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Abstract

The present study attempts to present the usage of different forms of directives in Chinese, whose meaning is attempts by the speaker to get the hearer to do something and when, how, and to whom it is appropriate to use these forms.

In the second chapter, we discuss basic concepts in directives, such as (direct) speech acts, indirect speech acts, felicity conditions, and some syntactic patterns of English and Chinese directives.

The first part of Chapter III is a review of Fraser and Nolen’s experiment on the associations of politeness and English linguistic forms. Its purpose is to point out that syntactic features of sentences have influences on politeness. The second part of this chapter is to examine, by experimental means, the association between Chinese linguistic forms and politeness. Our experiment shows that syntactic and lexical features both have some influence on politeness.

Chapter IV deals with Sadock’s tests for English directives and the counterparts of these tests in Chinese and some special Chinese particles used in directives, concentrating on the social meanings of these particles. In addition, reduplication as a way to enhance the force of directives is also discussed.

Chapter V compares the two languages in the framework developed in this study. It also discusses the implications of our findings, and some suggestions for teaching English and Chinese directives to second/foreign language learners are given at the end of the thesis.
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Chapter I

Introduction

The general direction of the present study is sociolinguistic rather than purely linguistic; that is, we are interested not only in linguistic forms and their distribution within sentences but also how these linguistic forms are used appropriately in context.

The importance of sociolinguistic study of language in language acquisition has been pointed out by Scarcella and Brunak (1981):

One of the most important tasks in acquiring a language is learning the rules and mechanisms which underlie appropriate uses…learning the appropriate forms of social usage of a language is just as important as learning the linguistic forms…communicative competence includes not only the linguistic forms of a language but also a knowledge of when, how and to whom it is appropriate to use these forms. (page 59)

Language is a product of social contact. This study is to present one of its basic functions, the once concerning how one gets another one to do things with words.

The purpose of this thesis is three-fold: first to explicate systematically how directives can be uttered; second, to look for the relationship between politeness and different types of directive sentences; third, to help learners of Mandarin as a foreign language use appropriate directive forms to the right persons at the right time.

In the second chapter, we will make clear what speech acts are, and why we adopt the definition of directives after Searle’s (1965), who divides speech acts into five types, directives being one of them. We will also go into some discussion of the basic concepts of direct indirect directives such as the felicity conditions of the direct directive and how they are related to the indirect directive. Since this study is a contrastive one, after a brief discussion on the basic concepts, we will make a preliminary contrast between English and Chinese directives.

In the third chapter, an experiment concerning the relevance of linguistic forms on the degree of politeness is reported. The task of the experiment is to determine whether native speakers do consistently associate a degree of deference relative to others in the set and to determine what linguistic factors might be involved in this difference. To the extent that our findings are valid, it would facilitate a great deal teaching Mandarin to English-speaking students. It would help them speak appropriately at the appropriate time, to the appropriate people because learning a foreign language is more than learning the linguistic forms. It is as important to learn
the sociolinguistic-interactional rules and principles which govern communicative competence.

Sadock (1974) gives three tests for what he calls true imperatives (syntactically imperatives and whimperatives) and one test for what he calls true questions. The three tests for true imperatives are: 1) please may follow imperatives, 2) the indefinite vocative someone may follow true imperatives, 3) true imperatives, but not true questions, may be conjoined with true imperatives. The test for true questions is that they may be preceded by tell me. In the fourth chapter, we will make a contrastive study of Chinese ching 請 versus English please; qaosu wo 告訴我 and chingwen 請問 versus tell me to see whether the Chinese translation of please and tell me can also be taken as tests for Chinese imperatives and true questions, respectively. For Sadock’s someone, we find its Chinese equivalents shemma ren 什麼人 and shei 誰.

On the basis of the tests given and some other considerations, Sadock opts for representing whimperatives semantically as a conjunction of an imperative and an interrogative hypersentence, i.e., as a conjunction of a sentence of imperative illocutionary force with a sentence which has the illocutionary force of an informational question. The two conjoined sentences are said to be partially identical. This solution is more or less AD HOC and does not provide an account of which questions can convey requests and commands and which cannot. (Heringer, 1976: 31; the emphasis is in the original)

Second, in many cases Mandarin uses zero conjunction to conjoin two sentences; for example, Shemma? Ni show shemma? 什麼？你說什麼？What？What did you say? Furthermore, when a person wants another to do things, he usually utters one directive at a time. We, therefore, have reasons to doubt whether this test is applicable to Chinese at all.

In the last chapter we summarize and deal with the application of what has been stated from chapter I to chapter IV; e.g., the implication of our study.

Finally an explanation of the terms Mandarin and Chinese is in order. The Mandarin discussed in this thesis is not the same as the Peiping dialect, which has generally been recognized as the standard language of China. Rather, it is Mandarin as it is used in Taiwan, especially that variety which has been used since 1949 when the central government moved to Taiwan. Mandarin in Taiwan is very complicated as it has been influenced by people from all over China—both “Mainlanders” and native Taiwanese people.
The Mandarin of elder mainlanders is inevitably greatly influenced by the
dialects from different regions, and the Mandarin of elder Taiwanese people is
inevitably influenced by Taiwanese and Japanese, whose people occupied Taiwan for
half a century until 1945 and Taiwanese people were educated in the Japanese
language during those years. Both varieties have very strong different dialectal
accents, and some different areas of vocabulary. Those who were born in Taiwan after
1948 or 1949, have been educated in Taiwan. They speak a common language called
Gwoyú 国語 (a language which is also called Mandarin in its derived sense). It is
this variety that we are interested in describing. In other words, what we are going to
describe in this thesis is the Mandarin that is spoken in Taiwan by those aged from 18
to 33. This restriction is necessary in view of the great diversity of Mandarin, as we
have pointed out. The subjects we chose in our experiments are from the group of this
age category. However, we believe that what we have described will also be
applicable to Mandarin in its broadest sense, except for some very small divergency;
however, we leave the final question open, since we cannot do a large-scale empirical
study of all Chinese speakers (it is either impractical or politically impossible).

In our study, Chinese and Mandarin are used interchangeably. Yale Romanization
as well as Chinese characters are both used in this thesis whenever we present
Chinese examples.

Notes of Chapter I

1 This observation was originally due to Prof. Tsao Feng-fu (personal
communication), and I am of the same opinion.
Chapter II

Fundamental Concepts of Directives

2.1 What are Speech Acts?

According to Austin (1962), linguistic acts fall into three categories, which he called ‘elocutionary,’ ‘perlocutionary,’ and ‘illocutionary’ acts. Locutionary acts are acts that are performed in order to communicate; their study is the domain of fields like phonetics, phonology, syntax and linguistic semantics. Perlocutionary acts are the by-products of acts of communication, acts performed by means of saying something, moving someone to anger, consoling someone in his distress, etc. Illocutionary acts, more commonly known as speech acts, are acts performed in saying something: making a statement or promise, issuing a command or request, asking a question, Christening a ship, etc. An utterance of this form, whose highest clause typically has a first-person subject, a simple present indicative active verb that conveys they intended force of the utterance and whose surface form is declarative and affirmative, is called an explicit performativ, or sometimes just a per formative.

One difference between illocutionary acts and perlocutionary acts is that while the former are directly involved in the act of producing an utterance, the latter are less central to the act (Austin, 1962). This is evidenced by the fact that, while a given utterance under normal circumstances must be the performance of one and only one illocutionary act, the same utterance may under normal circumstances be the performance of several perlocutionary acts or perhaps none.

If the addressee to whom (1) is directed takes it as an informational question while the speaker intended it as a request for action, the addressee has misunderstood.

(1) Do you want to open the door?

However, the utterance of (1) may inspire, persuade, frighten, etc., the addressee or may have several of these effects on him, independent of whether the speaker intended to produce any of these effects in the hearer.

How can an illocutionary act performed by the speaker using it be distinguished from the possible perlocutionary acts associated with the utterance? It should be answered by referring to the circumstances surrounding the utterance. For example, our utterance, “Shut the door,” has the illocutionary force of a directive, if we intend to command someone to shut the door. However, in the context of this article, “Shut the door” has no such force since we are not commanding you, the readers, to do
anything. The illocutionary force on the addressee is entirely determined by the speaker and is distinct from the perlocutionary effect. For example, our telling someone to “Shut the door” has the illocutionary force of a directive on the person regardless of whether the perlocutionary effect is compliance, refusal, anger, or incomprehension.

We conclude that the illocutionary force is determined by the speaker, and the perlocutionary act is the act functioning on the addressee; that is, the addressee’s understanding, feeling and behaviors about the illocutionary act. Coulthard (1977: 18-19) is of the same opinion.

2.2 Classification of Speech Acts According to Their Functions

Austin (1962) analyzes speech acts into five types: (1) BEHABITIVE: the adopting of an attitude—apologize, postulate, affirm, concede; (3) VERDICTIVE: an exercise of judgment—acquit, grade, estimate, diagnose; (4) EXERCITIVE: an assertion of influencing or exercising of power—appoint, order, advise, warn; and (5) COMMISSIVE: an assuming of an obligation or declaring of an intention—promise, guarantee, bet, oppose.

Fraser (1975) distinguishes illocutionary acts into eight types: (1) ACTS OF ASSERTING: the speaker’s assessment of how the proposition expressed fits into the conversation, and the speaker’s strength of conviction in the truth of the proposition expressed—admit, agree, refuse, say, suggest; (2) ACTS OF EVALUATION: the speaker’s assessment of the truth of the proposition expressed, and the basis for this judgment—conclude, find, judge, postulate, speculate; (3) ACTS OF REFLECTING SPEAKER ATTITUDE: the speaker’s assessment of the appropriateness of the state of affairs resulting from some prior act expressed by the proposition—agree, apologize, approve of, sympathize, thank; (4) ACTS OF STIPULATING: the speaker’s desire for the acceptance of the naming convention expressed by the proposition—classify, describe, dub, specify, term; (5) ACTS OF REQUESTING: the speaker’s desire for the hearer to bring about the state of affairs expressed in the proposition—ask, command, forbid, order, request, solicit; (6) ACTS OF SUGGESTING: the speaker’s desire for the hearer to consider the merits of the action expressed in the proposition—advise, caution, propose, suggest, warn; (7) ACTS OF EXERCISING AUTHORITY: the speaker’s proposal to create a new state of affairs by exercising certain rights or powers—allow, authorize, excuse, permit, reject; and (8) ACTS OF COMMITING: the speaker’s proposal to place himself under an obligation to bring about the state of affairs expressed in the proposition—accept, give one’s word, guarantee, promise, volunteer.
Searle (1976) divides speech acts into five basic types: (1) ASSERTIVES, whose point is to commit the speaker to something’s being the case, to the truth of the expressed proposition—boast, complain, conclude, deduce, describe, call, classify, identify; (2) DIRECTIVES, whose point is that they are attempts by the speaker to get the hearer to do something—ask, order, command, request, beg, plead, pray, entreat, invite, permit, advise; (3) COMMISSIVES, whose point is to commit the speaker to some future course of action—promise, pledge, vow; (4) EXPRESSIVES, whose illocutionary point is to express the psychological state of the speaker—thank, congratulate, apologize, condole, deplore, welcome; and (5) DECLARATIONS, whose point is to bring about a change of status of the object referred to solely by successfully performing the declaration—declare, bequeath, appoint, excommunicate.

The kind of speech acts we are going to discuss in this thesis is what Searle called DIRECTIVE. We did not choose Fraser’s and Austin’s classifications for the following reason. Both of their classifications are not clear-cut. Take Fraser’s example first, suggest can fall into his ACTS OF ASSERTING, ACTS OF SUGGESTING; command and order can be the ACTS OF EXERCISING AUTHORITY, but they are not included in it. If we want to use his classification, out of eight categories, our directives could fall into four categories: acts of asserting, acts of requesting, acts of suggesting, and acts of exercising authority. The classifications Fraser listed are not classifications of illocutionary acts but of English illocutionary verbs. There is a persistent confusion between illocutionary acts and illocutionary verbs and a great deal of overlap from one category to another.

Then, we take Austin’s example: some of what we call directives are in Austin’s category of executives such as ordering, advising; for our request, it can also be categorized in executives which are the (speaker’s) exercising of influence (on the hearer); but Austin did not list it under this category. Furthermore, Austin listed many other verbs under this category. Searle (1976) states that a taxonomy by Austin is defective, especially in its lack of clear criteria for distinguishing one kind of illocutionary force from another, though Austin’s five categories exhibit different syntactical properties, there is no clear or consistent principle or set of principles on the basis of which Fraser’s and Austin’s taxonomies are constructed.

On the other hand, Searle’s classification is really based on principles of illocutionary act: the illocutionary purpose of request is the same as that of a command: both are attempts to get hearers to do something. The illocutionary point of requests and promises is to get the world to match the words, but the point of a promise is to commit the speaker to doing something, the point of a request is to try to get the hearer to do something.
2.3 Speech Acts versus Indirect Speech Acts

The simplest cases of meaning are those in which the speaker utters a sentence and means exactly and literally what he says. In such cases the speaker intends to produce a certain illocutionary effect in the hearer, and he intends to produce this effect by getting the hearer to recognize his intention in virtue of the hearer’s knowledge of the rules that govern the utterance of the sentence. (Searle, 1975: 59)

In the preceding quotation Searle explains clearly what he calls ‘speech acts’ (or ‘direct speech acts’ as in contrast with ‘indirect speech acts’).

The essence of an indirect speech act, as Searle (1975) has pointed out, is that the speaker’s utterance meaning and the sentence meaning come apart in various ways. One important class of such cases is that in which the speaker utters a sentence, means what he says, but also means something more. For example, a speaker may utter the sentence I want you to do it by way of requesting the hearer to do something. In such a case a sentence that contains the illocutionary force indicator for one kind of illocutionary act can be uttered to perform, in addition, another type of illocutionary act; that is syntactically the sentence is a kind of representative illocutionary act which is normally used to express a proposition that can be either true or false of the speaker’s intention for the hearer to do something, but semantically it is a kind of directive illocutionary act. There are also cases in which the speaker utters a sentence and means what he says, and in addition, he means the utterance to be taken yet another illocutionary force. For example, a speaker may utter the sentence Can you reach the salt? And mean it not merely as a question but as a request to pass the salt. So indirect speech acts are cases in which one illocutionary act is performed indirectly by way of performing another. (Searle, 1975: 59-60)

How is it possible for hearer to understand the indirect speech act when the sentence he hears and understands means something else? The reason Searle (1975) provided is that the speaker and the hearer rely on their mutually shared background information both linguistic and non-linguistic, together with the general powers of rationality and inference on the part of the hearer. To be more specific, the apparatus necessary to explain the indirect part of indirect speech acts includes a theory of speech acts, certain general principles of cooperative conversation, and mutually shared factual background information of the speaker and the hearer, together with an ability on the part of the hearer to make influences (Searle, 1975).

The phenomenon that a sentence means what it is and something more is almost conventionally used. For a sentence like Can you reach the salt? or I would
appreciate it if you would get off my foot, it takes something ingenuity to imagine a situation in which their utterances would not be requests (Searle, 1975).

Searle (1975) gives an example of an indirect speech act that Y: I have to study for an exam is a rejection of the proposal X; Let’s go to the movies tonight. He gives ten steps for the X to derive the real meaning of rejecting the proposal from the literal meaning. The ten steps are based on general principles of cooperative conversation, and mutually shared factual background information of the speaker and the hearer, and most importantly, the ability on the part of the hearer to make inferences. But Searle (1975) himself claimed that

Unless a hearer has some inferential strategy for finding out when primary illocutionary points differ from literal illocutionary points, he has no way of understanding indirect illocutionary acts. (Searle, 1975: 63)

But Y’s reply still does not necessarily constitute a rejection of the proposal, because this conversational implicature can be cancelled explicitly by adding a clause: I have to study for an exam, but let’s go to the movies anyhow or I have to study for an exam, but I’ll do it when we get home from the movies.

We conclude that though many sentences conventionally mean what they are and something more, there are also many sentences which ‘non-conventionally’ mean more than their literal meanings.

Searle’s definition of indirect speech acts includes those sentences both conventionally and conversationally used in the performance of one speech act from another. Our definition of indirect speech acts, however, includes only those type of sentences that could quite standardly be used to perform illocutionary force of another type of sentences. For example, I want you to leave the room is a declarative sentence whose usual function is to declare a thing which has happened or is about to happen, but it has the conventional illocutionary force of getting the hearer to do the thing stated in the statement. Our indirect speech act do not include those things which conversationally implicated by the context of the sentences and factual background information. For example, to account for the fact that It’s cold in here can convey a request to close a door; it can also convey a request to open a door, or to bring a blanket, or to turn on the heater. The interpretation of the utterance is based on factual background information. This kind of speech act is included in Searle’s definition of indirect speech acts, but not in ours.

Our surface structure of English directives may contain a verb of saying, subject and indirect object pronouns, and various predicates including modals and verbs such as allow and like, in addition to what one might call the ‘core’ of the directive. The additional elements other than the core do not contribute in any obvious way to the meaning of the sentence, though they provide some additional features not shared by
corresponding direct directives. The surface form of English indirect directives may also be syntactically marked with, for example, the inverted word order characteristic question, which the actual illocutionary force might be that of a request, as the sentence Would you move your car? Indirect speech acts are very much like corresponding direct speech acts having the same meaning, or subset of the same meaning, and they are unique and unlike grammatically/semantically related speech acts (Davison, 1975), such as Would he never go? Which has only literal meaning of a question.

The surface structure of Chinese indirect speech acts of directives, like its English counterparts, may also contain a verb of saying, subject and indirect object pronouns, and various predicates including modals and verbs such as syiwang 希望 ‘hope’, and bisyw 必須 ‘must’, and the core of the speech act of a directive. The additional elements other than the core do not contribute in any obvious way to the pragmatic meaning of the sentence, though they provide some additional features not shared by the corresponding direct directives. For example, Wo gausu ni, ni bisyu ban-jya 我告訴你 ‘you must搬家’ ‘I tell you, you must move out of the house.’ the part of wo gausu ni 我告訴你 (‘I tell you’) contains a verb of saying, subject wo 我 ‘I’ and indirect object pronoun ni 你 ‘you’, bisyu 必須 ‘must’ is a modal; both parts do not contribute to the meaning of the core of the sentence ban-jya 搬家 ‘Move out of the house.’ Unlike its English counterpart, the surface form of Chinese indirect directives does not have the inverted word order characteristic of English question. Instead, Chinese has modal-not-modal such as keyi bu-keyi 可以不可以, neng bu-neng 能不能 inserted between the second-person subject and the imperative to form an indirect directive whose illocutionary point is very much like corresponding direct speech acts of imperative. For example, Ni neng bu-neng ba men dakai? 你能不能把門打開? ‘You modal-not-modal open the door?’ Ni keyi bu-keyi ba men dakai? 你可以不可以把門打開? ‘You modal-not-modal open the door?’ are indirect directives, whose propositional content is the same as the corresponding direct speech acts of Ba men dakai 把門打開 ‘Open the door’.

2.4 Classification of Directives

Directives in its largest sense are that kind of speech acts by which the speaker attempts to get the hearer to do something. It includes three types which we will discuss in this thesis: order, request, and suggestion.

As far as form is concerned, our classification of directives will be based on surface forms of sentences such as declaratives, interrogatives, and imperatives.

An interrogative directive is similar to the ‘whimperative’, a term dubbed by
Sadock (1970) for an imperative having a question form and a modal. In this thesis, we will use interrogative directives interchangeably with whimperatives. A declarative directive is a sentence which uses a statement, but has the force of asking the addressee to do the thing stated in the statement. For example: Wo yau nib a men guan-shang. 我要你把門關上。‘I want you to close the door’, and Ni bisyu ba men gwan shang. 你必須把門關上 ‘You must close the door.’

The explicit performative sentences, such as Wo Jyanyi ni chugwo lyousyue 我建議你出國留學 ‘I suggest that you study abroad’, Wo jyau ni chuchyu 我叫你出去 ‘I order you to go out’, and (Wo) ching ni lai (我)請你來 ‘(I) ask you to come’, are classified as direct directives, which again can be divided into two sub-types: implicit direct directives and explicit direct directives. Examples for the former type: Ba men gwan-shang 把門關上 ‘Close the door’, Gwo lai 過來 ‘Come here’; those for the latter kind: Wo jyau nib a men gwan shang 我叫你把門關上, ‘I order you to close the door,’ wo jyanyi ni jintyan-de gungdzwo jintyan dzwo wan 我建議你今天的工作今天作完 ‘I suggest you finish today’s work within the day’. Jyau 叫 ‘order’, ching 請 ‘ask politely’, and jyanyi 建議 ‘suggest’ are explicit directivelillocutionary verbs of order, request, and suggestion, respectively. Since the implicit direct directive is primary in the sentence that the other can be related to it in some general way, it is also called ‘primary directive’.

Indirect directives include interrogative directives and declarative directives: examples for the interrogative type: Ni neng bu-neng ba men gwan-shang? 你能不能把門關上 ‘You modal-not-modal close the door?’ Ba men gwan-shang, hau ma? 把門關上，好嗎 ‘Close the door, modal-question particle?’ Examples for the declarative type: Ni yinggai ba men gwan-shang 你應該把門關上 ‘You should close the door,’ Mafan nib a men gwan-shang 麻煩你把門關上 ‘Trouble you to close the door’. The reasons why they are called indirect directives are that in these utterances the speaker means what he says and also means something more and mafan 麻煩 is not a performative verb of saying. Searle (1975) claims that I want you to do it is incidentally meant as a statement, but it is also meant primarily as a request; i.e., a request made by way of making a statement. An interrogative directive is different from a general interrogative in that it resembles the corresponding primary directive with the same illocutionary force, rather than what the surface structure of a general interrogative taken in its literal meaning. For example, can you open the door? is a standard way of indirectly making a request, though it has its literal meaning of asking the hearer’s ability.

A cooperative response to an imperative or a whimperative is the following (Green, 1975):
1. Compliance (with or without verbal sign of acquiescence);
2. Promise of compliance at the definite time (e.g., yes, I will, in about 10 minutes or Sure, but not until I finish my pipe);
3. Announcement of intention not to comply.

An uncooperative addressee can block up a whimperative by treating it as a question, such an interpretation is a result of refusal to cooperate rather than misunderstanding (Davison, 1975).

Likewise, in Chinese a response to a directive is cooperative if a hearer responds to an imperative or a whimperative is one of the following three ways:

1. compliance (with or without verbal sign of acquiescence);
2. promise of compliance at a definite time (e.g., Hau, deng wo bas yin sye hau 好，等我把信寫好 ‘Yes, but wait till I finish the letter’, or Hau, deng yi-sya 好，等一下 ‘Yes, I will, in a moment’);
3. announcement of intention not to comply.

Treating a whimperative as a question in Chinese is also interpreted as a result of refusal to cooperate rather than misunderstanding. Using a whimperative is equivalent to saying something like: “Do R now, or tell me whether or not you’ll do R, and if so, when (and if not, why not).”

According to Searle (1975), in directives, politeness is the chief motivation for indirectness. He emphasized that politeness is the most prominent motivation for indirectness in requests, and certain forms naturally tends to become the conventionally polite ways of making indirect requests. For example: would you, could you forms are conventional polite ways of making requests. In most cases Searle is bright in saying it, but there are situations that whimperatives are no more polite than their imperative correspondences when the propositional contents in the imperatives are by their nature rude. (2) and (3) are English and Chinese examples of this kind respectively:

(2) Shut up, would you?

(3) Keyi bu-keyi bichi ni-de gou-dzwei?

可以不可以閉起你的狗嘴？

‘Modal-nod-modal close your—dog’s mouth?’

Of course, politeness or lack of it is not specifically a feature of requests but rather a general phenomenon which needs not even be verbal. As Heringer (1976: 8)
points out, if you request a person to do something that you believe he would object to doing, you are simply not being polite even though you use polite phrasing. A polite condition on requests is that the speaker believes his addressee would not object to doing what he is being asked to do. This condition is in conformity with Lakoff’s (1973) first rule of politeness. Lakoff’s (1973) rules of politeness are as follows:

1. Don’t impose
2. Give options
3. Make the hearer feel good—be friendly. Like R. Lakoff herself, we believe the rules of politeness to be universal, especially on the second item of giving options to the hearer.

2.5 Felicity Conditions

If the illocutionary force of a sentence takes effect, the utterance is said to be happy or felicitous. The factors that determine whether a particular illocutionary act succeeds or not are termed felicity conditions. If it goes away for some reasons, it is called unhappy or infelicitous.

Searle (1975) listed the following felicity conditions (rules) on directive illocutionary acts:

1. Preparatory condition: H (hearer) is able to perform A (action).
2. Sincerity condition: S (Speaker) wants H to do A.
3. Propositional content condition: S predicates a future act A of H.
4. Essential condition: counts as an attempt by S to get H to do A.

Heringer (1976) states that for every illocutionary act there is a relatively small set of necessary conditions on the intentions, beliefs, desires, and external circumstances of the speaker and addressee who are performing the illocutionary act, that is a set of conditions on the speaker’s and addressee’s set and setting. These conditions are called felicity conditions.

Heringer points out that Searle is probably wrong in saying that all felicity conditions are conventional. He is of the opinion that they are natural. For example, the condition that a speaker requesting something to be done must intend for that thing to be done is naturalistic rather than conventionalistic. We will not pursue the topic of whether they are regarded as conventional or natural, as it is not of great concern to the general points we are going to make in our thesis.

Heringer did not state that his felicity conditions are different from Searle’s. He
also did not make clear what external circumstances are. We believe that Searle’s four conditions are roughly equal to Heringer’s intentions, beliefs, and desires. But Heringer’s contribution is in pointing out the relevance of external circumstances.

In discussing Chinese directives, we will adopt Searle’s four conditions in addition to Heringer’s external circumstances. We are of the opinion that felicity conditions are universal.

Felicity conditions do not only have the function of allowing us to distinguish between the different possible illocutionary forces of an utterance. Their main function is to characterize felicitous illocutionary acts and thereby indicate the various ways that illocutionary acts can go wrong. The necessity for this derives from the fact that the illocutionary force of an utterance, unlike the proposition expressed by an utterance, is not strictly speaking true or false (Heringer, 1976). For example, a speaker utters Mafan nib a men gwan-shang 麻煩你把門關上 ‘Trouble you to close the door,’ when the hearer is a baby of ten months old. The utterance violates the preparatory condition. Likewise, when it is uttered when the speaker does not have the desire for the hearer to close the door, it is insincerely uttered and it is odd. Likewise, a mother cannot say to her son: “Kwai hwei-jya chyu 快回家去 (‘Go home now!’)” unless her son is not at home. Neither can one say, “Open the door,” unless the door is closed. It is self-evident that when a speaker utters a directive, it must predicate a future act A of the hearer H.

Gordon and Lakoff (1971) show that one can convey a request (in English) by (1) asserting a speaker-based sincerity condition (on that request) or (2) questioning a hearer-based sincerity condition (on that request). This is based on the fact that all sentences in (4) are possible requests (the examples are Gordon and Lakoff’s), and that there exist sincerity conditions on requesting expressible as follows: “if a sincerely requests of b that b do R, then a wants b to do R, a assumes that b can do R, a assumes b would be willing to do R, and a assumes that b will not do R in the absence of the request.”

(4) a. I want you to take out the garbage.
   b. Can you take out the garbage?
   c. Would you be willing to take out the garbage?
   d. Will you take out the garbage?

Besides the preceding ways of conveying indirect request, English uses subjunctive mood to avoid directness. For example, I should therefore be grateful if you could give serious consideration to the possibility of increasing my salary.
In Chinese, there are many conventionally fixed formulae of polite request, which are
different from English idiomatic forms for indirect speech acts. In Chinese, one can convey an indirect speech act of request by four ways as shown in (5) (these four types will be further elucidated in Section 2.7):

(5) a. Wo syiwang ni jintyan-de gungdzwo jintyan dzwo wan.
我希望你今天的工作，今天作完。
‘I hope you will finish today’s work within the day.’
b. (Wo) keyi bu-keyi mafan ni bang wow ye fung tweijyan-syin?
(我)可以不可以麻煩你幫我寫封推薦信？
‘May I bother you to write a recommendation letter?’
c. Ni neng bu-neng ba men gwan-shang?
你能不能把門關上？
‘Can you close the door?’
d. Ni yinggai ba men gwan-shang.
你應該把門關上。
‘You should close the door.’
2.6 English Directives

For a speaker to get the hearer to do something, the most direct way is by the use of imperatives. In uttering an imperative sentence, the speaker is prescribing with his sentence some future course of action for the addressee. It may be an order, a permission, a demand, a request, an entreaty, a suggestion, a recommendation, or a warning (Austin, 1962: 76-77)

In English, an imperative differs from a statement in that:

1. it usually has no subject,
2. it has an imperative finite verb (the base form of the verb, without inflectional endings for number or tense).

Imperatives are apt to sound abrupt unless toned down by markers of politeness such as please: Please eat up your dinner; Shut the door, please. Even with this addition the imperative only achieves a minimum degree of ceremony; a more tactful form of request can only be arrived at if one changes the imperative into a question or a statement: Will you shut the door, please? I wonder if you would kindly shut the door; I wonder whether you would mind shutting the door; etc. (Quirk et al. 1972).

There is, however, a type of command in which the subject you is often retained:

(6) You be quiet;
(7) You mind your own business, and leave this to me.

These commands are usually admonitory and frequently express strong irritation. As much, they cannot naturally be combined with markers of politeness, such as please: *Please, you be quiet! Therefore the following four utterances are in a hierarchical order of politeness:

(8) Please be quiet.
(9) Be quiet, please.
(10) Be quiet!
(11) You be quiet! 6

The principal effect of a request is to bring the addressee to the awareness that some action is desired of him, but there are numerous ways in which this can be accomplished other than uttering an imperative sentence or an explicitly performative request. When a speaker is uttering an imperative sentence or an explicitly
performative request, he is speaking literally; that is, that what he means does not deviate from the meaning of the sentence he utters.

Sentence (12), however, has, as a consequence of its successful performance, the same principal effect as an explicit request.

(12) I want you to bury the turtle.

Besides that a statement can be uttered to indicate that the speaker wishes to impose his will upon the addressee, the question-form sentences can also be used to get an addressee to do something.

(13) Why do you paint your house purple?
(14) Why paint your house purple?

(13) can be used either as a request for information or as a sort of weak negative suggestion, (14) has only the latter use. (Sadock, 1974: 115.)

(15) Can you close the window?

(15) is a hearer-based (in Gordon and Lakoff’s (1971) sense) interrogative question which conveys a polite request. It is similar to the meaning of (16):

(16) I request that you close the window.

2.7 Chinese Directives

In Chinese, the most direct way for a speaker to get the hearer to do something is also by the used of imperatives. However, the deletion of the second person subject ni you, nimen 你们 does not occur as frequently in Chinese as you in English does. And of course, it cannot have an imperative finite verb in a Chinese imperative, since Chinese verbs do not have inflectional changes. Sentence (17), (18) and (19) are imperatives. By contrast, sentences (20) and (21), which contain the sentence—final or verb-final particle le, are statements.

(17) Ni gwo-lai. 你過來
 ‘You come here.’
(18) Gwo-lai. 過來
 ‘Come here.’
(19) Nimen dou gwo-lai.

‘All of you come here.’

(20) Ta chrle wu-wan fan.

‘He ate five bowls of rice.’

(21) Ta pau-le. 他跑了

‘He ran away.’

Unlike English, Chinese imperatives, no matter with or without ni 你/ni men 你 們, can be preceded by Ching 請, a marker of politeness: compare (22) and (24) with (23):

(22) Ching ni gwo-lai. 請你過來

‘Please you come here.’

(23) Ching gwo-lai. 請過來

‘Please come here.’

(24) Ching nimen dou gwo-lai. 請你們都過來

‘Please you all come here.’

When comparing (17), (18), (19) with (22), (23), (24), we find the latter group of sentences is more deferential than the former, because of the use of ching 請. While if we compare either (17) with (18), or (22) with (23), no conclusive result exists: some native speakers say (17) and (22) are more deferential than (18) and (23), respectively; some say (18) and (23) are more deferential than (17) and (22), respectively; while others say (17) and (18) are of the same degree of deference, and so are (22) and (23). However, our experiment in Chapter III shows that Ni ba men gwan-shang 你把門關上 ‘Close the door’. (cf. 3.2)

Though (22), (23), and (24) show more deference to the hearer than (17), (18), and (19), the former only achieves a minimum degree of ceremony; they are not polite enough to be used by a student in addressing his teacher, nor are they deferential enough to be used by a child in talking to his parent. Now if we maintain that the crucial difference between an order and a request is that a request leaves to the addressee the option of refusal to comply with the mand7, whereas an order does not, then these two groups of sentences are orders.

To express an order explicitly, we may insert wo jyau ni 我叫你 ‘I order you’, wo show 我說 ‘I say’ before the imperative. But this kind of explicit performative sentence is never uttered in a discourse initial position. Wo jyau ni 我叫你 ‘I order
you’ is only used when the hearer is not willing to obey or when he did not hear clearly, the speaker, to reiterate what was said, may say wo jyau ni chuchyu ‘I order you to go out’, Wo jyau nib a men gwan-shang 我叫你把門開上 ‘I order you to close the door’; therefore wo-jyau-ni 我叫你 sentences are generally considered very rude and impolite (cf. 3.2). If an order of imperative form is preceded by wo jyau ni 我叫你, then ching 請 cannot occur in the same sentence. But when a sentence is preceded by wo show 我說 ‘I say’, ching 請 can occur in the same sentence:

(25) *Wo jyau ni ching (ni) ba men gwan-shang.

*I order you please (you) close the door.’

(26) Wo show (ching) ba men gwan-shang.

‘I say, (please) close the door.’

A speaker can also utter an order in a declarative form; (27), (28), and (29) are examples:

(27) Ni yinggai ba men gwan-shang.

‘You should close the door.’

(28) Ni bisyu ba men gwan-shang.

‘You have to close the door.’

(29) Wo yau nib a men gwan-shang.

‘I want you to close the door.’

An imperative form of order can be made stronger by adding gei wo 給我 ‘for me’ before it:

Such as (30c), (31c), and (32c). When gei-wo 給我 sentences are again preceded by ching 請, as in (30d), (31d), and (32d), the ching 請 in this case can show more deference and politeness, but it can also have an ironical effect to show increasing irritation on the part of the speaker.

(30) a. (Ni) gwo-lai. (你)過來

‘(You) come here.’

b. Ching (ni) gwo-lai. 請(你)過來
An imperative form of order can be softened by adding sentence-final particle ba 吧, such as:

(33) a. (Ni) gwo-lai ba. (你)來吧
   ‘(You) come here BA.’
 b. Ching (ni) gwo-lai ba. 請(你)來吧
   ‘Please (you) come here BA.’
 c. ?(Ni) gei wo gwo-lai ba. ?(你)給我來吧
   ?‘(You) for me come here BA.’
 d. ?Ching (ni) gei wo gwo-lai ba.
   ?請(你)給我來吧
The sentences in (33), (34) and (35) are much more deferential than those in (30), (31) and (32). The ba-sentences are either request, which gives the addressee an option to refuse in a non-interrogative way as its surface form is still an imperative, or as suggestions which are understood as being made at least partially for the addressee's benefit. The c. and d. sentences of (33), (34) and (35) are strong orders, it is, therefore, questionable whether they can be softened by adding the sentence final particle ba as indicated by a question marked before c. and d. sentences of (33), (34), and (35).

In English Why not stop here is a polite negative suggestion, while its Chinese translation Wei-shemma bu dzai jer thing? 為什麼不在這兒停 is more a request for information than a suggestion. And when it is used to convey a negative directive, it usually shows that the speaker is not happy with the addressee’s act or decision. It is, thus, more a reprimand than a polite suggestion.

In addition to the principle Gordon and Lakoff (1971) provide for (English) indirect directives (as shown on p. 33), Chinese has an embedded directive, embedded in a higher interrogative sentence for a speaker to utter a request for permission of the
addressee that the speaker humbly wants to bother or trouble the addressee to do something. Therefore, we provide here a principle for conveying indirect request in Chinese: if S sincerely requests of H that H do A, then (1) S wants H to do A, (2) S asks H’s permission to ask that H do A, (3) S assumes H can do A, (4) S assumes that H will not do A in the absence of the request.

Our principle for conveying Chinese indirect request is different from Gordon and Lakoff’s in that S asks H’s permission to ask that H do A. This is formed by adding a higher subject Wo 我 ‘I’ which is understood but usually omitted in the surface structure, a higher predicate which is either chint 請 ‘ask politely’ or mafan 麻煩 ‘trouble’, and an appropriate modal to the imperative. (36) is the linguistic form for conveying this kind of indirect directive:

(36)a. 

(36)b. 

Examples for the four ways of forming indirect directives have been shown in (5) on page 35. These four ways are further exemplified here in (37) (since the second way of a speaker asking H’s permission to ask that H do A is complicated, we give four examples (b1-b4) to explicate it):

(37) a. Wo syiwang ni jingyan-de gungdzwo jingyan dzwo wan.

'I hope you finish today’s work within the day.'

b1. Keyi bu-keyi mafan ni bang wow ye fung tweijyan-syin?

'May I bother you to write a recommendation letter?'

b2. Keyi ching nib a men gwan-shang ma?

'May I ask you to close the door?'

b3. Mafan ni dakai chwanghu, hau ma?

'May I bother you to open the windows?’

b4. Ching ni chuchyu, sying bu-sying?

'May I ask you to go out?'
c. Ni ning bu-neng ba men gwan-shang?
   你能不能把門關上？
   ‘Can you close the door?’

d. Ni yinggai ba men gwan-shang.
   你應該把門關上
   ‘You should close the door.’
1 In fact as Anderson (1971:3) points out, the restriction to first person is far from absolute; for example, the sentence The court boggles at permitting counsel to go on with such a sideshow is rather common, and whatever one may say about the first person force of such utterances, they are unexceptionally third person in their syntactic behavior. The affirmative restriction, is again somewhat unclear; for example, I do not agree to keep quiet about your eating all the tortillas, the act of not agreeing in this sentence is just as definite an act as would be the corresponding affirmative sentence.

2 For details of principles that Searle provides for his classification see Searle (1976).

3 For the details of the ten steps, read Searle, 1975: 61-64.

4 We follow Chao’s term ‘modal’ to refer to the auxiliary verb put before an action verb in expressing an interrogative directive and the tag element following a directive. For example, Ni keyi bu-keyi ba men gwan-shang? is often glossed as ‘You modal-not-modal close the door?’ and Ba men gwan-shang, hau ma? ‘Close the door, modal-question particle’.

5 For Searle, verbs denoting members of directives are ask, order, command, request, beg, plead, pray, entreat and also invite, permit, and advise. We roughly put order and command in the order category; ask, request, beg, plead, entreat in the request category; and invite, advise in the suggestion category. Permit is either in the order category or in the request category depending upon the context in which it is used. We don’t think that pray belongs to the directive illocutionary act. Fotion (1981) is of the same opinion.

6 Sometimes there will be a confusion easily made between a command with you as subject, and a statement with you as subject as used, for example, in giving street directions: You go up there until you reach the bridge then you turn to right. It is the unstressed subject of the statement that distinguishes it formally from the command, since the subject of a command is always stressed, even if a pronoun: ‘You go up there. Needless to say, the admonitory tone of the command would be quite unsuitable in giving street directions. (Quirk et al. 1972).

7 “Mand”, coined by Skinner, was used to refer to commands, demands, requests, entreaties, etc., and is used here in the same sense.

8 It is literal translation to gloss Ni gei wo gwo-lai as ‘You for me come here.’ The Chinese sentences with gei wo 给我 are very strong commands (despite their English glosses).

9 The elements in the two sets of square brackets must co-occur; and the upper
element in the first set of square brackets co-occurs with the upper element in the second set of square brackets, and the lower element with the lower element in the two sets of square brackets.
Chapter III

Experiments with Directives

As we pointed out in Chapter I, the sociolinguistic study of language is concerned with the appropriateness of utterances. As far as directives are concerned, one of the basic considerations in appropriateness is politeness. To be polite is to use an expression that properly reflects the relationship between the speaker and the hearer. To request reflects the speaker is of equal status with or is of inferior status to the hearer, while the order reflects that the speaker is of high status. Thus, it is nothing impolite for a parent to order a child to eat up his dinner quickly; but if a child says to his parent “Eat up your dinner quickly,” he violates the rules of the relationship and is viewed by the third person, if not by his parent, as impolite or uncultivated.

Politeness, as Fraser and Nolen (1981) point out, has the following characteristics: (1) it is a property associated with a voluntary action; (2) no sentence is inherently polite or impolite; (3) whether or not an utterance is heard as being polite is totally in the ears of the hearer, and (4) politeness is a continuum, not a dichotomous notion.

Politeness and deference are associated with an activity or with an utterance and not with a sentence, per se. Deference and politeness are often used interchangeably. Deference, however, is not the same as politeness, since deference is the conveying of relative status, but the inappropriate use of deference can result in an impolite utterance.

3.1 Review of Fraser and Nolen’s Experiment

Fraser and Nolen (1981) made an experiment on “how deference was associated with linguistic form.” Their task was to determine if native speakers would systematically associate a degree of deference relative to others in the set, and to determine what linguistic factors might create this difference in relative deference.

The instrument they used was 25 English sentences which reflect frequently used requesting forms. Each sentence had ‘you’ as the subject, and contained no vocative such as ‘hey’, no preliminary expressions such as ‘excuse me’ nor any politeness markers such as ‘please’. The sentences were short and without modifiers. In addition, the verb in each sentence was ‘do’ to avoid any unexpected associations with a specific predicate.

Fraser and Nolen developed a paired-comparison computer program to make an efficient determination. Subjects were 40 college students from the Boston area. They
generated some 3,000 pairs of requesting sentences using a random number generator program and provided each subject with between 45 and 50 pairs, 10 to a page with the following instruction:

We are engaged in research to determine how people use language. We are asking you to assist us by taking a few minutes to make some judgments on a set of English sentences.

On the attached pages are printed sentence pairs such as the following:

Sit down.
I would appreciate it very much if you would sit down.

Each sentence of a pair could be used to make a request of the listener. However, one sentence of the pair usually implies a greater degree of deference—respect for the hearer—than does the other one. In the example above the second sentence is the more deferential.

For each of the pairs of sentences, please write a check ‘√’ in front of the sentence which implies the greater deference. For the above case, you would have placed the check before the ‘I’ of the second sentence.

Since there is no information provided about a context in which the sentence might be spoken, or how the speaker may be using intonation or stress to convey certain attitudes, please try to consider just the sentences themselves. The length of a sentence should not be relevant to your decision.

Finally, there are no right or wrong answers. Take your initial judgment for each pair, and, when in doubt, check the one that ‘seems’ more deferential. Please make sure to place a check for each pair.

Thank you very much for your assistance. If you should want to know more about our research, please give your name to the person collecting these sheets, and we will send you the information.

They received some 2,000 judged pairs from the 40 subjects. The results are summarized in Table 1 (the highest is the most deferential and the whole table is in a hierarchical order of deference).

Three clear results emerged from their experiment. Using the 8 sentences in Table 2 as examples, we can present their findings as follow:

A conditional sentence was judged more deferential than the corresponding indicative one: (1/2; 3/7; 4/6; 5/8).

An interrogative sentence form was judged more deferential than the corresponding imperative + tag form: (1/4; 2/6; 3/5; 7/8).

A sentence with the positive modal was judged to be more deferential than the
corresponding one with the negative modal: (1/3; 2/7; 4/5; 6/8).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I’d appreciate it if you’d do that.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Will you do that?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Would you do that?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Could you do that?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How about doing that?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Would you mind doing that?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Why don’t you do that?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Can you do that?</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Won’t you do that?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I suggest that you do that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Couldn’t you do that?</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do that, could you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I would like you to do that.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do that, wouldn’t you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Shouldn’t you do that?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Do that, won’t you?</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. That need to be done.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Do that, will you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I must ask you to do that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Don’t you have to do that?</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Do that, couldn’t you?</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Can’t you do that?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Do that, can’t you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Do that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. You have to do that.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1 on the following page shows a very clear view of the hierarchical ordering of deference in association with linguistic form.

3.2 Experiment on Chinese Directives

The objective of our investigation on the association of politeness and deference with linguistic form is to develop an understanding of what contributes to the relative politeness or deference of an utterance. Of course the way in which the speaker talks—for example, the tone of voice, intonation, and speed—can all play a role in determining how deferential an utterance is perceived. This research focused on the contribution of the sentence itself. We selected a set of sentences which could be used to perform the same speech act but these sentences differ from one another in various ways. The task was to determine if native speakers would systematically associate a degree of deference and politeness relative to others in the set and, if so, to determine then what linguistic factors might be creating this difference in relative deference and politeness.

3.2.1 Method
We selected the act of directive and 30 Chinese sentences which reflect frequently used directive forms. The 30 sentences are listed in Table 3 and they have already been arranged in the order of decreasing deference according to the results of the experiment.

Our Chinese sentences are similar to English sentences which Fraser and Nolen (1981) selected in their experiment in the following ways: they are short and without modifiers, containing no vocatives such as ‘hey’—in Chinese ‘wei’—and no addresses such as ‘syau pengyou 小朋友’ (‘little friend’), ‘syansheng 先生’ (‘Mr.’), nor were names such as ‘Jang syauhwa 張小華’ ‘Li syaumei 李小美’ included. In addition, we also did not have preliminary expressions such as ‘dweibuchi 對不起’ (‘excuse me’).

Our sentences are different from theirs in some aspects: we did not avoid using the politeness marker ‘ching 請’ because Chinese ‘ching 請’ can function as a performative verb such as: (Wo) Neng bu-neng ching nib a men gwan-shang(我)能不能請你把門關上 ‘May I ask you to close the door?’ and we wanted to know whether or not ‘ching 請’ was not necessarily a politeness marker in strong order sentences Gei wo ba men gwan-shang 給我把門關上 ‘For me, close the door,’ Ching gei wo ba men gwan shang 請給我把門關上 ‘Please, for me, close the door.’ (Fortunately our experiment shows the positive answer; sentences (23) and (29).) Another big difference; we hesitated to use the verb ‘dzwo 做’ (‘do’) and the object ‘najyan shr 那件事’ (‘that; that thing’) to avoid any unexpected associations with a specific predicate as Fraser and Nolen did, because pronouns in Chinese are not frequently used. So we selected ba men gwan-shang 把門關上 ‘Close the door’, which we believe is neutral and common.

Though this thesis is a contrastive study, we did not translate the 25 requesting sentences into Chinese to make an unnatural sentence-to-sentence comparison. To prepare for the experiment, we first listed all possible directive sentence forms and there were some 50 sentence forms, among which we chose 30 which were to facilitate our analysis of sentence forms in relation to degrees of politeness and deference and which were judged to be more frequently used than those not selected.

We postulated that each of the 30 sentences possesses a varying but unknown degree of deference and politeness. One way of ordering these directives is to place them along points on a hypothesized psychological continuum which has the attribute, deference and politeness, and a referent. The law of comportive judgment (Thurstone, 1927) provides a rationale for this ordering by assuming: (a) for each directive there is some modal discriminant process on a psychological continuum; (b) that the distribution of all discriminant processes aroused by each directive is normal about the modal discriminant process. Discriminant process is a concept that refers to the reaction.
of an individual when asked to make a judgement of the amount of deference and politeness associated with one of the directives. What we wish to do is scale the values of the modal discriminable process of each directive with respect to the dispersion (variance) of their discriminable processes.

To efficiently determine the deference and politeness continuum, we developed a very simple way: 30 cards were designed with one sentence on each. We asked our 50 subjects to arrange the 30 cards in order of deference and politeness—from the most polite and deferential to the least—which they consider to be and gave the card which was considered the least polite and deferential a score of ‘1’, and the most polite and deferential ‘30’—thus we had 50 scores for each card.

Then we summed up the 50 scores on each card and the card which got the highest average was supposed to be the most polite and deferential sentence form of directive as judged by the subjects, and the one received the lowest average, the least polite and deferential. So we had 30 sentences in a hierarchical order (together with standard deviation (SD)) as shown in Table 3 on pages 68 and 69.

The experiment was made on Dec. 23rd, 1981. The subjects were 50 native Chinese speakers: 25 males, 25 females, all born in Taiwan, aged from 18 to 32, registered native provinces distributed to all parts of China (both so-called ‘mainlanders’ and ‘Taiwanese’), some 30 college students and the others are teachers at the Maindarin Training Center, instructors and administrative staffers of National Taiwan Normal University. An individual test was taken with the following instruction:

您好：

我們正在從事一項研究，調查「一個人如何叫另外一個人做一件事」。當然，叫人做事的方式很多，有命令、請求及建議等等。現在我們想耽誤您幾分鐘，將下列三十張卡片由「最有禮貌」或「最客氣」，排列到「最沒有禮貌」或「最不客氣」的。例如，給您下面二張卡片：

坐下。

請坐下。

您認為「請坐下」較有禮貌，就請您把「請坐下」卡片，排在「坐下」卡片的上面。

因為說話語氣的不同，往往影響禮貌和客氣的程度，因此請你不要考慮語氣，只就句子本身做判斷。而且這些問題也都沒有對與不對的答案，請你儘量憑著「第一眼的直覺」排列，碰到不太能決定放在那裏的卡片時，可以放在您認為「大概可以」的地方。請您務必把這些卡片都排進去。謝謝您的合作。如果您想知道我們研究的結果，請留下您的通訊處，調查有了結果，我們會寄給您。
3.2.2 Results and Discussion

given the scoring system adopted in this research, there is no fixed way of interpreting the results. Of course, if one item gets 24.8, and another 2.4, they reflected a meaningful difference on the assumption that the entire records provide a meaningful results. However, when two items are closely scored, say one item 22.1, another 22.0 any interpretation must be relatively subjective. Thus, like Fraser and Nolen (1981), we present a rather subjective analysis of the results, one that is in harmony with the ranking and with our intuitions about sentences.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Neng bu-neng mafa ni ba men gwan-shang?</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Mafan nib a men gwan-shang, hau ma?</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ching nib a men gwan-shang, hau ma?</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Rugwo wo ching nib a men gwan-shang, hwei bu-hwei tai mafan ni?</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Ching nib a men gwan-shang, hau bu-hau?</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Mafan nib a men gwan-shang.</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Mafan ba men gwan-shang.</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Ni ba men gwan-shang, hau ma?</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Ching nib a men gwan-shang.</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Ching ba men gwan-shang.</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Chingwen ni neng bu-neng ba men gwan-shang?</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Ni keyi bu-keyi ba men gwan-shang?</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Ni ba men gwan-shang ba.</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Ba men gwan-shang ba.</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Wo jyanyi nib a men gwan-shang.</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Ni ba men gwan-shang, sying bu-sying?</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Ching gei wo ba men gwan-shang.</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Ni yinggai ba men gwan-shang.</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Ni ba men gwan-shang.</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The scores in Table 3 appear to confirm nicely our first hypothesis, namely, that native speakers of Chinese were able to make consistent judgments about the relative degree of deference and politeness associated with a sentence used to make a directive. Given this result, we quickly move to the next question: Are there linguistic features of the sentences which determine the relative deference or politeness of the sentence? The answer appears to be affirmative, too, though this study only gave the indirect proof:

First, the more deferential sentences are likely to have the interrogative rather than the declarative or imperative syntactic form. This should not be surprising since an interrogative indicates that the speaker is conceding to the addressee the option of refusal. Asking ‘Ni neng bu-neng ba men gwan-shang 你能不能把門關上’ ‘Can you close the door?’ (18) is at least apparently inquiring about the hearer’s ability and apparently giving the hearer a chance to decide for himself whether he can or cannot and whether he wants or needs to take the implied request as the intended interpretation of the sentence. Such indirectness on the part of the speaker is surely giving certain options to the hearer than an imperative form such as (26) ‘Ba men gwan-shang 把門關上’ ‘Close the door,’ or (24) a declarative form ‘Ni yinggai ba men gwan-shang 你應該把門關上’ ‘You should close the door.’ denies. And such options would seem to enhance the status of the addressee, which is the essence of deference. This linguistic feature of showing deference is similar to the one formed by Fraser and Nolen (1981) for English request forms. (For other pairs involved here, see p. 73.)

According to Fraser and Nolen (1981), the second feature in the determination of degree of deference associated with a directive is the use of subjunctive conditional forms; that is the more deferential a sentence is, the more likely it is to have a conditional form rather than an indicative one. Since the Chinese language lacks the subjunctive form, we evidently cannot have a feature like this. However, in Chinese it seems that the more deferential the sentence is, the more likely it is to have the imperative embedded is a higher sentence seeking permission. For example, (1) Neng bu-neng mafan nib a men gwan-shang 能不能麻煩你把門關上 ‘May I bother you to close the door?’ the interrogative form is literally asking a permission of the hearer to allow the speaker to ask a question of the hearer and thus apparently giving the hearer
a chance to decide for himself whether he will give the permission and, then, whether
he wants to take the implied request as the intended interpretation of the sentence.
While (18) Ni neng bu-neng ba men gwan-shang 你能不能把門關上 ‘Can you close
the door?’ lacks the tentativeness on the part of the speaker to ask for permission. In
uttering both sentences, (1) and (18), the speaker knows the hearer has the ability to
close the door, sentence (1) is more indirect to ask the hearer to perform an action.
Sentence (1) can be interpreted as ‘Am I allowed to ask you a question? If so, I ask you,
“Can you close the door?” and if your answer is positive, then “Please close the
door.” While (18) can be interpreted as ‘Are you able to close the door? If your
answer is positive, please close the door.’ (For other pairs involved, see p.73.)

A third feature which stands out in our experiment involves the presence of
Modal-not-Modal markers in tags. They generally were ranked lower than their
affirmative counterpart Modal-ma forms. For example, ‘Mafan nib a men gwan-shang,
hau ma? 麻煩你把門關上，好嗎？‘Trouble you to close the door, OK?’ (3), we can
say that imperative + positive tag was ranked higher than imperative + neutral tag.
(For other pairs involved, see p.75)

Let us now take 20 sentences out of the original list of 30 and examine then
more closely. These sentences, listed in Table 4, fall into three types:
embedding-mafan type, embedding-ching type, and non-embedding type.

There are five clear results which emerge from considering these 20 sentences:
whenever the left group of sentences differs in only one way from the right group:
(the mark '>' is read as ‘is/are more deferential or polite than’)

1. An interrogative sentence form was judged more deferential and polite than
the corresponding imperative form: (1. 2. 3. 4. > 8. 10.; 5. 6. 7. 9. > 12. 13. ;
11. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. > 19. 20.).
2. An embedding sentence form was judged more deferential and polite than the
corresponding non-embedding form; (2. 5. > 11.; 3. 7. > 14.; 4. 9. >15.; 1. 6. >
16.; 8. 12.> 19.; 10. 13. >20.).
3. Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Neng bu-neng mafan ni ba men gwan-shang?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mafan nib a men gwan-shang, hau ma?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Keyi bu-keyi mafa nib a men gwan-shang?</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ching nib a men gwan-shang, hau ma?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ching nib a men gwan-shang, hau bu-hau?</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mafan nib a men gwan-shang.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Keyi bu-keyi ching nib a men gwan-shang?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mafan ba men gwan-shang.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ni ba men gwan-shang, hau ma?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ching nib a men gwan-shang.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ching ba men gwan-shang.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ni ba men gwan-shang.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ni keyi bu-keyi ba men gwan-shang?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ni neng bu-neng ba men gwan-shang?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ni ba men gwan-shang, sying ma?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ni ba men gwan-shang, sying bu-sying?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Ni ba men gwan-shang.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ba men gwan-shang.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. An interrogative formed by an imperative request + Modal-ma tag was judged more deferential and polite than the corresponding one by an imperative request + Modal-not-Modan tag: (2. > 3.; 5. > 7.; 11. > 14.; 17. >18.).

5. An embedding-mafan sentence was judged more deferential and polite than the corresponding embedding-ching one: (1. > 6.; 2. >5.; 3.>7.; 4.>9.; 8.>12.; 10.>13.).

6. An imperative request with ni was judged more deferential and polite than the corresponding form without ni: (8.>10.; 12.>13.; 19.>20.).

At first, we predicted that (7) Rugwo wo ching nib a men gwan-shang, hwei bu-hwei tai mafan ni? 如果你請你把門關上，會不會太麻煩你？ ‘If I ask you to close the door, will it cause too much trouble on you?’ should be ranked as most deferential, because it contains both ching 請 ‘ask politely’ and mafan 麻煩 ‘trouble and also in the interrogative form, and we may say it is conditional by nature. From what has about English directives, we would expect this expression to be regarded as the most polite. Our expectation, however, was not confirmed. Among our 50 subjects, only 15 chose it to be the most polite and deferential, and the sentence has the highest SD which shows that our subjects were much divided in judging its degree of politeness and deference. It was ranked seventh, below all interrogative mafan-sentences. One explanation is that it is too polite to happen in a real discourse. Once it is uttered, most people would think the speaker wants to alienate the addressee, thus they will not think it is the most polite and deferential request. If we should change Ba men gwan-shang 把門關上 ‘Close the door’ to Sye fung twei jyan-syin 寫封推薦信 ‘Write a recommendation letter’, perhaps most people would
consider it the most polite and deferential. (We will leave it to the later study.)

We believe that different verbs will result in different conclusions: for example, if
the request is to write a recommendation letter, we cannot have an order type of
sentences, if the letter is for the benefit of the speaker. In this case, it cannot have a
suggestion type of sentences, either.

Before we make a large-scale experiment with most verbs possible to occur in
directives, our conclusions can only be tentative. Our conclusions, however, will at
least furnish a sound basis for further studies.
Notes to Chapter III

1 In order to see whether or not the use of different primary directives would result in different conclusions, we made an informal experiment on eight Chinese sentences with 11 subjects, the results are presented in the following Table:

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Wo syiwang ni jintyan-de gung-dzwo jintyan dzwo wan.</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Jintyan-de gung-dzwo jintyan dzwo wan ba.</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Wo jyanyi ni jintyan-de gung-dzwo jintyan dzwo wan.</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Jintyan-de gung-dzwo jintyan dzwo wan.</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Jintyan-de gung-dzwo ni yinggai jintyan dzwo wan.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Jintyan-de gung-dzwo ni bisyu jintyan dzwo wan.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Wo yau ni jintyan-de gung-dzwo jintyan dzwo wan.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Wo jyau ni jinytan-de gung-dzwo jintyan dzwo wan.</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Wo syiwang ni ba men gwan-shang.</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ba men gwan-sahgn ba.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Wo jyanyi nib a men gwan-shang.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ba men gwan-sahgn.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ni yinggai ba men gwan-shang.</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ni bisyu ba men gwan-shang.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Wo yau nib a men gwan-shang.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Wo jyau nib a men gwan-shang.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 is derived from Table 3, the ranking of these sentences are in agreement with that in Table 5, except that the ranking of sentence patterns of 4. and 5. (We inadvertently omitted the sentence “Wo syiwang nib a men gwan-shang 我希望你把門關上” from the initial group of 30 sentences. However, when we were making the informal experiment on the eight sentences in Table 5 with the 11 subjects, we also asked them to arrange the 8 sentences in Table 6, and the experiment showed that Wo syiwang nib a men gwan-shang was ranked higher than Ba men gwan-shang ba. And the other 6 sentences were ranked in the same order as they were in the group of 30 sentences. Thus we feel confident in entering this omitted sentence into the data though without any scaled value. Because we think the experiment of 50 subjects was
more objective than the one with 11 subjects, we choose to present table 6 according to the ranking order of Table 3.)

2 It is indirectly cited from Fraser and Nolen (1981). So far I could not find the direct deference.

3. The use of cards instead of paired comparisons had the following benefits: first, it took subjects less time to do the test; second, it saved a lot of time and money to copy 435 possible comparison pairs and then Xeroxed to distribute to 50 subjects; third, it saved from many unnecessary troubles to arrange 30 cards at a time instead of comparing many pairs which every native speaker would think the answers very apparent. And the use of cards had its advantage over listing the 30 sentences in a sheet for subjects to judge and give the scores for their judgments; one card can hide another card, otherwise the subject would be mixed up by so many similar sentences. To make sure the subjects had a bird’s-eye view of all the sentences in the set, they were asked to put all cards on the table and read them before arranging them and after they had arranged the 30 cards, again they were asked to read it over and make sure they thought the arrangement was really in the politeness order.

4. The English translation for the instruction is below:

How are you?
We are engaged in a research, investigating “how a person asks another person to do a thing.” Of course, there are many ways to ask people to do things, for example, command, request, suggestion, etc. Now we want to trouble you for a few minutes to arrange the 30 cards in order from the most polite or the most deferential to the least polite or the least deferential. For example: Give you the following two cards:

Sit down.
Please sit down.
If you think ‘Please sit down’ is more polite, put the card of ‘Please sit down’ on the top of that of ‘Sit down’.
Since the different moods (intonation, or loudness) in uttering a directive have great influence on the degree of politeness and deference, please don’t reckon with the moods, just judge the sentences by the linguistic forms.
There are no right or wrong answers. Take your initial judgment in arranging them and, when in doubt, put the card at the place where you think it ‘seems’ OK. Please make sure to arrange all the 30 cards.
Thank you very much for your assistance. If you should want to know the
results of our research, please give us your name and address, and we will send you the information.
In this chapter, we discuss Sadock’s tests for directives and their counterparts in Chinese. Besides, some special Chinese particles used in directives are examined one by one and to the extent possible are contrasted with their counterparts in English.

4.1 Please versus Ching 請

The original meaning of please in Middle English is ‘to be smooth.’ It can be either a transitive verb or an intransitive one. When it is used as a polite addition to requests, commands, etc., it means ‘if you would be so kind or obliging’; for example, Please come here (Stein, 1967). Stein classified please as a transitive verb. Murray (1909) took please as an intransitive verb. When it was used with an imperative or optative, it was originally short for ‘please you’, ‘may it (or let it) please you’. But it is now usually taken as ‘be pleased’, or as short for ‘if you please’.

To cite Murray’s paragraphs in A New English Dictionary: on Historical Principles (p. 985):

When parenthetical, or without construction please is equivalent to may it please you, if it please you, if you please: e.g. Please, may I go out? May I come in, please? Come here, please; Give me my hat, please; Please, sir, did you call? Shall I ring the bell? Yes, please. Will you, please, take a message for me?

But when followed by an infinitive, it is equivalent to ‘be pleased’: e.g. Please to excuse my keeping you waiting; Please to return the book soon; Please not to close it.

Now please has lost its archaic form to be followed by an infinitive. Modern linguists such as Quirk et al. (1972) and Sadock (1974), take it as an adverb.

Quirk et al. (1972) states that please is an adverb that cannot be modified by very. It is a marker of courtesy and can appear both in imperatives and in questions that constitute a request. In imperative sentences, please may appear in sentence initial, medial, or final position. For example:

(1) Please leave the room.
(2) Ask him please what he wants.
(3) Open the door please.

With non-imperative sentences, it appears before the verb or in final position. For example:

(4) will you please leave the room?
(5) Will you leave the room please?

Sadock (1974) states that *please* in English has a very complicated range of uses. He discusses two *please*’s: sentences adverb *please* and free-standing *please*. Sentence adverb *please* provides a test for true imperatives (including whimperatives); it may follow true imperatives, but cannot follow true questions.

Gordon and Lakoff (1971) mention that Sadock has noticed that the word *please* has a different distribution in final position than in initial position:

In initial position, *please* goes with any sentence that conversationally conveys a request in the given context, regardless of the superficial grammatical forms of the sentence.
In final position, *please* goes with any sentence whose logical structure conveys a direct request and which conversationally conveys a request in the given context. (Gordon and Lakoff, 1971)

Sadock (1974) observes that free-standing *please* is a request all by itself. It is usually up to the addressee to figure out exactly what is being asked of him. However, it is usually a request to stop doing something (roughly speaking), to undo something that has just been done. Sentence (6), for example,

(6) Please! It’s cold in here.

might be a request to close a window that has just been opened, to turn up the heater (which has just been turned down), or to cease ripping off the speaker’s clothing. The Chinese equivalent for *please* is roughly *ching* 請. However, its range of use is different from English *please*:

First, *ching* 請 can be explicit performative verb. Grammatically, it is an incomplete transitive verb which requires an object complement, (7), (8), and (9) show *ching* 請 in this use.
(7) Wo ching ni yanjyang.
我請你演講
‘I politely ask you to make a speech.’
(8) Wo ching ni chrfan. 我請你吃飯
‘I treat you with a meal.’
(9) Wo ching ni dau wo jya chyu.
我請你到我家去
‘I politely ask you to go to my home.’

If the objective complement can be optionally omitted, it must be the object’s eating something. Therefore the objective complements in (7) and (9) are obligatory, while that of sentence (8) is optional and it can also be substituted by ke 客 ‘guest’, so we may say (10):

(10) Wo ching ni (ke). 我請你(客)
‘I treat you.’

In colloquial Mandarin, if a speaker wants to make a request of the addressee, usually he simply says ching + objective complement, or he may also say ching ni + objective complement, but he seldom says wo ching ni + objective complement. Sentence patterns of (11) and (12) are very productive in requests;

(11) Ching ba men gwan-shang. 請把門關上
‘Ching ba door close.’
(12) Ching nib a men gwan-shang. 請你把門關上
‘Ching you ba door close.’
(13) *Wo ching nib a men gwan-shang.
*我請你把門關上
*‘I ching you ba door close.’
(14) Wo ching nib a men gwan-shang, keyi ma?
我請你把門關上，可以嗎？
‘I ching you ba door close, keyi ma?’
(15) Wo keyi bu-keyi ching nib a men gwan-shang?
我可以不可以請你把門關上？
‘I keyi not-keyi ching you ba door close?’

Sentence (13) is odd as a request. But if (13) is followed by a tag as in (14) or used in a question as in (15), it can be used to convey an indirect request. (14) and (15)
are, therefore, whimperatives. Sentence (13) can be grammatical if taken as a reprimand by a speaker who wanted the addressee to close the door, but the addressee did not do as he requested. For this reason, it can never appear in the beginning of a discourse.

Second, Chinese also has a free-standing ching 請 and as is the case in English, it is also a request by itself. It is also up to the addressee to figure out what is being asked of him. But unlike English free-standing please, ching 請 is a positive request and it is also quite polite. For example, a college student and his teacher are both on the bus; they are to get off at the same bus stop. The college student may say: Ching 請! Nin ching 您請, Nin syan ching 您先請, or Laushr, ching 老師,請, accompanied by appropriate gestures which means ‘Please get off the bus first.’ In a situation of a hostess’s treating her guests with a meal, she may say ‘Ching 請!’ when she invites them to eat.

Third, ching 請, unlike English please which may be initial, medial, or final, usually procedes a verb. There are three possible relative positions for ching 請 and second-person subject ni 你, nin 您, or nimen 你們: 1) ching procedes ni 你, nin 您, or nimen 你們; 2) ching follows ni 你, nin 您, or nimen 你們; 3) ni 你, nin 您, or nimen 你們 is omitted, leaving ching alone to procede a verb. For example,

(16) Nin/ni ching sya-che. 您/你請下車
‘You CHING get off the bus.’

(17) Ching nin/ni sya-che. 請您/你下車
‘CHING you get off the bus.’

(18) Ching sya-che. 請下車
‘CHING get off the bus.’

The most common position of ching 請 is before the subject of a directive ni 你, nin 您, or nimen 你們 (nimen is seldom used here, instead we use daiya 大家 or gewei 各位). Since ching 請 can be placed after ni 你, nin 您; nimen 你們, it appears that ching at least in this case (such as (17), (18)), is not an incomplete transitive verb. It appears to be a functional marker of a request, very much like please in English, even though it is not as free as please yet. Ching 請 never occurs in a sentence final position; it occurs usually in the sentence initial position, and sometimes in the sentence medial position.

Chungbyan Gwoyu Tsrdyan 重編國語辭典(1981) classifies ching 請 as an adverb when it functions as a polite marker adding to a request; e.g., ching rang yi-rang 請讓一讓 ‘Please move over a little’; ching dakai chwanghu 請打開窗戶 ‘Please open the windows’. However, because ching 請 appears frequently before
certain verbs, and it together with the following verb has formed a two-character compound such as chingbyan 請便, chingwen 請問, chingjyau 請教. Ching 請 even in these cases still preserves its meaning of showing politeness.

(19) chingbyan. 請便
‘Please do as you like.’
‘Please leave me alone.’

(20) Chingwen jidian le?
請問幾點了？
‘Allow me to ask you what time it is?’

(21) Ching jyau ni je-jyu hwa shr shemma yisz.
請教你這句話是什麼意思
‘Please teach me the meaning of this sentence.’

Ching 請 in (19), (20), (21) cannot be omitted. Except the second meaning of (19), ching 請 in all three sentences, shows politeness on the part of the speaker. But, (20) and (21) are true questions, not whimperatives. (For discussion of chingwen 請問 see next section.) Can ching 請 serve as a test for true imperatives? Let us leave it to further studies.

4.2 Tell me versus Gausu wo and Chingwen

Sadock (1974) provides a tell me test: true questions allow the pretag tell me, but requests do not.

The Chinese equivalent for tell me is gausu wo 告訴我; and like English tell me, gausu wo can only precede a true question, and when it is attached to a whimperative, the whimperative becomes a true question: (22) is two-way ambiguous: a request or a true question; while (23) is a true question asking the hearer’s ability.

(22) Ni neng bu-neng ba men gwan-shang?
你能不能把門關上？
‘Can you close the door?’

(23) Gausu wo ni neng bu-neng ba men gwan-shang.
告訴我你能不能把門關上
‘Tell me, can you close the door?’

Chingwen 請問, like gausu wo, can pretag a true question as in (24) and (25).
Chingwen 請問, however, is different from gausu wo 告訴我 in that it can also be used to convey a whimperative. If the propositional contents following chingwen 請問 do not describe actions that can be carried out by the hearer, they are true questions—either personal questions as in (24), or impersonal ones as in (26) and (27)—requests for information.

(24) Chingwen gwei-geng dwo shau?
    請問貴庚多少？
    ‘Allow me to ask you how old you are.’

(25) Gausu wo ni jinnyan ji swei.
    告訴我你今年幾歲
    ‘Tell me how old you are.’

(26) Chingwen Columbus heshr fasyan syin dalu?
    請問Columbus 何時發現新大陸？
    ‘Allow me to ask you when Columbus discovered the new world.’

(27) Chingwen Chungshan bei lu dzai nar?
    請問中山北路在哪兒？
    ‘Allow me to ask you where Chungshan North Road is.’

However, if the propositional contents after chingwen 請問 describe actions that can be carried out by the hearer, then, they are whimperatives, as in (28).

(28) Chingwen ni neng bu-neng ba men gwan-shang.
    請問你能不能把門關上
    ‘Allow me to ask you whether you can close the door or not.’

There is, however, another important difference between the two. When chingwen 請問 and gausu wo 告訴我 are used to convey a true question, they are used in different contexts: chingwen 請問 is used to ask questions of a superior or an equal; while gausu wo 告訴我 is used to ask questions of an inferior or a close friend of equal status.

4.3 Someone versus Shemma ren and Shei

Sadock (1974) provides the indefinite vocative someone as a test for true imperatives. Both sentences (29) and (30) are imperatives (despite the second-person subject in sentence (29)).
(29) Will you close the door, someone?
(30) Get me a beer, someone.

In Chinese, if a teacher in a large class wants someone to close the door, he may simply say *Ba men gwan-chilai* ‘Close the door’, or he may say either (31) or (32) and one of the students near the door will close the door in response to his utterance.

(31) Shei, ba men gwan-shilai.

‘Who, close the door.’

(32) Shemma ren, ba men gwan-chilai.

‘What person, close the door.’

Sentences (31) and (32) are commands to an unspecified addressee. They can be uttered, for example, by a teacher to his students. It is also appropriate for a parent to ask one of his/her children to close the door. In general, they are restricted to situations where superiors give commands to inferiors or where close friends are talking together; otherwise, they will be thought impolite. If, for example, one member of a class wants another indefinite member of his class to close the door by uttering (31) or (32), he will be considered impolite and a certain classmate may feel offended and retort, “*Ni wei-shemma bu dzji gwan?* ‘Why don’t you close the door yourself?’”

In Chinese, when one is among his peers and when he must use an indefinite vocative, he should use *newei* 哪位 (wei 位 is a polite classifier for persons) or he may add a title to it, and it is better to have a courtesy marker *ching 請* and an interrogative tag to give the hearer an option of refusing: (33) and (34) are examples of this kind.

(33) Newei tungsyue, (ching) ba men gwan-chilai, hau ma?

‘Which classmate, (please) close the door, OK?’

(34) Newei syau jye, (ching) ba men gwan-chilai, hau ma?

‘Which lady, (please) close the door, OK?’

In Chinese, an imperative with indefinite vocative can co-occur with *ching 請*,...
e.g., (35a) and (36a). However, the indefinite vocative can not co-occur with a whimperative, e.g., (35b) and (36b); it can co-occur with a fractured whimperative (a term coined by Sadock (1974) to refer to an imperative + its tag), e.g., (35c) and (36c).

(35) a. Shei, ching ba men gwan-chilai.
    誰，請把門關起來
    ‘Who, please close the door.’

b. *Shei, neng bu-neng mafan nib a men gwan-chilai?
    *誰，能不能麻煩你把門關起來？
    ‘*Who, may I bother you to close the door?’

c. Shei, ba men gwan-chilai, hau bu-hau?/hau ma?
    誰，把門關起來，好不好？/好嗎？
    ‘Who, close the door, will you?’

(36) a. Shemma ren, ching ba men gwan-chilai.
    什麼人，請把門關起來
    ‘What person, please close the door.’

b. *Shemma ren, neng bu-neng mafan nib a men gwan-chilai?
    *什麼人，能不能麻煩你把門關起來？
    ‘*What person, may I bother you to close the door?’

c. Shemma ren, ba men gwan-chilai, hau bu-hau?/hau ma?
    什麼人，把門關起來，好不好？/好嗎？
    ‘What person, close the door, Modal-not-Modal?/Modal ma?

After the indefinite vocative shei or shemma ren 什麼人, the question must be an impersonal one, and between the vocative and the question gausu wo 告訴我 ‘tell me’ must be inserted, but chingwen 請問 is not allowed. The reason for the question following an indefinite vocative to be impersonal is obvious. As the vocative is not definite, the question of course can not be personal. However, the question may be asked with personal interest in the answer; (therefore, the question is not “requestion” a semantic request in the form of a question (Sadock; 1974)).

(37) Shei/Shemma ren gausu wo Chungshan bei lu dzai nar.
    誰/什麼人，告訴我中山北路在哪兒
    ‘Who/What person, tell me where Chungshan North Road is.’

(38) (*)Shei/(*)Shemma ren gausu wo ni jya you dwo-shau ren.
    (*)誰/(*)什麼人告訴我你家有多少人
    ‘(*)Who/(*)What person, tell me how many persons there are in your
family.’

(37) can be uttered by a teacher who does know how to get to Chungshan North Road to his students at the end of the class (the teacher is personally interested in the answer; therefore, it is a question of information—a true question). (38) is out if it is intended as a personal question; but if a teacher wants to illustrate family types by asking his students (38), it is acceptable. For example, a teacher asks (38); and one student answers “6;” the teacher follows it by saying, “Good, this is an example of a large family. Understand?” In this case, (38) is acceptable.

The indefinite vocative shei 誰 or shemma ren 什麼人 is supposed to be used appropriately by superiors to inferiors. The commanding force is rather strong, so it cannot be followed by a polite enquiring word chingwen 請問 to introduce a real question; the indefinite vocative and the polite enquiring word chingwen 請問 are not compatible with each other.

Unlike English indefinite vocative someone which can serve as a test for true imperatives, Chinese indefinite vocative shei 誰 or shemma ren 什麼人 can co-occur both with a directive or a question for information—a true question.

4.4 Chinese Sentence-Final Particles

In this section, we will discuss four sentence final particles ba 吧, le 了, ya 呀/a 阿, and jyoushrle 就是了 which are generally attached to direct directives to express request. These are called words of moods by traditional Mandarin grammarians (e.g., Lyu Shu-syang, 1977).

Lyu(1977) states that there are three sentence final particles in colloquial Mandarin which are attached to imperatives: ba 吧, ya 呀, and ne 呢. Ba 吧 and ya 呀 are still productively used by a speaker to get the hearer to do something in Mandarin in Taiwan. However, ne 呢 is seldom attached to an imperative to form a command or request, though it may be used in a whimperative sentence: for example, a speaker can say Ni neng bu-neng likai jer ne? 你能不能離開這兒呢? ‘Can you leave here, please?’ to ask the hearer to leave here immediately.

The examples of imperatives with ne 呢 which Lyu (1977) gives are from two novels written in the Ching Dynasty: Ernyu Yingsyung Chwan 兒女英雄傳, and Dream of the Red Chamber 紅樓夢, the language of which is noticeably different from contemporary Mandarin. In modern Mandarin we no longer use ne 呢 in imperative sentences.

Chao (1968) distinguishes different usages of sentence final particles. He gives the following sentence-final particles: ba 吧, le 了, ya 呀/a 阿, jyoushrle 就是了, and
sha 煞 as indicators of command. In contemporary Mandarin (at least in Taiwan), however, sha 煞 has never been heard of as a final particle in imperatives, which Chao says is used more frequently in Southern Mandarin and in some of the Wu dialects, and is often heard on the stage in spoken (as against sung) dialogues. So we are left with only four particles often used to express imperatives in modern Mandarin.

The four particles ba 吧, le 了, ya 呀/a 阿, and jyoushrle 就是了 have a feature in common: if they are omitted from the request, the utterance does not lose its pragmatic function; in other words, they are pragmatically optional. However, when they are used in an imperative they add different social meanings to the imperative: ba 吧, for example, softens a command while le 了, ya 呀, and jyoushrle 就是了 do not have this function. In the following sections we will elucidate the social meaning of each particle.

4.4.1 Jyoushrle

There are (at least) three possible situations in which the speaker can utter a direct directive with the final particle jyoushrle 就是了: first, he can utter it to block the hearer’s asking reasons why he should do the act requested. For example, a mother (M) wants her 8-year-old daughter (D) to take out the garbage:

M: Yu-hwa, chyu dau lese.
    玉華，去倒垃圾  ‘Yu-hwa, go to take out the garbage.’
D: Wei-shemma bu jyau meimei?
    為什麼不叫妹妹？‘Why not call younger sister to?’
M: Ni chyu jyoushrle.
    你去就是了‘You go; that’s all.’

Second, it may be used to give suspense or surprise to the hearer. For example, a husband has promised his wife a golden ring; when he has bought one, he does not show her at once as soon as he comes back from work. Instead, when he finishes bathing:

H: Mei-yun. 美雲
    (His wife’s name.)
W: Shemma shr? 什麼事？
And as the wife comes, he then shows her the golden ring. The third situation to utter an imperative with じょうしゅれ is to end an unhappy argument; for example,

A: Wo show syan you ji, tsai you dan.
    我說先有雞才有蛋。
    ‘I say: there were chickens first, then there were eggs.’
B: Bu-dwei, syan you dan, tsai you ji.
    不對，先有蛋，才有雞
    ‘You are wrong. There were eggs first, then there were chickens.’

(A and B argue furiously without a conclusion; it does not seem likely for them to end in a short time, so C says:)
C: Bei chau le, chrfan jyoushrle.
    別吵了，吃飯就是了
    ‘Please stop and forget that unhappy quarrelling. Let’s have supper now.’

A speaker can also say (Ni) Ting ta-de jyoushrle(你)聽他的就是了 ‘You just obey what he has said.’ To end the hearer’s unhappiness or irritation with the third person.

4.4.2 Ba吧

There are at least three ba’s in Mandarin which are used to express 1) conjecture, 2) suggestion, and 3) request, respectively. In expressing conjecture, the sentence final particle ba吧 is obligatory as in (39), but it can be substituted by pre-predicate adverb だがい大概 ‘probably’, or 一定 yiding ‘must’. That is, when だがい大概 or 一定 yiding is present in a sentence, ば吧 is optional as in (40).

(39) a. Syau-Wang, ni mei shwei-hau ba.
    小王，你沒睡好吧
    ‘Little Wang, you did not sleep well; right?’
b. Shr fashau fade tai lihai-le ba.
    是發燒發得太厲害了吧
‘It must have been too serious a fever; right?’

(40) a. Syau-Wang, ni dagai mei shwei-hau (ba).
小王，你大概沒睡好(吧)
‘Little Wang, you probably did not sleep well.’
b. Yiding shr fashau fade tai lihai-le (ba).
一定是發燒發得太厲害了(吧)
‘It must have been too serious a fever.’

When ba 是 used to express suggestion or request (signaling a solicitation of approval from the hearer with regard to the information contained in the sentence), it is optional. Both occurrences of ba 是 in (41a) and (41b) are optional. Linguistically, with or without it, the sentences are understood as command. Ba 是, however, has the effect of softening the imperative force.

(41) a. Kawai chr ba, fan leng-le.
快吃吧，飯冷了
‘Be quick with eating; the meal is getting cold.’
b. Ching lai chrfan ba.
請來吃飯吧
‘Please come and eat BA.’

Ba 是 to express request or suggestion can co-occur with ching 請, but it does not co-occur with modals keyi 可以 and neng 能 in a directive. (42) and (43) are ungrammatical as a request (though they are acceptable in its conjecture sense showing the speaker’s asking the permission of his doing something.)

(42) ?Keyi chrfan ba!?
?可以吃飯吧!?
‘May I eat now?’
(43) ?Neng chrfan ba!?
?能吃飯吧!?
‘May I eat now?’

Since ba 是 has the effect of softening the imperative force, while le 了, ya 呀, and jyoushrle 就是了 do not have this feature, an imperative with final particle ba 是 is judged more polite and deferential than the one with le 了, ya 呀, or jyoushrle 就是了. (See section 4.5.)
4.4.3 le

A command with le cannot be used in an imperative sentence with subject ni 你, nimen 你們; Ni(men) chrfan le 你(們)吃飯了 Have you eaten now? (a greeting). However, if ni(men)你(們)is used as a vocative—that is, a stressed ni(men)你(們), followed by a pause (no matter how sight the pause is)—it is acceptable to say Ni(men), chrfan le 你(們), 吃飯了 ‘You, eat now.’ But in most causes, we do not use ni(men)你(們) as a vocative, we use given names, nicknames, or titles (which can be used as vocatives), for example, Syau-hwa, chrfan le 小華, 吃飯了 ‘Little Hwa, dinner is ready. Eat now’; Baba, chrfan le 爸爸, 吃飯了 ‘Daddy, eat now’.

Chao(1968) states that le 了 is used in a command in response to a new situation. Our analysis is that a command with le 了 implies the change of situation from what cannot be done to what can be done. For example, after school, a schoolboy called Syau-hwa 小華 came home and was hungry, but he was told dinner was not ready yet. Then fifteen minutes later, he heard his mother shouting: “Chrfan le 吃飯了(‘Dinner is ready now.’)” The situation changes from dinner being unready to being ready. A command with le 了 can co-occur with modals keyi 可以, neng 能, or (ying)gai(應) 該.

(44) Keyi chrfan le.  
可以吃飯了  
‘We can eat now.’

(45) Neng chrfan le.  
能吃飯了  
‘We can eat now.’

(46) (Ying)gai chrfan le.  
應該吃飯了  
‘It is time for us to eat now.’

To summarize, a command with le 了 can be analyzed as having a proposition stating the coming of a new situation and the speaker asks the hearer to respond to the new situation. Ching 請 is an explicit performative verb and a courtesy marker, it is supposed to precede a direct directive. Chrfan le 吃飯了 is a directive, but it cannot be preceded by ching 請. (47) is an example. But when ching 請 is used free-standingly, it can co-occur with le optionally: e.g., (48) is acceptable and its interpretation is of course dependent on the hearer and the given situation.

(47) *Ching chrfan le. *請吃飯了  
‘Please eat now.’
(48) Ching le. 請了
‘Please do now.’

Give an example situation for (48): A wants to go into the house, but the door has been blocked with many things that B is moving out of the house. Having finished moving the things once blocked the door, B says, “Ching le 請了; ‘Please do now.’” which means A may go into the house now. In this situation, B tells A the coming of the new situation (from A cannot get into the house to A can); and the utterance usually shows that the speaker is a little sorry for causing inconvenience to the hearer.

4.4.4 le versus ba versus le ba

(49) a. Chrfan le. 吃飯了 (chrfan means ‘eat’.)
    b. Chrfan ba. 吃飯吧
    c. Chrfan le ba. 吃飯了吧
(50) a. Ba men gwan-shang le. 把門關上了
    (Ba men gwan-shang means ‘close the door’.)
    b. Ba men gwan-shang ba. 把門關上吧
    c. Ba men gwan-shang le ba. 把門關上了吧
(51) a. Shwei jyau le. 睡覺了
    (Shwei jyau means ‘sleep’.)
    b. Shwei jyau ba. 睡覺吧
    c. Shwei jyau le ba. 睡覺了吧

Imperative sentences which contain le 了 show either that the hearer has been supposed to do the action requested of him (i.e., he has the right), or he has the duty to do something, but the time has not been fixed until the speaker utters the directive—the change of situation from what cannot be done to what can be done, the speaker tells (reminds) him to fulfill at the time of utterance. Sentence (49a) can be uttered by a hostess to her intimate friends who have been invited to dinner earlier and have been seated in the living room already, but it can not be uttered to a causal visitor. Likewise, sentence (50a) can be uttered by a mother who has told her daughter to close the door when she finishes moving shopped articles into the house.

M: Deng wo banwan dungsyi, ba men gwan-shang.
    等我搬完東西, 把門關上
    ‘Close the door when I finish moving these things.’
Sentence (50a) can also be uttered by a mother to her forgetful son who has forgot to close behind him the door which is usually closed to keep mosquitoes and flies from entering the house. (Closing the door is something expected of everyone.) Sentences (49b), (50b), and (51b) do not convey the duty or the privilege of the hearer to eat, to close the door and to sleep. They are uttered usually as the speaker’s suggestion and polite request for the hearer to do something. To a casual visitor at the mealtime a Chinese housewife usually says, “Dzai jer chrfan ba 在這兒吃飯吧(‘Why not eat with us?’),” but she does not say jinlai chrfan le 進來吃飯了 ‘Come in and eat now’.

When one feels cold in the room, another may say, “Ba men gwan-shang ba 把門 關上吧(‘Why not close the door?’),” to him, but he can not say Ba men gwan-shang le 把門關上了 ‘Close the door now’ as a suggestion.

(49c), (50c), and (51c) show that the two sentence final particles le 了 and ba 吧 can co-occur in the same sentence with le 了 preceding ba 吧. These sentences can be analyzed as a conjunction of two parts: (49a)+(49b)=(49c), (50a)+(50b)=(50c), and (51a)+(51b)=(51c) (with the deletion of identical parts). The meaning of the combination is the sum of its parts.

Previously, we have analyzed the sentential particle le 了 as indicating a new situation. (See also Kwan-Terry (1979).) If we accordingly make an alternative analysis of these three sentences, (49c) can be interpreted in this way: by uttering chrfan le 吃飯了, the speaker informs the hearer that the new situation (that the meal is ready) has come; and by uttering chrfan ba 吃飯吧, the speaker states that since the new situation has come, so he solicits the hearer to have it. Therefore, chrfan le ba 吃飯了吧 is a conjunction of two sentences (49a) and (49b) in which le and ba can not be inverted—they are conjoined according to sequence of time. Likewise we may interpret (50c) and (51c) ad ‘it is time to close the door/to sleep; would you please close the door/sleep now?’

4.4.5 a 阿/ya 呀

According to Li and Thompson (1981), a 阿/ya 呀 performs the function of reducing the forcefulness of the message conveyed by the sentence. It tends to suggest kindness on the part of the speaker. When a 阿/ya 呀 is attached to a
command, Li and Thompson claim that it has the usual function of reducing the forcefulness of a command. They give an example (here cited as (52)) which, they claim, conveys the message that it is more of a suggestion or an encouragement than a command.

(52) Ni lai a/ya. 你來阿/呀
   ‘You come particle.’

They also explicate that a command with a阿/ya呀 is a much more friendly command than the one without it.

Chao (1968), on the other hand, contends that a command with a阿/ya呀 has a slightly insistent air, not as modest-toned as the advisative ba吧.

Our analysis of contemporary Mandarin in Taiwan in this respect is more similar to Chao’s explanation than to Li and Thompson’s. Our viewpoint is that a command with a阿/ya呀 has a slightly insistent air. It may even be possible that there is an air of unkindness and reproachment on the part of the speaker. For example, a primary-school teacher may say to one of his pupils impatiently and unfriendly the following sentence: Ni dzwo-sya a/ya! 你坐下阿/呀！‘You sit down.’ After he or she has failed an essay question. Therefore, we can easily imagine a situation in which a concerned parent is urging his/her child to eat, who has not much appetite and is perhaps watching TV instead. In such a situation, it is appropriate to use (53a) and (53b), or s/he can say (53c) gruffly, but (49) is inappropriate for the situation.

(53) a. Chrfan ya. 吃飯呀(Chrfan means ‘eat.’)
    b. Chrfan le ya. 吃飯了呀
    c. Chrfan. 吃飯

We also agree with Chao’s observation that a阿/ya呀 is not as modest-toned as the advisative ba吧. Besides the insistent air conveyed by a阿/ya呀, we are of the opinion that a阿/ya呀 has stronger urging force than le了 and ba吧. Chrfan le吃飯了 is a directive that can be uttered to one’s superiors, inferiors, or equals, and it is most frequently used, comparing with those with ba吧, a阿/ya呀, or jyoushrle就是了. (53a) and (53b), however, are seldom used to initiate a discourse. They are used as a second or third reiteration of the same command when the hearer did not comply at once to do the action requested of him by the speaker. And a阿/ya呀 le a, le ya are used to inferiors or familiar equals, not to superiors. To a superior, if the hearer did not hear of the request, the speaker may reiterate the request by saying (49c) Chrfan le ba吃飯了吧 which has more suggestive force than sentences with a/ya, le a, or le
The explanation of (53) is similar to that of (49c). (53b) is the total of (49a) plus (53a) deleting the identical part the speaker tells the hearer the coming of the new situation (that the meal is now ready) and therefore s/he wants the hearer to eat. It often occurs with the hearer did not hear the first command (49) and the speaker reiterates the command adding an impatient marker 阿/ya 呀.

4.5 Experiment with Sentence Final Particles

This experiment is a equal of the experiment discussed in the last chapter. The experiment has two purpose: 1) to examine whether native speakers of Chinese possess systematic knowledge of the relationship between linguistic forms, specially the different forms of sentence final particles, and politeness and deference; 2) to examine whether our two different predicates (chrfan 吃飯 ‘eat’ and ba men gwan-shang 把門關上 ‘close the door’) have any effect on the kind of relationship just mentioned.

The experiment was made from February 1st to February 4th, 1982. 50 native Chinese speakers participated in the study as subjects. All were born and have grown up in Taiwan most of their lives, aged from 18 to 33, educated in Taiwan. They were university students or university graduates; in other words, all were highly-educated. Each subject was asked to arrange two sets of sentences—each set containing 7 sentences—according to the politeness and deference order.

The instructions are similar to those on pages 65, 66, and 67 (with the change of sentence number and since sentences are only a few in number, we did not prepare cards, but showed two sets of sentences on a single sheet).

The most deferential and polite sentence was scored 7, the next 6, with the least polite and deferential scored 1. The two sets of sentences as well as the statistical results were given in Table 7 and Table 8 on page 120.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Chrfan le ba!</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chrfan ba!</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chrfan le!</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Chrfan le ya!</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chrfan ya!</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>2-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Chrfan!</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Chrfan jyoushrle!</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ba men gwan-shang ba!</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ba men gwan-shang le ba!</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ba men gwan-shang a!</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>2-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ba men gwan-shang le!</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ba men gwan-shang le ya!</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ba men gwan-shang jyoushrle!</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ba men gwan-shang!</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5.1 Results and Discussion

As has been stated in section 3.2, we cannot have a fixed way of interpreting the results. Each way of interpreting the results is rather subjective; however, we hope to provide as meaningful and persuasive an analysis as we can. Observing the two tables, we know 1/2, 4/5, 6/7 in Table 7 are closely scored; 1/2, 3/5, 4/5 in Table 8 are also closely scored; any interpretation of their minute differences must, therefore, be relatively subjective. 3 and 4 in Table 8 even got the same total score, the same average. The reason for our ranking them in this order is that 31 subjects thought 3 was more deferential and polite than 4, and 19 subjects did the reverse arrangement. Superficially, the two sets seem not to contain much similarity; however, we can divide the 7 sentences in each table into 3 sub-sets: 1 and 2 consist of the first sub-set; 3, 4, and 5, the second sub-set; 6 and 7, the third sub-set. Sentences in the same group are generally closely scored; they are not divided ad hoc.

The 7 sentences in Table 7 all contain the propositional content of asking the hearer to eat (the H’s future act of eating, to fit Searle’s felicity condition); those in Table 8 all contain the propositional content of asking the hearer to close the door. Two sets have the same structures (with variations of sentence final particle).

Comparing the first sub-sets in Tables 7 and 8, we find that the structures of 1 and 2 in Table 7 are the same as those of 2 and 1 in Table 8, respectively. In the second sub-sets, it is observed that the structures of 3, 4, and 5 in Table 7 become those of 4, 5, and 3 in Table 8, respectively. And in the third sub-sets, those of 6 and 7 in Table 7 become those of 7 and 6 in Table 8, respectively.

The wide ranges of the 14 sentences show that sentence final particles used in a command are controversial among native Chinese speakers. One possible reason is that these sentences are all different in meaning, they are probably used in different situations, politeness and deference then is not the sole concern of a speaker when he
uses them. It also explicates why Li and Thompson’s observation is so largely different from Chao and ours (on a 阿/ya呀).

From the two tables, we find that a command with the sentence final particle ba吧 is more polite and deferential than that with the other three particles. The majority’s opinion is in conformity with our analysis that ba吧 conveys the force suggestion (at least) partially for the benefit of the hearer). We can not explain why 1 and 2 in Table 7 become 2 and 1 of Table 8, though the average of the four sentences shows that the differences are not meaningful. We leave it open to future research.

The second sub-sets in both tables contain the same linguistic structures—their sentence final particles are le了，ya呀，and le ya了呀. Except 3 in Table 7, the other five sentences do not differ from each other significantly. In Table 7, the reason for 3 Chrfan le 吃飯了 to stand out rather significantly as we have observed in the last section is that it is neutral with regard to social status and can be uttered to superiors, inferiors, or equals; while 4 and 5 are seldom used to call superior to eat. In Table 8, the three sentences are not supposed to be appropriate to ask superiors to close the door for us; they do not show significant differences either, and their average scores are very close.

Sentences 6 and 7 in Table 7 are not significantly different, but those in Table 8 are significantly different from each other. The reason for the differences in the two tables, as we have observed, lies in the predicates: the purpose of the speaker’s asking the hearer to eat is roughly to prevent the hearer from hunger, there are few additional meanings (and intentions) underlying it. Bu uttering chrfan jyoushrle吃飯就是了, it is most possible, as we can guess, that the speaker is to block the hearer’s asking reasons or to end an unhappy argument happening at the table; it is not possible to leave suspense or surprise to the hearers (as discussed in section 4.4.1)—it also accounts for the fact that its range is 1-5, unlike its counterpart in Table 8, which receives a range of 1-7. However, though the immediate purpose of closing the door is closing the door, the possible situations may be all three (as shown in section 4.4.1). Without giving our subjects contexts, they might imagine many possible situations for a speaker to say Ba men gwan-shang jyoushrle把門關上就是了. If the context they thought was the speakers intention to block the hearer’s asking reasons, then the sentence cold receive 1—the least polite and deferential. If the context they thought was the speaker’s intention to leave suspense and surprise to the hearer, then the sentence could be scored 7. So that is why the range we obtained is 1-7.

We make a tentative conclusion that directives with sentence-final particle ba吧，le ba了吧 are generally more polite and deferential than those with le了，ya呀，le ya了呀; and those with zero sentence-final particles and with jyoushrle就是了 as their sentence-final particle will be even less polite and deferential than the former two
groups of sentence-final particles. Whether this conclusion can be applied to all possible predicates which can be used in directives, is a question that we have to leave for future studies.

4.6 Reduplication

An imperative can be reduplicated to add some urging force to it. The reduplicated part is usually uttered louder and higher than the original part. The imperatives with the final particles le and a/ya, can be reduplicated, but those with the final particles jyoushrle or ba cannot. For example,

(54) Chrfan! Chrfan! 吃飯！吃飯！
‘Eat! Eat!’

(55) Jwo chyangdau a! Jwo chyangdau a!
捉強盜阿！捉強盜阿！
‘Seize the robber! Seize the robber!’

(56) *Chrfan jyoushrle! Chrfan jyoushrle!
*吃飯就是了！吃飯就是了！
‘Just eat! Just eat!’

(57) *Chrfan ba! Chrfan ba!
*吃飯吧！吃飯吧！
‘Eat BA! Eat BA!’

Chao (1968) states that commands with V-R complements usually take –le just as in statements. For example, Syi kanjing le 洗乾淨了; Wen chingchr le 問清楚了; Na wen le 拿穩了. But when the V-R compound in a command has a reduplicated verb or a cognate object, then the suffix le is not used: syi-syi kanjing 洗洗乾淨.

Since we have given a rather detailed discussion of le (in section 4.4.3), it will not be repeated here. Let us take up the discussion of the reduplication of verb as it occurs in a directive. Syi-syi kanjing 洗洗乾淨 is different from syi kangjing, syi kanjing 洗乾淨, 洗乾淨; the former does not have such strong urging force as the latter; therefore, syi-syi kanjing 洗洗乾淨 can be modified by an adverb of future time denoting non-immediate future; while the latter can not.

(58) Ba yifu syi-syi kanjing.
把衣服洗洗乾淨
‘Wash the clothes clean.’

(59) (Ba yifu) syi kanjing, syi kanjing.
It is appropriate to modify syi syi kanjing 洗洗乾淨 with any time adverb denoting a not to remote future time from the moment of utterance. Mingnyan 明年 ‘next year’, yige ywe yihou 一個月以後 ‘a month from now’, for example, are unlikely because they are almost beyond the hearer’s memory. But syi kanjing, syi kanjing 洗乾淨, 洗乾淨 must be modified by the time adverb syandzai 現在 ‘right now’, it cannot even be modified by mashang 馬上 ‘immediately’. Syi kanjing, syi kanjing 洗乾淨, 洗乾淨 has much more urging force than syi-syi kanjing 洗洗乾淨. It seems to us that when the speaker utters (59), the hearer is washing (clothes), but the clothes have not been washed as cleanly as the speaker has expected. Thus, he urges the hearer to wash them cleaner. (58) does not have the sense of on-the-spot; that is, we do not know whether the hearer has begun to wash the clothes or not.

We conclude that if the whole imperative is reduplicated, the reduplicates have much urging force added to it. With only the verb reduplicated, the whole utterance does not have such urging force.
Notes to Chapter IV

1 The Chinese equivalent for English free-standing please may be *baitwo* 拜託 as a request to stop doing something: e.g. *Baitwo! Leng srle* 拜託！冷死了 ‘Please! It is extremely cold.’ It might be a request to close a window which has just been opened, or to cease ripping off the speaker’s clothing.

2 This fact was pointed out to me by Prof. Tsao Feng-fu (personal communication).

3 I have checked with several native English speakers sentences (29) and (30). Their responses are roughly “It seems to me they are ungrammatical,” or “I have never heard of the pattern.” They say that for sentence (29), it is better to say (29’):

(29’) Will someone close the door (for me), (please)?

For sentence (30), it is better to say (30’):

(30’) { Will Could }someone get me a beer, (please)?

When asked how they think of the sentence (31’)

(31’) Who will close the door for me?

(as contrasted with (31) and (32)), they answer that the situation in which it is used is different from that of (29’). The former (31’) implies that the teacher wants to see who is most eager to do him a favor and the students, on hearing the request will generally all rush to close the door to please the teacher; but the latter has a very common situation that the teacher wants the door closed, it is not important who will close it. So the situation of (31’) is obviously different from that of (31) and (32).

4 (49c), (50c), and (51c) are each two-way ambiguous: either it means that the speaker asks the hearer to do something or it means the speaker asks whether it is time to do something. If they are preceded by *keyi* 可以 or *neng* 能, then they have only the second meaning.

5 Reduplication is here more broadly defined than it is by Li and Thompson (1980), which is:

reduplication means that a morpheme is reduplicated so that the original morpheme together with its repetition form a new word

Reduplication is our sense includes the repetition of a phrase or even an utterance.
Chapter V

Conclusion

In the introduction we have stated the purpose of this thesis is three-fold: first, to explicate systematically how directives can be uttered; second, to look for the relationship between politeness and different types of directive sentences; third, to help learners of Mandarin as a foreign language use the appropriate directive forms to the right persons at the right time. In this chapter, we will by way of conclusion, summarize our findings, and then proceed to examine what implications these findings have for theory of foreign language teaching.

5.1 Summary of Findings

Certain sentences which appear on the surface to be declaratives and interrogatives can be used in certain contexts to convey other speech acts. This type of sentences is known as an indirect speech act. For example:

(1) Wo syang jrdau ni-de jujr.
我想知道你的住址
‘I’d like to know your address.’

(1) is superficially a statement, but it conveys the illocutionary force of an interrogative; it is, therefore, an indirect interrogative.

The speech act we have discussed in this thesis is directives, which, like other speech acts, are divided into direct directives and indirect directives. The most straightforward way to utter a directive is by way of an imperative sentence; therefore, this kind of directive is called a direct directive; and the uttering of a directive by way of a declarative sentence or an interrogative sentence is called an indirect directives. And the declarative and interrogative sentences must contain the proposition of the thing the speaker gets the hearer to do as ‘part of the context’. That is, the illocutionary force of the directive must be able to be understood by every native speaker. In other words, the indirect directives we have discussed in this thesis are conventionally used in their performance.

For a directive to be felicitous the following five conditions are necessary: 1) preparatory condition: H (Hearer) is able to perform A (action), 2) sincerity condition: S (Speaker) wants H to do A, 3) propositional content condition: S predicates a future act A of H, 4) essential condition: counts as an attempt by S to get H to do A, and 5)
external circumstances condition: A has not been performed yet.

A number of English syntactic/semantic and lexical features have been claimed to play a role in politeness (e.g., Fraser and Nolen (1981), and Carrell and Konneker (1981)). Our research in Chapter III has shown that a Chinese interrogative sentence is more polite than an imperative, and an embedded directive with mafan 麻煩 as its higher predicate is judged more polite than an embedded directive with ching 請 as its higher predicate. Our investigation on Chinese as the first language shows that syntactic, semantic and lexical features in Chinese also play a role in politeness. The discussion and experiment on sentence-final particles, furthermore, shows that an differences in particle choosing correspond to a difference in communicative intent. Four sentence final particles which are generally attached to direct directives to express request are ba 吧, le 了, ya 呀/阿, and jyoushrle 就是了. When they are added to an imperative they function differently in their social meanings. Ba 吧 softens a command, while le 了, ya 呀/阿, and jyoushrle 就是了 do not have this function. Ba 吧 is more advisative1 than the other three. Ya 呀 and le 了 have more urging force than ba 吧. Compared with ya 呀, le 了 is not so strong in its urging force as ya 呀. Ya 呀 shows a little impatience on the part of the speaker, but le 了 does not have this implication. For example.

(2) Chrfan le. 吃飯了
   ‘Eat le.’

(3) Chrfan ya. 吃飯呀
   ‘Eat ya.’

Jyoushrle 就是了 does not have the effect of softening a command nor does it add more urging force to an utterance. It is used either to block the hearer’s asking question, or to give suspense or surprise to the hearer, or to end an unhappy argument. Besides that ya 呀 and le 了 add some urging force to an imperative, reduplication of an imperative also has a similar effect.

None of Sadock’s (1974) three tests for directives, are found to be applicable to Chinese directives. Tell me as a test for true question, however, does have a Chinese equivalent gausu wo 告訴我, which also serves as a test for Chinese true questions.

5.2 Implications

On the basis of our findings summarized in the last section, several implications for teaching directives will be discussed in this section.

People are generally aware of their own status in relation to one another and will,
especially in more familiar situations, choose the appropriate language forms quite unconsciously, when they are speaking their own native languages. People are also aware that status is not inflexible since relationships between people can change over time and according to different situations.

When we are in a situation of social inferiority, as when we are talking to someone in a higher position, we will unconsciously choose an interrogative mood when we have to request something of him with word. But when we are using a foreign language, there is no such a thing as “unconsciously” choosing an appropriate utterance suitable for our status and situation; much has to be learned. Training is especially necessary in cases where there is possibility of a negative transfer from the native language communicative competence.

Canale and Swain (1980) propose a model of communicative competence which consists of three components: grammatical competence, sociolinguistic competence, and strategic competence. Grammatical competence consists of a knowledge of linguistic structures; sociolinguistic competence is the knowledge of what is acceptable usage within the speech community. Strategic competence consists of the ability to employ strategies of language use in the attempt to reach communicative goals. Tarone (1980) is of the opinion that strategic competence is used to bridge the gaps between linguistic (grammatical) competence and sociolinguistic competence.

In teaching the communicative competence concerning directives, we should first teach possible sentence patterns used in directives. (See Chapter III for a comparison of Chinese and English patterns of directives.) Second, we should teach the sociolinguistic competence of these patterns of directives. Third, we should let our students have opportunities to be exposed to conversations between native speakers so that the gap between linguistic competence and sociolinguistic competence can be bridged.

Here we wish to propose some practical classroom procedures in teaching directives to speakers of English learning Chinese as a foreign language or the reverse: 1) introducing all possible patterns of directives, 2) explaining sociolinguistic meaning of these directives, 3) fluency practice, 4) paraphrasing and discussion, and 5) role playing.

The order of introducing patterns of directives follow two principle: first, from direct directives to indirect directives. In other words, imperatives are introduced first to be followed by more polite indirect directives. And then finally still more polite indirect directives are introduced. The second principle is to start with patterns that are more similar to be gradually shifted to the more different and presumably more difficult patterns. That is, the directives of the target language which are expressed in similar ways in the native language are introduced first; and the patterns peculiar to
the native language are introduced later.

When explaining sociolinguistic meaning of directives, teachers should make clear in what situations one can use what directives. Contrastive information concerning the target language and the native language should be properly utilized in the classroom, since it is a very effective way to teach social meaning to adult language learners. There are a lot of language specific facts a foreign language learner will have to be explicitly taught before he can use them and have them recognized as such. For example, the Chinese directives containing the predicate *mafan* 麻煩 ‘trouble’ are productively used, but in English *trouble* is only marginally used in making indirect request. Likewise, Chinese students of English might have difficulty in using subjunctive mood in a request, i.e., *would you mind* patter, and *would you, could you* pattern.

In fluency practice, accuracy within the range to tolerance of error which native speakers can accept each other is required, because only accurate speech will communicate effectively with a wide range of listeners in many different situations. The first part of fluency practice is the repetition drill of the patterns. Then a what-do-you-say question and answer practice should follow. For example:

T: Ni syang syang ni fuchin yau yi-bai kwai cyuan, ni show shemma?
你想向你父親要一百塊錢，你說什麼？
‘If you want your father to give you one hundred dollars, what do you say?’
S: Baba, gei wo yi-bai kwai chyan, hau ma?
爸爸，給我一百塊錢，好嗎？
‘Papa, give me one hundred dollars, will you?’
T: Ni syang jyau ni didi dau lese, ni show shemma?
你想叫你弟弟倒垃圾，你說什麼？
‘You want your younger brother to take out the garbage, what do you say?’
S: (Ni) chyu dau lese.
(你)去倒垃圾
‘(You) go to take out the garbage.’

After fluency and accuracy practice, teachers can say different directives for students to explain and discuss in what possible situations, the speaker can say it, and the speaker’s relative status to the hearer as well as the degree of politeness the utterance may contain to make sure they have understood the social meaning of different forms of directives.

In a classroom situation, a teacher can then ask students to play roles of different statuses and get each other to do things with words. The teacher may now monitor
their speech and whenever there is a mistake, she/he can correct it. At this stage, error analysis is effective.

After the previously mentioned classroom procedures (activites), we can now put our students in ‘natural’ situations of the target language. In a natural situation they have to apply what has been learned and adjust to other speakers. We must encourage our students to use language with native speakers as part of the process of thinking, discovering, and manipulating. This process demands the learner’s active use, not passive reflection, and it is a central feature of a communicative method. We believe our students can benefit a lot both from formal learning in class and practice in a natural situation.

5.3 Mistakes Concerning Teaching and Learning Directives in the Republic of China

In this action, we will first discuss the mistakes we have found in teaching English directives to Chinese students in high schools and in teaching Mandarin directives to foreigners in the Republic of China. We will then present our suggestions on how the situation can be improved.

5.3.1 Wrongness in Teaching and Learning English Directives

Sedlak (1976) has pointed out that the approach to English teaching in R.O.C. is audiolingual in theory, but grammar-translation in practice. The development of communicative competence has generally been neglected in English teaching. The speech acts of directives are in general only superficially touched. Many Chinese students when they must utter a directive in a natural situation often find themselves speechless or else they say an inappropriate directive. For example, a native Chinese-speaking person (A) shares an office with an English-speaking person (B). A has been in the office for some time when B comes in. B closes the door behind him on a hot day. A asks B, “Please may I ask you a question: Can you open the door?” A Chinese speaker knows very well that A has translated Chinese Chingwen ni neng bu-neng ba men dakai 請問你能不能把門打開 into its English equivalent. A has uttered a grammatical sentence, but it is socially unacceptable, because English sentence ‘Please may I ask you a question’ is usually followed by a personal question, it cannot be followed by a whimperative.

The English directive beginning with Would you mind is very productive as a polite request. A gerund is required after Would you mind to ask the hearer to do something; for example, Would you mind opening the window? Semantically it is the
same as Please open the window.

In middle schools of R.O.C., many English teachers, in order to test students’ knowledge of this sentence pattern, usually give them a Chinese sentence and ask them to complete the English sentence by filling the blank with a proper word:

(4) Would you mind ______ the window?

你介意把窗戶打開嗎？

We have checked with many standard Mandarin speakers (so called Peikinese) whether they say “Ni jyeyi ba chwanghu dakai ma?你介意把窗戶打開嗎？” when they want a hearer to open the window. The first response they give is often: We don’t speake in this way when we ant a hearer to open the winsow. But if a speaker says this sentence, perhaps it is he himself who wants to open the window. However, we still do not say this strange sentence in this case. We could say Wo ba chwanghu dakai, hau bu-hau? 我把窗戶打開,好不好？ ‘May I open the window?’ or Wo keyi bu-keyi ba chhwanghu dakai?—Ni pa bu-pa chwei fung?我可以不可以把窗戶打開？你怕不怕吹風？ ‘May I open the window? Will it make you feel uncomfortable?’ From their esponses, first we know it is possibly the speaker who wishes to open the window when he says such a socially strange sentence. Second, we know jyeyi 介意 is seldom used in Chinese directives. Third, the Chinese translation of the item in the last paragraph is not the equivalent of the English directive. Their semantic meanings as well as social meanings in the respective language are different. From the above example, we conclude that Chinese teachers of English in Taiwan do not teach “preciseness”, they choose what “seems” to be right. One reason can be adduced here: most teachers wish to put everything in grammar-translation mode without checking whether the square can fit the round or not; they are too sociolinguistically unsophisticated to know that not only English but also Chinese has conventionally fixed ways to request, suggest, and command.

Besides the naïve translation test of would you mind pattern, many Chinese teachers of English in junior high schools often give a substitution test of can and be able to. The item for the substitution test may be like this:

(5) Can you open the door?

= ___________ you ___________ ____________ open the door?

In most situations in a given society when real conversation is involved, can you open the door? Is a request for the hearer to open the door, but Are you able to open
the door? Is not used freely in making an indirect request. Many Chinese teachers of
English in high schools are linguistically unsophisticated users of English themselves.
They lead students to the wrong conclusion that ‘can’ and ‘be able to’ can be used
interchangeably all the time.

In this case, the teacher should give a translation test instead of a substitution test.
Can can be translated into neng 能 in Chinese, and be able to, hwei 會. In Chinese, Ni
neng bu-neng ba men dakai 你能不能把門打開 is customarily and conventionally
used as a request; and Ni hwei bu-hwei ba men dakai 你會不會把門打開 is to ask the
hearer’s ability to open the door. The force of requesting is very slight in the latter
expression.

From the above three specific cases of errors in EFL acquisition and teaching, it
is recommended: 1) that the center of teaching be shifted from grammatical
competence to sociolinguistic competence. Linguistic form is basic and essential, but
not the EFL learner’s final aim of learning English; communication is central; 2) that
a native English-speaking advisor be hired to serve as a consultant in textbook-editing.
3) Sociolinguistic course be given additional emphasis at the training institutions both
for regular students and for in-service trainees.

5.3.2 Teaching Mandarin as a Foreign Language in R.O.C.

Since Mandarin teachers in Taiwan generally do not have pre-service training in
teaching MFL. So even though all of them intuitively know very well the social
meaning of a command, suggestion and request, they do not realize the importance of
teaching communicative competence. Many of them seem to be satisfied if their
students can speak grammatically correct sentences no matter whether or not the
sentences are socially appropriate acceptable. One reason can be adduced here: since
they cannot use the norm of their first language (Mandarin) acquisition, they re-call
the method their English teachers in high schools taught them, and try to transfer it to
teaching MFL. As we have stated a great mistake that most English teachers commit
is that they only teach grammatical competence, but no sociolinguistic competence,
Mandarin teachers emulating the method cannot do otherwise.

For example, we have overheard some Chiense teachers say they do not teach the
last section Ni show shemma 你說什麼 ‘What Do You Say’ of each lesson in
Chiense Dialogues because students can answer it without fail by omitting some
words—especially the interrogative word. For example, if the question is:

Q: Fan dzwo hau le, ni yau ching ni-de pengyou dau fanting chyru chrfan, nig en tan
show shemm?
飯做好了，你要請你的朋友到飯廳去吃飯，你跟他說什麼？
‘Meal is ready. You want to ask your friend to go to eat in the dining room, what
do you say to him?’

A student can answer successfully by picking up some words from the question:
Answer: Fan dzwo hau le, dau fanting chyu chrfan. 飯做好了，到飯廳去吃飯
‘Meal is ready. Go to eat in the dining room.’

This specific answer is grammatical, but it cannot be used to invite a friend to eat;
it may be used to call a seriously sick servant to supper by his unfriendly boss only.
Our analysis of Chinese directives and the comparison of Chinese and English
directives in this thesis can help teachers who teach Mandarin to English-speaking
students by pointing out when and on what occasion can a directive be appropriately
said. Of course, most teachers subconsciously know very well when, where, to whom
they can use what forms of directives. What we have done is simply to make explicit
what they have known intuitively to facilitate their teaching.

We should, therefore, suggest that people in charge of MFL teaching should
making teaching communicative competence an essential component in MFL training
program and incorporate sociolinguistic findings like those contained in this tesis into
textbooks.
Notes to chapter V

1 ‘Advisative’ is a term used by Chao (1968) to indicate the special attribute of ba which has the force of suggestion.

2 The example was given by Dr. alan Hudson-Edwards’ speech on ‘Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching Problems’, Dec. 3rd, 1981 at the Lecture Hall of National Taiwan Normal University.


Fraser, Bruce. 1975. “Hedged Performatives,” *Syntax and Semantics* Vol. 3: *Speech
Tsao, Fengfu. 1977. “Recent Investigations of Speech Acts and Teaching of


