

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING
UNIVERSITY OF DANANG**

NGUYỄN THỊ THANH BÌNH

**A STUDY OF SYNTACTIC AND
PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF INDIRECT
INTERROGATIVE DIRECTIVES IN
ENGLISH AND IN VIETNAMESE**

**Subject area: THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE
Code : 60.22.15**

**M.A THESIS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE
(SUMMARY)**

Supervisor: PHAN THỊ BÉ, M. Ed

DANANG – 2011

The study has been completed at
The College of Foreign Languages, University of Danang

Supervisor: Phan Thị Bé, M.Ed

Examiner 1: Trần Hữu Mạnh, Assoc. Prof. Dr.

Examiner 2: Trần Quang Hải, Ph.D

The thesis will be orally defended to the dissertation board

Time : January 15th, 2011

Venue : University of Danang

The origin of the thesis is accessible of purpose of reference
at:

- The College of Foreign Language Library, University of Danang
- Information Resources Centre, Danang University

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. RATIONALE

When people want someone to do something, they often make requests, give suggestions or ask for information... . In other words, language is used widely to demand some future act in response from the hearer. Thus, with *indirect interrogative directives*, we can really do things with words and language is a really means to an end.

But in fact, each language's characteristics and their unique culture is reflected in language in different ways both in form, content and quality. This makes me want to find, identify, classify, and find similarities and differences of requests, particularly in the field of pragmatics, use of language, in English and in Vietnamese.

(1) Can you pass the salt? [68, p.60]

In this utterance, we are not really asking a question about someone's ability, we normally use it to make a request.

1.2. AIM AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1.2.1. Aims of the study

The study aims at providing learners of English with a detailed description of indirect interrogative directive with their syntactic and pragmatic features in English in comparison with those in Vietnamese.

1.2.2. Objectives of the study

- To describe some kinds of indirect interrogative directive in teaching and learning English as a foreign language.
- To describe the syntactic and pragmatic features of indirect interrogative directive in teaching and learning English as a foreign language.

- To contrast these features in English and Vietnamese to find out the similarities and differences between two languages.

- To suggest some implications of the findings for the teaching and learning English and Vietnamese as foreign languages (essentially in Speaking and Translation).

1.3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What are the syntactic and pragmatic features of indirect interrogative directive in English and Vietnamese?

2. How many typical types of indirect interrogative directive in English and Vietnamese?

3. What are the similarities and differences of indirect interrogative directive in English and Vietnamese?

1.4. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

With the aim to making a study on the syntactic and pragmatic features of indirect interrogative directive in English and Vietnamese, the study will provide useful knowledge to enable better use of indirect interrogative directive in Cross- Cultural communication in English and Vietnamese. The findings of the study can be the potential source for the teaching and learning of speech acts in general and directives in particular in English and Vietnamese as foreign languages.

1.5. THE SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This research is carried out in contrastive analysis of the syntactic and pragmatic features of indirect interrogative directive in English and Vietnamese speech events, which focuses mainly on verbal communication through the analysis of the data collected from the conversations, books, novels, short stories, ...in both English and Vietnamese.

Within the scope of the study, non- verbal strategies such as facial expressions, body language, gestures are not included. Furthermore, during the time of collecting data, we find that there are too many samples of giving directives, so in this thesis we just mention and investigate some ways of indirect interrogative directives.

1.6. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Review of Literature

Chapter 3: Methodology and Procedures

Chapter 4: Findings and Discussions

Chapter 5: Conclusion, Implications, Limitation,

Recommendations.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1. PRIOR RESEARCH ON DIRECTIVES

- Nguyễn Thị Tố Nga [21]: “*An investigation into the syntactic and Pragmatic Features of directives in English and Vietnamese*”, the study focuses on the syntactic and pragmatic features of directives in English and Vietnamese and the author at the same time presents the similarities and differences between English and Vietnamese in the syntactic and pragmatic perspectives of directive speech acts. However, the study doesn't focus on indirect interrogative directives with their syntactic and pragmatic features in English and in Vietnamese. And the study has not denoted the influence of other factors of context to indirect interrogative directives utterances in their contrastive in English and Vietnamese.

- Searle [68], “*Syntax and Semantics*”, categories speech acts in 5 groups: Representatives, Directives, Commissive, Expressive and Declaratives.

- In Vietnamese, there are some studies on particles in relation to the illocutionary force of *directives* in Vietnamese by Dr. Đỗ Hữu Châu ,Dr. Nguyễn Văn Hiệp , Chu Thị Thuỷ An .

- Assoc. Prof. Dr Đào Thanh Lan [18], [19] has studied how to express the action of directives by interrogative directives.

2.2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

J.L.Austin (1962) was the first linguist who proposed the theory of speech act, his theory of speech act was adopted and developed by the subsequent linguists. George Yule (1996) includes speech act classification, performatives, felicity condition, direct and indirect speech acts. And I also introduce some theoretical concepts of J.L.Austin about speech acts of indirect interrogative directives, components of speech acts of indirect interrogative directives.

2.2.1. Speech Acts Theory

Speech acts theory based on the belief that language is used to perform actions was initiated by John Austin, a philosopher working at Oxford University in the 1940s and 1950s.

2.2.2. The Classification of Speech Acts:

George Yule (1996), lists five types of general functions performed by speech acts: declarations, representatives, expressives, directives, and commissives.

2.2.3. Direct and Indirect Speech Acts

Whenever there is a direct relationship between a structure and a function, we have a **direct speech act**. Whenever there is an

indirect relationship between a structure and a function, we have an **indirect speech act**.

2.2.4. Speech Acts of Indirect Interrogative Directives

For example, a speaker may utter the sentence:

Can you reach the salt?

In such cases it is important to emphasize that the utterance is meant as a request. Such cases, in which the utterance has two illocutionary forces, are to be sharply distinguished from the cases in which, for example, the speaker tells the hearer that he wants him to do something; and then the hearer does it because the speaker wants him to, though the request at all has been made, meant, or understood. The cases we will be discussing are *indirect interrogative directives*.

2.2.5. Components of Speech Acts of Indirect Interrogative Directives

1. *Locutionary act:*
2. *Illocutionary act or the illocutionary force:*
3. *Perlocutionary act or the perlocutionary effect:*

2.2.6. Performatives Hypothesis

1. *Explicit performative*
2. *Implicit performative*

2.2.7. Felicity Condition

Felicity conditions are conditions to count an act as having illocutionary act of one sort or another. Austin distinguished between three main categories on the conventional procedure and its effect with the appropriate speaker and circumstance, the completion and correctness of the procedure performance and the speaker's desires in giving *directives*.

2.2.8. The Directive and Its Realized Functions

Bach and Harnish's view that directives express the speaker's attitude toward some prospective actions by the hearer and the speaker's intention that his utterance. This category covers six kinds of acts including *requestives, questions, requirements, prohibitives, permissives, and advisories*.

2.3. LINGUISTIC COMMUNICATION

2.3.1. Spoken language in face-to-face communication

Spoken language has to be understood immediately. For that reason, spoken language depends much on the situational context in face-to-face interaction: gestures and body language, variation in speed and loudness, intonation, stress, rhythm, pitch range, pausing and phrasing.

2.3.2. Communicative intention

Communicative intention or *speaker's intended meaning* represents the aim, possibly linguistically irrelevant, that the speaker bears in mind before uttering the sentence(s) and the purpose of the act performed by the utterance is to achieve the aim.

2.3.3. Mutual belief in communication

Communication is a joint act. For communication to be possible, there must be certain mutual knowledge and beliefs between interlocutors.

2.3.4. Context in face-to-face interaction with *directives*

Context of communication can be understood as environment of the utterance including all that is present or in action at the moment of speaking. It may be divided into linguistic and non-linguistic context for the convenience of our investigation.

2.3.5. Participants in communication with *directives*

The most common term for the two participants in a dialogue is *interlocutors* with speaker as the initiator of the utterance and the *addressee* for the other which is used roughly by many linguists as the *hearer*.

2.4. CONVERSATIONAL PRINCIPLES AND CONVERSATIONAL IMPLICATURE

2.4.1. Conversational Principles

Typically there are three participants in any episode of language use: the *language*, the *speaker*, and the *listener*. We have analyzed language use at the two levels that correspond to the first two elements - the level of the linguistic act and that of the speech act.

2.4.2. Conversational implicature

Conversational implicature is a non-conventional implicature based on an addressee's assumption that the speaker is following the conversational maxims or at least the cooperative principle.

2.5. POLITENESS THEORY

2.5.1. The Politeness Principle

Leech [57, p.105] defines politeness as forms of behaviour that establish and maintain comity. That is the ability of participants in a social interaction to engage in interaction in an atmosphere of relative harmony.

George Yule [50, p.60] considered politeness "polite social behavior or etiquette within a culture". He mentions the concept of face, which is individual's feeling of self-worth or self-image which can be damaged, maintained, or enhanced through interaction with others. Different situations require different kinds of degrees of politeness.

2.5.2. Face Threatening Acts (FTAs)

According to Brown and Levinson, positive and negative face exist universally in human culture. In social interactions, face-threatening acts are at times inevitable based on the terms of the conversation. A face-threatening act is an act that inherently damages the face of the addressee or the speaker by acting in opposition to the wants and desires of the other.

2.5.3. Negative and positive face

Negative face is threatened when an individual does not avoid or intend to avoid the obstruction of their interlocutor's freedom of action. Positive face is threatened when the speaker or hearer does not care about their interlocutor's feelings, wants, or does not want what the other wants.

2.5.4. Strategies for performing face-threatening act

Positive politeness strategies seek to minimize the threat to the hearer's positive face. They are used to make the hearer feel good about himself, his interests or possessions, and are most usually used in situations where the audience knows each other fairly well.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

3.1. METHOD OF STUDY

The study is to utilize the methods of descriptive and contrastive. On the description of the samples gathered in each language, we draw out the fundamental features so that they are later put in a contrastive analysis to find out the similarities and differences of *indirect interrogative directives* in two languages.

3.2. DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

3.2.1. Object of the Study

The object of the study is utterances which have the communicative illocutionary force of *indirect interrogative directives* in their particular context and co-text in their monolingual or bilingual books, short stories, novels, research books, plays and in daily speech in English and Vietnamese languages.

3.2.2. Data Collection

The data will be collected from a number of books related to this study, in English and in Vietnamese.

3.2.3. Data Analysis

Describing and analyzing the utterances conveying indirect interrogative directive in both English and Vietnamese.

3.3. RESEARCH PROCEDURES

- Collecting samples on indirect interrogative directives.
- Observing on the sentence structures of the samples.
- Classifying into groups on the basic of the represented forms for the realizations of *indirect interrogative directives* in each language.
- Drawing out on the basic of the syntactic and pragmatic features of *indirect interrogative directives* .
- Proceeding contrastive analysis the similarities and differences in the syntactic and pragmatic features of *indirect interrogative directives* in English and in Vietnamese.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 DESCRIPTION ON SYNTACTIC FEATURES OF INDIRECT INTERROGATIVE DIRECTIVES IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE

4.1.1. Indirect interrogative directives consist of interrogative

Wh-word

4.1.1.1. *Indirect interrogative directives consist of interrogative*

What

(20) What makes you think so? [45, p78]

(21) Cả các ông, các bà nữa, về đi thôi chứ? Có gì mà xúm lại như thế này ? [4, p.19]

“*What makes you think so*” = “*It doesn’t concern to you.*” Or “*You shouldn’t take part in my problem.*” In this sentence, the speaker wants the hearer not to take part in his problem, so it isn’t a question.

“*Có gì mà xúm xít lại như thế này?*”. When saying this utterance, the speaker wants the hearer not to gather and go home.

4.1.1.2. *Indirect interrogative directives consist of interrogative*

Who

(27) Ai cho phép mày khóc? [13, p. 674]

(28) Get out of here, Dillon? [60, p.134]

We can understand that, the speaker wants to say: *Who allowed you to sit here, get out of here, Dillon?*

4.1.1.3. *Indirect interrogative directives consist of interrogative*

Why

To ask the reason, we use Why in English and *sao, tại sao, vì sao* in Vietnamese.

(30) Why don’t you rest a while before you start work? [72, p.4]

(32) Kia, sao anh không ngồi xuống? [4, p.427]

4.1.1.4. *Indirect interrogative directives consist of interrogative*

Where

(40) Taxi!

Where to, Miss? [70, p.116]

(41) Thông thả đã, đi đâu mà vội? [4, p.257]

In these examples, illocutionary act of **interrogative *Where*** is indirectly identified by some accompanied utterances.

4.1.1.5. *Indirect interrogative directives consist of interrogative How*

This kind is incapable of joining in interrogative directive structure, the second is used to ask about specific characteristics, either motive or stative; or ask about relationship.

(43) How can I help you, my friend? [61, p.45]

(44) Thế bây giờ anh định thế nào? [74, p. 360]

4.1.2. *Indirect interrogative directives consist of Tag-question*

(48) Let's go and see Auntie Mary, shall we?" [79, p.397]

(49) Anh sẽ giúp em chứ? [39, p.281]

Only when the tag is produced in a rising intonation, the sentence has the force of a question. The tag in a rising intonation in English can be indicated in Vietnamese by the final particles *hả, chứ, sao, à* or the group "*có phải không?*" which have the function of checking the true value of the previous statement.

4.1.3 *Indirect interrogative directives consist of Yes/No Interrogatives*

Yes- No questions are usually formed by placing the operator before the subject and giving a sentence a rising intonation.

(53) May I take your coat? [77, p.22]

(55) Anh không đợi xe điện mà về à? [18, p.110]

4.1.4. *Indirect interrogative directives consist of Alternative questions*

(56) Would you like us to keep them for you **or** send them on? [71, p.140]

The overt form of the alternative question then is one polar question with two or more alternative connected by the coordinator "or" in English and "*hay*", "*hay là*", "*hoặc*" in Vietnamese. The answer is to be found in the question itself, no other information sought outside that is contained in the question.

(59) Mày có giờ tay *hay không* thì bảo? [13, p.57]

4.2. DESCRIPTION ON PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF INDIRECT INTERROGATIVE DIRECTIVES IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE

4.2.1. Specific realizations of indirect interrogative directives in English and Vietnamese

4.2.1.1. *Indirect interrogative directives consist of Wh-word in English and Vietnamese*

a. *Some kinds of indirect interrogative directives consist of interrogative WHAT*

* Representation of indirect requestives in English and Vietnamese

(63) What can I do for you? [81, p.53]

(64) Các bà đi vào nhà. Đàn bà chỉ lời thôi, **biết gì?** [4, p.19]

* Representation of indirect suggestion in English and Vietnamese

In this case, participants in the communication consider the relationship between the speaker and the hearer is often higher than the behavior of *commanding*.

(66) Việc gì đến chị mà chị na một hót? [4, p.201]

* Representation of indirect advisories in English and Vietnamese

Participants in the communication consider as sentimental relationship between the speaker and the hearer, it is higher than suggestion. The agent of directive is often has higher position.

(67) Làm gì mà hốt hoảng thế? Bình tĩnh nào [36, p.36]

b. Some kinds of indirect interrogative directives consist of interrogative WHO

* Representation of indirect requestives in English and Vietnamese

(68) Ai cho anh kia ngó ngoáy? [70, p.57]

* Representation of indirect suggestion in English and Vietnamese

(70) Who do first? [48, p.77]

(71) Ai dám xung trận bây giờ? [74]

In this utterance, the speaker wants the hearers to attack the enemy.

* Representation of indirect urgency in English and Vietnamese

(72) Ai? Đứa nào? Nói mau lên, tao không thể chịu nổi nữa rồi!
[37, p.25]

c. Some kinds of indirect interrogative directives consist of interrogative WHY

* Representation of indirect command in English and Vietnamese

(75) Sao mày không rót nước mời bà xoi? [27, p.34]

* Representation of indirect requestives in English and Vietnamese

(76) Why not leave the priesthood rather than put up with it?
[79, p.195]

(78) Sao không tháo gông cho huynh trưởng? [71]

* Representation of indirect suggestion in English and Vietnamese

(79) Why don't we keep it safe for you until ...? [81, p.889]

(80) Kia, sao anh không ngồi xuống? [4, p.427]

* Representation of indirect advisories in English and Vietnamese

(81) Why not take advantage of your foresight and try to prevent it?

(82) Sao anh không lấy vợ? [4, p.427]

* Representation of indirect invitation in English and Vietnamese

(83) Then why don't we go back and find it? [81, p.386]

(84) Tại sao cậu không làm một hóp rượu nhỉ? [31, p.61]

* Representation of indirect urgency in English and Vietnamese

(85) Why don't you call your bank and check it out. [4, p.78]

d. Some kinds of indirect interrogative directives consist of interrogative WHERE

* Representation of indirect suggestion in English and Vietnamese

(87) Where would you like to go? [69, p.91]

(88) Thông thả đã, đi đâu mà vội? [4, p.257]

* Representation of indirect command in English and Vietnamese

(89) Where can I find the secretary's office, please? [69, p.88]

(90) Chúng đâu? Đem ra đây! [73, p.347]

e. Some kinds of indirect interrogative directives consist of interrogative HOW

The capacity of asking about the relationship in the second way is also eliminated in interrogative directive structure.

(91) How may I help you? [70, p.138]

(92) Thế nào? Mày có trả lời không thì bảo? [39, p.34]

4.2.1.2 Question with answering orientation

In this type of indirect interrogative directives, the hearer has only one choice to the answer.

(93) You will marry me soon. Miss Scarlett? [66, p.193]

(95) Dừng lại, tất cả có dừng lại hay không thì bảo? [36, p.56]

4.2.1.3. Question with recommending implication to do something

English informational question with “What about / How about...?” are conventionally used to avoid repetition in communication.

They are used in many functions of directives such as requestives, suggestion.

(102) How about going to that new Indian restaurant ? [70, p.85]

(105) Còn con Minh? [11, p.168]

4.2.1.4. *Question with recommending implication not to do something*

Negative orientation is found in questions which contain a negative form of one kind or another.

(107) When are you going to stop being such a boy scout?[81, p.378]

4.2.1.5. *Question about the ability of hearer*

This type of question has the implication directive and often expresses the *representation of indirect suggestion, invitation and offering* in English and Vietnamese.

(110) Will you help me escape? [51, p.181]

4.2.1.6. *Question with Wh-question in negative meaning*

(112) Why do you go on making so noise? [51, p.57]

This type of question often has situation allowing identifying the negative meaning. This negative meaning creates prerequisite implicature directive with as requestive.

4.2.1.7. *Question with the aspiration of speaker*

This type of question has the implication directive and often expresses *indirect suggestion, asking permission and offering* in English and Vietnamese.

(116) Could you help me to meet some of them? [61, p.150]

(119) Sao cháu không ướp cho thơm? [16, p.59]

4.2.1.8. *Question with particle directive*

(121) Harriet, may I speak to Mr. Stanhope, *please*? [81, p.73]

The indirect interrogative directives in this part express the actions: asking about directive, both asking and giving directive, asking and directive with threatening meaning.

Table 4.2. *Some types of indirect interrogative directives in English and Vietnamese*

Types	Representation in English and Vietnamese
1	<i>Wh-word interrogative</i>
2	<i>Question with answering orientation</i>
3	<i>Question with recommending implication to do something</i>
4	<i>Question with recommending implication not to do something</i>
5	<i>Question about the ability of hearer</i>
6	<i>Question with Wh-question in negative meaning</i>
7	<i>Question with the aspiration of speaker</i>
8	<i>Question with particle directive</i>

4.2.2. Directive under the influence of socio-cultural context in English and Vietnamese.

The purpose of this study is to investigate polite request strategies and the effect of social distance, social power and ranking of imposition in the choice of request indirect interrogative directives in their daily conversation.

(126) If we're finished eating, why don't we get back to the game? [81, p.298]

(132) Hễ được nước thì bắc lên đây, con nhé? [4, p. 112]

4.2.2.1. *The conception of solidarity in English and Vietnamese*

a. The representation of solidarity between the interlocutors in interrogative directives in English and Vietnamese.

Social relationship or solidarity between interlocutors can be indicated by the choice of clause type and sentence structure.

(135) How can I help you, *my friend*? [57, p.190]

(136) Tan lẽ rồi, sao *con* không về? [36, p.11]

b. Representation of distant relationship in interrogative directive in English and Vietnamese.

People of distant relationship often use formal style of language to communicate with each other.

(137) May I ask you a question, Mr Faber? [61, p.121]

(138) Tan lẽ rồi, sao *con* không về ? [36, p.11]

In formal context, English conventional address terms *Sir, Madam, Miss, Mrs* can be used alone when we don't know the surname, but in Vietnamese, we use a pronoun to express the utterance, and it depends on the relationship distance in the age. For instance, *ông, bác* for men, *bà* for women, *cô* for girls...

(142) Will you wait for me, Miss Scarlett? [43, p. 205]

(143) Kia con, ông hỏi, sao con không trả lời? [13, p.141]

c. Representation of close relationship in indirect interrogative directives in English and in Vietnamese.

The familiar relationship on both English and Vietnamese is marked by the informal and colloquial use of language and more subjective and direct way of giving indirect interrogative directives with some polite markers.

(150) Why do you do it ? [67, p.132]

(151) Cả tuần làm gì mà không chịu ôn bài? [74, p.317]

In Vietnamese, imperatives without subjects or with informal or colloquial address terms as subjects or vocatives with the vocative particle: *oi, à, a* in imperatives and *hở* in interrogative, signal close relationship between interlocutors. And we also have final particles, such as: *nào, đã, với* give an important contribution to inform the close relationship among interlocutors, which can not be found in English.

(153) Nghỉ tay chút xíu tụi bay *oi* [15, p.38]

In Vietnamese, a pronoun for family relationship in final position in a special tone is used more often to show the loving and caress toward the hearer that do not exist in English. Compare the tones for the final address terms in English and Vietnamese in the following sentence

(154) *Minh* có bằng lòng hay không bằng lòng ? [4, p.288]

English pronouns *I – You* makes no differences to the relative distance in age between interlocutors but Vietnamese pairs of pronouns such as *cậu, tớ, mày, tao* can be reciprocally used by close friends of equal age.

(160) Cậu giúp tớ làm bài tập này chứ? [17, p.55]

In Vietnamese, the choice of the appropriate address terms for a pair for speaker and hearer is an effective means for indicating the nature of the kind of close relationship: *bà – cháu, mẹ – con, anh - em* ... while that is by no means to be expressed in English.

4.2.2.2. Power relationship in indirect interrogative directive in English and Vietnamese.

a. The conception of power status relationship between the interlocutors in indirect interrogative directive in English and Vietnamese.

There are some differences in the perception of power relationship in English and Vietnamese. They enjoy more equality to adults. In Vietnamese, among the source of power: *age, wealth, social position, education*, the power that one has for his elder people and for his high hierarchical ranking in the kinship seems to dominate the force from other sources, especially in the old days.

(167) Could you just get me the menu again, please? [71, p. 140]

b. Representation of relationship in status and power between the interlocutors in indirect interrogative directive in English and Vietnamese.

The mood of the sentence of the utterance, the formality of the language use, the level of politeness of the act that is encoded either in the linguistic forms of the utterance or the para-linguistic elements can provide insights into identification of the relatively social status and power between the speaker and the hearer.

(170) Sao không giắt chuông gọi người nhà nó vào bữa? [13, p.49]

+ Representation of the speaker's higher status (high-low relationship) in interrogative directive in English and in Vietnamese.

In general, superior speaker take the prominent role in the talk. The inferior hearer then only giving verbal or nonverbal acts in response to such directive

(171) Mày đứng đây à? Mày có quét ngay, không thì chết với tao bây giờ. [13, p.327]

+ Representation of speaker's lower status (low-high relationship) in directives in English and Vietnamese.

As we know that, social group the hearer may belong to, people of lower status communicate with superior people in the formal style.

(177) Thưa Cha, Cha có thể cho con một đặc ân không? [36, p.11]

(178) Aye, aye. May I ask you a question? [60, p.108]

+ Representation of interlocutors's equal status in indirect interrogative directive in English and Vietnamese.

The level of formality in this relationship depends on the distance in the participants' solidarity and their common form: formal if they both are of high background, well- educated or not close acquaintances; informal if they both are of low status or of close relationship.

(181) Would you like me to come down there, Tracy? [64, p.47]

(182) Thong thả đã, đi đâu mà vội? [4, p.257]

In Vietnamese, *mày- tao, cậu - tớ* are used when the interlocutors have intimate relationship, but that in English, where the pair *I - you* are used for speaker and hearer of all ages.

4.4. FINDINGS

4.4.1. Similarities and differences in the syntactic features of indirect interrogative directives in English and Vietnamese.

4.4.1.1. Similarities in the syntactic features of indirect interrogative directives in English and Vietnamese.

Firstly, the illocutionary force of indirect interrogative directives in English and Vietnamese can be indicated by any clause types. In both languages, we can use some types of interrogative to express indirect directives, such as: Wh-question, yes/ no question, tag- question, alternative questions.

Secondly, the formation of indirect directives can contain vocatives, polite markers in forms of polite expression, mitigating devices and hedges as non-propositional component. Vocatives and

polite expressions, can exist in all forms of construction, while hedge and mitigating devices often work at the level of interrogatives.

Thirdly, the structures of indirect interrogative directives in every utterance are analogous and similar in the two languages. On the lower level, where the specifically linguistic means are motivated for the representation of such structure.

Lastly, there are correspondence in performative verbs and modal elements, and the verbs of wanting in “want statement”, we use some verbs when you want to give directives (want, would like, need

4.4.1.2. Differences in the syntactic features of indirect interrogative directives in English and Vietnamese.

Firstly, intonation is a *supra-segmental* element occurred as an effective illocutionary force indicating device in English whereas its role is rather limited in Vietnamese. In Vietnamese, final particles can take over that function (*à, ơ, hả, nhỉ, nhé...*)

Secondly, English uses mood, word forms and intonation for the distinction of clause types. In Vietnamese, the use of particles and other function words and word combination takes the role (*ơ, nhỉ*)

Thirdly, we can see morphological feature such as contraction in English and phonological features of coalition and assimilation are effective means for the indication or of a low level of formalities that do not have in Vietnamese.

Fourthly, the linguistic means for the realization of the components of indirect directives in English and Vietnamese are different in many ways. In English, it has grammatical categories such as *mood, modal finites, distal modals, passive voice, intensifying and mitigating devices* while in Vietnamese, lexical categories as

particles, indefinite words, address term of various kinds and of wide range for each kind are the effective means.

4.4.2. Similarities and differences in the pragmatic features of indirect interrogative directives in English and Vietnamese.

4.4.2.1. Similarities in the pragmatic features of indirect interrogative directives in English and Vietnamese.

Firstly, in both languages, the relationship between interlocutors in solidarity and status or power position is the most important factors of the context of indirect directives.

Secondly, in English and Vietnamese, the level of politeness and formality in giving indirect directive is corresponding to the level of face threat and the distance in the relationship between interlocutors.

Thirdly, the functions of indirect directives and the sentences structures for the representation of the functions are the same in both languages.

Fourthly, communication with indirect directive in English and Vietnamese always needs being compensated with an amount of politeness.

Lastly, most English and Vietnamese choose indirect interrogative to make directives, but the frequency of using indirect interrogative directive of English is more than Vietnamese.

4.4.2.2. Differences in the pragmatic features of indirect interrogative directives in English and Vietnamese.

Firstly, English show consideration to the hearer’s negative face with the preference on the indirect way of giving directive, whereas Vietnamese displays the care for the hearer’s positive face with the preference on the direct way of giving directive.

Secondly, the grammar and vocabulary of the language are motivated. However, the linguistic strategies are not the same. In English, it uses grammar such as modality, voice, mood, contraction and phonology such as intonation, coalition in the referring and inferring of the illocutionary force of indirect interrogative directives as well as other lexical item such as address term, particles, mitigating word.

Thirdly, the way for the speaker of indirect interrogative directive to reinforce imposition on the hearer is not correspondent in the two languages.

Fourthly, in some difficult situations, the English are more flexible in choosing some ways to express their speaking-aims than the Vietnamese.

Fifthly, The English use more modulators in structures than the Vietnamese because English has more modulators than English. The modulation in Vietnamese is only words, intonation or some supplemental behavior.

Lastly, the Vietnamese are more sensitive with high status and power relationship than the English.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION- IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATION

5.1. CONCLUSION OF THE STUDY

Description and discussion have been made on the syntactic forms and pragmatic factors concerning the referring as well as the use of indirect interrogative directives in communication in English and Vietnamese. The result analysis and discussion gives an overall view about directives especially in relation to interlocutor's

relationship and preference strategies in their contrast in English and Vietnamese.

The result analysis and discussion also gives an overview that most types of indirect interrogative directives in English can be translated into Vietnamese.

5.2. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

For teacher, the effective use of language and communication with indirect interrogative directives, whatever in linguistic form or function must be taught or learned. For learners, different strategies for learning are proposed. Young learners, especially children haven't formed a pragmatic routine in communication even in their mother tongue. But for adult learners who have established a firm pragmatic routine of the linguistic use in their mother tongue.

5.3. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Firstly, the thesis investigates some, not all, indirect interrogative directives in English and Vietnamese, that is, there are still other interrogatives which need studying. Secondly, there are different types of interrogatives which also express directives. Thirdly, the thesis just focus on written language, non- verbal strategies such as facial expressions, body language, gestures are not included.

5.4. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.

- The importance of social relationship in giving interrogative directives in English and Vietnamese.
- Different ways of expressing indirect interrogative directives in English and Vietnamese.