SPEECH ACTS IN ENGLISH AND BAJHANGI

A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Education

In Partial Fulfilment for the Master of Education in English

Submitted by

Ammar Bahadur Bohara

Faculty of Education

Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur

Kathmandu, Nepal

2012

SPEECH ACTS IN ENGLISH AND BAJHANGI

A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Education

In Partial Fulfilment for the Master of Education in English

Submitted by

Ammar Bahadur Bohara

Faculty of Education

Tribhuvan University, Kirtipur

Kathmandu, Nepal

2012

T.U. Reg. No. : 9-2-29-207-2003　　　　**Date of Approval of the**

Second Year Examination　　　　　**Thesis Proposal : 19-05-2011**

Roll No. : 280303/2010　　　　　　**Date of Submission : 08-05-2012**

DECLARATION

I hereby declare to the best of my knowledge that this thesis is original; no part of it was earlier submitted for the candidature of research degree to any university.

_____

Date: 07-05-2012   **Ammar Bahadur Bohara**

RECOMMENDATION FOR ACCEPTANCE

This is to certify that **Mr. Ammar Bahadur Bohara** has prepared this thesis entitled **"Speech Acts in English and Bajhangi"** under my guidance and supervision.

I recommend the thesis for acceptance.

_____

Date : 08-05-2012   **Mr. Ashok Sapkota (Guide)**

Teaching Assistant

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu

Nepal

RECOMMENDATION FOR EVALUATION

This thesis has been recommended for evaluation from the following
"Research Guidance Committee":

Signature

Dr. Chandreshwar Mishra _____

Professor and Head (Chairperson)

Department of English Education

Chairperson, English and

Other Foreign Language Committee

T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal

Dr. Tara Datta Bhatta _____

Reader (Member)

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal

Mr. Ashok Sapkota (Guide) _____

Teaching Assistant (Member)

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal

Date : 09-05-2012

EVALUATION AND APPROVAL

This thesis has been evaluated and approved by the following **"Thesis Evaluation and Approval Committee":**

Signature

Dr. Chandreshwar Mishra   _____

Professor and Head   (Chairperson)

Department of English Education

Chairperson, English and

Other Foreign Language Committee

T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal

Dr. Tara Datta Bhatta   _____

Reader   (Member)

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal

Mr. Ashok Sapkota (Guide)   _____

Teaching Assistant   (Member)

Department of English Education

T.U., Kirtipur, Kathmandu, Nepal

Date : 13-05-2012

DEDICATION

Dedicated

To

My Parents and Teachers

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

This research entitled "Speech Acts in English and Bajhangi" has tried to find out the different direct, indirect and non-polite speech acts and the main purpose of this study was to list and compare, the different speech acts used by English and Bajhangi native speakers. I listed and compared the speech acts used while taking to neighbours, guests, friends, strangers. For this study, I took sample population of 60 informants. The informants were selected using judgemental non-random sampling procedure from Byansi VDC in Bajhang for native speakers of Bajhangi dialect of Nepali language and different places in Kathmandu for native speakers of English. The data were collected with the help of interview and questionnaire. The sources of data were based on native speakers of English and Bajhangi dialect of Nepali language. I found that both English and Bajhangi speakers use direct, indirect and non-polite forms with guests, friends, relatives, strangers. It has been found that English native speakers used 13.86 percent direct speech acts, 69.34 percent indirect speech acts and 16.75 percent non-polite responses. Bajhangi native speakers used 25.48 percent direct speech acts, 21.55 percent indirect speech acts and 52.37 percent non-polite responses.

This thesis is divided into four chapters. Chapter one deals with introduction. It includes general background, review of the related literature, objectives of the study, significance of the study and definition of specific terms. Chapter two deals with the methodology applied to carry out the researcher under which sources of data, sampling procedures, tools for data collection and limitations of the study are presented. Chapter three presents the analysis and interpretation of the data. In this section, both average as well as percentage statistical tools are used. Finally, the fourth chapter contains the findings and recommendations of the research.

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

BNSs	Bajhangi Native Speakers
Dr.	Doctor
DSA	Direct Speech Act
ENSs	English Native Speakers
IDSA	Indirect Speech Acts
i.e.	That is to say
%	Percentage
No	Number
Non-PR	Non Polite Responses
P	Page
Prof.	Professor
Shop	Shopkeeper
SLC	School Leaving Certificate
SN	Serial Number
S.No.	Situation Number
TU	Tribhuvan University
VDC	Village Development Committee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1   General Background

Generally language is a chief means of communication. It is the voluntary vocal system of human communication. It is a system of communication in speech and writing that is used by the people of a particular place or country. It is a dynamic and has open system that makes human beings communicate their thoughts, ideas, feelings, emotions and expressions.

Sapir (1921, p. 8) states that "language is a purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas emotions and desires by means of a system of voluntarily produced symbols." It brings in the property of arbitrariness and restricts language spoken form. All that need to be said at this point is that as far as natural language are concerned, there is close connection between language and speech. Logically the latter pre-supposes the former. In general, one can not speak without using language (i.e. speaking in a particular language) but one can use language without speaking. However, granted that language is logically independent of speech, there are good grounds for saying that in all natural languages as we know them, speech is historically, and perhaps biologically, prior to writing and this is the view that most linguists take. In the same line, Lyons (1968, p. 158) views that language is "the institution whereby humans communicate and interact with each other by means of habitually used oral-auditory arbitrary symbols". Lyons (1968) like Sapir (1921) treats language as a purely human institution and term' institution makes explicit the view that the language that is used by a particular society is part of that society's culture.

These definitions focus that language is common property of only for human being who live in a particular society. Animals cannot acquire human language

because of its complex structure and their physical inadequacies to acquire human language. Language is purely human. It is god's special gift to human beings. It is very complex phenomenon and a form of communication which is used for some purposes in a community. It is the most significant aspect of human beings but other animal lack it.

By the end of the twentieth century, English was already on its way to becoming a common lingua franca, that is language used widely for communication between people who do not share the same first (or even second) language. Just as in the Middle Ages, Latin became for a time a language of international communication (at least in the Roman empire), so English is now commonly used in exchanges between, Japanese and Argentinean business people or between Singapureans and their Vietnamese counterparts. English is also, of course, a mother tongue for many people in the world, though as well as such 'native speakers' are increasingly out numbered by people who have English as a second language and use it for international communication (as cited in Neupane, 2006).

There is something awe-inspiring about the way English use has grown in the last few decades. Kachru (1985, p. 125) estimated that there were between 320 and 380 million speakers of English as a second language, but he had already predicted that the balance might change.

> Karchu's guess was absolutely right, but on a much greater scale
>
> than he might has supposed. Estimates vary, but the ratio of
>
> native speakers to non-native speakers is anywhere between 1:2
>
> (Rajagopalan, 2004) and 1:3 (Crystal 2003) and this gap is
>
> widening all the time. In terms of numbers, Crystal (2005)
>
> suggests that there are currently around 1.5 billion speakers of

English worldwide of whom only some 329 million are native speakers. More over, he writes, 'the population growth in areas where English is second language is about 2.5 times than in areas where it is a first language. A quarter of the world's population speak English, in other words native speakers are in a proportionately ever-decreasing minority. However, it is worth acknowledging, as Crystal (2003) does, that these totals are to some extent only guesstimate and avoid certain difficult questions, such as how good at the language someone has to be before we can say they are a real 'speaker of English'. (as cited in Chaudhary, 2010, p. 3)

Hence, language is most powerful convenient and permanent form of communication. English language is spoken all over the world even if it is not native language of all the speakers. English language speakers are increasing every day because it is international language.

1.1.1 An Introduction to Pragmatics

Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). It has consequently more to do with the analysis of what people mean by their utterances than what the words or phrases in those utterances might mean by themselves.

This approach also necessarily explores how listeners can make inferences about what is said in order to arrive at an interpretation of the speaker's intended meaning. This type of study explores how a great deal of what is

unsaid is recognized as part of what is communicated. We might say that it is the investigation of invisible meaning. Pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said.

This perspective then raises the questions of what determines the choice between the said and unsaid. The basic answer is tied to the notion of distance. Closeness, whether it is physical, social or conceptual, implies shared experience. On the assumption of how close or distant the listener is, speakers determine how much need to be said pragmatics is the study of the expression of relative forms (Chaudhary, 2010, p. 4). In the same way, pragmatics is the study of the relationships between linguistic forms and the users of those forms. In this three-part distinction , only pragmatics allows humans into the analysis. Two friends having a conversation may imply some things and infer some others without providing any clear linguistic evidence that we can point to as the explicit source of 'the meaning' of what was communicated. Example is just such a problematic case. I heard the speakers, I knew what they said, but I had no idea what was communicated.

>Her: So - did you?

>Him: Hey - who wouldn't?

Thus, pragmatics is appealing because it is about how people make sense of each other linguistically, but it can be a frustrating areas of study because it requires us to make sense of people and what they have in mind.

Interest in pragmatics among linguistics has grown recently Levinson (1994, p. 75) points out two reasons for this growing interest in pragmatics: historical and general. The historical reason is part as a reaction or antidote to Chomsky's treatment of language as an abstract device or mental ability, dissociable from the uses, users and functions of language. Generative reason

is shown the importance of language use in understanding language in general and communication in particular.

1.1.2 Philosophical Importance of Speech Act Theory

The theory of speech acts is an act that a speaker performs when making an utterance. To understand language one must understand the speaker's intention. It has been supposed that sentences containing words like 'good' and right' are used not to describe things but they can use - sometime to describe things. Normally the speech act is a sentence, but it can be a word or phrase as long as it follows the rules necessary to accomplish the intention. Therefore, understanding the speaker's intention is essential to capture the meaning.

> The above argument is but one illustration of what Searle (1969, p. 53) calls the speech act fallacy. He also identifies examples of the strong believe fallacy; whereby conditions of making an assertion are confused with what is asserted. For example, one might fallaciously argue, on the grounds that because one would not assert that one believes something if one was prepared to assert that one knows it, that knowing does not entail believing. Grice identified the same fallacy in a parallel argument, according to which seeming to have a certain feature. Entails not actually having that feature. (as cited in Shahi, 2011, p 7)

For philosophy of language in particular, the theory of speech acts underscores the importance of the distinction between language use and linguistic meaning. This distinction sharpens the formulation of questions

about capacities exercised in linguistic interaction from those specific knowledge of language itself.

1.1.3 Speech Acts and Types of Speech Acts

Generally, we think of an act of communication as linguistic or as an act of expressing oneself. This vague idea can be made more precise if we get more specific about what is being expressed. Take the case of an apology. For example: if you utter, [I'm] 'sorry, I didn't call back', and intend this as an apology, you are expressing regret for something, in this case for not returning a phone call. An apology just is the act of (verbally) expressing regret for, and thereby acknowledging, something one did that might have harmed or at least bothered the hearer. An apology is communicative because it is intended to be taken as expressing a certain attitude. In this case regret. It succeeds as such if it is so taken.

In general, an act of speech succeeds if it is taken as intended. That is, it must be understood or, in Austin's words (1962, p. 126), as 'produce uptake'. With an apology, this matter of the addressee recognizing the speaker's intention to be expressing regret for some deed or omission. Using a special device such as the perfomative. 'I apologize' may of course facilitate understanding (understanding is correlative with communicating), but in general this is necessary. Communicative success is achieved if the speaker chooses his words in such a way that the hearer will, under the circumstances of utterance, recognize his communicative intention. So, for example, if you spill some beer on someone and say 'Oops', your utterance will be taken as an apology for what you did.

In saying something, one generally intends more than just to communicate getting oneself understood is intended to produce some effect on the listener. However, our speech act vocabulary can obscure this fact. When one

apologizes, for example, one may intend not merely to express regret but also to seek forgiveness. Seeking forgiveness is, strictly speaking, distinct from apologizing, even though one utterance is the performance of an act of both types. As an apology, the utterance succeeds if forgiveness is thereby obtained. Speech acts, being perlocutionary as well as illocutionary, generally have some ulterior purpose, but they are distinguished primarily by their illocutionary type, such as asserting, requesting, promising and apologizing, which in turn are distinguished by the type of expressed (Austin, 1962,p. 128). The perlocutionary act is a matter of trying to get the hearer to form some correlative attitude and in some cases to act in a certain way. For example: a statement expresses a belief and normally has the further purpose of getting the addressee form the same belief. A request expresses a desire for the addressee to do a certain thing and normally aims for the addressee intend to indeed, actually do that thing. A promise expresses the speaker's firm intention to do something together with belief by his utterance, he is obligated to do it, and normally aims further for the addressee to expect, and to feel the speaker to do it.

Statements, requests, promises and apologies are examples of the four major categories of communicative illocutionary acts: constatives, directives, commissives and acknowledgements (Austin, 1962, p. 128). Out of these three facets, illocutionary force or act is the most discussed one in the field. It is because 'speech act' is generally interpreted quite narrowly to mean only the illocutionary force of an utterance. According to Searle (1975, p. 55), here are assorted examples of each types.

Searle (1975, p. 55) has set up the following speech acts:

Assertive: They commit the speaker to do something being the case. The different kinds are: suggesting, putting forward, swearing, boasting, and concluding for example: "No one makes a better cake than me".

Directives: They try to make the addressee perform an action. The different kinds are: asking, ordering, requesting, inviting, advising, and begging. Example: "Could you close the window?"

Commissives : They commit the speaker to do something in the future. The different kinds are: promising, planning, vowing, betting, opposing. Example: "I'm going to Paris tomorrow".

Expressives: They express how the speaker feels about the situation. The different kinds are: thanking, apologizing, welcoming, deploring. Example: "I am sorry that lied to you".

Declarations: They change the state of the world in an immediate way. For the different kinds are announcing, ordering, deciding. For examples: "I swear, I beg you."

Similarly, one general classification system lists five types of general functions performed by speech acts: declarations, representatives, expressives, directives, and commissives.

Declarations: Declarations are speech acts that change the world via their utterance. The speaker has to have a special institutional role, in a specific context in order to perform a declaration appropriately.

a.   Priest: I now pronounce you husband and wife

b.   Referee: you're out!

c.   Jury foreman: we find the defendant guilty.

In using a declaration, the speaker changes the world via words.

Representatives: Representatives are speech acts that state what the speaker believes to be the case or not. Statements of fact, assertions, conclusions, and

descriptions, are all examples of the speaker representing the world as he/she believes it is.

a.   The earth is flat

b.   Chomsky didn't write about peanuts.

c.   It was a warm sunny day.

In using a representative, the speaker makes words fit the world (of belief).

Expressive: Expressive are speech acts that state what the speaker feels. They express psychological states and statements of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy, sorrow. They can be caused by something the speaker does or hearer does but they are about the speaker's experience.

a.   I'm really sorry

b.   Congratulations!

c.   Oh, yes, great.

In using an expressive, the speaker makes words fit the world (of feeling).

Directives: Directives are speech acts that speaker use to get someone else to do something. They express what the speaker wants. They are commands, orders, requests, suggestions or they can be positive or negative.

a.   Give me a cup of coffee. Make it black.

b.   Could you lend me a pen, please?

c.   Don't touch that.

In using a directive the speaker attempts to make the world fit the words.

Commissives: Commissives are speech acts that speakers use to commit themselves to do some future actions. They express what the speaker intends.

They are promises, threats, pledges. They can be performed by the speaker alone or by the speaker as a member of group:

a.   I'll be back.

b.   I'm going to get it right next time.

c.   We will not do that.

In using a commissive, the speaker undertakes to make the world fit the words. These five general functions of speech acts, with these features, are summarized in table.

Table No. 1

Functions of Speech Acts

Speech Act Type	Direction of Fit	S =Speaker X = Situation
Declarations	Words change the world	S causes X
Representatives	Make words fit the world -	S believes X
Expressives	Make words fit the world	S feels X
Directives	Make the world fit words	S wants X
Commissives	Make the world fit words	S intends X

Table 1 shows the five general functions of speech acts (Searle, 1979, p. 55).

There are mainly five functions of speech acts. They are declarations, representatives, expressives, directives and commissives. In declaration the speaker has to have important role in order to perform declarations. In representative function the speaker has to represent what he believes. In expressive function the speaker has to express his own experiences. In directive functions the speakers has to direct what he wants. In commissive the speaker has to express what he intends.

1.1.4 The Performative Hypothesis

The characteristics of each sentence to have a cause, as well as performative verb, which makes clear illocutionary force. The advantage of this type of analysis is that it makes clear just what elements are involved in the production and interpretation of utterances.

Austin (1911-1960) the philosopher, distinguishes utterances into two types: constative and performative. The utterances that do things or perform something are called performatives as opposed with constative which make statement. In other words, things are done through performative utterances. For examples:

a)   I now pronounce you wife and husband.

b)   I apologize for my rude behaviour.

Performative can also classified into explicit and implicit performatives. Explicit performatives refer to those that use performative verbs and the implicit performatives refer to those that do not use performative verbs.

Austin's speech act theory distinguishes between three different kinds of speech act, i.e., three kinds of things we do Or perform when we make an utterance. The three kinds of acts are given below. They are locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary. The utterance itself is the locutionary act, the utterance that ferformed act is illocutionary act and the utterance that producing an effect by saying is the perlocutionary act.

In Austin's formulation of speech act theory a performative utterance is neither true nor false, but can instead be deemed "felicitous or infelicitous." According to a set of conditions whose interpretation differs depending on whether the utterance in question is a deceleration (I sentence you to death),

a request (I ask you to stop doing that) or a warning (warn you not to jump off her roof).

1.1.5 Direct, Indirect and Nonliteral Speech Acts

As Austin (1962) observed, the comment of a locutionary act (what is said) is not always determined by what is meant by the sentence being uttered. Ambigious words or phrases need to be disambiguated and the references of indexial and other context-sensitive expressions need to be fixed in or for what is said to be determined fully. Moreover, what is said does not determine the illocutionary act(s) being performed. We can perform a speech act (1) directly or indirectly by way of performing another speech act (2) literally and nonliterally, depending on rule we are using our words, and (3) explicitly or inexplicitly, depending on whether we fully spell act what we mean.

These three contrasts are distinct and should not be confused. The first two concern the relation between the utterance and the speech act(s) thereby performed. In direction a single utterance is the performance of one illocutionary act by way of performing another. When an illocutionary act is performed indirectly, it is performed by way of performing some other one directly. In the case of non-literal utterances, we do not mean what our words mean but something else instead. With non-literal the illocutionary act we are performing is not the one that would be predicted just from the meanings of the words being used, Occasionally utterances are both non-literal and indirect.

Non-literal and indirection are the two ways in which the semantic content of a sentence can fail to determine the full force and content of the illocutionary act being performed in using the sentence. They rely on the same sorts of processes that Grice (1975, p. 65) discovered in connection with what he

called 'conversational implicature' which as is. clear from examples illustrate nonliteally, e.g. 'He was a little intoxicated', used to explain why a man smashed some furniture, but most of them are indirect statements, e.g., 'There is a garage around the corner' used to tell someone where to get petrol, and 'Mr. X's command of English is excellent, and his attendance has been regular' giving the high points in a letter of recommendation. These are all examples in which what is meant is not determined by what is said. However, Grice overlooks a different kind of case, marked by contrast listed below:

There are many sentences which uses are not strictly determined by their meanings but are not implicatures or figurative uses either. For example, if one spouse says 'I will be home later'. She is likely to mean that she will be home later that night, not merely some time in the future. In such cases what one means is an expansion of what one says, in that adding more words ('tonight', in the example) would have made what was meant fully explicit. In other cases, such as 'Jack is ready' and 'Jill is late', the sentence does not express a complete preposition. There must be something which Jack is being claimed to be ready for and something which Jill is being claimed to be late. In these cases what one means is a completion of what one says. In both sorts of case, no particular word or phrase is being used nonliterally and there is no indirection. They both exemplify what may be called 'implicature', since part of what is meant is communicated not explicitly but implicitly, by way of expansion or completion.

1.1.6 Dialect: A Brief Introduction

We have treated languages as uniform way. We have largely ignored the fact that every language will have more than one variety, especially in the way in which it is spoken. This variation in speech is an important and we are setting aspect of our daily life as language users in different regional and social

communities. Here, we shall consider the type of variation which has been investigated via a form of 'linguistic geography', concentrating on regional variety. There are different verities of a languages such as dialect, register, pidgins and creoles. I have mentioned about dialect.

Simply, speaking dialect is a variety of language of the language to the users. A variety of language which is spoken in one part of country or by people belonging to a particular social class of language is called dialect. Nepali language has many dialects like Doteli, Bajhangi and so on. One dialect is taken as official or standard form of the language and this variety may come to be written down. It is said that dialect betrays the personality of the users of the language. It is because other can easily recognize our age, sex, education, social class, caste, economic status, color and so on when we use language.

Crystal (2003,p.136) defines dialects as "A regionally or socially distinctive variety of language identified by a particular set of words and grammatical structures." Similarly to this Lyons (1968, p.268) says "Dialect covers differences of grammar and vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation that differ one dialect from another.

The term dialect has generally been used in linguistics to refer to varieties of speech based on geographical location and social background. In the same way, Holmes (1968) defines 'Dialects are simply linguistic varieties which are distinguishable by their vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation' (as cited in Joshi, 1989, p. 7).

If we analyze the above definitions of dialect we can conclude that dialects are those varieties that basically represent different social and geographical origin. In other words dialects are varieties of language identified specially by

their vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation. So, it is said that dialects show the personality of the persons. Dialect can be classified into two types.

Regional variation is likely to be one of the most noticeable ways in which we observe variety in language as we travel through out of wide geographical area in which a language is spoken and particularly if that language has been spoken in that area for many years. We are almost certain to notice differences in pronunciation, words and syntax.

There may even be very distinctive local colourings in the language such distinctive varieties are usually called regional dialect of the language. So, it is variety of language that differs according to different geographical location.

The term dialect can also be used to deseribe differences in speech association with various social groups or classes. It is a variety of language used by the member of certain social class, occupation, education, social or ethnic origin, cultural back ground, caste, religion, gender and so on.

1.1.7 An Introduction to the Bajhangi Dialect

Bajhangi is a regional dialect of Nepali language spoken in Bajhang district that lies in Seti zone. Joshi (1989) describes Bajhangi dialect as the dialect spoken by the permanent inhabitants of lower hills and valleys of Bajhang district in the far western development region of Nepal except the Bungali. It is a dialect of Nepali language because it reflects difference on vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation, syntax. On the other hand it is intelligible to the speaker of Nepali language. Four dialects, (Chir Bungali, Lekali, Dhuleli and Bajhangi) are in use concurrently in Bajhang. Among them Bajhangi dialect is widely occupies prominent position.

> The Bajhangi dialect is regarded as one of the five dialects of
>
> Nepali language and mentioned as "Oragpchnama" dialect by

28

Pokharel and 'Kendriya' Nepali by Bandhu. It is spoken by 3/4th portion of Bajhangi people (ibid). Out of forty seven VDCs, it is spoken in 31 VDCS of this district. In the lack of intensive study the exact number of people speaking this dialect. This dialect is spoken in Bajura, Achham, Jumla, Kalikot District. (Joshi, 1989, p. 7)

Bajhangi dialect is spoken in many VDCs in the district. Bajhangi dialect is not spoken only in the Bajhang district but also on other districts of far western part of Nepal, such as Bajura, Achham, Jumla, Kalikot.

The Bajhangi dialect has neither well documented history nor written materials. It has not been widely studied yet. It exists only in spoken form like more of the unrecorded languages of the world. Regarding Bajhangi dialect's history of writing, Joshi (1989) had written 'Jhagdiya Genesh Kumarko Milap" first in this dialect. Later, Bist had translated "Guru Prasad Mainali's Naso' a story in this dialect into Nepali.

Bajhangi Dialect is widely used in the district in spoken form. There are not many written materials in this dialect. There are only few local advertisement and books are in written forms.

Bajhangi dialect is a less studied dialect among these but while speaking with speakers of other languages they switch over, the Nepali language is not being as a medium of instruction in primary school too. People living in headquarter of Bajhang, Chainpur, a Bajhangi dialect speaking areas have started using Nepali due to the influence of modernization and educated people who mostly Nepali. There is the strong case of degeneration of this dialect and death because of language shift due to the lack of language loyalty. So,

representation and maintenance has been our responsibility. Considering those factors, I have made an effort to study on this dialect.

1.2   Review of Related Literature

Many researches have been carried out on the comparative study of different languages like English, Nepali, Limbu, Rai, Newari, Tharu, Maithali, Doteli and Bajhangi. Some of the researches have been conducted including Bajhangi dialect on different languages and their conclusions are reviewed below.

Joshi (1989) carried out a research study on 'Linguistic study of Bajhangi dialect.' This main objective of the study was to introduce the structure of the Bajhangi dialect describing its grammatical patterns. The study has selected native speakers of Bajhangi dialect. The study has used judgemental non random sampling procedures. The study was based on attended lexical and semantic structure and found that most of the Bajhangi lexical items can occur single while producing sentences but no in English. Most of the sentences are shorter in Bajhangi than in English (Morphological and syntactical).

Neupane (2006) carried out research on 'A study on code mixing in Bhojpuri language.' The main purpose of the study is to compare, contrast and use the code mixing between English and Bhojpuri language. The study has used primary and secondary sources to collect data. The study has selected native speakers of Bhojpuri language. The study has chosen the literate and illiterate speakers by judgemental non-random sampling. The study used interview for illiterate and questionnaire for literate informants. The study found that the number of English nouns mixed in Bhojpuri language speaking is the highest number and adverbs mixed speaking is the last in number.

Bohara (2009) carried out research on 'Deixis system in English and the Bajhangi dialect of Nepali language.' The main objectives of the study was to find out Bajhangi speaker, time and place deictic, compare and suggest some

pedagogical purpose. The study has selected 50 native speakers of Bajhangi dialect of the Nepali language from two VDCs. The study has chosen the informants by judgemental non-random sampling procedure. The study has used questionnaire and interview to collect data. The study found that different deictic terms are used to refer to singular and plural number in second person but English has the single term, English is richer than Bajhangi in time deixis because Bajhangi has same terms to refer to different English terms and English is richer than Bajhangi in place deictic terms.

Chaudhary (2010) has carried out a research on 'Speech act in Tharu and English language.' The main objective was to find out different speech acts used by Tharu speakers, compare speech acts and suggest some pedagogical implication in English and Tharu language. The study has selected native speakers of Tharu and English language. The study has selected informants by judgemental non-random sampling procedure. The study used interview schedule and questionnaire to collect data. The study found that the relation of assertive forms both in Tharu and English. English has different negative expression but Tharu has no such expression and English speakers have many expressive words but Tharu speakers have no many expressive words.

Shahi (2010) has carried out a research on 'Speech Acts in English and Jumli.' The main objective of the study was to find out different speech acts in English and Jumli and to find out some pedagogical implication in English and Jumli. The study has selected 60 native speakers of Jumli and 20 native speakers of English language. The study was based on direct and indirect speech acts. The Jumli native speakers used English form like 'please' for indirect speech act who were educated and literate. English native speakers used 30 percentage indirect speech act responses but the Jumli native speakers did not use such responses to address. The English native speakers were used more polite form of language than Jumli native speakers.

The present research is basically different from the above mentioned researches because there is almost no research found on speech acts in English and Bajhangi. In my study as I am from Bajhangi community. I chose this topic as my interest to the language identification. I have selected Searle's different kinds of speech acts as a basis for my study analysis.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study were as follows:

a.   To find out different speech acts used by Bajhangi and English native speakers.

b.   To compare between different speech acts used by native speakers Bajhangi and English.

c.   To suggest some pedagogical implications based on finding

1.4 Significance of the Study

Anything has its own significance in the related area. So, this study has also its significance in its own area. As the study is related to the comparative study of the speech act in English and Bajhangi language. This study is beneficial to all those who are interested in the English language and the Bajhangi dialect.

In the same way the study will be helpful for other researchers and linguistics to find out some new speech terms in Bajhangi language. The research will be equally important for course designers, text books writers, language planners, teachers and students because they can get some idea from it. They can use the findings of this study. Beside this, the study can also be useful for other people.

1.5   Definition of Specific Terms

Speech act: Speech act refers to a communicative activity with reference to the intentions of a speaker while speaking and the effect achieved on a listener.

Responses: Responses refer to all the answer of the questions in which direct, indirect and non, polite forms of speech act are used.

Direct speech acts: Direct speech acts deal with those responses which show the direct relationship between a structure and a function.

Indirect speech acts: Indirect speech acts refer to those responses which show the indirect relationship between a structure and a function. They are generally associated with greatness in English than direct speech acts.

Literate: Literate refers to those Bajhangi informants who got their academic qualification to read and write.

Educated: Educated refers to those Bajhangi informants who have got academic qualification of intermediate or above.

Illiterate/uneducated: Illiterate/uneducated refers to those Bajhangi informants who have not got academic qualification to read and write.

Non-polite responses: All the other responses except direct and indirect speech act. Non-polite responses are impolite responses which do not give the expression of direct and indirect speech acts explicitly or implicitly.

Pragmatics: Pragmatics refers to the study of speaker meaning or contextual meaning.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

This chapter deals with the methodology applied during the study. For the fulfilment of the study, I adopted the following methodology.

2.1 Sources of Data

I used both primary and secondary sources of data. The sources are as follow.

2.1.1 Primary Sources

The native speakers of Bajhangi dialect residing in Bajhang especially at Byansi VDC and the native speakers of English language from different places of Kathmandu especially British council, Hotel in Thamel, Tourist information office Basantapur, Orbit Institute were the primary source of data.

2.1.2 Secondary Sources

In addition to the primary sources, I used the secondary sources of data viz. different books: Searle (1969), Grice (1975), Leech (1983), Yule (1993), Levinson (1994) and Crystal (2003). I used different researchers reports: Joshi (1989), Bohara (2009), Chaudhary (2009) and Shahi (2011). I used journals: Journal of NELTA (2009), Journal of NELTA (2010). The data for the speech acts in English were taken from other related books and magazines.

2.2 Population of the Study

Native speakers of Bajhangi dialect and the English language constituted the population of this study.

2.3 Sampling Procedure

The sample population of this study was 60 native speakers of Bajhangi and English. Among them 20 respondents were the English native speakers from

different places of Kathmandu and 40 respondents were the Bajhangi native speakers from Byansi VDC, Bajhang to collect as much as direct, indirect and non-polite speech acts.

I used judgmental non random sampling procedure for the selection of the sample. Sixty informants were selected non randomly, there were 40 Bajhangi informants, 20 were males and 20 females. Similarly, there were 10 males and 10 females respondents of the English language. They are shown in the following table.

Table No. 2

Different Native Speakers Informants

S.N.	Native language	Sex		Total No. of Respondents
		Male	Female	
1.	English	10	10	20
2.	Bajhangi	20	20	40

While collecting data from native speakers of the English language were contacted.

2.4   Tools for Data Collection

A set questionnaire was the tool of this study. The questionnaire contained 40 items in all. They were the categories of direct, indirect and non-polite speech acts.

2.5   Process of Data Collection

I prepared a set of questionnaire in English language involving different situations related to the direct, indirect and non-polite speech acts. The Bajhangi native speakers were allowed to respond in Bajhangi language and

the English native speakers were allowed to respond in the English language. I visited Byansi VDC in Bajhang and different places in Kathmandu for the English language. I contacted the sample population of both English and Bajhangi and provided the informants selected non-randomly, questionnaires having similar situations. The situation was very friendly and informal. They were ready to fill in the questionnaire and to talk with me.

2.6   Limitations of the Study

This study had the following limitations:

i)   The study was confined 40 native speakers of the Bajhangi language and 20 native speakers of the English language.

ii)   The study was selected forty native speakers of Bajhangi language from Byansi VDC and 20 native speakers of English language from Kathmandu.

iii)   The study was used judgemental non-random sampling procedure.

iv)   The study was limited to the informants obtained through questionnaires only.

v)   This study was based on three speech acts, i.e. direct, indirect and non-polite speech acts.

vi)   This study was limited to Byansi VDC of Bajhang and the related places of Kathmandu.

vii)   The study included equal number of males and females.

CHAPTER THREE

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of data. All the responses the English and Bajhangi native speakers on the speech acts were tabulated on the basis of direct and indirect speech acts within non-polite response. The responses of English and Bajhangi native speakers were analyzed, compared and contrasted in the given situations. The division is made on the basis of the relationship of the respondents interaction and carried out under the relationship between friends, strangers, fathers, mothers, sons, aunts and sisters on the basis of direct, indirect and non-polite responses.

3.1   List of Different Speech Act Addressed

The English and Bajhangi native speakers used direct and indirect speech acts to adress different people which can be shown as follow.

3.1.1 List of English Direct and Indirect Speech Acts in English

The following were the direct and indirect speech acts used by English speakers. The obtained data through questionnaire were analyzed and interpenetrated on the basis of direct and indirect speech acts.

Table No. 3

English Direct Speech Acts

Direct Speech Act English Native Speakers (DSA by ENSs)	Frequency	%
Is it ok, if I/you	46	5.75
Is it alright if I	2	0.25
Do you mind if I	21	2.62

I feel sorry to …..	1	0.12
Is it possible to …..	8	1
I want to you inform …..	7	0.87
I'll not forget	16	2
Isn't it ok, if I …..	6	0.75
Hey why don't you …..	4	0.5
Total Direct Speech Act 9	111	13.86

From the above table we can say that direct speech acts were used by English native speakers.

Only 111 (13.86%) responses were direct speech acts. The per-cent of each form of direct speech acts are based on their total number of frequency. Among the different forms used by the English native speakers, the forms 'is it ok/if I/you' direct speech act were the most frequent (46) and 'I feel sorry to' was the least frequent (1).

Table No. 4

English Indirect Speech Acts

Indirect Speech Acts by English Native Speakers	F	%
Could you/I	61	7.62
Could you please	35	4.37
Can you please	45	5.62
Please ……….	146	18.25
May I …..	50	6.25

Excuse me	52	6.5
Would you mind	76	9.5
I would be pleased	8	1
Can you/I …..	25	3.12
Excuse me, can you/I …..	5	0.62
Would you please …..	17	2.12
I would be graceful …..	20	2.5
Excuse me may I …..	2	0.25
I beg your pardon	2	0.25
………. please	11	1.37
Total Acts 15	555	69.34

From the above table we can say that the indirect speech acts used by English native speakers were 15. Only 555 (69.34%) responses were indirect speech acts. The per-cent of each form of indirect speech acts are based on their total number of frequency. Among the different forms used by the English native speakers, the forms, 'please' indirect speech act was the most frequent (146) and 'excuse me, I beg your pardon were the least frequent (2).

3.1.2 Direct and Indirect Speech Acts in Bajhangi

The total direct and indirect speech acts used by Bajhangi native speakers can be shown as follows.

Table No. 5

Bajhangi Direct Speech Acts

Direct Speech Acts by Bajhangi Native Speakers (DSA by BNSs)	Frequency	%
kya mu ta me	34	2.12
kya tame mukhi	32	2
…….. Ardinya hauki ?	9	0.56
…….. hunaki ?	6	0.37
Hunya chhyo ?	25	1.56
O hajur	26	1.62
O baini	19	1.18
E dai	8	0.5
E bhai	4	0.25
Tamelai thulo dharma hola	3	0.18
Janakhau	11	0.68
Khana saknya hainu ?	10	0.68
Niko bhayo	10	0.62
Dhekaideula	33	2.06
Sakula ?	27	1.68
Sakuli ?	8	0.5
Saknyahauki ?	15	0.93

Dhukha arnupadyaho	5	0.31
Taiki sahayoga hunyaho	23	1.43
Ardaya hau ?	4	0.25
Niko manya chhe	6	0.37
Janadeu	7	0.43
Janalyaya	5	0.31
Aaya	4	0.25
Nikoarideula	3	0.18
Dinyahuki	2	0.12
Saknyahuki	10	0.62
Aanuki ?	13	0.81
Khanyahuki ?	8	0.5
Pieunyahuki ?	3	0.18
Deuliki ?	28	1.75
Balnyahuki ?	3	0.18
Saknyahuki ?	2	0.12
Choodidinyahyki ?	3	0.18
Total 34	409	25.48

From the above table we can say that the direct speech acts used by Bajhangi native speakers were 34. Only 409 (25.48%) responses were direct speech acts. Among the different forms 'kya tame mukhi' was the most frequent (43) and 'Dinyahauki Saknyahuki' were the least frequent (2).

Table No. 6

Bajhangi Indirect Speech Acts

Indirect Speech Act by Bajhangi Native Speakers	F	%
Hajur	123	7.68
Kirpaya sir	12	0.75
Khusi hunyachhe	76	4.75
Taikhi nikomanya chhe	61	3.81
Kailain Birsinya chhe	56	3.5
Gali gya	17	1.06
Total Acts 6	345	21.55

From the above table we can say that the indirect speech acts used by Bajhang; native speakers were 6.

Only 345 (21.55%) responses were indirect speech acts. Among the different forms 'Hajur, khusi hunyachhe' were the most frequent and 'Kirpaya sir, gali gya' were the least frequent.

3.2   Comparison of English and Bajhangi Speech Acts

The comparison between the English and Bajhangi on direct and indirect speech acts is done on the basis of different forms used for different persons in different situation which can be shown as follows.

3.2.1 English and Bajhangi Speech Acts Used for Different Persons/ People

The total number of direct and indirect speech acts used by the English and Bajhangi native speakers to address different persons/people can be shown as following:

Table No. 7

Total Speech Acts for Different Persons

S.N.	Native language	Speech Acts					
		DSA		IdSA		Non-PR	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
1.	English	111	13.86	555	69.34	134	16.75
2.	Bajhangi	409	25.48	345	21.55	838	52.37

The above table shows that the English native speakers were more polite than the Bajhangi native speakers. Out of 800 responses in English and 1600 responses in Bajhangi, 111 (13.86%) responses in English and 409 (25.48%) were direct speech act forms. Similarly, 555 (69.34%) in English and 345 (21.55%) in Bajhangi were indirect speech acts. It shows that the Bajhangi native speakers seem less polite than the native speakers while responding to the situations. The respondents used different polite terms in different situations. Some examples from the English and Bajhangi native speakers are as following:

1.   Dad, can you open the door please ? (S. No. 33) In English

        Baba, tame delo ughari saknayahau ? In Bajhangi

2.   I would be grateful if you lend me some money, today. In English

Mukhi aaja namai rupiya deupuna. (S. No. 37) In Bajhangi

I found that the Bajhangi native speakers did not use polite terms in speech acts but the forms of sentences expressed such act indirectly. For example:

3.   I would be pleased if you won't smoke again. (S. No. 19) In English

        Tamele tamakhu nakhaidiya hunachhya. In Bajhangi

4.   Sister, what time is it now ? In English

        E baini kati bajyo ha ? (S. No. 32) In Bajhangi

5.   Fool guy ! Don't smoke here again. (S. No. 19) In English

        ya bhittra chuurat janakhau. (In Bajhangi

6.   How can I get to Thamel. In English

        Ei, baini bato kabata padochha. (S. No. 29) In Bajhangi

These responses were not polite to respond to the situation. This shows that the number of non-polite response forms in Bajhangi were found greater than those in English. The Bajhangi native speakers were found less polite than the English native speakers while responding to the situations. The Bajhangi native speakers were polite but they were less polite than the English native speakers in the per cent comparing with each other.

3.2.1.1 Total Speech Acts to Address Friends

In the discourse between friends the direct, indirect and non-polite speech acts used by English and Bajhangi native speakers to their friends, the equivalent form of speech acts can be shown as follows.

1.   Please, shut the door. It's very cold. In English (S.No. 1)

        Dhoka banda arta, chhisho bhayo. In Bajhangi

2.   Please, could you give me your phone numbewr ? (S.No. 9) In English

Tero phone number deta mukhi. In Bajhangi

3.   Please, lend me your pen ? In English (S.No. 16)

Mukhi Kalam deta aila. In Bajhangi

4.   Can you please wait for me little for while ? In English (S.No. 17)

Namai bar perkhe hata. In Bajhangi

5.   Please help me to prepare police report. In English (S.No. 20)

Police Nibedan lekhnaki saheta arideta. In Bajhangi

6.   Friend, lend me some money. (S.No. 34) In English

Namai rupiya deihalpama mukhi. In Bajhangi

7.   Can I use you phone for a minute. (S.No. 38) In English

Yak cal phone adaki tero phone depana. In Bajhangi

In the time of conversation, the English native speakers used more polite forms than those of Bajhangi native speakers. English native speakers used more indirect speech acts and polite responses but there were no indirect speech acts and polite responses found by Bajhangi native speakers.

3.2.1.2 Total Speech Acts to Address Strangers

In the time of talking between friends, the direct, indirect and non-polite speech acts used by English and Bajhangi native speakers to their strangers. The equivalent form of speech acts can be shown as follow.

1.   I feel sorry to tell you to search my mobile. (S.No. 31) In English

Mero mobile khognalagata hajur. In Bajhangi

2.   Can you sing a good song. (S.No. 4) In English

        Eak ramoro geeta gaihalpan. In Bajhangi

3.   Please be quiet. (S.No. 5) In English

        Oh ! hajur halla jana arata. In Bajhangi

4.   Are you all right ? Can I help you ? (S.No. 7) In English

        Tame kei dukhayakachhau. In Bajhangi

5.   Please, stand on queue. (S.No. 8) In English

        Oh ! hajur sabai lainama basideha. In Bajhangi

6.   Please, madam take your seat here. (S.No. 10) In English

        Aei sitami basa tame. In Bajhangi

7.   Could you please turn your left, so I can pass by ? (S.No. 12) In English

        Namai bayatira sarideuta, mukhi jhanaki. In Bajhangi

8.   I would be pleased, if you wont' smoke again. (S.No. 19) In English

        Churota nakaidiya hunachhiyo. In Bajhangi

9.   Could you please open the window. (S.No. 24) In English

        Tyo jhala khole hunaychhyo. In Bajhangi

10.   Excuse me, have you got watch ? (S.No. 32) In English

        Jamekhi ghadi chha. In Bajhangi

After analyzing these speech acts, English native speakers used more indirect speech acts compared to Bajhangi native speakers. The Bajhangi native speakers used a very few of polite forms compared to the English native

speakers. In conclusion, it was found that the English native speakers were more polite than of t he Bajhangi native speakers to respond to the strangers.

3.2.1.3 Total Speech Acts of Address Neighbors

In the communication between strangers, the direct, indirect and non-polite speech acts used by English and Bajhangi native speakers to their neighbors, the equivalent forms of speech acts can be shown as following.

1.   Please, don't enter with your shoes, leave them out the door. (S.No. 6) In English

    Juta bhitra jana aana, bahirai kholiaau. In Bajhangi

2.   Could I have some water please ? (S.No. 14) In English

    Mukhi sarai pani Tisha lagekichha, thanna pani aanata. In Bajhangi

3.   Please, help me to fill out my form. (S.No. 37) In English

    Mero faram bhaddaki namai ruppaya paulaki. In Bajhangi

The English native speakers used more indirect speech acts than Bajhangi native speakers to the neighbors. The Bajhangi native speakers used more direct speech acts than the English native speakers. The greater number of responses were found in more polite speech acts by English native speakers than Bajhangi native speakers to address their neighbors.

3.2.1.4 Total Speech Acts to Address Teachers

In the discourse with teachers the direct, indirect and no-polite speech acts used by English and Bajhangi native speakers to their teachers, the equivalent form of speech acts can do shown as following:

1.   I will not forget you help if you teach my children. (S. No. 2) In English

    Mero Bacchaki tamele padaidinu padyaho guru. In Bajhangi

2.   Sir, can you teach my children with their maths please. In English

        Guru mero chhorachhori ki ganita nekori sikai denupadayho. In
        Bajhangi

The English native speakers used more direct speech acts than Bajhangi native
speakers to addresses their teachers. The Bajhangi native speakers used more
indirect and non-polite responses of speech acts than the English native
speakers. So, the Bajhangi native speakers were less polite than the English
native speakers to address their teachers.

3.2.1.5 Total Speech Acts to Address Grandparents

In discourse with grandparents the direct, indirect and non-polite responses of
speech acts used by English and Bajhangi native speakers to their
grandparents, the equivalent forms of speech acts can be shown as following.

1.   Is it ok, if you take this medicine. (S.No. 24) In English

        Okhto khau taba nikohola. In Bajhangi

2.   Please, grandpa can you take your medicine. In English

        Baje, ausadhi khana saknaya hauki. In Bajhangi

It was found that Bajhangi native speakers used equal number of direct
speech acts but more non-polite response than their English native speakers
but they used to less polite responses that the English native speakers.

3.2.1.6 Total Speech Acts to Address Guests

In communication with guests the direct, indirect and non-polite responses of
speech acts used by English and Bajhangi native speakers to their guests, the
equivalent forms of speech acts can be shown as follows.

1.   Isn't it ok, if I something to have ? (S.No. 25) In English

ek gilash chaha khauheta. In Bajhangi

2.   Please, sit here and have some food with us. (S.No. 11) In English

Oh ! hajur aauheta khanakbau. In Bajhangi

3.   May I bring you a cup of tea ? In English

E hajur chaha khaupanta. In Bajhangi

4.   Take you tea here. (S.No. 25) In English

Chaha khauta. In Bajhangi

It was found that the Bajhangi native speakers used more direct speech acts and non-polite responses than the English native speakers. The English native speakers used more indirect speech acts and less non-polite responses.

3.2.1.7 Total Speech Acts to Address Shopkeepers and Doctors

In discourse with shopkeepers and doctors the direct, indirect and non-polite responses of speech acts used by English and Bajhagi native speakers to the shopkeepers and doctors the equivalent forms of speech acts can be shown as follows:

1.   Is it ok, if you show me a pair of shoes ? (S.No. 28) In English.

Sauji, ekjor juta dhekauta. In Bajhamgi

2.   I'll not forget your kind co-operation (S.No. 36) In English

Mu tamro sahayoga kailai birsinayhuna. In Bajhamgi

3.   Would you mind coming to my home please ? (S.N. 36) In English

Mero ghara aaunakhi dukha paidinupadygho. In Bajhamgi

4.   Excuse, me have you got new shoes. (S.No. 28) In English

Sauji tamro dokana naya juta chhanki. In Bajhamgi

5.   I would be pleased, if you medicated me. (S.No. 40) In English

Mukhi neko aridiya tamekhi dharmahola. In Bajhamgi

6.   Let's see a pair of shoes. (S.No. 40) In English

Juta chhanki. In Bajhamgi

It was found that the Bajhamgi native speakers used more direct speech acts and non-polite responses than the English native speakers. The English native speakers used more indirect speech acts and less non-polite responses than Bajhamgi native speakers. Both English and Bajhamgi native speakers used less non-polite responses to doctors than shopkeepers.

3.2.1.8 Total Speech Acts to Address Father and Mother

In discourse with father and mother the direct, indirect and non polite responses used by English and Bajhamgi native speakers to their parents, the equivalent forms of speech acts can be shown as follows:

1.   Dad, can you open the door, please ? (S.No. 33) In English

Baba dhawar lagauta. In Bajhamgi

2.   Please, mum give me some food. (S.No. 26) In English

Aama mukhi bhok lagyaki chha, khana halideuta. In Bajhamgi

3.   Dad, I am tired, open the door fast. (S.No. 33) In English

Chhati duwar ugharata mu galigya. In Bajhamgi

4.   Mum give me some food. (S.No. 26) In English

Khana chhati halide. In English

5.   Is it ok, if you give me something to eat ? (S.No. 26) In English

        Aama khana hadidenta. In Bajhamgi

It was found that the English native speakers used more indirect and less non-polite responses than Bajhamgi native speakers. The Bajhamgi natie speakers used more direct and non-polite responses than English native speakers. Both English and Bajhamgi native speakers used more indirect speech acts and less non-polite responses to address their father.

3.2.1.9 Total Speech Acts to Address Sons

In discourse with sons the direct, indirect and non-polite responses used by English and Bajhamgi native speakers to their sons, the equivalent forms of speech acts can be shown as follows.

1.   Is it ok, if you walk a little fast ? (S.No. 13) In English

        Namaya chhati hidaya hunyachhyo. In Bajhamgi

2.   Please, son walk a little fast. (S.No. 13) In English

        Chhora namayi chhati hid. In Bajhamgi

3.   Go fast it's very late ? In English

        Chhati hid bhanya. In Bajhamgi

4.   My dear son, hurry up and put on your dress. (S.No. 23) In English

        Iskul janaki chhati kapada la. In Bajhamgi

It was found that English native speakers used more indirect speech acts and les non-polite responses in comparison to Bajhamgi native speakers. Bajhamgi native speakers used more direct speech acts and non-polite responses than English native speakers.

3.2.1.10 Total Speech Acts to Address Uncle and Aunts

In the time of communication with uncles and aunts the direct, indirect and non-polite responses of speech acts used by Bajhamgi and English native speakers to address their uncles and aunts, the equivalent forms of speech acts can be shown as follows:

1.   Is it ok, if you come to my birthday ? (S.No. 3) In English

        Mero janma dinki aaunyahauki ? In Bajhamgi

2.   Uncle, come to my birthday, please. In English

        Kaka janma dinki aaunupadya ho. In Bajhamgi

3.   Please, aunt give me some salt. (S.No. 22) In English

        Kaki, namai nun deuta. In Bajhamgi

4.   Aunt, give me some salt. In English

        Kaki nun deuta he. In Bajhamgi

It was found that Bajhamgi native speakers used more direct speech acts and non-polite responses to address their auncles and aunts than the English native speakers. English native speakers used more indirect and less non-polite responses than Bajhamgi native speakers. Bajhamgi native speakers used more indirect speech acts to aunts but English native speakers used more indirect speech acts to uncle.

3.2.1.11 Total Speech Acts to Address Sisters

In the discourse with sisters the direct, indirect and non-polite forms of speech acts used by Bajhamgi and English native speakers to address their sisters, the equivalent forms of speech acts can be shown as follows:

1.   Is it ok, if you don't walk fast. (S.No. 15) In English

E bahini namai tar hidpana. In Bajhamgi

2.   Please, sister don't walk so fast. In English

Namai dhila didpana. In Bajhamgi

3.   Sister, walk slowly. In English

Tati chhati janahid. In Bajhamgi

It was found that the English native speakers used more indirect speech acts and less non-polite responses but the Bajhamgi native speakers used more direct speech acts and non-polite responses. Bajhamgi native speakers didn't use indirect form of speech acts to address their sisters.

On the basis of analysis and interpretations, I came to conclusion that English speakers used more indirect speech acts than the Bajhangi native speakers. They were more polite than their Bajhangi counterparts while addressing different parts whereas the Bajhangi native speakers used more direct speech acts and non-polite responses.

It was also found that the Bajhangi native speakers did not use any indirect speech act responses to their friends and sisters but they used such responses for their son whereas English speakers equally used such responses for their friends, sisters and sons. It was also found that Bajhangi speakers did not be more polite with their friends and sisters while responding to the situations but they were little bit polite with their sons.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The analysis of data provided with the following findings and recommendations were made accordingly.

4.1   Findings

The following findings have been deduced from the study.

1.   Forty situations were asked and out of 800 responses in English and 1600 responses in Bajhangi, the English native speakers used 111 (13.86%) direct speech acts, 555 (69.34%) indicate speech act responses and 134 (16.75%) non-polite responses.

2.   Out of all responses used by the English speakers the form 'please' related to indirect speech act was more frequent i.e. as 146 (18.25%).

3.   Out of 1600 responses, the Bajhangi native speakers, used 409 (25.48%) direct speech act, 345 (21.55%) indirect speech act and 838 (52.37%) percentage non-polite responses.

4.   Out of all the responses used by the Bajhangi native speakers, the from 'Hajur' related to indirect speech act was more frequent 123 (7.68%).

5.   In the relationship between friends, the English speakers were more polite. But no indirect speech act was found from Bajhangi interlocutors.

6.   Out of all the responses, the English native speakers used 186 (77.5%) indirect speech acts and the Bajhangi native speakers used 124 (25.83%) indirect speech acts in the relationship with stangers. So, the English speakers were more polite than Bajhangi speakers with strangers.

7. The English speakers used 40 (66.66%) indirect speech acts for neighbors but the Bajhangi native speakers used 39 (32.5%) indirect speech acts. So, English native speakers were found more polite than the Bajhangi native speakers to address their neighbours.

8. The English speakers used 13 (65%) indirect act responses but the Bajhangi native speakers used 15 (37.5%) indirect speech at responses to address their teachers. So, the English native speakers were found more polite than the Bajhangi native speakers to address their teachers.

9. The English native speakers were found more polite in the relationship with grandfather where the Bajhangi native speakers were found less polite.

10. Out of the responses, the English native speakers used 32 (80%) indirect speech acct responses but Bajhangi native speakers used 55 (68.75%) such responses to address their guests. So, the English native speakers were found more polite with their guests.

11. The English speakers used 30 (75%) indirect speech acts responses and the Bajhangi native speakers used 55 (68.75%) such act to address shopkeepers. So, the English speakers were found more polite than their Bajhangi counterparts.

12. English speakers used 32 (80%) and Bajhangi speakers used 55 (68.75%) of indirect act responses to addressed doctors. So, the English speakers were found more polite than the Bajhangi native speakers in the interaction to the doctors.

13. Bajhangi native speakers were found less polite than the English native speakers in the interaction between father. Out of the responses, 14

(70%) indirect speech act responses were used by the English native speakers and 23 (57.5%) by the Bajhangi native speakers.

14. Out of all the responses, 13 (65%) indirect speech act responses were used by the English speakers but Bajhangi native speakers used 20 (50%) such responses to address mother. So, the English native speakers were found more polite with their mother.

15. The English speakers used 15 (37.55) indirect speech act responses to address their sons but the Bajhangi speakers used 14 (17.5%) only. So the English speakers were found more polite than Jumli to address their sons.

16. Out of all the responses, the English speakers used 15 (75%) indirect speech act responses to address uncles and 14 (70%) for aunts but the Bajhangi speakers used 21 (52.5%) indirect speech act responses to address uncles and 18 (45%) for aunts. So, the English speakers were found more polite than the Bajhangi speakers to address their uncles and aunts.

17. The English speakers used 6 (30%) indirect speech act responses but the Bajhangi speakers did not use such responses to address sisters. So, the English speakers were found more polite than the Bajhang native speakers to address their sisters.

18. The Bajhangi native speakers used English form like 'please' for indirect speech act who were educated and literate. So, it was found that educated and literate Bajhangi native speakers used English form like, excuse me sir, please etc.

4.1.1 Similarities between the Bajhangi and English Native Speakers while using Direct, Indirect and Non-Polite Responses of Speech Acts

1.	Both English and Bajhamgi native speakers used direct , indirect and non-polite responses.

2.	Both English and Bajhamgi native speakers used more indirect speech acts and less non-polite responses while addressing to their guests, neighbors, teachers, grandparents, doctors, parents, aunts and uncles.

3.	Both English and Bajhamgi native speakers used high percentage of indirect speech acts and less non-polite responses to address guests and doctors.

4.	Both English and Bajhamgi native speakers used more non-polite responses to address their sister in comparison to others.

**4.1.2	Differences between the Bajhamgi and English Native Speakers while using Direct, Indirect and Non-Polite Responses**

1.	English native speakers and more indirect speech acts to address their guests, neighbor, teacher, grandparents, doctors, parents, aunt and uncle than Bajhamgi native speakers but Bajhamgi native speakers used more direct speech acts to address them than English native speakers.

2.	Bajhamgi native speakers did not use any indirect speech act responses to address their friends and sisters but English native speakers equally used such responses to address their friends and sisters.

3.	English native speakers seemed more polite but Bajhamgi native speakers seemed less polite.

**4.2	Recommendations**

On the basis of findings, I attempted to forward some suggestions for teaching 'speech acts' i.e. (direct and indirect speech acts) which would be beneficial

for teachers, students and learners of English and Bajhangi as second language/dialect. The recommendations made are mentioned below.

1.   The Bajhangi native speakers who want to learn the English language should be informed that the English speakers use the term 'please' more frequently to be polite.

2.   The Bajhangi speakers who want to learn the English language should be taught to be more polite in English to address other in speech acts.

3.   The English native speakers should be informed that the Bajhangi native speakers use the term 'Hajur' more frequently to be used in indirect speech acts.

4.   The English native speakers who want to learn Bajhangi should be informed that the Bajhangi native speakers are less polite than those of the English native speakers while addressing their friends and sisters whereas English speakers equally use the polite form for their friends, sisters and sons.

5.   The English speakers who want to learn Bajhangi should be informed that the Bajhangi speakers are less polite than the English speakers in speech act forms.

6.   The English native speakers also should be informed that the Bajhangi native speakers are less polite than the English native speakers while addressing others.

REFERENCES

Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to do things with words.* Oxford: Claredon Press.

Bach, K. and Harnish R.M. (1979). *Linguistic communication and speech acts.* Cambridge: MLT Press.

Bohara, T.B. (2009). *Deixis system in English and Bajhangi dialect.* An unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Tribhuvan University.

Chaudhary, K.K. (2010). *Speech act in Tharu and English language.* An unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Tribhuvan University.

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language* (2nd edition). Cambridge: CUP.

Grice, H.P. (1975). *Logic and conversation.* In P. Cole and J. Morgan. Eds. Syntax and Sementic III. Speech Acts. 41-58. Academic Press.

Joshi, A.R. (1989). *Linguistic study of Bajhangi dialect.* An unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Tribhuvan University.

Kachru, B. (1985). *Standard, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle.* British: CUP.

Kumar, R. (I 999). *Research methodology.* New Delhi: Sage publication.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principals of praginatics.* London: Longman.

Levinson, S.C. (1994). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: CUP.

Lyons, J. (1968). *Language and linguistics.* London and New York: CUP.

Neupane, K. (2006). *A study on code mixing in Bhojpuri language.* An unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Tribhuvan University.

Rai, V.S. (2001). *Semantics and pragmatics.* Kathmandu: New Hira Books Enterprises.

Sapir, E. (1921). *Language.* New York: Harcourt.

Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech acts: an essay in the philosophy of language.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shahi, D.B. (2011). *Speech acts in English and Jumli.* An unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Tribhuvan University.

Subba, D.M. (2007). *A comparative study on greeting and taking leave in English and Libmu language.* An unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Tribhuvan University.

Yule, G. (1993). *Pragmatics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yule, G. (1995). *The study of language.* Cambridge: CUP.