

**The Use of Politeness Strategies when Implicating a Third Person:  
A Case study of Indonesian Au Pairs in the Netherlands**



**Maria Christiani**

s4404440

Master English Language and Linguistics

Radboud University Nijmegen

Supervised by

Dr. Jarret G. Geenen

## Abstract

Many studies have evaluated politeness strategies between speakers and hearers in general, but not many have investigated the politeness strategies in which a third person addressee is implicated in the utterances, especially in a sociolinguistic interview. This study looks at how Indonesian au pairs employ politeness strategies when interviewed regarding their perception of their host parents and when they talk about the host parents. The data was collected from interviewing two Indonesian au pairs who have stayed in the Netherlands for at least four months. The participants were asked some questions relating to the host parents in a semi-structured sociolinguistic interview. The findings show that the au pairs use not only independence strategies, but also involvement strategies. Both of the politeness strategies are employed when implicating the host parents in different ways. It is concluded that the au pairs use complex politeness strategies when responding to questions in a semi-structured sociolinguistic interview and their choice of strategy appears to be directly contingent on the context given and individual situational relationship.

## **Acknowledgement**

First and foremost, I would like to thank my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ for His grace and many blessings He has poured out upon my life.

I also would like to express my gratitude to my incredibly helpful supervisor, Dr. Jarret G. Geenen for his time, guidance, trust, and encouragement during the process of writing my thesis.

My sincere thanks also goes to my family for their unwavering support and including me in their prayers.

Lastly, I also would like to heartily thank my friends for being there to embolden me and believe in me.

## Table of Content

ABSTRACT.....	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	3
TABLE OF CONTENT .....	4
CHAPTER I .....	5
INTRODUCTION.....	5
1.1. Background of the study.....	5
1.2. The aim of study .....	7
1.3. Outline of the study .....	8
CHAPTER II .....	9
LITERATURE REVIEW .....	9
2.1. Face .....	9
2.2. Defining Politeness .....	10
2.3. Brown and Levinson .....	11
2.3.1. General Universal Rules about Politeness .....	11
2.3.2. Power, Distance, and Ranking of Imposition .....	11
2.3.3. Positive and Negative Politeness Strategies .....	13
2.4. Scollon and Scollon .....	15
2.4.1. Description of Power, Distance, and Weight of imposition .....	15
2.4.2. Involvement and Independence strategies .....	16
2.4.3. Politeness systems.....	17
2.5. Deference politeness system researches .....	18
2.6. Previous studies on politeness strategies in interviews.....	19
2.7. Au pair studies .....	21
2.8. Evaluation and preference terms.....	22
2.9. Conclusion .....	23
CHAPTER III.....	24
METHODOLOGY .....	24
3.1. Participants .....	24
3.2. Materials .....	25
3.3. Design of study.....	25
3.4. Analysis .....	28
CHAPTER IV.....	29
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION .....	29
4.1. Findings .....	29
4.1.1. Independence strategies in negative evaluations of the host family ...	30
4.1.2. Involvement strategies in positive evaluations of the host family .....	38
4.2. Discussion.....	43
CHAPTER V .....	47
CONCLUSION .....	47
REFERENCES.....	49
APPENDIX .....	55
INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTION OF AU PAIR A.....	55
INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTION OF AU PAIR B .....	85
INVITATION LETTER-RESEARCH STUDY .....	97
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET.....	98

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Background of the study

The position of the au pairs is double-edged. Au pairs are assigned to provide childcare, but they stay with the host family and are supposed to be treated equally as a family member (Immigration and Naturalization Service, 2015). The various au pair programs in Europe are intended to be a cultural exchange for young people and offer many opportunities for young foreigners to visit a new country, learn the language and about the culture, while temporarily living with and providing some services such as childcare for a host family. In the Netherlands, au pairs come for a maximum period of one year and are to become acquainted with Dutch society and culture. The au pair scheme in the Netherlands is organized as an immigration regulation because the Netherlands did not ratify the European Agreement on au pair placement, though they follow some of the requirements specified in the Agreement in order to issue au pair visas and residence permits (Directorate-General for Internal Policies. Policy Department Citizen's Rights and Constitutional Affairs, 2011).

Mellini, Yodanis and Godenzi (2007) claim the primary goal of being au pairs is not employment-related but sharing the life of the host family while providing childcare and doing light housework. Au pairs are engaged in day-to-day family activities and receive pocket money because they are not formal employees and do not have an employer but a host family. Indeed as the name au pair states, au pair should be 'on par' or an equal member of the host family (Yodanis and Lauer, 2005). Au pairs are not simply caregivers, but should be seen as family members.

The au pair situation is considerably complex as they perform the bulk of their responsibilities in the house of their host family, which is an atmosphere of a rather intimate nature that can therefore have a tremendous impact on the relationship with the family that provides board and lodging for them. Zelizer (2005) proposes that the host parents-au pairs relationship requires interdependence and engenders a need for mutual trust, which can make the relationship between employee and employer seem more personal in nature. There is a great ambivalence to an au pair's position, depending on what duties an au pair has in each specific family (Tročilová, 2013). As Anderson explains, 'it is widely accepted that there are two meanings conflated in the term 'care': care as labor and care as emotion, and it

can be very difficult to disentangle the two' (2000, p.14-15). Tročilová (2013) claims it appears almost impossible to view an au pair only as an employee.

Tročilová (2013) points out that an au pair lives in the household of their host family and builds a relationship with them; therefore, the nature of their personal relationships are of interest. The au pair-host family relationship is often seen as a family-like relationship with the au pair is being seen as a family member. Becoming a member of the host family might have both positive and negative sides; it can be a source of joy and delight as well as forlornness and frustration.

Relationships between an au pair and a host family are constructed through interactions. If an au pair does not communicate with their host family, it can create problems. The mutual process of give and take lies at the basis of the relationship between an au pair and a host family. It is crucial for both the au pair and the host family to communicate clearly their various expectations and issues (Aupairworld.com, 2015). Harquail (2011) suggests that understanding the balance between an employee and family members leads to building strong relationships between an au pair and the host parents.

Elkin-Clearly (2015) claims that the relationship with an au pair is a substantial one for the host family as well as for the au pair themselves. The relationship can be filled with hope, enthusiasm, anxiety and expectations, and those can make the relationship positive but also complex. Their interactions can nurture this relationship. Getting to know each other and sharing experiences can establish and maintain communication and understanding, and it can also form a promising relationship for both the au pair and the host family (Matusiak, 2014).

DeVito (2012) states that politeness is an approach to look at relationships since politeness is a major factor in growing, sustaining, and nurturing relationships. Politeness theory can help elucidate the process of relationship development or deterioration. Therefore, this study addresses the issue of the politeness particularly in au pairs and host parents relationships in a semi-structured sociolinguistic interview.

Au pairhood in particular is a very interesting topic with many issues that have not been explored. Most studies in the field of au pairs have only focused on au pairs from sociological and anthropological standpoints (Pelechova, 2014). Far too little attention has been paid to investigate au pairs' interview discourse from linguistics domain. Much less is known about how the au pairs articulate their opinion about the host parents. According to Maha (2014), what interlocutors say is influenced by interpersonal relationships, and conversational frictions may appear if the relationships are not considered. Thus, it is

paramount to examine how politeness strategies are used by the au pairs when they are interviewed about their host parents. This notion is pertinent to au pairs and host parents who have complex relationships and the au pairs are positioned as employees in which they are supposed to employ politeness strategies while representing their employer because of the inequality in power and distance.

This thesis examines the way in which the politeness strategies are manifested in an interview discourse and in a reference to a third person addressee, the host parents. It provides an overview of politeness not only applicable for interactants, but also instructive of how a third party can affect the trajectory of the way language is used in a particular situation. This study is designed to investigate the use of politeness strategies applied and looks at the way au pairs establish their position in relation to the host family using English in a sociolinguistic interview. In an interview, the host parents are not interlocutors, but are involved in the au pairs' utterances. Therefore, the present study is situated within the field of socio-pragmatics as, 'the study of language from the point of view of users and the choices they make' (Crystal, 1987, as quoted in Vitah Hanchoko, 2014).

## **1.2. The aim of study**

The reader should bear in mind that the study is based on a case study of two Indonesian au pairs who have been living and working in the Netherlands, and aims to shed light upon the utterances that represent politeness in speech acts from a pragmatics perspective. This involves a focus on language from the users' point of view, in terms of the alternatives they face, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the impacts the use of language has on the other participants in the act of communication (Crystal, 1997).

The research questions addressed in this study are as follows:

- 1) Do Indonesian au pairs use independence or involvement strategies in a semi-structured sociolinguistic interview?
- 2) How do Indonesian au pairs use politeness strategies in the interview discourse specifically when a third party addressee is implicated?

The study will be useful to reveal the politeness strategies used with the implication of a third party addressee in the discourse. Investigating politeness in a reference to a third party is a continuing concern within politeness strategies between speaker and hearer. It also suggests that the use of politeness strategies which implicate a third person addressee are quite complex. The findings of this study are expected to point to the need to understand

context to gain awareness of the politeness strategies used and develop pragmatic competence, and especially the need for realization schemes for various speech acts inferred as politeness strategies. Research of politeness can be of great value in intercultural communication. This study provides an exciting opportunity to advance our knowledge of intercultural communicative competence and linguistic realizations of politeness strategies in the reference of a third party. The study offers some important insights into face management system. Throughout this thesis, the term “saving face” is used to refer to a third party addressee. Understanding the link between politeness strategies and a third person addressee will help us to comprehend that protecting the identity and face of a third person addressee in utterances are also prominent. The findings of this thesis could be used to help to understand about the host parents-au pairs relationship which can also be manifested in the interview discourse.

### **1.3. Outline of the study**

The study identifies the politeness strategies used in two sociolinguistic interviews. It contributes to the impact of expressing politeness in the different contexts.

The overall structure of the study takes the form of five chapters. I first provide a theoretical background of the research questions and outline some preliminary background on au pairs. Chapter two begins by laying out the theoretical dimensions of the research, and looks at politeness and a thorough review of the extant literature in the relevant fields, and ties them into this study. The fields whose literature I review include theoretical perspectives and socio-cultural aspects of politeness, including Brown and Levinson’s (1987) universal theory on politeness expression. Politeness strategies as outlined by Scollon and Scollon (1995) are discussed as the theoretical framework for the study. The third chapter is concerned with the methodology used for this study. The data collection method and process employed in the study are described, including employing speech acts theory for the first step to analyze the utterances. In this section, I also explain the process of data collection and analyze the speech acts. The fourth section presents the findings of the research. The results include a qualitative analysis I conducted to show how the politeness strategies are utilized in the period of the interview in which third persons are implicated in the discourse. The discussion of the qualitative analysis supplement this section. In the final chapter, I summarize the study and discuss the implications of the findings.



## **CHAPTER II**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

This chapter covers face management and the theoretical perspectives on politeness. The various academic approaches to politeness strategies and phenomena will also be discussed. First, the theoretical framework proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) will be introduced and Scollon and Scollon's work as a reformulation (1995) will then be discussed. Politeness is not just something that explains why a particular utterance may not abide by a Gricean maxim but, in fact, is a system which is negotiated in interaction. This section also looks thoroughly at what the previous research has found, and outlines the theoretical framework for the present study.

#### **2.1. Face**

The starting point of politeness is the concept of face which was introduced by Erving Goffman (1967). Goffman (1967) defines face as an image of self-portrayal that is located in the flow of events and manifests when these events are interpreted for the appraisals expressed in them. Brown and Levinson (1987) adopted Goffman's notion of the social self and define face as "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself/herself" (p.61). Both Goffman's and Brown and Levinson's views argue that face is a kind of illustration or representation that people want for themselves in terms of how others view them, and it needs to be established, maintained, misplaced, and rebuilt in social interactions (Song, 2012). Face refers to a person's public identity, and face management refers to those activities designed to support, protect, and ratify that identity (Goffman, 1967 as cited in Holtgraves, 2014). A certain act or speech act may implicitly or explicitly appeal to the face of the individual.

Scollon and Scollon (1995) describe face as "the negotiated public image, mutually granted each other by participants in a communication event" (p.35). Central to this definition lies the negotiation of face. When participants negotiate each other's faces, they make assumptions about the face they want to maintain and the desired face of their interlocutor.

Face is divided into two types: positive face and negative face. Positive face is 'the positive consistent self-image or "personality" (crucially including desire that this self-

image be appreciated and approved of) claimed by interactants' (Watts, 2003, p.104). Negative face is 'the basic claim to non-distraction-e.g. freedom from imposition or obligations' (Watts, 2003, p.104). Song (2012) explains that positive face is the image that an individual wants others to approve, while negative face is the line that the speaker wants to prevent others from crossing. During any communication or social interaction, positive face and negative face can be at risk. Negative face is at risk when there is an unequal relationship between interactants while the positive face is at risk among the interlocutors when power is more or less equal between the communicators (Song, 2012). Brown and Levinson propose the face-saving model with its two specific constituents (negative and positive face). This suggests that we employ different kinds of linguistic strategies to counterbalance the threats to face that our speech acts may encompass. LoCastro (2012) points out it is the domain of *politeness theory* that attempts to explain the ways in which linguistic resources are used to mitigate face threats.

## **2.2. Defining Politeness**

Humans express their feelings and articulate their opinions on various issues through their utterances. The management of relationship and specifically face can be seen in utterances, which is at the heart of politeness. Individuals are supposed to apply politeness while interacting with interlocutors. Conversational strategies are interpreted as related to universal sociolinguistic rules of politeness (Cheng, 2012). Utterances can be polite based on the positioning of the speaker to the addressee which is exemplified in the particular grammatical and lexico-grammar of any specific utterance which manifests in any social interaction. However, utterances have structures which not only position the speaker in relation to their addressee but also, simultaneously, to the content of their discourse. While a particular utterance is always and only directed at their immediate interlocutor, speakers often implicate third parties in their utterances.

Lakoff (1990, as cited in Eelen, 2001) highlights politeness as an approach to facilitate interactions by minimizing the potential for confrontation inherent in interpersonal relations. Since politeness is a critical concept in interpersonal communication, there are an abundance of studies which apply theories on politeness to specific data (e.g. Brown and Levinson, 1987; Coulmas, 1981; Eelen, 2001; Fraser and Nolen, 1981; Gu, 1990; Ide, 1982, 1989, 1993; Kasper, 1990; Leech, 1983; Watts, 2003).

Based on social circumstances, we are obliged to tailor our communication because our words or phrases needs to meet social expectations so as to be understood as polite

(Song, 2012). Brown (2005) argues politeness is can be seen as modifying one's language in a particular way to explicitly consider the feelings of the addressee. Linguistic politeness is defined as the linguistic strategies employed to express communicative meaning while simultaneously embedding in the structure of the discourse itself, an explicit consideration of the interlocutors feelings and face (i.e. self-image).

### **2.3. Brown and Levinson**

#### **2.3.1. General Universal Rules about Politeness**

Brown and Levinson (1987, as cited in Eelen, 2001) relate their theory with the Gricean framework, in which politeness strategies are viewed as “rational deviations” from the Gricean Cooperative Principle (CP). However, politeness has a entirely different status from the CP: whereas the CP is plausible and seen as a socially neutral strategy, politeness should be explicitly communicated. It can never be simply reputed to be functional and it must be signaled by the speaker. Politeness principles are “principled reasons for deviation” from the CP when communication is about to threaten face (Brown & Levinson 1987, p.5). Brown and Levinson (1987, as cited in Eelen, 2001) point out that their politeness model is the mutual awareness of ‘face’ sensitivity, and that together with the CP allows the inference of implicatures of politeness.

#### **2.3.2. Power, Distance, and Ranking of Imposition**

Eelen (2001) identifies that the cultural amplification in politeness is supposed to be on the level of types of speech acts threaten face, types of social relationships, and types of politeness styles (dis)preferred, etc. The convictions of power and distance which are employed vary widely in linguistics, and many studies within sociolinguistics, pragmatics and discourse analysis has investigated their effects on the production and interpretation of language. Linguistic strategies of politeness are affected by three bound factors: the power, the social distance between speaker and hearer, and the weight of the imposition of the request being asked (Brown and Levinson, 1987; Scollon & Scollon, 1995). These three factors are critical to predicting the type and level of politeness strategies which may be used (Scollon & Scollon, 1995).

Brown and Levinson (1987), in their influential model of politeness, assert that interlocutors consider the power and distance of their relationship when selecting strategies for conveying a given speech act. Furthermore, numerous subsequent empirical studies have provided additional confirmation for connection between language and the variables power

and distance. For instance, there are relatively few historical studies in the area of wording of speech acts, such as requests (e.g. Blum-Kulka et al., 1985; Holtgraves and Yang, 1990), disagreement (e.g. Beebe and Takahashi, 1989), and apologies (e.g. Holmes, 1990).

In the interpretations of the 'vertical' dimension of interlocutor relations, various linguists have emphasized one or more of the following aspects regarding the term used for power (Spencer-Oatey, 1996):

- 1) Power of control (e.g. Brown and Gilman, 1972; Brown and Levinson, 1987)
- 2) Social status or rank (e.g. Cansler and Stiles, 1981)
- 3) Authority, or the legitimate right to wield influence (e.g. Leichthy and Applegare, 1991)
- 4) A general notion of equality-inequality (e.g. Holtgraves, 1986)

The distance parameter has not only been discussed in terms of low and high values. In addition to Lorés Sanz (1997), Suh (1999), Tanaka and Kawade (1982) or Thomas (1995) have argued that hierarchical distance may exist between interactants, defined by their social features or roles, and/or a psychological distance, which is determined by their discernment of factors such as age, intimacy, or familiarity (as cited in Cruz, 2005). According to Hays (1984), Distance is associated with the following factors (as cited in Cruz, 2005):

- 1) companionship, which appertains to the context in which interlocutors do activity together, share experience, or company.
- 2) consideration (or utility), which signifies the extent to which an individual considers his interlocutor will give him goods, services, or support in order to show his care.
- 3) communication (or self-disclosure), intends to a situation in which the interlocutors exchange or discuss personal information, ideas, opinions about any topic.
- 4) affection, which is manifested through expressing positive or negative notions by means of emotional expressions.

Spencer-Oatey (1996) listed down that distance is interpreted as comprising one or more of the following (often overlapping) factors:

- 1) Social similarity/difference (e.g. Brown and Gilman, 1972)
- 2) Frequency of contact (e.g. Slugoski and Turnbull, 1988)
- 3) Length of acquaintance (e.g. Slugoski and Turnbull, 1988)
- 4) Sense of like-mindedness (e.g. Brown and Gilman, 1972)
- 5) Positive/negative affect (e.g. Baxter, 1984)

### 2.3.3. Positive and Negative Politeness Strategies

According to Brown and Levinson's logic (1987), positive politeness is oriented toward the hearer's positive self-image and generally attempts to build solidarity and intimacy between the speaker and the hearer. It confirms that the relationship between the communicators is friendly (Song, 2012). Brown and Levinson (1987, as cited in Song, 2012) indicate that the positive politeness strategy focuses more on the feeling of cordiality between the interlocutors, such as showing exaggeration, interest, approval, and sympathy; the use of in-group identity markers; or the search for common ground. On the other hand, negative politeness is concerned with the desire of the speaker or the hearer to have his or her freedom of action unhindered by the expression of restraint and avoidance (Song, 2012).

Wolfson (1989, as cited in Song, 2012) proposes that positive politeness strategies can be employed for showing social intimacy and approval, while negative politeness strategies can be used by the less powerful person to deal with higher-status people. The concept of discernment originates from Ide's idea (1982) of politeness as socio-pragmatic concord, which means that a person's social position and social relationship with the hearer dictates his/her linguistic politeness behaviour as a social indexing mechanism (as cited in Song, 2012). There are some positive politeness strategies recommended by Brown and Levinson (1987, as cited in Barešová 2008), as presented below:

#### 1) Notice, attend to hearer (their interests, wants, needs, goods)

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), in general the Speaker (S) should take notice of aspects of Hearer (H)'s condition (noticeable changes, remarkable possessions, anything which looks as though H would want S to notice and approve of it).

#### 2) Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with hearer)

This strategy softens the impending face-threatening act (FTA) by creating a friendly environment. It utilizes emphatic expressions such as 'really', 'absolutely' and 'exactly'. This is often done by exaggerated intonation, stress, and other aspects of prosodics, as well as with intensifying modifiers.

#### 3) Be optimistic

This strategy is aimed to presume the hearer's willingness to cooperate, and getting a positive outcome, as shown in the examples below:

- a. *You'll come to help me on Tuesday, won't you?*
- b. *I hope you can finish the project this week*
- c. *You don't mind if I smoke, do you?*

A variation of this is to imply that the imposition is minor:

- a. *That wouldn't be too much to ask, would it? (formal)*
- b. *What's a few dollars between friends?(used in price negotiations)*
- c. *In Japanese, this strategy is possible only between close friends or to a subordinate*

Negative politeness is based on minimizing imposition, with apologies, deference, various kinds of hedges, impersonalizing, and other devices:

- 1) Be conventionally indirect

This strategy is conventionalized and can be considered as on-record expressions.

- 2) Question, hedge

Many speech acts contain the speaker's opinion and assumptions. Some of these are potentially FTAs— particularly assumptions about the hearer's beliefs, wants, and abilities. This type achieves the illocutionary goal of making minimal assumptions about H's wants (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Matsumoto-Gray (2009) concludes that a hedge minimizes the degree of the claim and it is considered a negative politeness type because it protects against the obligation of H to bear unmitigated claims. Matsumoto-Gray (2009) suggests tokens such as "*to a degree, sort of, kind of, in a way, seem to*" as examples of hedges in his study. The stronger the face threat, the more hedging is used.

Hedging to mitigate illocutionary force is an important resource for the realization of politeness strategies. Hedging can be achieved by prosodic, particles, lexical items, parenthetical, full adverbial clauses, and other means, such as embedding complements of expressions like "*I guess that, I suppose that*" (Matsumoto-Gray, 2009). The level of illocutionary-force hedges is represented by *you know* and *I mean* in sentences like (Brown and Levinson, 1987):

- a. *I was coming out of the door, you know, when I mean I saw him standing there, waiting.*

- 3) Be pessimistic

Minimizing the imposition is the basis of this strategy. It implies that a positive outcome is not expected. This strategy gives redress for H's negative face by explicitly expressing doubt (Brown and Levinson, 1987). The strategy of being pessimistic has three signals: the use of negative (with a tag); the use of the subjunctive; and the use of remote-possibility markers (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Brown and Levinson (1987) point out that hedge underlies the construction of polite indirect speech act in being pessimistic.

- 4) Give deference

Giving deference also attaches explicitly to the social factors. This gives H's view some credence and acts to alleviate the speaker's opinion by showing that they can understand that some people have a different opinion (Matsumoto-Gray, 2009).

#### 5) Apologize/show reluctance

Showing reluctance is a way a speaker can indicate that they do not want to threaten H's face. Brown and Levinson (1987) state that the deferential use of hesitation is one way of showing this reluctance.

## **2.4. Scollon and Scollon**

### 2.4.1. Description of Power, Distance, and Weight of imposition

According to Scollon and Scollon (1995), speaker and hearer in the politeness system would use a definite, relatively regular set of face strategies in speaking to each other. Power, distance, and the weight of the imposition are three main factors involved which determine such a politeness (or face) system.

#### 2.4.1.1. Power

Power refers to the vertical distinction between the participants in a hierarchical structure (Scollon and Scollon, 1995). Languages used between participants in the relationship reflecting +P (plus power) such as in most business and governmental structures is relatively predictable. On the other hand, a situation in which egalitarian system or -P exist between participants, this type of relationship is demonstrated in close friends, or two people having equivalent ranks in a company, such as company presidents talk to company presidents.

#### 2.4.1.2. Distance

Distance is not the same as Power. Distance can be seen mostly in egalitarian relationships. For example, two close friends would be categorized as -D because of the intimacy of their relationship. Nevertheless, two officers from different nations are likely to be of equal power within their systems but distant, +D because they rarely have contact with each other.

#### 2.4.1.3. Weight of Imposition

The last factor that contributes to face strategies is the weight of the imposition. Scollon and Scollon (1995) mention that the face strategies used will vary depending on how important the topic of discussion is for the participants although they have a very fixed

relationship between them. There will be an increased use of independence strategies when the weight of imposition increases; and there will be an increased use of involvement strategies when the weight of imposition decreases (Scollon and Scollon, 1995).

#### 2.4.2. Involvement and Independence strategies

Scollon and Scollon (1983) state that “Brown and Levinson’s insights have provided a theoretical framework within which discussions of face relations between speakers as a matter of deep assumptions about the relationship that are encoded in the politeness strategies of deference and solidarity” (p.170). Scollon and Scollon (1995) propose replacing the terms positive politeness strategies and negative politeness strategies with ‘involvement strategies’ and ‘distancing strategies’ to avoid traditional semantics embedded in the terms of positive and negative. They argue positive and negative terms may determine the value judgement of the politeness system, implying that positive politeness is more desirable than negative politeness.

Involvement is a discourse strategy of showing that the speaker is closely connected to the hearer. The person’s right to be treated as ‘a normal, contributing or supporting member of society’ constitutes the basis of the involvement strategy (Scollon & Scollon, 1995, as cited in Witczak-Plisiecka, 2010). Sharing and reinforcing the views of other interlocutors show involvement strategy. Involvement strategies can be indicated by means of linguistic forms: to notice or to attend to the hearer; exaggerate (to show interest, approval, sympathy with the hearer); claim in-group membership with the hearer; claim a common point of view (to share opinions, attitudes, knowledge, be emphatic); be optimistic; indicate that a speaker knows the hearer’s wants and is taking them into account; assume or assert reciprocity; use given names; be talkative and use the hearer’s language or dialect (Scollon and Scollon, 1995 as cited in Witczak-Plisiecka, 2010).

On the other hand, independence strategies emphasize the individuality of the participants. Independence is shown by such discourse strategies as making minimal assumptions, or giving options to the interlocutor (Scollon & Scollon, 1995). Individuality, the right not to be dominated, and freedom from the impositions of others are peculiar features of the independence aspect of face. An individual acting independently will display his/her freedom of movement and respect the right of the participants to their independence (Witczak-Plisiecka, 2010). Independence strategies can be shown by employing the following ways: make minimal assumptions about the hearer’s wants, give the hearer the option not to perform the act, minimize the threat, apologize, be pessimistic, dissociate the



speaker/hearer from the discourse, state a general rule, use family names and titles, be taciturn and finally use one's own language or dialect (Scollon and Scollon, 1995, as cited in Witczak-Plisiecka, 2010)

With involvement strategies, the speaker appears to be friendly and helpful. Independence strategies do not mean that the speaker is impolite. Rather it reflects a greater degree of social distance between speaker and addressee, signaling the intended meaning that the speaker wishes to disturb the addressee as little as possible (LoCastro, 2012). LoCastro (2012) points out that the speaker's choice of which face-saving strategy to use is constrained by contextual factors, involving perceptions of degrees of social distance or intimacy, power, or weight of the problematic behavior. The speaker's assessment of possible politeness strategies, cultural practices, and even personal characteristics enter into the decision-making process. Thus, Scollon and Scollon (1995) propose that involvement and independence must be projected simultaneously in any communication.

#### 2.4.3. Politeness systems

Scollon and Scollon perceive politeness as a model of social interaction focusing on how interlocutors negotiate face relations during a conversation (Felix-Brasdefer, 2007). Scollon and Scollon (1995) recommend a face systems model for analyzing the negotiation of face and propose relationships are categorized under one of the three face systems (deference, solidarity, hierarchy) and influenced by two social factors (power [P] and distance [D]) (Scollon and Scollon, 1995).

In a deference face system, the interlocutors conceive themselves at the same social level with no interlocutor wielding power over the other (-P), but with a distant relationship (+D) (Scollon and Scollon, 1995). In this system, consequently, the interlocutors use independence strategies to minimize the possibility of threatening or losing face. In a solidarity face system, interlocutors see themselves as being of equal social position (-P) and with a close relationship (-D); in this system, the interlocutors employ involvement strategies to assume or denote reciprocity or to affirm a mutual point of view and to provide a sense of friendliness and closeness (Scollon and Scollon, 1995). Ultimately, in a hierarchical face system, one participant is placed in a superordinate position (+P) and the other is in subordinate position (-P). In this asymmetrical system, the interactants apprehend and respect the social difference where the speaker and the hearer may be close (+D) or distant (-D) (Scollon and Scollon, 1995). Involvement strategy is employed by the dominant interlocutor in a hierarchy face system; nevertheless, the subordinate interlocutor uses

independence strategies to avoid any face threat addressed to the other interlocutor whose position is superordinate.

## **2.5. Deference politeness system researches**

According to Scollon and Scollon (1995), face relationships between and among participants consist of two elements, assumptions and negotiations, which are either ratified or altered in some way. The relationship is not likely to change from meeting to meeting. Once it has been established, it is likely to remain the same until one or the other moves to a different position. General and persistent regularity in face relationships is called the politeness system (Scollon and Scollon, 1995). Both interlocutors in the system use a particular regular set of face strategies while speaking to each other.

Power and distance are the basis of a politeness system between interactants. A deference politeness system is one in which interactants are considered to be equals or near equals in power but treat each other at a distance (Scollon and Scollon, 1995). Most of these studies conducted on politeness strategies carried out in various speech acts have focused on investigating the use of the politeness strategies in certain speech acts and intercultural communication.

Yamazaki (2001) carried out a number of investigations into the politeness in speech acts of apology in Japan, America, and Australia in two scenarios in a Discourse Completion Test. It was shown that the higher the status of the hearer, the more frequently the participants apologized and the more they used formal expressions. The Japanese participants used negative politeness strategies with a teacher, but with a classmate or a younger sibling employed positive politeness strategies. Al-Marrani and Sazalie (2010) conducted a cross-linguistic investigation of deference politeness systems and found that both female-female interactions and female-male interactions use indirect head act request strategies more than any other politeness strategies. One study by Johns and Félix-Brasdefer (2015) examined linguistic politeness and pragmatic variation in the production of speech acts of requests among Senegalese speakers of French in Dakar. The results of the study show that the groups demonstrate similar variation in the types of head act strategies employed for deference politeness in the scenarios with a salesman and a friend's mother. However, that variation in head act strategies was limited to the salesman scenario for the French-French group.

## **2.6. Previous studies on politeness strategies in interviews**

Politeness strategies are used in various situations in both written and oral communication. The frameworks proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) and Scollon and Scollon (1995) have been adapted as a guide to analyze the politeness in interaction in many studies on face-to-face interaction. Previous studies have attempted to address the use of politeness in interviews and have focused on the topics of interaction. However, there is no clearly defined politeness regarding implicating a third person in the utterances.

In their case study of politeness strategies used in an interview between an Indonesian journalist and Barack Obama, Sari and Mulatsih (2013) identify bald on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record as the politeness strategies that the journalist used and highlight the majority of the utterances represented is negative politeness strategies. It has been demonstrated that Obama also used all of the politeness strategies except off-record, and bald on-record dominated the politeness strategy used. The findings found that there are several factors that influence the use of the politeness strategies: the payoffs and the circumstances (such as the occupation, social status, and formality of the interlocutors).

In relation to this, Petříčková (2012) also points out that the choice of politeness strategies does not depend only on the real distance of speaker and hearer but also on how the hearer wants the distance to evolve during the conversation. She argues that the complicated relationships between groups of participants make TV interviews the showcase of the importance of careful choice of politeness strategies. Love (2011) evaluates the politeness strategies of two participants in a television interview and looked at how these strategies corresponded with the participants' roles in the television show. The study has indicated that a variety of strategies are used, including on-record (redressed) constructions as well as off-record utterances. There are also some positive politeness strategies used such as accepting a compliment.

Saving face is generally expected to occur during the interview. Robins and Wolf (1988) propose confrontation and politeness strategies in physician-patient interactions. In a medical interview, patients are required to present a 'patient face' which may be quite different from their face of choice. The politeness strategy that is favored asserts reciprocity, because it fulfills both requirements. It is both face-saving and therapeutic because it draws patients into the process of treatment design and satisfies their desires not to be imposed upon (Robins and Wolf, 1988). Using positive politeness strategies is done by the medical experts to build a secure personal relationship with the patients and the family. They also

avoid disagreement strategies in medical interviews with patient. The politeness strategy places patients in passive compliant roles, whereas a strategy that asks patients to be decision-makers empowers them. Meier (1995) and Bargiela-Chiappini (2003) (as cited in Matsumoto-Gray, 2009) point out that positive and negative faces overlap and can be mixed. They both work and there is no clear line circumscribing the two.

One of the factors that may also affect the occurrence of varied politeness strategies is the relationship between interactants. Hasegawa (2007) concludes that the variation in types of condolence comments offered appears to be motivated by the factors of relationship, with those in more distant associations choosing lower-risk strategies, while those in higher power positions choosing strategies of higher risk. In a study conducted by Chien (2013), most interviewees stated that the relationship with the person with whom they spoke may affect the way they said something. Also, if the interviewees are not a straight forward person, they dare not express their feelings directly. Chien (2013) thus far provides evidence that politeness strategies are diversely used in interviews; positive politeness and negative politeness strategies are used to maintain a relationship; and relationship, power distance, and personality play influential roles in determining politeness strategies.

Regardless of the relationship of the interlocutors, the topic of the interaction generally determines the politeness strategies employed. Tanskanen' analysis (1998, as cited in Paraiera, 2006) found the use of hedges, stance markers, and third person pronouns in a mailing list discussion group. This study confirmed that the more negative the topic, the more independence politeness strategies are used. As the topic becomes more positive, more positive politeness strategies should be used. Paraiera (2006) draws our attention to how people employ certain politeness strategies in written form, focusing on the discussion of taboo topics in email. The study compares the politeness strategies used by participants in the emails written to close friends and strangers. Five features of language in the emails are compared across three taboos of high, medium, and low seriousness. The findings report that different politeness strategies are used than when talking face-to-face, and email is developing a unique set of politeness conventions. The study highlights that people use more negative politeness strategies with their close friends than with the strangers, which is the reverse of what the Brown and Levinson framework predicted.

Previous researches do not focus on discussing whether the utterances implicates a second or third person. This study delves into how au pairs use politeness strategies, and how their utterances implicate third party addressee or are regarding third parties. The study

focuses on how the au pair does not attribute characteristic, evaluations, and judgements through the use of lexical items directly to the host parents.

## **2.7. Au pair studies**

There have been a number of studies related to au pairs' experience and roles in recent years (Mellini, Yodanis and Godenzi, 2007; de Mesquita, 2012; Tročilová, 2013). Most of the studies use interviews to collect data and are situated in fields of the sociology or anthropology (Cox & Narula, 2003; Hess and Puckhaber, 2004; Williams & Baláž, 2004; Hovdan, 2005; Búriková, 2006; Pelechova, 2014). However, there remains a paucity of evidence on how the participants—either au pair or the host families—use politeness strategies in sociolinguistic interviews.

De Mesquita explains (2012), that respondents were quite reticent when they were asked about their relationship with their host families. Commentary of negative experiences was frequently couched in terms of how their host family were 'actually good people, but...' It can be interpreted that the au pairs employed extensive hedging when expressing their negative experiences that relate to their host family.

Tročilová (2013) identifies that as au pairs are required to follow certain rules and regulations, it may indicate their host families impose on them and signify the dominant position of these families, pointing to the rather inferior status of the au pair. Cox and Narula argue that: 'the use of rules... in the employer's home is an effective way of establishing power relations between domestic worker and employer whilst using the idiom of family membership rather than the rhetoric of employer and employee' (2003, p. 341). The important point here is that despite following the pseudo-familial relationship, the relationship between an au pairs and host families is a relationship that exemplifies differences in power.

Power and distance in the relationship between au pairs and their host parents can be seen as a hierarchical politeness system since the host parents have more power than the au pair. Tročilová (2013) concludes that the host family holds a dominant position in the relationship while the au pair has to submit to their demands. The assumption is that the family has the dominant position in the relationship, and it is they who decide whether or not the au pair will be recognized as a part of the family. The evidence documents several ways in which au pairs cope with the fact that, within the relationship with their host families, they find themselves in a subordinate position. Tročilová (2013) argues that the attitude of the family is crucial in defining the relationship with their au pair and the status of the au

pair; whether she is a part of the family or not is mostly decided by the host family, which determines the character of the relationship.

Even if the relationship between au pairs and their host parents is hierarchical, there is still a possibility that the au pairs still save the face of that host parents, and this is explicitly evident in de Mesquita's (2012) work. Politeness is used to save the face of the hearer or the speaker, and the utterances can also implicate third persons. Therefore, this study investigates the politeness strategies used by the au pairs whose utterances implicate host parents during the interview.

## **2.8. Evaluation and preference terms**

Evaluation and preference terms are intent to either face-supportive or face-threatening depending on their context (Holtgraves, 2014). Positive preference and evaluation terms have a positive politeness function, and their use indicates a positive evaluation of an event or being linked to the other; for example, *I liked your presentation, your dinner was good*. According to Holtgraves (2014), the use of uncertainty terms will vary as a function of the degree of face threat in a situation and face management may be recognized as a potential reason for the use of an uncertainty term utilized in a situation that is potentially face threatening for either the recipient or the speaker. Meanwhile, perceptions of increasing face threat will result in lowering the perceived actual evaluation. Particularly, a recipient or hearer should be more likely to believe that a positive preference or evaluation term is motivated by face management if a situation is potentially face threatening (Holtgraves, 2014). For example, if Sam cooks a meal for his wife, Nancy, and asks her what she thought about the meal he cooked, there is a potential that a face-threatening situation has been created. There is a potential that she applies face management, if she says, "I liked it." On the other hand, the situation is less face-threatening if Nancy's friend make inquiry about her opinion of the meal her husband cooked and she says "I liked it" in response to her friend's question; face management is likely to evaluate Nancy's actual liking of the meal to be higher in the latter situation than in the previous situation. Her conveyed opinion is less positive than when Nancy provides exactly the same answer to a query from her friend.

It is predictable that speakers are engaged in face management and employ evaluation and preference terms in a particular situation. The meaning of uncertainty terms is varied and contingent on the interpersonal context; specifically, as a function of the degree of face threat in a situation (Holtgraves, 2014). Holtgraves (2014) proposes that speakers

will be intent to employ uncertainty terms as face threat increases. They are apprehensive that uncertainty terms would rather be used to manage face than exemplify the speakers' feelings, judgements or evaluations concretely. Holtgraves (2005) identifies when a situation is potentially face-threatening, recipients are more likely to infer a relevance violation as conveying face-threatening information (e.g. negative opinion) than speakers do. With uncertainty terms, the recipient may fail to realize that the speaker chooses to use such a term in order to imply uncertainty (Holtgraves, 2005). Hence, face threat may influence their interpretations above and beyond what the speaker intended.

## **2.9. Conclusion**

Brown and Levinson's principles have dominated the majority of empirical research on politeness. Politeness is a social and interactive phenomenon which has grabbed numerous scholars' attention (Locher & Graham, 2010). Three keys notions combine to set the tone of politeness: power, distance, and weight of imposition. Asymmetrical power relations between the host parents and the au pair may change the level of (in)directness, and the level of (in)formality expected in the utterances explains their non-offensiveness. In the course of an interview with Indonesian au pairs topicalizing notions of politeness, au pairs implicate the host family in utterances they would consider amenable to judgments of politeness.

The role of social situation determines the scope and nature of politeness. Considering the power of specific situational variables such as the degree of social distance or power have been addressed to predict the type and amount of linguistic politeness used. No less important is the type of speech event in which politeness is expressed. Both the linguistic choices made and the meanings attached to these choices are affected by the overall nature of the social situation. Au pair interviews provide a particularly clear example of this claim.

An au pair interview is a unique speech-event type. The specific nature of the speech event studied, namely an au pair interview, imposes several constraints on the expression of linguistic politeness, affecting both its linguistic encoding and the social meanings attached to various forms.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **METHODOLOGY**

This chapter describes the methodology and design employed in this study.

#### **3.1. Participants**

The criteria of the participants to be selected in this study are Indonesian au pairs who have been in the Netherlands for at least four months. Their education background ranged from high school graduates to university graduates, and their level of English ranged from A2 to B2 (based on the Common European Framework of Reference).

The procedure used to collect the data was an adapted version of Bikova's model (2008). The participants were contacted via an au pair agency in Indonesia. As soon as I received information regarding the social media account or telephone number of the au pairs, I contacted them to inform them about the study and invite them to participate in it. An information letter containing the theme and objectives of the research, issues of anonymity, contact information, and informed consent were prepared and sent to the potential participants. All of the candidates were notified of the opportunity to withdraw from the project at any time without having to provide an explanation for this. They were also told that their anonymity would be preserved both during and after the research had been completed.

After getting positive responses from the participants, interview times were established. The interviews were taped and then transcribed. Data was collected in two weeks by visiting each participant. On each visit, I made a recording of the interviews with the focus on the au pairs' experience and their perception of the host family (See appendix for full transcriptions). This was aimed at encompassing the idea of subjective knowledge and emphasis on the individual.

An interview protocol was prepared containing questions on major themes of interest. Bikova (2008) states that an open guide is meant to direct the conversation, letting the participants talk freely about their experiences, feelings, and opinions. The reason why an interview was chosen to gather data is because this approach can reflect the spontaneous reaction from the participants and also get the information directly. It expresses and tells their opinion. It is assumed that they have more freedom in uttering their perceptions.



There were two participants in this study. They are both young women from Indonesia who are au pairs in the Netherlands. The first participant, Au pair A (not the initial of her first name), has been in the Netherlands for 11 months. Her educational background is a master's degree and her English level is B2. She communicates with the host parents by using English. The second participant is Au pair B (not the initial of her first name), who has stayed in the Netherlands for four months. Her last education was high school. The language that she uses to communicate with the host father is English, but both Indonesian language and English are used to interact with the host mother.

### **3.2. Materials**

The materials involved were a tape recorder, consent form, and a set of interview questions. All the respondents were presented with the purpose of the study and attention was drawn to ethical issues related to the research. These ethical issues primarily involved clarification of confidentiality and anonymity of their contribution, obtaining consent to record the interviews and interactions as well as emphasizing the right of the respondents to withdraw from the project at any time. Then, after data was collected, the interview recording and transcription were the main data materials analyzed.

### **3.3. Design of study**

This study is designed to record interviews of the au pairs. An interview provides much more detailed information than what is available through other data collection methods. The interview method is a non-experimental design and can supplement and extend our knowledge about an individual's thoughts, feelings and behaviors, meanings, and interpretations (Woods, 2015). Thus, I collected detailed information from individuals in one sitting using oral questions. This meant I could ask some spontaneous questions to participants and encourage them to express themselves. A case-study approach was adopted to provide rounded, detailed illustrations of the politeness strategies applied.

Furthermore, a sociolinguistic semi-structured interview was conducted to get the data. By interviewing the participants, I could get more data about politeness in how they position themselves in relation host parents to what they are saying. Folkestad (2008) claims interviews give the respondent an opportunity to reflect and reason on a variety of issues.

An interview allows for observation of natural speech events with precise recording about the participants. It demonstrates how language is used in real contexts. The degree of

politeness expected is highly contingent on the contextual setting of the communicative situation (Mullany, 1999).

Traditional theories of politeness draw on the classic pragmatic theories. Speech act theory (e.g. Austin 1962; Searle 1969) is the basis of theory used in this study. Speech act theory is discussed in relation to single utterances with single functions, single speakers and single addressee. Speech act theory also contributes to a better understanding of the functions of language.

Based on speech act theory (Searle, 1969), utterances consist of both a propositional content and an illocutionary force (the speech act with the utterance). Language is viewed as social action in speech act theory (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969; Searle & Vanderveken, 1985). At a certain level, a speaker is performing a locutionary act, or producing a sentence with a particular sense and reference or its propositional meaning). The term illocutionary act refers to the specific force unified with the uttering of particular words in a particular context; it is the specific speech act (e.g. warn, request, promise, etc) that a speaker performs. This view has implications for models of language apprehension, because it indicates that the comprehension of an utterance will encompass recognition of both the propositional meaning and the act performed (Holtgraves and Ashley, 2001). For example, if a customer asks a waiter, "*How is the meal going?*" his/her aim of questioning may be to make the waiter bring the meal. The illocutionary force of the utterance is not an query about the progress of cooking the food, but a request that the food should be brought (Loos, et al., 2004).

Speech act theories have suggested that sentence type aids the addressee's recognition of the context come into play and the speech act performed (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969). Recognition of the illocutionary force represents an interference process of sorts. Because of the reasons above, speech act theory can applied to analyze what is implied in the participant's utterances.

According to Austin (1962), speech acts can be distinguished into constatives and performatives. Constatives are utterances of something true or false and it depends on the correspondence (or not) with fact and is thus truth-conditional (Birner, 2012). Meanwhile, performatives are used to perform an act as presented in the examples below (Birner, 2012):

- a. I apologized to Mr. Manor
- b. I promise to never again make remarks
- c. Mike apologized to Mr. Manor
- d. Mike is promising not to make remarks anymore

The utterance of (c) does not portray act of apologizing, but rather performs the act of apologizing; the utterance itself is the apology and also (b) does not describe a promise, but rather perform the act of promising.

Performatives are distinguished into explicit and implicit performatives. Explicit performative performs direct speech act. It can be categorized into several types:

- 1) Declarative statements infer statement; declaratives canonically have the illocutionary force of statement; they state something
- 2) Imperative statement. imperatives infer the illocutionary force of a command (a request, invitation, suggestion, etc.)
- 3) Interrogative form. It represents the illocutionary force of asking a question

Austin (1962) distinguished action within each utterances:

#### 1) Locutionary act

It is an act embedded in the actual uttering of any particular utterance speaker produces utterances in unique ways contingent on various contextual factors and interpersonal relationships. The actual utterance and its grammatical form is considered to be the locutionary act. The locutionary act is that what is said, in its exact linguistic form.

#### 2) Illocutionary act

The illocutionary act is an act embedded in the function of the utterance. Thus, an interrogative like “how is the meal going” may have the grammatical construction of an interrogative; however, as mentioned above, given certain contextual factors, it is possibly functioning as a request for the meal, or perhaps an indication that the meal is taking longer than expected. Thus, there is a distinction between that which is said or the locutionary act embedded in the utterance, and the ways in which the utterance is functioning given the context of its uttering.

According to Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984), individual variability affects the realization of the speech act in communication because of the unique communication behaviour of each individual. Pragmatic markers are also analyzed because these are metalinguistic indicators which attend closely to what is happening in the communicative situation and explicitly remark on aspects of the ongoing speech event and pragmatic markers have ‘indexically rich’ sociolinguistic or situational meanings (Aijmer, 2013). Before attending to that, I also applied politeness strategies theory recommended by Scollon and Scollon (1995).

### **3.4. Analysis**

This study focuses on politeness strategies used by au pairs during a semi-structured sociolinguistic interview. The study uses qualitative analysis in order to gain insights into the politeness strategies applied. The first step to analyze the data was by transcribing the recorded interviews. The classification of utterances as speech acts was the first step in analysis. For example, an utterance such as “you know” was coded as illocutionary act of hesitating. Thus, attention is primarily allocated to what is exemplified in the illocutionary acts.

My analysis is limited to the data collected from the interviews. Only excerpts are provided below; namely, those which involved explicit discussion about the host parents. I selected the illustrative excerpts that demonstrate most clearly how the strategies were used by the au pairs. A microscopic analysis of the interviews was conducted in an attempt to explicate how politeness strategies functioned within the interview with a specific focus on the management of face between the au pair and a third-party addressee whom is explicitly incorporated into the discourse.

After analyzing the politeness strategies used by the participants, the findings are discussed and I provide suggestions for further research.

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, excerpts from the interviews are analyzed in detail to illustrate how politeness strategies are used by the au pairs during the interview and how the host parents are presented and positioned within the discourse. Certain types of strategies were used within the sections of the interview where the au pairs explicitly discussed about the host parents. Independence strategies are frequently used to alleviate the negative evaluation of the host parents; whereas, involvement strategies are applied in relation to positive evaluation. As exemplified below, independence and involvement strategies (Scollon and Scollon, 1995) are used as contingent upon the theme of the current discussion, and individual situational relationships. The major factor contributing to whether independence or involvement strategies are utilised in the particular utterance itself is the content. Thus, in line with de Mesquita's (2012), au pairs appear to position themselves in relation to the host family in interesting ways exemplified by the particular construction of their utterances. It appears as though, given the intimacy of a live-in relationship, au-pairs show an explicit tendency to manage the face of third-party addressee (host family) in interesting ways in the interview discourse. There is also a critical discussion regarding the politeness strategies employed.

#### **4.1. Findings**

The politeness strategies discussed in this study focus on how the participants implicate the host parents and use explicit face management. The qualitative presentation of the data is explained and coupled with an elaboration of the significance of each data excerpt.

The politeness strategies used are contingent on the topic of the conversation during the interview. In general, the data shows that the au pairs frame the utterances using both independence and involvement strategies. The participants sometimes change their strategies from one strategy to the other as illustrated in the following excerpts.

#### 4.1.1. Independence strategies in negative evaluations of the host family

In general, the au pairs use hedging in their utterances. Hedging allows them to break the silence and evaluate their judgment before articulating their opinion. In addition, hedging also constitutes hesitation to answer a question which can be a sensitive issue, therefore they appear to be hesitant to articulate directly.

#### 1. Speech event: The participant's perception regarding her relationship with the host family

##### Data 1 - au pair A

The question below sought to elicit an explanation regarding au pair's interpersonal relationship with her host family. The au pair hedges at the beginning of her response to attempt to save the face of the host parents. The response from au pair A is provided below.

Researcher (R) : How is your relationship with your host family?

Participant (P) :

1. *Well,*

pragmatic markers

2. *it's good.*

Illocutionary act of stating

3. *They are kind of...understand my culture,*

Illocutionary act of hesitating

4. *they try to understand it.*

Illocutionary act of informing

Based on the excerpt above, the au pair hedges and hesitates to discuss the relationship, thereby shielding her own and her host family's face. The participant attempts to soften a potentially face-threatening act in the initiation of the response with "well" in utterance (1), which is associated with hedging and has the function of mitigating illocutionary force (Aijmer, 2013). The au pair's response to this question which pertains to an evaluation of her relationship can be consider vague. While there is a potential to represent the host family (host parents) in a negative light, the hedging "well" suggests that the participant is apprehensive to articulate concretely the exact nature of the relationship and avoids giving a direct answer. Talking about this relationship might be something sensitive for the au pair because it builds the perception of the condition of the relationship between the au pair and the host parents. Therefore, the au pair is careful in answering this question.

Then, in excerpt (2), “It is good” demonstrates partial uncertainty that can reflect face management. So exactly how good and the specific nature of her relationship with the host parents is unclear. However, this utterance is used to signify a positive image of the relationship despite being ambiguous. The ambiguous evaluation embedded in ‘good’ coupled with an explanation regarding the degree to which the host family understands the participant culture in “they kind of” (excerpt 3) and the further explanation about how they “try to” (excerpt 4) understand insinuates that while indeed they may not, they make an active effort to try. The language is indirect and signals certain implied meaning in the utterance. We can infer that their effort to “try” is an attempt to identify an active process in which the host family engages which can be evaluated positively. Thus, while it appears as though host family indeed does not understand the participant’s culture which could potentially be very negative to the cultivation of a positive working or living relationship, the participant decides to articulate this potentially negative evaluation in positive terms. This can be seen as an attempt to save the face of the host parents.

A negative evaluation i.e. “They do not understand my culture” is explicitly avoided, and instead, the participant chooses to articulate what might be perceived as a positive characteristic of the host family, that being their “effort” to understand the participant’s culture.

## **Data 2 - au pair A**

The question in the excerpt below was an attempt to elicit more information about whether the participant has good communication and a good relationship with the host family. Hesitating and expressing personal perception are illustrated below.

*Researcher (R) : Do you think you have good communication with the host family and have a good relationship with them?*

*Participant (P) :*

5. *Hmm let’s say...*

Illocutionary act of hesitating

6. *ya let’s say we speak...*

.....

Illocutionary act of hesitating

7. *and about the relationship I think...*

....

Illocutionary act of considering

8. *but I think for my side,*

Illocutionary act of assuming

9. *well I don't know from their side*

Illocutionary act of stating

The excerpts above illustrated how the au pair hedges when being asked to evaluate whether she has good communication and a good relationship with her host family. Uncertainty is portrayed in the utterances as illustrated in the excerpt. Hedging mitigates her opinion of judging the relationship from her side.

The au pair might use the hesitation marker “hmm let's say” (excerpt 5) to keep the conversation from breaking down by possible (impolite) silence while she evaluates her communication and relationship with the host family. There is also an avoidance of situating the upcoming evaluation as autonomous and personal in the use of “let's say” which is left out of a contraction form would be “let us say”. Despite being the only participant responsible for the articulation, the participant distances herself and her evaluation by using a collective form which implicates an imaginary collective as the bearer of the evaluation. There is, indeed, no actual “us” and we see here that the participant seemingly attempts to distance herself from the evaluation, insinuating it is an evaluation of some imagined collective.

The excerpt (7) may reflect that this is only a subjective evaluation of the relationship, and the au pair hesitates to explain concretely whether it is good or not. There is a mitigation of illocutionary force in the subjective initiation of the utterance itself in this excerpt. This utterance demonstrates that the participant hedges her perception with the following short clause “I think.” The information provided by the participant is not intended to be ‘fact’ about their relationship, but only a subjective evaluation. This subjectivity marker is used in the interview to emphasize the subjective attitude of the speaker towards the message. The speaker's utterance can be considered a personal opinion or judgment which is open for further negotiation; thus, the participant selects hedging.

This subjective evaluation might be further strengthened with the next utterance, “I think from my side” in excerpt (8). The participant states clearly that their relationship is good based on her viewpoint. She uses hedging by uttering “I think” which is a subjectivity marker that is a speaker-oriented markers and emphasizes the subjective attitude of the speaker towards the message (Willamová, 2005, as cited in Švárová, 2008). This subjectivity marker is considered to be more polite because the subjectivity signals a personal perception. The statement “I think for my side” is an attempt to avoid speaking on behalf of the host family, explicitly signaling this is a subjective evaluation and thus, is



granting individual autonomy to the host family which is implicated as a third party in the discourse.

Excerpt (9), “Well I don’t know from their side” can be classified as hedging. The word “well” is a hesitant marker that involves politeness. Aijmer (2013) argues the motive of using *well* may be to soften a potentially face-threatening act or to reinforce it (e.g. in an argument). However, in both cases, something must be added to *well* to show how it is intended. Combinations such as *well I don’t know* occur and have the function of mitigating illocutionary force in contexts which can be perceived as face-threatening. *Well* is alligned with: ‘reluctance, regret, resignation, or indifference, sometimes impatience, irritation, embarrassment, or defensiveness; sometimes caution, uncertainty, doubt or fear’ (Carlson, 1984, p. 43, as cited in Aijmer, 2013). Thus, “well” might indicate the uncertainty of the au pair to signify the opinion of the host parents.

## 2. Speech event: What the participant dislikes about the host family

### Data 3 - au pair A

The question below sought to elicit an explanation about potential dislikes. Au pair A implicated the host parents, particularly in discussing what she dislikes about the host family, as observed in the following excerpt.

Researcher (R) : *Is there something that you dislike from them?*

Participant (P) :

*10. Ya, that they like*

Illocutionary act of hesitating

*11. ...how to say...hmm...*

Illocutionary act of hesitating

*12. when they give something,*

Illocutionary act of acquainting

*13. they expect something in return*

Illocutionary act of acquainting

The response to the question is initiated by hedging. The au pair tries to evade the question and this is reflected in excerpt (11). It expresses a lack of assurance and reflects anxiety. An example of hedging is the utterance “how to say”. This pragmatic marker is most frequently used to soften uncomfortable or unpleasant statements and is clustered as hesitation strings (Willamová, 2005, as cited in Švárová, 2008). The speaker softens a threat that may implicate the negative side of the host parents. Instead of directly expressing her

evaluation regarding what she dislikes about the host parents, the participant says “that they like and how to say” to distance the negative evaluation about the host parents. This shows careful consideration in choosing the right words to articulate what she dislikes about the host parents. This is an attempt to save the negative face of the host parents.

“When they give something, they expect something in return” suggests that the participant implicates host parents doing something insincerely. Instead, they require some payoff. The illocutionary force of disagreeing with the actions of the host parents is portrayed. The explanation of what she dislikes about the host parents is vague. Instead of articulating clearly what she dislikes, she provides a vague explanation.

#### **Data 4 - au pair A**

The following excerpts clearly illustrate the response from au pair A.

*14. they say*

Illocutionary act of stating

*15. “Ya ya you can go,*

Illocutionary act of reporting

*16. this is your free time*

Illocutionary act of informing

*17. and you can go”*

Illocutionary act of stating

*18. but actually they need me*

Illocutionary act of expressing distress

Despite the host parents apparently giving her time off, the participant insinuates that they give her time off but are not happy about it. She minimizes the imposition by uttering that the host parents need her instead of explaining directly that the host parents do something which makes her feel like they need her. The utterances can be categorized as a booster, which is employed to emphasize the point the speaker wants to make and to signal the speaker’s emotional status. It is a fact that she revealed the reality of the host parents who counteract their permission with expectation.

With the word “actually,” the contradiction expressed is mild and it is aimed at emphasizing reality. The au pair tries to avoid stating that the host parents are demanding of her and do not give her permission sincerely. ”Actually” is aimed to insinuate how the parents expect her to be home. The utterance “actually they need me” expresses a negative evaluation of the way she is made to feel like she cannot have time off but without explaining what the host parents do to make her feel this way.

### 3. Speech event: Days off policy

#### Data 5 - au pair A

In the declaration of au pair awareness written by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Netherlands, it is stated that an au pair has two days off a week and the informant also clarifies this statement is on her au pair contract agreement (see appendix for the full transcription). The au pair states some facts about her days off that have changed several times since she arrived in the Netherlands, as illustrated in the following excerpts.

19. *because they changed several times my schedule, my week, my days off.*

Illocutionary act of stating

....

20. *...they told me only...*

Illocutionary act of stating

....

21. *only...only Sunday I'm free*

Illocutionary act of stating

....

22. *the first two months*

Illocutionary act of stating

23. *and then they changed again*

Illocutionary act of expressing annoyance

24. *and they say oh ya*

Illocutionary act of stating

25. *now because **the host mum had to work at that time***

Illocutionary act of stating

26. *she gave me a long weekend Saturday Sunday*

Illocutionary act of stating

27. *but then it's only for two or three months*

Illocutionary act of stating

28. *and after that she changed it again*

Illocutionary act of bemoaning

....

29. *so she told me,*

Illocutionary act of stating

30. *"oh okay because **I am mostly at home**"*,

Illocutionary act of stating

31. *so ya they...*

Illocutionary act of stating

32. *she changed again my off days Tuesday and Thursday,*

Illocutionary act of stating

The utterances infer that her days off have changed several times since she became the au pair of the host family. With the utterance, “The host mom had to work at that time” (excerpt 25) infers the reason why the au pair had days off on the weekend and further reason “she is mostly at home” provides a clear explanation of why the days off were altered. The participant tries to provide logical reasons why her days off change in order to make it sound reasonable. While it appears that the host parents are inconsistent, which might represent them in a negative light, her utterances exemplified how *the rules* of days off have changed several times and explicated the reasons of the alteration. This can be an attempt to save the face of the host parents.

#### **4. Speech event: The participant’s perception about the English level of the host parents**

##### **Data 6 - au pair A**

The following question was an endeavor to elicit more information about the au pairs' evaluation of the host parents' fluency in English.

Researcher (R) : How do you rate her English? Is it good? Or is it like native?

Participant (P) :

.....

*34. The host mum, is...*

Illocutionary act of stating

*35. she’s also good*

Illocutionary act of adjudging

*36. just sometimes makes mistakes in grammatical*

Illocutionary act of adjudging

*37. ya she makes grammatically mistake*

Illocutionary act of stating

The utterances above signal how the au pairs try to signify positive evaluation of the host mother. The utterance “the host mom, is...” (excerpt 34) reflects how the au pair shapes the frame of hedging. Her hesitation attempts to avoid expressing her opinion about the English proficiency of the host mother. In excerpt (35), we can infer that “she is also good” is aimed to represent the positive image of the host mother to be perceived as a person who is proficient in English, although this evaluation term “good” is considerably ambiguous. There is an avoidance of saying that the host mother is not fluent in English, so

she articulates what might be perceived more accepted by saying “she just sometimes” makes mistakes in grammatical. “Sometimes” pertains to be considered as a less negative evaluation. Thus, her utterances might attempt to save the face of the host mother.

## 5. Speech event: The frequency of communicating with the host parents

### Data 7- au pair A

The question below sought to elicit an explanation regarding the au pair’s frequency of talking with the host family. Au pair A implicates she communicates only when she works, as shown in the following excerpt:

*Researcher (R) : How often do you talk to them?*

*Participant (P) :*

*38. Only when I work*

Illocutionary act of stating

*39. and when they want to*

Illocutionary act of hesitating

*40. ...they want to... ask for help,*

Illocutionary act of stating

*41. and then ...ya we talk.*

Illocutionary act of confirming

*42. Ya we usually talk*

Illocutionary act of informing

*43. when we are having dinner or like*

Illocutionary act of adducing

*44. ... in the morning when I work to clean the house*

Illocutionary act of adducing

*45. and my host mom is there,*

illocutionary act of describing situation

The participant hesitates to express concretely the frequency of communication. Repeating “they want to” two times represents a potential that they may communicate only in a certain time and only when the host parents need her. In order to avoid negative light of the host parents that potentially they do not communicate often, she hesitates by articulating “and then.” The participant utters “when having dinner” embedded with “when my host mom is there” to demonstrate positive evaluation of the communication between them. This can be classified as an attempt to save the face of the host parents.

#### 4.1.2. Involvement strategies in positive evaluations of the host family

The question below sought to elicit an explanation regarding the au pairs' interpersonal relationships with the host families. The positive assessments about the host parents are demonstrated in the involvement strategies applied. The response from the participants can be observed in the following excerpts.

#### 6. Speech event: The participant's perception regarding her relationship with the host family

##### Data 8 - au pair A

Researcher (R) : *How is your relationship with your host family?*

....

Participant (P) :  
46. *They treated me well and also....*

Illocutionary act of reporting

Excerpt (46) attempts to implicate the goodness of the host family. The utterance signifies a positive evaluation and that she has a good relationship with the host parents. Instead of saying direct evaluative term such as "my relationship with them is good," the participant provides evidence of how good the relationship is by articulating evaluative statement regarding how the host parents treat her. "Treated well" can be considered as a clear positive image and highlights that the host parents have a positive relationship with her.

##### Data 9 - au pair A

The question in the excerpt below was an attempt to elicit more information about whether the participants have good communication and relationships with their host families.

Researcher (R) : *Do you think you have a good communication with the host family and have a good relationship with them?*

Participant (P) :  
47. *we can communicate,*

Illocutionary act of stating

48. *ya we are good ...*

Illocutionary act of stating

.....

49. *ya we are also have a good relation*

Illocutionary act of stating

Positive evaluations are inferred in the utterances and reflects that the participant has good communication and a good relationship with the host family. “Can communicate” signals how they are able to interact each other. The utterance “good” is used to signify a positive image of the relationship despite being ambiguous and to strengthen the previous utterance. It can be inferred the word “good” embedded with “have a good relation” deduce how good their relationship are. This situates the host parents au pair relationship explicitly.

### **Data 10 - au pair B**

In the interviews, I asked the participants to elaborate on an experience within the home which they deemed a good example of their relationship with their host family. Here is an excerpt from my interview with au pair B.

*R (researcher) : So you don't have any expectation. How is your relationship with your host family?*

*P (Participant) :  
50. It's nice,*

Illocutionary act of stating

*51. It's good*

*R (researcher) : Can you describe how nice? Why you think they are?*

*P (Participant) :  
52. Because I feel like at home*

Illocutionary act of expressing satisfaction

*53. so **we are like a family**, not au pair, not like boss,*

Illocutionary act of expressing bliss

*54. and **we are like a team**,*

Illocutionary act of expressing delight

*55. so **we work together***

Illocutionary act of stating

The excerpts above can be considered as a clear explanation regarding the degree to which the host parents and the au pair treat each other. Her utterances “we are like a family, we are like a team” demonstrate how the participant represents the host family as having positive attribute. “like a family” deduces a positive evaluation that the host family treats her as a family member. “like a team coupled with “work together” represent the host parents who are cooperative and can build a solid team. We can draw an inference that the

utterances are an attempt to solidify positive evaluation towards the host family. This can reflect the position of the au pair who positions herself as a family member.

### **7. Speech event: The participant's perception regarding her experience during being an au pair**

#### **Data 11 - au pair A**

Consider the following excerpt below taken from the interview with au pair A, concerning her experience about being an au pair.

*Researcher (R) : so...that's the things that you have experienced so far...*

*Participant (P) :*

*56. ya*

Illocutionary act of stating

*57. We also have a great time together,*

Illocutionary act of stating

*58. ya they invited me several times for holiday,*

Illocutionary act of stating

*59. ya together with them,*

Illocutionary act of stating

*60. it was also fun ya*

Illocutionary act of stating

The utterances illustrate a positive assessment of being together with the host family. Excerpt (58) infers a companionship between the host parents and the au pair. It is an attempt to solidify the kindness of the host family and demonstrates how the au pair's experience with the host family is framed to describe a positive evaluation of spending time with the host family. "Together with them, it was also fun" illustrates that doing an activity together with the host family is enjoyable. We can infer that "together" is an attempt to identify the closeness between the au pair and the host family and this approval combined with "fun" signals that having quality time with the host family is pleasurable and reflects a positive evaluation.

### **8. Speech event: What the participant dislikes about the host family**

#### **Data 12 - au pair B**

*R (researcher) : Is there any something that you dislike from them?*

*P (Participant) :*

*61. No because...*



Illocutionary act of stating

62. *because their character a bit same like my family's character*

Illocutionary act of comparing

The participant elaborates her judgment that there is nothing she dislikes about her host parents by giving further explanation that the host parents have the same character as her own family. We can infer that instead of mentioning unfavorable things about the host family, the participant chooses to articulate the similarity of the characteristics of the host family compared to hers. There is a likelihood of demonstrating that the host family has a positive attitude and they make the participant feel home. This can be considered as an attempt to represent the positive evaluation of the host family.

### 9. Speech event: What the participant likes about the host family

#### Data 13 - au pair A

The question in the excerpt below was an attempt to elicit more information about what au pair A likes about her host family.

Researcher (R) : What do you like most from your host family?

Participant (P) :

63. *They treat me like a family.*

Illocutionary act of conjecturing

64. *And they....ya...*

Illocutionary act of hesitating

65. *how to say...*

Illocutionary act of considering

66. *That's what I like most.*

Illocutionary act of stating of fact

67. *They treat me like a family member.*

Illocutionary act of clarifying

The utterance “treat me like a family” expresses the positive evaluation of how the host parents treat her. On the other hand, in the next articulation, the au pair employs hedging, as she utters “how to say,” which is deemed as a hesitant marker. It can be inferred that she distances herself in deducing how the host parents treat her. The hesitation might implicate that the au pair is not sure that being treated as a family member is the thing that she likes most about the host family. This represents a subjective evaluation. There is also a potential that the host parents may not truly treat her like a family. Thus, she avoids representing negative evaluation and decides to articulate “how to say” to indicate that there

is an uncertainty to express what she likes about the host family and saves the face of the host parents.

The last response of the question pertains to a positive evaluation. “treat me like family member” can be considered as a strong testimonial regarding how the host parents truly treat her like a family member. “They treat me like a family member” is interpreted as carrying the illocutionary force of praising the host parents and implies approval of how the host parents treat her as a member of the family.

### **10. Speech event: The participant’s perception about English level of the host parents**

#### **Data 14 - au pair A**

The question about the English of the host parents in the excerpt below was an endeavour to elicit more information about their evaluation of the English fluency of the host parents.

*Researcher (R) : How do you rate her English? Is it good? Or is it like native?*

....

*Researcher (R) : How about the host dad?*

*Participant (P) :*

*71. The host is great,*

Illocutionary act of complimenting

*72. he speaks English very well*

Illocutionary act of complimenting

Based on the presented utterances, the participant attempts to highlight the positive face of the host father. “The host is great” shows the participant’s approval of the ability of the host dad. The participant gives a compliment, as reflected in the word “great.” It is remarkable that the utterance “the host dad is great” is an attempt to complement the host dad and coupled with “speaks English very well” constitutes a positive assessment to the host dad. This results in saving the positive face of the host dad.

### **11. Speech event: Reasons why the participant agreed to become the au pair of the host family**

#### **Data 15 - au pair B**

The question below sought to elicit information regarding why the au pair agreed to be the au pair of the host family. The response from the au pair B is illustrated in the following excerpt.

*R (researcher) : They saw your family and your family saw them. Ya and After that you decide to be... So what is actually the strong reason that ...I want to stay in the Netherlands and I want them to be my host parents?*

*P (Participant) :  
73. Because **they are looking so friendly***

Illocutionary act of expressing being impressed

*74. and **I think***

Illocutionary act of showing perception

*75. **we are matched each other***

Illocutionary act of expressing happiness

The excerpts demonstrate how the participant frames the reason she chose the host family. Based on the presented utterances, the participant attempts to highlight the kindness of the host family. It is worth noting here that positive evaluation is reflected in the utterance “looking so friendly” and coupled with further explanation “we match each other.” She inserts her cognitive linguistic perception that they fit each other. Additionally, an act of showing perception “I think” is portrayed, serves as a subjective evaluation and judgment.

## **4.2. Discussion**

In this section, the findings of the politeness strategies types in the semi-structured sociolinguistic interview are summarized. The study has shown that these two Indonesian au pairs appear to share several types of politeness strategies in addressing responses about their host parents. The independence politeness strategy mostly used is hedging, which is to soften the tone of voice. It appears that the au pairs emphasize hedging when they feel uncertain and mitigate negative commentary or evaluation such as illustrated in the following excerpts:

*a. They are kind of...understand my culture,*

*b. how to say...hmm...*

*c. The host mum, is...*

The au pairs used the involvement politeness strategy to explain positive values and, as shown in the excerpts below.

- a. *We are like a family, not au pair, not like boss, and we are like a team, so we work together*
- b. *The host is great; he speaks English very well*
- c. *Because they are looking so friendly*

It is evident that involvement and independence strategies are employed at certain times during the interview. Those politeness strategies are mainly used to depict or represent positive or negative commentary and evaluation. From the interview discourse, it can be concluded the au pairs use an involvement strategy to compliment, however, they use the independence strategy to mitigate negative commentary about the host parents. The au pairs use certain politeness strategies because of what they experience and the sensitivity of explicit judgment. In addition, it demonstrates that politeness can be encoded in the particular language the au pairs use when they speak about the host parents. Therefore, using certain politeness strategies may allow us to develop a particular understanding of the perception of the host parents. The politeness keywords emphasized by the au pairs to discuss the host parents are efforts to manage the face of the host parents.

These results are in agreement with the findings of Blum-Kulka (1992) and Harris (2001) which showed that positive and negative politeness strategies can be combined in discourse, and they are not as distinctive as what other theories has presented (as cited in Locher & Graham, 2010). It further supports the idea of Brown and Gilman (1989), who said that more than one face-threatening act may be performed in actual language encounters, and it is presumably encoding different degrees of imposition, so distinct politeness strategies will be necessary (as cited in Locher & Graham, 2010).

Some significant findings have been made in this study. First, the most salient and pervasive independence politeness strategy is hedging. This shows that the au pairs are devoted to making sure that they do not threaten the face of their host parents in their utterances. The reason why the hedging was used by the au pairs may be due to the fact that they hedge when saying exactly what they dislike about the host family.

Second, there is inconsistency in the use of the politeness strategies. A possible explanation for this may be due to the theme and questions themselves and the content of the responses given. When asked about their relationship and communication with the host parents, participants mainly employ involvement strategies. However, when the questions are related to what they dislike about their host families, they use independence strategies. These results are in agreement with those obtained by Scollon and Scollon's (1995) assertion that in any communication, involvement and independence politeness strategies must be

utilized simultaneously. Thus, speakers find accurate ways of uttering something to show the degree to which he or she grants independence as a means to manage face.

Another possible explanation for the complexity of strategies used is the complicated relationships between au pairs and host parents. The au pairs have double positions in the family and this may contribute to managing the face of the host parents who are their employer but also interim family. It is in line with the previous politeness strategies study by Petříčková (2012) who found that the careful choice of politeness strategies depends on the complicated nature of the relationship between interlocutors.

The focus of the study is on politeness between the au pairs and the third party (host parents); thus, the politeness system implicated is a hierarchical politeness system because the power and distance between them are unequal. Cox and Narula (2003) found that the dominant position of the host families points to the rather inferior status of the au pair. Therefore, it might be predicted that a particular and stable politeness system might manifest even when the party in question is a third-party addressee. However, the findings reveal that the au pairs do not only use independence strategies when implicating the host parents, but also involvement strategies. Overall, these results indicate that it is difficult for social distance to predict what politeness strategies will be used because it is much more effective if we look at the topical content itself. Thus, power and distance factors are not definite in determining politeness strategies used. It can thus be suggested that the thematic content of the utterances may influence the use of the politeness strategies.

Importantly, the way the au pairs talk about the host parents does not necessarily provide a window of representation on their relationship. Their perception of their position automatically affects the third party and means they try to save the third party's face. For example, the hedging strategy used is a signal of trying to mitigate negative commentary about the host parents. They use it to save the negative face of the host parents. There is also a possibility that the close live-in relationship involved in au-pair work make the participants appear to be very careful when implicating third party addressees (host family) into their discourse.

These results corroborate the ideas of Holtgraves (2014), who suggested that face management continuously occurs. However, it is less threatening if the au pairs talk about the host parents in private than if these parents are involved in the interviews. Nevertheless, it can be said that the au pairs consistently practice face management in interviews as they continually hedged before implicating their host parents in their utterances.

The politeness strategies in the excerpts are the involvement strategy and

independence strategy. These discursive choices highlight the pragmatic awareness of the au pairs wherein content related to positive values result in the use of involvement strategies, whereas open-ended questions such as the relationship and communication with the host family leads to the use of independence strategies. The current study found that independence strategies are used to mitigate anything untoward, as the independence aspect of face emphasizes the individuality of the participants (Scollon and Scollon, 1995).

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONCLUSION**

The use of the politeness strategies model proposed by Scollon and Scollon (1995) combines the conceptual semantic and pragmatic analyses of the au pairs' utterances during interviews. The main goal of the current study was to determine whether the independence or involvement politeness strategies were used by the au pairs while implicating host parents. By applying the theoretical framework of politeness strategies, this study has identified that the au pairs use both involvement and independence strategies in their utterances.

This study has found that, generally, the diversity of politeness strategies used are adjusted and conditioned in accordance to the questions' theme and situational context. The involvement strategies are employed when the au pairs would like to show approval and imply how good their host parents are. Meanwhile, independence politeness strategies are utilized to mitigate negative commentary about the host parents. A hedged opinion is given to avoid a precise conveyance of judgments. Hedges were frequently employed in the speaker's replies to avoid a precise expression of opinions and attitudes, thereby protecting the host parents' reputation.

The findings of this study have a number of practical implications. The result of the findings will be useful for linguists to enhance understandings of politeness and linguistic realizations of politeness in reference to a third party. This research extends our knowledge of how politeness strategies are not only between speaker and hearer, but also can be implicated in utterances referring to third person addressees. The current findings add to a growing body of literature on the notion of the face management in politeness system(s). Power and distance factors are not definite in determining politeness strategies used. It is contingent on the questions' theme and the content being discussed.

The analysis of politeness strategies in implicating host parents undertaken here, has extended our knowledge of the host parents-au pairs relationship. The results of this study indicate their complex relationship and face of the host parents are still saved although the host parents is not the interlocutor in the interview. Also, the findings of this research provide insights for understanding how the au pairs may articulate comprehensively their relationship in a position as a family member and how it can impact assessment of the host

parents. In short, the study documents how the relationship appears to be explicitly managed in the discourse and the relationship between the au pairs and the host parents is managed carefully because of the double position of the au pairs in the relationship.

This small-scale case study has highlighted how complicated relationships are simultaneously embedded in the use of politeness strategies when third parties are implicated. A further study with more focus on politeness in interactions between au pairs and the host parents is therefore suggested. Had the interaction occurred between the host parents and the au pairs, the strategies used and the perception of the politeness strategies may have been different. The conversational expectations also may be different in that one may expect some people to be more or less polite, appropriate, immediate, or attentive, based on the relationship that exists. Following Magginis (2011), testing different relationship types will add to the understanding of the effect of politeness messages.

Further research should be undertaken to investigate the shifts in the use of politeness strategies and the tendencies of au pairs and host parents' utterances on one particular occasion in the period prior, during, and after the event. This would provide insights into whether the politeness strategies are contingent on the event. A more elaborate and detailed investigation, over a longer period of time, could improve the study and negate the expectations with any findings that were not considered here.

It would be interesting to look at the threshold of au pairs' utterances which will be tolerated or seen as polite while they are in a face-to-face conversation with their host parents. Understanding the nuances of how politeness are used can reveal information about our social and personal values, and how we portray these to the people we communicate with. The findings can be the stepping stone and be an extension of the study into the politeness strategies used by au pairs with the host parents and vice versa.



## REFERENCES

- Aijmer, K. (2013). *Understanding pragmatic markers*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Al-Marrani, Y. M. A. & Sazalie, A. B. (2010). Polite request strategies by Yemeni females: A sociopragmatic study. *MJAL*, 2(6), 478-516.
- Anderson, B. (2000). *Doing the dirty work?*. London: Zed Books.
- Aupairworld.com. (2015). *Basic idea of au pairing - AuPairWorld*. Retrieved 4 June 2015, from [https://www.aupairworld.com/en/tos/au\\_pair\\_regulations](https://www.aupairworld.com/en/tos/au_pair_regulations)
- Austin, J. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Barešová, I. (2008). *Politeness strategies in cross-cultural perspective*. Olomouc: Palacký University.
- Beebe, L.M., & Takahashi, T. (1989). Sociolinguistic variation in face-threatening speech acts: Chastisement and disagreement. In M.R. Eisenstein (Ed.), *The dynamic interlanguage: Empirical studies in second language variation* (pp.199-218). NY: Plenum.
- Bikova, M. (2008). *A Family Member of A Family Servant?* (Master). University of Bergen.
- Birner, B. (2012). *Introduction to pragmatics*. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning to Say What You Mean in a Second Language: A Study of the Speech Act Performance of Learners of Hebrew as a Second Language. *Applied Linguistics*, III(1), 29-59. doi:10.1093/applin/iii.1.29
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and Apologies: A Cross-Cultural Study of Speech Act Realization Patterns (CCSARP)1. *Applied Linguistics*, 5(3), 196-213. doi:10.1093/applin/5.3.196
- Blum-Kulka, S., Danet, B., & Gherson, R. (1985). The Language of Requesting in Israeli Society. *Language And Social Situations*, 113-139. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-5074-6\\_7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-5074-6_7)
- Brown, P. (2005). Linguistic politeness. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. J. Mattheier & P. Trudgill (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: An international handbook of the science of language and society* (pp.1410-1416). NY: Walter de Gruyter.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness*. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]: Cambridge

- University Press.
- Búriková, Z. (2006). The Embarrassment of Co-Presence: Au Pairs and their Rooms. *Home Cultures*, 3(2), 99-122. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2752/174063106778053228>
- Cheng, W. (2012). Speech acts, facework, and politeness: Relationship-building across cultures. In J. Jackson, *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication* (1st ed., pp. 148-163). Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Chien, Y. (2013). Communication Strategies for Exit Interviews in Business: From the Employee's Perspective. In *Conference on Interdisciplinary and Multifunctional Business Management & High Education Forum on Business Management* (pp. 1-12). Taipei: National Taiwan Normal University. Retrieved from [http://www.scu.edu.tw/ba/2013conference/paper/6H\\_01.pdf](http://www.scu.edu.tw/ba/2013conference/paper/6H_01.pdf)
- Coulmas, F. (1981). Introduction: Conversational Routine. In F. Coulmas, *Conversational Routine* (1st ed., pp. 1-17). The Hague: Mouton.
- Cox, R., & Narula, R. (2003). Playing Happy Families: rules and relationships in au pair employing households in London, England. *Gender, Place & Culture*, 10(4), 333-344. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0966369032000153304>
- Cruz, M. (2005). *Towards New Politeness Systems*. <http://personal.us.es>. Retrieved 12 July 2015, from [http://personal.us.es/mpadillacruz/uploads/Proceedings/Politeness\\_systems.pdf](http://personal.us.es/mpadillacruz/uploads/Proceedings/Politeness_systems.pdf)
- Crystal, D. (1997). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language* (2nd Ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- De Mesquita, L. (2012). *They don't understand what an au pair is. A qualitative study of Brazilian au pairs in the Netherlands and their self-perception: temporary migration, domestic 'non work and tourism* (Undergraduate). University of Amsterdam.
- DeVito, J. (2012). *The interpersonal communication book*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson.
- Directorate-General for Internal Policies. Policy Department Citizen's Rights and Constitutional Affairs. (2011). *Abused Domestic Workers in Europe: The case of au pairs*. Brussels: European Parliament.
- Eelen, G. (2001). *A critique of politeness theories*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Pub.
- Elkin-Cleary, E. (2015). *Establishing a strong relationship with your au pair*. [infosource.culturalcare.com](http://infosource.culturalcare.com). Retrieved 4 May 2015, from <https://infosource.culturalcare.com/lcc/servicing-host-families/counseling-advice-outreach/establishing-a-strong-relationship-with-your-au-pair/> doi:10.1016/0378-2166(90)90081-n

- Felix-Brasdefer, C. (2007). *Politeness*. Retrieved August 14, 2015, from Indiana University, Discourse Pragmatics Website: <http://www.indiana.edu/~discprag/polite.html>
- Folkestad, B. (2008). Analysing Interview Data: Possibilities and challenges. In *Eurosphere Working Paper Series*. Bergen: Eurosphere.
- Fraser, B., & Nolen, W. (1981). The association of deference with linguistic form. *International Journal Of The Sociology Of Language*, 1981(27). doi:10.1515/ijsl.1981.27.93
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual; essays on face-to-face behavior*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 14(2), 237-257. doi:10.1016/0378-2166(90)90082-o
- Harquail, C. (2011). *5 Key Strategies For Building A Strong Relationship With Your Au Pair*. *Aupairmom.com*. Retrieved 4 May 2015, from <http://aupairmom.com/5-key-strategies-for-building-a-strong-relationship-with-your-au-pair/2012/11/08/celiaharquail/>
- Hasegawa, Y. (2007). Simultaneous Application of Negative and Positive Politeness. In *the 10th International Pragmatics Conference*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Hess, S. and A. Puckhaber. (2004). '“Big Sisters” Are Better Servants?! Comments on the Booming Au Pair Business', *Feminist Review* 77: 65—78.
- Holtgraves, T. (2005). Diverging interpretations associated with the perspectives of the speaker and recipient in conversations. *Journal Of Memory And Language*, 53(4), 551-566. doi:10.1016/j.jml.2005.06.002
- Holtgraves, T. (2014). Interpreting uncertainty terms. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 107(2), 219-228. doi:10.1037/a0036930
- Holtgraves, T., & Yang, J. (1990). Politeness as universal: Cross-cultural perceptions of request strategies and inferences based on their use. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 59(4), 719-729. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.4.719>
- Holtgraves, T., & Ashley, A. (2001). Comprehending illocutionary force. *Memory & Cognition*, 29(1), 83-90. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/bf03195743>
- Holmes, J. (1990). Apologies in New Zealand English. *Language in Society*, 19 (2): 155-99.
- Hovdan, M. (2005). Au pair in Norway. A qualitative study. Institute of sociology: UiB.
- Ide, S. (1982). Japanese sociolinguistics politeness and women's language. *Lingua*, 57(2-4), 357-385. doi:10.1016/0024-3841(82)90009-2
- Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: two neglected aspects of universals of

- linguistic politeness. *Multilingua - Journal Of Cross-Cultural And Interlanguage Communication*, 8(2-3), 223-248. doi:10.1515/mult.1989.8.2-3.223
- Ide, S. (1993). Preface: The search for integrated universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua - Journal Of Cross-Cultural And Interlanguage Communication*, 12(1), 7-12. doi:10.1515/mult.1993.12.1.7
- Immigration and Naturalization Service. (2015). *Au Pair Awareness Declaration*. ind.nl. Retrieved 27 July 2015, from <https://ind.nl/en/documents/7646.pdf>
- Johns, A., & Félix-Brasdefer, J. (2015). Linguistic politeness and pragmatic variation in request production in Dakar French. *Journal Of Politeness Research*, 11(1). doi:10.1515/pr-2015-0006
- Kasper, G. (1990). Linguistic politeness. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 14(2), 193-218. doi:10.1016/0378-2166(90)90080-w
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London/New York: Longman.
- Leech, G., & Short, M. (1981). *Style in fiction*. London: Longman.
- LoCastro, V. (2012). *Pragmatics for language educators*. New York: Routledge.
- Locher, M., & Graham, S. (2010). *Interpersonal pragmatics*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Loos, E., Anderson, S., Day Jr., D., Jordan, P., & Wingate, J. (2004). *illocutionary force*. *Ccat.sas.upenn.edu*. Retrieved 12 August 2015, from <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/~haroldfs/dravling/illocutionary.html>
- Love, R. (2011). *Politeness strategies in a television interview*. *Academia.edu*. Retrieved 29 June 2015, from [http://www.academia.edu/3515159/Politeness\\_strategies\\_in\\_a\\_television\\_interview\\_undergraduate\\_assignment\\_2011\\_](http://www.academia.edu/3515159/Politeness_strategies_in_a_television_interview_undergraduate_assignment_2011_)
- Maginnis, J. (2011). *Texting in the Presence of Others: The Use of Politeness Strategies in Conversation* (Ph.D.). University of Kentucky.
- Maha, L. (2014). Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Linguistic Politeness. *Cross-Cultural Communication*, 10(1), 56-60.
- Matsumoto-Gray, K. (2009). *Politeness in Increasing Degrees of Imposition: A Sociolinguistic Study of Politeness in Political Conversations* (Master). University of Utah.
- Matusiak, A. (2014). *The key to success with live-in au pairs*. *Au Pair Buzz*. Retrieved from 20 August 2015, from <https://aupairbuzz.culturalcare.com/setting-expectations-with-an-au-pair/>
- Meier, A. (1995). Defining politeness: Universality in appropriateness. *Language Sciences*, 17(4), 345-356. doi:10.1016/0388-0001(95)00019-4

- Mellini, L., Yodanis, C., & Godenzi, A. (2007). 'On Par'? The Role Of The Au Pair In Switzerland And France. *European Societies*, 9(1), 45-64. doi:10.1080/14616690601079432
- Mullany, L. (1999) 'Linguistic politeness and sex differences in BBC Radio 4 broadcast interviews' *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics and Phonetics* 7:119-142.
- Pariera, K. (2006). The Use of Politeness Strategies in Email Discussions About Taboo Topics. *Mcnair Scholars Online Journal*, 2(1), 320-341. doi:10.15760/mcnair.2006.320
- Pelechova, L. (2014). *Bringing migrant domestic work literature into family studies: the intricate dynamics of au pair families* (Ph.D.). University of Nottingham.
- Petríčková, I. (2012). *Politeness strategies in interview questions* (Undergraduate). Masaryk University.
- Robins, L., & Wolf, F. (1988). Confrontation and politeness strategies in physician-patient interactions. *Social Science & Medicine*, 27(3), 217-221. doi:10.1016/0277-9536(88)90124-4
- Sari, Y., & Mulatsih, S. (2013). *Politeness Strategies Used In The Exclusive Interview Between Putra Nababan And Barack Obama, March 10, 2010 On RCTI* (Undergraduate). Dian Nuswantoro University.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (1983). Face in Interethnic Communication. In J. Richards & R. Schmidt, *Language and Communication* (1st ed., pp. 156-190). London: Longman.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (1995). *Intercultural communication*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J., & Vanderveken, D. (1985). *Foundations of illocutionary logic*. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]: Cambridge University Press.
- Song, S. (2012). *Politeness and culture in second language acquisition*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (1996). Reconsidering power and distance. *Journal Of Pragmatics*, 26(1), 1-24. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(95\)00047-x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00047-x)
- Švářová, J. (2008). *Politeness Markers in Spoken Language* (Undergraduate). Masaryk University Brno.
- Tročilová, E. (2013). *Manufacturing Au pairhood: How Czech Au Pairs Understand Their Role and Negotiate Position in Host Families* (Master). Masaryk University.
- Vitah Hanchoko, M. (2014). *The Sociopragmatic Significance of Some Address Forms in Tonga* (Master). University Of Zambia.
- Watts, R. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Wilamová, S. (2005). *On The Function Of Hedging Devices In Negatively Polite Discourse* (pp. 85-93). Brno: University Brněnské. Retrieved from [http://www.phil.muni.cz/plonedata/wkaa/BSE/BSE\\_2005-31\\_Offprints/BSE%202005-31%20\(085-093\)%20Wilamova.pdf](http://www.phil.muni.cz/plonedata/wkaa/BSE/BSE_2005-31_Offprints/BSE%202005-31%20(085-093)%20Wilamova.pdf)
- Williams, A.M., & Baláž, V. (2004) 'From Private Sphere to Public Sphere, the Commodification of the Au Pair Experience? Returned Migrants from Slovakia to the UK', *Environment and Planning A* 36(10): 1813—33
- Witczak-Plisiecka, I. (2010). *Pragmatic perspectives on language and linguistics*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.
- Woods, M. (2015). *Interviewing for Research*. <http://owll.massey.ac.nz/>. Retrieved 4 September 2015, from <http://owll.massey.ac.nz/pdf/interviewing-for-research.pdf>
- Yamazaki, T. (2001). Politeness: How it is realized in a speech act. *Ann.Rep. Faculty Of Education, Iwate University*, 60(2), 19-34.
- Yodanis, C., & Lauer, S. (2005). Foreign Visitor, Exchange Student, or Family Member? A Study of Au Pair Policies in the United States, United Kingdom, and Australia. *International Journal Of Sociology And Social Policy*, 25(9), 41-64.  
doi:10.1108/01443330510791171
- Zelizer, V. (2005). *The purchase of intimacy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

## APPENDIX

### Interview Transcription of Au Pair A

Researcher (R) : Can you tell me about the moment you decided to become an au pair, how the process was and how your experience has been until now.

Participant (P) :

- Oh ya so I have

*Illocutionary act of thinking*

- I knew an agent from my friend

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- and she gave me her number

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- and then I contacted her.

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- And then she told me how to...how to register and also about the payment

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- that I had to pay.

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- Is...ya then...

*Illocutionary act of thinking*

- The process took...

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- like...let's see four months

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- and then I came here..

*Illocutionary act of informing*

Researcher (R) : Why did you decide to become an au pair?

Participant (P) :

- ya your question

*Illocutionary act of remembering*

Researcher (R) : Your motivation?

Participant (P) :

- I would like to experience...experience culture exchange,

*Illocutionary act of wishing*

- and I also would love also to learn other languages. Ya...Like Dutch

*Illocutionary act of expecting*

- and get to know more the culture, the food,

*Illocutionary act of yearning*

- and everything relates culture related...ya

*Illocutionary act of stating*

Researcher (R) : How was your experience so far?

Participant (P) :

- Well... well,

*Pragmatic markers*

- it was a great experience,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I have to say,  
*Illocutionary act of confirming*
- but ya at first, it was very hard,  
*Illocutionary act of conveying information*
- because I have to adapt to the kids,  
*Illocutionary act of stating*
- and also hmm adapt to my...also different...different culture...then...apart from Dutch  
*Illocutionary act of stating*
- because I stay with Iranian family,  
*Illocutionary act of asserting*
- so it's first...  
*Illocutionary act of stating*
- first it's kind of hard, but now,  
*Illocutionary act of informing*
- well  
*pragmatic markers*
- I think it is okay,  
*Illocutionary act of stating*
- it's really fun.  
*Illocutionary act of stating*
- I really enjoy.  
*Illocutionary act of informing*

Researcher (R) : How is your relationship with your host family?

Participant (P) :

- Well,  
*pragmatic markers*
- it's good.  
*Illocutionary act of stating*
- They treated me well and also....  
*Illocutionary act of reporting*
- They are kind of...understand my culture,  
*Illocutionary act of hesitating*
- they try to understand it.  
*Illocutionary act of informing*
- Before they had an Indonesian au pair,  
*Illocutionary act of apprising*
- so it's a ...  
*Illocutionary act of stating*
- I think  
*Illocutionary act of predicting*
- it's a ...easy for them to know... to understand me.  
*Illocutionary act of assuming*
- Ya...  
*Illocutionary act of stating*
- So I think ya,  
*Illocutionary act of stating*
- we are good.  
*Illocutionary act of concluding*



Researcher (R) : How often do you talk to them?

Participant (P) :

- Only when I work

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and when they want to

*Illocutionary act of hesitating*

- ...they want to... ask for help,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and then ...ya we talk.

*Illocutionary act of confirming*

- Ya we usually talk

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- when we are having dinner or like

*Illocutionary act of adducing*

- ... in the morning when I work to clean the house

*Illocutionary act of adducing*

- and my host mom is there,

*illocutionary act of describing situation*

- so we talk ya random things, talk about the kids or also sometimes talk about me or talk about the...about her... and then...

*Illocutionary act of adducing*

- but I rarely talk to my host dad

*Illocutionary act of contrasting*

- because he travels a lot

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and we don't have

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ...we don't talk that much.

*Illocutionary act of acquainting*

Researcher (R) : Do you feel comfortable while you talk to them?

Participant (P) :

- Hmm...
- Well...
- ya...
- it depends...

*Illocutionary acts of hesitating*

- it depends on the subject that were

*Illocutionary act of reckoning*

- ...like... if I have some questions

*Illocutionary act of considering*

- ...ya just...
- how to say..

*Illocutionary act of hesitating*

- ya...
- it depends on the subject...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- like...
- hmm...

*Illocutionary act of pausing*

- if I want to ask for...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- if I can change my off day...

*Illocutionary act of preferring*

- ya it's kind of sometimes uncomfortable ya

*Illocutionary act of disappointing*

- because I have to be ready

*Illocutionary act of describing situation*

- if they say no or they say ya

*Illocutionary act of worrying*

- ...and uhm
- I think that's it.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

Researcher (R) : Do you feel comfortable while they are home? For example they are home, but then you have to stay in your house. Do you feel awkward?

Participant (P) :

- Yes, it's right.

*Illocutionary act of agreeing*

- I feel awkward because...

*Illocutionary act of confirming*

- like the first month when I was here,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- the kids, they were really attached to their parents

*Illocutionary act of stating of fact*

- wherever the parents went,

*Illocutionary act of reporting*

- they always looked for the parents like "momma momma"...or "daddy daddy"...

*Illocutionary act of adducing*

- when his dad was working downstairs.

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- And I had to take care of the kids...

*Illocutionary act of claiming*

- I had to take care of the kids in the... in the living room.

*Illocutionary act of describing situation*

- So he was like

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- "I want my dad, I want my dad"

*Illocutionary act of adducing*

- it's...I feel like,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- "what should I do, what should I do?"

*Illocutionary act of expressing confusion*

- It's really, it's not comfortable.

*Illocutionary act of abominating*

- Ya it's kind of awkward

*Illocutionary act of apprising*

Researcher (R) : What do you like most from your host family?

Participant (P) :

- They treat me like a family.
- Illocutionary act of conjecturing*
- And they...ya...
- Illocutionary act of hesitating*
- how to say...
- Illocutionary act of considering*
- That's what I like most.
- Illocutionary act of stating of fact*
- They treat me like a family member.
- Illocutionary act of clarifying*

Researcher (R) : Is there something that you dislike from them?

Participant (P) :

- Ya, that they like
- Illocutionary act of hesitating*
- ...how to say...hmm...
- Illocutionary act of hesitating*
- when they give something,
- Illocutionary act of acquainting*
- they expect something in return
- Illocutionary act of acquainting*
- ...so it's like
- Illocutionary act of growling*
- "I give you this
- Illocutionary act of explaining*
- but I expect you to work more and then more and
- Illocutionary act of informing*
- expect you to do this"...to do this...although...
- Illocutionary act of informing*
- and they also sometimes
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- they say no, but ..
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- ooh sorry...
- Illocutionary act of correcting*
- they say
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- "Ya ya you can go,
- Illocutionary act of reporting*
- this is your free time
- Illocutionary act of informing*
- and you can go"
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- but actually they need me
- Illocutionary act of expressing distress*
- but then if I go,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- then I come back after my free time,
- Illocutionary act of informing*
- then they will be like

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- “Ooh well ....(the au pair’s name) where have you been?

*Illocutionary act of expressing annoyance*

- We are waiting for you.

*Illocutionary act of expressing aggravation*

- Actually we need your help”.

*Illocutionary act of expressing irritation*

- You know sometimes

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- it’s confused me.

*Illocutionary act of expressing confusion*

- And also about my off days.

*Illocutionary act of bemoaning*

- They don’t give me national holidays,

*Illocutionary act of lamenting*

- they don’t give me off days.

*Illocutionary act of lamenting*

- ..ya... so it’s sad.

*Illocutionary act of expressing disappointment*

Researcher (R) : Do you know what’s on the contract?

Participant (P) :

- Ya ya,
- I do ya.

*Illocutionary act of clarifying*

- And they’re supposed to know,

*Illocutionary act of alleging*

- I guess

*Illocutionary act of faltering*

Researcher (R) : Do you try to find a solution for that? Have you talked to them?

Participant (P) :

- About national holidays?

*Illocutionary act of clarifying*

- No...I don’t feel like...

*Illocutionary act of faltering*

- I don’t have the gut to tell them...

*Illocutionary act of worrying*

- I don’t...

*Illocutionary act of faltering*

- because besides I am going back home soon, in a month.

*Illocutionary act of asserting*

- It’s like ya,

*Illocutionary act of faltering*

- it’s okay.

*illocutionary act of excusing*

Researcher (R) : So, it’s not really a big problem that they don’t give...?

Participant (P) :

- About the national holiday?

*Illocutionary act of confirming*

- Ya...
- It is not really a big problem for me.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- It's okay

*Illocutionary act of stating*

Researcher (R) : How about you work for more than hours you said before?

Participant (P) :

- More than 30 hours you mean?

*Illocutionary act of stating*

Participant (P) :

- Well, I also don't complain

*Illocutionary act of succumbing*

- and don't talk about it with them

*Illocutionary act of relenting*

- because also things sometimes...they also give me...

*Illocutionary act of hesitating*

- if they bring the kids the whole day,

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- and then I stay at home

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and just do the....clean the house

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- and I also have more free time .

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- Ya, it's okay

*Illocutionary act of stating*

Researcher (R) : You accept that? The hours...

Participant (P) :

- Ya accept...

*Illocutionary act of affirming*

- I think

*Illocutionary act of considering*

- it is still acceptable in case in terms of...hmm.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I think

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- it is still acceptable

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- because they also give me free time on the weekdays like Thursday and Tuesday from

*Illocutionary act of stating of fact*

- ... ya they say from 9-5

*Illocutionary act of bemoaning*

- but in fact I am free from 10-4

*Illocutionary act of lamenting*

- because at 4 pm I have to go back to help to prepare for dinner.

*Illocutionary act of being obliged*

- Two days and once a month I have a long weekend from Friday to Sunday

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ... so I think it's okay.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

Researcher (R) : Do you think what you have experienced so far with host family met what you expected before you came here?

Participant (P) :

- Hmm...No, not really.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- Ya before I expected

*Illocutionary act of expecting*

- that I will have a long weekend, every week,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- but now it's no...

*Illocutionary act of expressing dissatisfaction*

- it's only once a month

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I will have a long weekend.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- And how to say

*Illocutionary act of hesitating*

- ...and also about ...
- the profe...
- how like...
- how they treat me....

*Illocutionary act of considering*

- because it feels like ...

*Illocutionary act of faltering*

- they treat me very well like a family member

*Illocutionary act of reporting*

- but sometimes even if I am free, like...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I will to help,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I have the willingness to help them,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ya so it's like

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ...how to say...

*Illocutionary act of hesitating*

- I'm like ...confused...really confused ...

*Illocutionary act of doubting*

- where am I?

*Illocutionary act of expressing confusion*

- like...
- I work,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- this like...

- is this work?
- Illocutionary act of questioning*
- Is it a job or not?
- Illocutionary act of expressing confusion*
- Because sometimes it's like ...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- you know...
- Illocutionary act of hesitating*
- we like,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- we are very closed like...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- but I don't feel free...
- Illocutionary act of expressing displeased*
- I don't feel free to just tell them...
- Illocutionary act of worrying*
- oh ya I want to go...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- I want to go,
- Illocutionary act of planning*
- I have an appointment on Tuesday and Thursday, or this... on Saturday
  - because they...they...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- oh ya...they also have a dog,
- Illocutionary act of informing*
- by the way.
  - And then, so I want to stay up late,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- I really have to tell them,
- Illocutionary act of being obliged*
- and I don't feel comfortable
- Illocutionary act of expressing disfavor*
- because it means
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- they have to wait for me
- Illocutionary act of worrying*
- until I come back
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- because they have to open the door for me,
- Illocutionary act of expressing guilt*
- otherwise the dog will bark
- Illocutionary act of abominating*
- and he's awake, so it's really
- Illocutionary act of execrating*
- ... ya I don't feel comfortable...
- Illocutionary act of worrying*
- I have never expected
- Illocutionary act of expressing surprise*
- that they would be... like this
- Illocutionary act of expressing disenchantment*

- and also the dog thing.
- Illocutionary act of abominating*
- think makes me lazy to go out, to...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- you know to also socialize with the Dutch people.
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- I only go out at the weekend,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- so rarely go out at the weekdays.
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- Whereas I have some...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- I try to join a church,
- Illocutionary act of asserting*
- and then there is a connect group and then they...usually they...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- the connect group takes place on Wednesday,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- so I can't join.
- Illocutionary act of expressing sadness*
- Because it really...
- Illocutionary act of hesitating*
- because sometimes I also finish worked at 9.
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- Or if they have...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- they invite the family,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- and there will be a lot of dishes to be finished
- Illocutionary act of expressing disfavor*
- and then I will finish at ten
- Illocutionary act of expressing disfavor*
- and bring the kids to sleep
- Illocutionary act of expressing disfavor*
- and then I can have a rest ya.
- Illocutionary act of assuaging*

Researcher (R) : You said you don't feel comfortable if you want complain. What is the reason?

Participant (P) :  

- Ya ya ya...ya well...

*pragmatic markers*

- but Sometimes when I really like having an appointment,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and they....because they forgot,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- so I just tell them

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ya I have to go.

*Illocutionary act of affirming*



- Ya for that reason, I can...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I would say that.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

Researcher (R) : For example, if they asked you to do something, and then are you afraid to refuse? What do you feel?

Participant (P) :

- Well, if it is still....

*Illocutionary act of hesitating*

- If they ask me to do something on my free days,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and like if I don't have any appointment

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and I can still do that,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and it is still like...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- let's say make sense .

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- If they really need help,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- for example the kid is sick

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and they asked

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ... "(the au pair's name), could you please bring (the kids) some water?"

*Illocutionary act of telling*

- Because they are upstairs busy with the kid,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- of course, I will do that.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- It depends also on my situation.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- If I have the appointment like this,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- then I tell them sorry

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- that I have that appointment,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ya, it depends on the situation.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

Researcher (R) : You are not afraid to say no to your host family?

Participant (P) :

- Ya no I am not afraid,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- it depends.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

Researcher (R) : You said your expectation, you are gonna experience the Dutch culture, but your host family is Iranian family. How is it? How you experience the Dutch culture?

Participant (P) :

- As I told you previously...that...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- they are not really...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- well...

*pragmatic marker*

- They are...they have Dutch passport,

*Illocutionary act of stating of fact*

- they are originally they come from Iran,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- so I think

*Illocutionary act of considering*

- it can more Iranian culture than the Dutch,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ya they...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- they prepare the food Iranian food every day

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and when they talk to each other and sometimes to the kids,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- they use their own language.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- Yes, only when they talk to me,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- they speak English.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- But when they interact to each other...ya...so sometimes with the kids

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- or when they get angry,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- they speak

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- or they want to show their love,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- they speak their own language to the kids,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- but and the rest they speak Dutch with the kids.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- But for sure

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ... when they talk for husband,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and ya the mother...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- the mother talk...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- they are in the family...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- the mom speaks Persian with the father,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- so I don't know

*Illocutionary act of doubting*

- ... really...I don't think that...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- well ya

*pragmatic marker*

- maybe ya the language is also part of the culture

*Illocutionary act of confirming*

- so ya I experience it,

*Illocutionary act of clarifying*

- with the kids I speak Dutch with them

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and then it's good

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and I also have some Dutch friends

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- which I can practice my Dutch with

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ...so it's a nice experience.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

Researcher (R) : Do your host parents always speak English to you?

Participant (P):

- ya

*Illocutionary act of affirming*

Researcher (R) : They never speak Dutch to you?

Participant (P) :

- Well, they...oh well they speak Dutch

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- if they ya just like

*Illocutionary act of thinking*

- when they deal with the kids,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and they want to say something with the kids

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- or they want the kids to confess

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- what they did so

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ...or wait wait sorry...

*Illocutionary act of correcting*

- I will give you an example,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- for example

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- While we are having dinner
- Illocutionary act of exemplifying*
- and then the kid singing
- Illocutionary act of exemplifying*
- so they will like
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- “(the au pair’s name) je mag niet zingen”...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- you cannot sing
- Illocutionary act of forbidding*
- while having a dinner,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- they said it just
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- so the kid did not feel oh
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- they did not want to blame the kid,
- Illocutionary act of protecting*
- so they talk to me in the Dutch,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- so the kid understands
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- and also like
- ...oh okay oh ya sorry,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- and then the kid will stop singing
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- so only in that situation they speak Dutch.
- Illocutionary act of clarifying*

Researcher (R) : You usually speak Dutch to the kids, and what do you think about the English of the host parents? Do feel like sometimes misunderstand what they are saying?

- Participant (P) :
- Ya ya Sometimes...
  - Illocutionary act of stating*
  - their Eng...
  - Illocutionary act of stating*
  - ya I speak Dutch with the kids
  - Illocutionary act of claiming*
  - *because they can't speak English,*
  - Illocutionary act of stating*
  - so but that sometimes the miscommunication happens between us
  - Illocutionary act of stating*
  - because the host mom also...she's...she uses ...
  - Illocutionary act of stating*
  - sometimes ya...she...
  - Illocutionary act of stating*
  - she forgot the name of the English like the colander.
  - Illocutionary act of stating*

- When she want...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- we want to cook together
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- and then “(the au pair’s name), could you please pick up the...the?”
- Illocutionary act of requesting*
- Argh...what is it?”
- Illocutionary act of growling*
- ...and she was just like...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- “What’s the name of it?”
- Illocutionary act of recalling*
- What’s the name of it?
- Illocutionary act of recalling*
- That you put the spaghetti,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- and then so then the water comes out” .
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- ..and then I like
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- oh my God what it is...
- Illocutionary act of recalling*
- I also think what it is
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- and then finally came
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- and point to...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- and open the case ...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- and then show it
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- “oh this one...
- Illocutionary act of ascertaining*
- this what I mean oh colander”
- Illocutionary act of confirming*
- ..ya colander...ya so...
- Illocutionary act of confirming*
- or sometimes she forgot like
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- “Could you please...get me the colander
- Illocutionary act of requesting*
- she said,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- and I was like “Coliander?”
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- What’s colander?”
- Illocutionary act of querying*
- It’s a spice right?
- Illocutionary act of querying*

- But then you mean this one...

*Illocutionary act of*

- and the she's like

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- "no no, the one that you put spaghetti"

*Illocutionary act of describing*

- ...oh colander...

*Illocutionary act of affirming*

- oh that's colander ya so

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- Sometimes there is a misunderstanding.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- But it just...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- it doesn't affect much,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ya it's okay

*Illocutionary act of stating*

Researcher (R) : Is there any misunderstanding that make you feel offended?

Participant (P) :

- No no no,

*Illocutionary act of claiming*

- it's good

*Illocutionary act of stating*

Researcher (R) : How you rate her English?

Participant (P) :

- Sorry?

*Illocutionary act of asking for repetition*

Researcher (R) : How do you rate her English? Is it good? Or is it like native?

Participant (P) :

- Oh no..

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- its like... from...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- how to say scale 0-10,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- let's say maybe 6

*Illocutionary act of judging*

Researcher (R) : How about the host dad?

Participant (P) :

- The host is great,

*Illocutionary act of complimenting*

- he speaks English very well

*Illocutionary act of complimenting*

- The host mom, is...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- she's also good

*Illocutionary act of adjudging*

- just sometimes makes mistakes in grammatical

*Illocutionary act of adjudging*

- ya she makes grammatically mistake

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ya well everyone has its our own language

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- but it's okay

*Illocutionary act of stating*

Researcher (R) : How about you? How do you rate your English?

Participant (P) :

- It's gonna hard

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- Well I think I speak well,

*Illocutionary act of conjecturing*

- I also make mistakes grammatically,

*Illocutionary act of admitting*

- but I think the point is

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I speak in

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- people can understand

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and then it's good,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and I can understand people

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- when they are talking

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and that's good,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- so I have no idea.

*Illocutionary act of concluding*

Researcher (R) : So you usually have no problem ?

Participant (P):

- No...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- we have no problem

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- although sometimes when I talk to them,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I mix the language... languages Dutch and English

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ya because...

- how to say...

- like...

- when they when I want to say garlic,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- at that time I forgot the English word

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- like I really have no,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- what's pops into my mind is the Dutch word like knoflook,

*Illocutionary act of recalling*

- ya right?

*Illocutionary act of asking for agreement*

- So I say

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- "ooh knoflook",

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- "ooh (host mom's name) do you need knoflook?"

*Illocutionary act of reporting*

- And then she was like

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- "ooh ya, knoflook",

*Illocutionary act of confirming*

- "wow you speak Dutch",

*Illocutionary act of expressing impressive*

- she was like...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ya because I forgot the English word

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- because you always say knoflook

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- that's why

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- there are some words just more comfortable for me to say in Dutch than in English

*Illocutionary act of expressing preference*

- because it takes time for me to...to find the word in English

*Illocutionary act of stating*

Researcher (R) : Do you think you have a good communication with the host family and have a good relationship with them?

Participant (P) :

- Hmm let's say...

*Illocutionary act of hesitating*

- ya let's say we speak...

*Illocutionary act of hesitating*

- we can communicate,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ya we are good ...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and about the relationship I think...

*Illocutionary act of considering*

- ya we are also have a good relation

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- but I think for my side,



*Illocutionary act of assuming*

- well I don't know from their side

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- what they think about me

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- but me I just don't like it

*Illocutionary act of abominating*

- when I don't have

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ...how to say

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ...holiday...national...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I have to work on those days

*Illocutionary act of lamenting*

- when my other friends who no need to work

*Illocutionary act of comparing*

- and when they ask me out, like

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- "Come on let's go..."

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- let's go to Keukenhof"

*Illocutionary act of being invited*

- and on the...national

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- or let's go somewhere to...

*Illocutionary act of being invited*

- "Let's say have some fun"

*Illocutionary act of expressing being invited*

- but I have to stay to work

*Illocutionary act of expressing being obliged*

- it's like

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- oh my God

*exclamation*

- it's really ya... disappointing,

*Illocutionary act of bemoaning*

- but ya so far they treat me well,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- also try to...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- to do my job ...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- proficiently I try to do my best

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- so I think

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- we are good except that part

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and the dog part,

*Illocutionary act of loathing*

- ya dog!

*Illocutionary act of execrating*

Researcher (R) : You don't really tell them if you dislike about something

Participant (P):

- If I don't...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- if I dislike?

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- Ya I didn't really tell them

*Illocutionary act of faltering*

Researcher (R) : Why?

Participant (P):

- Ya except.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- If I want have appointment.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- If I don't like...

*Illocutionary act of worrying*

- like ya I don't know

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I just feel not comfortable to tell them

*Illocutionary act of expressing discomfort*

- what I don't like.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

Researcher (R) : Because you are afraid of them? or because it's just like I should not tell them

Participant (P) :

- Because I think

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- it's still ...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- how to say...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- it's still accepted...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- okay let's say they...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I don't have the off days...

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- I also think like...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- because I am going back soon ...

*Illocutionary act of explaining*

- so I think it's no problem

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and I don't want to make the situation gets

*Illocutionary act of worrying*

- ...how to say...

*Illocutionary act of hesitating*

- gets awkward

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- because I think

*Illocutionary act of expressing opinion*

- they will also think,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- oh okay you also have to tell us earlier right.

*Illocutionary act of predicting*

- Ya it's because first I think

*Illocutionary act of assuming*

- it was my fault

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- that I didn't tell them about the...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I didn't ask questions about the ...

*Illocutionary act of regretting*

- if I will be off on nation...on public holidays...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- so I think it's my fault

*Illocutionary act of admitting*

- I should have asked ...

*Illocutionary act of regretting*

- when they interviewed me

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- before I came to the Netherlands,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- they asked

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- if I have questions,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- but at that time I really didn't think about it,

*Illocutionary act of regretting*

- so it's my fault,

*Illocutionary act of blaming herself*

- so I think I was too late to tell them

*Illocutionary act of regretting*

- besides in one month I am going back ...

*Illocutionary act of conveying info*

- so it's okay

*Illocutionary act of stating*

Researcher (R) : Did you read your contract carefully before you came here?

Participant (P):

- Ya ya, I did

*Illocutionary act of stating*

Researcher (R) : Did it mention about your holiday, your job?

Participant (P) :

- But they did not mention about...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- on the contract there is no...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- it's not stated explicitly ..

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- they didn't...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- there is no...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- it's nothing about the public holidays,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- all I know is

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I will have free days on the weekend and...

*Illocutionary act of understanding*

- I will have two weeks holiday,

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- that's it

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- Actually it's not really mentioned,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- but it's mentioned

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- that you will have days off on the weekend.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- Yes.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- It's says on Saturday Sunday I will be free,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- but in fact when I came there are...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- things are changed

*Illocutionary act of bemoaning*

- and I don't get it, only once a month

*Illocutionary act of lamenting*

Researcher (R) : But you are okay with that?

Participant (P):

- Ya what should I say...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- like I came and then...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- but they give me also off days on the weekdays,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- but I'm actually...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I'm not really okay

*Illocutionary act of deprecating*

- but well it's okay....
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- ya...cause I also free...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- to the... on the weekdays once a month from Friday to Sunday,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- so ya I think
- Illocutionary act of doubting*
- it's still accepted
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- Although I cannot complain
- Illocutionary act of lamenting*
- because like at first
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- when I got it
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- because they changed several times my schedule, my week, my days off.
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- First when I came,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- ya you are free from Saturday, only
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- ...they told me only...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- only...only Sunday I'm free
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- and then I was free on the..
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- ooh I forgot...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- oh Monday and weekdays some days on...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- other month Mondays Friday if I am not mistaken
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- I was free from certain time
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- and then once a month I got..
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- I had the long weekend, Saturday Sunday...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- it was the first.. the first month...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- the first two months
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- and then they changed again
- Illocutionary act of expressing annoyance*
- and they say oh ya
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- now because the host mom had to work at that time
- Illocutionary act of stating*

- she gave me a long weekend Saturday Sunday
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- but then it's only for two or three months
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- and after that she changed it again
- Illocutionary act of bemoaning*
- because she did not have any job anymore
- Illocutionary act of informing*
- so she spent more time with the kids,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- so she told me,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- “oh okay because I am mostly at home”,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- so ya they...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- she changed again my off days Tuesday and Thursday,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- I am free from two... 10 to 4,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- and then Saturday I'm free and once a month,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- I...have a long weekend Friday, Saturday, Sunday...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- so ya, she keeps changing it
- Illocutionary act of lamenting*

Researcher (R) : Have they ever been angry at you?

Participant (P) :

- ya ya, sure.
- Illocutionary act of affirming*
- When we went vacation,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- when I joined them,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- they invited me to go to Antalya ...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- and I was with...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- oh we were having lunch at that time, and near the swimming pool.
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- I ate...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- I finished ate my food first
- Illocutionary act of conveying information*
- because they told me that
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- “(the au pair's name) is good
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- if you finished your food first

*Illocutionary act of feeling obliged*

- and then so you can take care of the kid

*Illocutionary act of being commanded*

- while we are having our lunch”.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- So I was ya for me

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- it doesn't matter.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- So I finished my food

*Illocutionary act of feeling obliged*

- and then (the kid's name), the kid,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- he's like oh

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- “I wanna go to the swimming pool, I wanna go to the swimming pool”

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and they told me,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ya “(the au pair's name) you can bring him

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and play there” .

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- Okay I will just stay there

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and play with them....

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- play with him

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- but then I was staying there for like an hour,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- but I was a little bit worried

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- because oh why they did not turn up yet,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I was looking...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- where were they.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I was really afraid that they...

*Illocutionary act of worrying*

- maybe they came

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- because I haven't seen them

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and the kid say

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I want to ...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- oh no...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- he didn't say
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- I saw like..
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- he pooped in the swimming pool...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- oh my God
- Illocutionary act of panicking*
- he pooped!
- Illocutionary act of panicking*
- so I brought him to the toilet
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- and then I think at that time
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- I miss the...my host parents
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- I think at that time
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- when I was bring the kid to the toilet,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- then they came to look for us
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- while we were not there,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- so and then we came back
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- and then the kids swam again in the swimming pool...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- played in the swimming pool until for like 30 minutes
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- after that I realized
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- oh my God this is not right,
- Illocutionary act of panicking*
- where are they
- Illocutionary act of panicking*
- So suddenly ah I saw the host father came
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- but it was...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- when I saw him,
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- he looked very unhappy and angry ...
- Illocutionary act of frightening*
- and then he came to me and then ...
- Illocutionary act of stating*
- he's like "(the au pair's name) where have you been?"



*Illocutionary act of being investigated*

- You know we've...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I've been searching for you

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and the hotel and everywhere

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- but I couldn't find you.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- Where have you been?

*Illocutionary act of being investigated*

- Where did you go?"

*Illocutionary act of being investigated*

- I was like,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- oh my God

*Illocutionary act of panicking*

- "ooh I'm sorry

*Illocutionary act of regretting*

- I didn't mean it,

*Illocutionary act of regretting*

- but I brought (the kid's name) to the toilet

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and after that we played,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- we are here,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- we didn't move anywhere, just here",

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- so he was like, "(sigh)"

*Illocutionary act of being blamed*

- And then he hold the kid

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and then just carried the kid with him

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and I came after him,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and said

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I'm so scared

*Illocutionary act of expressing frightening*

- he was really angry

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and then my host mom also asked " why...why you didn't tell us like "

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ya I should have told ,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- but I was busy with the kid,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and then I put my bag there on the bench,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- so I didn't have

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I didn't think

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- it will happen to get to text them ,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ya that was also my fault

*Illocutionary act of admitting*

- then they got really angry

*Illocutionary act of stating*

Researcher (R) : And what did you say?

Participant (P) :

- Ya I said sorry.

*Illocutionary act of regretting*

- I am really sorry.

*Illocutionary act of regretting*

- I didn't mean to worry you guys

*Illocutionary act of apologizing*

- but the ya...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- then they like

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- that's okay

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- just don't do it anymore..

*Illocutionary act of being forgiven*

- ya okay

*Illocutionary act of being forgiven*

R Researcher (R) : Do they often angry at you? Or just once?

Participant (P) :

- No no, of course

*Illocutionary act of affirming*

- if I only make mistakes,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- they will say

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- why you did it,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- or ya

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- they will...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- they will tell me

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- why they don't like it

*Illocutionary act of being explained*

- and I would say sorry

*Illocutionary act of planning*

- I would not do that again

*Illocutionary act of promising*

Researcher (R) : How do you feel?

Participant (P) :

- but it's rare...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- that they get angry at me

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- only when it's related to the kid.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- Or when they didn't pick up the kid.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- While I was at the park,

*Illocutionary act of exemplifying*

- because I forgot

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- that I put it on the silent mode,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- so when they called me,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and we didn't pick up the phone.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- They like,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- "please pick up the phone..."

*Illocutionary act of being requested*

- please pick up the phone

*Illocutionary act of being requested*

- because it is very important,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- when you are with our kids,

*Illocutionary act of being commanded*

- then it is very important

*Illocutionary act of being commanded*

- that you pick up your phone."

*Illocutionary act of being commanded*

- Oh ya that's my mistake

*Illocutionary act of admitting*

Researcher (R) : so...that's the things that you have experienced so far...

Participant (P) :

- ya

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- We also have a great time together,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ya they invited me several times for holiday,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- ya together with them,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- it was also fun ya

*Illocutionary act of stating*

## Interview Transcription of Au Pair B

R (researcher) : Can you tell me about the moment you decided to become an au pair and how the process was?

P (Participant) :

- ?

*Illocutionary act of expressing confusion*

R (researcher) : Can you tell me about the moment you decided to become an au pair and how the process was?

P (Participant) :

- It's a long process

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- because I must wait two years for... for...hmm... to be an au pair

*Illocutionary act of informing*

R (researcher) : So how did you hear about the au pair program?

P (Participant) :

- I found the books about au pair

*Illocutionary act of informing*

R (researcher) : Okay so you found a book, and then?

P (Participant) :

- and then ya...I am interested to be an au pair

*Illocutionary act of asserting*

R (researcher) : What attracted you to the program specifically?  
Why you...why you are interested in to be an au pair after you were reading the book?

P (Participant) :

- I just...

*Illocutionary act of hesitating*

- I just think

*Illocutionary act of thinking*

- oh it's like

*Illocutionary act of assuming*

- it's interesting to be an au pair.

*Illocutionary act of expressing interest*

- I will have experience like that

*Illocutionary act of wishing*

R (researcher) : What kind of experience that you expect to be an au pair?

P (Participant) :

- Experience with children, how to can, how to babysit the children...only that

*Illocutionary act of wishing*

R (researcher) : Is there any other reasons besides taking care of kids that makes you want to be an au pair?

P (Participant) :

- Oh learn the language, and learn about the culture... in that country

*Illocutionary act of expressing interest*

R (researcher) : Why the Netherlands?

P (Participant) :

- Because ...because the family who asked me to be their au pair in Netherlands,

*Illocutionary act of reasoning*

- so I want.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- Because I don't have specific country

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- where I will go

*Illocutionary act of stating*

R (researcher) : So it is because the host family asked you to be their au pair. How do you know them?

P (Participant) :

- From agent

*Illocutionary act of informing*

R (researcher) : From agent. What you made you agree to be their au pair?

P (Participant) :

- Because we had skype before

*Illocutionary act of describing*

- and we chatted on Facebook

*Illocutionary act of describing*

- and our...we met our family. My family...

*Illocutionary act of describing*

- They saw my family

*Illocutionary act of describing*

- and skype

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and also asked me

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- so their family on skype

*Illocutionary act of stating*

R (researcher) : They saw your family and your family saw them. Ya and After that you decide to be... So what is actually the strong reason that ...I want to stay in the Netherlands and I want them to be my host parents?

P (Participant) :

- Because they are looking so friendly

*Illocutionary act of expressing being impressed*

- and I think

*Illocutionary act of showing opinion*

- we are matched each other

*Illocutionary act of expressing happiness*

R (researcher) : What did you expect from your host family before you arrived in the Netherlands?

P (Participant) :

- No

*Illocutionary act of affirming*

R (researcher) : Did you expect something from them? Like... Oh maybe I want to visit another country with my host parents or...

P (Participant) :

- No

*Illocutionary act of affirming*

- just let it go

*Illocutionary act of affirming*

R (researcher) : So you don't have any expectation. How is your relationship with your host family?

P (Participant) :

- It's nice,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- it's good

*Illocutionary act of stating*

R (researcher) : Can you describe how nice? Why you think they are?

P (Participant) :

- Because I feel like at home

*Illocutionary act of expressing satisfaction*

- so we are like a family, not au pair, not like boss,

*Illocutionary act of expressing bliss*

- and we are like a team,

*Illocutionary act of expressing delight*

- so we work together

*Illocutionary act of stating*

R (researcher) : How often do you talk to them?

P (Participant) :

- Every day ...every day every night

*Illocutionary act of reporting*

- because we like watching movie together

*Illocutionary act of expressing please*

- and we are watching

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- and talking about the day,

*Illocutionary act of expressing comfort*

- how was the day is...

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- like that

*Illocutionary act of informing*

R (researcher) : Do you talk to them in the morning? In the breakfast time?

P (Participant) :

- No,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- because no,

*Illocutionary act of emphasizing*

- we never have breakfast together,

*Illocutionary act of claiming*

- we just only have lunch together...

*Illocutionary act of claiming*

- eh no, dinner together

*Illocutionary act of correcting*

R (researcher) : You usually talk to them in the dinner time

P (Participant) :

- Dinner time?

*Illocutionary act of assuring*

- Ya sometime

*Illocutionary act of confirming*

- because at dinner time we ate at...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- we eat at living room

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- while watching movie

*Illocutionary act of informing*

R (researcher) : So you have conversation with them while you are watching movie and having dinner. Do you feel comfortable when you talk to them?

P (Participant) :

- Ya

*Illocutionary act of affirming*

- because

- ya

*Illocutionary act of affirming*

R (researcher) : Do you feel comfortable when they are home? Like for example, when you have days off, you decided to be home, do you feel awkward?

P (Participant) :

- Ya because because...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- hmmm when I have free day

*Illocutionary act of asserting*

- they did not really like it

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- if I working on free days,

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- so they let me to do everything

*Illocutionary act of expressing happiness*

- what I want

*Illocutionary act of expressing joy*

R (researcher) : So what do you like most from them?



P (Participant) :

- They are welcome

*Illocutionary act of hailing*

- and nice

*Illocutionary act of hailing*

- and lovely

*Illocutionary act of hailing*

R (researcher) : How nice are they? Can you give me example? Like what you have experienced so far that make you think that they are nice? Maybe they ever bought you something or...?

P (Participant) :

- Oh ya...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- They just like,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- if I want something

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- and I can't get it.

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- They will try to...

*Illocutionary act of asserting*

- They try to help me

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- to get that one

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- which I want.

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- Like...

*Illocutionary act of thinking*

- I want to go to Paris,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- but my dad forbid me,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- but...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- so they gave me a ticket to Paris as a my early ...kado for birthday

*Illocutionary act of feeling joy*

R (researcher) : Ohm...

P (Participant) :

- So they like...

*Illocutionary act of thinking*

- they are so happy

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I am happy

*Illocutionary act of stating*

R (researcher) : So they will be happy if you are also happy

P (Participant) :

- ya

*Illocutionary act of confirming*

R (researcher) : Is there any something that you dislike from them?

P (Participant) :

- No because...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- because their character a bit same like my family's character

*Illocutionary act of comparing*

R (researcher) : So you said in the beginning you don't expect anything from the beginning when you came here because you said you want to learn the language, the culture. Does it meet your expectation so far?

P (Participant) :

- huh

*pragmatic marker*

R (researcher) : Like you said you want to experience the culture, the language in the beginning when you decided to become an au pair. And now you have been here for four months. Does your experience so far meet what you expect in the beginning? I mean you have experienced all of the things that you have expected before?

P (Participant) :

- Because they teach me ...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- they teach me their culture a

*Illocutionary act of claiming*

- and they... and they teach me the language sometimes at home

*Illocutionary act of informing*

R (researcher) : What language do you use at home?

P (Participant) :

- Indonesian and English sometimes.

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- But normally Indonesian

*Illocutionary act of stating*

R (researcher) : Do you speak Indonesian to whom?

P (Participant) :

- To their son,

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- and host mom

*Illocutionary act of informing*

R (researcher) : So you speak Indonesian to the host mother. Do you also speak English to the member of the family?

P (Participant) :

- Ya, but sometimes

*Illocutionary act of clarifying*

R (researcher) : With whom do you speak English?

P (Participant) :  
● With their daughter and host dad

*Illocutionary act of stating*

R (researcher) : So you don't speak English to the host mom

P (Participant) :  
● Sometimes ...sometimes use English

*Illocutionary act of informing*

● but usually Indonesian

*Illocutionary act of informing*

R (researcher) : Do you often talk to the host dad?

P (Participant) :  
● No

*Illocutionary act of asserting*

R (researcher) : You use Indonesian language more than English at home

P (Participant) :  
● ya

*Illocutionary act of asserting*

R (researcher) : How do you feel then when you speak Indonesian or English to the host mother? Do you ever experience a misunderstanding?

P (Participant) :  
● ya lot

*Illocutionary act of asserting*

R (researcher) : Can you give me examples?

P (Participant) :  
● When she is at office,

*Illocutionary act of telling*

● and she texting me about something

*Illocutionary act of stating*

● and I answer her in Indonesian

*Illocutionary act of stating*

● so she is didn't understand

*Illocutionary act of stating*

● what about they are...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

● she's talking about

*Illocutionary act of stating*

● and she didn't understand about

*Illocutionary act of stating*

● what I am talking about ,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

● so ya...

*Illocutionary act of hesitating*

● so sometimes she must call me

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- and she must repeat

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- what she want

*Illocutionary act of informing*

R (researcher) : And then after she repeat what she said and then after that you both understand each other?

P (Participant) :

- Ya if I underst...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- if I did ...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- but she...like she wants

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- she will...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- okay that's good ...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- like that

*Illocutionary act of stating*

R (researcher) : How you experience the Dutch culture? Because you said you want experience the Dutch culture. Have you experienced it so far? So it doesn't meet your expectation?

P (Participant) :

- Not really (laughing)

*Illocutionary act of stating*

R (researcher) : You said you ever had misunderstanding when you talk in Bahasa in Indonesian language to the host mother

P (Participant) :

- hmm ya

*Illocutionary act of affirming*

- and sometimes when she talks to me in English or in Bahasa

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- because her Bahasa is good

*Illocutionary act of lauding*

- but not native

*Illocutionary act of informing*

R (researcher) : ya native. So when it's in Bahasa there is a misunderstanding?

P (Participant) :

- ya

*Illocutionary act of confirming*

R (researcher) : and when in English also?

P (Participant) :

- Ya, so sometimes I must write

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- what I want

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- or I open the Google. Google...Google translate or whatever

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- and she will told me...

*Illocutionary act of explaining*

- oh you mean like blablabla

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- and ya

*Illocutionary act of confirming*

- so that why we have conversation,

*Illocutionary act of explaining*

- they gave me...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- she gave me advice...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and ya...

*Illocutionary act of affirming*

- it will be better again

*Illocutionary act of stating*

R (researcher) : usually if there is a misunderstanding is it because you do not understand what she said or she does not understand what you said in Bahasa or in English?

P (Participant) :

- Usually I am not understand

*Illocutionary act of claiming*

R (researcher) : You don't understand what she says

P (Participant) :

- Ya but sometimes she doesn't understand

*Illocutionary act of confirming*

R (researcher) : Do you think you have a good communication and relationship with them?

P (Participant) :

- Ya because when I have mistake,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and they will give me a like a lesson

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- or they told...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- they gave me the...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- how I must say it...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- like that...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- that's...

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- I think

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- it is good for improvement my English

*Illocutionary act of expressing delight*

R (researcher) : Do you tell them if you dislike about something?

P (Participant) :

- No

*Illocutionary act of affirming*

R (researcher) : Why?

P (Participant) :

- No because I don't want to .....

*Illocutionary act of insisting*

- I don't want to talk about

*Illocutionary act of affirming*

- what I like

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and I don't like it

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- because if she likes...

*Illocutionary act of worrying*

- they like it

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and I don't like

*Illocutionary act of disagreeing*

- it's like....

*Illocutionary act of thinking*

- it's like hmm...

*Illocutionary act of thinking*

- so I always say

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- it ya

*Illocutionary act of affirming*

- I like it,

*Illocutionary act of agreeing*

- I like it

*Illocutionary act of agreeing*

R (researcher) : What's the best part of being an au pair?

P (Participant) :

- When I...

*Illocutionary act of thinking*

- their son of course,

*Illocutionary act of expressing joy*

- can taking care of their son,

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and when we have quality time

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- and sometimes there is a neighborhood

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- who came to my home

*Illocutionary act of stating*

- we have barbeque

*Illocutionary act of expressing bliss*

- or..ya chitchat

*Illocutionary act of stating*

R (researcher) : And how about the worst part?

P (Participant) :

- Huh?

*Pragmatic marker*

R (researcher) : The worst part?

P (Participant) :

- Worst?

*Illocutionary act of asking for repetition*

R (researcher) : Things that you dislike being an au pair?

P (Participant) :

- The routine

*Illocutionary act of claiming*

R (researcher) : The routine. Why?

P (Participant) :

- Because sometimes I feel boring about the routine

*Illocutionary act of affirming*

- and I feel boring

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- because I must do it every day

*Illocutionary act of Expressing disfavor*

- and there is no change, watching TV

*Illocutionary act of expressing boredom*

- and then go to the park
- and then sometimes boring

R (researcher) : What have changed you since you are here?

P (Participant) :

- huh

*pragmatic marker-asking for repetition*

R (researcher) : Do you think you have changed since you started your life as an au pair?

P (Participant) :

- Ya

*Illocutionary act of affirming*

R (researcher) : What is it?

P (Participant) :

- More...maybe more like independent than before

*Illocutionary act of expressing opinion*

- and my host mom said

*Illocutionary act of informing*

- I am more mature

*Illocutionary act of informing*

R (researcher) : Than like in the beginning?

P (Participant) :

- Ya

*Illocutionary act of asserting*



## Invitation Letter-Research Study

Dear Au pair,

My name is Jarret Geenen and I am an assistant professor in the department of English Language and Culture at Radboud University, Nijmegen. My graduate student, Maria Christiani, is conducting a research study as part of the requirements of her master degree. We are writing this letter to invite you participate in a study titled *The Use of the Politeness Strategies when Implicating a Third Person: A Case study of Indonesian Au Pairs in the Netherlands*.

Before you decide whether or not you would like to participate in this research study, it is important for you to understand why we are doing this research study and the details of your involvement should you decide to participate. Please take some time to read the enclosed information about the study and consider whether or not you would like to participate.

Your participation is completely voluntary and you would be able to withdraw at any time.

This study will contribute to generating deeper understandings about au pair perception and communicative situation affect utterances produced and politeness strategies used. The result of the study will be beneficial for the politeness strategies domain specifically but also au pairs' situation. Understanding the politeness strategies in implicating third person can help foster more effective communication.

The details about study specifics and your involvement in particular are detailed below.

**If you have any questions about the study, please feel free to contact us at:**

*Maria Christiani* (email: [mariachristiani@student.ru.nl](mailto:mariachristiani@student.ru.nl))

Project supervisor contact details:

*Dr. Jarret G. Geenen* (email: [j.geenen@let.ru.nl](mailto:j.geenen@let.ru.nl))

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Dr. Jarret G. Geenen

## **Participant Information Sheet**

**Title of the research study:** The Use of the Politeness Strategies when Implicating a Third Person: A Case study of Indonesian Au Pairs in the Netherlands.

### **Aim and procedure of the research study**

The study will investigate the host parents Indonesian au pairs relationship in the Netherlands in a semi-sociolinguistic interview. The research seeks to explain the politeness strategies used by the au pairs in implicating a third person addressee, host parents. This research involves interview and data collection in which the participants will be asked during interview. Participants will be asked to answer some questions during the interview, they are expected to go on expressing their opinions. Participation will include audio recording of one multi party semi-structured interview to be conducted at your convenience. A list of questions will be prepared for the interview for the data collection session. The results of this research study may be presented at scientific or professional meetings or published in scientific journals.

### **Risks and discomfort**

There are no foreseen discomforts or risks to participating in this research.

### **Confidentiality of the research data**

The data collection during this study will follow the ethical guidelines set by Radboud University and this includes participant confidentiality and anonymity. The data collected will be transcribed by the primary researcher alone and no other individuals will have access to the information. Participants may look over the transcriptions of the interactions at any time if they so choose. In addition, fictitious name will be used in a place of your name in all publications. Finally, all information provided will be kept completely confidential.

### **Data storage**

Research data e.g. interview recordings, questionnaires, transcripts, coded/analyzed data will be stored in a secure institutional setting with restricted access. It will be locked in a filing cabinet by the primary investigator for a duration of 3 years. Following this period, the data will be destroyed in a secure manner.

### **Voluntariness**

Your participation is completely voluntarily. You can withdraw your participation at any time during the research without penalty or loss of benefits which you are otherwise entitled. As participants, you have complete control over data collection. This is prioritized in this type of research and is seen as a methodological advantage.

### **Compensation**

While we are not in a position to provide monetary compensation, the potential benefits to you and your family and the community at large could be seen as compensatory in itself.