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Abstract

This work examines politeness expressions in Hausa request act, using politeness theory proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). Every society has certain norms and values which are considered as total way of life, and every individual has a face that needs to be protected when it comes to the issue of communicating. So, in contributing to an utterance, speakers need to consider such norms and values in order to be polite or impolite. Thus, speakers need to speak in a way that is appropriate to the societal norms and values. The aim here is to analyze how the politeness strategies work in Hausa when it comes to issue of request making. Data were collected during conversations among Hausa speakers at various settings. Three sociological variables of social distance, power status and ranking of imposition were used in the analysis (P, D and R) that exist between the interlocutors, using – and +. Findings show that the Hausa socio-cultural norms of politeness play a role in claims common ground between speaker and hearer, and also convey that speaker and hearer are cooperators in request act. The study concludes that while making request in Hausa, the people use a politeness strategy of common ground of speaker and hearer as cooperators that play a role according to the politeness of Hausa and it is for communication effectiveness in building and maintenance of their social relationship.

Introduction

Request act in Hausa is an expression or utterance that encodes the act of asking someone to perform certain action in favour of the speaker or the hearer. The act could be immediate or done at a later time. Request is an act that human beings do in everyday interaction with their fellow humans. In making such an act, we are conscious in the selection of appropriate words/sentences we use. Such selection is the employment of strategy which is considered to be politeness.

Linguistically, being polite is an attempt for the speakers to save their face or the face of who they are talking to (Holmes, 1995). Since language is the only means of communication by which human beings do communicate, studying it, is very crucial to understanding people’s values and world views which are tied up to their culture. During communication, establishing social relation between interlocutors is perhaps the first step to every communication. The purpose of every communication is the mutual intelligibility; that is, for the hearer to understand what the speaker wants to communicate. It is in view of this, that sociolinguists are interested in explaining why people speak differently in different contexts. For instance, Holmes (1992:1) posits that “examining the way people use language in different social context provides a wealth of information about the way language works as well as about the social relationships in community”. We should understand that, not all words are interpreted without considering the social context they appear, but other things are put into consideration, such as the sociological variables that exist between the interlocutors like social distance, power status and ranking of imposition. So, in communicating,some utterances are perceived to be an imposition which gives room for politeness to be employed. Such selection is the employment of strategy which is considered to be politeness.

The essence of politeness is communicating attention to other’s feelings and expectations about how individuals should be treated in an interaction. It includes behaving in a way that shows appropriate concern for the interlocutors’ social status and their social relationship. Politeness has generally been considered the proper concern of ‘pragmatics’, the area of linguistics that accounts for how we attribute meaning to utterances in context, or “meaning in interaction” (Thomas 1995:23).

In some societies and Hausa in particular, the people use different strategies in communication,to achieve what they want to achieve. The strategies used by Hausa people in communication resemble the western concept of politeness; though, they differ in some situations (Zailani, 2019). The paper is restricted to the politeness strategy in Hausa request acts that show common ground of Speaker and Hearer as cooperators (henceforth, S and H). Positivepoliteness as a politeness strategy is an expression, act, feeling, thought or idea that is a plus to a person, place, or thing,thatis said to be positive. It introduces an atmosphere of encouragement, praise and or reward to the addressee or recipient. It is always a mark of admiration displayed openly. This is a situation whereby H is made to realize that he is regarded as a friend, and an in-group member, a well-known and liked personality and also he has equal status as the S, and perhaps other members of that group or social environment they are with the S. The strategy is primarily based on how S approaches H, treating him/her as a friend, a person whose wants and personality traits are liked, and using friendly markers or stating optimism.

The study is limited to the request act using the concept of face (FTAs) by Brown and Levinson’s theory of politeness. Data used for this study were collected mainly from primary and secondary sources. Data were analyzed using three sociological variables the social distance (D) between S and H, the relative power (P) H has over the S and the ranking of imposition (R) of a request in Hausa culture.

Literature Review

Pragmatics

Pragmatics studies the use and understanding of language. It involves the process of expressing meaning by the speakers. Crystal and Varley (1993:54) are of the opinion that: pragmatics is the study of the factors that govern our choice of language (the sounds, construction, words) in social interaction, and the effects of our choice upon others. The subject includes the analysis of what it means to be appropriate and cooperative in our speaking behaviour, and it thus begins to explain what is involved when we use language to convey politeness, intimacy, playfulness, rudeness, awkwardness, and a range of other social attitudes.

Pragmatics can therefore be seen as a systematic way of explaining how language is used in context. It also seeks to explain aspects of meaning which cannot be found in the plain sense of words or structures (Thomas, 1983). In other words, pragmatics is the study of meaning in context. It also deals with particular utterances in particular situations and is especially concerned with various ways in which many social contexts can influence how language is used. According to the Webster’s New World Dictionary of the American Language, (1951), context means “the parts of a sentence, paragraph, discourse, etc, immediately next to or surrounding a specified word or passage and determining its exact meaning.” Following Goffman’s (1974) abstraction, Goodwin and Duranti, (1992) describe context as a “frame that surrounds the event being examined and provides sources for its appropriate interpretation.”

Yule (1996:3) states that pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker and interpreted by a listener.It’s a well known that, speakers and listeners usually use a strategy in order to convey the meaning well to one other. It also is in line with how good they can cooperate in their interaction. Politeness strategy is one common strategy that appears in communication.

Politeness

Politeness makes an important impression on how people interact. Observing politeness conventions is important when people communicate with each other to display deference and respect, to minimize imposition, and to save face. The study of politeness is interdisciplinary. Universally, it can be exercised in verbal or nonverbal manners. However, politeness conventions can differ from one language to another, as well as from one culture to another. Speakers may depend on the norms of their own culture, i.e. socio-culturally and individually created knowledge in the shape of ‘frames’ (House, 2012). Participants usually acquire the frames in early socialization through language used in a specific culture. When inappropriate frames are activated and used, pragmatic failure in communication may result. Linguistic Politeness (LP) has generally been considered the proper concern of ‘Pragmatics’, which is the area of linguistics that accounts for how we attribute meaning to utterances in context, or “meaning in interaction” (Thomas, 1995:23). With regards to this approach, politeness can be defined as the selection of specific linguistic alternatives, between a set of possible ways of saying something (Holmes, 2006). Thomas (1995) states that politeness refers to the respect we show to other people by virtue of their higher status, greater age, etc. Politeness is an important factor in developing effective relationships with people, and any misuse of these strategies can hinder the effective communication, leading to individuals` dissatisfaction and indifference.

Grundy (2008) sees, linguistic politeness as the exercise of language choice, to create a context intended to match the addressee’s notion on how he or she should be addressed. Schmidt (2010) says, linguistic politeness is an attempt to establish, maintain and save face during conversation, which is carried out in a speech community. Holmes (1992:297) asserts that, what is or is not considered polite in any community involves, assessing social relationship along dimensions of social distance and solidarity, and relative power or status. Being polite may also involve the dimensions of formality. The speaker is expressing respect towards the person to whom he talks and avoiding offending him. Hence, it is necessary to understand the social values of society to speak politely.

The Theory of politeness was originally developed and published by Brown and Levinson (henceforth B & L) in 1978 and 1987. This consists of two parts: a fundamental theory concerning the nature of politeness and how it functions in interaction. B & L introduce the notion of ‘face’ in order to illustrate politeness in the broad sense. That is to say, in an interaction or conversation, interlocutors have an interest in maintaining two types of ‘face wants’: ‘positive face wants’ and ‘negative face wants. Negative Face want is the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, and rights to non-distraction – i.e. freedom of action and freedom from imposition. On the other hand, Positive Face want is the consistency of self-image or personality (crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interlocutors (Brown and Levinson, 1987:61).

Common Ground and Face Saving Act

Common ground is a broad strategy of politeness that falls within the strategies of positive politeness. That is the ability to perform Face Threatening Act (FTA) onrecord, with redressive action by means ofpositive-politeness strategies. It is a strategy whereby speaker and hearer (S and H) shares specific wants, including goals and values with the H. Cooperation between S and H need to be considered too in avoiding misinterpretation, so the participants can achieve the goal of the communication. Using strategies of politeness properly can control ourselves when we communicate with others. Brown and Levinson (1978), politeness is basic to the production of social order and a precondition of human cooperation. Therefore, we must use appropriate strategies of politeness by considering the condition and with whom we speak in order to avoid misunderstanding. Itis supported by Olutayo (2015): Participants can cooperate with one another by respecting each other’s view and allowing interlocutors to take their turns in the conversation. Grice (1975) states, speakers intend to be cooperative in conversation. Similar toGumperz (1990) who said that to successfully conduct a conversation, participants must display a willingness and ability to collaborate. According to Grice (1975:45),the cooperative principle which consists of four maxims (maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relation and maxim of manner) are the suggested principles for the S and H to show their cooperation by giving appropriate contributions in their conversation. Using cooperative principle means that H has to assume about S’s intention by his self. Nevertheless, sometimes people cannot fulfill all the maxims and they seem to disobey them. Grice (cited in Cutting, 2003: 40) says that when speakers do not fulfill the maxims, the speaker is said to “violate” them. Violation is a condition where the speakers do not use the maxims in their utterances.

Face Saving Act (henceforth FSA) which Babatunde and Adedimeji (2008) describe as utterances and acts which avoid a potential threat to the other person’s face. In using this strategy, the S recognizes the public self-image of the responder. The S respects the responder and does not wish to trample on it. However, considering Brown and Levinson (1987) that point out that S should take notice of aspects of H’s condition (noticeable changes, remarkable possessions anything which looks as though H would want S to notice and approve of it). Consequently, in Hausa, S takes notice of respondent’s interests, wants, goods and anything that H looked like and wants requester to notice before he puts down his request. In so doing, S satisfies H’s positive face wants. This is to say that the people use this strategy in their social request act.

According to Goffman (2008:17),in order to save face, speakers tend to employ circumlocutions and deceptions, facing his replies with careful ambiguity so that others face is preserved. Talking about the use of politeness and cooperative principle in communication, it means language learners have to study about politeness and cooperative principle.

Theoretical Framework

In pragmatics, politeness is concerned with “…ways in which the relational function in linguistic action is expressed” (Kasper in Barron, 2003: 15). In other words, it concerns how language is employed in a strategic way to achieve such aims as supporting or maintaining interpersonal relationship. Nevertheless, politeness not only indicates a pragmatics concept but also signifies a lay concept and a sociolinguistic concept. The lay concept of politeness relates to an appropriate social behaviour and good respect of others. The etiquette book designed for different cultures is the one of its examples. In contrast, politeness as a sociolinguistic concept is concerned with obligatory signals of respect or familiarity, which derive from such characteristics as age, sex, family position and social position.

The Theoretical Framework of the research is face management view of politeness which center on Face Threatening Acts (FTAs). In communication, people often use unpleasant utterances named Face-Threatening Act (FTA) which are acts that by their nature go against the face wants of H; they are acts that threaten H's social image. When face-threats must occur, participants are expected to take appropriate actions to mitigate the threat.

The cross classification of FTAs are:

i. Those acts that threaten H's negative face ii. Those acts that threaten H's positive face, and iii. Those acts that threaten H’s face versus threats to S’s face (Brown and Levinson, 1987:65-67).

There are number of strategies that a speaker can use depending on the potential of risk that a certain verbal act has for the S’s face or the H’s face. They are:

1. Performing the FTA baldly on-record, without redressive action.
2. Performing the FTA on-record, with redressive action by means ofpositivepoliteness strategies.
3. Performing the FTA on-record, with redressive action by means ofnegative-politeness strategies. And
4. Performing the FTA off-record.

Presentation of Data

To avoid committing Face Threaten Act (FTA) while making request in Hausa, S may perform the on-record strategy with redressive action by means of positive politeness which claims common ground with H, and by means that conveys that S and H are cooperative in the act. That is to say, S do request using on-record plus redress to H’s wants (S wants H’s wants). The politeness strategy strengthens H's positive face through a number of strategies. What we do here is to show how Hausa people use their language in terms of politeness when it comes to the issue of committing FTA during a conversation.

The table below illustrates the use of the politeness strategies in request making in Hausa during a conversation:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Examp  le | Speaker (S)  Hausa | Glossary |  | Hearer (H)  Hausa | Glossary |
| 1 | Kai, kamarwaniango | You gorgeous | appear like a | Bin-Baz ne yaxinka. | It’s Bin-Baz |
|  | ka yikyau. Wane ne yayimakawannan xinki? | groom, who sew this? | |  | that sews it. |
| 2 | Ka san abin da nagani da naisawajen?  Komai a  warwatse, hularsa a can, wayarsa a nan, ankumayiwatsa-  watsa da kayayyakinsa da kecikinxakin. | Do you know what I saw when I arrived at the scene? Everything was scattered, his cap was there, and handset and all that was in the room were turned upside down. | | A’a ban saniba. | I do not know. |
| 3 | Abokinabuxeman iqofar can. | Open that door for me my friend? | | To, bari in buxemaka,  sannu da zuwa. | Ok, let me open it, you are welcome. |
| 4 | Shegeya aka yi ne? | Bros what is going on? | | Babu yanayi fa. | The situation is bad. |
| 5 | Ni ne nahaife ka, nakula da kai har ka  kawowannanmat  sayi da kakeciki, faxamanimatsala r da kedamun ka. | I gave birth to you and took care of you up to this level, so tell me your problem? | | Babu abin da  yakedamuna | There is no  any problem |
| 6 | Na san kana so ka yiamfani da motarka bayan  sallarazahar, zantafiyayanzu? | I knew you want to use your car after afternoon (zuhur) prayer, I will go with it know? | | To, shikenan a dawolafiya. | Ok, you can go now wish you safe return |
| 7 | Mu yimagana a kanwaniabu? | Do we talk on  something else | | To, shikenan. | Ok, we can. |
| 8 | Me zaihana ka dawogobe? | Why don’t you come back tomorrow? | | Shi kenansaigob en. | Ok, till tomorrow. |

Data Analysis

The politeness strategies are directed toward positive face in which one’s self image is evaluated by others through appreciation and approval to assure the person addressed to is liked and his ways of life approved of and that his wants are also accepted by S. The aim here is to analyze how the politeness strategies work in Hausa when it comes to issue of request making.

Below are the analyses of the collected data:

Common Ground with Hearer (H) in Request Act

The analyses below are of the collected data of examples 1-5 of politeness strategies that are found under the above heading.

Example 1

This is a conversation between two friends at a particular gathering, A is asking B and A is the S while B is the H. S is requesting for information from H on who sews his cloth.

The face-supporting devices in the example or rather the politeness marker, the clause kai, kamarwaniango ka yikyau satisfies H’s positive face wants. It also functions in politeness model, as a mitigating device for the coming requests which is expected to be an FTA as it encroaches on H’s autonomy to request which tailor sews H’s dress. This made the request to be polite because S might have used baldly on-record strategy without redressive action by saying wane ne yayimakaxinki? But S decided to use on-record with redressive action by means of positive politeness strategy. That is to say, S employs claim common ground with H. At the end of the conversation, S received the information he is desired to have from H by saying Bin-Baz yaxinka.

The sociological variables of P, D and R that exist between S and H are –D and +P while the R variable is high.

In Hausa, S can claim common ground with H by taking notice of H’s interest, wants or needs. It include anything which looks as though H would want S to notice and approve of it, as in the above example.

Example 2

This is a conversation between two friends Umar and Salisu, Umar is S while Salisu is the H. The conversation is on account of door break that led to stealing of valuable items in the H’s room. S put down the request while H is the requestor.

The face-supporting devices in the example or rather the politeness marker, the clause komai a warwatse, hularsa a can, wayarsa a nan, an kumayiwatsa-watsa da kayayyakinsa da kecikinxakin intensify interest to the H’s positive face wants. It also functions in politeness model, as a mitigating device for the coming requests which is expected to be an FTA as it encroaches onto H’s autonomy to request him in such manner. This made the request to be polite because S might have used baldly on-record strategy without redressive action by saying ka san abin da nagani da naisawajen? But S decided to use on-record with redressive action by means of claim common ground with H. At the end of the conversation, S received the information he is desired to have from H by saying a’a ban saniba.

The sociological variables of P, D and D that exist between S and H is –D and =P, while the R variable is low.

In Hausa, S can communicate to H by intensifying interest of his contributions to the dialogue that is taking place between them. This strategy can be achieved in Hausa by employing certain expressions that stress S’s good intention in the conversation. The request made by S is for the benefit of H as he intends to give information on what had happened and what he the S saw when he arrived at the scene vividly. S did not only make a request but he intensifies interest to the H which functions as politeness strategy.

Example 3

This is a conversation between an adult and a young boy he met when he visited a friend’s compound. S is the requester while H is the one requested to perform an action to open a door.

The face-supporting devices in the example or rather the politeness marker, the term abokina claim common ground with H’s positive face wants. It also functions in politeness model, as a mitigating device for the coming request which is expected to be an FTA as it violates H’s autonomy to request him in such manner. This made the request to be polite because S might have used baldly on-record strategy without redressive action by saying buxemaniqofar can. But S decided to use on-record strategy with redressive action by means of positive politeness strategy. That is to say, S used in-group identity marker the address form abokiwhich claims common ground. At the end of the conversation, S received the information he is desired to have from H by saying to bari in buxemaka, sannu da zuwa.

The sociological variable of D, P and R that exist between the interlocutors is +D and –P, the R variable is low.

In Hausa, this address forms are politeness strategies which claims common ground between the interlocutors. Using in-group kinds of address form abokina with imperatives to request for a door to be opened by the young boy indicates that S considers the relative P variable between himself and the addressee to be small, that is –P thus softening the imperative by indicating that it is not a power-backed request or command. Thus even when used to children or those with lower status compared with the S, it turns a command into a request.

Example 4

This is a conversation between two people who share and belong to a special language variety (LV) and they also belong to the same speech community (SC). S is the requester while H is the one requested to perform the act or the work.

The face-supporting devices in the example or rather the politeness marker, the term shege claim common ground with H’s positive face wants. It also functions in politeness model, as a mitigating device for the coming request which is expected to be an FTA as it violates onto the H’s autonomy to request him in such manner. This made the request to be polite because S might have used baldly on-record strategy without redressive action by saying ya aka yi ne? But S decided to use onrecord strategy with redressive action by means of politeness strategy. That is to say, S claims common ground with H. At the end of the conversation, S received the information he is desired to have from H by saying babu yanayi fa yau.

The sociological variables of D and P are equal, and the R variable is very low because it is a request for information. That is to say the sociological variables that exist between the interlocutors is –D and =P between the interlocutors in the example.

The expression shows that there is equal status between S and H and stresses the sense of in-group membership. It also gives clues on the interpersonal relationship that exists between S and H by using term, shege. And the term, shegeclaims common ground with H, by indicating that S and H both belong to some set of persons who share specific wants, including goals and values.

Example 5

This is a conversation between a father and his son. Son is the H while father is the S.

The face-supporting device in the example or rather the politeness marker, is the clause ni ne nahaife ka nakula da kai har ka kawowannanmatsayi da kakeciki which claims common ground with H’s positive face wants. It also functions in politeness model, as a mitigating device for the coming request which is expected to violate H’s autonomy to request him in such manner. Considering the words chosen for making the request, it shows that the request imposes on H and threatening his privacy. And considering the status of the S, S may decide to request using baldly on-record strategy without redress by saying faxamanimatsalan da kedamunka ‘tell me your problem’?But S decided to use onrecord strategy with redressive action by means by claiming common ground with H. At the end of the conversation, S received the information he is desired to have from H by saying babu waniabu da kedamuna.

The sociological variables of D, P and R that exist between S and H is –D and –P, the R variable is low.

In the example, S prefaces his speech with introductory talk, reminding the H that he gave birth to him and knew his childhood and how kind he was towards him. This is very significant and effective in Hausa culture, where children are socialized to pay deep respect to their parents, elders and the people who bring them up and to also those who took care of them. This technique pragmatically functions as a communication facilitator, giving H confidence that S is not trying to use the advantage from the request and curiosity is not a likely reason for issuing such request. But the undoubted desire from S to help H out of the difficulties or problems he is experiencing. Again in Hausa, there are certain instances where S presupposes to H on what is discussing in the conversation by talking for a while about unrelated topics before he puts in his request.

Speaker and Hearer are Cooperators in Request Act

In an instance where, S and H are cooperating, then they share goals in some domain, and thus to convey that they are cooperators and can serve to redress H’s positive face want. The analyses below are of the collected data of examples 6-8:

Example 6

This is a conversation between two brothers. The younger brother is the S while the H is the elder one.

The politeness marker, is the clause na san kana so ka yiamfani da motarka bayan sallarazaharwhich he used before he made the request of saying zantafiyanzu. ‘I will go with it know’ so, the cause of the FTA was reduced by presupposing the knowledge of the H’s want. It would be impolite if S employed bald-on record strategy without redressive action to request for what he had requested.

The expression conveys that S and H are cooperators and it also functions in politeness model, as a mitigating device for the coming requests which violates H’s autonomy to request him in such manner. But S decided to use on-record strategy with redressive action which conveys that S and H are cooperators. At the end of the conversation, S received the information he is desired to have from H by saying to shikenansai ka dawo.

The sociological variables of D, P and R that exist between the interlocutors is –D and –P. while for the R variable, its high since the request is for a material item. In Hausa, S normally asserts knowledge of H’s wants and willingness to fit one’s own wants in them in a conversation or request made.

Example 7

This is a conversation between two people, a bus driver and a passenger. Driver is the S while passenger is the H. The conversation started when the driver refused to obey traffic rule. As they quarreled over the issue S insisted that H was at fault.

The politeness marker, include both S and H mu which he used before he made the request of saying yimagana a kanwaniabu. So, the cause of the FTA was reduced by including both of the interlocutors. It would be impolite if S employed bald-on record strategy without redressive action to request for what he had requested by saying ka yimagana a kanwaniabu. As a form of politeness strategy, S cooled off tempers by saying mu yimagana a kanwaniabu ‘we talk on something’. Here, S reveals diverse interpersonal goals, manifested in the need to change the line of ongoing conversation and at the same time to avoid causing any harm to the H’s face. Therefore, instead of issuing a direct request for H to stop talking about the topic of conversation S takes special care to protect the H’s face, using the personal pronoun 2nd person plural mu ‘we’. S is polite by asking/requesting the H to move to another topic instead of terminating the entire conversation. This in turn gives S enough face immunity to perform the request without fear of any potential face threat in case H declines to cooperate. S decided to employ the politeness strategy which conveys that S and H are cooperators.

The sociological variables of D, P and R that exist between the interlocutors is –D and –P, for R variable it’s high.

In Hausa, S redresses a threat to H’s positive face by including both S and H in the activity, through the use of the pronoun. Pronouns show syntactic significant variation according to person, number and gender. By using an inclusive pronoun mu ‘we’, S called upon the cooperative assumptions and thereby redress FTAs. Therefore, pronoun mu ‘we’ is used to include S and H in the activity in request in Hausa. In addition, according to Hausa culture asking someone to stop talking or change the topic of the talk is taken as an indication that what has been said by S is not interesting to H, and it is a threat to the face. Therefore, to protect H’s face, S includes himself or herself in the activity by conveying that S and H are cooperators.

Example 8

This is a conversation between two friends Ado and Sani who went to see a girlfriend of one of them. In this example, Ado and Sani are friends Ado escorted Sani to see his girlfriend, Ladidi, on their arrival they were told that Ladidi went to the market. Then Ado (S) appealed to Sani (H) to come back the next day.

The politeness marker, is the reasoning me which he used before he made the request of saying ka dawogobe. This request demands reasoning for making the request me zaihana that if there are no good reasons why H shouldn’t or can’t cooperate with S’s demand he will. Similarly, for past actions, if H is asked to give reasons why he did or didn’t do something, and he has no good reasons, the FTA of criticizing may thereby be accomplished. Here, S decided to employ substrategy which take note, attend to the H’s needs which Conveys that S and H are cooperators.

The sociological variables of D, P and R that exist between S and H is –D and =P, while the R is low.

In Hausa, S gives reasons as a way of implying or assuming cooperation on what is needed from the H. Thus, indirect suggestions which demand rather than give reasons are a conventionalized politeness form. Data show that, politeness involves S making H to reason along his own opinion. Therefore, me zaihanais a form of appeal or reasoning in order to accept and act accordingly. So in Hausa, the people give or ask for reasoning in making request as a strategy.

Conclusion

The study concludes that while making request in Hausa, the people uses a politeness strategy of common ground of speaker and hearer as cooperators that play a role according to the politeness of Hausa and it is for communication effectiveness in building and maintenance of their social relationship. In short, data in examples 1-8 contained baldly on-record with redressive action of politeness strategy which claims common ground with H, and conveys that S and H are cooperators in making requests, data were analyzed by adopting Brown and Levinson (1987) theory. The strategies are found to be used by Hausa people in their requestivebehavior at various settings. The analyses demonstrates that FTAs as in Hausa involves the use of politeness strategies the strategies were considered as an efficient way of expressing polite requests in order not to lose face wants of the interlocutors.
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