



Variation of Language Prestige and Politeness Patterns in Genders: A Punjabi Speakers' Community Analysis

Rahat Bashir, Principal Lecturer, Department of English, University of Central Punjab, Lahore Pakistan,

rahat.bashir@ucp.edu.pk

Musarat Yasmin, Assistant Professor, University of Gujrat, Hafiz Hayat Campus, Gujrat, Pakistan,

musarrat.yasmin@uog.edu.pk

Sadia Asif, Assistant Professor, Center for Teaching and Learning, University of Management and Technology Lahore Pakistan, sadia.asif@umt.edu.pk

Abstract

This study aims to dig out the politeness strategies employed by Punjabi speakers; males and females, while requesting their seniors, juniors and friends. Furthermore, it seeks out their preferred language; English, Urdu or Punjabi, during these face-saving acts. The researcher enquired two queries; if there is an association between gender and politeness strategies and gender and their preferred language code. Secondly, which of the strategies and languages are the most preferred ones, while requesting different interlocutors who are different to them in their social status, intimacy and power? The sample comprised of 168 Punjabis (male=83, females= 85), and a Discourse Completion Test (DCT) was given to them to collect data. The results were analyzed through SPSS by applying the chi-square test. The results concluded that there is a close association between gender and language choice while requesting friends and subordinates, but no difference is observed in the language choice and politeness strategy while requesting someone who is senior to them socially. Interestingly, females have totally abandoned Punjabi with their friends, and they are more into Urdu, while males' second preferred language is Punjabi, unlike females. Males request their juniors in Punjabi, contrastingly to females who use the Urdu language. The research is beneficial to the language policy makers and the institutes who are stakeholders of languages and who are responsible for the maintenance of languages and preservation of culture.

Keywords: politeness, politeness strategies, Punjabi culture and language, language prestige

I. INTRODUCTION

Politeness is socially constructed and is responsible for the making-up of identity. It is verbal behaviour which instrument the harmonious flow of communication in social interaction and it arbitrates between society and speaker. Language is not only the system of arbitrary symbols but also the mirror of complete philosophy of any group of people. Since 1925, with the study of Jespersen, researchers are contributing to the differences of speech in men and women, and it became revolutionary with the study of William Labov (1960). These gender dissimilarities exist due to many factors which include mainly social status and aspiration to get close to the speech pattern of rich people. This is called gender and prestige preference theory and females have more inclination to adopt the language of higher class (Lambert, Hodgson, Gardner, & Fillenbaum, 1960; Lambert, 1967; Labor, 1971; Edelsky, 1976). Our first concern in this study to find out what differences Punjabi males and females make in selecting the language while requesting; if they chose Punjabi, Urdu or English. Our second concern is to determine if Punjabi females are politer than Punjabi males and in which context. The linguistic politeness has always been an area of interest after the work of Goffman (1967), where he put forward the concept of face, which was later modified by Brown and Levinson in (1987). Politeness is a behaviour which is adopted by the speaker for a smooth flow of communication during communication (Goffman 1967, cited in Bloomer, Griffiths & Merrison, 2005: 113).

Various theories have been put forward to conclude that females are politer than males. During the last decade considerable attention to the speech act of requesting (e.g. Cameron, 1995). However, as Lorenzo-Dus and Bou-Franch (2003) claim, there are not so many studies regarding gender differences, even though,

historically, there has been a diversity of approach within the language and gender study (Sunderland and Litosseliti, 2002). On the contrary we can also notice, as Ishikawa (2013) says, that gender differences do have been analysed from different perspectives for the last four decades, paying attention to, for instance, the use of different linguistic aspects (e.g. Labov, 2001), styles (e.g. Trudgill, 1972), directness (Ishikawa, 2013), interruptions (Zimmerman and West, 1975), or politeness aspects (e.g. Holmes, 1995; Mills, 2003). This study will investigate the relationship between gender and request strategy, and gender and language choice, under a specific situation.

Moreover, this study will examine the impact of power, rank, and level of distance in making the above said choices. So far, no literature is found, which has studied gender, request strategy and language code, in the context of this social variable. It will be a valuable addition, for the ethnographic research for future researchers, to understand the position of females in Punjabi society and her role. Furthermore, this study can be an asset to the policymakers.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Gender and Language Choice

Gal (1979), investigated out a study on the speech pattern and language choice made by males and females of the Austrian village of Oberwart. Findings revealed that women are shifting from Hungarian; that is their peasant language, to the German language, which is the modern language and the language of social power and social advancement. This proves that women are relishing a lower status in almost in all societies and they endeavour to break the traditional shackles. However, Gal did not make any comment on the difference of the language, but she concluded that women try to move away from the traditional language, which embodies negative connotation to the modern language, which is liberal. Another study was carried out by Swigart (1992), in Dakar. This research pointed out another interesting factor that female community does not behave monolithically. Changes are observed even within the female population even in any specific region. The study revealed that young married mothers code-switch between two languages; between Wolof and French. Whereas the young girls' language was French with the total exclusion of the Wolof language. Wolof is the traditional language, and Spanish is the modern language. These study shows are agents of change in any society, and they rebel the rules of society by discarding the old language. Cheshire & Gardner-Chloros (1998), Punjabis in Birmingham. They didn't find any significant difference in code-switching produced by two genders and the established notion that females use more standard like language was rejected with an addition that no remarkable change was observed in their speeches, neither in type nor in quantity. Language does not only reflect the belief system of its users; rather it bounces back the past and present of any community. It is like a collective memory bank, which leaves the cultural and historical traces in the linguistic socket (Frank 2003, 2005; waThiong'o 1986). In this study selection of language by the speakers reveals the cultural embodiment of the belief system. In Pakistan, all languages do not enjoy the equal status, and this is the reason few of the languages are deteriorating not only in their usage but also they are considered of low status. On the other hand, some languages are considered influential and powerful (Romaine 2007, Khalique 2006). Language is used not as a medium of communication, but also as an identity marker (Kim, Siong, Fei & Ya'acob, 2010). This is the factor that interlocutors prefer prestigious code over the less prestigious code. It gives them a sense of power (Riaz 2009). This attachment of power and prestige for certain language is also due to certain socio-political factors (Al-Tamimi & Shuib 2009). Punjabi speakers do not code switch to facilitate their conversation. They use code-switching to establish identity, and this is what this research will explore.

Women use a particular language to differentiate herself from the rest and thus develops her very own identity. She establishes her social role and status (Farida, 2018). Females do code-switching to negotiate her position to exert power or to mitigate the social distance (Garcia, 2010).

2.2 Linguistic Politeness

Linguistic politeness is a debatable concept in the field of sociolinguistic because of its variability in different cultures. That is why many linguists have conducted researches and proposed their theories. Grice theory was an attempt to explain how hearer extracts the implied meaning from the speakers' words, which is different from what is expressed. So, he proposed his General Cooperative Principle (CP). Lakoff in 1973 proposed two rules of politeness and these two rules of clarity and politeness were further divided into a maxim of quality, quantity and manner. Goffman defined face as the public image and "positive social value"

that an individual assumes that he has gained through social contact (1967: 5). The face is public property, and it is permanently at risk if the individual does not project him for its suitability.

Supporting Goffman concept of face, Brown and Levinson proposed their theory of politeness in their book "Politeness: Some Universals In Language Usage" in 1987. They say that face is public image and everybody wants to maintain it and claim for himself. According to their theory, every individual has two faces; Positive and Negative Face.

Brown and Levinson (1987) claim that every speech act is vulnerable to face a threat. We all have to be conscious of maintaining the self-image. If someone's desires are being damaged by someone acts, then he is facing face-threatening acts (Yule, 1996). Acts like promises, apologies and expressing thanks are considered to threaten the speaker's face, whereas warning, criticism, orders, requests etc. are viewed to threaten the hearer's face. (Leyla Marti, 2006). All that acts which the one's public face and lessen the threat to another person's face are called face-saving acts (Yule, 1996).

Politeness strategies are used by the speaker when he wants to save the hearers face when face-threatening acts are desired or unavoidable. Brown and (Levinson (1987) mentions four types of strategies, which includes, bald on record, positive politeness strategy, negative politeness strategy and off the record. Bald on strategy is the highest level of being direct to others, and if not used properly, it often threatens the hearer's face. So Brown and Levinson have suggested a certain situation, where it can be used, other than the conditions where interlocutors are too close and frank to each other.

Positive politeness strategy is used by interlocutors by coming to the common grounds, showing concern to the hearer, respecting his time, and offering friendship etc. these techniques are used to make the hearer feel about himself well and respected. This strategy is used when interlocutors are quite familiar with each other.

Negative politeness strategy is used for negative face, and it is employed to show deference to his face and to accept that the hearer has social distance and is not compliance with in-group membership. This technique is used to save his face and to lessen the effect of imposition on the hearer.

Off record, strategy is the highest level of being indirect for hearer that the speaker doesn't want to impose any of his desires. He only gives hints to show what he wants and take care of hearer's face to the maximum level.

The formula for calculating the weightiness of an FTA (Brown&Levenson, 1987: 75-77)

Formula: $W_x = P(S, H) + D(S, H) + R_x$

X= speech act

- Relative power (P): The degree of influence capacity of interlocutors upon each other's face
- Social Distance (D): the degree of familiarity between interlocutors
- Absolute rank of Imposition (R): ranking of imposition varies situationally and culturally by the degree to which the interlocutors make self-determination or act of approval of each other's negative and positive face wants.

The theory of Brown and Levinson's (1987) has received a lot of attention and born a lot of criticism as well. There are two significant criticisms which hit their theory are discussed below.

Predominantly, few researchers have very heavily criticized the concept of face. They disagreed with their theory and advocated that universality of the face is not applicable to western culture. It is highly personal and individualistic. (Penman, 1994; Ting-Toomey, 1998), whereas in many Asian cultures, "social relativism" (Kasper, 1990), is taken into consideration for face-saving which concerns group membership, belonging and acceptance, is emphasized. Matsumoto (1988) argued that Brown and Levenson concept of face is alien in Japan because they believe in preserving relative position, rather than an individual. Chinese, similarly, develop a feeling of connectedness through their face and seeks interpersonal harmony (Mao, 1994)." Both Chinese and Japanese concepts of face emphasize the public, communal aspect of social relationships. The face in Punjabi culture is a symbol of honour and dignity. Losing face in the Punjabi language means losing dignified position or status, which is not exactly according to B&L (1987) concept of face.

The second criticism came from Brown and Levinson's universal assumption of the linear relation between the directness and politeness. They, like Leech (1983), asserts that there is a direct liaison in between politeness and indirectness. So, the choice of the strategy is the decisive factor to determine the degree of politeness (Kasper, 1990). It means that direct strategies should be avoided when any speech act is to be performed politely. However, some researches have rejected the automatic linear association of indirectness with politeness. House (1986, cited in Blum-Kulka, House Kasper, 1989) compares the British English and German. It was found that it was conventional indirectness (i.e., negative politeness), but not non-conventional indirectness (off the record) that was regarded as the politest strategy, but the use of imperative

constructions and directives were also regarded as appropriate in Russian (Thomas, 1983) and German (House, 1989) in normal situations. The issue of universality of directness versus politeness was also called into question in languages such as Chinese (Lee-Wong 1994, Yu 1999), Japanese (Takahashi & Beebe 1993), Nepali (Upadhyay, 2003) etc. According to the results of the studies mentioned above, the relation between directness and politeness is regarded as a cultural specific instead of universal phenomena. Several studies have been conducted about politeness strategies or on politeness modifiers because politeness is not only culture-specific, but also individual property. Moreover, it has to do a lot if the politeness has to be shown in the second language, as it definitely explains the speakers' language proficiency also (Economidou, 2008; 2009; Hassall, 2001; Schauer, 2004; Woodfield, 2006; Pérez i Parent, 2002; Barron, 2003 to name a few). Requests are frequently used in daily lives for the smooth flow of conversation. This is why, based on certain context, a certain kind of imposition is essential for natural communication (RasouliKhorshidi&Subbarkrishna, 2014). The current does not find adequate literature to review this kind of imposition for the comparison of genders' politeness.

At last, compared to any of the researches, mentioned above, they are either on communication between male and female, their learning strategies and use of second language, comparison of one language to another or in general their speaking style. None of the work has been conducted on Punjabi community, under the social factors, such as power, rank and frankness and their effects on both genders, in selecting the type of code and the type of request strategy. Over the years, the research inconsistently tries to define politeness or compare the patterns of males and females, but they are never examined in a similar situation of power, rank and social distance.

III. METHODOLOGY

A total of 168 Punjabi (immigrants; from India to Pakistan Punjab province) speakers were selected through random stratified sampling as a sample of this study. The participants included teachers, students, traffic wardens, accountants (munshi) and teachers in madrassa schools. The variety in the sample is brought to get the true opinion of Punjabi speakers who are engaged in different professions, background and financial status. The reason for choosing only three professions is their massive public dealing, where they have to inquire common man with various strategies, depending on their age, social status and gender. The sample comprised of 83 males and 85 females. A simple questionnaire as given to them to choose the best option in the given scenario. In the given questionnaire a situation was given where the speaker has to request his/her friend to turn the car towards ATM, then to his boss/senior and thirdly to his/her subordinate/servant. Now first of all the speaker has to choose the language (Urdu, Punjabi, English) for a particular hearer (friend, boss, servant) and afterwards the speaker will choose a one particular style of requesting out of the four requests types (positive politeness, negative politeness, on record and bald off strategy). The data were analysed through SPSS by applying chi-square test to find associations between the choice of languages and request strategies with respect to gender. Furthermore, the data was analysed by observing the variations within the variables of gender, language and request strategy to specify which request pattern and request strategy is preferred by which gender and for whom.

IV. RESULTS

4.1 Preferred code and request strategy to request friend, boss and subordinate concerning the gender of respondent

The Gender of Respondent	In which language you will request your friend to turn around ATM?				χ^2	P
	English E(O)	Urdu E(O)	Punjabi E(O)	Total		
Male	13(22.7)	42(45.9)	28(14.3)	83(83.0)	34.686 ^a	.000
Female	33(23.3)	51(47.1)	1(14.7)	85(85.0)		
Total	46(46.0)	93(93.0)	29(29.0)	168(168.0)		

1: language used for friends while requesting

The table 1 shows if the choice of language changes with the change in gender or not. To check the association between them chi-square test is applied. The table represents that there is a significant association between gender and language, as the value of $\chi^2= 34.686$ and $p= 0.000$, which is less than $\alpha= 0.05$.

How will you request to your friend for ATM?							
The gender of the respondent	Negative Politeness E(O)	Positive Politeness E(O)	Bald on Record E(O)	Off Record E(O)	Total E(O)	χ^2	<i>P</i>
Male	11(14.3)	7(14.3)	40(31.6)	25(22.7)	83(83.0)	13.774 ^a	.003
Female	18(14.7)	22(14.7)	24(32.4)	21(23.3)	85(85.0)		
Total	29(29.0)	29(29.0)	64(64.0)	46(46.0)	168(168.0)		

2: request strategy employed for a friend concerning gender

Table 2 represents the association between gender and type of request strategy. To find out the association, chi-square test is applied. The chi-square value is $\chi^2= 13.774$ and $p= 0.003$, which is less than $\alpha= 0.05$. Hence, it is concluded that there is an association between gender and type of request strategy.

What is the choice of language for the boss(ATM)?						
The gender of the respondent	English	Urdu	Punjabi	Total	χ^2	<i>P</i>
Male	42(50.9)	34(27.7)	7(4.4)	83(83.0)	8.832 ^a	.012
Female	61(52.1)	22(28.3)	2(4.6)	85(85.0)		
Total	103(103.0)	56(56.0)	9(9.0)	168(168.0)		

3: language choice for the boss, while requesting

Table 3 explains if the choice of language changes with the change in gender or not. The table represents that there is an association between gender and language, as the value of $\chi^2= 8.823$ and $p= 0.012$, which is less than $\alpha= 0.05$. This concludes that there is an association between language and gender.

How will you request to your boss for ATM?							
The gender of the respondent	Negative politeness	Positive politeness	Bald on Record	Off record	Total	χ^2	<i>p</i>
Male	59(58.3)	17(18.8)	0(1.0)	7(4.9)	83(83.0)	3.998 ^a	.262
Female	59(59.7)	21(19.2)	2(1.0)	3(5.1)	85(85.0)		
Total	118(118.0)	38(38.0)	2(2.0)	10(10.0)	168(168.0)		

4: request strategy employed for a boss concerning gender

Table 4 represents the association between gender and type of request strategies. To find out the association, chi-square test is applied. The chi-square value is $\chi^2= 3.998$ and $p= 0.262$, which is greater than $\alpha= 0.05$. Hence, it is concluded that there is no association between gender and type of request strategy.

What is the choice of language for the driver(ATM)?						
The gender of the respondent	English	Urdu	Punjabi	Total	χ^2	<i>P</i>
Male	9(13.8)	32(43.0)	42(26.2)	83(83.0)	27.764 ^a	.000
Female	19(14.2)	55(44.0)	11(26.8)	85(85.0)		
Total	28(28.0)	87(87.0)	53(53.0)	168(168.0)		

5: choice of language for subordinate concerning gender

Table 5 explains if the choice of language changes with the change in gender or not. To check the association between them, chi-square test is applied. The table represents that there is a significant association between gender and language, as the value of $\chi^2= 27.764$ and $p= 0.000$, which is less than $\alpha= 0.05$

The gender of the respondent	How will you request your driver for ATM?				Total	χ^2	p
	Negative politeness	Positive politeness	Bald on record	Off record			
Male	2(6.9)	1(4.4)	67(62.3)	13(9.4)	83(83.0)	15.653 ^a	.001
Female	12(7.1)	8(4.6)	59(63.8)	6(9.6)	85(85.0)		
Total	14(14.0)	9(9.0)	126(126.0)	19(19.0)	168(168.0)		

6: request strategy employed for subordinate concerning gender

Table 6 represents the association between gender and type of request strategies that are adopted by Punjabi speakers. To find out the association, chi-square test is applied. The chi-square value is $\chi^2= 15.653$ and $p= 0.001$, which is less than $\alpha= 0.05$. Hence, it is concluded that there is an association between gender and type of request strategy.

4.2 Preferred code and request strategy to request friend, boss and subordinate concerning the gender of the respondent (variation within the variable)

The Gender of a Respondent	In which language you will request your friend to turn around ATM?			
	English (% within the age of respondent)	Urdu (% within the age of respondent)	Punjabi (% within the age of respondent)	Total (% within the age of respondent)
Male	15.7%	50.6%	33.7%	100.0%
Female	38.8%	60.0%	1.2%	100.0%
Total	27.4%	55.4%	17.3%	100.0%

7: language choice for a friend concerning gender (variation within the variable)

Table 7 explains the choices of language according to gender while requesting their friend. Accumulatively, the most preferred language of Punjabi speakers is Urdu (55.4%), and English is on second number (27.4%), but within gender, the result is different for English is a second favourite language. Only 1% of females have chosen Punjabi while requesting their friends, and on the other hand, contrastingly, 38% of males have chosen Punjabi.

The Gender of a Respondent	How will you request to your friend for ATM?				Total (% within the age of respondent)
	Negative Politeness (% within the age of respondent)	Positive Politeness (% within the age of respondent)	Bald on Record (% within the age of respondent)	Off the record (% within the age of respondent)	
Male	13.3%	8.4%	48.2%	30.1%	100.0%
Female	21.2%	25.9%	28.2%	24.7%	100.0%
Total	17.3%	17.3%	38.1%	27.4%	100.0%

8: request strategy for a friend concerning gender (variation within the variable)

This table 8 shows the different types of request strategies employed by Punjabi speakers while requesting their friend. On the whole bald on record is the most favourite choice, but it does not succeed with a very bulk (38%), because the second preference is given to off the record with 27.4%, and negative and positive politeness are with 17.3%. Within the genders, though the maximum choice is for bald on record, the percentage is varied; (males 48.2%, females=28.2%), which is a big difference. The second choice is off record; (males= 30%, females=24%). Females employ more positive politeness (25.9%), than males (8%).

The Gender of a Respondent	What is the choice of language for the boss (ATM)?			
	English (% within the age of respondent)	Urdu (% within the age of respondent)	Punjabi (% within the age of respondent)	Total (% within the age of respondent)
Male	50.6%	41.0%	8.4%	100.0%
Female	71.8%	25.9%	2.4%	100.0%
Total	61.3%	33.3%	5.4%	100.0%

9: language choice for a boss concerning gender (variation within the variable)

This table 9 represents the preferred language of Punjabi speakers while requesting their boss. Overall the most desirous language is English (61.3%), and the second choice is Urdu (33%). Within genders, though the preference remains the same, yet percentage varies for both languages. For example, for English the percentage is; males=50.6%, females=72%, and for Urdu; males=41 % and females=25.9%.

The Gender of a Respondent	How will you request to your boss for ATM?				
	Negative Politeness(% within the age of respondent)	Positive Politeness(% within the age of respondent)	Bald Record(% within the age of respondent)	on Off the record (% within the age of respondent)	Total (% within the age of respondent)
Male	71.1%	20.5%		8.4%	100.0%
Female	69.4%	24.7%	2.4%	3.5%	100.0%
Total	70.2%	22.6%	1.2%	6.0%	100.0%

10: request strategy for a boss concerning gender (variation within the variable)

Table 10 manifests the preferred request strategy by Punjabi speakers while requesting their boss. The percentage shows that negative politeness is the most preferred one by both males and females; males=71%, females=69%, and accumulatively it is 70.2%. The second desirous language is positive politeness which has the make the total percentage of 23%. Bald on record is not chosen by any male, while, 2.4% of females have employed it also.

The Gender of a Respondent	What is the choice of language for the driver (ATM)?			
	English (% within the age of respondent)	Urdu (% within the age of respondent)	Punjabi (% within the age of respondent)	Total (% within the age of respondent)
Male	10.8%	38.6%	50.6%	100.0%
Female	22.4%	64.7%	12.9%	100.0%
Total	16.7%	51.8%	31.5%	100.0%

-11: language choice for subordinate concerning gender (variation within the variable)

Table 11 exhibits the preference of language given by Punjabi speakers while requesting their drivers. In total 52% of the respondents have gone for Urdu, but within gender, this choice does vary, as 57% of males have chosen Punjabi as their first choice, and only 12% females are gone with Punjabi. Females have chosen Urdu with 64.7% and males with 38.6%.

The Gender of a Respondent	How will you request your driver for ATM?				
	Negative Politeness(% within the age of respondent)	Positive Politeness(% within the age of respondent)	Bald Record(% within the age of respondent)	on Off the record (% within the age of respondent)	Total (% within the age of respondent)
Male	2.4%	1.2%	80.7%	15.7%	100.0%
Female	14.1%	9.4%	69.4%	7.1%	100.0%
Total	8.3%	5.4%	75.0%	11.3%	100.0%

12: request strategy for subordinate concerning gender (variation within the variable)

Table 12 represents the preferred way of requesting by Punjabi speakers to their drivers, according to their gender. In aggregate, the most preferred style is bald on record (75%), within gender the case is also similar;

male=80.7%, females=69.4% respectively. The second preferred choke for males is bald on record (16%), while for females, it is negative politeness (14.1%). There is a little tendency of using positive or negative politeness by males; positive politeness=1%, negative politeness=2.4%.

V. DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION

5.1 Gender and language choice under social variables (power, social distance and rank)

Gender plays an important role, and it greatly influences the choice of language, even while requesting friends. Accumulatively, the most preferred language of Punjabi speakers is Urdu (55.4), but within gender, the result is different. It is striking that 38% of the females chose English to request their friends. This shows that Punjabi females are more conscious of their status within the same rank, with no fear of social distance and power. Winter and Pauwels (2001) declared that women use the language of the minority in a market place where power does not execute, but here we can see that contrastingly to Punjabi males, who are using Punjabi as their second preferred language (38%), females are setting a different pattern. Secondly it also challenges the conclusion of Sachs, Lieberman, and Erickson (1973) who stresses that males are more accurate and more frequent in using the power language or language of the rich people because they have culturally more responsibilities to go around to make money etc. and that is why they are more educated and skilled in the other language. Only 1% of females have shown their preference for Punjabi within their community. This sets a finding that females have totally abandoned Punjabi even from their comfort zone. Now, this is very significant that the friend circle is the ward where we don't wear any artificial face, and none of our attempts is artificial or intentional. We speak and behave naturally as we are not controlled by any social factor due to which we adopt any other behaviour. Females are agents of change, and they take the lead in bringing any change in the speech pattern of any society. Female as a changing force, has been studied in many contexts, but in Punjab where females are not lesser in their education, nor in their exposure has not been studied yet. Due to this, the sample was intentionally collected of those males and females, who are not housewives, rather they were working women or students, with a minimum of 14 years of education. The results reveal that male trend of talking to each other in Punjabi their closely knitted group will be no more observed in the next coming years as Punjabi is obsolete in female interaction.

The second variable of this study is to check the gender preferences of languages under the social variable of power and rank, with less social distance, tells that gender does influence the choice of language while requesting seniors. 71% of the females have chosen English to request their boss, in comparison to the males where this percentage is only 50% as it is discussed earlier that both genders are equally qualified and none of the genders is staying at home. Both of the genders are working participants. Still, there is a huge difference in their response. This elaborates that it is not only the socioeconomical factor of responsibility and need owing to which males learn the language of power, but it's more than that. It could be the reason that females are culturally considered weak and vulnerable, living in a patriarchal society, their status consciousness urges them to behave more dominantly, by using another language which is the language of wealth and power. This concludes that women see higher class language as part of their role ideal, whereas men's masculine ideal includes the use of lower class language. But here in this context, this does not go for Punjabi as it threatens the face of other, who is senior to them in rank and power.

The third social variable under which the language preferences were analysed, is, where the hearer is from the lower social status thus the speaker has less social distance and high exertion of power on the other; requesting maid/servant/driver. The results manifest that in total 52% of the respondents have gone for Urdu, but within gender, this choice does vary, as 57% of males have chosen Punjabi as their first choice, and only 12% females are gone with Punjabi. Females have chosen Urdu with 64.7% and males with 38.6%. This shows that Punjabi which is considered the language of illiteracy or lower class is not used by females even for their maids. They are more prestige or class conscious than men. Same was observed earlier with friends, where males have chosen Punjabi as their second preference, but females didn't.

Interestingly females' first choice is Urdu (64%), while males' first choice is Punjabi (50%). It is really striking that again here females are for socially prestigious language as they can't talk to the servant in English but to maintain their social status and to exert power on other they have to take the support of the language to

maintain their social role. Does it show their vulnerability which is woven deeply in the culture, where they have to wear an artificial face to gear up their daily life routine chores? Secondly, it also supports the notion that females feel their selves more secure, powerful and ideal by adopting the speech of the upper class and males show their masculinity by using the lower class language. This further intensifies that women try to move away from the traditional language which embodies negative connotations to the modern language, which is liberal.

5.2: Gender and politeness Strategy under social variables (power, social distance and rank)

5.2.1 Gender and Friend (Request Type)

Male and female are also different in their requests' style while requesting their friends. Gender strongly influences the linguistic politeness and level of directness or indirectness. For instance, on the whole bald on record is the most favourite choice, but it does not succeed with a very heavy bulk (38%), because the second preference is given to off record strategy with 27.4%, and negative and positive politeness are with 17.3%. Within the genders, though the maximum choice is for bald on record, the percentage is varied; (males 48.2%, females=28.2%), which is quite a big difference. The second choice is off record; (males= 30%, females=24%). Females employ more positive politeness (25.9%), than males (8%). Males are more direct and franker with their friends, whereas females are reserved or take more precautionary measures while requesting. Females prefer positive politeness instead as they believe in solidarity and mutual interest. Leo Hickey (1991) and Vazquez (1995) conducted a research on Spanish and English people politeness with their friends and they stated that Spanish people use positive politeness and English people use negative politeness as two different cultures believe in two different systems of politeness, one believes in solidarity while others believe in giving individuals pace. But here in Punjabi culture, people use bald on strategy and surprisingly do not threaten each other's space, rather it commutes their communication process smoothly. This shows that more you are close to each other, more you are direct. So, it proves that there is a relationship, in being indirect and polite which is opposed to Leech (1983) and Brown and Levinson (1987).

5.2.2 Gender and boss (request type)

Punjabi male and female opt the same request strategy for their boss and hence show no association. It is concluded that negative politeness is the most preferred one by both males and females; males=71%, females=69%, and accumulatively it is 70.2%. The second desirous language is positive politeness which has made the total percentage of 23%. Bald on record is not chosen by any male, while, 2.4% of females have employed it also. Though negative politeness is somehow face-threatening, as the majority of the respondents have chosen English for requesting their seniors, so it was difficult to assess the politeness through the use of modal verbs. Apart from this interpretation, there is another interesting understanding that in Punjabi culture the boss wants to exert power and desires to maintain distance and does not want his/her subordinates to intervene his personal space thus demands not solidarity but individual freedom.

5.2.3 Gender and subordinate (request type)

There is a close association between gender and request strategy opted for juniors or seniors. In aggregate, the most preferred style is bald on record (75%), within gender the case is also similar: male=80.7%, females=69.4%. The second preferred choice for males is an off-record record (16), while for females, it is negative politeness (14.1%). There is a little tendency of using positive or negative politeness by males: positive politeness=1%, negative politeness=2.4%. It explains that both genders do not care about the use of politeness strategies and threatens the face of the listener. But here it does not look awkward as it is the demand of speaker's rank and the power execution.

VI. CONCLUSION

In Punjabi community with the change in gender, the choice of language is changed, while requesting different interlocutors of different social status. Males use Punjabi, while females use the English language to request their friends. For requesting seniors (boss), females prefer English, while males go for Urdu as well. These two findings, open three important rooms for discussion: (1) Punjabi women are more educated than Punjabi males or (2) Punjabi females are equal contributors to earn bread and butter for the family or (3) Punjabi culture gives her women more opportunities to grow and learn the foreign language; power

language. Females are more conscious of their social status and repute in comparison to the males of the same social setting.

Punjabi males do not care for the face of their friends while requesting them. They use bald on record strategy, and it does not create friction in the conversation, which concludes that politeness is not only limited to the strategies, rather personal relation, level of understanding and frankness, plays a vital role for the smooth conversation and face-saving. Contrary to these, Punjabi females do not use any specific strategy to request, they keep on changing it, without any specific reason. For the boss, both genders use negative politeness as it seems that in Punjabi culture, at the workplace, personal space is given and getting closer to each other or developing frankness in between juniors and seniors is avoided.

It is concluded that in the Punjabi community gender drastically delineates changes in human behaviour and thought.

REFERENCES:

- 1) Al-Tamimi, A. & Shuib, M. (2009). Motivation and attitudes towards learning English: A study of Petroleum Engineering undergraduates at Hadhramout University of Science and Technology. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 9 (2), 29-55.
- 2) Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics. Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 3) Blum-Kulka, Shoshana (1989). Playing it safe: the role of conventionality in indirectness. In *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*, Shoshana Blum-Kulka, Juliane House, and Gabriele Kasper (eds.), 37-70. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- 4) Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 5) Cameron, D. (2000). *Good to talk? Living and Working in a Communication Culture*, London: Sage Publications
- 6) Cheshire, J. & P. Gardner-Chloros (1998). "Code-switching and the sociolinguistic gender pattern". *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 129, 5-34.
- 7) Economidou, K. (2009). Examining the pragmatic competence of Greek Cypriot learners of English in oral requests – A comparison with American native speakers. In *Proceedings of the 41st Annual Meeting of the British Association for Applied Linguistics*, 33-35. Retrieved from <http://www.baal.org.uk/proc08/economidoukogetsidis.pdf>
- 8) Farida, P. (2018). Multilingualism in Sindh, Pakistan: the functions of codeswitching used by educated, multilingual, Sindhi women and the factors driving its use. Unpublished Thesis, Sussex University, UK.
- 9) Gal, S. (1979). *Language shift: Social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*. New York: Academic Press.
- 10) Garcia, M. (2010). Serious games: code-switching and gender identities in Moroccan immigrants girls' pretendplay. *Pragmatics* 20:4.523-555
- 11) Goffman, Erving (1967), *Interaction ritual: Essays on face-to-face behavior*. New York: Anchor Books.
- 12) Hassall, T. J. (2001). Modifying requests in a second language. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 39, 259-283.
- 13) Hickey, Leo (1991) Comparatively polite people in Spain and Britain. *Association for Contemporary Iberian Studies* 4.2: 2-7
- 14) Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, Men and Politeness*, New York: Longman.
- 15) House, Juliane (1989). Politeness in English and German: *the functions of please and bitte*. In *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*, Shoshana Blum-Kulka, Juliane House, and Gabriele Kasper (eds.), 96-119. Norwood, NJ: Ablex In Thorne, B. & Henley, N. (eds.) (1975), *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. 105- 129.
- 16) Ishikawa, S. (2013). The ICNALE and sophisticated contrastive interlanguage analysis of Asian learners of English. In S. Ishikawa (Ed.), *Learner corpus studies in Asia and the world*, 1 (pp. 91-118). Kobe, Japan: Kobe University.
- 17) Jespersen, Otto. 1929. *An International Language*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- 18) Kasper, G. (1990). *Linguistic politeness: Current research issues*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 193-218.
- 19) Khalique, H. (2006). The Urdu English relationship and its impact on Pakistan's social development. *International Wissenschaftsforum Heidelberg International Workshop*. Heidelberg

- 20) Kim, L.S.; Siong, L.K.; Fei, W. F. & Ya'acob, A. (2010). The English language and its impact on identities of multilingual Malaysian undergraduates. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 10 (1), 87-101
- 21) Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press, Inc.
- 22) Lakoff, R. (1973). *The logic of politeness; or minding your p's and q's*. *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 292-305.
- 23) Lambert, W.E., Hodgson, R.C., Gardner, R.C. and S. Fillenbaum (1960). Evaluational reactions to spoken languages. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 60(1): 4451.
- 24) Leech, Geoffrey N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- 25) Lee-Wong, Song Mei. (1994a). *Imperatives in requests: direct or impolite Observations from Chinese*. *Pragmatics* 4 (4), 491-515.
- 26) Lee-Wong, Song Mei. (1994b). *Qing/ Please-a Polite or requestive marker? Observations from Chinese*. *Multilingua*, 13 (4), 343-360
- 27) Lorenzo-Dus, N. and Bou-Franch, P. (2003). "Gender and Politeness: Spanish and British Undergraduates' Perceptions of Appropriate Requests". In Santaemilia, J. (ed.) (2003), *Género, lenguaje y traducción*, Valencia: Universitat de Valencia/ Dirección General de la Mujer. 187-199.
- 28) Mao, L.R. (1994). *Beyond politeness theory: 'Face' revisited and renewed*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21(5), 451-486.
- 29) Marti, Leyla (2006). Indirectness and politeness in Turkish-German bilingual and Turkish monolingual requests. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38 (11): 1836-1869.
- 30) Matsumoto, Y. (1988). *Reexamination of the universality of face*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12, 403-426.
- 31) Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and Politeness*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 32) Pauwels, Anne and Winter, Joanne (2001) 'Gender and language contact research.' *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 20 (6). pp. 508-522.
- 33) Pearson, B. and McGee A. 1993. *Language choice in Hispanic-background junior high school students in Miami: A 1988 update*. In: A. Roca *Contact and Diversity*. Berlin; Newand J. Lipski, eds. Spanish in the United States. Linguistic York: Mouton de Gruyter. 91-101.
- 34) Penman, R. (1994). *Face work in communication: Conceptual and moral challenges*. In S. Ting-Toomey (Eds.), *The Challenge of Face work* (pp.15-46). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- 35) Pérez i Parent, M. (2002). The production of requests by Catalan learners of English: Situational and language proficiency level effects. *ATLANTIS*. XXIV.2, 147-168.
- 36) RasouliKhorshidi, H. & Subbakrishna, R. (2014). Internal/External Modifiers in Request Speech Act among Iranian Study Abroad Learners. *Research Journal of Recent Sciences*. 3(5), 55-64
- 37) Riaz, S. (2009). Exploration of the Socio-cultural, Linguistic and Psychological Factors involved in Intrasentential Code-switching from Urdu to English. Unpublished M.Phil thesis. Department of AIS, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad.
- 38) Romaine, S. (2007): Preserving Endangered Languages. In: *Language and Linguistics Compass* 1 (1-2), 115-132.
- 39) Schauer, G. A. (2004). May you speak louder 'maybe? *Interlanguage pragmatic development in requests*. In S. Foster.
- 40) Sociocultural situatedness, Roslyn M. Frank, René Dirven, Tom Ziemke, and Enrique Bernárdez (eds.). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. forthcoming Gut feelings: Locating intellect, emotion and life force in the Thaa Yorre body. In *Culture, Body, and Language: Conceptualizations of Internal Body Organs across Cultures and Languages*, Farzad Sharifian, René Dirven, Ning Yu, and Susanne Niemeier (eds.). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. Fraser
- 41) Sunderland, J. and Litosseliti, L. (eds) (2002). *Gender, Identity and Discourse Analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 42) Swigart, L. (1991). "Women and language choice in Dakar. A case of unconscious innovation". *Women and Language* 15, 11-20
- 43) Swigart, Leigh. 1992. 'Two codes or one? The insiders' view and the description of codeswitching in Dakar', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 13 (1-2).
- 44) Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). Intercultural Conflict Styles: A Face Negotiation Theory. In Y.Y. Kim & W.B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in Intercultural Communication* (pp. 213-238). Newbury Pk, CA: Sage.
- 45) Trudgill, P. (1972). "Sex, covert prestige and linguistic change in the urban British English of Norwich", *Language and Society* 1: 179-195.

- 46) WaThiong'o, Ngugi(1986) *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: Heinemann
- 47) Woodfield, H. (2006). Requests in English: ESL learners' responses to written discourse completion tests. Paper presented at the 31st International *LAUD Symposium. Intercultural pragmatics, linguistics, social and cognitive approaches*. Landau/Pfalz, Germany.
- 48) Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- 49) Zimmerman, D. H. and West, C. (1975). "Sex, roles, interruptions and silences in conversation".