CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

The approach taken in this study is more from the semantic and pragmatic aspect. As such in this chapter, the significance of pragmatic and semantic theories and features that are relevant to the study will be defined. However, as this study explores the use of language in a community and in their social activity, the aspects of sociolinguistic will also be touched generally in this chapter.

2.1 Pragmatics, Semantics and Sociolinguistics

The first area crucial to this study is pragmatics. According to Mey (2001), most of the definitions on pragmatics pay lip service to Charles Morris's definition of pragmatics as *"the study of the relation of signs to interpreters"* (1938: 6). But, Mey himself (2001) claims that pragmatics, as the study of the way humans use their language in communication, bases itself on the investigation of how human affect and effectualize language in context. Levinson (1987) considers pragmatics as the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language. Therefore pragmatics can be considered as the study of the use of language in human communication as determined by the conditions of society. Pragmatics is much related to this study, as this study is on the use of language among the seller and customer in the selling-buying context.

Besides pragmatics, another discipline relevant to this study is semantics. Semantics is central to the study of communication; as communication becomes a crucial factor in social organization, the need to understand it becomes more relevant. Semantics is also at the centre of the study of human thought processes, cognition, and conceptualization of all these are intricately bound to the way in which we classify and convey our experience of the world through language (Leech ; 1974).

An understanding of semantics is essential for understanding language in social contexts, as it is related to meaning-making, and for understanding varieties of speech and effects of style. It is one of the most fundamental concepts in linguistics. Griffiths (2006), writes that semantics is the study of word meaning and sentence meaning, and, is therefore a descriptive subject. It is an attempt to describe and understand the nature or the knowledge about the meaning in the language used that people have from knowing the language. The study of semantics includes the study of how meaning is constructed, interpreted, clarified, obscured, illustrated, simplified negotiated, contradicted and paraphrased. In this sense Semantics is seen to be relevant to this study and is therefore one of the elements explored.

Sociolinguistics encompasses the wide spectrum of variable that an individual's language covers, starting from the language speaker himself who is the basic unit of a society (Loga; 2005). Dell Hymes, (1964, in Nik Safiah Karim, 1981:10), defines sociolinguistics as a discipline which investigates the action of language linked to factors such as background, participant, topic, function of interaction, forms of connection and community's values.

Basically, sociolinguistics is one of the social science disciplines as it relates to social interaction and linguistics phenomenon among social dialectal and social class member of different ethnicity, age and sex (18 July 2010). According to this description, sociolinguistics can be interpreted as a study of feature and language variation function in a general society (Fishman; 1971). According to Holmes (1992), sociolinguistics is the study of the relationship between language and society. She adds on that sociolinguistics also explains why people speak differently in different social contexts and concerned with identifiying the social meaning. Based on the above information, sociolinguistics in this study is taken as the relation between community and language. Since it involves the people, the function of interaction and the culture of the community of *Pasar Kedai Payang*, sociolinguistics is an important aspect of this study.

2.2 Negotiation Language

As 'negotiation' is essential in the selling-buying interaction, it is necessary to also discuss the definition of 'negotiation language' and 'strategy'. Gibbons, Bradac, and Busch (1992) proposed that negotiation "represents the exchange of information through language that coordinates and manages meaning". Lewicki et al (2006) concludes that in negotiation, language operates at two levels: the logical level (proposals of offers) and the pragmatics level (semantics, syntax and style). The meaning conveyed by a proposition or a statement is a combination of one logical surface message and several pragmatic (i.e hinted or inferred) messages.

Acuff (2008), expresses agreement in connection to Malays, negotiating and politeness when he suggested eleven rules that need to be obeyed when interacting and negotiating with the people in Malaysia especially the Malays. He says, Malays always try to avoid from being rude to the hearer when negotiating. The suggested rules are:

1. Address people by a title such as Mr, Miss or Mrs; to show respect;
2. Greet the addressee with the common Malay greeting *Selamat pagi* (Good morning) and *Apa khaba*r (How are you). Hello is a casual greeting. A more appropriate greeting to Muslims is *"Assalamualaikum"* (Peace be upon you);
3. Shake hands upon meeting and parting. Sometimes a slight bow or nod is more appropriate with older Malaysian women;
4. Be prepared for lengthy small talk unrelated to business issues before business items are discussed;
5. Build rapport and trust. The relationship forms the basis for the business aspects of the negotiation;
6. Expect discussions to be long and detailed. Be prepared to provide a lot of information;
7. Expect Malay negotiators to be generally courteous. Etiquette is important;
8. Respect the concept of face. Status is important. Don't ask direct, probing questions that could be embarrassing;
9. Be diplomatic in the rejection of your counterpant's proposal. A direct rejection of the proposal is sometimes considered to be a rejection of the person;
10. Be prepared for much diplomacy from your Malaysian counterpart. Read between the lines to determine the real positions; and
11. Expect Malay negotiators to graciously but firmly keep the pressure on for you make concessions and to remind you of the business in Malaysia.

(Acuff, 2008: 256-258)

2.3 Grice's Pragmatics Theory (1967)

The pragmatics theory is introduced by Grice, a pioneer to the modern pragmatic theory (Nor Hashimah, 1994.) Grice (1967) had tried to establish a solid disparity between semantics and pragmatics through the concepts of "what is said" and "what is implied". "What is said" covers the element of semantics and "what is implied" covers the element of pragmatics.

This theory was later expanded by Leech (1983) who views both semantics and pragmatics as being concerned with meaning, but the difference between them can be traced to two different uses of the verb 'to mean': [1] What does X mean? and [2] What did you mean by X?

Grice (1975) also has distinguished 4 co-operation principles known as maxims. They are Maxim of Quantity, Maxim of Quality, Maxim of Relevance and Maxim of Manner (Huang, 2007:25). In the Maxim of Quantity, the speakers are obligated to give the information as required but not overloaded or more than required. In the situation of selling-buying at the market, a customer asks the seller about the price of good, by asking *"How much?"* or *"Can you reduce the price?"*. The seller who complies with the Maxim of Quantity just replies by saying *"10 ringgit."* if the price is really ten ringgit and *"Yes"* or *"No"* in order to give the information needed by the customer. The seller's answers show that he/she has completely given the information as required by the customer.

For the Maxim of Quality, the speaker is not permitted in giving any information to the addressee if the information is untrue. In addition, the speaker cannot give the information to the hearer if he/she thinks where there is lack of adequate evidence to support the information. For example, in the situation of selling-buying the textile, in order to attract customer to buy his/her goods, the seller must be honest in advertising the goods such as giving the accurate information about the type or material of the textile.

In the Maxim of relevance, the speaker needs to give the relevant information which is related to the discussed topic. For example, in the interaction of the *keropok* selling-buying, a customer may ask the seller about the quality of the advertised *keropok* by asking *"Is it itchy or not?* .The seller who follows this maxim should reply either *"Yes"* or *"No"*. If the reply is *"It is made in Seberang Takir."* it shows that the co-operation principle is violented as the answer is not relevant to the topic in progress. The fourth maxim is the Maxim of Manner. There are 4 sub-maxims in the Maxim of Manner. In this maxim while giving information, the speaker is compelled to avoid the obscurity of expression and ambiguous. The speaker must brief in explaining the information and the speaker must be certain that the information is always arranged.

Grice on the other hand introduced the implicature concept which is one of the important aspects in pragmatics. The conversational implicture is a message that is not found in the plain sense of the utterances (18 July 2010). It is a translation of meaning that extends beyond the limitation of a sentence's literal meaning (Grice, 1975) as it contains hidden messages in the speech which is the initial meaning intended by the speaker's mind. Thus, implicature relies on a certain context contained in the previous speech. Here, context plays a major role alongside implicature and the process of interpretation of the utterances.

It can be concluded that implicature is a *hidden meaning* or underlying message within a speech. It also gives a better picture on how a speaker can deliver a meaning more significances than what is being said literally.

2.4 Politeness and Conversation Theories

Politeness is seen especially from the verbal expressions of what is considerd socially acceptable and expected of a particular culture. The different approaches to politeness related to this study will be discussed in this section, particularly works by Fraser (1990), Leech (1983), Lakoff (1975), and Brown & Levinson (1987).

2.4.1 Fraser's Conversational Contract (1990)

Fraser's (1990) conversational contract view of politeness is an adaptation of Grice's Co-operative Principle which at the same time recognizes Goffman's notion of face. Fraser suggests that each party upon entering into a given conversation:

> *"....brings an understanding of some initial set of rights and obligations that will determine, at least for the other/s. During the course of time, or because of a change in the context, there is always the possibility for a renegotiation of the conversational contract; the two parties may readjust what rights and what obligations they hold towards each other."*
>
> (Fraser, 1990: 232)

R2-Give options, sometimes goes along with R1 or at times operates when R1 seems inappropriate. Under this rule what is said reflect as much freedom as possible for the Adreesee (A) to make up his mind. Tag questions and hedges are good examples.

Lakoff provides an example 'I guess it is time to leave' and 'It's time to leave, isn't it?' Verbs of thinking like 'think' or 'guess' serve to dilute the force of the directive. Devices such as tag questions also serve the same purpose as tags have complex formation rules and it can complicate the surface structure of sentences. But the hedging effect that it has makes it possible for the Speaker (S) to make commands indirectly. Hedging devices are very useful because they do not reveal the real intentions of the Speker (S) and the Addresse (A) cannot feel the 'command' through the utterances.

The S sounds uncertain of what he is saying although at the same time he does sound confident. He does not wish to assert himself even though he is sure of what he is talking about because he does not want to risk offending anyone. He actually means to say, "I say this to you, but you are under no compulsion to believe it: I'm not trying to buffalo you" (Lakoff, 1973). Therefore the S gives options or he really does not know, he leaves the final decision to the A. Lakoff says that the careful speaker will tailor R1 and R2 according to his purpose because he is aware that people respond differently towards these two rules.

This rules seems to amount to expressing deference to the A. Conventional politeness in Lakoff's terms means that the S expresses politeness uncertainly, so as not to allow the A his options but to make it appear that he is allowing options when in fact both of them know that the S is certain and that the A has no real option but to go along with the S (Jamaliah, 2000). This linguistic device also exists in the Malay language. In the selling-buying interaction, the customer allows the seller to have the options. For example, S (customer) gives an option to A (seller): *"Boleh tak beri saya RM2 lagi?"* [Could you reduce a further RM2?] Again, here it makes the A (seller) feel as if he has the option but actually he is obliged to reduce the price by RM2 more.

R3 on the other hand, is 'least hypocritical', although it is often used conventionally. This rule produces the sense of 'camaraderie' between the S and the A. Jamaliah (2000). The ultimate effect is to make A feel good i.e. sense of equality between them or that A is even better than S (Of course, A is not supposed to take liberties because of this or he will cause the termination of the conversation). This can in fact be called a rule of informality since in situations of formality, intimacy, either genuine or conventional is the characteristic of this situation. In cases of genuine intimacy, there is no need to stand on ceremony; in situations of social inequality, the S with higher authority would show camaraderie by putting the socially inferior at ease (Asmah,1992).

Lakoff says that R1 and R3 are contradictory, because if they co-exist in the same conversation, we have to assume that for any of the various extra linguistic reasons, the participants are really or conversationally, shifting their relationships with each other (1975). In fact all the three rules are designed to make A feel good; but according to Lakoff's Politeness, it is achieved in different ways. R3 makes A feel wanted and appreciated. The expression of solidarity as in the use of first names or particles puts A as the more respected in the conversation.

In the case of the Terengganu Malay culture generally, when we talk to people of our own age we use honorific terms of address to create a polite distance e.g. making others feel good with the use of the terms such as *'kak', 'adik', 'kak long, 'abang', 'pakcik', 'makcik.* Where appropriate a feeling of warmth and informality is expressed in other ways, for instance by showing concern on interest about the other's welfare, e.g *"Dah nak dapat cucu ke Makcik Minah?"* [Makcik Minah, are you going to get a grandchild?]

2.4.4 Brown & Levinson's Politeness Strategies (1987)

Politeness is the expression of the speakers' intention to mitigate face threats carried by certain face threatening acts towards another (Mills, 2003). Being polite therefore consists of attempting to save face for another. Brown & Levinson's politeness theory states that some speech acts threaten others' face. First formulated in 1987 by Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson, the politeness theory has since expanded academia's perception of politeness (Mills, 2003). They outline four main types of politeness strategies: bald on record, negative politeness, positive politeness, and off-the-record or indirect strategy.

The bald on record strategy does not attempt to minimize the threat to the hearer's face. This happens because it is most often used between speakers who closely know their audience intimately such as between close friends and family. With the bald on record strategies there is a direct possibility that the unfamiliar audience will be shocked or embarrassed. For example, the request *"Hey, lend me some money?"* could make the adressee feel a bit uncomfortable.

However, the second strategy, positive politeness attempts to minimize the threat to the hearer's face. This strategy is most commonly used in situations where the speakers know each other fairly well. Quite often hedging and attempts to avoid conflict are used during this verbal exchange.

An example of a positive politeness strategy for request is as below:

"Do you think you could lend me some money?"

The third strategy, negative politeness presumes that the speaker will be imposing on the listener. The potential for awkwardness or embarrassment is greater than in bald on record and positive politeness strategies. Negative face is the desire to remain autonomous. Thus, a request without consideration of the listener's negative face could make the listeners feel uncomfortable.

The final politeness strategy outlined by Brown and Levinson is the indirect strategy. This strategy uses indirect language and removes the speaker from the potential of being imposing. For example, a speaker using the indirect strategy might merely say *"wow, it's getting cold in here"* insinuating that it would be nice if the listener would get up and turn up the thermostat without directly asking the listener to do so.

The fourth strategy is most relevant to this study, when sometimes the seller and at other times the customer use the indirect language and avoid dropping the listeners' face value during negotiation. In situations where a customer asks for a reduction in price, he/she would not say directly *"It's expensive, you should reduce the price."* It sounds rude and commanding to the seller. So, in order to be courteous, polite language such as *"I will buy it if you reduce the price"* or *"Give me a special price, please"* would be more appproprite.

2.5 Speech Act

Speech acts are acts of communication. As described by (18 July 2010), speech act is an act that a speaker performs when making an utterance. This means, to communicate is to express a certain attitude, and the type of speech act being performed corresponds to the type of attitude being expressed. For example, a statement expresses a belief, a request expresses a desire, and an apology expresses regret. As an act of communication, a speech act succeeds if the audience identifies, in accordance with the speaker's intention, the attitude being expressed.

Speech acts are difficult to perform in a second language because learners may not know the idiomatic expressions or cultural norms in the second language or they may transfer their first language rules and conventions into the second language, assuming that such rules are universal. As the natural tendency for language learners is to fall back on what they know to be appropriate in their first language, it is important that they understand exactly what they do in that first language in order to be able to recognize what is transferable to other languages. In the case of this study, the sellers and the customers in *Pasar Kedai Payang* are Terengganu Malay dialect speakers and they have their own understanding of the implicit language rules and conventions practiced among their community members during interacting in the process of selling-buying. As they could understand the indirect language, the message will be sent clearly to the addressees and the conflict in the communication would not occur.

On the other hand, Austin (1962) defines speech acts as the actions performed in saying something. Austin himself identifies three distinct levels of action beyond the act of the utterance itself. He distinguishes the act **of** saying something, what one does **in** saying it, and what one does **by** saying it, and dubs these the *'locutionary'*, the *'illocutionary'* and the *'perlocutionary'* acts, respectively.

Seven years later Searle (1969) classifies speech acts into five macro-classes. (1) Declarations: The utterances that can be considered as declaration as suggested by Cutting (2002: 16-17), are 'I bet', 'I declare', 'I resign.', 'I baptise this boy John Smith', which changes a nameless baby into one with a name. (2) Representatives: the acts in which the words state what the speaker believes to be the case, such as 'describing', 'claiming', 'hypothesising', 'insisting' and 'predicting'. (3) Commissives: include acts in which the words commit to the speaker to future action, such as 'promising', 'offering', 'threatening', 'refusing', 'vowing' and 'volunteering'. (4) Directives: covers acts in which the words are aimed at making the hearer do something, such as 'commanding', 'requesting', 'inviting', 'forbidding', and 'suggesting'. (5) Expressives: include acts in which the words state what the speaker feels, such as 'apologising', 'praising', 'congratulating', 'deploring' and 'regretting'. Searle suggests that a speaker using a direct speech act wants to communicate the literal meaning that the words conventionally express where there is a direct relationship between the form and the function (Cutting; 2002). At the same time, Searle explained that someone using an indirect speech act wants to communicate a different meaning from the apparent surface meaning. This means that the form and the function are not directly related.

Searle's (1969) and Austin's (1962) theories on speech acts are parallel to the theories of conversation in the Malay culture as written by Asmah (1992) and Jamaliah (2000) which will be discussed in Section 2.6. A combination of these Malay and western theories will be used to describe the language used among the Pasar Payang community.

2.6 Conversation and Interaction in the Malay Community

In this research, the politeness of communication in the Malay community is the major aspect in relation to the data obtained for this study. Politeness is associated with manners (Jamaliah, 2000) and is highly emphasized in the Malay community because an individual's 'self-value' and 'self-respect' is determined by others in the community through his or her manners and politeness. According to Jamaliah, the judgment on one's manners is considered as a serious and important matter because it reflects the up-bringing of the individual and indirectly involves the family's reputation. For example, if a child 'inappropriately' raises his voice when speaking to the elders, the child is considered as '*biadap*' or disrespectful (Asmah, 1992; Jamaliah, 2000). This stigma is not only aimed at the child, but it also questions the parents' and the family's credibility in educating the child.

Being polite will lift and strengthen the social value of an individual in the community, while failure in doing so will cause the community to segregate the individual from their circle (Jamaliah, 2000). Therefore, the importance of 'manners' and 'politeness' are emphasized in the behavior and communication skills of the Malay community (Azizah Ahmad, 2005). When the emphasis is on self-restraint in the face of social communication, uttering dissatisfaction or disagreement is less likely to happen. If disclosed, it is considered as uncouth behavior, threatening the listener's face and providing potential disrupt to the perseverance of social harmony among speakers involved (Jamaliah Mohd Ali, 2002; 1995; Asmah Haji Omar, 1992; Asma Abdullah; Teo, 1996; 1995). In fact, as Muslims, Malays are obligated to be 'good mannered' when interacting even with non-muslims as Islam places politeness or good behavior *(akhlak)* at a high place (Rosman Md Shah, 2010).

According to Asmah (1992) and Jamaliah (1995; 2000), indirectness or '*bahasa kiasan'*, is one of the politeness features of the Malay language. Asmah (1992) identifies 4 types of indirectness in communication among Malays. They are:

i) Beating about the bush.

ii) Using imagery.

iii) Saying the opposite of what one means.

iv) Using a surrogate.

The beating-about-the bush (B.A.B) type is used by both children and elders. According to Asmah (1992), in this category, the speaker takes a few minutes to talk about other things before arriving at his real intention. These 'other things' that he talks about may or may not be related to the core of the main story that he wants to deliver. B.A.B is very typical of Malay culture as it does not only neutralise the directness and unrefinedness of manner, but it also serves as a 'small talk' device in a social interaction as *"Nak pergi mana?"* [Where are you going?], *"Tengah buat apa tu?"* [what are you doing?] etc.

The use of imagery can be clearly seen in *pantun.* In communication, the *pantun* is used as a form of communication in formal propositions for marriage and engagement and ceremonies. It is in such events that indirectness is most used. In ordinary conversation among friends, imagery is also commonly used. When one wants to ask a friend to confirm a rumour that he has heard about his friend getting married, or to enquire when the wedding date is, the elicitation makes use of the imagery such as *"Bila nak makan Nasi Minyak?"* [When do you get to eat nasi minyak?]. To ask the person concerned straight on his face whether it is true that he is getting married or when his wedding day is, would embarrass him. Therefore, in traditional Malay culture, indirectness in language is used as an acceptable way of communication.

Asmah (1992) then states that the contradiction technique is applied in amicable as well as antagonistic situations. Contradiction serves to suppress one's self-pride or feeling of self- importance because such attitudes are not condoned by society as they are contrary to the teachings of Islam. Contradictions of this nature can be seen when someone or someone's belongings is praised, such as *"Kamu cantik!"* [You are beautiful], she could not respond with a smile or the utterance *"Terima kasih"* [thank you] as it is considered as *riak* (having self-importance) and arrogance, she will use the appropriate response of the Malay culture by saying *"Tak adalah!."* [Not actually!].

The final rule outlined by Asmah (1992) is surrogate. The surrogate situation arises when there is a big gap between the message originator and its receiver. This gap may relate to status, age and camaraderie. The message originator holds that receiver in respect or in fear, such that a direct verbal communication between the two would cause an embarrassment to the originator of the message such as the mother-in-law using her daughter as a surrogate or *middle-man* to speak to her son-in-law. Asmah then adds that traditions rule that there should be some distance between the mother in-law and the son-in-law or for that matter the father-in-law and the daughter-in-law.

Jamaliah (2000), in addition outlines 4 behavioral aspects in the Malay community that depicts good manners or *'budi bahasa'* which influences the individual's speech skills. The 4 aspects are:

a) Avoid being too frank or too forceful or showing aggressiveness.

b) Avoid responding to other's request with a direct "NO".

c) Avoid being too outspoken in conveying thoughts and ideas.

d) Avoid creating an interpersonal conflict or causing the family to lose self- respect.

These 4 aspects are parts of several manner criteria commonly found in Bahasa Melayu. There are also other criterions such as the usage of different 'noun' or 'pronoun' and never to address the elders using *"kau"* [you] and *'aku'* [I].

It can be concluded that in any social interaction, politeness and morality must be placed foremost. A speech act is taken as a social act where the speakers are expected to behave politely with no offensive, abusive, rude or vulgar words. For instance the speaker does not reveal the information that she or he ought not to reveal without permission, direct the addressee to do something that the addressee should not do or commit him/her self to do something to the speaker that the speaker does not want to do.

Nor Hashimah (1994), identified 13 strategies used in the transactions at several textile shops situated in Kota Bahru, Kelantan. The thirteen strategies identified are comparison strategy, tricking strategy, confidence strategy, coaxing strategy, origin strategy, local strategy, intimate strategy, lucky strategy, genuine strategy, optimist strategy, evaluation strategy, strength or long lasting strategy and using first pronoun, *kita* [we].

Based on the strategies mentioned above, Nor Hashimah analyzed the speech implicature and meaning involved during the transaction process using Grice's pragmatic theory as the framework to identify the exact meaning of the speech. She adds that the meaning of the speech becomes meaningful if the speech production is done layer by layer to ensure the exact interpretation is acquired. In this way too, the interpretation of the meaning is featured scientifically and accountably (Nor Hashimah: 1992).

In the comparison strategy, she discovers that the sellers had compared the price of the same merchandise sold in their shops with that at the supermarkets. By comparing the prices, the sellers hope the buyers are convinced that they have succeeded in getting the same merchandise at a lower price at their shop.
This is an example of an analyzed utterance.

Seller : Kalau di gudang-gudang besar, awak tak akan dapat dengan harga ni, mahal lagi.

[Seller : You won't be able to get it at this price at the supermarket, very expensive.]

(Nor Hashimah, 1994: 182)

Meanwhile, in the tricking strategy, Hashimah states that terms such as special offer, special price, and giving discounts requested by the customer, interesting expressions and the lowest price offered are able to influence the customer to purchase the merchandise. Therefore, the customer will make an implicature conclusion from what was said by the seller, so that, the customer would not regret purchasing the merchandise.

The third strategy, the confidence strategy refers to the situation where the seller impresses the customer to continue buying merchandise at his shop without prejudice. According to Nor Hashimah, utterances such as 'merely a bus fare', 'the cheapest price' and 'give and take are sure to convince the customer that the price offered by the seller is the best or cheapest. When the customer is convinced enough, the transaction will move on to the next stage. In this way, the seller implicitly tries to convince the seller that his or her price is really low while the customer understands the real meaning intended by the seller and subsequently buys the specific merchandise.

In using the coaxing strategy, the seller implores the customer to consider his or her position as he/she is only trying to gain a marginal profit to cover the cost and taxes. This is an example of the coaxing strategy:

Customer *: Lapan ringgit tak boleh ke?*

[Customer : Can't you give it to me for eight ringgit?]

Seller *: Tak boleh dah la, sebab 50 tulah hak kita, kalau kurang lagi gak, nanya (teruk) kita pula, modal nan dah mahal.*

[Seller : It can't go any cheaper because fifty is our right, lesser than that we lose out, because our capital is already high.]

(Nor Hashimah, 1994: 195)

There are also pleas from the customer that coax the seller to be more tolerant. The pleas are used implicitly in utterances such as *'sekolah dah nak buka'* [School is re-opening soon] and *'harga minyak semakin naik sekarang'* [the price of the palm oil has gone up] which helps to strengthen the pleas successfully.

The origin strategy refers to the source of the merchandise. The origin factor sometimes presents positive and negative connotations. It can also influence the customer and seller in agreeing on the price they desire for the particular merchandise they are haggling over.

Customer *: Bagi 6 ringgitlah sehelai.*

[Customer : Sell it at 6 ringgit a piece.]

Seller *: Saya jual kain Malaysia belaka, tak jual kain Siam.*

[Seller : I only sell Malaysian made materials, not Siamese.]

(Nor Hashimah, 1994: 199)

In the example above, Hashimah states that the origin strategy is the main factor in influencing the buyer. Usually, the word 'Siamese' carries a negative connotation especially in relation to the quality of the product. The word, Siamese, itself can change the customer's perception as a hearer and help the buyer to interpret the implicit meaning of the speech. It also helps the buyer to agree indirectly with the price offered by the seller.

The sixth strategy identified is the local strategy. It refers to the personal relationship between the customer and the seller as the local community. Utterances such as *'orang biasa'* [regular customer], *'kita sama'* [we are the same] and *'selalu membeli di sini'* [buy here often] are used to gain what is wanted by both the customer and seller. These utterances are used more to show familiarity to ensure personal judgment is involved in the price setting.

The seventh strategy is the intimate strategy that involves pleasant and pleasing treatment by the seller towards the customer. Usually, this strategy is put into play to coax the customer to become a regular customer of the seller. Utterances such as *'untung sikit sahaja'* [the profit is very small] and *'cukup untuk buat minum air'* [just enough to buy a drink] fosters a friendly seller-customer relationship so that the bargaining process is less business-minded. This will please the customer and give the seller an opportunity to foster a close relationship with the customer. It would help to entice the customer to patronize the shop regularly.

The next strategy is the luck strategy which often refers to the first transaction for the day. The seller usually associates business acquired in the morning hours with luck and a good beginning for him or her:

Seller : Pagi-pagi ni buat gori (luck).

[Seller : You bring luck early in the morning.]

(Nor Hashimah, 1994: 209)

Based on the interaction above, the customer is described as bringing *gori* (luck), and as an assurance that a sale made with the first customer will bring in more sales later in the day and the seller is also impliying that he/she will give the customer a good price in order to get the first sale. If the customer's request is rejected, this means the seller is rejecting luck from the first customer.

According to Nor Hashimah, in the buying-selling process, the distinctive factor is a strategy usually used by the seller to increase his or her profits. The distinctive factor is used as a reason to attract customers especially when it comes to the price.

For example:

Customer : 9 ringgitlah.

[Customer : 9 ringgit, okay?]

Seller : *9 ringgit tidak boleh, sebab yang ini metalik, yang lembik, yang nipis boleh harga tu, sebab modal 11 (ringgit) dah.*

[Seller : No, I can't sell it for 9 ringgit because this is metallic, the soft and thin ones are at that price. The buying price is already 11 ringgit.]

(Nor Hashimah, 1994: 212)

Optimistic strategy is usually used by the customers to get the best price by suggesting to the seller that besides gaining lower profit, it also means that the seller will get more business. Actually the customer wants the seller to sell the merchandise at a lower price.

For example:

Customer : *Sikit-sikit, lama-lama jadi bukit, kan?*

[Customer : Slowly but steadily it will accumulate, right?]

(Nor Hashimah, 1994: 214)

The eleventh strategy used by the seller is the evaluation strategy. In this strategy, the seller claims he/she only sells quality products. This is in accordance with the utterances such as 'we only sell merchandise of high standard' used by seller when the customer complains of the high price placed on certain merchandise. The implicit rejection on the part of the buyer helps the seller to reinforce his or her statement that the high price matches the quality and value of the merchandise sold. The twelfth strategy is called the durability strategy in reference to the merchandise's durability. According to Nor Hashimah (1994), the seller tries to advertise his or her merchandise with attractive guarantees like *'Tahan sampai dua tiga tahun. Padanlah dengan harga'* [can last up to two, three years, worth the price]. The seller gives this answer when the customer asks for a price lower than that quoted. With these words, the customer will assume that the merchandise is really durable and it would be a good buy for them.

The final strategy used by the seller during selling and buying transaction is the usage of the prounoun *'kita'* [we]. Nor Hashimah states that *'kita'* in Kelantanese colloquial speech has two functions. First it serves as the first group speaker pronoun (inclusive) and this function is similar to its function in standard Bahasa Melayu. While, the second function of *'kita'* is as first person singular pronoun. Nor Hashimah found that the second function mostly appear in the buying and selling transactions among the Kelantan Malay community. The second function can develop a sense of commonness and reduce the gap between the seller and buyer hence making the business environment harmonious.

2.7 Previous Research on Cooperative Principles and Politeness Principles

Ramli (1999) found that the Arabs use 3 cooperative principles as suggested by Grice: direct cooperation, indirect cooperation and non-cooperation. In order to see the indirect cooperative principle, Ramli collected conversation data which had taken place in a mosque.

The following is an example of a conversation between 'A' and 'B':

A: Why, are you not joining us for Tarawih prayers?

B: Of course. *Insyaallah*. [With Allah's will].

In the conversation above, it indicates that B directly cooperates when he responds to A's question precisely with *"Insyaallah"* that shows he will perform the prayer with them. Such an answer is often observed in Arabic conversations, when one tries to avoid him or her self being marked as not performing the act (in this example prayer).

The second principle is indirect cooperation. The conversation is between P and R. The context was taken when P woke up late. After waking up, P poses a question to R who is in the bedroom.

The following is an extract of their conversation:

P: What is the time now?

R: The newspaper has arrived.

The answer has apparently violated Grice's maxim of relevance. R is seen as not directly answering P's question as the answer is not related to the question. However, in the context, by saying *"the news paper has arrived",* meaning the time is already 8 am or later. P understands the utterance and is able catch the R's intent as they both know the newspaper usually arrives at or after 8 am as they have shared knowledge.

A second example given by Ramli is the conversation between P and R in the dining room.

P: Did you go to the wedding yesterday?

R: I had a fever.

The answer given by R does not answer the question given by P directly. The norm would be for R to answer Yes or No. R has violated the maxim of relevance by saying *"I was having a fever"*. However, according to the conversation implicature, R's answer meant *"I did not go to the wedding because I was having a fever"*. Therefore, R has answered P's question by following the conversation implicature.

The third example below given by Ramli, is the conversation between H1 and J1 which took place in the male staffroom before lesson, but after the first recess.

H1: Do you have a class?

J1: I am not well.

H2: You did not go to the hospital?

J2: I have taken many kinds of medicine.

In the above conversation, J1 gave an answer which did not adhere to the maxim of relevance because it was not related to what was asked. The implicature was *"I have a class but I'm not able to go in because I'm not well"*. Similarly, the answer given by J2 also did not follow the maxim of relevance as when he was asked whether he had gone to the hospital or not, J2 replied that he had taken several types of medicines. That answer is not related to what was asked in H2. The conversation implicature was *"I had gone to the hospital and have taken various medications but I am still not cured. So, I'm not going to the hospital anymore."*

Ramli (1999) also found that Arabs make conversations which do not adhere to any maxim but still adhere to the cooperative principle and the conversation implicature. This happens because the speaker may have certain aims such as to be sarcastic or to convey figurative expression. This may be caused by anger or because he or she is offended or that he or she wants to create jokes. Ramli (1999) has proposed several extracts of conversations based on different contexts. The first example is a teacher asking a male teacher who has been absent from school for quite some time.

A: Where have you been, I haven't seen you for a while now?

B: I took maternity leave.

B's reply has violated the maxim of quality and the maxim of manner. With the experience and relationship they both share, A could infer that B was not telling the truth. The conversational implicature which occurred was that B was only trying to be funny with A, as the utterance was made with a smile.

The second example features a student who was late for school and was asked by the disciplinary teacher for the reasons.

T1: Why are you early today?

U1: I slept late last night.

T2: Do you know the school rules?

U2: I am sorry.

In the context above, the discipline teacher scolded a student because he was late by sarcastically saying that he is early. The student understood the meaning behind the query by replying that he was late because he slept late the night before. This meant the conversational implicature in this context are "*Why are you late?*" and *"The school's rules do not permit you to come late"*.

In Arabic language there are also speeches which do not fulfill the cooperative principle. In certain circumstances, a speaker may not want to cooperate with another speaker because of specific reasons such as being too occupied or too tired. Therefore, the speaker may deviate from continuing their conversation. At times, they may just exit the place where the corversation took place.

Below is an extract to illustrate the act:

K: What do you think about suicides?

L: I don't know.

K: Suicide is crazy.

L: (No response)

In the extract above, it is found that L intentially does not want to cooperate with K by answering *"I don't know"*. This type of answer is actually one of the ways to show that L does not want to cooperate and continue with the conversation. K once again tried to push L to continue the conversation by giving his opinion that *"Suicide is crazy"*, however L just remained silent. The act of silence indicates that L did not want to entertain K any longer. With the act of silence, L hoped that K would understand that he did not intend to continue the conversation. Through this strategy, L thought that it would be more polite rather than saying *"I am not interested to have a conversation with you"* which would offend K.

Look (1997) analysed rhetorics used by an insurance sales person in the process of selling his/her product. The analyses done on the transcription produced were based on the ten maxims under the Cooperative Principle and Politeness proposed by Grice and Leech, respectively.

The maxims are:

i. Maxim of Quantity

According to Look (1997), in insurance sales, this maxim is important to establish cooperation and to attract the listener's interest. During a conversation with a client, an insurance sales person uses the maxim of quantity to make a contribution as is required. This means when making a discussion with the client, the sale person only touches the issues that is related to the topic. At the same time, Looks says that the contribution which is more informative than is required must be avoided by an insurance sales person.

ii. Maxim of Quality

An insurance sales person should be honest in conveying his or her messages. When conversing any doubts or anything which lacks adequate evidence should be avoided. At a more important level, anything which is believed to be false must be prevented from being said to the targeted person. In the process of insurance sales, this maxim is really important to convince the clients or potential buyers that the sales person is someone who is trustworthy.

iii. Maxim of Relation

In a conversation, contributions or answer given should be relevant or have a relation to what is being discussed or questioned. It has become the practice of insurance sales persons to go against or to disagree directly with the opinions of their customers. For a sales person, any queries from their customers must be answered based on the questions asked so as to please them. This is important for an insurance sales person to ensure conversational continuity in the insurance sales.

iv. Maxim of Manner

In a conversation, what is hoped from the speaker is orderly and clear contributions. Any expression which is ambiguous, vague and obscure should be avoided. According to Look (1997), utterances which are obscure in the process of insurance sales will dampen the sale process and this will be a loss for the sales person. Moreover, customers will not believe the promises or the gained advantages of the insurance being promoted.

v. Maxim of Politeness

The maxim of politeness is really important in a conversation. Politeness can influence a buyer to continue listening to what a sales person has to say. Non- offensive language will be used by a sales person during the process of insurance sales so as not to offend the buyers. In addition, the customers are more easily deceived by language which is more polite and decent.

vi. Maxim of Generosity

Every contribution in a conversation has characteristics of generosity. The virtue of being generous is not only through words of mouth but it has to present itself with a will to contribute materialistically. A sales person who is honest with a customer will inform him or her that insurance payments through monthly instalments will benefit the sales person and not the customer.

vii. Maxim of Approbation

This maxim gives priority to the feelings of others or of the listeners. Finger-pointing, insulting and condemning one another have become norms in the competitive business world. Nonetheless, these techniques are not practiced by the sales persons. Although there are customers' complaints against sales persons from other companies, of deceiving the customers or telling lies, they still try not to bad- mouth the sales person with the assumption that they are having personal problems.

viii. Maxim of Modesty

Focusing on oneself by minimizing the expression of praise of self. The sales person refused to be praised as being well- versed in insurance sales by his customers. This has to be the way for every customer so as to reveal the character of kindness of the sales person.

ix. Maxim of Agreement

Both parties involved in a conversation will try to deviate from any tension, disagreement or confrontation if they hope to achieve harmony and polite communication. In this study, it was found that the sales person was in disagreement with the customer. Nevertheless, by using the intelligence and politeness, the sale person managed to conceal their disagreements from the eyes of their customer.

x. Maxim of Sympathy

In selling insurance, the sales person used the story of his friend who was involved in a fatal accident but was not covered by insurance. The sales person expressed his sympathy to his friend's family members especially his children because his friend ignored his advice on purchasing insurance even though it was recommended by the sales person. This maxim is an important strategy to persuade the customer to buy his/her insurance.

According to Look (1997), every maxim plays an important role in the transaction of insurance. However, the maxim of sympathy is less appropriate in the transaction of textile and food compared to the transaction of insurance. Maxim of quality and quantity in the other hand are able to attract the attention of customers. The two maxims would be able to gain consumer confidence on the transaction conducted.

Look (1997) mentioned that the insurance vendor needs to adopt the maxims of manner to avoid customers running away from buying the products sold, so do the textile and food sellers. Customers should be treated with polite language. In the maxim of politeness, the seller should apply polite conversation with the customers. At the same time, a good relationship between the seller and customer will occur. This is known as the maxim of relation. As an insurance sales person, he/she needs to be generous to the customers. The customers have the right to know all the advantages and disadvantages of subscribing to the insurance policy. In relation to the present research, the customers need to know the advantage or disadvantages of using a particular textile or eating a particular the food on offer. In this situation, the maxim of generosity is needed.

The maxim of approbation is needed to make sure that in the competitive business world, the sales person do not insult or condemn other sales person from other companies. The maxim of modesty is also one of the ways to attract customers' attention to buy the product advertised. This is because this maxim is able to show the sales person's character of kindness. Finally, before the sales person proceeds with the transaction, both parties need to agree with each other on the terms and conditions of the policy. Any disagreements should be managed by the sales person wisely othermise the customers might flee.

2.8 Theoretical Framework

This study employs Grice's pragmatics and semantics theories (1967), to explore the use of politeness language by sellers and customers of Pasar Payang when they interact in the selling-buying situation. The theoretical framework is based on an approach to what Grice termed as conversational implicature, that is how hearers manage to work out the complete message when speakers mean more than they say.

In addition to Grice's implicatures, the study also has taken into consideration the theory of indirectness in communication among Malays as identified by Asmah Hj Omar (1992), Nor Hashimah's selling-buying strategies (1994) and behavioral aspects in Malay community (Jamaliah, 2000) have also been taken as the work frame in order to identify strategies used by the seller and customer involved in this study.

2.9 Summary

Chapter Two, has discussed Grice's Theory of Pragmatics that underlines 4 main maxims in conversation and implicature. Besides that, the chapter has defined in detail a few politeness theories from Lakoff, Brown and Levinson, Fraser and Leech and some speech act theories. The chapter also elebarated on 3 past researches related to the use of language in the Malay community that focused on language theories among the Malay community as suggested by Asmah Hj Omar (1992) and Jamaliah Mohd Ali (2000) in addition to the usage of language during selling and buying transaction at textile shops in Kelantan by Nor Hashimah (1994). Finally, 2 related previous research by Ramli (1999) and Look (1997) were disccused in order to support this research. Based on the above literature review, it can be conclude that people use a lot of strategies when communicating with others. In order to save listeners' face, the speakers use many strategies during interaction in order to avoid their manners from being considered as impolite. Indirectness and implicature are the two most important elements when interacting with the Malay community. All the theories and past findings discussed in this chapter are considered as important to this research as a guide to the analysis presented in Chapter 4.