Politeness In Gojri Language (A Case Study Of Patrak AndGwaaldai)

Shautkat Islam[1], Dr. Rabia Rustam[2], Dr. Mian Shah Bacha (Corresponding Author)[3,] Mis Bakht Sheema Bibi[4]

[1]*MPhil Scholar, Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University, Sheringal, Dir Upper* misbahulislam17@gmail.com
[2]*Assistant Professor Department of Humanities COMSATS University Islamabad (Abbottabad Campus) E-mail: Rabiahrustam2cuiatd.edu.pk*
[3]*Head, Department of English, Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University, Sheringal, Dir Upper, KPK, Pakistan Emails:* bachamsb@gmail.com, bachamsb@sbbu.edu.pk
[4]*Lecturer in English, Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University, Sheringal, Dir Upper, KPK*

Abstract

The current study aims to investigate the phenomenon of politeness as well as its claimed universal strategies in Gojri. Brown and Levinson's (1978-1987) politeness theory served as the research's model. The study's secondary goal was to investigate the two types of politeness as well as the level of directness in Gojri. For measuring the phenomenon of politeness in Gojri language, the speech acts of request and apology were chosen. Fifty male Patrak and Gwaaldai residents were chosen as respondents. The study's instrument was contextualized and indigenized open role plays adapted from Reiter's Study (2000), and the data was analyzed using Blum Kulka, House, and Kasper's (1989) analytical framework and coding scheme. According to the study, the concept of politeness and its two variations (positive and negative) exist in the Gojri language. The findings also demonstrate that native speakers use three of Brown and Levinson's proposed strategies in their interactions. The existence of directness and indirectness in the Gojri language is further explored in the study. The study's findings also suggest that Gojri language speakers favour negative politeness more and are more explicit and precise in their requests.

Keywords: Politeness, Request, Apology, Strategies, Investigate

Introduction

The present research aims at investigating the phenomenon of politeness and its strategies employed by the speakers of Gojri language to maintain balance between efficiency and good relationship among the members of the community. The main focus of this research is to find out how two speech acts namely request and apology are expressed in Gojri language.

Background to the Study

Man is endowed with the unique gift of language and through the power of language, knowledge, skills, experiences and cultural heritage etc. have come down from generation to generation since human life came into existence. Through this important tool, man has not only made immense progress in different walks of life but also continues to control the mightier forces in this unfathomable cosmos. Man is by instinct, a social being who loves to live in societies and communicate with his fellow beings.

Brown & Levinson (1978-87) state that every competent member of the society has instinctively some sensitive feelings and emotional needs which he wants to be met at all costs. When he is criticized, threatened, humiliated, not approved of, not received appreciation for his assumed good deeds,

impeded and imposed on, he gets angry and is likely to retort in a negative way.

Brown & Levinson (1978-1987) further say that whenever the members of a community enter into social interaction, their words are supposed to be a double-edged sword, which on the one hand can build a magnificent edifice of mutual trust, relationship and harmony but on the other hand, the same edifice could be demolished within seconds by the same language if not used carefully and judiciously. Such aspects of language have been investigated by many scholars in order to avoid discord and ensure complete harmony in human society. In order to ensure efficiency in thedaily business of life without hurting the feelings of the interlocutors Brown & Levinson (1978-1987) propose politeness theory with its universal strategies.

Lin (2013) states that in the modern era, the tendencies for cultural studies have got momentum as maintaining good relationship between the speaker and the hearer is important in face to face conversation, particularly in cross cultural communication.

Goffman (1955) states, "Just as the member of any group is expected to have self-respect, so also, he/she is expected to sustain a standard of considerateness., he/she is expected to go to certain lengths to save the feelings and face of others present, and he/she is expected to do this willingly and spontaneously because of emotional identification with others and with their feelings''.

Many names have been given to this condition of man in the society as self-image, public image, self-esteem or social status. Goffman (1951) calls it face which can be lost as well as enhanced in certain situations.

Brown & Levinson (1978-87) define this face as, "The want to be unimpeded and the want to be approved of in certain respects''.

They further divide this face into negative face and positive face. They want and desire to be approved of in certain respects is called positive face while the want to be unimpeded in certain respects is called negative face. They call the acts that threaten this face as FTAs (Face Threatening Acts) which threaten the face of interactants, whenever, they enter into some social interaction.

For this purpose, the famous sociolinguists (Brown & Levinson (1978-1987) propose "Politeness Theory" which is in fact the extension of Coffman's face notion.

This theory suggests that all these acts should be performed in an indirect and polite way by employing certain universal politeness strategies in order to avoid FTAs. These politeness strategies are as follows,

a) Bald on record

Bald on record means to be direct and clear in performing the speech act.

For example; A friend invites you to dinner where you find that the meat is not well cooked and you tell your friend that the meat is not well cooked.

b) Bald on record with redress

Bald on record with redress means that you clearly mention something, apparently that may offend the hearer but simultaneously you restore his or her face in some other way.

Example; In the above situation you tell your friend that the meat is not cooked well but at the same time you say that the sauce, salad and other dishes are marvelous.

c) Off record

Applying the off-record politeness strategy one says something implicitly.

For example; In the above situation if you say that you love to eat only the food which is well cooked, you are using off record strategy.

d) Avoidance FTAs at all.

It means to avoid FTA at all. In the above-mentioned example if you neither mention explicitly nor implicitly the low quality of the food you are using the strategy not to do FTA at all.

Research Questions

The main research questions of the present research study are as follows:

1) What are the main politeness measures in Gojri language?

2) In the Gojri language, what percentage of people are impolite?

3) Does the theoretical framework of politeness proposed by Brown and Levinson hold water when applied to the Gojri language?

4) What are the different degrees of directness in Gojri?

5) What degree of politeness is present in the Gojri language?

Significance of the Study

This research study is essential because it will serve as a starting point for future research on the Gojri Language's politeness phenomena. This ground-breaking research on the Gojri language will be extremely helpful to the educated members of the neighborhood. They might also encounter actual data elicitation, and the outcomes will also be communicated to them. Additionally, this study will open up new possibilities for future researchers to examine different facets of the Gojri language. This study will educate young people who speak Gojri and encourage researchers to look at it more thoroughly from various angles. The primary contribution and significance of this study lies in its being the first attempt in Dir

LITERATURE REVIEW

Speech Acts

The 10th edition of the Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary states that a speech act is something that someone says that is regarded as an action, such as "I forgive you."

John Austin (1962) played a significant role in popularizing the idea of speech acts. He was a pioneer in the analysis of the connection between speech and acts.

Austin (1962) has laid great emphasis on the significance of the speech acts within the human social utterances. He says that mere grammatically correct utterances are not sufficient for a meaningful human communication, rather there should be certain factors that guarantee a fruitful interaction among the members of a community. Thehearer and the speaker go into the depth of the utterances with the help of their shared knowledge of the language and social norms. They fully exploit the context to share much more than what is visible on the surface. The context plays vital role in determining the deeper meanings of human utterances. The branch of linguistics which deals with such linguistic cues, markers and other socio-pragmatic factors is called pragmatics.

Austin (1962) further states that an utterance may be three layered in terms of meaning; Locutionary act, Illocutionary act and perlocutionary act. He means that an utterance has lexical and intended meanings along with the effects the hearer feels. He further classifies these speech acts according to the functions they perform into representative, directive, commissive, expressive and declarative.

John Searle (1969) classifies speech acts according to their structure into the following three categories:

1) Declarative

2) Interrogative

3) Imperative

The Etymology of the Term, Politeness

Jami (2018) says, جراحات السان ن لها الئوام وال بلئام ما جرح اللسان

Phonetic   Transcription. dʒɑrɒːhtʊsənɒːni ləhəl tij

Translation: The wounds of the spears may heal but the wounds of the tongue may not heal.

Bacha (2015) states that in social interaction the words, phrases and utterances may be remembered by the interlocutors but their effects stay longer in the memories of the people. Human beings have the feelings of joy, cooperation, friendliness, rudeness, grief, wonder, fear and admiration etc. in their memories. While the precise quantity of words, sentences, and utterances is long forgotten, all such sentiments are typically the long-lasting impacts of the spoken words. All of this demonstrates how a variety of sociopragmatic elements have a significant impact on human discussions and, in turn, behaviour. Use of civility to the greatest extent feasible is one of the most productive and beneficial ways to reduce conflict and resentment in interpersonal interactions.

According to Merriam Webster Dictionary (11th edition 2014);

a) Politeness is relating to, or having the characteristics of advanced culture

: marked by refined cultural interests and pursuits especially in arts and belles lettres
b) showing or characterized by correct social usage

c) marked by an appearance of consideration, tact, deference, or courtesy

d) marked by a lack of roughness or crudities.

According to Oxford Advanced Learner Dictionary (10th edition,2021) politeness is,

a) good manners and respect for the feelings of others

b) the fact of being socially correct but not always sincere.

The term politeness is a multidimensional one. Richard Watts (1983) says, 'Writing an introduction to politeness is like being in mortal combat with a many headed hydra, you have barely severed one head when a few more grow in its place''.

Leech (1983) asserts that undoubtedly there is something baffling and multidimensional about politeness as the list of considerations regarding this topic in the last chapter may have shown. Politeness occupies a multi sided space within which most of the ingredients are difficult to note down. Books and publications in this field are beset by fundamental issues that might be called philosophical issues. What is the nature of politeness? Does it stem from linguistics, sociology, social psychology, cultural history or anthropology? Does it exist in the mind of the speaker, the hearer, both, or neither? Can one propose a coherent theory of politeness, and if so, what theoretical position should be taken? Leech (1983) defines politeness as a conflict avoidance strategy which could be gauged in terms of the degree of struggle used into the avoidance of a conflict situation.
Arndt and Jenney (1985) define politeness as an interpersonal supportiveness.

Robin Lakoff (1975) definespoliteness as a tool and means which helps interlocutors reduce friction and discord in personal interaction.

The sociolinguists with whom the theory of politeness is associated to such a degree that they are almost part and parcel are Brown & Levinson (1987-1987). Their definition of politeness deals with it as a complex system for mitigating face threats. The basis for their work and definition is in fact Goffman's Face Theory. They generously accord the credit to Erving Goffman (19550) by expressing their gratitude, ''we dedicate this work to the memory of Erving Coffman, from whose ideas it directly stems, and from whose encouragement we took much succor, but specifically with this thought in mind- that without him, observational studies of social interaction would hardly exist today''.

Brown & Levinson (1978-1987) state that man is not born with politeness. He

acquires the same from the society he lives in. The more one gets exposed to social norms and conventions the better his knowledge of social norms and conventions is. In this way, politeness keeps on evolving in course of time. In a nutshell, politeness is the key to friendly, smoother and more refined interaction among the members of a society.

The politeness model of Brown & Levinson (1978-1987) is clearer and more articulated and built upon Gricean foundations. The theory of Brown & Levinson (1978-1987) as already mentioned is basically meant to save the face of the interlocutors in social interaction by employing certain strategies. The deep investigation of the theory shows that it mainly focuses on face threatening acts (FTAs) and the use of a set of strategies that have been developed to minimize and mitigate these FTAs in social interaction.

According to Brown & Levinson (1978-1987) the following five major strategies can be applied to avoid FTAs.

1) Bald on Record

It is more blatant and the least polite way of saying something to someone. It means to ensure efficiency without any adornment and hedging. For example:

A student comes to his teacher with an assignment to check. The teacher examines the assignment carefully and finds it very poor and against the set standards. He without regarding for doing FTAs tells the student that the assignment is poorly written and is against the set standards. In this case, the teacher does the FTA but ensures efficiency.

2) Bald on Record with Redress

It means to do the FTA on the one hand but to pay for it on the other hand. For example: If someone is invited by a friend to dinner and the rice is not well cooked. The guest is asked by the host about the food and he says, 'the taste is good and the ingredients are perfect but the rice is not cooked well it should have been left on the stove for a few more minutes.

3) Off Record

Applying off record strategy the interlocutors say something face threatening indirectly.

For example, a person standing by roadside requests a car driver to give him a lift and the driver replies that he has to pick his family a few yards ahead.

4) Not to do FTA at all

For example the food is not good but the guest says nothing about its poor quality and thus avoids FTA at all. This is the least and the last strategy.

Leech (1983) states that for the smooth flow of human communication and avoiding friction and discord in social order Brown & Levinson (1978-1987) list fifteen positive, ten negative and fifteen off-record strategies. The speaker has to choose the most appropriate strategy after estimating the weightiness of the FTA and the situation which is gauged in terms of three quantifiable components: distance, power and the rank or degree of imposition.

Brown & Levinson (1978-1987) further divide face into two types:

1) Positive face

2) Negative face.

They define positive face as the desires to be approved of, respected, valued and appreciated in interaction according to the social norms and rules. For example;

A university student has not come to the expectations of his teacher in the internal exam, but like other students he still desires to be appreciated by the teacher. Now the teacher has to maintain efficiency on the one hand by giving the real feedback to the student and on the other hand to save the positive face of the student. To this end, Brown & Levinson (1978-1987) suggest politeness strategies.

Negative face is the freedom of action and freedom from imposition in certain social set up according to specific rules and normsregulating a society. For example;

A man has forgotten to take his pen with him and now he needs to write something important. He has to borrow the same from someone who instinctively wants to be free from imposition. In such situation's politeness strategies are to be applied.

Kadar & Mills (2011) in their edited book, Politeness in East Asia state that politeness is not as simple as some stereo typists hold; rather it is a very complex phenomenon. The politeness in a region may be impoliteness in some other region and vice versa. It varies from culture to culture and region to region. Their findings show that some people prefer negative politeness to positive politeness and vice versa. They after an extensive study and observation of the cultures of China, Japan, Korea, Singapore and Vietnam reveal that though politeness according to some all agreed upon definition does exist in all these cultures but it varies in degree, pattern and manner.

Brasedefer (2013) in his research article, 'Indirectness and Politeness in Mexican Requests' states that after conducting a research on the topic through formal and informal role play the findings reveal that the conventional indirectness is common means of requesting in situations which display (+Power or +Distance) while there is commonly directness when the conversation is between the close relations (-Distance)

The conventionally indirect requests increase level of deferential politeness and can be used to express respect or distance between the interlocutors. The Scholar further states that on record and direct requests are situations dependent and seem to be expected among the Mexicans subjects in a solidarity polite system (-Power-Distance).

Aydin (2013) finds out that there is a marked difference between the non-native speakers of English learners and the native American speakers of English. The findings reveal that the native speakers of American English are much higher than the native speakers of Turkish in using Illocutionary Force Indicating Device as an apology strategy. The researcher further states that while using the apologies there is a big difference between Native Speakers of American English and the Native Speakers of Turkish in terms of power relationship. The native speakers of Turkish are more indirect than the native speakers of American English. Power, rank, relationship and distance have great effects on the apologies of the native speakers of Turkish. The findings further reveal that the norms of the native culture could not be stopped from interfering into the conversation even if the advanced learners get closer to the target language and its culture. According to findings of the study, the intensifiers of the apology are generally not applied by the non-native speakers, even if they are able to apply the norms of the target culture as general strategies.

Research Methodology

The present research study investigated the speech acts of request and apology in order to find out the politeness strategies employed by the speakers of Gojri language. The aim of the research was to probe which kind of politeness was preferred by the speakers of Gujjar community.

This research was conducted by adopting, adapting and contextualizing the Reiter's (2000) open role plays. The situations were translated into Gojri language for the convenience of the native speakers of Gojri language. The services of an excellent native translator were hired to translate the role plays into Gojri and to explain the same to the respondents during the recording.

Due to their importance, widespread usage, and centrality in daily life, the speech acts of request and apology were chosen to evaluate politeness in the Gojri language. Additionally, these speech acts involve soliciting approbation on the one hand, and on the other hand, the loss of face is also at risk.

Through open roleplays, the data were gathered. Ten role plays were performed (5 requests & 5 apologies). The role plays involved 50 participants from various social and professional backgrounds. They came from

the Patrak Sharqi, Patrak Gharbi, and Gwaaldai UCs. The respondents' communications were lawfully recorded after receiving their prior consent. One round of role plays took between ten and fifteen minutes to record.

The Framework for the Methodology

Labov (1972) states that everyday speech data is natural and unadulterated, the more the data being every day, the real it would be to gauge some phenomenon of sociolinguistics. So data of the everyday speech should be real or at least near to be real. This is possible only if the observed are not aware of the fact that they are being observed. When such observed speech community becomes aware of the fact that they are being observed, then, they become conscious and thus, the natural and everyday speech does not come. Labov (1972) terms such observation as Observer`s Paradox. So, every care has been taken to ensure as much real data as possible.

Piloting of the Research Design

Porta (2008) defines piloting as a small-scale test of the methods, procedures and estimated cost and required time to be used on a larger scale. Piloting test is one of the most important phases in a research. It is a well calculated practical examination of the pros and cons prior to duly embark on an intended research project. In the field of research, the whole research process largely depends on piloting test.

Translated role play situations were pilot tested to see if there was any anomaly or discrepancy in the role play of the open role plays. For this propose, many well-educated native speakers of Gojri language were engaged throughout the process of piloting test. After piloting, the discrepancies and difficulties of comprehension, and time management were removed. The open role play situations were contextualized to possible extent.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed by using the coding scheme of Blum Kulka, House & Kasper (1989) CCSARP (Cross Cultural Speech Act

Realization Project). They have a supposition that probably every language has three main levels of directness while making a request; direct, conventionally indirect and non-conventionally indirect. They have further proposed a ten-point scale for measuring these three major levels. Their ten points are as follows:

1) Mood Derivable

2) Locution Derivable

3) Explicit Performative

4) Hedged Performative

5) Obligation Statement

6) Want Statement

7) Query Preparatory

8) Suggestory Formula

9) Mild Hint

10) Strong Hint

The apologies were also analyzed through their following constituents:

1) Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (IFID)

2) Responsibility Taking

3) Explanation for some fault or mistake

4) Offer of Repair/Restitution

5) Promise of Forbearance

6) Expression of concern

7) Downgrading

DATA ANALYSIS

To evaluate appropriately, Blum Kulka et al (1989).'s coding method was employed.

50 participants from Patrak and Gwaaldai participated in ten open-ended role plays (5 requests and 5 apologies). For the sake of the

readers, it should be stated again that only fifty of the 100 Gojri native speakers who were approached for the role plays reacted positively, with the remainder offering their apologies.

Additionally, it is clarified for the readers' convenience that the respondents typically employed multiple patterns in their requestsand apologies. For instance, a reply may have utilized Mood derivable, Want statement, and Hints all at once when responding to a request. In the same way, when offering an apology, a reply may have simultaneously employed the Explanation Illocutionary Force Indicating Device, an offer of repair, and a promise of forbearance. As a result, there were 292 total solutions utilized in five circumstances involving requests from 50 respondents, compared to 524 total apologies.

Divide the number of times a strategy is used by the total number of times a strategy is used,then multiply the result by 100 to get the percentage.
For instance, IFID 148 524 100 = 28%
Therefore, 28% of people use illocutionary force indicators.

Results

Table 1: The overall results of the request strategies used by the native speakers of Gojri

Strategy	Frequency out of 292	%
Mood Derivable	38	13%
Explicit Performative	Nil	0%
Hedged Performative	Nil	0%
Locution Derivable	Nil	0%
Obligation Statement	Nil	0%
Want Statement	132	45%
Suggestory Formula	14	5%
Query Preparatory	58	20%
Strong Hint	43	15%
Mild Hint	7	2%
Total	292	100%

Overall results are shown in the table above, showing that want statements, which are used by native Gojri speakers 45% of the time, are the least common form of request, while mild hints, explicit performatives, hedged performatives, obligation statements, and locution derivables were not identified in the data gathered from native Gojri speakers. As more than 50% of the speakers made explicit requests, the aggregate results also highlight the low context culture of the Gojri speaking community. According to Hall (1972), a low context culture is one in which information is conveyed directly. Such civilizations mostly

rely on spoken language and intonation. The physical surroundings, body language, and other factors have less bearing on communication.

The outcomes of the aforementioned scenario also demonstrate that it is the only one with

12% MH and a 47% frequency when combined with SH.

Table 2 shows the proportion of direct and indirect requests in the Gojri language.

Request	Type of Strategies used	Frequency	Percentage
Request for Money	I	50	69%
	CI	21	28%
	NCI	02	03%
	Total	73	100%
Request for Water	I	31	60%
	CI	13	25%
	NCI	08	15%
	Total	52	100%
Request for Hay	I	35	64%
	CI	12	20%
	NCI	09	16%
	Total	55	100%
Request for Ox	I	40	70%
	CI	12	21%
	NCI	05	09%
	Total	57	100%
Request for Front Seat	I	14	26%
	CI	15	27%
	NCI	26	47%
	Total	55	100%

The Table above suggests that there is a marked difference between the phenomenon of directness and indirectness. The frequency of the overall usage of directness is almost 58%. Next comes the conventional indirectness with almost 25% and the least used is non-conventional indirectness which is 17%. It shows that the Gujjar community markedly prefers directness to indirectness in making their requests. The percentage of the non-conventional indirectness shows the least usage of this strategy in making requests.

The findings point out to the fact that the community is more direct in their requests to avoid any misunderstanding and ambiguity.

Moreover, the results indicate that the Gujjars' culture is a low context culture where clarity in the speech act of request is preferred by the native speakers of Gojri language.

Looking at the situations individually it is found that the degree of directness and indirectness varies from situation to situation. It is between 60% and 70% in the first four situations while it's just 26%.in 5th situation in which a Malik, (a highly influential and powerful figure among the community) is the addressee which decreases the ratio of directness to a mere 26%.

Moreover, in the four situations the non-conventional indirectness is less as compared to the fifth one. This glaring difference between the two shows the non-egalitarian nature of the community. The socially influential figures in the society are held in high esteem by the commoners.

Table 3: The politeness strategies used in the request patterns by the native speakers of Gojri language.

Request	Type of Strategies used	Frequency	Percentage
Request for Money	Bald on Record	05	07%
	Positive Politeness	45	62%
	Negative Politeness	23	31%
	Total	73	100%
Request for Water	Bald on Record	16	31%
	Positive Politeness	15	29%
	Negative Politeness	21	40%
	Total	52	100%
Request for Hay	Bald on Record	08	15%
	Positive Politeness	27	49%
	Negative Politeness	20	36%
	Total	55	100%
Request for Ox	Bald on Record	07	12%

	Positive Politeness	33	58%
	Negative Politeness	17	30%
	Total	57	100%
Request for Front Seat	Bald on Record	02	04%
	Positive Politeness	12	22%
	Negative Politeness	41	74%
	Total	55	100%

The results suggest that bald on record strategy is only 13%, negative politeness 42% and positive politeness 45%. The results indicate that though positive politeness is almost 3% higher than the negative politeness but it's comparatively nearer to negative politeness. Bald on record is the least used politeness strategy used by the native speakers of Gojri language.

Thus, the results show that the three strategies of Brown and Levinson are used in Gojri language with variant percentage. Bald on record is the least used strategy with a meager 13% while positive politeness is 45% and negative politeness comes second with a percentage of 42%. The most polite strategy, not to do FTAs at all, is not found in the data.

The Pattern of Apology

Olshtain (1983) defines apology as an admission of error, fault or discourtesy accompanied by an expression of regret.

Bernstein (2006) says that a healthy apology has three parts; acknowledgement, remorse and restitution. The apologizer has to admit his fault with the expression of regret and promise not to repeat the same in future.

Brown & Levenson (1978-1987) state that like the request, the apology is also such a speech act where the face of both the speaker and the hearer is always at stake. This face could be protected with the help of certain strategies. The results of the apology strategies used by the speakers of Gojri language are as follows;

The following table shows the overall results of the apology strategies used by the speakers of the Gojri language.

Table 4: Overall usage of the apology strategies

Apology strategy	Strategy Frequency	Percentage %
Illocutionary Force Indicating Device	148	28%
Explanation	212	41%
Responsibility	68	13%
Downgrading	18	3%

Offer of Repair	44	8%
Promise of Forbearance	29	6%
Expressing concern	5	1%
Total	524	100%

The above table illustrates that the explanation strategy of apology is the most frequently employed strategy with the highest percentage of 41%. It is the strategy which tries to save the faces of both the interlocutors. The use of IFID (Illocutionary Force Indicating Device) with 28% comes next to explanation which indicates that the speaker takes more care about the face of the hearer. Responsibility is also with considerable proportion of 13% while offer of repair is 8% and the least employed strategy is expressing concern which is only 1%.

The results of the data show that in making apologies the native speakers are more indirect as only 28% IFID (which shows directness) has been used in contrast to 72% indirectness. It is a marked difference between directness and indirectness. The highpercentage of indirectness suggests that in making the apologies the native speakers of Gojri language are more concerned about the face of the speaker.

Negative Politeness & Positive Politeness

The following table shows the ratios of negative and positive politeness

Politeness	Apology Strategy	Frequency	%
Negative Politeness	Illocutionary Force Indicating Device	148	28%
	Explanation	212	41%
	Responsibility	68	13%
	Downgraders	18	3%
	Total	446	85%
Positive Politeness	Offer of Repair	44	8%
	Promise of Forbearance	29	6%
	Expressing concern	5	1%
	Total	78	15%

It has already been mentioned in the objectives of the study that the purpose of conducting this study would be to investigate the two kinds of politeness namely Positive Politeness & Negative Politeness. Therefore, the above table indicates that the overwhelming majority of the Gujjar community employs negative politeness strategies while making apologies. Negitve politeness is the kind of politeness in which the speaker tries to restore the negative face of the addressee or the hearer Brown & Levinson (1978-1987)

85% negative politeness indicates that it is the more preferable kind of politeness among the Gujjar community. The ratio of the positive politeness is just 15% which shows that the speakers of the Gujjar community are very less concerned about the positive face of the hearer or the addressee.

قرض روپیہ لیٹ ہوڑ پہ گوݨڈی ئے معافی ئے معذرت
Gojri منگݨ

Phonetic Transcription; kɜːz rʊpiə leit hʊn pə gəwəndi θe mɑːfi θe mɑːzirəθ məngən

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The main purpose of the current study was to investigate the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson (1978-1987) with their proposed universal politeness strategies. The study further aimed at contributing to the research of Gojri language which is one of the most widely spoken languages in the subcontinent Rahi (2015).

The current study primarily aimed at investigating the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson (1978-1987) along with their proposed universal strategies in connection with the Gojri language. For this purpose, two frequently used speech acts namely request and apology were taken in order to measure the phenomenon of politeness and its various strategies. The study chose two UCs of Patrak and UC Gwaaldai as population. For this study Reiter's (2000) open role play situations were adopted and thoroughly contextualized as instrument. Fifty respondents played the situations which were audio recorded and later

transcribed by an educated native speaker. The data was analyzed using Blum Kulka et al's (1989) coding scheme CCSARP (CrossCultural Speech Act Realization Project)

In light of the results of the data it was established that the phenomenon of politeness exits in the Gojri language. Positive and negative politeness are there in Gojri language. The three politeness strategies namely bald on record, bald on record with redress and off record were noticed at variant ratios. The frequent use of external and internal modifications was witnessed to mitigate FTAs during the performance of the two speech acts. The social variables of status, age, relationship and frankness would greatly affect the pattern of request and apology. The use of more directness in requesting shows the clarity of the native speakers in their social interaction.

The marked preference of the respondents to negative politeness in apologies indicates that the native speakers of Gojri language are more cautious about the negative face of the hearer or the addressee. Though the current research was limited to a couple of specific aspects of the Gojri language excluding numerous aspects of the same yet it might contribute to the introduction of Gujri language to the speakers of other languages in the present global world.

Furthermore, it may encourage the other scholars in general and the Gojri speaking scholars in particular to investigate the unexplored areas of Gojri language.

References

1. Anwar & Naseem (2017) 'Gulistane Gujjar'Chudhri Books Center GIilani Chowk Muzaffarabad AJK
2. Arndt. H. and Janney, R. W.(1985). Politeness revisited: cross-modal supportive strategies. IRAL, 23 (4): 281–300.
3. Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words. Oxford: OxfordUniversity Press.
4. Aydin, Mehmet, "Cross Cultural Pragmatics: A Study of Apology Speech Acts by Turkish speakers, American English Speakers and Advance Nonnative Speakers of English in Turkey" (2013). Thesis, Dissertations, and Other Capstone Projects. Paper 269.
5. Bacha, M. S. (2015). Politeness in the Pashto Language and Culture [Ph.D Dessertation University of Azad Jammu and Kashmir] Muzaffarabad, Pakistan.
6. Bacha.M.S, Kumar.T, Sheema. B (2020). INDIRECTNESS OF REQUESTING IN PASHTO LANGUAGE . PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology, 17(6), 5610 - 5626. Retrieved from https://archives.palarch.nl/index.php/jae/article/view/1834
7. Bernstein .J(2006).10 Days to a Less Defiant Child.Marlow & Company, Cambridge Massachusetts, USA
8. Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). Applied linguistics, 5(3), 196-213.
9. Brasedefer, J. C. (2008). Politeness in Mexico and United States. New York: Routledge.
10. Brown, J. (2020). Perseverance.In E. M. Sanchez (Ed.), Merriam-Webster.com dictionary.Merriam-Webster.https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/perseverance
11. Brown.P Levinson.S (1987). Indirectness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. Chohan, R. H. (2017). A Short History of Gujjars. Lahore: Chouhdri Abdul Baqi Naseem Pring Press Lahore.
13. Collins English dictionary. (1994). Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers.

14. Daniel Z. Kadar & Sara Mills. (2011). Politeness in East Asia. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
15. Edmondson, W. (1981). Spoken discourse. London: Longman.
16. Ehlich, K. (1992). On the historicity of politeness. In R. Watts, S. Ide, and K. Ehlich (Eds.), Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice, 71– 107. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
17. Fairclough, N. (2013). Language and Power. New York: Routledge.
18. Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. Journal of Pragmatics, 14,219-236.
19. Goffman, E. (1955). On Face work; An analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction. pp. 213-231.
20. Green, J. (1975). Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press.
21. Grice, P. (1973). Principles of Pragmatics.Hall, E. T. (1976). Beyond culture. New York: Doubleday.
22. Hornby, A. S., Ashby, M., & Wehmeier, S. (2000). Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English. Oxford: Oxford Univers
23. Kousar.S (2015). International Journal of Society, Culture & Language, 3(2), 112-145.
24. Labove, W. (1972). Sociolinguistics Patterns. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
25. Lakoff, R. (1972). Language in Context. 907-927.
26. Leech, G. (1983). Explorations in Semantics and Pragmatics. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
27. Lin, Y. L. (2013). Vague language and interpersonal communication: An analysis of adolescent intercultural conversation. International Journal of Society, Culture and Language, 1(2), 69-81.
28. Olshtain, E. (1989). Apologies across languages. In Blum Kulka et al., Crosscultural pragmatics: Requestsand apologies, 155–173. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
29. Rahi J (2012), The Gujjars a Book Series on History & Culture of Gujjar Tribes Vol .1 Sirinagar/Jammu:J&K Academy of Art, Culture and LanguagesSrinagar/Jammu
30. Reiter R.M (2000). Linguistic politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A contrastive study of requests and apologies. John Benjamin.
31. Searle, J. (1969). Speech acts: Anessay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
32. Sheema. B. (2017). Indirectness of requesting in Pashto language. [M.Phil thesis, SBBU Sheringal],
33. Jami Mulla (2018) 'Sharh Mullah Jami'Maktabul Bushra,Karachi,Pakistan
34. Wang, Y. (2018). A Principled Understanding of Compliment Functions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
35. Watts, R. J.(1992). Linguistic politeness and politic verbal behavior: Reconsidering claims for universality. In R. J. Watts, S. Ide & K. Ehlich (Eds.), Politeness in language (pp. 43-69). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
36. Wolfson. N. (Ed.). (1989). The social dynamics of native and nonnative variation in complimenting behavior. NY: Plenum.