this research were two classes of English literature program consisting of 50 students. The primary sources of data were the individual student presentations which had been recorded. There were fifty transcriptions of the recording which lasted for five to seven minutes for each presentation. The transcriptions were analyzed and discussed based on the Theory of Politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The findings from this study revealed that English students used different kinds of expressions to encode their politeness in the class. Those expressions were in the forms of greetings, thanking, addressing terms, apologising, and fillers. There were also some terms derived from the students' vernacular language which were used as a softening mechanism for their presentation. These expressions were categorized as positive and negative politeness. The findings of this study might be used as an input for teachers and students in an effort to create effective classroom interaction. The reviewed related studies above assist the present study to establish how politeness strategies have been used to project power struggle.

2.7 How have the politeness maxims been violated?

This section of the study reviews literature that speaks to the third research question of the study, which seeks to determine the manners in which the politeness maxims have been violated in the plays. This objective also addresses disagreements or conflict and power relations between people in a conversation, and this guides us towards realising how the violation of the politeness principles occurs. As indicated earlier in the study, the politeness principle seeks to avoid conflict when the speaker and the hearer enter into a speech event that is conversational. The failure to observe the politeness principles entails the violation of the principle. This section of the review explains these violations, which are sometimes also referred to as disobeying the maxims. Section 2.5 identified and explained the six maxims of politeness. These are also critical to this section of the study and are thus revisited.

Al-Delumi (2016) identifies three significant social factors that speakers should consider when interacting with each other namely; power, social distance, and the degree of imposition. Power in particular refers to the social status of both speaker and hearer, while social distance is imagined as the factor that indicates the degree to which interlocutors are familiar with each other. This means that when individuals engage in a conversation, a disruption may

occur. This can now result in the violation of a maxim(s). As indicated by Kida (2011, p. 183), a violation can be caused by social distance. Social distance are the differences in linguistic forms that such as “respect, deference, and politeness.” In addition, conflict between the speaker and the hearer can occur when an addresser enjoys his/her ability to impose his/her ideas and desires on others.

In the same breath, Martinze-Flor (2007, p. 6) observes that the degree of imposition is related to the way in which the speaker can impose his intention on the hearer. This thus implies the necessity to take these social factors into account when making utterances within any speech act. Such acts should be expressed appropriately according to the social contexts as these control the preferred linguistic forms to be used. It has also been well documented by Wang, Johnson and Gratch (2010, p. 2) that, to be highly polite, depends on the “potential threat of a communicative act.” In a manner of speaking, the factors involved in evaluating face threats as proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) might affect the politeness strategies used to express certain speech acts.

Along the same line, Scollon and Scollon (2001) adopt, to some extent, Brown and Levinson’s (1987) definition of the social factors as a vertical relationship that takes place between participants not from the same level or status. However, while maintaining this definition of social distance, they warn about the importance of not to confusing distance with the difference in the social power between participants. This is due to the fact that not all hierarchical relationships involve a social distance between participants. For instance, two persons may have a hierarchical relationship between them because, for example, one is a manager, while the other is an assistant manager, but they know each other well, they meet each other every day, and they work together such that there is no distance between them (Scollon & Scollon, 2001, p. 53). Therefore, associating hierarchical structure relationships with social distance is not imperative, and as such, they thus conclude that, a hierarchical relationship between participants does not always imply that there is social distance. What is clear from this discussion is that politeness is resoundingly based on recognising the difference in power and the degree of social distance between the speakers and hearers in any conversational exchange that is likely to result in the violation of the politeness principles.

In a related study, Handayani, (2013) sought to identify the kinds of politeness principles that are violated by written texts in advertisements and to establish the intention of violating such

principles. Advertising is a method of communicating between the speaker and the hearer. The study classified the violation through the six maxims of politeness principles as identified and explicated by Leech (1983). The data were collected using the documentation method and non-participant observation. The population of this research was all the cellular phone provider advertisements in Indonesia. The sample was purposively selected and only the advertisements that violated the politeness principles qualified to be the data for the research. In analysing the data, the Politeness Principles Theory proposed by Leech (2005) was adopted at the analytical theoretical framework in order to classify the advertisements according to the maxim that they violate. The study also relates the violations with the ethic regulation of politeness principles. After identifying the kinds of maxim, the study extends to the intention of violating through explicature and implicature meanings. The violations occur with regards to six maxims of politeness principles, i.e. the tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim, modesty maxim, agreement maxim and the sympathy maxim. The study submits that most of advertisements that violate the politeness principles also violate the ethic regulation of advertisement. In addition, the study observes that the general intentions of those violations were to attract the viewers' attention to use their product.

In a related study, Wildana, Wisasongko and Wahyuningsih (2022) examine the violation of politeness maxims by the characters in the movie *"300"*. The violations result in other meanings that differ from the actual and expressed meanings. The ultimate goal of this study was to identify the implied meanings from utterance by the characters in the movie. Several theories are embraced to help the researcher in examining the meanings in the movie. The theories are pragmatics, politeness, politeness principle, and language and context. Adopting the qualitative research methodology, the data for the study is in the form of sentences extracted from the subtitles of the movie. There are several steps to in processing the data in this research, first all the utterances classified into maxims using Leech's (1983) Politeness Principle Maxim Approach to categorize the type of the principle maxim, and then applying the language and context to establish the reason and implied meaning of the violating maxims using Brown and Yule's (1983) Pragmatic Theory. Through analysis of the data, the study observed the types of maxims in 21 utterances uttered by 11 characters in the movie in using The Politeness Principle Theory (Leech, 2005). The importance of this study is in the manner that it assists the present study with the research procedures that classifies all the utterances

into maxims using Leech's (2005) taxonomy. Further it provides the current study with ideas on how to categorise the type of the principle maxims and then, applying the language and context, to establish the reason and implied meaning of the violating maxims.

Osondu and Umeh, (2020) investigate the violation of politeness principles as a catalyst for tragedy in a literary text which is a fair representation of a community. The study also evaluates the applicability of this principle to regulate spoken discourse. Excerpts from the text *"Roses and Bullets"* were collated and analysed through the lenses of Leech's (1983) Politeness Maxims. The research establishes that so many expressions which violate the maxim of politeness principles are prevalent in the text. The study reveals that violation of politeness principles leads to many forms of tragedy-strife, rancour, agitations and even death. The study recommends that conversation principles should not be violated to ensure that society enjoys a harmonious and peaceful living atmosphere.

2.8 Research gap/s

Although there has been ample research done on pragmatic stylistics little, if at all any, has been conducted within the Namibian context and focusing on Namibian fictional imaginaries – specifically, plays. Therefore, the researcher has selected two Namibian plays for the purpose of this study. As far as the current research has established, there is little research that was conducted on Namibian literature, particularly in the field of pragmatic stylistics, and even more so of Namibian plays. This is the gap that the current research seeks to fill.

2.9 Theoretical Framework

Geoffrey Leech's (1983) theory, The Politeness Principle [PP] is adopted to guide this study. The theory is selected on the merit of its politeness maxims, which aims at benefiting the other rather than self and which in the process speaks to the major concerns of the current enquiry. The principle, through its maxims is herein used to help identify and evaluate the different levels of politeness depicted in the two selected Namibian plays Petrus Haakskeen's *'The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School'* (2001) and *'Finders Keepers Losers Weepers'* (2000). In the same vein, conclusions drawn on the previously referred to levels are therefore chiefly based on this principle.

2.9.1 Historical account of politeness principle

Historically, traces of the English term 'polite' are dated back to the 15th century. However, etymologically, it is adopted from late Medieval Latin *politus* meaning 'smoothed and accomplished' (Shahrokhi & Bidabadi, 2013). Shahrokhi and Bidabadi (2013) maintain that term 'polite' was synonymously used with concepts such as 'refined' and 'polished'.

The Politeness Principle as explicated by Zou, Ren and Zhu (2013) was put forward by Brown and Levinson in 1980 and later specified by Geoffrey Leech in 1983. Shahrokhi and Bidabadi (2013) explain that the politeness principle may be formulated into two perspectives which are to minimise the expression of impolite beliefs and to maximise the expression of polite beliefs. As a point of departure, Leech (1983) believed that politeness is a facilitating factor that influences the relation between the 'self' which refers to the speaker, and the 'other', referring to the addressee and/or a third party involved. The above implies that to Leech, politeness is described as a means minimising the expression of impolite beliefs as the beliefs are unpleasant. Therefore, the terms "self" and "other" are used in the maxims to make up the politeness principles.

Contrary to Zou, Ren and Zhu (2013), Moore (2020) asserts that this principle is the brainchild of Geoffrey Leech which he defines as forms of behaviour that establishes and maintains comity. Basing on the Gricean cooperative principle, Leech (1983) proposes the Politeness Principle and emphasises on politeness as a regulative factor in communication through a set of maxims. According to Leech (1983) the politeness principle is aligned to the cooperative principle (CP) to tries and account for the violation of the CP in conversations. It is for this reason that politeness is regarded as the key pragmatic phenomenon, not only for the indirect conveying of what people mean in what they communicate, but also as one of the reasons why people deviate from the cooperative principle.

More recently, politeness as defined by Leech (2014) is a type of behaviour that allows the participants to socially interact in an atmosphere of relative harmony. Leech further explains that the concept of politeness is crucial in any communication, but particularly in cross cultural communication and this explains why what is polite with respect to the hearer or to some third party may be impolite with respect to speaker and vice versa.

In stating the maxims Leech (1983) uses the following terms to identify two kinds of illocutionary acts namely the representatives 'assertives, and directives 'impositives'. Leech therefore, summed up the principle as a series of maxims which were proposed as a way of explaining how politeness operates in conversational exchanges. The maxims are listed as tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement and sympathy.

In the last three decades or so many researchers have conducted studies in the field of politeness and many definitions and perspectives have since emerged on the concept. More recently, the concept of politeness has gained remarkable significance particularly in pragmatics stylistics related studies. Reiter (2000) begins by explaining that,

...politeness is not necessarily a natural phenomenon, however it exists because of interactions between people and culture. Therefore, politeness is acquired with the passage of time through the sociocultural coexistence of people with one another. People perform functions of politeness to various degrees to successfully communicate with each other (p. 1-2).

From a scholarly point of view, politeness has been defined and in other cases explained by many as discussed below.

Maharani and Isnu (2017) explain that the complexity of politeness is reflected in a variety of approaches to the delimitation formed within the notion where its manifestation is apparent in various discourses. Goffman (1967) as cited in Rong (2009, p.100) posits that "politeness is normally perceived as a series of social practices of good manners". Often people are referred to as being polite because of certain behaviour traits. By inference, politeness is therefore a mandatory social rule of human conduct. Rong believes politeness to be acts of community with certain cultural systems and are performed within these communities as monitored through its cultural systems.

According to Mills (2003) politeness is an important aspect for pragmatic competence. Politeness is the "expression of the speakers' intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face threatening acts towards another" (p.6). Leech (1983) adds that, the principal role of politeness is to avoid disruption and maintain the social equilibrium and friendly relations between interlocutors. Vazquez-Hermosilla (2012) on the other hand notes that it has become general knowledge that successful communication is depended on the

interlocutors' cooperative interaction with each other. Vazquez-Hermosilla further argues that interlocutors share knowledge, beliefs, experience, ideas and assumptions and hence observe similar rules of cooperative interactive.

The above implies that, though the forms of politeness may differ from culture to culture most especially in the way they are understood, universally, politeness is a vital and integral part of human interaction. The conclusion Maharani (2017) makes is that conceptualising linguistic politeness is rather vague, especially when the concept of politeness is used in the pragmatic and sociolinguistic study of socio-communicative of verbal interaction. It is therefore important to use the right level of politeness by employing different politeness strategies to achieve the intended goal. It is equally important that the levels of politeness are based on the relative imposition involved in the communication of messages.

As mentioned earlier, politeness has been studied for years, and among some of its pioneer and prominent scholars are Lakoff (1973), Brown and Levinson (1978; 1987) and Geoffrey Leech (1983; 2005) (whose principles of politeness has been adopted for this study). Different theories have been proposed to explicate how politeness is involved in any act of communication. Therefore, a brief review of Lakoff's (1973), Brown and Levinson's (1987), and Leech's (1983, 2005) theories of politeness is imperative, not only simply because they are the most widely used theoretical approaches, but to also shed more light and enhance our understanding on the concept of politeness within which the current study is couched.

2.9.2 Lakoff's theory of politeness

Lakoff (1973) was among the first group of scholars to conduct studies on politeness. Her theory of politeness is both an extension and integration of Grice's (1961; 1975) Conversational Maxims characterised by their universal constructs. Lakoff proposes two basic rules toward the theory of politeness namely, be clear and be polite. Fundamentally, such an attempt was for considering the importance of pragmatic competence in the theory. The "be clear," basic rule was summed up from Grice's maxims because they are mainly related to the intention of communicating clearly. Accordingly, Lakoff (1973) argues that clarity warrants that the speaker communicates the message clearly. Lakoff further claims that politeness, which is the second basic rule, is chiefly concerned with the social factors that govern the communication among interlocutors in a speech situation.

2.9.3 Gricean cooperative principle

The Cooperative principle was first proposed by the American linguist Paul Grice in 1975 (Li, 2015). The principle is divided into Grice's four maxims of conversation, called the Gricean maxims i.e. quantity, quality, relation, and manner. These four maxims describe specific rational principles of characterisation between utterance and meaning. This explains the link between speaker's utterances and what is understood from them by the hearer. These maxims do not describe how the speaker issues utterances to the hearer, but they give a description to the receiver's presupposition about the way they intended. The principle is intended as a description of how people normally behave in conversation. Jeffries and McIntyre (2010) describe Grice's maxims as "encapsulating the assumptions that we prototypically hold when we engage in conversation." This principle is also known as the theory of conversational implicature and a principle of conversation. It is one of the major principles guiding people's language learning. Austin (2000) describes how effective communication in conversation is achieved in common social situation because the maxims explain the link between utterance and what is understood from them. The maxims are based on his cooperative principle, which states that participants expect that each will make a conversational contribution as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange.

2.9.4 Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness

Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory can be perceived of as a development of Grice's Theory of conversational implicature. According to the Politeness Theory, it's not always the case that speakers are constrained by Grice's maxims of conversation. There are instances in the communicative process whereby there is more pressure on the speaker to observe the needs of their fellow interlocutor(s). Such considerations may necessarily entail the avoidance of putting pressure on fellow conversationalists thereby ending up regarding whether they can be potentially embarrassed or put under unnecessary pressure. Thus trying to save or maintain face becomes an overriding conversational goal. Therefore, politeness, involves phrasing utterances so as to show respect and esteem for the face of others (Sabao, 2019). This occurs throughout social interchange (Morand and Ocker, 2003).

Brunet, Cowie, Donnan, & Douglas-Cowie (2012) state that, the most prominent and widely used theory of politeness is that which is propounded by Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987).

This theory mainly focuses on how politeness is expressed to protect the participants' face. This means that any form of aggression directed at the other person in a conversation is considered to be a face threatening act. The theory is largely based on Brown (2015), who was the first to study positive face and indicated its importance and necessity in any social interaction (Brunet et al., 2012, p. 2). According to Al-Duleimi, Rashid and Abdullah (2016) Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) were clearer in their treatment of face. They named two ways of portraying the concept of face 'negative' and 'positive'. The first manner deals with face from a positive and negative point of view, while the second concentrates on the claim that positive and negative faces represent the interlocutors' steady wants. Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) also emphasise the importance of three social factors that speakers should consider when interacting with each other. These factors are power, social distance and the degree of imposition.

2.9.5 Leech's politeness principle

The principle was first proposed in 1983 by Leech and realising that it was largely criticised for its vagueness, Leech reformulated the principle in 2005. Leech's (2005) Politeness Principle is centred on six maxims "tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy" (p. 12). Since the term 'maxim' is complicated by morality which leads to misunderstanding of the meaning intended by the speaker, according to Leech there was a need to propose a new constraint in order to comprehend the previous maxims and the pragmatic constraints. Leech named the new single constraint the 'Grand Strategy of Politeness'. This is regarded as the 'super constraint' under which all maxims of politeness are subsumed. Its principal role is to estimate the value of the speaker and the hearer.

2.9.6 Literary criticism of the politeness theory

The politeness theory has its own merits and demerits. This section of the chapter critiques the politeness principles. Leech's (1983) Politeness Principle has been welcome with both criticism and praise. According to Al-hindawi and Alkhazaali (2016) the principle has several flaws. To begin with, Al-hindawi and Alkhazaali (2016) direct their criticism to the maxims of politeness themselves, citing that they overlap and that there is no clear distinction between the workability of one or another maxim in a given context. Moreover, "Leech's model makes no reference to the importance of the culture-specific conventions of different language

communities other than English that will interpret or evaluate maxims differently or even conflictively” (Thomas, 1995, p. 167-168).

Arguing on the same notion, Eelen (2014) refers to Leech’s theory as problematic as far as the methodology is concerned. Eelen believes that since a new maxim can be introduced to account for the regulatory of any language use, the number of these maxims is infinite and arbitrary. The above resonates with O’Driscoll’s (1996) observations who argues that the politeness principle is at best too theoretical to be applied to real language and its maxims do not in any way contribute to the universality of politeness. Locher (2006) also expressed dismay over the principle’s equation of indirectness with regards to politeness, because the idea has found many counterpoint cases where a direct utterance can be the appropriate form of politeness in a speech situation.

Although criticised, the principle has had much to be applauded for too. According Yu and Hao (2013) one of its advantages is that, the principle is widely used in our daily life to explain why some utterances are more easily accepted than others. Yu and Hao (2013) further explain that it is the key point in enhancing the interpersonal relationship and communication. Therefore, if people can obey this principle, they can make their expression more tactful, but if violated, the hearer may be put at some level of discomfort.

Thomas (2014) believes the maxims have an advantage in that they can be employed to account for the cross-cultural variability of the use of politeness strategies. Of the same sentiment are Brown and Levison (1987), who believes that cross-cultural variability will be evident in the relative importance given to one of these maxims contrary to another.

2.10 Theoretical application of the politeness principle to the present study

Various politeness strategies are applied to real life conversations. However, scholars have looked into the possibilities of using the strategies to analyse the discourse of literary works. Jonathan Culpeper in his study of (Im)politeness in Dramatic Dialogues (2001) opines that, “...[b]roadly speaking, politeness is about the strategic manipulation of language, about expediting our conversational goals by saying what is socially appropriate”. Culpeper further explains that a framework which brings together face and sociological variables like power and social distance fosters a deeper understanding of how characters relate themselves to

others, manipulate others in pursuit of their goals and how the plot is pushed forward in the dramatic text.

The researcher also uses the framework to systematically describe, for instance, how one character might ingratiate or offend another. Through this theoretical framework, the study exclusively concentrates on how characters in the play communicate most effectively and harmoniously by using positive and/or negative strategies. The context in which the characters are presented and the language used is Namibian. As such, taking into consideration social factors such as social status, the role of power and powerlessness, social distance among others, the current study evinces a new context for the analysis of the discourse of fictional imaginaries through politeness principles. These factors highly influence the existence, or lack thereof, of politeness in the selected plays.

2.11 Chapter summary

This chapter gave provided insights on pragmatic stylistics, the politeness principle and discussed Politeness as the theoretical framework selected for the analysis and interpretation of data in this study. In addition, the chapter presented an overview of work previously conducted in this field, thus shares and discusses the findings of previous works and closely examines the link they have to the current study, especially so with regards to the research questions established in Chapter 1. The next chapter focuses on explaining the methods that were used in conducting the current research study.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODS AND PROCEDURES

3.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the research methods and procedures employed in this study. These are the steps that were applied in the design of the study. Research procedures include the methods and the tools that were used to collect and analyse data. The chapter also discusses how pragmatics stylistics was applied in the context of the study. Ethical procedures were also discussed.

3.2 Research design

The explanatory research design was used in this study. This design allows the researcher to explain how the data was collected and the methods of analysis that were used to analyse the data from two plays under this study. A content analysis checklist was created to define the patterns of politeness principles in the two plays. According to Creswell (2014) research designs are the plans and procedures for research that span the decisions from broad assumptions to detailed methods of data collection and analysis. This study adopts a qualitative approach to analyse conversation between characters in the chosen plays, a phenomenon the researcher believes to be qualitative in nature. Kothari, (2004) affirms that a research design is the arrangement of the conditions for the collection and analysis of data. The definitions evince that the research design is an overall plan in which the researcher outlines how the study unfolds. The design thus addresses the how, when and where questions of the study.

Sanjari (2014) explains that a qualitative approach is utilised to explain and clarify the meanings of different aspects of the human life experience. In the same vein, Kothari (2018) also, establishes that the qualitative method is about making arguments and interpretation aimed at comprehending the complex nature of the world from a specified context. Through this approach, researchers can interpret people's experiences as they are involved in human activities.

Since the study analyses existing data, the qualitative approach is best suited to explore the research as outlined in the research questions. This approach allows the researcher to analyse the characters' use of language in the conversations as encoded in the chosen plays and

consequently determine any possible effects that the politeness maxims have on these plays. The approach further enables the researcher to identify and use research methods which are in line with the research questions formulated to achieve the ultimate goal of the study which is to conduct a pragmatic stylistics interpretation of the two selected Namibian texts. Given the qualitative nature of the study, it is therefore delimited to being a desktop study and as such, no data is collected from the field.

3.3 Research paradigm

The present study used the interpretive research paradigm to understand how the concept of politeness evinces itself in the two selected plays. The interpretive paradigm is concerned with understanding the world as it is from the subjective experiences of individuals. They use meaning (versus measurement) oriented methodologies, such as interviewing or participant observation, that rely on a subjective relationship between the researcher and subjects.

3.4 Qualitative research approach

This study employed the qualitative research approach. Data was collected in the form of text from the two selected plays. Textual data was then grouped accordingly in response to the research questions.

3.5 Text selection criteria

Petrus Haakskeen's (2001) *'The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School'* and *'Finders Keepers Losers Weepers'* (2000) are Namibian plays by a Namibian, which the researcher purposively sampled. A far reading of the plays reveals that evince instance of the use of polite and impolite language. The context of such is Namibia and therefore satisfies one of the requirements of the current study which is to undertake an analysis of the proliferation of im/politeness in the plays, from within the Namibian socio-cultural context. The texts also display power struggles between characters, another element that the current analysis attempts to determine how such dialogic contexts evince im/politeness. The discourse between characters in the play *'Finders Keepers Losers Weeper'* assists the researcher in analysing the different levels of politeness maxims between people from different socio-cultural backgrounds. In addition, *'The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School'* and *'Finders Keepers Losers Weepers'* discuss themes around social problems such as alcoholism, poor education system, lack of moral values, lack of land and homelessness which may lead to

im/polite behavior. The characters are also of different ages - young and adult characters and as such presents potential data to analyse the proliferation of politeness maxims from an age perspective.

3.6 Research Instrument(s)

This study employs conversation analysis as the research method. According to Schegloff and Sacks (1973, p. 289) Conversation analysis (CA) can be simplified as an approach which studies the social interaction, embracing both verbal and non-verbal conduct in situations of everyday life. The approach was propounded by sociologists Harvey Sacks and Emanuel Schegloff in the early 1960s as a “naturalistic observational discipline that could deal with the details of social action rigorously, empirically and formally”. Conversation Analysis therefore aims to “describe, analyse, and understand talk as a basic and constitutive feature of human social life” (Sidnell, 2010, p.1). Although CA is rooted in Ethnomethodology, which can be used ‘to study any kind of human action’ Seedhouse (2004, p.13), proclaims that (CA) has its own principles and procedures and focuses exclusively on actions that are manifested through talk. Basically, conversation analysis is about interpreting casual conversation.

This study employs CA to analyse the conversations between characters in the two selected plays. A content analysis checklist in Applied Linguistics was also developed and guided the study in analysing the existing data which in this case are the two plays. The checklist principally focuses on the use of politeness maxims in the studied texts. It is developed from Leech’s (1983) Politeness Principle which is used to determine the polite and impolite beliefs and expressions in the plays. While not all utterances are analysed, the analysis focuses on most the characters’ conversations in the six scenes of *‘The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School’* and three characters in *‘Finders Keepers Losers Weepers’*.

The table below is the content analysis checklist that was developed to guide the research:

Table 3.1: Content analysis checklist in Applied Linguistics

Types of politeness principles used in the plays	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● tact maxim ● generosity maxim ● approbation maxim ● modesty maxim ● agreement maxim ● sympathy maxim
Politeness and power struggle between characters	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Tact maxim in projecting power struggle ● Generosity maxim obeyed ● Negative approbation maxim ● Negative modesty maxim apathy of self-praise ● Agreement maxim ● Sympathy maxim obeyed
Violation of the politeness principles	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Violation of the tact maxim ● Generosity of reconciliation ● Violation of the approbation maxim ● Violation of the modesty maxim ● Agreement maxim ● Expression of sympathy in a maxim

3.7 Data analysis

The content analysis checklist is followed in the data analysis process. The checklist was formulated following the politeness principle by Leech (1983) as indicated in the theoretical framework section. The principle is a series of six maxims namely; tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement and sympathy which aims at maximising benefits to “others” and never to the “self” in order to be polite. These maxims are therefore used as outlined in the content analysis checklist to interpret selected conversations from the texts

of the plays. The maxims aid in locating different levels of im/politeness in the plays and evaluating its effectiveness as perceived by the audience. In a nutshell, the analysis is based on a systematic presentation of selected data which targets most fictional characters from plays.

Together, the plays are made up of several scenes in which both independent and run on conversations (scenarios) are presented. '*The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School*' comprises of six scenes with conversations by the school principal, two teachers and learners in the grade 12 (O) class group, and '*Finders Keepers Losers Weepers*' has only one scene where three characters are featured. While the analysis focuses on most characters featured in both plays, the study uses purposive sampling to select specific utterance and conversations containing different level of im/politeness. As mentioned earlier, the study is qualitative and as such, no data is collected through interviews or questionnaires. It is an exclusively desktop research.

3.8 Ethical Issues

Since conversation analysis (CA) exclusively analyses different levels of content, conversations, views and ideas encoded in texts, it is imperative that every research study that uses (CA) be approved by the supervisor prior to conducting the actual process of the research. This study is no exception and as such, the researcher sought approval from relevant authorities. In addition, the researcher is fully committed to all university rules and regulation formulated for qualitative studies. Because the study is of a qualitative nature, ethical clearance was obtained from the Namibia University of Science and Technology (NUST) Ethics Committee. In academic research, the issue of the avoidance of plagiarism can never be over emphasized. In this regard, all sources cited in the research are acknowledged in line with the APA standard practice for in-text and reference list referencing.

3.9 Chapter summary

This chapter outlined the research methodology and procedures used to conduct this study. It explicated the qualitative research design which the study employed. The chapter also further highlighted other methodological issues such as the criteria followed to select the texts and conversation analysis. The research tools, data analysis and ethical issues were also clarified. The next chapter chiefly focuses on a pragmatics stylistics interpretation of the data from the selected plays.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 Introduction

The previous chapter discussed the research design and methodology employed in this study. In this chapter, the researcher attempts the pragmatic stylistics discourse analyses of the two selected plays namely, *'The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School'* and *'Finders Keepers Losers Weepers'* (Petrus Haakskeen, 2001). The chapter examines the proliferation of politeness maxims in the fictional plays by employing a pragmatic stylistics interpretation of these selected plays. The researcher therefore presents an analysis of the fictional representation of politeness – a social phenomenon in context, through the analysis of conversations between characters in the plays. This analysis is guided by a content analysis checklist in Applied Linguistics based on Leech's (1983) Politeness Principle which consists of six maxims (tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy). The Politeness Principle (Leech, 1983) is vital to this research as it helps in giving direction and focus to the current study, and in responding to the earlier established specific research questions (See Chapter 1, Section 1.3). The plays are thematically analysed in response to these research questions, which are reproduced again below.

The research questions as earlier established in Chapter 1 are as follows:

- What are the significant types of politeness principles used in the plays?
- How have the politeness strategies been used to project power struggle between characters?
- How have the politeness maxims been violated in the plays?

4.2. Synopsis of *'The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School'* (Haakskeen, 2001)

'The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School' is a Namibian play. The play presents events in the Grade 12(O) classroom at Jabula High School, a school which was previously disadvantaged during colonial times in Namibia. Although the current education system brought about changes to the old education system, there are still many problems that need to be addressed within the new system. The play brings to light some of the problems in the classroom environment through the events experienced by both the learners and their teachers. The play aims at exposing the barriers characteristic of the challenges faced within the Namibian

education system such as unruly behavior patterns, alcohol and drug abuse and the lack of facilities and materials necessary for effective and equitable education to take place among others.

The playwright therefore takes the initiative to sensitise society about the challenges, and in the process jostle the relevant stakeholders to effect measure in order to eradicate these. The learners in the grade 12 (O) class group as presented in the play are highly undisciplined, lazy, naughty and perform poorly in school. In most times they blame their poor performance on the teachers and the system itself. There are however other learners in this very class who, despite the squalor of the learning conditions or at times the lack of facilities, work very hard to perform better and are also well mannered. As for the teachers, Mrs Coetzee is very hardworking and very strict and as such, every learner knows she is not one to be messed with.

Mr Hangwe on the other hand is very lazy and ever late for lessons. His attitude is nonchalant and quite rude as he uses vulgar language. The principal, Mr Basson is very strict, but also very fair to both learners and teachers when it comes to expected behaviours and activities at school. He is also quite a disciplinarian and is really strict with regards to expected behaviour patterns from both teachers and students alike – how they are supposed to behave themselves around the school grounds. The play is a true reflection of the situation(s) depicted in the Namibian schools.

4.3 Synopsis of *Finders Keepers Losers Weepers* (Haakskeen, 2000)

'Finders Keepers Losers Weepers' is a play about reconciliation between Namibia and its former coloniser, South Africa. The play is set in the heart of Windhoek, the capital city of independent Namibia. It features three characters, Hendrik Dollar, Jan Van Rand and Old Survivor. The two protagonists Hendrik Dollar and Jan Van Rand are in fact bank notes who, for the play's sake, become human characters. The play opens with an encounter of the two men who coincidentally meet in the Zoo Park. They robustly debate about who the real owners of the widespread landscapes are. Each believes that they have played a significant role in the development of Namibia.

4.4 What are the significant types of politeness principles used in the plays?

This section of the study discusses the different types of im/politeness. But first, it is important to state the function or what im/politeness is intended to achieve when used as a

tool for humans to interact. According to Leech, (2005) politeness is a “strategic conflict avoidance”. It is a system of interpersonal relations designed to facilitate interaction by minimising the potential for conflict and confrontation inherent in all human interchange. It then becomes a point to respond to the objectives of the present study to analyse the politeness principle (maxim) in the two plays. Since humans are involved in conversational interaction – also mimicked through dialogue in the plays – there is the likeliness of conflict to occur or to be avoided by using the principles of im/politeness. The next section delves into the types of politeness that were identified in the present study. These are first stated and then examples from the two short plays presented in the form of a table afterwards.

Types of politeness principles can be identified depending on the nature of conversational exchange. There are six types of politeness principles identified in this study. These are the maxims of tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement and sympathy (Leech, 1983). The role of politeness is to make the other person in the conversation feel comfortable. It mainly involves the issuing of appropriate utterances in a conversational exchange between the addressor and the addressee. This means that for the addressor to be considered polite, they must first understand the social values of the addressee. In the context of the present study, politeness principles were used in the two plays and are presented in the table below.

Table 4.1: Presentation of the six politeness principles identified in the two plays

Type of politeness principle	Delineation	Examples
Tact maxim	Communication offered to deprive self while benefiting another person	Relying the on West! Well why shouldn't we? They enriched themselves with our wealth over the centuries (Haakskeen, 2000, p. 85).
Generosity maxim	Offers generosity in communication	Hendrik Dollar, let me put it categorically clear for you now. Apartheid was not as evil as you label it to be. There were good things...(Haakskeen, 2000, p. 84)
Approbation maxim	Communication to praise or aiming for approval	There is it, Sir! Complete proof that nobody cares anymore (Haakskeen, 2001, p. 94).
Modesty maxim	Avoiding self-praise	I have a bad memory. I didn't intend to criticize you Hendrik (Haakskeen, 2000, p. 14).
Agreement maxim	Consensus conversation	Yes, guys. We're going to make a right fool of her. (Haakskeen, 2001, p. 191)
Sympathy maxim	Feeling sorry for another person	Well sorry for the person who lost it. I could have given it back if he was around but there is nobody around here, which means...(Haakskeen, 2001, p. 98)

The table above exemplifies the six types of politeness principles identified in this study. The function of the politeness principle (PP) is to "maintain the social equilibrium and the friendly relations which enable us to assume that our interlocutors are being cooperative" in their communication with us (Leech, 1983, p. 83). Accordingly, the principle also gives the general explanation of indirectness in communication, for instance, how to mean more than what is said. Leech (1983) further proposes that the principle in its negative form, "minimises (all other things being equal), the expression of impolite beliefs and in the corresponding positive form maximize (all other things being equal) the expression of polite beliefs" (p. 81). The PP has six maxims with their sub-maxim to perform its functions. These maxims are employed in the analyses of *'The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School'* and *'Finders Keepers Losers and Weepers'* using a pragmatics stylistics approach.

4.5 How politeness strategies have been used to project power struggle between characters

In the plays currently under study in the present study, there are characters whose dialogues represent power struggles between representatives of the former colonial powers and those who were in the liberation struggle in on context, and on the other hand between teachers and learners in another. These characters perform opposing roles and present divergent views about what each one of them has done to contribute to the betterment of the other in terms of the socioeconomic and political value. Their arguments are conversations that are worthy of deeper analyses through the explications of the theoretical tenets of the politeness principles. Thus responding to the second study objective. The analyses are not merely about which side wins over the other but chiefly about the conversational exchanges between the characters, specifically focusing on the politeness principles that they apply in discoursing with each other. All the six principles of politeness identified in the present study are analysed in the several sections below;

4.5.1 Tact maxim in projecting power struggle

The tact maxim can be observed in two strands: first it is intended to minimise the benefit to or cost to the listener by causing the listener to be at a conversational loss, secondly, it is intended to maximise benefit to the speaker by causing the speaker to profit from the listener in a conversation. According to Leech (1983), the maxim of tact is the most important of all kinds of politeness. In other words, it is expressed through minimising of cost to others and maximising benefit. This maxim is commonly used for impositives like ordering, commanding,

requesting and inviting among others. The extract below (Data set 1) from the text demonstrates how the tact maxim is used to project power struggle. The two categories (minimise and maximise) are analysed after the example below;

DATA SET 1

Mr Hangwe: Listen. I am the only one giving homework. I am the only teacher and you are the learner. You have no right to tell me how to do my work. You just do what I tell you. Now is that clear everybody? *(there is a loud noise over which Mr Hangwe screams)* I say keep quiet! You should behave yourselves. Otherwise ... *(sudden silence followed by 'hooh!')*

Herman: Otherwise what, sir?

Mr Hangwe: Otherwise I will find myself a whip and beat the hell out of you.

James: I am sorry, that is out. Completely out.

Herman: *Uit soors kers.* [Out like a candle.] (laughter)

(Haakskeen, 2001, p. 188)

The conversation above depicts a power struggle between a teacher and his learners. The teacher obviously being in a position power has higher authority over the learners but abuses such a position to his advantage. He does not want anyone to question his authority regardless of him being right or wrong.

On the other hand, the learners try to challenge him relying on their given rights to be educated. They also remind him that he has no right to whip them, despite his superior authority and position in class as corporal punishment has long been abolished.

4.5.1.1 Tact Maxim to minimize the cost of the speaker

In the extract below, the maxim has been disobeyed. The tact maxim implies that the speaker minimises the cost (and correspondingly maximises the benefit) to the listener (Leech, 1983). The exchange between Herman and Michael reveals Michael maximising benefit to himself while maximising cost onto Herman, thus in the process disobeying the maxim. In other words, Michael seeks to benefit while putting Herman at a conversational loss.

DATA SET 2

Herman: Hey Mike, you're sitting in front of me man. *Hoe kan jy so op 'n bank sit, ek kannie onnie siennie man!* [How can you sit on a desk, I can't see anyone] come on, get up!

Michael: *(sitting on top of the desk, turns to look down at Herman)* Aaooh! Herry, what's your problem bro? I can't help it we don't have enough chairs. I don't have a chair- that's why I'm sitting on a desk. It's not my fault.....*(interrupted)*

(Haakskeen, 2001, p. 185-186)

In the above conversation, Michael defends himself claiming that he is a better person to sit on the desk and that obstructing Herman is not a problem as long as Michael benefits in the conversation. Michael's decision to sit in front of Herman was so that he could see better while disregarding Herman. The maxim has therefore been disobeyed by Michael as he was selfish and only thought of himself. When asked why he was sitting on a desk in front of Herman, he responded by saying that he did not have any chair to sit on. Therefore, it can be concluded that the move was deliberate and impolite because, although it was true that there was a lack of chairs and tables at the school, he could have politely asked to share a sitting place with Herman or perhaps position the desk where it was not obstructing Herman's view or that of any other person for that matter. This conversational exchange therefore depicts Michael violating the tact maxim through his action and consequently appears impolite towards Herman. Furthermore, Michael's utterance of the words '*Aaooh! Herry, what's your problem bro*' and his tone towards Herman is very rude and impolite. "'It's not my fault...' says Michael". In saying this, he shifts the blame onto someone else. In this regard, he was being impolite because he maximised cost to the other, hence disobeying the tact maxim.

4.5.1.2 Tact maxim that maximize the benefit of the hearer

The conversational exchange in Data set 3 is between Mr Hangwe, a teacher and the learners in Grade 12 (0). The encounter happened during a lesson. When Mr Hangwe entered the class and greeted the learners by saying "*Good morning class!*" and was met by an unpleasant

response. The learners immediately began to make noise and responded to his greeting sarcastically, “*Good afternoon siiir!*”. Out of anger, the teacher yelled at the class and this leads into commotion in the class.

The extract depicts a high level of impoliteness with the word exchange between Mr Hangwe and the three learners. The tact maxim in conversational exchange between Mr Hangwe and three learners (James, Herman and Michael) has been disobeyed in order to benefit the hearer (Mr Hangwe). This is evident in Hangwe’s response to the learners.

DATA SET 3

Mr Hangwe: Good morning class!

Learners: (*sarcastically*) Good afternoon siiir!

Mr Hangwe: (*angrily*) What the hell is that? You are not small kids. You dam grown-up children in Grade 12. Why do you greet me “good afternoon”?

James: (*the main troublemaker in the class*) Well, if you would like to know, it’s the time, Sir.

Mr Hangwe: Nonsense, I’m just a few minutes late.

James: (*looking at his watch*) Well, according to my watch, which is always on time, you are 18 minutes late.

Herman: Yeah, which is almost half the period.

Mr Hangwe: Now shut up, you two and sit down! Who gave you the right to talk to me like that? Whether I am late or not is none of your business.

Michael: But we are the ones who suffer! Look, we’re already in the second half of the period and we haven’t even done anything yet!

(Haakskeen, 2001, p.185)

Mr Hangwe disobeyed this maxim by being late for the lesson. Thereby maximising his benefit to the conversation. Being late for a lesson most especially without a valid reason imposes difficulty to the learners because they are forced to learn a large chunk of the prepared work

within a short amount of time. Also, Mr Hangwe used unfriendly words such as *'nonsense, shut up', 'you damn fools' and 'none of your business'* with the learners. The situation portrayed in the extract therefore gives a vivid picture of the tact maxim being disobeyed by Mr Hangwe, because he, through his late coming has maximised cost on to the learners whilst maximising benefit on to himself.

Based on example from Data 3 which reads; *"What the hell is that? You are not small kids. You dam grown-up children in Grade 12. Why do you greet me "good afternoon"?",* Mr Hangwe refuses to accept that he was late for class by negating the students' protest. On the other hand, Mr Hangwe applies an impositive function of the tact maxim, meaning that he expects the learners to obey him despite having inconveniencing them. The implication of the above exchange reveals that, Mr Hangwe used the time allocated to his lesson to attend to some other perhaps unrelated business which is beneficial to him, whilst making the learners wait and in the process, stealing away from their learning time.

Moreover, Mr Hangwe also, minimises benefit to the learners whilst maximising benefit onto himself by employing force and or commands in the classroom. When James and Herman indicate that he was late for class by 18 minutes, he yells at them to shut up, *"Now shut up, you two. Who gave you the right to talk to me like that? Whether I am late or not is none of your business."* Mr Hangwe's words yet again disobeyed of the tact maxim, as he is taking away the learners' right to learn and the opportunity to express a genuine concern/complain. He in a way verbally threatened their right and therefore maximises cost on to them and minimised benefit to them. This is so because, not only were they not taught for the day, but it also appears that they were not allowed to do anything about it, such as perhaps bringing the complaint to the principal's attention. As seen in the words of Michael, one of the learners in the class, who indicates that *"But we are the ones who suffer! Look we're already in the second half of the period and we haven't done anything yet!"*, the learners are at the non-beneficial receiving end of class. It can therefore be concluded that the extract presented above depict the tact maxim being disobeyed by Mr Hangwe.

4.5.2 Generosity maxim obeyed

Leech (1983) states that, the generosity maxim aims at minimising benefit to self thus maximising cost. It thus collaborates with the tact maxims as they are both concerned commissives and impositives.

DATA SET 4

Mr Basson: Admit it, Mr Hangwe! Besides, even if you are only suffering from a hangover, as you claim, how will you be able to teach? Maybe you should just go home and sleep it off.

Mr Hangwe: (*pleading*) No! Mr Basson. Please I am okay. I am just fine. Don't send me home. I have an important lesson to give today. Please Sir, I will cope, don't worry, trust me.

Mr Basson: Okay then, if you insist. But, Mr Hangwe, this must be the last time I see you in my office. If I have to see you again like this, I will deal very severely with you. Take that as serious warning, Mr Hangwe. Now you can go to class.

Mr Hangwe: (*relieved*) Thank you very much, Mr Basson. I promise I will never again come to school like this. That's a promise

(Haakskeen, 2001, p.200)

The conversational exchange between Mr Basson and Mr Hangwe portrays the generosity maxim being obeyed by Mr Basson when he acts generously towards Mr Hangwe. Simultaneously, Mr Basson also obeyed the sympathy maxim when he offered Mr Hangwe the day off to go and sleep so he could recover from his hangover and be fresh enough for the following day's work. As portrayed in the above extract, Mr Hangwe is careless and is somewhat suffering from alcohol abuse as demonstrated by his coming to school intoxicated, which is unacceptable for teachers or any employee for that matter. As usual he denies being under the influence of alcohol but admits to having a little hangover.

The conversational exchange between the two characters reveals a high level of generosity and sympathy exercised by Mr Basson towards Mr Hangwe. Mr Basson, in his capacity as the

principal of the school, could have charged Mr Hangwe with misconduct on account of working and teaching under the influence of alcohol. However, he acts generously by simply verbally warning him and allowing Mr Hangwe to continue with lessons for the day. Because Mr Basson did not punish Mr Hangwe for violating the rules of the school as one would expect. It can therefore, be concluded that he was very generous and sympathetic towards Mr Hangwe. By being generous Mr Basson minimises benefit to himself and indeed maximises cost on to himself because he took the risk by of not charging Mr Hangwe for misconduct.

Mr Basson was indeed very generous to Mr Hangwe and because of his generosity he has maximises benefit onto the other whilst minimising cost on self. Mr Basson's act of generosity and sympathy could have been prompted by the fact that, charging Mr Hangwe with misconduct could result in Mr Hangwe losing his teaching job and consequently the learners would suffer more for they would now be without a teacher. Also, allowing Mr Hangwe to return home and get some sleep, was to spare him the embarrassment for going to class highly intoxicated and end up being mocked by the learners. Moreover, Mr Hangwe had pleaded for mercy *"No! Mr Basson. Please! I am okay. I am just fine. Don't send me home, I have an important lesson to give today."*

Mr Basson therefore responds positively to Mr Hangwe's request and allows him to proceed with work for the day. However, he warns him to never repeat the same thing again, *"If I have to see you like this again, I will deal very severely with you."* In sum, obeying the generosity maxim and at the same time the sympathy maxim depicts a sense of politeness. Hence, the researcher is concluding that Mr Basson proved to be very polite towards Mr Hangwe. This is because he, by all means, maximises benefit to Mr Hangwe although he does not necessarily deserve it because he has violated the school rules. Mr Hangwe has equally proven to be polite to Mr Basson by pleading with and humbling himself as well. This has therefore, allowed Mr Basson to calmly deal with his case and resolve it in a manner that was convenient to both.

4.5.3 Negative approbation maxim

This maxim discourages people from talking about anything unpleasant. According to Leech (1983), in fulfilling the maxim, one makes sure that they minimise the expression of dispraise to others and maximises praise to others.

DATA SET 5

Michael: (*triumphant*) There is it, Sir! Complete proof that nobody cares anymore.

Mr Hangwe: What do you mean “nobody cares anymore”?

Michael: Sir, you just said you are here just for your job... just for your pay.

That means you don’t care about our education at all.

Mr Hangwe: (*driven into a corner*) Well that’s what you say.

Clemence: Perhaps that is exactly the problem. The teachers no longer worry. They’re just wishing for the days of the rod when they could ‘solve’ all their problems by beating it out on us.

(Haakskeen, 2001, p.189)

The extract above depicts a conversation between two learners, Michael and Clemence and one of their teachers, Mr Hangwe. The trio are conversing about the teachers’ lack of care towards the learners’ education observed in the school. Michael and Clemence made utterance which dispraise Mr Hangwe and the rest of the teachers in their school, and therefore violated the approbation maxim, which advocates for the speakers to minimise dispraise of others and instead praise others (maximise praise).

DATA SET 6

Michael: Sir, you just said you are here just for your job ... just for your pay. That means you don’t care about our education at all.

Mr Hangwe: (*driven into a corner*) Well, that’s what you say.

Clemence: Perhaps that is exactly the problem. The teachers no longer worry. They are just wishing for the days of the rod when they could ‘solve’ all their problems by beating it out on us.

Mr Hangwe: (*surprised by Clemence’s view*) Now, who are you trying to prove wrong? Don’t you see what is wrong? Don’t you see what is going on in this dam class? Everybody acts the way they please. Nobody respects me or any other teacher. Nobody

cares about the school work. Your performance is so poor, you just want to play or act stupidly... (*'hooh!' sound*) ...exactly like you're doing now. Not to mention hanging around the streets when school is out, instead of being home with your books.
(*loud noise*)

(Haakskeen, 2001, p.189)

The above extract depicts Mr Hangwe's response to Clemence's view as seen above as being impolite. The conversation takes place during a lesson, and was just like one of the usual arguments in the grade 12 (O) class. Clemence and Michael argue that the teachers no longer cared about the learners' education or their wellbeing in school. The boys claim that the teachers seem to care more about their pay cheque than anything else. During the argument, Mr Hangwe violated the approbation maxim as evident in the extract. As put by Leech (1983), the approbation maxim aims at minimising dispraise of the other while maximising praise of the other.

Mr Hangwe criticized the learners' performance and called them stupid. Although it may be true that the learners in that class perform poorly at school, calling them stupid is unprofessional, rude and impolite. When Mr Hangwe points out that everybody acts the way they please and that nobody respected him, by inference, he means that the learners are both irresponsible and disrespectful towards him. The learners are hurt by Mr Hangwe's utterance, as result they start making noise to show their disgruntlement. Considering what Leech (1983) has outlined regarding the use of the approbation maxim, it can be concluded that Mr Hangwe has violated the approbation maxim while trying to express his own point of view and in the process ends up insulting the learners. Mr Hangwe violated this maxim because he maximises dispraise to the learners, instead of aiming to minimise it.

DATA SET 7

Mrs Coetzee: (*angry*) crazy fools! There, I have said it- that's precisely what you are. Ill-disciplined, badly mannered, lazy...crazy fools. Who do you think you're fooling? Nobody but yourselves. Goodness gracious!

Herman: (*defending their case*) But, Mrs Coetzee, that's highly insulting. What did we do to deserve this? We are good learners.

(*the rest of the group laugh*)

Mrs Coetzee: (*interrupting the laughter*) Good learners! Goodness gracious! Shame on you. You are nothing but a bunch of lazy parasites. Do you think you will ever become anything in life with this childish behavior? Never! You are nothing unless you take your education seriously and stop fooling around. Now sit down class. (*Everybody sits*)

Clemence: This is not fair.

Mrs Coetzee: What? What is not fair?

Clemence: It's not right that we should be insulted like this.

(Haakskeenp, 2001, p. 207)

The above conversational exchange between Mrs Coetzee and the two boys (Herman and Clemence), evinces a violation of the approbation maxim. Mrs Coetzee disobeys the approbation maxim when she uses vulgar or unpleasant language to mock the learners during her lesson. The learners in grade 12 (O) class are portrayed as rude, lazy and ill-mannered. They have a tendency of deliberately going wild during Mrs Coetzee's lessons. As evident from the above exchange, the learners had obviously behaved inappropriately and angered her. She retaliated by calling them as "*crazy fools*". The word 'fool' has a negative connotation, which according to Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary means "a person who you think behaves or speaks in a way that lacks intelligence or good judgement".

Calling the learners "*crazy fools*" discredit their intellectual ability. Consequently, Mrs Coetzee is disobeying the approbation rule which requires one to, by all means, minimise the dispraise of others and aims at maximising praise to others. Herman who attempts to interrupt Mrs Coetzee in the learners' defense is met with more insults by the teacher, who calls the learners "*a bunch of lazy parasites*". Mrs Coetzee also somewhat encourages them with her words i.e. that they should take their education serious and do away with the childish behavior at once. The learners however, are too overwhelmed to notice that positive aspect of the whole outburst. The use of unpleasant words by Mrs Coetzee hence leads to the

violation of the approbation maxim when she minimises praise to the learners and maximises dispraise to them, and that by extension represents impoliteness.

DATA SET 8

Mrs Coetzee: (*surprised*) Bantu Education System! You must be crazy. You wouldn't do any better in IGCSE, not to mention HIGCSE. Under the present circumstances I don't think this school is ready for that.

Gerson: But why? Is it because our school doesn't have the necessary qualified teachers and facilities?

Mrs Coetzee: (*reasonably cooled down*) not necessarily. In fact, you are the reason that the system can't be implemented at this school.

(Haakskeen, 2001, p. 209)

The extract above depicts a conversational exchange between Mrs Coetzee, the English teacher and Gerson, a learner in the grade 12 (O) class. Both speakers are impolite during this exchange because each violates the approbation maxim by minimising praise to the other as opposed to maximising praise to the other. When Mrs Coetzee indicates that the school was not ready to offer IGSCE and much less HIGSCE, she means that the learners at the school were academically weak and hence would not be able to pass at an advanced level of their current education curriculum. Mrs Coetzee's thoughts, means that the learners were academically challenged or if explicitly put, they are stupid.

Maximising dispraise to the other means that the speakers have violated the approbation maxim because it advocates for speakers to minimise dispraise to other, which is not the apparent case in the above extract. Gerson also violates the approbation maxim when he implies that the teachers do not have the necessary qualifications. In some way, Gerson was mocking the teacher, that she and the rest are unqualified teachers. Although Mrs Coetzee and Gerson speak to each other in a calm manner as outlined through the narrator's words, it is clear that both characters are impolite because, they through their choices of words, discredited each other, with Mrs Coetzee mocking Gerson's and the rest of the learners'

intellectual capability and Gerson through suggesting that, Mrs Coetzee and the rest of the teachers at the school are unqualified. The conversation represents a violation of the maxim by both genders, given that the exchange was between a female teacher and a male learner.

4.5.4 Negative modesty maxim apathy of self-praise

The ultimate aim of the modesty maxim is to minimise praise of self and maximise dispraise of self. It is closely related to the approbation maxim (Leech, 1983).

DATA SET 9

Mr Hangwe: Listen. I am giving you homework. I am the teacher and you the learner. You have no right to tell me how to do my work. You just do what I tell you to do. Now is that clear to everybody? *(there is a loud noise, over which Mr Hangwe screams)* I say keep quiet! You should behave yourselves. Otherwise... *(sudden silence followed by 'hooh')*

(Haakskeen, 2001, p. 188)

The extract above is a part of a conversation between Mr Hangwe, the teacher and the learners in the grade 12 (O) class. In the extract showcases how Mr Hangwe violates the modesty maxim through his utterance to the learners. According to Leech (1983) the ultimate goal of the modesty maxim is to minimise praise of the self and maximise dispraise of self. However, what is evident in the extract above is Mr Hangwe maximising praise to self, by categorically emphasizing the importance of his position as the teacher, *"I am the teacher and you the learner. You have no right to tell me how to do my work."* Mr Hangwe used his position as a teacher not only to threaten the learners but also to boast about being superior and more important than them.

What his words and attitude vividly depict is self-righteousness and too much pride. His words also imply that he is the smart and knowledgeable one in the class, and that the learners do not know anything. As such, he believed that the students therefore, are in no position to question him on anything in the classroom. In the extract Mr Hangwe therefore projects impoliteness onto the learners, because he belittles and regards them as empty vessels. Also,

he praises himself through boasting about him being the teacher which consequently violates the rules of the modesty maxim.

DATA SET 10

James: *(interrupting the singing)* Oh! Come on guys. Cut it short. Now let me show you how a real donkey does the real thing when he needs to have...aaaaah *(looking the boys in their faces)* ...the real thing. You know...sex! *(laughter)*

Herman: But remember to use a condom, donkey.

James: well, we donkeys don't eat grass with the container on.

No

man, we eat grass just as it is. Naturally! *(Laughter)*

Michael: Okay then, come on donkey! Let's hear from you.

(Haakskeen, 2001, p.192-193)

The extract reveals the modesty maxim being violated by James – the chief troublemaker in the class. As portrayed in the above extract, James praises himself for his “outstanding performance during the animal resistance drama rehearsal” which the boys had planned to perform during Mrs Coetzee’s lesson. The boys had planned to annoy Mrs Coetzee with animal sounds during her English lesson, where each one had to imitate a particular animal sound. In the extract, James, the donkey praised himself “Now let me show you how a real donkey does the real thing when he needs to have...aaaaah *(looking the boys in their faces)* ...the real thing. You know...sex!”

His words were that of self-praise hence violating the modesty maxim which aims at minimising praise to self and maximising dispraise to self. The scenario takes place in the classroom where all learners were present. As such, the act by James of praising himself could have been motivated by the desire to impress his classmates. Moreover, James’ conversation had by then already redirected its focus from the animal resistance plan to donkey sex. Clearly James wanted to prove or perhaps convince his classmates how good he is in that area. When advised by his friend Herman to use a condom, again with so much pride and self-approval

James responded that “donkeys don’t eat grass with the container on. No man, we eat grass just as it is. Naturally!”

What is depicted from his response is that James is too proud, which on its own proves that James is impolite. More so, the fact that he wanted to show the rest of the class how a donkey has sex, means that he considers himself an expert. Therefore, James violates the modesty maxim during the conversational exchange, because he praised himself verbally, instead of allowing friends and classmates to praise him.

4.5.5 Agreement maxim

Leech (1983) describes agreement maxim as one that minimizes disagreement between self and other, speakers should therefore promote agreement with others.

DATA SET 11

James: Now listen carefully you guys. We’re going to have an animal resistance when Mrs Coetzee comes in. We’re gonna drive her crazy man, making a nice fool of her, understand?

Boys: *(very excited about the plan)* yes bro man, that’s a good thing.

Michael: *Ja ouense. Ons gaat lekke gek van haar maak.* [Yes guys. We’re going to make a right fool of her.] *(all laugh)*

James: *(interrupting the laughter)* Okay, okay guys, take note. Listen to me. What I call you now is the sound you make. You are that animal, understand? If I call you a dog, you act like a dog and I mean a real dog, understand?

Boys: *(together)* Yeah! Understood!

James: *(looking at MICHAEL)* Mike, you are a chicken. Now let’s hear you.

Michael: Pock-pock-pock, pock-pock, pock- pock-pock. *(loudly)* Pock-pock, pockiyaaah! *(the class is surprised at his performance and there is much applause)*

(Haakskeen, 2001, p. 191)

The agreement maxim is obeyed as evident in the above extract. This maxim aims to minimise disagreement between the self and other. The conversation projects the learners' agreement to take part in the animal resistance as planned by James, one of the trouble makers in the class. When James informs them about his absurd idea to drive Mrs Coetzee crazy, the boys scream in excitement and agreement to the animal resistance. In fact, they all agreed that it was indeed a good idea, as it can be deduced from the utterance made "*very excited about the plan*", "*yes bro man*", "*that's a good idea.*" Also, what is evident in the extract is the simultaneous manifestation of the tact and sympathy maxims.

Planning the animal resistance to drive Mrs Coetzee crazy, meant that the learners were actually maximising cost onto Mrs Coetzee while maximising benefit to themselves, because she had to scold and perhaps beg them to be quiet so she could continue with the planned lesson. More so disturbing the class also means wasting valuable teaching time, which in a long or short run may cost her to sacrifice her free time to make up for what have been lost through the process. On contrary, the whole idea of the animal resistance was a tactful act to get a free lesson, because they knew that the chaos would definitely make Mrs Coetzee leave the classroom and they would be left alone to enjoy the free lesson, which was their ultimate goal.

As mentioned earlier, the extract also portrays the sympathy maxim violated by the boys. Because the boys have shown Mrs Coetzee no sympathy, they violate the maxim by maximising antipathy between her and themselves. Viewed from the tact and sympathy maxims perspective, it can be concluded that the idea of driving Mrs Coetzee crazy depicts an element of impoliteness towards her. However, if viewed from the agreement view point, it is evident that this maxim was obeyed, because all that was planned by James, was agreed upon by the boys and executed by them too. The boys all cheered in agreement to make a fool of Mrs Coetzee, and together yelled! "*Yeah! Understood*" and then immediately after, they all started to rehearse the different animal sounds they were going to make upon her arrival as it is seen in Michael's utterance (making sounds imitating a chicken). In a manner of speaking, the agreement maxim was obeyed by boys in the class, because they have all agreed to take part in the animal resistance planned against Mrs Coetzee. Such an agreement reveals that these learners are indeed polite towards each other because they have minimised disagreement and maximised agreement amongst themselves.

DATA SET 12

Janet: (*pointing at the boys who were doing the 'animal resistance'*) No! No! We are not all in this. You guys are the ones who were going crazy with that animal thing of yours. You will take the heat not us.

Johanness: (*agreeing with Janet*) That's true Janet. They are the ones who should face Mr Basson. Not the whole class.

James: So what? You think we're cowards. No way my bro, we are not cowards. Isn't it bros? (*looking at his friends*)

Herman: Yeah! We are not mamparras [idiots]. Right guys?

Michael: Oh yes! We are not afraid of anyone. Not so, chommies?

Barabas: Ja man! We are not afraid of Mr Basson.

(Haakskeen, 2001, p. 194)

In the extract above, one observes how the characters obey the agreement maxim. The conversation is between learners in the troublesome grade 12 (O) class – Janet one of the girls in class and the boys who took part in the animal resistance during Mrs Coetzee's lesson. The agreement maxim is obeyed during this conversation because when Janet pointed out to the boys that they would be the only ones who will have to answer to the school principal, Mr Basson regarding the commotion they had caused in class, Johannes, one of the boys in the class immediately agreed with Janet. Through the narrator's voice it is revealed that Janet and Johannes both felt that it would be unfair for all the learners in class to be held accountable for the actions of a few.

According to Leech (1983) the agreement maxim aims at minimising disagreement between self and the other(s). So, when two or more people or fictional characters agree on particular case, theory or so, they are in a manner of speaking complying with the general rule of this maxim. The extract depicts Janet and Johannes sharing a similar sentiment on the issue of animal resistance. In doing so, the two have minimised disagreement between self and other and maximised agreement between themselves. Additionally, one also observes agreement between the culprits. They proved to have succumbed to Janet's call for them to take

responsibility for their actions, just to prove that they do not fear Mr Basson. More so, that they wanted to prove that indeed they were not cowards neither idiots who would run away out of fear when it arrives, indicates agreement amongst them.

When James, the leader of the trouble makers in class, made these remarks, *“So what? You think we’re cowards. No way my bro, we are not cowards. Isn’t it bros? (looking at his friends)”* his fellows, Herman, Michael and Barabas all responded one after the other, *“Yeah! We are not mamparras [idiots]. Right guys? Oh yes! We are not afraid of anyone. Not so, chommies? Ja man! We are not afraid of Mr Basson.”* The utterances made depict agreement between them because they have all agreed to take responsibility for the dramatic animal resistance they had planned against Mrs Coetzee. As evident from the text, the agreement maxim was obeyed spontaneously by these boys, because of James’ extreme ego, which did not allow him to be seen as weak and fearful. Taking responsibility for their irresponsible actions, means that they maximise agreement between themselves. Such an act is polite.

DATA SET 13

Mr Hangwe: *(nastily)* Well, that’s none of my business. Neither is it yours. This is the teacher’s table, which is supposed to be used by the teacher, not you. Besides, it’s not my fault that there are not enough desks. That’s your own fault. Breaking up everything over the years...now you complain. What you sow is what you harvest.

(A noise breaks out as some of the learners are unhappy about Mr Hangwe’s uncaring attitude)

Johaness: *(loudly)* Please people, let’s have order! I think Mr Hangwe is not wrong. *(almost the whole class turns against him; some even throw paper at him)*

Tangeni: *(in support of Johaness)* Yeah! That’s really true. We are vandalizing our own things ourselves. We break things and do whatever we want. And when we suffer at the end as a consequence of our actions, we blame others. *(some of the class takes offense)*

(Haakskeen, 2001, p.201)

Mr Hangwe, Johannes and Tangeni as portrayed in the conversational exchange agree on the fact that it is the learners who are vandalising and breaking the school properties. This common agreement between the trio resonates with Leech's (1983) aim for the agreement maxim, which is to minimise disagreement between the self and other, while maximising agreement. Although the characters agree on the above mentioned, which according to Leech's basic of rule of agreement is regarded as polite, it can also be argued that, the utterances made are equally impolite, because of the tone and the choice of words by Mr Hangwe. The narrator points out that Mr Hangwe is nasty, when he tells the learners that the issue of lack of tables in the school was definitely not his business, neither was it theirs and as such the learners should not use the teacher's table. Mr Hangwe's attitude depicts impoliteness because he is mocking the learners and in the process he uses unfriendly register and tone. Although most of the learners are unhappy with what Mr Hangwe said, Johannes and Tangeni support him. They too agreed that it was indeed the learners who break the facilities at school and do whatever they want.

The conversation also depicts a violation of the maxim, because some of the learners were offended by Mr Hangwe. According to the narrator, some of the learners take offense in what Mr Hangwe says. Similarly, they were offended by Johannes and Tangeni who decide to side with the teacher. Although what is said might be true, the learners' disapproval of the utterance made indicate both disagreement and impoliteness. Leech's (1983) Politeness Principle highlights that the violation of the politeness maxims results in impoliteness. When viewed from the earlier mentioned two perspectives, the conclusion is that the conversational exchange depicts both politeness and impoliteness, because of the agreement and disagreement observed between the characters –to be precise, specifically the agreement between Mr Hangwe, Johannes and Tangeni and the disagreement between them and some other learners in the class who took offense to what is said.

DATA SET 14

Mr Hangwe: (*unhappy and angry*) Well if that is the case I will go. But remember, Mr Basson. You have just declared war

against me and I'm not going to rest until I've paid you back for this.

Narrator: *(Mr Hangwe walks out of the class angrily. At that moment the bell rings for recess. Mr Basson also leaves that classroom, followed by the much-relieved learners. The classroom is left in an unusually neat and orderly state.)*

(Haakskeen, 2001, p. 21)

In the above extract, Mr Hangwe literally obeys the agreement maxim, however he also indirectly disobeys it. The extract presents an unhappy and angry Mr Hangwe responding to Mr Basson, the school principal who has just publicly announced his dismissal from the school. The announcement was done during Mr Hangwe's lesson, right after the principal has also announced the names of some learners who were expelled from school. Mr Hangwe obeys the agreement because he, in his own words tells Mr Basson that *"if that is the case I will go. But remember, Mr Basson you have just declared war against me and I'm not going to rest until I've paid you back for this."* Mr Hangwe agrees to leave the school, although he seems to have agreed only because of the mere fact that the dismissal was an official directive from the school board and if he wanted to challenge the decision, he then had to follow it up through the right procedures. Also, because the announcement is done in class with all the learners present, and were the situation gets out of hand with the learners chanting, relieved by the news of Mr Hangwe's dismissal, protesting at that time would not have served him well. More so, it was during the last lesson of the day and everyone was already looking forward to the weekend.

Alike, Mr Hangwe, in his response, swears to make Mr Basson pay and declares war against him. By virtue of such utterances, Mr Hangwe's anger and words mean that he disagrees with the decision that was taken against him. Although he complies with it, he still swears to challenge the decision and eventually make the principal pay. Although Mr Hangwe possibly deserves the dismissal which was decided based on his several cases of misconduct at school and the fact that he had received several warnings before and had not changed his behaviour, and instead had made things worse. He does not deserve to be embarrassed in front of his learners. Announcing his dismissal in class is unprofessional and impolite on the part of the

principal and also embarrassing and this is reason enough for Mr Hangwe to be furious. The principal should instead have handled the matter privately in his office, perhaps call Mr Hangwe and politely handle the situation. Evidently his lack of professionalism has led to a disagreement between the two parties, which according to Leech is an impolite act. This is because Mr Basson, through his announcement, maximises disagreement between him (self) and Mr Hangwe, (the other).

4.5.6 Sympathy maxim obeyed

This maxim aims for maximum sympathy between people. Leech (1983), states that it is aimed at minimising antipathy between self and others therefore maximising sympathy.

DATA SET 15

Mr Basson: Please Mr Hangwe, calm down. Have a seat and listen to what I have to say. *(Mr Hangwe sits on his chair)* As I told you yesterday, the School Board, the Director of Education, and the Student Representative Council met last night. The shocking behavior of some of the learners at this school was discussed. We went through the records and short-listed...blacklisted...until we decided who the troublemakers, or shall I say rotten apples, are. These we will get rid of once and for all. *(there is murmuring as the tension rises amongst the learners)*. The following learners will be expelled from this school. When I call your name, take what is yours and go. Leave behind what is not yours. *(the learners are now very nervous as Mr Basson starts reading the names)* James Aixab!

(Haakskeen, 2001, p. 217)

In the extract, Mr Basson- the school principal speaks to the learners about their bad behaviour and announces the names of those whom the School Board have decided should be expelled from the school. As seen in the utterance made, Mr Basson shows no mercy for the troublesome learners. He explains that they are going to get rid of all the troublemakers once and for all. Mr Basson is unsympathetic, he expels all those whom he calls the rotten

apples at the school. His lack of sympathy towards the learners was not surprising at all because he has previously warned the learners in the grade 12 (O) class several times before about their unruly behaviour. The learners in the class are rude, lazy and somewhat behave like hooligans. They are ever picking fights with each other and some of the teachers like Mrs Coetzee, the English teacher and Mr Hangwe, the history teacher.

The behaviour of the troublemakers was beginning to take a toll on some of the innocent learners in the class, hence getting rid of them is a benefit to many at school. When Mr Basson announces that they were going to get rid of the rotten apples at school, the learners panicked and began murmuring and the tension rose when the principal reads out the names of those expelled. When the learners respond with a murmur it was evident that some learners are not pleased with the decision taken by the relevant authorities, hence their reaction is imagined as a kind of protest. What transpires between Mr Basson and the learners, most especially those who are expelled is anger and rage which consequently leads to maximised antipathy between them. Mr Basson has therefore violated the sympathy maxim as outlined by Leech. According to Leech (1983), the sympathy maxim aims at minimising antipathy between the self and the other. What Mr Basson has done is maximise antipathy and minimise sympathy. With that he has violated the maxim and was therefore impolite towards the learners. The narrator also states that, the learners are very nervous and fear to be potentially dismissed from school. Moreover, the tone and type of language that Mr Basson uses is quite unfriendly, especially when he rudely tells the learners to take only what is theirs and leave behind what is not theirs as soon as they hear their names called out. Clearly the attitude he portrays is too egocentric, rude, harsh and unsympathetic – on the whole, impolite.

DATA SET 16

Mr Hangwe: (interrupting) Enough! Enough! I have had enough of your nonsense. From today onwards I won't worry. I will just come here, give my lesson and get myself the hell out of here. Julle wil mos nie hoor nie, maar nou gaan hulle sien.[You don't want to listen, but now you will see.] (*he looks very angry but tries to keep cool*).

James: *(trying to reason with Mr Hangwe)* Yeah! That's fine with me, Sir! No spanking- just teaching. That's what we're here for. We're human beings, not animals that should be spanked left, right and centre. *(laughter)*

(Haakskeen, 2001, p. 187)

Mr Hangwe disobeys the sympathy maxim in the extract. He has had enough of the learners' behavior to a point where he no longer cares about the work and future but was now only going to class to earn a living. He has no mercy for the learners. *(You don't want to listen, but now you will see.)* Mr Hangwe says these words whilst angry and yet at the same time portraying a friendly look. The learners' bad behavior provokes the teacher to make the drastic decision not to care about them anymore. What has also made the situation worse is that the likes of James and other troublemakers in the classes do not care much about being punished because of their attitude. Mr Hangwe violates the sympathy maxim when he decides to not care about his learners anymore, as seen in the above extract. His attitude towards them maximises antipathy instead of maximising sympathy between self and other (himself and the learners).

James who tries to reason with Mr Hangwe, is very sarcastic and mocks him. In fact, he is not at all worried about the teacher's lack of care and sympathy, and instead also agrees with the idea of teaching only and suggests that they should just be taught and not spanked as if they were animals. Through James' utterance, the agreement maxim manifests in what was meant to be the sympathy maxim, because he agrees with what his teacher has said as he literally supports the idea of the teacher to fully attend to the class even if he does not give the learners any special attention in order for them to improve their studies.

Although James' utterance can be described as polite, based on what was outlined by Leech (1983) as constituting the principles of politeness, the same utterance is equally impolite because the choice of words and tone used in the extract do not necessarily represent any form of politeness. James' attitude towards Mr Hangwe is quite rude, as he sounds arrogant. It is common knowledge that the learners ought to respect the teacher and also obey all the school rules. However, this does not seem to be the case for James and some other learners in the Grade 12 (O) class who are continuously misbehaving on the school grounds. One

observes that it is the attitudes and misbehaviour of some of the learners that have led to Mr Hangwe's anger and subsequent lack of sympathy for them. Mr Hangwe has sworn not to do anything beyond just teaching. Mr Hangwe's attitude can be construed to be potentially detrimental to the students because all the learners at school need special care, especially those who are slow in learning. Even when provoked and pushed into a corner, a lack of care from the teacher paints a picture of impoliteness and being unsympathetic.

4.6 Violation of the politeness principles

The violation of the polite principles occurs when the speaker breaks or fails to comply with what is expected of them to fulfil the maxim principle (Leech, 2005). The extract below presents an argumentative encounter between two heroic figures, Hendrik Dollar and Jan Van Rand. They argue about the Industrial Revolution, and each one of them believes that their distinctive race has contributed immensely to the success of the industrial revolution. In the extract the tact maxim is violated, thus violating a maxim principle. However, the maxim is not directly violated by the two speakers as their argument was more of a calm conversation, as they both are said, through the narrator's words, to be relaxed. The violation of the maxim is depicted through the events of the industrial revolution as narrated by Hendrik Dollar. He states that *'the wise and strong African slaves were the driving force behind it.'* He further explains that taking people from Africa and turning them into slaves was a major blow to the continent, mostly because all the capable men and women were victims of American slavery.

4.6.1 Violation of the tact maxim

In the conversation below, the tact maxim is violated. Hendrik Dollar represents the colonised while Jan van Rand is the coloniser. These two characters are engaged in a constant verbal power struggle. The representative of the colonial powers deprives the colonised opportunities to gain/benefit much in the conversation. The excerpt below presents the discussion between the two and is analysed at the bottom of the conversation.

DATA SET 17

HENDRIK DOLLAR: (*proud and relaxed*) Industrial Revolution. All I can tell you about it is that wise and strong African slaves were the driving forces behind it. Indeed, that's the major blow you hit Africa. Taking away

all its capable men and women into slavery. Wise men and women, merchants, builders, craftsmen, artist, warrior, gold and copper smiths, farmers – yes, almost all the capable men Africans were selected and taken away. Here you are talking about developing Africa. Tell me who developed Europe and America? Nobody else but the African slaves. I am telling you again, Jan van Ran, count your words. *(smiling)*

JAN van RAND: *(once again driven into a corner but somehow relaxed)* Dollartjie, looks like you are getting all wiser. How could you possibly say that African slaves were the driving force behind the Industrial Revolution? Are you trying to say that they are the ones who invented the wheel, the different industrial machines, the cars, locomotives, radios, TVs and what have you? No, my friend, all the masters of invention are Europeans. All of them. No Africans.

(Haakskeen, 2000, p. 81- 82)

The industrial revolution, since time immemorial, is popularly known as the transition period to new manufacturing processes which took place in Europe and the US in the 18th and 19th century. Based on Hendrik Dollar's argument it is clear the tact maxim has been violated by the then European and US governments respectively. The two governments have maximised cost to the African slaves through the forced use of black African manpower. Through the process of industrialisation the maxim has been violated and thus depicts minimised benefit on the Africans, whilst maximising benefit on the American and European governments. This is so because, although the African slaves worked hard to see the industrialization project succeed, neither Africa nor the Africans benefited from the industrial revolution at the time. The capable African men and women were slaves and worked without pay since they were forcefully taken away from Africa into enslavement. Because of this violation of the tact maxim, the conversational exchange is thus impolite as it does not comply with the fundamental rule of this maxim as explained precisely.

DATA SET 18

HENDRIK DOLLAR: (*angrily*) Relying on the West! Well why shouldn't we? They enriched themselves with our wealth over the centuries. As a matter of fact, they are giving back what they took – negotiations took place as a result of struggle. Brave sons of Africa: Nkwame Nkrumah, Hiale Selassie, Patrice Lumumba and Jomo Kenyatta, Agostinho Neto and Kenneth Kaunda, Nujoma to name a few, led the struggle to liberate Africa. It was not negotiations. No. The people fought and sacrificed their lives for the liberty of their countries.

JAN VAN RAND: (*standing up from the bench and pointing at HENDRIK DOLLAR*) Brave sons of Africa! Are they not the detained, tortured and even killed their own people? I am telling you they caused much more suffering and killing to the African people than the colonial forces. So what?

(Haakskeen, 2000, p. 85)

The extract depicts yet another argumentative debate between Hendrik Dollar and his opponent Jan van Rand. What appears different in this conversation however is that the two opponents are no longer calm and relaxed, but angry and are agitated. These emotions are made vivid from the narrator's comments, "HENDRIK DOLLAR *angrily* and JAN VAN RAND *standing up from the bench and pointing at HENDRIK DOLLAR*". Expressing anger and agitation as done by the two opponents in question violates the general rule of politeness. Politeness is principally associated with positive behaviour and utterances. One thus further observes that the tact maxim is violated.

4.6.2 Generosity of reconciliation

The data set 19 below is an exchange of utterances between Jan van Rand and Hendrik Dollar in a mutual offering of generosity. These two have accepted each other's offer of

reconciliation by admitting that now the liberation war is over, it is time to move forward with forgiveness. That data is presented and discussed below.

DATA SET 19

JAN van RAND: Ja that's really the case. Anyhow my friend, I am stretching out to you my hand of friendship and brotherhood, reconciliation and nation building, development and social progress for us all. I know that wrong things have been done to you in the past. Apartheid colonialism took its toll- dehumanized and deprived you in your own land. Anyhow it's all something of the past now. It is time to rebuild and rectify the damage that has been done to you. So, friends for now and forever.

HENDRIK DOLLAR: Yes, friends for life. Whatever happened in the past is something of the past now. It doesn't matter anymore. It's. We may only acknowledge it but can never build our future on it. We are now one people with a common destiny. One family, one nation, one children of mother Namibia. Above all, the bottom line is reconciliation.

JAN van RAND: (*agreeing loudly*) Yes the bottom line is reconciliation.

(Haakskeen, 2001, p. 96-97)

The above conversational exchange depicts a twist of feelings and events between Jan van Rand and Hendrik Dollar. The two speakers obey the agreement maxim when they both extend a hand of friendship to the other. Evidently the previously analysed conversations between the two reveal anger and bitterness regarding the industrial revolution and the colonial system that was imposed onto the African people, particularly the blacks. Hendrik Dollar and Jan van Rand who are clearly representative of oppressed and oppressor respectively, shake hands and turn a new page towards reconciliation. What is evident from

the extract is that both speakers have obeyed the agreement maxim, although other maxims such as the sympathy maxim also manifest in the conversation.

First, on the one hand, Jan van Rand says to Hendrik Dollar “Anyhow my friend, I am stretching out my hand of friendship and brotherhood, reconciliation and nation building, development and social progress.” On the other hand, Hendrik Dollar also embraces the opportunity of friendship “Yes friends for life. Whatever happened in the past is something of the past now.” The utterances by the two made evinces both parties obeying the agreement maxim. Jan van Rand and Hendrk Dollar share similar sentiments regarding the importance of reconciliation. Both agree to let bygones be bygones and focus on building a new future where they share a common goal geared towards development.

Hendrik Dollar refers to the past by observing that, “We may only acknowledge it but can never build our future on it.” Dollar reckons that although the past that the people had experienced may have been painful and remains unforgettable, he acknowledges that grudges are not worth it as they do not have any relevance in the present, thus the future cannot be built in the presence of old grudges. In his speech, Jan van Rand also further obeys the maxim by agreeing that it is true that the African were colonised and the era of colonisation took its toll in dehumanizing the natives of the African continent. He however calls for reconciliation when he strongly agrees that indeed “Yes reconciliation is the bottom line”.

The principal goal of agreement maxim is to minimise the expression of disagreement between self and other and maximise the agreement between the parties, which is what one observes in the extract. Hendrik Dollar and Jan van Rand agree on two things. First, that the Europeans or bluntly put the whites are blamed for taking away the land and other resources from Africa, and also for enslaving the African natives. Second, the parties agree on reconciliation and on letting the past be buried. Because of this agreement between the two characters, in the conversation evinces politeness traits and qualities as no vulgar or impolite language is used.

DATA SET 20

HENDRIK DOLLAR: *(looking at JAN van RAND)* Hai! My friend, I am kind of hungry. Are you not?

JAN van RAND: Well you know what?

HENDRIK DOLLAR: What?

JAN van RAND: *(smiling)* I am not hungry ... I am starving.
(Both laugh loudly.)

HENDRIK DOLLAR: *(smiling)* Well ... let's go to the Apollo restaurant and eat something.

JAN van RAND: *(loudly, with much laughter)* The Apollo restaurant! Yes, that's the right place to go. Let's go and break the system. *(Both laughing)*

HENDRIK DOLLAR: Anyhow, how much have you got?

JAN van RAND: I have gotten rand, and you?

HENDRIK DOLLAR: I have gotten Namibian dollars.

JAN van RAND: So together we got 10 +10 ...twenty rand!

HENDRIK DOLLAR: No. We have got 10 +10 ...twenty Namibian dollars.

(Haakskeen, 2000, p. 97)

This is an extension of the previously discussed conversation between Hendrik Dollar and Jan van Rand. In the exchange the characters both simultaneously obey and violate the generosity maxim. The two opponents have evidently reconciled from their differences as alluded to previously hence they agreed to have lunch together at the Appolo restaurant, which Hendrik Dollar suggests as seen in the extract below.

DATA SET 21

HENDRIK DOLLAR: *(smiling)* Well ... let's go to the Apollo restaurant and eat something.

JAN van RAND: *(loudly, with much laughter)* The Apollo restaurant! Yes, that's the right place to go. Let's go and break the system. *(Both laughing)*

During the conversational exchange, the generosity maxim manifests in the utterance made by the two parties when each of them enquires from other about the amount of money they have and would spend on lunch at the said restaurant. What can be deduced from the conversation is that both Hendrik Dollar and Jan van Rand have obeyed the generosity maxim. This is because the utterances prove that each person was going to pay for his own food hence lifting the fiscal burden of the other. The reason for the generosity act can be linked to the principal goal of this maxim which is minimise the expression of benefit to self and maximise cost to self.

The fact that both characters contributed towards their own lunch is a sign of being very generous towards the other. Through the paying for the self's own lunch, cost has definitely been minimised on the other and maximised on self. On the other hand, it can also be argued that Hendrik Dollar and Jan van Rand have equally violated the generosity maxim because neither of them offers to pay for lunch for the both of them. The aim of the maxim heavily emphasises on taking an upper hand in owning cost rather than benefiting from the situation at hand. Hendrik Dollar is the first to inquire, *"Anyhow, how much have you got?"* In his response Jan van Rand says he has ten rand and also poses the same question, *"I have gotten rand, and you?"* Basing on the above presentation, the maxim has been violated, because asking how much money the person has implies that the inquirer wants the person to make a financial contribution. However, if for instance Hendrik Dollar had offered to pay for lunch for the both of them, then the generosity maxim would have been fully obeyed since owning up to the payment would have maximised the expression of cost on him while minimising it on Jan van Rand. The same would also apply if the reverse has also happened. The extract thus presents a tale of two sides of the coin, in which the generosity maxim is both obeyed and violated by the characters in question.

4.6.3 Violation of the approbation maxim

The approbation maxim is violated when the speaker/hearer fails to praise or approve the person they are in conversation with (Leech, 2005). The main characteristic of the politeness principle is the avoidance of conflict. If the speaker/hearer fails to comply, they breach or violate this principle. The excerpt below projects the negative utterances that leads to the breach of the approbation maxim.

DATA SET 22

HENDRIK DOLLAR: (*quite serious but still nervous*) Don't you dare call me a Hottentot. My name is Hendrik Dollar. I am the original inhabitant of this land – the land of my forefathers. Africa! My land. And nobody – I say nobody – pushes me around here understand! Not even you. Who are you anyway? A white person. You don't belong here. You are an intruder from over the seas. This is my country Namibia.

JAN van RAND: (*standing up and pointing at HENDRIK DOLLAR*) You stupid fool, calling me an intruder. I am a respectful man. You should know that and count your words. This might be your country but that doesn't give you any right to call me an intruder. My presence here is justified by all means and you should know that I had been a great help to you and your people. Imagine what should have happened to you if we were not here.

(Haakskeen, 2000, p. 78)

The extract depicts a robust debate between the two named characters who debate about land ownership. Jan van Rand first violates the maxim during the conversation when he calls Hendrik Dollar a 'Hottentot' a derogatory word used to mean stupid in some Northern parts of Namibia. However, the semantics of the term 'Hottentot' varies depending on the geographical region especially in Namibia. Historically, the term was also used to describe the Khoisan/San in Southern Africa. This remark contradicts the main aim of the approbation maxim which prohibits persons from dispraising others. An infuriated Hendrik Dollar retaliates, and argues that he and fellow black Namibians are the rightful inhabitants of Namibia and categorically refer to the Jan van Rand as an intruder from overseas, with no rights over even a piece of land in Namibia.

Hendrik Dollar equally violates the maxim through the said utterance. The characters diminish and shame each other in the conversation, therefore equally violating the maxim. One further

observes that there is a presence of self-praise from both characters. Hendrik's pride of land ownership implies self-praise while Jan refers to himself as a respectful man. With approbation maxim self-praise should have been minimised and praise of the other maximised. This basic requirement is not observed in the extract and thus makes the conversation impolite. Jan further violates the maxim by implying that Namibians are dull and could not develop their own land. Haakskeen also employs impolite gestures in the extract such as standing and pointing a finger. Words such as 'hottentot' and 'stupid fool' are insults and only used during aggressive arguments or fights. Overall, the conversation depicts impoliteness where, impolite words and gestures are used by the characters in question. This conversation generally reveals that the two characters are bitter and angry therefore resorting to impoliteness was a way of venting.

DATA SET 23

HENDRIK DOLLAR: *(quite relaxed but pointing at JAN van RAND)* Listen here Jan van Rand, I have been told about you and your people by my grandfather. How you came to Africa on a on ships from over the oceans and landed on the Cape that you have called the Good Hope. You were received in friendship and were accommodated by the native people. Our ancestors gave you land and a place to stay. But you know what you people did?

JAN van RAND: What did we do? Developing and uplifting the primitive lifestyles of your people. Making them decent human beings – even clothing them ...
(interrupted by HENDRIK DOLLAR)

HENDRIK DOLLAR: *(angry but relaxed and somewhat proud)* No, no, no. Ever since you set your white feet on the black bottom of motherland Africa you have caused catastrophe and suffering – dehumanization and deprivation to the original inhabitant of the land. What development and upliftment of the people are you

talking about? And what do you mean by primitive lives.

Why should you say something like that?

(Haakskeen, 2001, p. 79)

This is a follow up conversation from the previous debate between Hendrik and Jan. This conversation also depicts a high level of impoliteness which is revealed through language use and physical gestures by the two characters. They continue to violate the approbation maxim with their utterances. Although quite relaxed at the time, Hendrik pointing his finger at Jan is rather rude and impolite. The gesture is a sign of anger and impoliteness. He further violates the maxim when he praises his fellow people for accommodating and allocating land to the whites. Praising his people carries an element of self-praise and consequently violates the maxim. It is important to note that Hendrik also slightly obeys this maxim when he submits that, Cape or rather the Good Hope was named by the white Europeans. He indirectly praises the whites for being the deed and thus obeys the maxim.

The extract also depicts how Jan van Rand violates the approbation maxim. He claims that they (the whites) developed and pacified the primitive blacks and thus turning them into decent and civilized people. The utterance here violates the two main aims of the approbation maxim. Jan dispraises black people when he calls them primitives, and praises himself (the whites) because it was them (the Europeans) who have developed the uncivilised Africans. Referring to Africans or anyone as primitive is impolite in and therefore contributes the impoliteness embedded within the conversation. When Hendrik interrogates Jan about the supposed development and upliftment, it further reveals how he feels insulted and undermined. Generally, one can conclude that the conversation does not conform to the basic principle of politeness. In this instance both characters do not comply with requirements of approbation maxim.

4.6.4 Violation of the modesty maxim

When a person praises himself, he acts in contravention of the modesty maxim. The modesty maxim defies self-praise. If one does so, he violates this principle of politeness. This breach of the politeness principle is discussed below.

DATA SET 24

HENDRIK DOLLAR: *(quite surprised)* Great help to us- who are you? And what help have you been to us? As far as I know we have been helping ourselves all through the ages even during the days of our ancestors. Tell me, what help are you talking? *(HENDRIK DOLLAR takes another puff from the pipe and blows the smoke in JAN van RAND's direction)*

JAN van RAND: *(fanning away the smoke with his hand while coughing)* Well if you would like to know I am Jan van Rand and ... *(interrupted by HENDRIK DOLLAR)*

HENDRIK DOLLAR: *(Surprised)* Aah! Aah! Jan van Rand I think I know you. I heard about you. I read about you. I ... *(interrupted by JAN van RAND)*

JAN van RAND: I came to your land to develop you. We plunged you out of primitive life and civilized you. We developed your country and ... *(interrupted by HENDRIK DOLLAR)*

(Haakskeen, 2000, pp. 78-79)

In this extract, both Hendrik Dollar and Jan van Rand violate the modesty maxim. The modesty maxim aims at minimising praise of self thus maximising dispraise of self. Haakskeen displays how both characters violate the maxim through utterances and physical gestures, which consequently makes the whole conversation aggressively impolite. Firstly, Hendrik violates the maxim through self-praises. He denies having received any help from the whites and claims self-help of the black people. It is common knowledge that we all at some point need assistance from others therefore, cannot claim total self-reliance.

Hendrik's denial is a violation of the maxim and contributes to impoliteness. Hendrik also violates the maxim when he blows smoke onto Jan. Doing so is not only rude to say the least but signals disrespect for Jan. Smoke is toxic and unhealthy, thus explaining why Jan coughed from the smoke. Because Hendrik acted knowingly this proves to be a deliberate move to annoy and provoke Jan. Another impolite element evident is how both Jan and Hendrik

interrupt each other during the conversation. This gesture is disrespectful and impolite. One should allow others to present information or their point of view without being interrupted not matter what the audience think of what is said.

It is important to never interrupt anyone's speech so you can fully hear the intended message and avoid missing out on anything. It is important to note that, while Hendrik violates the maxim through self-praise, Jan does exactly the same through claiming he (whites) developed the black's land and ultimately developing them as people. He also claims that they are primitive, and thus, further claiming to have civilised them. Notably, both characters violate the modesty maxim through self-praise and dispraise of the other. This level of impoliteness can be avoided by simply choosing words that are friendly and by avoiding personal attacks. Many a time, when one argues from an emotional point of view, chances are that they become more and more impolite. Also it is also always wise to avoid conversations which offend you and in the process also avoid offending others.

DATA SET 25

JAN van RAND: (*scratching his beard*) It's rather interesting to say that all human beings are equal. Well that may be the case but it is an actual fact that some people are more advanced than others. Some people are more intelligent, creative, artist and even more powerful than others. My friend I don't mean to elevate the Europeans but- as a matter of fact – if we should compare black man to a white man it is most likely that the white man will be the wiser one. It has been proved over the centuries ever since white and black people met each other. The way you think and we think, the way you act, the way you behave and we behave – almost in every way are different – with us always better off than you. It's a God-created situation. We can do nothing about it.

(Haaskeen, 2000, p. 82-83)

Jan van Rand is impolite in the above extract as he praises himself and thus violates the aim of the modesty maxim. Because he is white, he claims to be a better person than Hendrik who is black. According to Jan, God has created better human beings in whites who are more intelligent, creative and powerful than blacks. Jan's utterances of self-praise contravene the basic rule of the modesty maxim which defies self-praise as stated earlier thus termed impolite.

4.6.5 Agreement maxim

When people are engaged in conversation, the speaker should minimise disagreement with the listener and maximise agreement with them. This complies with the politeness principles which stipulates the need for the avoidance of conflict. Excerpt 26 below demonstrates the avoidance of conflict and is discussed afterwards.

DATA SET 26

JAN van RAND: (*driven into a corner*) anyhow ... whatever the case may be, we should be aware not to employ people in jobs they are not capable or content enough to do simply because of affirmative action or to counter nepotism. At the end the whole country will suffer as a result of that.

HENDRIK DOLLAR: (*calmed down and nodding his head in agreement*) Yes we have to look out for that. But indeed affirmative action is imperative and should therefore be implemented especially in the private sector where the status quo is still in place. However, training should also go hand in hand with affirmative action so that lack of skills or illiteracy cannot be used as a scapegoat.

JAN van RAND: (*also nodding in agreement*) Ja, training and education I believe is the only means through which we can address the backlog of those who have been left behind for so long. But we need to bear in mind that these things take time and effort and not expect too much too soon.

(Haakskeen, 2000, p. 94)

In the above extract, both parties obey the agreement maxim. The speaker should minimise disagreement with the listener and maximise agreement with them in order to comply with the principle and be polite to the other. Jan van Rand and Hendrik Dollar agree to end their fighting.

4.6.6 Expression of sympathy in a maxim

Sympathy is a maxim of politeness in which a person feels sorry for another person. This can be identified from examining by the kind of utterances which the two people who are in conversation choose to express themselves through. In other words, it is when the speaker minimises antipathy towards the listener and maximises sympathy towards them. The excerpt below in Data 27 represents the sympathy maxim and the analysis afterwards.

DATA SET 27

OLD SURVIVOR: *(looking quite happy now that he has got some money to eat something and also have a drink. He looks guiltily around the park for someone who might have lost the money, but when seeing no one he says to himself)* Well, well, well! Looks like this is my lucky day. I have got twenty bucks now. Well sorry for the one who lost it. I could have given it back if he was around but there is nobody around here, which means... this is all mine. Well what else shall I buy?...aag! So bruin brood and chips en sommer n'lekker straight rooiwyn. *(looking up at the sky)* Aaoh-yeah! Dankie Allah! *(looking guilty again)* Anyway I am sorry for the guy who lost this but FINDERS KEEPERS LOSERS WEEPERS. *(he takes off)*

(Haakskeen, 2000, p. 98)

Old Survivor in this extract is the only other character who features in the play apart from Hendrik Dollar and Jan van Rand. In the extract, he obeys the sympathy maxim. He expresses sympathy when he indicates that he feels sorry for the person who had lost the money and that he would have given it back, but no one was around. “*Well sorry for the one who lost it.*” “*I could have given it back if he was around but there is nobody around here, which mean...this*

is all mine.” Although claiming to be sorry, his actions speak louder. Old Survivor violates the maxim by picking up the lost 20 dollars. He should have left it there, because the owner could have come back looking for money. The happy face, also implies that he is pleased that someone had lost their money and that he was lucky to pick it up, thus he says, *‘Finders Keepers Losers Weepers’*. This rhyme literally translates to he who finds will rejoice while he who has lost shall weep. By stating that, Old Survivor shows no remorse and thus violates the basic principle of the sympathy maxim and also promotes impoliteness towards the losers (Hendrik Dollar and Jan van Rand).

4.7 Discussions

4.7.1 What are the significant types of politeness principles used in the plays?

Politeness is a principle that seeks to prevent conflict in human communication. Conflict is likely to occur if two or more individuals who are engaged in a conversation engage into a discourteous conversation. The present study establishes that there are six politeness principles that were observed to be present in the two texts. This finding is supported by the findings of Pasaribu and Manik, (2019) who also identify six principles of politeness but however, only analyse four. In concurrence with that, the present study also identifies these four maxims of the politeness principles – the tact maxim, generosity maxim, approbation maxim and agreement maxim. Leech, (1983) the author propounds the politeness principles and what is implied by the principles is minimising the cost of the speaker, maximising the speaker's benefit. The present study believes that this claim cannot be credited to scholars who have cited Leech, but to Leech (1983). In other words, this expression implies that the choice of words that are used in a conversation between the speaker and the hearer are meant to benefit the speaker and leave the listener at a conversational loss.

Besides the six types of politeness identified, the present study also identifies mock politeness within the plays. This finding is also observed in a study conducted by Yin and Zhou (2019). Mock politeness can be described as a type of politeness that is negative politeness. The present study agrees that mock politeness refers to utterances that attack the face or sociality rights of a participant in a particular communicative context (Yin & Zhou, 2019). With reference to the present study, the characters Hendrik Dollar and Jan van Rand in the play *‘Finders Keepers Losers Weepers’* spent a significant part of their conversations mocking at

each other. Hence their belligerent behaviour towards each other is identified as mock politeness.

4.7.2 How have the politeness strategies been used to project power struggle between characters?

Politeness is a quality of communication that avoids conversational conflict. Individuals (speaker/hearer) who contest in unpleasant or rude conversations pose a threat to each other's face. For politeness to be achieved the speaker must minimise threat on the face of the hearer (Borris & Zecho, 2018). The result is a power struggle between these individuals. In the context of the present study, there are characters in the play *'The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School'*, who engage in a power struggle. These are the learners and their teachers such as Mr Hangwe as well as Mrs Basson and the school Principal. The power struggle in this particular play represents the struggle between the colonial and the new Namibian education systems.

On the other hand, in the play *'Finders Keepers Losers Weepers'* has Hendrik Dollar and Jan van Rand who are a good example that showcases the power struggle that existed then and still exists now between the former colonial masters and the Namibians (who are the formerly colonised by western powers). Hendrik Dollar is a Namibian liberation struggle hero who fought against colonialism and argues for his position as a better contributor to the liberation of present day Namibia. Jan van Rand, a Dutch explorer who first settled in the Cape of Good Hope in South Africa, on the other hand also wants to prove his own contribution to Namibia's independence.

Making utterances aimed at proving that one is better than the other represents a power struggle. The present study concurs with the views in Sugianto, (2021) who examines politeness from a socio-cultural standpoint between the Javanese and the Western cultures. When two people from different linguistic and cultural background meet, a power struggle is likely to occur. Since politeness is a universal phenomenon in society, it is a reflection of specific cultural values, which can be observed in all languages and cultures (Sugianto, 2021). Breaching these cultural values can result in a conflicted conversation. This means that communicative norms differ from one culture to another (Locher, 2015). It then become relevant to apply the techniques of linguistics in explaining these power struggles. In a power

struggle, the speaker of the utterances seeks to minimise cost and maximise benefit in a conversation.

4.7.3 How have the politeness maxims been violated in the plays?

A violation of politeness principles is a condition that occurs when a speaker/hearer fails to comply, thereby breaching the principles of politeness (Leech, 2005). For this situation to occur, the speaker/hearer acts in the opposite manner from what is ordinarily expected of them. The present study concurs with the findings of Al-Delumi, (2016) that the social factors that speakers should consider when interacting with each other are power, social distance, and the degree of imposition. When the speaker and the hearer fail to adhere to these three social factors, a violation is committed. The violation of politeness principles then becomes a catalyst for tragedy in a literary text which is a fair representation of a community (Osondu & Umeh, 2020).

The two character involved in an exchange of utterances in '*Finders Keepers Losers Weepers*' represent such violations through Jan van Rand who minimises the benefits of Hendrik Dollar who represents the former colonised. Observing Hendrik Dollar's argument, it is clear that the tact maxim has been violated by the European and US governments. The two governments have maximised cost onto the African slaves through the use of forced labour. The process of industrialisation demonstrates an instance in which the maxim has been violated and thus depicting minimised benefit on the Africans, whilst maximising benefit on the American and European governments.

This is so because, although African slaves worked hard to contribute to success of the project, neither Africa nor the Africans benefited from the industrial revolution at the time. Enslaved able bodied African men and women were worked on slave farms without pay despite having been forcibly shipped away from Africa to Europe. Because of this violation of the tact maxim, the conversational exchange between the two characters is thus impolite as it does not comply with the fundamental rules of this maxim as explained by Leech (1983).

This level of impoliteness can be avoided by the interlocutors simply choosing words that are friendly, less provocative and by also avoiding personal attacks. Many a time, when one argues from an emotional point of view, chances are that they become more and more impolite especially if they engage in discourse from an especially subjective point of view. It

will also be wise for people to avoid conversations which offend them, and in the process also avoid offending others.

4.8 Chapter summary

This chapter discussed and analysed data from the two texts. The discussions and analyses in the chapter are mainly categorised under three sub-headings which are in response to the research questions as formulated in Chapter 1. The research questions attempted to respond to the question of what the significant types of politeness principles used in the plays were; how the politeness strategies have been used to project power struggle between characters and how the politeness maxims were violated in the plays. The next chapter summarises the findings and concludes the study. Recommendations will also be suggested in chapter 5.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the conclusions of the study in response to the study research questions. Two short play texts were identified and analysed using pragmatic stylistic techniques. The results from the data were discussed and analysed in the previous chapter (Chapter 4). Considering that the two texts in this study are conversational texts, the six principles of politeness were identified and applied to their analysis. Principles of politeness are also termed maxims as envisioned by Leech, (1983). The main objective of the study was to conduct a pragmatic stylistics interpretation of the '*The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School*' and '*Finders Keepers Losers Weepers*'. The following three specific research questions guided the study:

- What are the significant types of politeness principles used in the plays?
- How have the politeness strategies been used to project power struggle between characters?
- How have the politeness maxims been violated in the plays?

5.2 Summary of the findings

The following sections summate the findings of the study. The presentation of the summation of the findings is done in a manner that directly responds to each of the research objectives as explicated in Chapter 1 and reiterated here.

5.2.1 What are the significant types of politeness principles used in the plays?

The study first identified the types of politeness principles to establish their presence in the texts under study. The study findings reveal that all six the principles of politeness were present in the texts. These were the tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement and sympathy maxims. The maxims were analysed in two manners i.e. firstly in the manners that they were aimed at minimising cost and secondly, in manners that they were used to maximize profit. The conversations between Herman and Michael from the text '*The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School*' (Haakskeen, 2001) address these two aspects. The findings reveal that Michael succeeded in minimising the cost to the speaker, thereby maximising his benefit. It is on the occasion when Herman and Michael engaged in a verbal exchange, when

the two individuals were seated in the same class that an altercation ensued. Michael sat in such a position that he obstructed Herman's view. Michael defends himself by claiming that he is a better person and could sit on the desk as well as that obstructing Herman was not a problem as long as Michael benefits from the act. Michael's decision to sit in front of Herman was so that he could see better, in the process he is seen as disregarding Herman's needs and concerns as well. The maxim has therefore been disobeyed by Michael because he deliberately minimises cost and maximises benefit for himself. The study further reveals another type of tact maxim in the incident in which Mr Hangwe engages in a confrontational verbal exchange with his learners. He chooses to engage in a confrontational dispute with his learners and this can be seen as directly minimising cost and maximising his benefit in the discussion. He refused to admit that he was late for class.

The study reveals that the generosity maxim was present and relevant. The generosity maxim applies when the speaker behaves generously to the hearer as the two engage in a conversational exchange. The other maxim observed was the approbation maxim. This maxim was utilized for the sole aim of praising or approving another person's actions in a conversation. The modesty maxim was also noted to be proliferate in the short plays. This is a maxim that is obeyed when the speaker/hearer, depending on who is issuing the utterances, avoids self-praise during a conversational exchange.

The last two maxims that were present in the study were the agreement and the sympathy maxims. The agreement maxim is intended to produce a consensus during a conversation thereby characterized by the two individuals involved in conversation coming to an agreement. The other one of sympathy is a maxim which evinces itself when one feels sorry for another person. The maxim was revealed when the character identified as the Old Survivor expresses sympathy in his words "Well sorry for the person who lost it. I could have given it back if he was around but there is nobody around here, which means..." (Haaksteen, 2000, p. 98). He made it clear that he feels sorry for the person who had lost the money and that he would have given it back, but unfortunately, the owner could not be found. These findings demonstrate that the study succeeded in identifying the six principles as proliferate within the texts.

5.2.2 How have the politeness strategies been used to project power struggle between characters?

The study findings reveal that the politeness strategies have successfully been used in the short plays to project power struggles between the characters. The two plays analysed by this study, *'The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School'* and *'Finders Keepers Losers Weepers'*, have two distinct sets of characters. In the former, the characters are teachers and learners who evince power struggles when they engage in conversations throughout the text. In the latter, Hendrik Dollar, a Namibian liberation struggle hero who fought against colonialism argues with Jan van Rand, a Dutch explorer who first settled in the Cape of Good Hope in South Africa and a representative of the former colonial master with regards to who was a better contributor to the liberation of present day Namibia. Both their images appear on Namibian Ten Dollar note and the South African Ten Rand note respectively. In the two separate texts, the characters engage in various exchanges of utterances that satisfy the politeness principles that were identified in this study. It is therefore possible to conclude in this regard that the study reveals the presence and use of negative politeness principles as strategies used in communication by these characters.

5.2.3 How have the politeness maxims been violated in the plays?

The study reveals that there were several occasions in which the politeness principles were violated. In satisfying one of the major objectives of the study, observing the violation of some maxims, the study observes that the following three politeness maxims were violated –the maxims of tact, approbation and modesty. They were used in manners that breach the requirements the politeness theory. A violation of politeness principles is a condition that occurs when a speaker/hearer fails to comply, thereby breaching the principles of politeness (Leech, 2005). For this situation to occur, the speaker/hearer acts in the opposite manner from what is ordinarily expected of them.

The study findings indicated a breach of the tact maxim. This is evinced when two characters in *'Finders Keepers, Losers Weepers'*, Jan van Rand and Hendrik Dollar are involved in an exchange of utterances in which Jan van Rand (who represents that coloniser) minimises the benefits of Hendrik Dollar who represents the formerly colonised. Because of this violation of the tact maxim, the conversational exchange is thus impolite as it does not comply with the fundamental rule of this maxim as explained precisely.

The study reveals that the approbation maxim was violated when the character named Jan van Rand makes insulting utterances towards Hendrik Dollar when he says, “You stupid fool”. The approbation maxim is violated when the Jan van Rand failed to praise or approve the opinion of Hendrik Dollar. The main characteristic of the politeness principle is the avoidance of conflict. If the speaker/hearer fails to comply, they breach or violate this principle. The conversation between Jan van Rand and Hendrik Dollar projects the negative utterances that lead to the breach of the approbation maxim.

It was further observed in this study that the modesty maxim was also violated. The exchange of the utterances between Hendrik Dollar and Jan van Rand represents a violation of the modesty maxim. The modesty maxim aims at minimising praise of self thus maximising dispraise of self. Haakskeen displays how both characters violate the maxim through utterances and physical gestures, which consequently makes the whole conversation aggressive and impolite. Firstly, Hendrik violates the maxim through self-praises as observed by his denying having received any help from the whites and claiming success through self-help for the black people. It is common knowledge that we all at some point need assistance from others therefore cannot claim total self-reliance. Hendrik’s denial is a violation of the maxim and contributes to impoliteness. Hendrik also violates the maxim when he blows smoke onto Jan. This behaviour is not only rude, but also signals disrespect for Jan. It is important to note that, while Hendrik violated the maxim through self-praise, Jan does exactly the same through claiming he (whites) developed the black’s land and ultimately developing them as people. He also said that they are primitive; therefore, further claiming to have civilised them. Notably both characters violate the modesty maxim through self-praise and dispraise of the other. The level of impoliteness can be avoided by simply choosing words that are friendly and by avoiding personal attacks.

5.3 Conclusions

The following sections summate the study by drawing conclusions from the analyses undertaken. The conclusions are also drawn with regards to how the data collected and analysed has attempted to respond to the research objectives as established in Chapter 1.

5.3.1 What are the significant types of politeness principles used in the plays?

The study concludes that politeness principles were present and applicable to the analysis of the two conversational texts under this study. When two persons engage in a discourse exchange, they are expected to use words that avoid conflict. This is a social etiquette and moral belief among human beings. Human beings, despite their social, economic or political status need each other to interact. The study assumes that the two characters in the short play *'Finders Keepers Losers Weepers'* (Haaksteen, 2000) are black and white. That means politeness has got nothing to do with race. Hence, the study concluded that the identified politeness principles are relevant to the analysis of conversational texts.

5.3.2 How have the politeness strategies been used to project power struggle between characters?

The study further concludes that the characters in the two texts engage in power struggles that sometimes were negative to the politeness principles approach. Politeness is a method that restrains people from rude and argumentative exchange of utterances. In the text, *'Finders Keepers Losers Weepers'* (Haaksteen, 2000). Hendrik Dollar and Jan van Rand constantly exchange aggressive utterances where each one of them constantly seeks to minimise cost and maximise their own benefit. It is a verbal battle between the formerly colonised and the former coloniser's viewpoints. On the other hand, the other text demonstrates similar patterns through the fights between Mr Hangwe and his learners. The teacher always wants to demonstrate his authority and that he is in charge. This means that he constantly minimises costs and maximises benefit through the exchange of utterances. This means that the teacher and the learners were contenders of a social power struggle.

5.3.3 How have the politeness maxims been violated in the plays?

There are three identified politeness maxims that were violated in the texts, namely; the maxims of tact, approbation and modesty. A violation occurs when the speaker/hearer fails to comply with the principles of the politeness maxims. It becomes a breach when one acts in complete opposite of conflict avoidance. This was revealed when Hendrik Dollar and Jan van Rand engage in an exchange of utterances. The two of them failed to show some level of politeness. In their argument, Hendrik Dollar claims that the Europeans used oppressive strategies to minimise cost and maximise their own benefit at the loss of the African history of slavery. Therefore, the study concludes that impoliteness can be avoided if the people that

use language in their daily life social conversations in places such as the market place and so forth understand what it means to be polite.

5.4 Recommendations based on the findings

Based on the research questions and the above conclusion, the study `makes the following recommendations:

- Since it has been observed that the politeness principles are relevant to the study of conversational texts, other pragmatic stylistics theories such as cognitivism and the speech acts theories can be applied as theoretical understandings of the same texts.
- Similar politeness principles other than those by Leech, (1983; 2005) can be used to analyse different texts such as poetry, drama or musical lyrics.
- Instead of applying a qualitative method study approach, the same study can be conducted by applying quantitative a method that reveals the frequency of each politeness principle in each text.
- The politeness theory can be applied to the study of literature as opposed to Applied Linguistics.
- The study reflects the pragmatic power struggle between characters in the two plays, reconciliatory plays can be studied as a way of uniting communities; both the former colonisers and the colonised.

References:

- Al-Duleimi, H. Y., Rashid, S. M., & Abdullah, A. N. (2016). A critical review of prominent theories of politeness. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(6), 262-270.
- Al-Khatib, M. A. (2012). Politeness in the Holy Quran: A sociolinguistic and pragmatic perspective. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 9(4), 479-509.
- Borris, D., & Zecho, C. (2018). The linguistic politeness having seen on the current study issue. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 2(1), 32-44.
- Brown, P. (2015). Politeness and language. In *The International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences (IESBS) (2nd ed.)* (pp. 326-330). Elsevier.
- Brown, P., Levinson, S. C., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage* (Vol. 4). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brunet, P. M., Cowie, R., Donnan, H., & Douglas-Cowie, E. (2012). Politeness and social signals. *Cognitive processing*, 13(2), 447-453.
- Chapman, R. S. (1997). Language development in children and adolescents with Down syndrome. *Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities Research Reviews*, 3(4), 307-312.
- Crystal, D. (1987). Towards a 'bucket' theory of language disability: Taking account of interaction between linguistic levels. *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 1(1), 7-22.
- Eelen, G. (2014). *A Critique of Politeness Theory: Volume 1*. London: Routledge.
- Erichsen, C. (2022, January 5). *German-Herero conflict of 1904–07*. *Encyclopedia Britannica*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/German-Herero-conflict-of-1904-1907>.
- Eshghinejad, S., & Moini, M. R. (2016). Politeness strategies used in text messaging: Pragmatic competence in an asymmetrical power relation of teacher–student. *SAGE Open*, 6(1), 2158244016632288.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face interaction*. Royal Society Publishing.

- Haakskeen, P. (2000). Finders Keepers Losers and Weepers: A Play about Reconciliation. In T. Zeeman. *New Namibian Plays* (Vol. 1. pp. 75-98). National Theatre of Namibia.
- Haakskeen, P. (2001). The Rotten Apples of Jabula High School and Finders Keepers Losers and Weepers. In T. Zeeman. *New Namibian Plays* (Vol. 2. pp. 54-62). National Theatre of Namibia.
- Handayani, T. (2013). Violating politeness principles in cellular phone provider. *Lantern (Journal on English Language, Culture and Literature)*, 2(3), 293-303.
- Holm, G., & Londen, M. (2010). The discourse on multicultural education in Finland: Education for whom? *Intercultural education*, 21(2), 107-120.
- litula, L. K. (2018). *Authoring the unspeakables, moralising the public sphere: a literary examination of social commitment and the artistic vision in Sifiso Nyathi's Oeuvre* (Master's dissertation, University of Namibia).
- Jucker, A. (2013). *English historical pragmatics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Kádár, D. Z. (2017). Politeness in pragmatics. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*.
- Kaguda, D. (2015). Death and dying: An analysis of the language used in copying with death in the Shona society. *Journal for Studies in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 057-068.
- Kangira, J. (2009). *Product-oriented communication: A linguistic analysis of selected adverts*. Ounongo Repository.
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*. New Dehli: New Age International.
- Lakoff, S. A. (1973). Science policy for the 1970's: Canada debates the options. *Science*, 179(4069), 151-157.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Pragmatics, discourse analysis, stylistics and "The Celebrated Letter"*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Leech, G. N. (2005). Politeness: is there an East-West divide. *Journal of foreign languages*, 6(3), 1-30.

- Leech, G. N. (2014). *The pragmatics of politeness*. Oxford Studies in Sociolinguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leech, G. N. (2016). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Routledge.
- Locher, M. A. (2006). Polite behavior within relational work: The discursive approach to politeness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Locher, M. A. (2015). Interpersonal pragmatics and its link to (im)politeness research. *Journal of pragmatics*, 86, 5-10.
- Maharani, S. A. I. (2017). Politeness maxim of main character in secret forgiven. *Jurnal Bahasa Lingua Scientia*, 9(1), 1-14.
- Мамбетова, М. А. (2019). Expression of Politeness in Different Cultures. *Вестник Международного Университета Кыргызстана*, (2), 99-102.
- Mahmud, M. (2019). The use of politeness strategies in the classroom context by English university students. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 8(3), 597-606.
- Matley, D. (2018). "This is NOT a# humblebrag, this is just a# brag": The pragmatics of self-praise, hashtags and politeness in Instagram posts. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 22, 30-38.
- Mayamasita, P. (2016). *Politeness principle as seen in the dialogue among characters on "Karate Kid"* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar).
- Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and politeness* (No. 17). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moore, R. (2020). Whiteness= politeness: interest-convergence in Australian history textbooks, 1950–2010. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 17(1), 111-129.
- Morand, D. A., & Ocker, R. J. (2003, January). Politeness theory and computer-mediated communication: A sociolinguistic approach to analyzing relational messages. In *36th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, 2003. Proceedings of the* (pp. 10-pp). IEEE.

- Mulyono, E. (2016). Politeness principle analysis in cartoon movie entitled Stand by Me Doraemon. *Premise: Journal of English Education and Applied Linguistics*, 5(1), 9-23.
- Namhila, E. N. (1997). *The price of freedom*. New Namibia Books.
- Nghiwete, R. V., Shejavali, N., & Hanes, B. (2010). *Valentina, the Exile Child: Autobiography*. VEEM Publishing House.
- Ningsih, R., Boeriswati, E., & Muliastuti, L. (2020). Language politeness of students and teachers: An ethnographic study. *Getsempena English Education Journal*, 7(1), 159-169.
- Nujoma, S. (2001). *Where others wavered: the autobiography of Sam Nujoma*. Windhoek: Panaf Books.
- Nyathi, S. (2003). *The Oracle of Cidino*. Windhoek, Namibia: The African Publishers.
- Nyathi, S. (2008). *The Other Presence*. Windhoek, Namibia: The African Publishers.
- Nyathi, S. (2012). *God of Women*. Windhoek, Namibia: The African Publishers.
- O'Driscoll, J. (2017). Face and (Im) politeness. *The Palgrave handbook of linguistic (im) politeness*, 89-118.
- Olaniyi, K. (2017). Politeness principle and Ilorin greetings in Nigeria: A sociolinguistic study. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 5(1), 58-67.
- Osondu, P. A., & Umeh, I. J. Violation of Politeness Maxims as a Catalyst for Tragedy: A Study of Akachi Adimora-Ezeigbo's *Roses and Bullets*. *Pan-African Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. 2 (1), 184-211
- Pankaj, L., & Seetharaman, P. (2021). The balancing act of social enterprise: an IT emergence perspective. *International Journal of Information Management*, 57, 102302.
- Pasaribu, T. K., & Manik, S. (2019). Politeness Strategy in Maxims Used by Staff and Students of language and Arts Faculty HKBP Nommensen University in Their Academic Services. *The Explora Journal of English Language Teaching (ELT) and Linguistics*. 1(2), 1-15.
- Philander, B. F. (2010). *The Porridge Queen*. Windhoek, Namibia: Typoprint.

- Reiter, R. M. (2000). Linguistic politeness in Britain and Uruguay. *The University of Survey*.
- Rong, R. (2009). How to make a drama out of (im)politeness: (Im)politeness in *The Joy Luck Club* (1993). In *Lancaster University Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics & Language Teaching* (Vol. 3, pp. 98-121).
- Sabao, C. (2019). *Advanced grammar*. University of Namibia.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2003). Conversation analysis and communication disorders. *Conversation and brain damage*, 21-55.
- Schegloff, E. A., & Sacks, H. (1973). *Opening up closings*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Schivute, M. (1997). *Go and come back home: A Namibian's journey into exile and back*. Gamsberg: Macmillan.
- Scollon, R. (2001). Action and text: towards an integrated understanding of the place of text in social (inter) action, mediated discourse analysis and the problem of social action. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, 113, 139-183.
- Seedhouse, P. (2004). The interactional architecture of the language classroom: A conversation analysis perspective. *Language Learning*. Research Gate.
- Shahrokhi, M., & Bidabadi, F. S. (2013). An overview of politeness theories: Current status, future orientations. *American Journal of Linguistics*, 2(2), 17-27.
- Shankule, K. and Woldemariam, H. Z. (2015). An evaluation of the pragmatic competence of high school students of English: a case study in Ethiopia. *NAWA journal of language and communication*, 9 (2), 40-63. <http://ir.nust.na/handle/10628/704>
- Sidnell, J. (2010). Conversation analysis. *Sociolinguistics and language education*, 492.
- Sugianto, R. (2021). Pragmatic Comparison on Javanese and Western Politeness in Cross-Cultural Communication. *PANDAWA*, 3(1), 34-45.
- Thomas, J. A. (2014). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. London: Routledge.
- Tujuba, Eticha, D. and H.Z. Woldemariam. (2018). The pragmatic knowledge of university

- lecturers: a case study. *International journal of research in social science*. vol. 8 (1), 30-45. Impact Factor: 7.081.
http://www.ijmra.us/project%20doc/2018/IJRSS_JANUARY2018/IJMRA-12854.pdf
- Van Olmen, D. (2017). *Politeness in language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vazquez-Hermosilla, S. (2012). Gender and politeness: A case study on advertising discourse. *Rice Working Papers in Linguistics*, 3.
- Verdonk, P. (2001). *Stylistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Waheeb, K. A. (2017). A Pragmatic-Stylistic Approach to the Study of Dramatic Texts. *Journal of Babylon University/Human Sciences*, 25(5), 2121-2131.
- Winterfeldt, V., & Vale, H. (2011). Encodings of society in Namibian literature. *Journal of Namibian Studies: History Politics Culture*, 9, 85-108.
- Wiryomartono, B. (2020). Politeness and patrimonial communities in Indonesia. In *Traditions and transformations of habitation in Indonesia* (pp. 283-304). Singapore: Springer., Singapore.
- Woldemariam, H.Z. (2015). The development of pragmatic competence (pc) through pragmatic stylistics (PS). *NAWA journal of language and communication* 9 (1), 46-88. DOI: 435095410. <https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1G1-435095410/3-the-development-of-pragmatic-competence-pc-through>
- Yin, M., & Zhou, H. (2019, December). A Research on Mock Politeness——A Case Study of the Legend of Zhen Huan. In *5th Annual International Conference on Social Science and Contemporary Humanity Development (SSCHD 2019)* (pp. 705-711). Atlantis Press.
- Yu, H. A. O., & Ren, C. H. I. (2013). Politeness principle in human communication. *Studies in Sociology of Science*, 4(3), 54-57.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford university press.
- Zeeman, T. (2000). *New Namibian Plays* (Vol. 1). National Theatre of Namibia.
- Zeeman, T. (2001). *New Namibian Plays* (Vol. 2). National Theatre of Namibia.

Zou, X., Ren, H., & Zhu, G. (2013). Topology-directed design of porous organic frameworks and their advanced applications. *Chemical communications*, 49(38), 3925-3936.

ANNEXURES

Annex A: Content analysis checklist in Applied Linguistics

Types of politeness principles used in the plays	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● tact maxim● generosity maxim● approbation maxim● modesty maxim● agreement maxim● sympathy maxim
Politeness and power struggle between characters	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Tact maxim in projecting power struggle● Generosity maxim obeyed● Negative approbation maxim● Negative modesty maxim apathy of self-praise● Agreement maxim● Sympathy maxim obeyed
Violation of the politeness principles	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Violation of the tact maxim● Generosity of reconciliation● Violation of the approbation maxim● Violation of the modesty maxim● Agreement maxim● Expression of sympathy in a maxim