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Cross Cultural Pragmatics and Politeness Strategies in Arabic and English:

A Case Study of Secondary Schools, El Hassahiesa Locality, Gezira State, Sudan (2017)

AbuBakr Fadlalla Ahmed Ali

Abstract

Pragmatics and politeness strategies are differ cross-culturally. Every language offers different terms to refer to cultural-specific concepts of politeness. This study aims at delimiting politeness behaviours a cross-culturally, investigating factors influencing politeness in Arabic and English, explaining cultural differences in politeness behavior between Arabic and English languages and showing request strategies that emerge in Arabic and English. The study adapts the descriptive analytical method. The data were collected by means of a questionnaire from (50) teachers of secondary level, then it were analyzed by the (SPSS) program. After analyzing the data, the study has received the following results: EFL learners need to develop awareness about cultural aspects of the target language, being polite helps in showing respect in an interactional act, it is important to keep a positive face when addressing people, it is crucial for the translator from a language into other one to recognize the motive that led the speaker to be polite, classroom discourse reflects social nature and culture, positive politeness is to show solidarity and it is directed to the positive face of the addressee. EFL learners should develop awareness about cultural aspects of the target language, the use of address forms expresses the functional part of language and socio-cultural context influences what to say and how to say it, classroom discourse reflects social nature and culture, Positive politeness is to show solidarity and it is directed to the positive face of the addressee. The study recommended: EFL learners should learn how to keep a positive face when addressing people, communication should be done through positive face in EFL teaching and learning, classroom discourse should reflect social nature and culture, EFL learners should avoid negative face practice, terms of address should be used according to people status, class rank or position in a particular community or society and a suitable form of address should be used for people in social interaction.
استراتيجيات التأدب اللغوي والبراغماتي في العرض الكلامي عبر ثقافات المقارنة بين اللغة العربية والإنجليزية:
دراسة حالة المدارس الثانوية، محلية الحصاحيصا، ولاية الجزيرة، السودان (2017)

أبو بكر فضل الله أحمد علي

ملخص الدراسة

استراتيجيات التأدب اللغوي والبراغماتي في العرض الكلامي في العالم الكلامي يختلف باختلاف ثقافات اللغة، أي لغة بها مفردات تعبر عن تأدب معين لفواجيم ثقافية تخص ذلك المجتمع. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تحديد سلوكيات التأدب عبر ثقافات المجتمع، تقسيم العوامل التي تؤثر في سلوكيات التأدب في اللغة العربية والإنجليزية، وتوضيح الاختلافات في سلوكيات التأدب بين اللغة العربية والإنجليزية. استخدمت الدراسة التحليل الوصفي كمنهج عام في هذه الدراسة كما استخدمت نظام الاستبانة لجمع المعلومات، وتم توزيع البيانات على (50) معلم من معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية بمحلية الحصاحيصا ولاية الجزيرة السودان. تم تحليل الاستبانة إحصائياً بواسطة برنامج الحزم الإحصائية للعلوم الاجتماعية (SPSS). وبعد تحليل الاستبانة توصلت الدراسة إلى العديد من النتائج وكانت نتائج تحليل كالآتي: أن الطلاب يحتاجون إلى تطوير الوعي بمفاهيم ثقافية تشمل ثقافة اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، عملية التأدب تؤدي إلى عرض الاحترام في عملية التواصل بين طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية داخل الفصول، من المهم أن تختار الناس باحترام لكي يعكس ثقافة اللغة، على المترجم أن يراعي الدوافع التي جعلت المتحدث المتحدث مودباً، ومخاطبة الطلاب داخل الفصول تعكس تفاعل المجتمع وثقافته، الخطاب المنCRET يمكن تعاطي المجتمع وأدب المتحدث في اللغة، يحتاج طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية إلى تطوير الوعي بأدب المخاطبة في اللغة الأجنبية، أشكال الخطاب يجب تعبيرها بطرق ثقافية وملائمة، يجب طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية يكون مخاطبهم جيدًا، عبارة عن تفاعل المجتمع تؤثر على المخاطبة وكيفية أدائها للمجتمع، لغة التخاطب داخل الفصل تعكس ثقافة الطلاب وطابع المجتمع، التدرب الإيجابي يظهر تصور الترابط بين أفراد المجتمع ويدفع به الوجه الجيد للمخاطب على ضوء هذه النتائج أوصت الدراسة بالآتي: يجب على طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية تعلم ثقافة وأدب المخاطبة، يجب أن يؤدي التواصل الصفيي الدياسي بين طلاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية بثقافة جيدة توضح ثقافة اللغة، الخطاب الصفيي يجب أن يعكس طبيعة وثقافة المجتمع، على الطلاب تجنب ممارسات الخطاب السلبي في استخدام اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، مصطلحات الخطاب يجب أن تتضمن منزلة المخاطب في التفاعل بين الناس، يجب استخدام المصطلحات التي تناسب المجتمع.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background

Cross cultural pragmatics is a sub discipline of pragmatics that closely follows the original thought of ordinary language philosophy. Austin's, Searle's and Grice's contributions to the development of the field of pragmatics are also central to the politeness theories on which most research conducted to cross cultural pragmatics is based. People of different languages and cultures may have access to the same range of speech acts and realization strategies, yet, they can differ in the strategies they choose (Wolfson 1989). The notions of politeness and the degree of politeness also differ cross-culturally and thus the different perceptions on politeness may lead to misunderstandings and conflicts in international communication.

Moreover, every language offers different terms or lexemes to refer to polite behavior which help us understand culture-specific concepts of politeness, it is important to shed light on the semantic meanings of the word 'politeness in Arabic as compared to English. According to Austin's (1962) speech act, utterances of language are not simply information, but rather equivalent to actions. Searle (1969) asserts that, all speech acts such as requests are meaningful and that they are rule-governed. For that reason, in interactions, participants ought to be aware of their actions and thus consider what named 'face', defined as the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact and that face can be lost, maintained or enhanced during interactions with others.

Brown (1987) asserts that, face is a set of wants, roughly "they want to be unimpeded" and a person's desire to act without imposition, and "the want to be approved in certain respect". In everyday communications, there are considerably a very large number of acts such as requests. Threatening Acts (FTAs) are acts that violate the hearers' need to maintain his/her self steam, and be respected.

Requests are FTAs because the speaker (S) is impeding on hearer(H) by asking H not to do what S wants, but rather to do what S wants Fasold, (1990). Therefore, people do face work in order to offset FTAs Brown and Levinson (1978) identified five types of
politeness strategies that people resort to in their politeness behavior to manage face: Act baldly, Going off-record-indirect, Do not perform the act, Positive politeness, Negative politeness. People vary their request strategies based on three factors: the social distance of speaker and hearer, the relative power between them, and the absolute ranking of impositions in the particular culture.

Requests are directly related to 'politeness' since people use polite behavior to minimize the potential threat of a person’s face. Thus, people vary their request from being the most direct to the most indirect depending on different socio-cultural factors such as power and social distance between interlocutors, rate of imposition, context, sex, age, etc. This study attempts to show the differences in speech acts and politeness and cross cultural pragmatics in Arabic and English.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

The notions of politeness and the degree of politeness differ cross-culturally and thus the different perceptions on politeness may lead to misunderstandings and conflicts for EFL learners. So EFL learners need to be effective communicators in EFL settings, they are required to be aware of these of the convention required in these contexts for more appropriate language. This study tries to explain the polite behavior which helps EFL learners understand culture-specific concepts of politeness in Arabic and English.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

This study aims to:

a. Resort different politeness behaviors cross-culturally
b. Investigate factors influencing politeness in Arabic and English
c. Explain cultural differences in politeness behavior between Arabic and English languages.
d. Show request strategies that emerge in Arabic and English.

1.3 Research Questions

The study tries to answer the following questions:
a. To what extent does showing politeness vary cross-culturally?
b. How do social factors affect the choice of request strategies in Arabic and English?
c. What are the differences in politeness behavior between Arabic and English languages?
d. What are the request strategies that used in Arabic and English?

1.4 Hypotheses of the Study

The study suggests the following hypotheses

a. Showing politeness cross-culturally.
b. Power, distance and weight of imposition are factors influencing politeness in Arabic and English.
c. There are cultural differences in politeness behavior between Arabic and English languages.
d. Request strategies that emerge in Arabic and English are differs.

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study explains the polite behavior which helps EFL learners understand culture-specific concepts of politeness in Arabic and English. It helps EFL learners understand culture-specific concepts of politeness; it sheds light on the semantic meanings of the word politeness in Arabic as compared to English.

1.6 Research Methodology

The study will use the descriptive analytical method. The questionnaire is used as a tool to collect the data from the EFL teachers at secondary level. Then it will be analyzed statistically by the SPSS Program.

1.7 Delimitation of the Study

This study is limited to cross cultural pragmatics and politeness strategies in Arabic and English. Secondary school level, Hassahiesa locality, Gezira state, Sudan.
1.8 Definitions of Terms and Abbreviations

Politeness: Showing respect to others in an interactional act

Inter-Language: The study of non-native speakers language.

Pragmatic: Is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker or writer and interpreted by a listener or a reader

FTA: Face-threatening Acts

IDS: Infant-directed speech
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter investigates the differences in politeness in expressions and attitudes between Arabic and English languages. It also shows some types of politeness as positive and negative. The chapter also shows cultural behaviours as requests, apology, greeting, welcoming and home selection. It also casts light on considerable items related to politeness differences.

2.1 Pragmatics

Compared with other branches of linguistics, pragmatics has only recently come on to the linguistic map. It nevertheless became a significant factor in linguistic thinking in the 1970's. Since then, pragmatics has developed as an important field of research. Pragmatics may be roughly described as "the study of the meaning of linguistic utterances for their users and interpreters" (Leech, and Thomas, 1985).

Thus, at the boundary of linguistics and philosophy, the study of speech acts, implicatures and conversational postulates Searle, (1969) for the first time not only emphasized the role of social action in language use, but also accounted for the (formal) contextual conditions of the appropriateness of utterances, as one of the characteristics of the new cross-discipline of pragmatics (vanDijk, 2008).

Moreover, van Dijk (2008), in his attempt to distinguish pragmatics from semantics states that “a pragmatic account is not about reference(extension, truth, etc.) but about the appropriateness of the use of such and other expressions in the current communicative situation” (van Dijk’s emphasis). Pragmatics distinguishes two intents or meanings in each utterance or communicative act of verbal communication. One is the informative intent to the sentence meaning, and the other the communicative intent or speaker meaning (Leech,1983; Sperber and Wilson, 1986). Thus, pragmatics is a study which explains language use in context. It is concerned with speaker meaning and not utterance meaning and seeks to explain social language interactions. Modern linguistics has been referred to as
the study of language as a system of human communication. In this tradition, pragmatics has come to be applied to the study of language from the point of view of its users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction, and the effects their use of language may have on other participants in an act of communication.

According to Levinson (1983), pragmatics is the study of "ability of language users to pair sentences in the contexts in which they would be appropriate". In fact, the focus of pragmatics has been on an area between semantics, sociolinguistics, and extralinguistic context. The boundaries between pragmatics and other areas have not been determined precisely (Leech, 1983 and Wierzbicka, 1991).

Pragmatics, however, has not been without its own discrepancies. To resolve some of its oddities, several derivative terms have been proposed for the classification of the wide range of subject matters involved in pragmatics. Leech (1983) draws on the term "pragma-linguistics" to refer to the study of "the more linguistic end of pragmatics where we consider the particular resources which a given language provides for conveying particular illocutions (namely, the speech act performed by an utterance)". In fact, pragmatics is often divided into two components: pragmalinguistics, which concerns appropriateness of form, and sociopragmatics, which concerns appropriateness of meaning in social context (Leech, 1983).

Pragmatic competence is the speaker’s knowledge and use of rules of appropriateness and politeness which dictate the way the speaker will understand and formulate speech acts. Speech acts are one of the key areas of linguistic pragmatics. Specific speech acts include apology, complaint, invitation, compliment, refusal, request, and suggestion. Leech (1983) uses the term sociopragmatics to refer to the "sociological interface of pragmatics." In other words, sociopragmatics is the study of the way in which conditions on language use derive from the social situation. In his treatment of the "register" of pragmatics, Leech uses the term "general pragmatics" to refer to the so-called, and to exclude more specific 'local' conditions on language use". Along the same lines, Crystal (1992) speaks of "applied pragmatics" as the study of "verbal interaction in such domains as counseling, medical interviews, judicial sessions, where problems of communication are of critical importance".
Crystal (1992) refers to "literary pragmatics" as the study of the relationship of "production and reception of literary texts to their use of linguistic forms". This area of research usually involves an interaction between linguistics, literary theory, and the philosophy of language. According to Shammas (2005)

“The pragmatic force of an utterance will be dependent on several factors, the most important of which will be the relation of the pragmatic components to one another, their relations to context and the freedom of linguistic choice available to the communicator”.

Moreover, Martinez-Flor and Uso-Juan (2006) Pishghadam and Sharafadini (2011) and Naiditch (2011) regarded pragmatics as a linguistic concept related to language use which involves speakers’ intentions while communicating utterances in particular contexts and considered the notion of pragmatics as a reaction to Chomsky’s abstract construct of language in which grammar played a predominant role. In brief, most linguists seem to agree that pragmatics is the study of language from the point of view of the users, especially of the choice they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction, and the effects their use of language has on the other participants in the act of communication. In other words, pragmatics includes the study of:

i. how the interpretation and use of utterances depends on knowledge of real world;
ii. how the relationship between the speaker and the hearer influences the structure of sentences and;
iii. how speech acts are used and understood by speakers.

2.1.1 Pragmatic Competence

Al-Erayani (2007) recognized that the learners’ ability to use appropriate speech acts in a given speech act event and to use appropriate linguistic forms to realize this speech act is a main component of pragmatic competence. In fact, pragmatic competence is an important component of communicative competence (Lihui and Jianbin, 2010). As Kasper (2001) states, pragmatic competence refers to the acquisition of pragmatic knowledge and to gaining automatic control in processing it in real time. Pragmatic knowledge of appropriateness reflects two major concepts: sociopragmatic (i.e. evaluation of contextual factors) and pragmalinguistic (i.e. linguistic resources available to perform language functions) (Kasper, 1992; Leech, 1983).
Fraser (1983, p. 29, as cited in Allami and Naeimi, 2010) defines pragmatic competence as “the knowledge how an addressee determines what a speaker is saying and recognizes intended illocutionary force conveyed through subtle attitudes in the speaker’s utterance”. In Bachman’s model (1990), language competence is divided into two areas as consisting of “organizational competence” and “pragmatic competence”. Organizational competence consists of knowledge of linguistic units and the rules of joining them together at the level of sentence (‘grammatical competence’) and discourse (‘textual competence’). Pragmatic competence subdivides into “illocutionary competence” and “sociolinguistic competence”. Illocutionary competence is the knowledge of communicative action and how to carry it out. “Sociolinguistic competence” is the ability to use language appropriately according to the context.

Fraser, et al. (1980:76) define pragmatic competence as “the knowledge of how to use the linguistic competence in a social context”. This definition should be seen in light of the fact that “a grammar is a system of rules that characterizes the sentences of a language, not the rules for use of the sentences” (ibid:76). They then (ibid.:77) sum up the situation by stating that whereas linguistic competence can be viewed as the knowledge required to construct or understand well-formed sentences of the language, pragmatic competence can be viewed as the knowledge required to determine what such sentences mean when spoken in a certain way in a particular context. To sum up, we should bear in mind that pragmatic competence deals with the utterance level, while the more general level of communicative competence embodies some other areas (e.g. conversation structure, and participants’ choices of language structures) as well as the relevant nonverbal aspects of language use.

### 2.2 Teaching Pragmatics to EFL Learners

In exploring the teaching of pragmatic to EFL learners, pragmatic transfer is probed into to discuss the development of L2 learners’ knowledge of the target language at a pragmatic level. Kasper (1996, as cited in Jiang, 2006) states learners’ lack of appropriate pragmatic competence can be attributed to the insufficient input supplied by pedagogical materials. As Scotton and Bernsten (1988, as cited in Jiang, 2006) indicate there is inconsistency between real life language and textbook language.
2.2.1 Pragmatic Transfer

Pragmatic transfer, by definition, refers to “the influence exerted by learners’ pragmatic knowledge of language and culture other than L2 on their comprehension, production and learning of L2 pragmatic information”. Kasper (1992) follows Leech’s (1983) division of pragmatics to propose pragmalinguistic transfer and sociopragmatic transfer. The former concerns the transfer of learner’s choice of language resources which are given to convey certain illocutions. On the other hand, the latter deals with a language user’s interpretation and performance of the linguistic behavior which is influenced by the gap between L1 and L2 contexts, subjectively assessed by the language user. Pragmatic transfer is divided into positive and negative transfer (Kasper, 1992 and Pishghadam and Sharafadini, 2011). When L1 and L2 share the same language- or culture- specific conventions of usage and use, positive pragmatic transfer occurs. However, negative pragmatic transfer occurs “when a pragmatic feature in the interlanguage is (structurally, functionally, distributionally) the same as in L1 but different from L2” Kasper, (1998), which results in pragmatic failure proposed by Thomas (1983).

According to Naiditch (2011), some scholars argue that pragmatic transfer is related to the learner’s personality Littlewood, (1983), to issues of conventional usage, the interactional dimensions of a conversation (Richards and Sukwiwat, 1983), and even to discourse rules (Blum-Kulka, 1996). Conversational routines do have a specifically ocutionary force and their use reveals social competence in a language. Yet the problem for L2 learners is that these routines are usually acquired before their function is fully understood. Because of differences between the form and function of routines in the learner’s native language (L1) and L2, there is a strong possibility of negative language transfer, especially in areas where there is no L1–L2 correspondence. Such correspondence is often lacking, not only because of differences in social situations but also because of differences in routines when situations appear similar. For example, the meaning of the phrase “I’d like to have lunch with you sometime” varies from language to language in terms of time, intention, and sincerity Naiditch,( 2011).

The response to this statement will vary according to its interpretation as a real or phatic invitation. Here, conversational discourse reflects relationships and interactions between participants, marking dimensions of social distance, status, and politeness (Blum-
Kulka, 1987). Pragmatic transfer explores how linguistic conventions for marking these dimensions affect the interlanguage of L2 learners, who may operate according to L1 interactional patterns.

2.2.2 Pragmatic Failure

2.2.2.1 Definitions of Pragmatic Failure

Many researchers in the area of second language acquisition (SLA) and sociolinguistics have claimed that in order to acquire native-like competence, language learners should acquire the rules of language use and ways of speaking as well as linguistic competence (Wolfson, 1983). Research studies of ten revealed that although second language learners have already acquired an advanced level of grammatical competence, their inappropriate uses of language in context of ten result in interpersonal communication breakdowns. This kind of failure is called pragmatic failure. Pragmatic failure is the term for the learner attempting to encode and transmit a particular intention unsuccessfully. Pragmalinguistic decisions involve word choice "linguistic strategies for implementing speech intentions," while sociopragmatics involves "appropriate language use, social rules for 'what to do, when, and to whom'" Roever, (2006).

Therefore, pragmatic failure (also referred to as pragmatic error)(Richards, Platt, and Platt,( 1992) refers to the speaker's production of wrong communicative effects through the faulty use of speech acts or one of the rules of speaking. Thomas (1983) defines pragmatic failure in Cross-cultural Pragmatic Failure (my emphasis) as “the inability to understand what is meant by what is said”. She points out that pragmatic failure has occurred on any occasion “On which (the hearer)perceives the force of S’s (the speaker’s) utterance as other than S intended she or he should perceive it” (Thomas, 1983). The following examples are used by Thomas to illustrate her definition:

a) H perceives the force of S’s utterance stronger or weaker than S intended s/he should perceive it;

b) H perceives as an order an utterance that S intended s/he should perceive as a request;

c) H perceives S’s utterance as ambivalent where S intended no ambivalence;
d) S expects H to be able to infer the force of his/her utterance, but is relying on the
system of knowledge or beliefs that S and H do not share.” (1983)

Lihui and and Jianbin (2010) point out that pragmatic failure refers to failure to
achieve the desired communicative effect in communication. He Ziran (1997) further
indicates that “Pragmatic failures are not the errors in diction, but those mistakes failing to
fulfill communication because of infelicitous style, incompatible expressions, and improper
habit”. Qian Guanlian (2002) defines pragmatic failure in a more specific way pointing out
that “Pragmatic failure is committed when the speaker uses grammatically correct sentences,
but unconsciously violates the interpersonal relationship rules, social conventions, or takes
little notice of time, space and addressee”.

2.2.2.2 Classification of Pragmatic Failure

Particularly interesting about Thomas's description of pragmatic failure is the
dichotomy between two types of pragmatic failure. She makes this distinction on the basis of
the difficulty of analysis and possible remedies in terms of both the responsibility of
language teachers and the responses of language learners. She calls the two categories of
failure "pragmalinguistic" and "sociopragmatic" failure.

2.2.2.3 Pragmalinguistic Failure

Thomas (1983) points out that “pragmalinguistic failure occurs when the pragmatic
force mapped by the speaker onto a given utterance is systematically different from most
frequently assigned to it by native speakers of the target language, or when conversational
strategies are inappropriately transferred from the speaker’s mother tongue to the target
language”. In fact, she refrains from using the term pragmalinguistic error because, to her,
pragmatics is not strictly formalizable. The term error, therefore, does not seem applicable
here. In other words, although grammar can be judged according to prescriptive rules, the
nature of pragmatic or sociopragmatic patterns is such that it is not possible to say that "the
pragmatic force of an utterance is wrong. All we can say is that it failed to achieve the

The learners, however, fail to get their meaning across because the communicative
conventions behind the utterances used are different. This, as Thomas points out, is more a
linguistic, hence pragmalinguistic, problem than a pragmatic one because:
i. it has little to do with speaker's perception of what constitutes appropriate behavior; and;

ii. it has a great deal to do with knowing how to phrase a request, for instance, so that it will be interpreted as a request rather than as an information question. For example, at pragmalinguistic level, “Would you like to read?” is conventionalized as a polite request or directive in the American culture; however, Russians tens to respond “No, I wouldn’t” by regarding it as a real question (Thomas, 1983). Thomas (1983:101-103) also identified two sources of pragmalinguistic failure. The first one is “teaching-induced errors”. It refers to the errors resulting from the teacher’s explicit statement of wrong input or the teacher’s unconsciously omitting of particular input. The other source is “pragmalinguistic transfer”, which occurs when learners inappropriately transfer speech act strategies from L1 to L2. In terms of teaching-induced errors, Kasper (1982) proposes that foreign language teaching itself may cause failures by directly providing the inputs deviating from the language norms from, namely, “primary teaching induction”, or by indirectly involving students in a psycholinguistic process to yield specific interlanguage rules resulting from the way they practice or the input in them aterials in the classrooms, namely, “secondary teaching induction. Moreover, Kasper (1996) thinks that it is the incomplete input of the target language given by the teacher that results in students’ inability to be native-like in pragmatic behavior. These two sources possibly lead to pragmatic overgeneralization. For example, Russian speakers appear to use “to be to” on any occasion to express obligation in English; however, “to be to” is pragmatically restricted to be used by people of higher status.

2.2.2.4 Sociopragmatic Failure

The second type of "pragmatic failure" that Thomas identifies is what she calls "sociopragmatic failure". It has to do with knowing "what to say" and "whom to say it to". Many of the misunderstandings that occur stem from what Thomas identifies as differences in evaluation regarding what she terms "size of imposition," "tabus", "cross culturally different assessments of relative power or social distance", and "value judgments". Thomas provides a useful way of looking at the type of diversity which exists across cultures and which often leads to cross-cultural problems. In doing so, she separates out what she sees as major areas in which there exist differences in cultural rules regarding speech behavior. In Beebe, Takahashi and Uliss-Weltz’s (1990) study on refusal, Japanese learners of English
choose different excuses to refuse suggestions by interlocutors of higher ranking status or lower ranking status. However, for American native speakers, the standard of excuse selection is based status, i.e., the interlocutors being equal or unequal. That is, the excuses made by Japanese learners of English at the sociopragmatic level are negatively transferred from Japanese culture to American contexts. To repeat, communication needs far more than just a set of linguistic rules. Both pragmalinguistic knowledge and sociopragmatic knowledge are necessary to determine the appropriateness of a verbal behavior.

Therefore, sociopragmatic failure results from different cultural norms and pragmatic principles that govern linguistic behaviors in different cultures. Since speakers with different cultural backgrounds have different understandings of the appropriateness of linguistic behavior, there may be barriers to effective communication. As Thomas (1983) points out, different cultures have different ways of thinking, rules of speaking, social values and place different relative weights on the pragmatic principles, and these cross-culturally different assessments of social parameters have negatively affected language users’ linguistic choices, which finally result in sociopragmatic failure.

Moreover, according to Naiditch (2011), pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic failure are crucial to understanding a learner’s language use for two main reasons: First, because when using language, learners show their knowledge of grammar as well as their own belief systems (both about the language and about the world); Second, because the only way to interpret a speaker’s intended meaning is to consider it from its linguistic and contextual aspects. Separating linguistic issues from appropriate sociolinguistic behavior is ill advised because these two areas are clarifying and useful for researchers’ descriptions of interlanguage. Indeed, understanding how pragmatics influences behavior in other cultures is the first step toward eliminating stereotypes and improving L2 pragmatic performance.

2.3 Definition of Politeness

Politeness is regarded as a restraint apart from being a means to an end, some kind of social norm imposed by the conventions of the community of which we are members. For instance, to offer your seat to the elderly on a bus is considered polite behavior, and to interrupt when someone is talking is considered impolite behavior; to greet to someone at the first time when you meet in the morning is polite and to stand up to reach for the dish
you want at a dinner table is impolite. So first of all, politeness can conceived as an observable and social phenomenon. Then, in terms of a means-and-end analysis, politeness is readily understood by means. We well know that in being polite we have an end to achieve. The most common example is that whenever we want someone to do us a favor we have to make the request in a polite manner. We say “hello! ”, to someone, or to shake hands with him, or send him a card on the occasion of Spring festival, or to give him a birthday gift or pathim on the shoulder—all this we do in order to show our good feelings, our friendliness, our intention to maintain harmonious relationships with him.

2.4 Politeness Theory

Speech act theory, as it appears, is based on the assumption that language is a form of behavior. Austin (1962) defined speech acts as the actions performed in saying something. Searle (1969), on the other hand, defined a speech act as the minimal unit of linguistic communication. It is an utterance that serves a particular function in communication. The theory of speech acts attempts to explain how utterances of the speaker are related to the surrounding world. According to Searle (1969), utterances involve the simultaneous performance of multiple acts.

Sugawara (2009) disputes Austin’s, Searle’s and many others’ view which reduces each speech turn to a definite or simple illocutionary act in isolated turns, not in on-going discourse. Sugawara’s analysis reveals the complex nature of illocutionary force exerted in the negotiation. Sugawara states that a speech act is the composite of various indirect acts such as reporting the circumstances of the speaker, predicting an undesirable course of events, guessing the hearer’s inner state, and so on. Thus, a move can be composed of two or more speech acts; there cannot be a finite number of rules that govern the infinite number of combinations or sequences of different acts. Leech, (1983:94) claims that

“Speech acts in effect operate by universal principles of pragmatics, according to which communicative interaction between speaker and addressee is governed by some general mechanisms such as principles of cooperation”.

Yu (2003) contrasts the different views about the issue of universality versus culture-specificity. One of these views suggests that the strategies for realizing specific linguistic behavior are essentially identical across different cultures and languages, though the
appropriate use of any given strategy may not be exactly the same across speech communities. By contrast, other theorists (as cited in Yu, 2003) maintain that speech acts actually vary in both conceptualization and realization across languages and cultures, and that the difference in their performance is mainly motivated by differences in cultural conventions and assumptions. The study of politeness is usually in accompaniment with speech acts (O’Driscoll,).

Politeness has been considered as socio-culturally appropriate behavior. It is characterized as a matter of abiding by the expectations of society (Yu, 2003). It is used to refer to behavior which actively expresses positive concern for others, as well as non-imposing distancing behavior. Politeness is the form of an expression of good-will as well as camaraderie, and non-intrusive behavior (Holmes, 1995). Politeness also refers to the choices that are made in language use during interaction Cutting, (2002); Yu,( 2003). It has been defined as the linguistic encoding of social relations that individuals establish in interaction; these reflect participants’ socio-cognitive perceptions and expectations (Bandl, 1987).

Politeness is always context-dependent Holmes,( 1995). If a mother says to her son “open the door,” this does not mean that she is impolite. Similarly, “You must have a cup of coffee with me tomorrow” is polite if used with a close friend but may sound rude if used with a superior at work.

Locher (2006) and Watts (2003) have developed the discursive approach to politeness. They stress that there is an ongoing struggle over forms of appropriateness in any given group of people. Accordingly, they reject classifying utterances as polite or impolite. Watts (2003) claims that no linguistic structure is inherently polite. In this sense, he makes a distinction between politics and polite behavior. To Watts, politic behavior is ritualized; it is socio-culturally determined, directed towards the goal of establishing and/or maintaining a state of equilibrium in the personal relationships between the individuals of a social group. In this sense, Watts elaborates that some utterances do not in themselves denote politeness but are ritualized by the society to abide by the rules of appropriateness of this society. Some utterances are formulaic such as using pleaseand thank you and some are less semi-formulaic such as Would you like X?
Politeness or polite behavior to Watts, on the other hand, is when the utterance goes beyond what is considered appropriately politic at the moment of utterance in the verbal interaction Positive politeness apology strategies.

2.4.1 Definition

The strategies constitute indirect realisations of the speech act of a polologising since their apologetic function is context-dependent and they are not applicable to all offensive situations. Whereas offer of repair and promise of forbearance belong to the speech act set suggested by Olshtain and Cohen (1981 and 1983), the status of concern for hearer is controversial, with some researcher treating it as an apology strategy e.g. Bielski (1992), Frescura (1993) and others as a form of external intensification (e.g. CCSARP 1989).

What all three strategies have in common is that they exhibit a stronger orientation towards positive face than IFIDs and accounts. Incidentally, they all appear in Brown and Levinson’s chart of positive politeness strategies as “offer”, “promise”, and “attend to H”, respectively (1987). Since positive face needs tend to be mutual, strategies oriented towards the hearer’s positive face are generally also beneficial to the speaker’s positive face. The strategy concern for hearer classifies as a positive politeness strategy because it attends to the victim’s needs, which have been negatively affected by the offence. At the same time, an offender showing concern for the hearer avoids damage to his or her own self-image. Offer of repair and promise of forbearance are directed to both interlocutors’ positive face as they emphasise the speaker’s interest in maintaining the relationship. While the former has the function of restoring the equilibrium by repairing the damage in a more than verbal way, the latter is used to ascertain the smooth functioning of the relationship in the future. Since offers of repair and promises of forbearance fall into Searle’s category of commissives, they entail a future commitment on the part of the speaker and, therefore, additional threat to negative face.

2.4.2 The Necessity to be Polite

In general, we act politely in order to show our wishes to start a friendly relation with someone, or to maintain it if it is already existing, or to mend it if it is being threatened for some reasons. To maintain the kind of smooth, harmonious interpersonal relationships, politeness serves as a ready means.
2.4.3 Positive Politeness Strategy

Positive Politeness Strategy is used when the speaker attempts to minimize the threat to the hearer’s positive face by finding an agreement or giving compliments to the listener so that he/she feels good about himself/herself. This strategy is mostly used in situations where they both know each other fairly well. The friendliness in the relationship and the desire to be respected is recognized. For instance, “How about shutting the door for us?.

2.4.4 Negative Politeness Strategy

Negative Politeness Strategy is used when the speaker wants to protect the hearer’s negative face by performing indirect acts to minimize the imposition of the request on the hearer. This strategy is similar to Positive Politeness in that it is mostly used in situations where the speaker recognizes the friendliness and the desire to be respected by the hearer. However, the speaker assumes that he/she is in some way imposing on the other, for instance, “Could you shut the door?” (Holtgraves and Yang 1990).

Off-record Strategy, the most ambiguous tactic, is used when the speaker is trying not to directly impose on the hearer by using indirect language to transfer the decision making to the hearer. Sometimes we feel that we have to be polite in order to show that we are civilized and cultivated to such an extent that we know what to do to live up to the conventionally recognized social standards so that we will not be accused of being rude or ill–manned. In order to be polite, we have to be tolerant. Under certain circumstances, to meet certain standards, we have to refrain from doing certain things which we would readily do in private.

Moreover, politeness can at once be understood as a social phenomenon, a means to achieve good interpersonal relationships, and a norm imposed by social conventions. So it is phenomenal, instrumental and normative by nature. In many ways, politeness is universal. It can be observed as a phenomenon in all cultures; it is resorted to by speakers of different languages as a means to an end and it is recognized as a norm in all societies. Despite its universality the actual manifestations of politeness, the ways to realize politeness, and the standards of judgment differ in different cultures. Such differences should be traced back to the origin of the notion of politeness in different cultures. As a social phenomenon, the evolution of the concept of politeness finds ready reflection in English language, especially
in its lexis. It has arisen and evolved under the changing historical conditions. Synonymous with the word politeness in English is courteous, urbane and civil. The relatedness between politeness on the one hand and court and city on the other hand and court and city on the other is only too clear and such relatedness is mirrored not uniquely in the English language but also in at least another major European language.

2.5 Considerable Items Related to Politeness

To achieve the goal of politeness, we should consider it from the following aspects according to C, Yule., 1996):

a) Considering the social background of the communicator. Generally, the more educated a man is, the more he tends to show his politeness to other people. The more he knows about the suitable ways to show politeness, the better he uses them to be polite to others. Besides, the personality of the communicator is also very important here. Good-tempered person prefers to use “face-saving act” while bad-tempered person prefers “face-threatening act” when they come across the “face-losing condition”.

b) According to the communicative circumstances. Communication is a very complicated process. In formal occasions, people tend to use formal expressions to show politeness, esp. between the new acquaintances. While in informal states, people tend to be casual to show intimacy even if it is in the very moment they meet. And that doesn’t mean impoliteness. Look at the following example:eg.1. A man came into a bar and said to the waiter: “Hi! Buddy! Give me some Whisky, would ya?” Although they’ve never met before, the man used very casual phrases to enclose their relationship. This is a usual way to show friendliness to strangers in similar entertaining places.

c) “In situations of social distance or closeness, showing awareness for another person’s face when that other seems socially distant is often described in terms of respect or deference. Showing the equivalent awareness when the other is socially close is often described in terms of friendliness, camaraderie, or solidarity.”

But there are exceptions. For example, people often use family names to call their close friends, and when these people speak to each other, they will use direct offer or
request. But sometimes they use very formal expressions in their speech. Look at the following example: eg.2. Husband to his wife: “Would you be so kind as to hand the bread over to me?” Surely we know that the wife has just quarreled with the husband and the husband is trying to amuse her in a certain way. Besides all the aspects discussed above, there’s another important point to concern with that is the cultural differences.

2.6 Types of Politeness

In an attempt to elaborate and refine the notion of *politeness* beyond the idea of appropriateness, some researchers have distinguished between this more traditional notion of *politeness* and a more theoretical, linguistic notion (Watts, Ide and Ehlich, 1992). Developing this idea, some linguists differentiate between two types of politeness; first-order (or *politeness1*) and second-order (or *politeness2*) politeness respectively. This twofold distinction is a crucial one in the linguistics literature. It is probably the most basic and far reaching in the field.

2.6.1 First-Order Politeness

Kasper (1994) discusses first-order politeness as the social notion of "proper social conduct and tactful consideration of others". Janney and Arndt (1992) follow the same categorization, referring to first-order politeness as *social politeness*. According to Janney and Arndt (1992), the function of social politeness is to provide routine strategies in social situations to "coordinate social interaction". In this classification of approaches to politeness, Fraser (1990) views politeness as etiquette and social appropriacy (*the social-norm* view and *the conversational contract* view in his terminology), i.e., the first-order politeness. Terms can be regarded as binary opposites if they complete each other. For example, *dead* and *alive* are binary opposites. If somebody is not alive, then he/she will be dead. However, the adjectives *polite* and *impolite* are not binary opposites because the two adjectives do not complete each other. Utterances cannot be judged as either polite or impolite. If she is not impolite, that does not mean that it is going to be polite. Utterances or behaviors lie on a scale of politeness that has values such as polite, less polite, impolite, rude, etc.

Another basic categorization has emerged. Watts (1992) proposes the term *polite behaviour* (first-order politeness). He sets two marked forms of behaviour: *non-politic*, i.e. behaviour leading to communicative breakdowns, and *polite*, i.e., behaviour whose function
is to "enhance the individual's own image in the eyes of the others" (Meier, 1995:347). Van De Walle refers to the same dichotomy in his analysis of two frameworks (Brown and Levinson's and Fraser's), where he proposes a broader definition of politeness in terms of "adequacy" (1993), i.e. first-order politeness.

2.6.2 Second-order politeness

Kasper (1994:3206) discusses second-order politeness as the pragmatic concept of "ways in which rational function in linguistic action is expressed". Janney and Arndt (1992) refer to second-order politeness as interpersonal politeness (also called tact). Janney and Arndt point out that tact involves looking at politeness on the pragmatic level as a supportive relationship with the function to "preserve face and regulate interpersonal relationships" (1992:24). According to Fraser, second-order politeness is politeness as seen through a linguistic perspective (the conversational-maxim view and the face-saving view). Watts (1992) uses politic behaviour to refer to second-order politeness. He defines politic behaviour as "socioculturally determined behavior directed towards the goal of establishing and/or maintaining in a state of equilibrium the personal relationships between the individuals of the social group" (Watts, 1992), i.e., socially appropriate behaviour. Van De Walle proposes a narrow concept of politeness of the strategic/social indexing type (1993:76), i.e. second-order politeness. The distinction proposed by Watts (1992) is a useful one since it allows for layers in the conceptualization. In other words, politic behaviour is the broader concept of social appropriateness from which the narrow concept of politeness may be derived. Brown and Levinson (1978) view politeness as "a complex system for softening face threatening acts". They are concerned with avoiding threatening the face of the speaker.

Leech (1980:19) defines politeness as "strategic conflict avoidance", which "can be measured in terms of the degree of effort put into the avoidance of a conflict situation" and "the establishment and maintenance of comity". Here, the avoidance of conflict is represented as a conscious effort on the part of the person being polite, since it is strategic. The categorizations presented above rest on an important point: the duality of the two levels of politeness and the conceptual need for them to be separated although they are constantly interrelated. If the distinction between them is not addressed, the confusion between politeness as a commonsense term and politeness as a technical term will continue to lead to
more contradictory research since different levels of analysis will be used each time without this difference being taken into consideration.

2.7 Cultural Differences

When we are communicating with people from different cultures, it is best to consult what is appropriate in their culture and act with regard to that, so as to avoid misunderstandings caused by culture differences. Different culture causes different views of values, which affects the criteria of politeness and leads to differences in various aspects.

2.7.1 Greeting Differences

The westerners often greet others with a cheerful “Hello!” or something like “How are you?” If they are talking with a stranger, they tend to talk about the weather as a way of greeting. But to Arabs like to say Hello as “Alikom uslam, marrhaba, haiyakalla, have you eaten?” “tafadal, “where are you going?” All these would be considered as interferences to privacy for westerners.

2.7.2 Women and Politeness in Arab Culture

Al-Khatib et al., (2006) argue that, the relationship between women’s talk and politeness has not been satisfactorily investigated in the Arabic-speaking societies. Most studies examined this relationship as a subordinate issue in investigating a broader issue of speech act formulations. Politeness in women’s talk, in its limited appearance, has always been contrasted to men’s performance). To answer the question whether women use politeness formulas in complimenting differently from the men’s formulas, Migdadi (2003) collected naturally occurring data through observation. He found out that women in Jordanian society primarily used compliments as positive politeness devices. Men were more likely to hedge on the addressee-pleasing function of compliments. Men tended to use compliments in order to soften criticism and other FTAs more than women. Gender differences were also present in responding to compliments. Women preferred questions and accounts whereas men preferred blessings and disagreements. Cross-sex complimenting was more restricted to the Jordanian data than in the Western one due to the restricted social interaction between the two sexes in the Arab-Islamic societies (Migdadi, 2003).
In another study in the Jordanian context, Al-Khatib (2006) investigated the polite formulas used by the Jordanians when making an invitation or accepting it. He emphasized the effect of gender on the type of strategies employed by Jordanian people. Al-Khatib posited that sociological factors such as gender might have caused observable differences in the choice and variation of politeness strategies. Al-Khatib collected a huge number of speech acts from different occasions. The results showed that the type of strategy used by the speaker when inviting, accepting, and refusing an invitation was highly influenced by the sex of the speaker and the degree of solidarity between the interactants. Although both men and women preferred on-record strategies in refusing the invitation with a lot of repressive action in the use of several politic expressions to lessen the illocutionary force of the refusal, the females tended to use such strategies more often than the males.

At a cross-cultural level, Bataineh (2008) investigated apology strategies used by the speakers of American English and Jordanian Arabic. They used a questionnaire that consisted of 10 situations to elicit apologies. They examined differences between male and female respondents in both groups, and found that there were more differences between Jordanian male and female respondents than between American male and female respondents. They attributed this to the fact that there is a greater similarity between how boys and girls are raised in the U.S. than between how they are raised in Jordan. The researchers, however, did not draw comparison between the gender groups across the two cultures, that is, Jordanian men against American men and women against women.

Regarding the Gulf area, Emery (2000) found it reasonable to assume that segregation in the Gulf societies might be reflected in differing linguistic usage between the two sexes. He expected women’s language, in these societies, to be more linguistically conservative. Thus, in investigating the politeness formulas under the headings of greetings, condoling and congratulating in Omani Arabic, Emery (2000) found old women to be more linguistically conservative while the young use more standard and “pan-Arabic” forms.

Another study from the Gulf was conducted by Turjoman (2005). Turjoman investigated differences between Saudi men and women in the formulas of greeting and leave-taking when they interact with someone of the same sex. Data were recorded in naturally occurring conversations, social and family gatherings, work, school, and the hospital. Relationship between participants included close friends, relatives, acquaintances,
and strangers. Results showed that Saudi men and women greet and reply to greetings of someone of the same sex similarly. Conversely, they differ significantly when they take leave and reply to a leave-taking. The results also showed that social status has no significant effect on how Saudis greet/reply and take leave/reply of someone of the same sex. The relationship between participants show a significant correlation with how Saudis greet/reply and take leave/reply of someone of the same sex. It is also indicated that women consistently took longer to greet and take leave of someone of their own sex. Women are found to repeat their greetings and leave-takings more than men. Unlike the above studies, the present study focuses on the cultural differences between female speakers of Saudi Arabic and British English in the speech act of offers.

2.8 Differences in Using Addressing Terms

Yanchang etal, (1989) explain that, Arabs often use one’s occupation to address him to show respect, either in formal or informal occasions when their social status is considered to be high or respectful. e.g. Professor, Teacher, Dean Sun, etc. If their social statuses are considered to be low, such as barber, cleaner, technical worker, cook, plumber and most people in service profession, people will often call them “given name” instead of their occupations to be polite. To westerners, this is not the same. In formal situations, they often address people who hold high social status with their professions as: Professor Green, Chairman Johnson etc. But they never address people with “teacher or manager”. In informal occasions, even a professor or a chairman prefers himself to be called with his given name to show intimacy to others. And they tend to call others like this while easterner may feel unpleasant to be called in such a term by unfamiliar person. For example, if a girl named “Yang Liyuan” is called as “Liyuan” or “yuan” by an ordinary friend, she will look on it as an insult.

Deng, etal (1989) claim that, the addressing terms used for strangers are also different. Arabic people like to use family terms to address strangers or people elder than them. For example, children are told to address adults with “aunty” or “uncle”; call old people”, even at the first time they meet. But westerners never call a family outsider with those items. For instance, “Bill, can you get the report to me by tumor row?” The terms “Mr”, “Miss”, “Mrs.”, “sir” and “madam” are widely used among people. “Mr.”, “Miss”
and “Mrs.” are used together with a surname while “sir” and “madam” are often used alone. Another example is “Mr. Lee, there is a phone call for you.” When an Arabs want to draw the interests of a passer-by, he may use “Yaa gamaa or yaa shabab” to address people of both sexes, but there is no such a term in English. They would say “Pardon me, Madam.” Or “Excuse me, Sir.” to address different sexes.

2.9 Ways to Praise Others

Runqing, (1981) points out this dialogue below:

(Seeing a beautiful curtain in an American family, the Arabs want to praise the room settings) Arab: “How beautiful the curtain is!”
Hostess: “I made it on my own.” Arab: “Really? I can’t believe it!”

The Arabs used surprising tone to show he really liked the curtain, this strategy works well in Arabs countries, but the hostess felt insulted. We know the Americans are very confident about themselves. Imagine what they may feel when their self-esteem is being hurt. The hostess thought the Arabs didn’t believe she was capable of doing it, and her ability was doubted. What’s more, the westerners like to praise the hostess or the host on their first visit, they consider that to be polite and natural, but it may make the Arabs host be offended, suspicious whether he is interested in the woman. In most cases, the westerners prefer to be praised over their house, garden, car, wife, decorations and room arrangements etc. esp. something made on their own hands, but often not their children’s beauty or intelligence which is considered as leading the kids to be vanity.

2.9.1 Differences in Expressing Thanks

The ways to express thanks are different in Eastern from western countries. Westerners prefer to convey their thanks directly while Arabs like to minimize themselves to achieve the same goal. eg. When you praise them: “How beautiful your dress is!” Westerners: “Thanks a lot!”
Arabs: “Really? It’s just an ordinary dress.”

eg. When they appreciate your help, westerners: “You’re really a great help to me.”
“I can’t imagine how I can manage it without you!”
“Thank you for enduring so much trouble I brought to you!” “I really appreciate your help!”
2.10 Politeness and Culture Values

Gu (1992) asserts that, attitudinal warmth is one of the four aspects underlying politeness in the eastern culture. To show warmth and concern for others is considered as a polite act.

2.10.1 Considerations of Privacy

According to Gu (1992) privacy is regarded more important value in English-speaking culture than in Arab culture. What is considered as an act of politeness in the eastern culture might simply be regarded as an intrusion upon a person’s privacy by an English-speaking person. Different people hold different views about what privacy is. That is why when two eastern people meet; their conversation may include age, marriage, family, occupation and even incomes, all of which are considered as privacy to westerners. The eastern think that they are being polite by showing concern for other people, and asking all these questions will help shorten the social distance between themselves and their interlocutors. But speakers of English, should they be asked all such questions, would feel their interlocutor is rudely encroaching upon their privacy. Look at the following conversation: eg. “(I feel close to the young man now.)

I--- an old man
He--- a young man

I: How old are you? He: Nineteen. I: How long have you been in the army? He: One year.
I: How did you join the revolution? He: I followed the army voluntarily when they retreated to the north.
I: Who else are in your family? He: My mother, father, brother, sister and my aunt.
I: Are you married?

This seems to be an interview or an interrogate for a westerner, otherwise it may be taken as an insult, but it’s a daily conversation in eastern societies, people like to talk about their age, marriage, children, salaries etc. even on their first meet. That may seem somewhat ridiculous for the westerners, who never like things like this to be asked, for they look on them as privacy. In the western countries, the homes and offices, desks and desk drawers are private territory. The letters, documents, journals or even newspapers on top of the desk belong to the person whose desk it is. Without permission, one should not pick them up and
read or look at them. The vast majority of people will gladly lend you what is theirs just ask. By the way, it is also very impolite to read over someone’s shoulder.

2.10.2 Expressing Generosity

Offers in Arabic literature are related to the common generosity of Arab people. Emery (2000) posits that the importance of hospitality in the Arab World is proverbial and commemorated in Arabian history in the deeds of those such as ḥātim, whose name became an icon of generosity when he gave away the camels that he was herding for his father to a passing caravan. In the Arab world, offering as sociolinguistic behavior represents an important part of the Arabian character due to historical, social, and religious motives. Jordanian society has a special pattern of inviting/offering that may be appreciated only by people sharing the same socio-cultural background.

2.10.3 Considerations of Individualism

Individualism spelled out in detail by the seventeenth-century English philosopher John Locke, that each individual is unique, special, completely different from all other individuals, and “the base unit of nature”. Individualism is considered of great value in English-speaking countries, it is closely related with the history and the culture. It usually refers to the freedom, right and independency of an individual. It is regarded that the actions showing respect to individualism as polite ones. Easterner who have been overwhelmed by feudalism for more than two thousand years, is hard for them to understand individualism. So what is considered to be “threatening act” to “Negative face” “in western countries may be a natural or welcomed act in east countries. For example, people will not think “offering something” “offering some help”, or “sending some invitations” to be an insult to individualism or a “face-threatening act”, people consider those actions to be of care or sincerity; they even think sometimes they have to force you to accept to show their sincerity. Thus it’s common to see people add food into a guest’s plate constantly to show enthusiasm; oblige others to accept gifts to show sincerity, etc. They are all considered to be polite in their culture but the opposite in western culture. Westerners with a strong notion think that there is something wrong with someone who fails to demonstrate individualism. The individual notion is deeply rooted in the English-speaking culture.
2.11 The Concept of Face Across Cultures

People have different conceptualizations of face. In many cultures, the upper part of the body is considered to be the most important part of the body because it contains the head and the face. For example, in Thai culture, according to Ukosakul (2005), a human body is divided into three parts which have different levels of importance. The most important and meaningful is the upper part of the body, which includes the head. Being located at the highest part of the body, the head, as perceived by Thai people, is believed to be exalted whereas the feet are dishonored. Therefore, touching someone’s head carelessly or casually must be avoided and if it happens accidentally, repair work should be undertaken immediately. Ukosakul (2005) also argues that it is considered as an offence to pass any object over someone’s head. In Igbo society, as described by Nwoye (1992), face refers to the area above the neck from the front of the head to the hairline. The most prominent part of the face is the eyebrows. They are considered the locale where concepts such as shame and honor reside. Similarly, in Palestinian culture the most prominent part of the body is the head because it contains the face. As it is the case in Thai culture, it is considered as an offence to pass any item over the head of the person.

Face is also used metaphorically across cultures to stand for notions such as “respect, honor, status, reputation, credibility, competence, family/network connection, loyalty, trust, relational indebtedness and obligation issues” (Ting-Toomey and Kurogi 1998:190). For example, in Thai culture, face-related idioms reveal that face metaphorically represents four aspects of a person: “one’s personality, one’s countenance, one’s emotions and the concept of honor”. These aspects of Thai face are similar to the concepts held by other cultures such as Chinese, Japanese and other Asian cultures which associate face with concepts such as dignity, self-esteem, prestige, reputation and pride.

Al Fattah (2010) and Mao (1994) argue that Chinese face consists of two components, namely, mianzi and lian. mianzi stands for “prestige or reputation which is either achieved through getting on in life, or ascribed (or even imagined) by members of one’s own community”, whereas lian refers to the respect a person gains from the people due to his moral behavior Mao (1994). Mao also maintains that there is also difference between losing lian and losing mianzi. To lose lian is considered far more dangerous than to lose mianzi. If someone’s mianzi is lost due to a misfortune or to a certain failure, say,
losing a financial fortune in the share market, his/her lian will not be affected. However, if one’s lian is lost, it is difficult to keep his/her mianzi intact. In fact, for Mao (1994:469), the notion of face embraces the relative placement of individuals in social hierarchies. Chinese face encodes a reputable image that individuals can claim for themselves as they interact with others in a given community. “Chinese face emphasizes not the accommodation of individual ‘wants’ or ‘desires’ but the harmony of individual conduct with the views and judgment of the community”.

Koutlaki (2002) mentions that Iranian face consists of two face components, namely, saxsiat and ehteram. Saxsiat means “personality, character, honor, self-respect, social standing”. A person who behaves according to the codes of behavior endorsed the society can be characterized as basaxsiat, meaning “with saxsiat”, whereas a person who shows no respect to others and behave in an offensive manner is characterized as bisaxsiat, meaning “without saxsiat” (ibid: 1742). The second component of face isehteram. It can be rendered as “honor, respect, esteem, dignity”. Ehteram establishes the positions and statuses of the interactants with respect to one another and is shown through “the adherence to the established norms of behavior according to the addressee’s position, age, status and interlocutors’ relationship” (ibid: 1742).

Elarabi (1997:14) argues that “wijjeh ( ﺔﺒ ) in Tunisian Arabic can be glossed as “face” in English. It is used metaphorically to represent politeness”. Besides wijjeh, according to Elarabi, the “beard”, “moustache” and “eyes” as parts of the face are also used metaphorically to describe certain behavior. The beard and moustache represent prestige and reputation when they are used to describe men. Both terms can be used interchangeably to refer to the same thing. A person described as having a beard or a moustache is being approved by his society as reputable and moral. Whereas, if the person is described as having no beard or no moustache, this indicates shame, and it is considered a serious accusation to the person’s reputation and represents his group’s condemnation of his despicable or immoral behavior. The metaphorical usage of face among Igbo is prominent. Nwoye (1992:314) argues that

“face is used to stand for “shame, negative, or positive dispositions toward others, honor, good and bad fortune, and so forth”. This is noticeable in Igbo society, where people use a variety of expressions to stress this fact”.
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For example, the expression “there is no shame on his (eye) brows” indicates an assessment of the person being described as shameless. Rosenberg (2004:1) argues that face is a “multi-faceted term, and its meaning is inextricably linked with culture and other terms such as honor and its opposite, humiliation”. She also points out that cultures have different assessments of the importance of face. According to Rosenberg (2004), in “high-context cultures”, which include countries such as Korea, China, and Japan in Asia, Middle-eastern countries such as Egypt and Iran”, the concepts of shame and honor are important than in low-context societies such as “U.S. and Western countries”. Similarly, Fox (2008) points out that the “Asian concept of face is similar to the Western concept of face, but it is far more important in most Asian countries”.

Ng (2008) stresses the importance of face in Asian cultures as well as Western ones. Ho (1976:881-2) states that “while it is true that the conceptualization of what constitutes face and the rules governing face behavior vary considerably across cultures, the concern for face is invariant”. It could be argued that both Rosenberg (2004) and Fox’s (2008) claims are questionable. The point in question is that what constitutes shame and honor is culture specific. Each culture assesses shame and honor in relation to its values, traditions and social norms. For example, according to Strecker (1993), in Hamar culture, the bigger animal a person kills, the more honorable he will appear among his people. This tradition would probably seem ridiculous to Western people and appalling to vegetarians who refrain from eating meat to protect animals. Since honor can be achieved through actions that are valued differently in high-context cultures and low-Castillo and Eduardo (2009) propose two different categories of context to categorize communication styles: low context where the message is direct, explicit and high context where the speech is indirect, subtle and understood because of social situation signs.

Context cultures, it seems that honor is valued differently in these two cultural groups. Likewise, the concept of shame cannot be understood across two cultural groups. For example, while certain issues relating to women are very sensitive in countries like Palestine, Egypt and Jordan, the same issues may not be as significant in U.S. and Western countries. It is worth mentioning that Sara Palin (American Vice Presidential candidate for the Republicans in 2009) has a daughter who gave birth to a baby before getting married. In
Egypt, Palestine and Iran, such an action is among the most shameful, whereas as in U.S. it is no longer considered as a despicable act. In short, researchers who issue evaluative judgments on cultural issues, describing one value or standard as more or less important in one culture than in another, ignore the fact that “every culture is so distinctive than one would have to spend years if not a life time mastering its rich intricacies and nuances”.

The second point to be addressed is Fox’s (2008) claim that face is far more important in Asian cultures than in Western cultures. Redding and Ng (1982) comment on this point, arguing that the negative consequences of losing face in Chinese culture affect the individual as much as they affect the group one belongs to. This claim invites the question “How do Westerners (e.g. Americans) and Arabs (e.g. Palestinians) conceptualize face?” “How can we measure the importance of face in two different cultures?” In order to answer the first question we need a thorough investigation in both cultures to identify how these cultures define and conceptualize face. To answer the second question, we need to find the common ground between Western and Arab cultures so that this shared basis can be used as a starting point for comparison. This is no easy matter, since we are talking about different cultures which embrace different values and traditions. It could be also argued that the stronger consequences of losing face in Palestinian culture, compared to those of its loss in Western cultures are attributed to different norms of social life. While in Western cultures the individual constitutes the core concept of the societal structure, in Arab countries the group, or collectivity, constitutes the basis. Nevertheless, in every society people strive to project a good self-image in public and, accordingly, use face-saving procedures as much as necessary during an encounter.

2.11.1 The Concept of face in Palestinian Culture

In Arabic, the concept of face is derived from an expression in classical Arabic (Fusha) that literally translates as “losing the water of one’s face” (Iragat maaalwajh اراقة ماء الوجه) which is used to mean losing one’s positive face wants (Nureddeen, 2008). Wajih, meaning face, in Palestinian culture, is used to describe the front part of the head from forehead to the lower jaw. However, it is also used metaphorically to stand for expressions such as respect, shame, honor, and dignity. In his study of the notion of face in
the Palestinian context, Farahat (2009) explores some expressions that have to do with *face* in the Palestinian society.

Farahat (2009) notices that unlike other cultures such as Chinese culture (Mao, 1994) and Iranian culture Koutlaki, (2002) which employ two expressions to refer to *face*, Palestinian culture does not make such a distinction. However, in the folk sense, Palestinian culture distinguished between two types of face-related expressions. Echoing Agyekum’s (2004:77) classification, the key concepts can be referred to as “face upgrading/honoring” and “face demeaning/threatening” actions. Both types figure prominently in many face-related expressions.

Goffman’s (1967) definition of *face* as the “positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact” fits well with Palestinian face. Every person takes care of his/her social behavior because *face* is not an individual property, but rather, it is the possession of the whole social group one belongs to. So, avoiding anti-social behavior is not only desirable but also obligatory as well. In order not to tarnish the name of the family and put one’s face in danger, every person has to think twice before uttering a word and ten times before carrying out an action. In some situations a person has to avoid some actions, even though carrying out these actions may make one feel good and fulfill one's ordinary expectations, in order not to create a clash between one’s face wants and the face wants of his or her social circle. If it happens and one’s face is lost through committing some anti-social actions or violating certain social rules, it is not easy to redeem face and make a fresh restart.

According to Goffman (1967), face functions as “the traffic rules of socialinteraction”. Brown and Levinson (1987) stress the role of face as a significant factor that affects the manner in which interlocutors interact socially Ruhi and Isik-Guler, (2007). According to Farahat (2009:86), “*Wajih* in Palestinian culture functions as a deterrent, making people abide by the institutionalized and sanctioned code of politeness”. At the same time, the significance of face in the Palestinian society prevents people from violating social rules and engaging in actions that might be considered as antithetical to the interests of the group. Similarly, as Strecker (1993:3) argues, in Hamar culture, face is a “*coercive social concept and indirectly speaks of social chains*”.
Ruhi and Isik-Guler (2007:695) claim that in Turkish culture “it is the avoidance of face damage that is the predominant cultural schema”. De Kadt (1998) argues that the fear of losing face prevents Zulu people from behaving inappropriately. Nwoye (1992) also maintains that in Igbo society, the fear of darkening face and, hence, tarnishing the name of the group the person belongs to deters people to behave from breaking the norm of politeness. In Thai society, face guides people to behave well in order to be socially acceptable (Ukosakul, 2005). Igbo face, according to Nwoye (1992), is used as a “mechanism of social control and as a deterrent against anti-social behavior”.

Likewise, Lee-Wong (2000) states that the Chinese face has a major and basic role to play in the establishment of the social code. Farahat (2009) stresses the important role of face in Palestinian culture in which face has an important role in solving disputes among people. In most cases, if members of two families engage in any kind of dispute which leads to direct confrontation, a mediator is always called in. The first step the mediator takes is to prevent any future clashes or confrontation between the members of the two families. This can be always done by using an expression such as wijhi ǧ aleeha which could be interpreted as “I stake my reputation on it”. Once the two families agree to show respect to the face of the mediator, it is considered as a commitment from the two families to end all kind of hostilities. If a member of one family harasses any member from the other family, he or she is said to “affront the face of the mediator” (ibid:86).

In fact, affronting the face of the mediator is a very serious matter, because mediators are always well-respected people in the Palestinian community. The face work used to restore the face of the mediator is in proportion to the severity of the affront. It is worth mentioning that the work of the mediator usually ends in arranging big banquets which aim at honoring the agreement to stop all actions of enmity and controversy between the two sides. Reaching a settlement between the two sides sometimes ends in arranging banquets to celebrate the agreement. Groups exchange invitations to indicate the end of disputes.

Like Goffman (1967) and Brown and Levinson (1987), Ho (1976) stresses the reciprocity concerns for saving face during an encounter. According to Ho, the need to save face exerts a pressure on the individual to behave in line with the requirements necessary to maintain face in a particular culture. The actions carried out by one person will be under
scrutiny and the more face he or she claims the more pressure will be put on them in terms of the social visibility of his or her actions, and hence the constrains imposed on their action will be greater. The need to protect self’s face and the other’s face affects the line of the encounter. Therefore, to avoid losing face is an overriding concern in many cultures. Such reciprocity concerns dominate in Palestinian culture. The proverb َ múil anáns kámá táfih an táºal, meaning “Do as you would be done by” encapsulates such concepts Baalbaki, (2003). This sense of reciprocity prevails among members of the community irrespective of the social status of the person or his/her relative power. People in power cannot overlook other’s face needs to be treated politely in public. Hence showing respect to other people means paying respect to the self in Palestinian culture. In fact, the analysis of face as a metaphor to describe politeness in action uncovers both the informational and affective dimensions of language use in structuring human relationship and friendship in both American and Palestinian cultures.

2.11.2 Face Upgrading/Honoring Expressions

People in different cultures use certain expressions to offer judgments and assessments of honorable actions that are carried out in the society. In Palestinian Arabic, there are some expressions that uphold face and portray positive image of the person. Farahat (2009) points out that some of these expressions are used to describe face and give an overall picture about the person being described, while others are used to describe a person after carrying out an immediately honorable action. For example, the expression َi wájhu náir (في وجهه نور) which literally means that “there is light on his face” is used to describe people who have good and sincere faith in God. It is also taken for granted as an indication that the person being described is good and righteous. Being a righteous person implies that the person is moral, polite, well behaved and considerate. It is hard to describe a person as being righteous where such features are absent. The above expression is more general in that it covers social and religious values.

Farahat (2009) mentions another example which is used to describe the face of people who show sincere devotion to God. This expression is wájhu kalqamár (وجهة كالقمر) meaning “his face is like the moon”. Linguistically speaking, this expression is a simile where the face of the person is described as the moon. It has the same connotative functions as the expression َi wájhu náir (في وجهه نور) but it is less popular when it comes to
describing religious people. It is often connected with description of the face and it is considered as certifying the beauty of the person being described. It is also associated with women rather than men and denotes their physical beauty (Farahat, 2009).

Two expressions used in Palestinian culture to enhance face are \(fi\ wajhu\ dam\) and \(fi\ wajhu\ hayaa?\) (في وجهه دم وفي وجهه حياء) meaning literally “there is blood on his face” and “there is bashfulness on his face” respectively. Since blood is vital for life in human body, it is used metaphorically to describe polite people. This expression is used for people who behave according to the sanctioned rules and to the codes of politeness. It is important to mention that this expression is not used to address the person directly, but it is used to praise and elevate the person’s face in his or her absence. Other related expressions connected with the concept of politeness are \(?insān\ Ωaqīl\) and \(?insan\ xajūl\) (إنسان ثقيل وانسان خجول) which are literally “a heavy person” and “a modest person” respectively. The person is described as a heavy man or woman only if he or she is polite and well respected in the community. In the second expression, although the word \(xajūl\) (خجول) has a negative meaning in other situations, it is considered the opposite in this situation and is equivalent to the adjective.

Farahat (2009:89) mentions two other face upgrading/honoring expressions which are connected directly with actions. They are \(bayaD\ wajhu/bayaD\ wjuhna\) (meaning “he whitens his face/he whitens our faces” and \(rafaç\ rāsu/rafaç\ rūsna\) (meaning “he raised his head/he raised our heads”). These expressions are connected only with honorable actions, irrespective of whether the action is religious, social, educational or humanitarian. They are used to enhance and support not only the face of the person but also the face of his/her family. Similarly, in Akan culture of Ghana, expressions that upgrade or honor face are used to show respect and exalt the person. Expressions such as “she brightens my face”, “to bring glory” and “she uplifts my face” are used when a person has achieved a reputable action that reflects well on his/her family members, friends or the community.

The speech act of inviting, the target act of this study, is issued by most Palestinian people to enhance and support not only the face of the speaker but also the face of his/her family. For example, in Palestinian culture, the bigger a party or a banquet a person has and the larger the number of the invitees, the more ‘honorable’he/she will be among his/her people. There is a belief that inviting a large number of people to such parties is an indication of generosity. However, such practices are troublesome for poor people who
cannot make such large banquets. In fact, poor people sometimes receive financial support from their extended families or clans so that they can prepare such banquets. This tradition may seem ridiculous to Americans who have different values concerning such acts.

2.11.3 Differences in Requests

Searle (1969) asserted that all speech acts such as requests are meaningful and that they are rule-governed. For that reason, in interactions, participants ought to be aware of their actions and thus consider what Goffman (1967: 5) named 'face', defined as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" and that face can be lost, maintained or enhanced during interactions with others. Brown and Levinson (1987) expanded Goffman's theory of face in their 'politeness theory'. According to them, face is a set of wants, roughly "the want to be unimpeded" and a person's desire to act without imposition, and "the want to be approved in certain respect". (ibid.63); the former refers to negative face, and the latter refers to positive face.

2.11.4 Non Face-Threatening Act (FTA)

Leech (1983) considers offers as inherently polite speech acts, directed towards the positive face of the hearer. In this sense, offers are non face-threatening act. However, any act on the part of the speaker that puts some pressure on Hearer, to accept it such as offers is a positive FTA. Moreover, the firmer the invitation, the more polite it is. Speakers resort to this type of strategy to minimize face threats when the danger of H’s face is very small as in offers that are clearly in H’s interest and do not require great sacrifices of Ss.

2.11.5 Face-Threatening Act (FTA)

Bandl, (1987) argues that any utterance which could be interpreted as making a demand or imposing on another person’s autonomy can be regarded as a potential face-threatening act (FTA). Offers, suggestions, advice, and requests can be regarded as face-threatening acts, since they potentially impede the other person’s freedom of action. Offers can be a threat to the H’s negative face, somewhat violating his/her privacy. This occurs both when H receives an offer, and in those cases where H feels constrained to accept it. An act that primarily threatens the addressee’s negative face is a negative FTA (such as
requests) because they indicate impeding the hearer’s freedom of action. However, in everyday communications, there are considerably a very large number of acts such as requests that threaten face intrinsically (FTAs). Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) are acts that violate the hearers’ need to maintain his/her self-esteem, and be respected. Requests are FTAs because the speaker (S) is impeding on hearer (H) by asking H not to do what H wants, but rather to do what S wants (Fasold 1990).

Therefore, people do face work in order to offset FTAs (Brown and Levinson 1978). Brown and Levinson identified five types of politeness strategies that people resort to in their politeness behavior to manage face: Act baldly, Going off-record-indirect, Do not perform the act, Positive politeness, Negative politeness. People vary their request strategies based on three factors: the social distance of speaker and hearer, the relative power between them, and the absolute ranking of impositions in the particular culture (Brown and Levinson).

2.11.6 Face Demeaning/Threatening Expressions

People also use certain expressions to portray the negative aspects of actions. What has been said so far about upgrading/honoring expressions represents the positive side of the face. Face demeaning/threatening expressions use the exact opposites of the literal meanings of the upgrading/honoring expressions and are used to describe the negative side of face. According to Farahat (2009:89), the expression *wajih miṣ ṣ✿ bis* (meaning “he has a dark face”) is used as an exact opposite for the expression *fiwajhu nūr* ( “there is light on his face”). It used to describe people who are not friendly. It is also used to describe people who are not keen on showing respect to God or who behave badly.

According to Farahat (2009:89), two face-related expressions are *ma feeš fi wajhūdām* (ما في وجهه دم) and *ma feeš fi wajhu ḥayā’?* (ما في وجهه حياة), literally meaning “there is no blood on his face” and “there is no bashfulness on his face”, respectively. The word *dam* (blood) is very similar to polite behavior in this expression, where the absence of blood is interpreted as the absence of polite behavior. Another expression connected with impoliteness is *?insān xafīf* (إنسان خفيف), meaning “he is a light person”. In Palestinian culture, if a person is described as a light person in terms of weight, he/she is perceived as impolite and inconsiderate. This is similar to Akan culture where the same expression (light) is collocated with face as in the expression “his/her face in light”. Such an expression damages the person’s good image and also threatens one’s positive face.
by portraying him/her as a demeaned or undignified person in the community Agyekum, (2004).

According to Agyekum, there are also some face related expressions that represent an insult to the person. For example, the expression “to use one’s face as a plantain” is considered as an insult to the person being addressed(ibid:86). In the same vein, in Tunisian culture, some expressions are offensive or insulting in nature. Unlike beard/mustache-related expressions, eye related expressions, according to Elarbi (1997), are not gender specific. The expression “he/she fell from my eye” is used when someone’s behavior is considered repugnant. It also shows the speaker’s anger and dissatisfaction. The expression, “his/her face is covered with shit, may God protect you from [from having the same disgrace]” (ibid: 17) is used when someone’s face is tarnished because the person has committed a very serious breach of moral behavior. It is important to mention that these face-related expressions are used in accordance with the weight for the actions committed. In Palestinian culture, a similar expression to the Tunisian “he/she fell from my eye” is used in very similar situations. The last two face-related expressions are closely connected with “committing shameful and immoral acts” (Farahat, 2009:90).

They are sawad wajhu/wjūhna and waTa rāsu/rūsna (سودوجهاهووجهناووطارأسهاوروسنا) meaning “he blackens his face/our faces” and “he lowered his head/our heads”. White is symbolic in Palestinian culture: it stands for chastity, honor and freedom from wrong-doing. In contrast, black is a color of dishonor, disgrace and signals wrong-doing. It collocates with face to describe how much damage one does to his or her face or to the face of the family. Similarly, according to Ruhi and Isik-Guler (2007), in Turkish culture white, black and red, are used metaphorically to make judgments about one’s social behavior. While “white” is associated with “pride”, “black” is associated with “disgrace”. Red is connected with “embarrassment and shame” (ibid: 689). The second expression waTarāsu/rūsna is used if a person commits a serious anti-social act such as theft or rape and, hence, commits a very serious breach of the codes of morality and politeness. In such a case the lowering of the head indicates shame and disgrace. People sometimes say “he/she cannot raise his/her head” because the burden of shame is unbearable.

Farahat (2009) mentions two other face-related expressions used to attack face. These expressions can be used in face-to-face interaction to offend or they can be used to...
describe a person’s face to others in his or her absence. In both cases the offensive nature of these expressions is presented. These offensive expressions are *wajhukalqird* (وجهة كالقرد), meaning “he has a monkey face” and *wajhu kashayTan* (وجهة كالشيطان) meaning “he has a devil face”. Although the monkey is considered as appeasing intelligent animal, in Palestinian culture the word *kalqird* is used as an offensive word. Describing a person as having a monkey face is considered as an insult.

In the second expression, although the devil is considered a legendary being, it has a wicked ugly face in Palestinian folk-tales. In short, using these expressions to attack a person's face is immediately connected with certain speech situations. People use such offensive expressions when they feel outraged and cannot control their behavior. Concerning the speech act of inviting, people are supposed not to turn down invitations so as not to affect badly on the faces of both the inviter and the invitee. It is impolite to refuse an invitation without a reason. People are supposed to share and attend happy and sad occasions with others. Refusing affects badly on the faces of both the inviter and the invitee. On the other hand, in most cases it is not polite to make a banquet without inviting friends, relatives and people of one’s tribe. Therefore, speakers usually try to meet certain social expectations in the Palestinian Society.

2.11.7 The concept of face in American Culture

According to The Collins English Dictionary (2001:543), face refers to the “front of the head from the forehead to the lower jaw”. Metaphorically speaking, and after reviewing previous literature, *face* stands for concepts such as *respect, reputation, social status, pride, embarrassment* and *shame*. The American notion of *face* spirals outward from individual desires or wants, and see the self as the initiating agent. Americans use some expressions that have to do with the notion of *face*. Rub it in your face is a common expression in AE. It is used to mean that you are somehow reminding someone of an unpleasant fact or occurrence more or more prominently or more harshly than you need to. That is, you need to tell them about it, but you need to be diplomatic and not crow over your good fortune in front of your bandmates – that would be rubbing it in their faces. Another expression is *someone's face fits* which is used for saying that someone is the right type of person for something. Yuka,( 2009). It is worth mentioning that in contrast to Palestinian culture, face-
related expressions are not widely found in previous literature that has to do with American culture.

2.11.8 The Concept of ‘Loss of Face’

Goffman (1976:9) argues that “in our Anglo-American society, as in some others, the phrase ‘to lose face’ seems to mean to be in the wrong face, to be out of face, or to be shamefaced”. Ho (1976) argues that losing face refers to important changes that have occurred to one’s face. That is to say face may be lost “when the changes constitute a departure from the quality or quantity of the individual’s claim”. Brown and Levinson (1987) conceptualize face as consisting of two aspects: negative face and positive face. When they are talking about the concept of losing face, they are talking about threatening either aspect of face, depending on the type of the speech act performed.

2.11.8.1 Acts that cause loss of face

Face may be lost as a result of one’s inability to meet social expectations and also as a result of other people’s failure to meet social expectations. The distinction between one’s failure and others’ failure to meet certain social expectations is worth considering when discussing acts that cause loss of face because it gives us information about the effect of a person’s social circle on his or her social behavior. Bearing this in mind, it is worth mentioning the speech act of inviting in Palestine and in America might lead to the loss of face as a result of one’s inability to satisfy certain social expectations within each speech community.

The notion of face is related to the English expression losing face as in the sense of being embarrassed or humiliated. Face becomes established as something that is emotionally invested, that can be lost, maintained or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction. Generally, people’s mutual cooperation in maintaining each other’s face is based on the knowledge of its vulnerability. People expect others to defend their face if it is threatened; however, defining one’s own face can lead to threatening another’s face, which is why mutual cooperation can usually be assumed Ruzickova, (1998).

Farahat (2009:93) states that face loss can be in the form of embarrassment. Embarrassment is defined as an “emotional state experienced upon having a socially or
professionally unacceptable act or condition witnessed by or revealed to others. Usually, some amount of honor or dignity is involved.

To maintain one’s social status, to function adequately in a given role, or to safeguard integrity of character in one’s general conduct will make the loss of face a likely possibility”. In fact, according to Oetzel et al (2001:235), face represents the “individual’s claimed sense of positive image in the context of social interaction”. Loss of face can be also caused by the behavior of family. According to Ho (1976:867) face is lost “when the individual, either through his action or that of people closely related to him, fails to meet the essential requirements placed upon him by virtue of the social position he occupies”. Farahat (2009:93) tells a story by a Palestinian woman who mentioned a situation where her face was lost as a result of the bad behavior of her child at one of her friend’s house. The woman comments on the situation, “I was very embarrassed when my children started running from one room to another in a friend’s house. They refused to stop when I told them”. Although children are children in all cultures, according to Farahat, “sometimes they cause embarrassment to their parents when their behavior falls below what is thought to be acceptable and as a result parents lose face”.

Ho (1976) states that face can be lost when conduct or performance falls below the minimum level considered acceptable”. In Palestinian culture, for example, people are not free to comment negatively on another’s performance. They are held accountable by their families for every word they utter about someone. Farahat (2009) argues that “describing a story told by someone as silly would be taken as a direct insult to the person who tells the story. Therefore, face work in such a case is necessary”. Unlike apologies in American culture, apologies such as “I’m very sorry ”addressed to someone after insulting him or her in a public arena cannot redeem or restore face in Palestinian society. Other forms of remedial work should take place afterwards, depending on how serious the damage to face is. Insulting a person is less serious than insulting his or her family. The age and gender of both participants are also crucially important.

An insult from an old man to a young one is less serious than an insult from a young man to old man. An insult from a man to a woman is more serious than an insult from a woman to a man. Similarly, if a Palestinian makes a wedding party, without preparing a huge banquet and without inviting all relatives and acquaintances, this leads to the
possibility that all family will lose face. Making big banquets is an indication of generosity which is a highly considered value in the Palestinian culture. Families are usually proud of the generosity of individuals. Palestinians are supposed to attend and support each other in happy occasions, such as wedding parties. Therefore, Palestinian people take into consideration, not just the face of the individual but also the face of the whole group.

According to Farahat (2009), loss of face can be attributed to differences in family rules. In Palestinian culture, although smoking is considered a bad habit if it is practiced in front of parents by either adults or teenagers and may cause face loss. It could be argued that such an action would never cause any face loss for speakers of American English because the cultures have different values in terms of family relationships. In Palestinian culture, smoking is considered socially taboo if it is practiced by young and adults in front of their parents because it is considered disrespectful and a serious affront to the parents. Related to the concept of respectability is the use of titles when addressing people in Palestinian culture. The titles Dr./ Prof. are used by university students to show respect to their instructors. Similarly, the title Haj/ Haji is used to address old people to show respect to them.

Conversely, addressing an old man or woman without using the title will definitely indicate disrespect and cause loss of face. What causes loss of face in such situations is the fact that an old man might become humiliated or belittled for not receiving due respect from a younger person. However, it could be argued that in American culture a situation like the one above would never cause any face loss to either a speaker or hearer. It is because the habit of addressing people in the two cultures is different. If someone loses his or her respectability, he or she will be hated or ostracized and will suffer the consequences of being alone in a culture which is based on the group rather than the individual. In fact, it is clear that differences between American and Palestinian cultures arise as a result of a person's social connections.

2.11.9 Cultural Meanings to Polite Behavior

As every language offers different terms or lexemes to refer to polite behavior which help us understand culture-specific concepts of politeness, it is important here to shed light on the semantic meanings of the word 'polite' (مؤدب) in Arabic as compared to English. The Arabic word 'adab' (أدب) - nowadays refers to either politeness or literature based on the
context- was only intended to mean 'invitation' in the pre-Islamic period. I drees (1985: 13) pointed out that the first meaning of the word 'adab' (أدب) in the ancient Arabic environment was meant to be generosity and hospitality. For example, Arabs used to say (Fulan adaba al-qawm) (فلان أدب القوم إذا دعاهم لمأدبه) meaning that someone invited people to feast; thus, the meaning of the word 'adab' (أدب) was concerned with the behavioral aspect of a person's relationships with others. That is to say, a greater emphasis was placed on positive aspects of face and connectedness with others. Then the use of the word (أدب) has expanded in the Islamic era to refer to morality, generosity, tolerance, and virtue. All these meanings have been numerously reported by many sayings of Prophet Muhammed (PBUH). After that, in the late Umayyad and early Abbasid era, the word has also been used to refer to education and literature.

On the other hand, Watts (2003: 35) mentioned 'considerate', 'thoughtful', 'well-mannered', as synonyms of the English 'polite'. Requests are directly related to 'politeness' since people use polite behavior to minimize the potential threat of a person’s face. Thus, people vary their request from being the most direct to the most indirect depending on different socio-cultural factors such as power and social distance between interlocutors, rate of imposition, context, “taken from www.ccsenet.org/ass Asian Social Science Vol. 8, No. 10; August 2012Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education 87” sex, age, etc.

However, as Brown and Levinson (1978 and 1987) pointed out, there exists cross cultural differences in the realization of speech acts. That is to say, people of different languages and cultures may have access to the same range of speech acts and realization strategies, yet, they can differ in the strategies they choose (Wolfson 1989: 183).

Scollon and Scollon ([1995] 2001) highlighted the fact that politeness is deeply influenced by such factors as power, distance and weight of imposition. They introduced three main types of politeness systems based essentially on whether there is a power difference and on the distance between participants. First, deference politeness system, an egalitarian system in which the participants maintain a deferential distance from each other. They are considered to be equals or near equals with no interlocutor exerting power over the other (-Power), but treat each other at a distance (+Distance). As a result, both interlocutors use independence strategies, including expressions that minimize threat to avoid the risk of losing face. Second, solidarity politeness system which is also an egalitarian system in
which the participants feel or express closeness to each other. The speakers may feel neither power difference (-Power) nor social distance (-Distance) between them. The interlocutors use involvement strategies to assume or express reciprocity or to claim a common point of view. Third, hierarchy politeness system which is a system with asymmetrical relationships; in other words, the participants recognize and respect the social differences that place one in a higher position and the other in a lower position. The speakers resort to different politeness strategies: the 'superordinates' use involvement politeness strategies and the 'subordinates' use independence politeness strategies. To Scollons, cultural differences in politeness behavior can be explained in these three types of politeness systems.

To better account for the structure of requests, this current study uses Blum-Kulka et al.’s (1989) coding scheme in classifying request strategies into three main types: direct, conventionally indirect, non-conventionally indirect. Of these head acts, five are considered direct (mood derivable, explicit per formatives, hedged performatives, obligation statements, want statements), two are considered conventionally indirect (suggestory formulae, query preparatory), and two are considered non-conventionally indirect (strong and mild hints). In interpreting the different request strategies the samples employed, we drew upon Scollon and Scollon’s (1995- 2001) politeness framework and took into account the views of some pioneering researchers in this field.

2.12 Considerations of Taboos

Taboos are the words that are closely bounded to cultures. In a word, when we are communicating with people from different cultures, it is best to consult what is appropriate in their culture and act with regard to that. Take the forage considerations. In western countries, woman’s age is a taboo in daily conversations, never will you hear a woman ask you questions like “How old are you?” during your chatting. And in western countries, the aged people do not like the young people to call them as “old man”, they like “senior man” or “senior citizen” better.

They do not like others help at all. Because if he accepts your help, it seems that he need other’s help and sympathy. It means they are old. Also there are many taboos we should remember when talking with westerners. Such as the questions about religions, salary, children, marriages, sex, etc. in Chinese traditional culture, there also have some taboos. For example, in the Spring Festival, people forbid to say some words such as
“broken” and “death”. They are afraid that these words may take away their whole-year fortune. So to politeness, we should remember these taboos (Young 2008English Language Teaching).

2.13 Apology

According to Marion (1983), apology is a remedial interchange (work) with the function of changing the meaning that otherwise might be given into an act, transforming what could be seen as offensive into what can be seen as acceptable. Remedial interchanges including apologies and accounts as those concerned specifically with repairing damage to face, where face preservation itself becomes the object of the conversation for a time, however short. A distinction between the use of “excuse me” and” I am sorry” in apologetic behavior. Borken et al (1978) assert that, “acquiring appropriate formulas for ritualistic apology is problematic for non-native speakers; however, substantive apologies are a more complex learning task”. According to Coulmas (1981) the function of much apologetic behaviour is ritualistic and that it varies cross culturally as shown in a number of western languages as opposed to Japanese. Olishtain 1983 claims that the events that require apology have been shown to vary cross-culturally. Severity of the offence and the weight of contextual variables are also subject to cross-cultural variation.

2.13.1 Apology Background in Inter-Language Pragmatics

Inter-language pragmatics has been defined as “the study of non-native speakers” use and acquisition of linguistic action patterns in a second language (L2) Kulka (1993). A huge part of literature on inter-language pragmatics has focused on the production processes rather than comprehension or developmental issues.

2.13.2 Classifying Apologies

According to Austin’s classification of illocutionary forces, apologies belong to the category of ‘behabitives’, along with congratulating, commending, condoling, cursing, and challenging, which he defines as “a kind of performative concerned roughly with reactions to behaviour and with behaviour towards others and designed to exhibitattitudes and feelings” (1975). In apologising the speaker performs: A locutionary act S utters the words: I apologise (explicit performative) or I’m sorry (primary performative). An illocutionary act S
apologises A perlocutionary act S placates the hearer (who accepts the apology and forgives)The class of behabitives is the one Austin was least satisfied with, as evidenced by his own comment: “a shocker this”. He admits that it is to omiscellaneous and that a “fresh classification altogether is needed” (ibid: 152). The need for a new taxonomy has also been recognised by Searle, who assigns apologies to the category of ‘expressives’, which further includes: thanking, congratulating, condoling, deploiling, and welcoming. All these verbs “express the psychological state specified in the sincerity condition about a state of affairs specified in the propositional content” (1979).

On ApologisingAn attempt at applying Searle’s felicity conditions to the speech act of apologizing according to the rules proposed for the category of expressives (1969) would run as follows:

(a) Propositional content Past act A done by S
(b) Preparatory condition S believes that A is an offence against H
(c) Sincerity condition S regrets act A
(d) Essential condition Counts as an apology for act A

The application of Searle’s conditions to the speech act of apologising is discussed in great detail by Owen (1983), who also demonstrates the impracticability of reconciling Searle’s rules for the class of expressives with his conceptualization of indirect speech acts Searle (1975). Subsequent taxonomies shift the focus from felicity conditions to the social functions of speech acts. Bach and Harnish’s taxonomy of communicative illocutionary acts, for instance, has been developed according to the type of attitude expressed (1979). They adopt the term ‘acknowledgements’ over Austin’s ‘behabitives’ and Searle’s ‘expressives’ for apologies and other speech acts associated with the social functions of condoling, congratulating, greeting, thanking, accepting, rejecting, etc. Speech acts classified as acknowledgements “express, perfunctorily if not genuinely, certain feelings toward the hearer” (1979). They acknowledge the event by which the performed speech act was occasioned, one of the motivations for performing them being to satisfy a social expectation. In the case of apologies, the speaker acknowledges responsibility for committing an offence, and the apology is successful when the hearer recognises his or her intention of expressing regret.
According to Leech’s classification of illocutionary functions (1983), apologies can be assigned to the convivial speech act type, in which the illocutionary goal coincides with the social goal. In the case of apologies it is the goal of maintaining harmony between speaker and hearer, which makes them inherently polite. I try to apply leechs’ classification and translate them to adopt our Arabic Language in the following examples:

معليش ، ما امكون جرحتك
*malish ma akoon jarahtak*

ياخ ، والله انا نادم علي هذا
*Yax wallahi ana nadim ala haza*

i. Apology

ii. I know that I did something that was bad for you

iii. I think that you may feel something bad towards me because of it

iv. I say: I regret having done it

v. I say it because I want you not to feel anything bad towards me

Glovins

2.13.3 Defining Apologies

An important contribution to the understanding of the social functions of apologies has been made by Goffman (1971). In his work on remedial interchanges, apart from accounts and apologies, he also discusses requests asking “license of a potentially offended person to engage in what could be considered a violation of his rights” (1971). Such disarming apologies seem to be what Brown and Levinson had in mind when classifying apologies as negative politeness strategies (1987). Cross-cultural research, however, focuses on remedial apologies, which are reactions to offences, such as violation of social norms or failure to fulfil personal expectations Fraser (1981). Apologies have been defined as transactions involving “a bid to change the balance-sheet of the relation between s and h”.

The imbalance in the relationship between S and H is created by S committing an offence harming H, and S’s apology constitutes an attempt at restoring the balance. Accordingly, remedial apologies can be defined as compensatory actions used to restore and maintain social harmony. They allow “the participants to go on their way, if not with satisfaction that matters are closed, then at least with the right to act as if they feel that
matters are closed and that ritual equilibrium has been restored” (Goffman 1971: 140). Another important distinction in Goffman’s definition of apologies is that between substantial and ritual apologies. While the motivation for the former.

On Apologising is genuine regret for the committed offence, the latter aims at fulfilling social expectations. The social function of apologies is emphasised by Norrick, according to “whom they are performed in order “to evince good manners, to assuage the addressee’s wrath, or simply to get off the hook and be on one’s way” (1978).

On a similar note, Zimin argues that by apologising we are “doing what is socially acceptable and expected” (1981), while Tarasenko suggests that apologies are used “to present oneself as an educated member of a society”. It is mainly this function of apologies that Coulmas refers to as “highly recurrent and routinised” (1981). He defines ritual apologies in terms of conversational routines, which he views as conventional implicatures in Grice’s sense (1981). The distinction between genuine and ritual apologies is, of course, fuzzy as they can be “motivated from both perspectives” (Fraser 1981: 266).

It seems, therefore, that apologies combine normative and strategic elements of politeness: Uttering the appropriate routine formula under the circumstances requiring it can be viewed as an aspect of normative politeness, but engaging in considerations regarding the future relationship with the offended party or one’s reputation and weighing them up against the humiliation involved in admitting responsibility for the offence is clearly strategic. This strategic side of apologies brings S’s as well as H’s face into play and seems to justify Brown and Levinson’s concept of face as ‘wants’.

In order to restore H’s face damaged by the offence, S performs a speech act which is costly to his or her own face, which makes apologies “face-saving for the H and face-threatening for the S” Olshtain (1989). Edmondson defines apologies as “an instance of socially-sanctioned H-supportive behavior” (1981) and Holmes maintains that apologies are “addressed to B’s face needs and intended to remedy an offence for which A takes responsibility.

While the definitions provided in cross-cultural research focus on the hearer’s face and its restoration, research dealing with apologies as a means of image restoration conducted in the fields of sociology and social psychology is mainly concerned with the speaker’s face needs. The view of apologies as strategies benefiting the speaker also features
in some definitions provided in linguistic studies. Edmondson and House, for instance, point out that the purpose of an apology is not only to placate the hearer, but also to restore one's own social status (1981). Fraser seems to share their view when arguing that apologies relieve the offender of some moral responsibility (1981), and Meier refers to research conducted in the field of psychology when arguing: “Contrary to Brown and Levinson, I posit remedial work as a face-saving device as regards S (not H). Concern for H’s face is only a by-product of the attempt to serve the intent of saving S’s face”.

2.13.4 Applying Brown and Levinson’s Theory to Apologies

Apology studies conducted in cross-cultural pragmatics focus on remedial apologies and, following Leech, define them as beneficial to the hearer and inherently polite. This definition is generally adopted along with Brown and Levinson’s classification of apologies as negative politeness strategies, i.e. strategies oriented towards the hearer’s right to non-distraction. Combining these two definitions suggests that a speech act which benefits the hearer and restores social harmony is based on an avoidance-based type of politeness. Since Brown and Levinson’s classification is strongly influenced by their viewing apologies in their anticipatory disarming function, this chapter’s objective is to examine whether and how their framework can be applied to remedial apologies.

Holmes’ defines remedial apologies as negative politeness strategies on the grounds that their “primary purpose is redressive action” (1995), thus focusing on the damage caused by the offence necessitating the apology rather than that occurring to S’s face when performing the apology. Holmes does take into account S’s face, however, when she notes that apologies including an explanation redress the “loss of positive face incurred by the speaker” (1990). According to Deutschmann, a great part of remedial apologies in his corpus involves positive politeness. He argues that “this important function of apologising has been entirely overlooked by Bandl and many other scholars, who have primarily classed apologising as an example of negative politeness” (2003). Larina suggests that apologies should be viewed as positive politeness strategies while describing their function as: “to assure the addressee that he is being noticed, respected, and that the maintenance of a conflict-free relationship is desired.”
As I have already mentioned, there is not only a lack of consensus as to the type of politeness apologies involve, but also as to whether it is the speaker’s or the hearer’s face that they redress. Whereas linguists tend to see them as oriented towards the hearer’s face needs, or even as face-supportive acts (Holmes 1989,1995), sociologists discuss apologies as devices used for image restoration, benefiting the speaker. Considering all the contradictions found across and even within apology definitionsoffered in previous research, the most promising approach to determining whose face and which face is affected in what way by the apology is to consider all the possibilities. Deutschmann suggests that when analysing apologies “both negative and positive face needs should be to be [sic] taken into account” and “these should be viewed from both hearer and speaker perspectives” (2003: 39).

Additionally, I deem it necessary to analyse all the elements of a remedial interchange and the potential damage and restoration of both interlocutors’ face involved in each of them. Since ritual apologies are not particularly face-threatening, the following discussion applies primarily to substantial, strategic apologies offered for offences causing damage to H’s face and S’s reputation. What makes it problematic to apply Brown and Levinson’s framework to apologies is that, although it is meant to be applicable to all kinds of FT Asalike, the majority of their examples and many of the substrategies presented in their charts apply exclusively to requests (see e.g. “Give H option not to do act”,1987: 131).

The association of politeness with avoiding imposition and the focus on speech acts threatening H’s negative face lead to the association of indirectness with politeness.

The fact that this does not apply to apologies, whose polite realisations adhere to rather than flout the CP, has been noticed by Edmondson, who points out that with regard to apologies “gushing is socially acceptable” (1981). Meier asks herself the question: “And, what do we do if we maintain that indirectness implicates politeness in the case of I apologise, which, containing a performative verb, is unambiguous, therefore direct and must be dubbed non-polite, impolite, informal. All of these are intuitively untenable” (1992). Speech acts that are beneficial to the hearer generally do not constitute an imposition on the beneficiary’s face. This is why direct offers, such as: “Have a chocolate” are fully acceptable and this is why polite apologies take the form of bare performatives, such as ‘I apologise’ or even bald on record requests such as ‘forgive me’. They are not only beneficial to the hearer, but since they are preceded by an offence, their performance is expected. The
hearer’s face has already been damaged by the offence and the function of the apology is to restore it, so that failure to fulfil this expectation is likely to be interpreted as another offence.

One could, of course, argue that certain apologies may also threaten H’s face, for instance, when the offence was so grave that the victim does not want to be reminded of it even in the form of an apology or when the very sight of the offender makes them sick. In such cases, an apology would do more harm than good – but they can be safely dismissed as marginal. On the whole then, it can be concluded that when performing a speech act which is beneficial to the hearer and expected by him or her, no redress of their negative face is necessary, and hedges on the illocutionary force will not make it more polite. I disagree, however, with Edmondson who claims that in the case of apologies “there is no cause for not being explicit” (1981a: 280), for this would mean that apologies are always performed in their most direct form, which is clearly not the case. The reason for indirectness in apologising has been provided by Brown and Levinson, who explain:

Given the following set of strategies, the more an act threatens S’s or H’s face, the more S will want to choose a higher-numbered strategy; this by virtue of the fact that these strategies afford payoffs of increasingly minimized risk. (1987– emphasis added) In their subsequent argumentation, the focus is almost exclusively on the hearer’s face. Apologies are, however “essentially threats to S’s face” (1987: 76), and it is the damage to the speaker’s face that can be minimised: In the case of apologies, the use of a higher-numbered strategy results in redress of S’s and not H’s face. Basically, by choosing a higher-numbered strategy, we are being more polite to ourselves, or rather more protective towards our own face. Applying Brown and Levinson’s chart to a speech act threatening the speaker’s face clearly shows that face-work rather than politeness lies at the heart of their theory. Since most cross-cultural apology studies focus on politeness phenomena, they do not discuss the speaker’s face needs and the function of indirectness in apologising. At the same time, several researchers point out the increasing popularity of public apologies.

Abadi (1990), Cunningham (1999), and some discuss their effectiveness in image restoration, thus shifting the focus to the apologiser’s positive face needs. Studies analysing the role of apologies in restorative and criminal justice have, on the one hand, demonstrated that apologies serve as a means of empowering the victims and may even lead to reduced
recidiv is. On the other, they have been shown to play a crucial role in settlement negotiation as well as in sentencing and parole hearings, Robbenholt (2006), where the acceptance of responsibility and show of remorse can reduce the sentence or even make the offended party drop the charges.

However, the apologiser’s positive face needs are central to all apologies, for if we did not care about what others think of us, we would see no reason for putting things right and humiliating ourselves by doing so. Brown and Levinson only briefly mention remedial apologies, and they categorise them as FTAs that damageS’s positive face, which is explained as follows:

indicates that he regrets doing a prior FTA, thereby damaging his own face to some degree – especially if the apology is at the same time a confession with H learning about the transgression through it, and the FTA thus conveys bad news. (1987: 68) This definition depicts a very specific type of apology, namely one including a confession. A confession, however, is a separate speech act within a remedial interchange, which may or may not accompany an apology. Indeed, most offences happen with both parties present, while situations in which H has to be told that he or she has been offended are the exception rather than the rule. While I agree that apologies affect S’s positive face, the apology is not the part of the remedial interchange that damages it, but the one used to restore it.

It is the offence that damages S’s positive face because, obviously, we do not approve of people who offend us. Consequently, S’s positive face – the desire to be liked by and share wants with others – is not damaged by the apology but the factor motivating it. The damage to S’s positive face caused by the offence is sometimes delayed by the necessity to verbalise it. There seem to be two cases in which one of the parties involved needs to be made aware of the offence: either S’s confession informs H that he or she has been harmed, or H’s complaint tells S that his or her behaviour has been interpreted as offensive. Having defined apologies as speech acts restoring the speaker’s positive face, I would like to turn to the speaker’s negative face needs, specifically the want “that his actions be unimpeded by others” Brown and Levinson (my emphasis). What is problematic about this definition is that it applies to speech acts which are performed by one person and threaten the face of another. When apologising, however, the speaker is the one who performs the speech act and simultaneously the one whose face is threatened.
Apologies have been described as humiliating Olshtain (1989) and a sa “painful experience” Norrick , (1978), and some even regard the suffering of the offender as an important contribution to the healing process Lazare (2004), which shows why we are reluctant to apologise. The only way of explaining this reluctance in terms of Brown and Levinson’s conceptualisation of face seems to be that by performing an act which is humiliating and unpleasant to them, apologisers restrict their own freedom of action, i.e. threaten their negative face. Unless other human needs, not included in Brown and Levinson’s model, are used to explain why people are reluctant to apologise, one could argue that since they are certainly not worried that the apology will make them less likeable, which is what threat to positive face would imply, the threat involved in apologising must concern their negative face. Damage to positive face has already been caused by the offence and will be even greater if no apology takes place. We do not risk our positive face when apologising but attempt to restore it, which is why apologies are oriented towards satisfying S’s positive face needs, at the expense of S’s negative face.

Although most researchers agree that apologies are meant to restore H’s damaged face, usually no distinction is made between positive and negative face needs. The last question to be addressed is, therefore, whether it is H’s positive or negative face which the apology aims at restoring. Which face needs to be restored is largely determined by the type of offence necessitating the apology: While offences that damage the hearer’s positive face require apologies which are directed to this face type, damage to negative face is most effectively remedied by addressing the hearer’s negative face needs. Hence, the type of offence determines whether positive or negative politeness strategies are more likely to placate the hearer. Damage to H’s positive face is likely to occur when S’s behaviour indicates that he or she “does not care about the addressee’s feelings, wants, etc.” (Brown and Levinson( 1987).

Examples of such offences include disappointing H by not keeping a promise or forgetting an appointment. Since positive face needs tend to be reciprocal – for we generally like people by whom we want to be liked – they mainly matter in relationships based on low social distance. In the case of offences taking place between strangers, in contrast, negative face is more likely to be at stake. A typical offence restricting H’s basic claim to territories
is a space offence. While such offences also occur between friends, the low social distance characterizing friendships makes them less offensive.

Ultimately, some offences cause damage to both face types, and with the speaker and the hearer both having a positive and a negative face, a remedial interchange can affect up to four faces. Although Brown and Levinson recognize that the threat underlying the performance of an FTA may involve H’s and S’s and even both interlocutors’ face, and that damage can occur to both positive and negative face, their chart of strategies available for performing an FTA (1987) does not account for all these possibilities: The calculation of the necessary amount of face-redress is determined by risk to face (singular). Typically, the focus is on the negative face of the hearer, which is threatened by a speech act invading his or her private territory, such as a request. Through the use of higher-numbered strategies, the threat is minimised, the speech act becomes less direct and more polite. Whereas it would be exceedingly difficult to develop a chart that is applicable to all speech acts alike and takes into account S’s and H’s face as well as the tension between their positive and negative face needs.

The offence, sometimes followed by a complaint or a confession, damages both H’s and S’s face. In the case of H, it may be either positive or negative face that is harmed, depending on the offence. In S’s case, it is positive face that is damaged, for committing an offence makes S’s wants less desirable. Positive face is especially important in relationships characterised by low social distance; with both parties willing to maintain social harmony and continue the relationship, S’s and H’s positive face wants can be regarded as mutual. H’s negative face is more central in offences between strangers, though brief encounters involving space offences generally require ritual rather than substantial apologies.

The apology restores H’s negative and / or positive face as well as S’s positive face, but some damage to S’s negative face is unavoidable. The apologiser not only has “two points of view – a defensive orientation toward saving his own face and a protective orientation toward saving the other’s face” Goffman (1972), but is also caught in a conflict between his or her positive and negative face needs. Lazare makes yet another distinction when explaining an offender’s reasons for apologising, namely that between psychological concepts, such as empathy, guilt and shame and external circumstances, such as avoidance of abandonment, damage to reputation and retaliation (2004).
His approach shows that in many cases it will not be possible to tell apart all the factors motivating an apology and that there is more at stake than Brown and Levinson’s negative and positive face. The restoration of both interlocutors’ face and their reconciliation are completed with the apology reaching its perlocution, i.e. with H forgiving S or at least expressing apology acceptance. Strategy choice oriented more towards S’s than H’s face needs, in contrast, can lead to a rejection of the apology. As is evident from the above argumentation, both parties’ positive face needs are crucial in performing an apology. While damage to the hearer’s positive as well as negative face can necessitate it, without the speaker’s positive face needs, there might be no apology, which is uttered despite threat to negative face.

Hence, whenever an apology takes place, positive face needs can be said to supersede negative face needs. Considering that remedial apologies are not likely to be successful when verbalised reluctantly, and that there is virtually no need to redress H’s negative face when performing an act from which H benefits and which he or she expects, it seems that the function of apologies as negative politeness devices is largely restricted to disarming apologies. One of the objectives of this study is to find out how the preference for negative politeness in British culture, and that for positive politeness in Polish and Russian cultures influences apology behaviour. On the basis of the above discussion, one could hypothesise that Poles and Russians focus on both parties’ positive face when apologising: S will want to signal H that H’s wants are still desirable to S and to ensure that, despite the offence, also S’s wants remain desirable to H. In doing so, Polish and Russian speakers are more likely to disregard their negative face needs than members of a negative politeness culture. People with an Anglo-Saxon cultural background, on the other hand, might be more reluctant to allow threat to their negative face, more likely to apologise indirectly or avoid the confrontation than members of positive politeness cultures. At the same time, they might apologise more readily in situations involving damage to H’s negative face; situations which may not require an apology in positive politeness cultures.

One might also hypothesise that the function of apologies is culture-specific and that the general agreement on viewing apologies as negative politeness strategies is related to the fact that most apology studies have been conducted by researchers with a Western cultural background. While members of individualist cultures seem to view apologies as a post
factum acknowledgement of the hearer’s right to non-distraction, thus focusing on the past, in collectivist cultures, the future relationship seems to be central, a precondition of which is that S’s wants are still desirable to H.

Furthermore, while both Polish and Russian cultures have been classified as positive politeness cultures, the stronger individualist tendency characterising Polish culture could lead to differences in the conceptualization and realisation of apologies in these two Slavic cultures. Ultimately, by focusing on face as a factor determining apology behavior and by taking into account both parties’ positive and negative face needs, the following analysis can be expected to contribute to the description of the manifold functions of apologies and culture-specific ways of dealing with offensive situations.

2.14 Comparison between Issues in Arabic and English

In Arabic language phrases for praise and respect are different according to situation which you are in it; for example, you can say (Hatha wajepi, "That's my duty") when someone thanks you for a service or you can say (La taqoul hatha, "don't mention it"). also, you can say (Atal allah oumrak, "may God prolong your life") when someone gives you a good thing or (barak Allah bek, "God bless you"). By the way, I think that matter is not too different from English language, every situation or circumstance has a specific phrase to show praise or respect.

2.14.1 Family

The family is the key social unit to an Arab. This loyalty influences all aspects of an Arab’s life. Arabs honor and respect their family. They highly value friendships. Family and kin’s honor most important. Patriarchal and hierarchal: Fathers/elders dominate Larger the better: Large families provide for possible economic benefits, particularly for the possibility that a son will care for his parents in their elderly years. Large families provide the father with the prestige of virility. Clan and then tribe in terms of loyalty follow family as a social unit, although most contemporary Arabs express a national identity as well.

Children: Male offspring are favored, since a son is expected to care for his parents in their advanced age, whereas a daughter becomes part of the son-in-law’s family. Also, a son can bring a family honor, whereas a daughter can only bring shame. Women typically have a private area in the household separate from men, especially in rural areas.
2.14.2 Youth Explosion in the Arab World

Statistics show a dramatic increase in the number of persons less than 15 years of age in the Arab world. Rates in the developed world are around 20%. Rates in the developing world are around 35%. Rates in the Arab world are 42%. The impact of this increase could be positive and/or negative and will depend upon how each country addresses the issue.

Positive: Increase labor pool, new talent and leadership potential. Negative: If economy cannot support (jobs, education, etc.) growing youth bulge – discontent and social unrest are likely.

2.15 Politeness and Religious Expressions

Religious terms are very frequently used to express politeness in any utterance in Arabic. It can be seen as an expression of positive politeness (Emery, 2000). Mostly, blessings are used which are consistent with the Islamic tradition, as in Bajri (2005): “Allah yixalīk” (May God preserve you), “Allah yiţawwil fi umrak” (May you live long.)” (Migdadi, 2003) Bajri (2005) adds that Saudi speakers use blessings as alerters to express politeness in requests, such as: “Allah yirẓ aʕalēki (May God be pleased with you), bring me a glass of water, please;” “Allah yijzak xēr (May Allah reward you with His blessings). Nuredeen’s (2008) study also illustrates

“the use of religious words and phrases in everyday communication with varied illocutionary forces, possibly as fillers, hedges, or devices to soften the threat of an act. In the present study, the researcher will investigate the religious expressions”

2.15.1 Arab Perspective and Western Perspective

**ARAB Family** – Center of everything. (Father has first and last word.)

**Friends** – Periphery, but courteous to all.

**Honor** – Very Important amongst Arabs. Honor will be protected and defended at all costs.

**Shame** (especially against family) – avoided at all costs, insults and criticism taken very seriously.

**Time** – less rigid. Approach to time is much more relaxed and slower than that in Western cultures.

**Religion** – Central to all things. Society – Family / tribe is most important
Government – Most governments are secular, but still emphasize religion. Age and Wisdom honored. Wealth honored in both cultures.

2.15.2 Western
Family – Important but not as central to individual. Friends – Core to some, important to most. Honor – Typically not as important. Shame – Typically not as important. Time- Very structured, deadlines must be met. Religion – Varies by individual, very personal, not discussed in polite conversation. Society – Individual rights. Government – Purpose is to protect rights and improve standard of living. Youth and Beauty praised. Wealth honored in both cultures.

2.15.3 Arab World Views
An Arab worldview is based upon six concepts: atomism, faith, wishes versus reality, justice and equality, paranoia and the importance of family over self.

2.15.3.1 Atomism
Arabs tend to see the world and events as isolated incidents, snapshots, and particular moments in time. Westerners tend to look for unifying concepts whereas Arabs focus on parts, rather than on the whole. Faith Arabs usually believe that many, if not all, things in life are controlled by the will of God (fate) rather than by human beings.

2.15.3.2 Wish and Reality
Arabs, much more than Westerners, express emotion in a forceful and animated fashion. Their desire for modernity is contradicted by a desire for tradition (especially Islamic tradition).

2.15.3.3 Justice and Equality
Arabs value justice and equality among Muslims, and to a lesser degree to others. All actions taken by non-Arabs will be weighed in comparison to tradition and religious standards.
2.15.4 Family and Self

Arabic communities are tight-knit groups made up of even tighter family groups. Family pride and honor is more important than individual honor.

2.15.4.1 Paranoia

Arabs may seem paranoid by Western standards. Many are suspicious of any Western interest or intent in their land.

2.15.5 Arab Customs: Shame and Honor

Admitting, “I don’t know” is distasteful to an Arab. Constructive criticism can be taken as an insult. Be careful not to insult. Women wear headscarves as a show of respect, even if wearing Western clothing.

2.15.5.1 Family

Family is the center of honor, loyalty, and reputation for Arabs. Males are always the head of the Arab family.

2.15.5.2 Personal Space

Most Arabs do not share the American concept of “personal space” in public situations, and in private meetings or conversations.

2.15.5.3 Offensive to Step or Lean Away

Women are an exception to this rule. DO NOT stand close to, stare at, or touch a woman.

2.15.6 Socialization and Trust

When conducting business, it is customary to first shake the hand of all males present, taking care not to grip too firmly. Allocate plenty of time for refreshment before attempting to engage in business. It is important to first establish respect and trust.

2.16 Politeness and Women’s Speech

Lakoff (1973) makes the distinction based primarily on perception between women’s language and men’s language, asserting that the first is more polite than the second. Lakoff
(1975) claims that women use more polite structures such as tag questions, hesitation markers, trivializing adjectives, and so forth. Although these claims have not been supported empirically, the argument that women have distinct style due to their position in the society still exerts considerable influence on research (B and L, 1987). Bataineh and Bataineh (2008) claim that girls are more likely than boys to use language to form and maintain connections whereas boys are more likely to use language to assert their independence, establish dominance, and achieve goals. Cameron (2005), and Mills (2003) assert that

"feminist theory has radically changed in the recent years. Feminists researching the relationship between gender and language have had a longstanding interest in the ways in which language reflects and helps constitute sexual inequality"

Weatherall,( 2002), Cameron (2005) summarizes the changes that occurred on language-and-gender research in two periods: the modern and the postmodern feminist approaches. However, since the scope of this study is not to investigate linguistic gender differences but to compare women’s polite speech across cultures, a very brief review will be given on how women’s language has been accounted for in gender research. In the traditional approach to women’s language, gender is seen as a given that one is born with. Thus, men and women are biologically gendered and this is reflected in their language. Men’s language is seen as dominant, formal and direct; women’s, on the other hand, is feminine, inferior, powerless, and indirect (Cameron, 2005; Mills, 2003).

The modern approach views gender as distinguished from sex. Sex is a biological categorization that we are born with whereas gender is socially constructed ( Eckert and McConnell, 2003). In the postmodern period, feminist language has taken a constructionist approach. Since the first half of the 1990s, the concept of binary gender differences has been broken down, and replaced by the diversity of gender identities and gendered practices. They question the distinction of sex/gender. To the proponents of this approach, gender in itself is not natural but constructed. The proponents are influenced by the concept of performativity. Gender is a repeated performance of a range of behavior associated with a particular sex. That is, gender is not a given or a possession but a process in which one constantly performs. Instead of focusing on binary differences, the approach emphasizes the intra-group differences and inter-group similarities. Femininities and masculinities are produced in certain contexts in relation to local social arrangement.
Feminist-language researchers taking a social constructionist approach have been highly critical of the notion of gender differences in speech (Cameron, 2005; Mills, 2003). In this approach, gender must not be viewed as a given or as absolute dichotomy. Instead, gender must be conceptualized as both psychologically and socially situated; it must be represented as differences that grow out of experience, learning, and self-definition in the family and the culture. Differences do not necessarily imply distinctness or separateness; rather they represent a particular way of being connected to the others.

Whiting and Edwards (cited in Ervin-Tripp, 2001) on the basis of an extensive program of careful observation in many diverse societies, conclude that “girls get more practice in nurturance and pro-social dominance, boys in egoistic dominance and challe. However, this difference, according to the two researchers, could be the result of gender socialization through adult assignment of girls and boys to different settings and tasks in the societies they studied. They contend that this difference could disappear if these activity contrasts did not exist. The present study aims to investigate whether women across cultures are gendered in that they use the same politeness strategies in their linguistic behavior of offering as claimed by the proponents of the traditional approach, or use strategies based on the social practices of each society as claimed by the constructivists in the (post) modern approach.

2.17 Women’s Indirectness and Power

Indirectness has been associated with women’s speech (Mills, 200). However, little empirical evidence supported this feminine-indirectness relationship (Rundquist, 1992). This assumption has been refuted by Rundquist (1992), who observed that male parents used more indirect speech with their children than did the mothers. In contrast, Bajri (2005), conclude that women use more conventionally indirect strategies whereas men use more direct as a sort of politeness. Indirectness has been interpreted as a feature of powerless speech. Consequently, feminine speech is viewed as being powerless. Sociolinguistic research on gender and language in the past suggested that women’s language is powerless “due to the relative lack of particular linguistic elements that are generally regarded as being part of the masculine power code.” Takano, (2005).
Holmes (1995) asserts that the more polite tone of women’s speech is often associated with submissive social roles. An interesting view that links indirectness with powerfulness is proposed by Macaulay (2001). She examined a particular register, interviewing, in which female speakers employed questions or requests for information both to get information and maintain conversation. She examined differences between male and female interviewers in topical and political interviews on radio and television. The female interviewers in the study employed more indirect requests for information than did the male interviewers. The female interviewers employed these indirect requests for information to ask tough questions. In this way, they were able to get the information they wanted from their interviewees, and so both maintained their status and position themselves in talk as powerful speakers. Some studies restricted women’s speech in some cultures to negative politeness strategies as an indication of their powerlessness in communication.

In this respect, Bandl (1987) claim that women’s predominant negative politeness derives largely from Power variable in societies where women are vulnerable to men. Mills (2003) posits that characterizing women’s linguistic behavior as being concerned with cooperation, conflict avoidance, and excessive use of respect and deference is based on the assumption that women are powerless and display their powerlessness in language. Because it has been seen as a display of powerlessness, women’s linguistic behavior is, therefore, characterized as hesitant and unassertive, and thus, women would show negative politeness for others. Women usually prefer not to go on record since they do not feel “entitled to make demands.” (Tannen, 1994: 7) Tannen rejects this link asserting that indirectness is not in itself a strategy of subordination that is used by powerless speakers; rather it is used by the powerful and the powerless, men or women, depending on the setting of a cultural context. She contends that cross-cultural evidence has refuted this assumption, and adds that the American tendency to associate indirectness with women’s speech is not universal.

More importantly, in some nations, women were found to be more direct than men (Tannen, 1994). assumes that in societies where gender groups are segregated, “there is systematic higher rating of FTAs.” Bandl (1987) argue that women are more likely to use positive politeness with groups of lower-status groups, and more prestigious dialect variables with higher status groups (e.g., male groups). They also claim that two men of
equal status and same social distance (e.g., cousins) use less face-redressive measures than two women in a comparable situation (i.e., cousins).

Takano (2005) proposes a different, yet more realistic, view about women’s polite speech. He contends that women choose the type of polite strategy according to the communicative demands of the context. He focuses on this dilemma that Japanese women are exposed to when they are in position of authority and power, which is, choosing between specific cultural rules of feminine speech and powerful speech according to their positions of authority. Takano (2005) obtained some speech samples from professional Japanese women in similar occupational positions. His aim was to refute the false assumption that women are restricted to negative politeness strategies. The results show that PWC (Professional Japanese women in charge) effectively manipulated both negative and positive politeness to achieve the communicative goal. Their choice of negative politeness strategies, however, is not a matter of the feeling of powerlessness but rather a matter of high awareness of language context.

2.18 Arabic Calendar/Holidays

Islamic practices are based on the lunar calendar or cycle, consisting of twelve months of 29 or 30 days each, totaling 353 or 354 days. Each new month begins at the sighting of a new moon. Actual dates may differ from dates provided. The holy day of the Muslims is FRIDAY. It is considered to be sacred and the Day of Judgment will take place on Friday. In the Friday sermon the Imam (prayer leader) Eating Etiquette Arabs are restricted by Islamic conventions from eating pork, most carnivorous animals, and unscaled fish. Alcohol is forbidden.

Meat must be butchered in line with Qur’anic ritual (know as Hallal =“permitted”)
The staple of the Arab diet is dark pita bread. Lamb is the most common meat. Always offer snack foods to visitors and accept what is offered to you as a guest, but only after modestly refusing the first offer. It is assumed that guests will accept at least a small quantity of drink (tea usually or sometimes Arabic coffee) offered as an expression of friendship or esteem. It is considered rude to decline the offer of drink. When served a beverage, accept with the.
2.18.1 Right Hand only

When eating, drinking, offering, or passing use right hand only! When eating with Arabs, especially when taking food from communal dishes, the left hand must never be used, it is considered unclean. Not eating everything on one’s plate is considered a compliment. It is a sign of wealth when an Arab can afford to leave food behind. If invited to an Arab home, leave shortly after dinner. The dinner is the climax of conversation and entertainment. Avoid discussions on political issues (national and international), religion, alcohol, and male-female relations over dinner or tea.

2.18.2 Hygiene

Personal hygiene is extremely important to Arabs for both spiritual and practical reasons. Because meals are frequently eaten by hand, it is typical to wash the hands before and after eating. Formal washing of face, hands, and forearm required before daily prayers or fasting. Some interpretations of the Qur’an suggest that all flowing water is clean, to include that coming from open air canals within the cities that are sometimes garbage or sewage clogged. The immunity systems of Arabs accustomed to this water prevents ill effects, but Westerners should only use water from a trusted source.

2.19 Arab Culture in Homes Building

Homes vary from one room to multiple room dwellings. One room homes may be curtained into sections to make sleeping areas. The walls are made from mud mixed with the chaff from wheat and most often are left the tan mud color although they can be painted a white or light color. The walls tend to be thicker near the ground and tend to taper off as the walls approach the roof. Roofs tend to be flat topped, since the lack of rain does not warrant a sloped roof. The poor tend to build their dwellings slightly below ground and everyone sleeps on the floor to escape the summer heat.

2.19.1 Body Language and Greetings

Body Language takes on extra significance in Arab culture. The body language is distinctly different and must be learned in order to effectively reinforce the intended message, and perhaps more importantly to not give unintended insults.
i. Shake Hands with right hand only and at the beginning and end of any visit. Shake hands longer but less firmly than in the West.

ii. Left hand grasps elbow.

iii. Close friends or colleagues hug and kiss both cheeks upon greeting.

iv. During the Hajj (pilgrimage), people may kiss only on the shoulders as a gesture of friendship and greeting. Touching noses together three times when greeting is a Bedouin gesture of friendship and respect.

v. Placing a hand on your heart along with a slight bow is a sign of respect.

This is usually done during greeting. US soldiers should limit physical contact to a handshake.

2.20 General Behavior, Attitudes and Demeanor – The Golden Rule

Taken from 30 Days International journal

“A Muslim should treat others as he would wish them to treat him (and) Like for others what he would like for himself.” Here are some important customs to watch when you visit Muslims anywhere:

a. Practice Humility: Have a demeanor which models kindness and forbids being harsh, rude, or even speaking loudly to others. Seek Moderation: Many Muslims value deliberation, a careful consideration which focuses on the outcome of a matter. Moderation in speech, and avoidance of being nervous, highly strung or liable to sudden anger, characterizes many of those who “submit to God.”

b. Sincerity is Key: A kind, honest, humble approach–free of an arrogant and overbearing attitude–naturally opens the way for agreeable exchanges.

2.20.1 Greetings and Contact

Handshakes, though regarded as important, usually do not possess the same firmness as handclasps of many Europeans or Americans. British usually shake hands only the first time we are introduced to someone. Most Arabs shake hands every time they meet you and every time they leave you. This applies whether they meet you on the street, in an office, at a
conference, restaurant, or at home. The customs and behavior in Arabs Countries Arabia is to shake hands on meeting, chat a bit, and shake hands again on leaving—even if you meet ten times a day. If sitting, rise when shaking hands as well as when an esteemed person enters a room.

Touching, long handshakes, grasped elbows, even walking hand in hand by two males is common place in the Arab world. A considerable number of Arabs touch more between the same sex, to show relationship. They hold hands, hug each other, kiss if close friends. As Arab customs and behavior condones the outward display of affection between male friends, one may see Arab men, even officials and military officers, holding hands as they walk together or otherwise converse with one another. If an individual Arab does not touch you, he does not like you—or he may be trying to restrain himself because you are not used to being touched. A full body embrace, accompanied with hugging, should not be initiated until you are sure that the Arab is a close friend. If the Arab initiates it, participate and consider yourself honored and/or accepted. Contact between the opposite sex in public is considered close to obscene. Use the right hand to eat, touch and present gifts. The left is generally regarded as unclean.

2.20.2 Greetings and Conversations

Small talk and ritual greetings is normal in Arabs countries. Middle Easterners often greet each other with a number of ritual phrases and fixed responses. Ancient custom governs these interactions. To Western eyes, profuse greetings, inquiries about health and well-being, often take up inordinate amounts of time but it is important in establishing friendly relations. Remember, however, it is insulting to ask about a Muslim’s wife or another female family member. Eye contact during discussions—often long and direct—is important. Staring is not necessarily rude (except gazing at women).

Be aware of appearing to be in a hurry when you are among Arabs. For example, during a business appointment or social visit with an Arab, do not look at your watch or otherwise act as if you have little time to talk. Arabs can be very offended by this. Time is much less rigidly scheduled in Arab countries than in western countries. Pointing your finger or a pen at anyone while speaking, or beckon anyone with your finger. It is
considered a threat, and only animals are treated in this manner. Distance in talking with one another (body space) may be much closer with Middle East peoples than with Westerners.

2.20.3 Hospitality and Visits / Meals

Hospitality and giving a warm reception to strangers goes back to the culture of the desert. Developed over centuries, where the desert environment bound traveling nomads to depend on the graciousness and generosity of others, hospitality enabled inhabitants of the Arabian Peninsula to survive thirst, hunger and sudden raids/attacks. Many Middle Eastern peoples continue this custom of showing courtesy and consideration to strangers. Demonstrating friendliness, generosity and hospitableness become expressions of personal honor, even sacred duties. Take off your shoes at the entrance and leave them there before going in. Sometimes oversize slippers are provided for you to put on. Men should not wear shorts, and women should not go there wearing short sleeves or sleeveless dresses. Take care when sitting. Avoid stretching legs in front of or sitting up higher than others, sitting with the left hand behind the back, or positioning oneself so the shadows fall upon half of one’s body. Avoid putting feet on tables or furniture. Show respect. Refrain from leaning against walls, slouching in chairs, and keeping hands in pockets. Keep from pointing with the feet. Do not show the soles of the feet, as they are the lowest and dirtiest part of the body. Allowing your host to initiate discussion topics is a good policy. Expect handshakes from all personnel in a party. Sometimes Arabs use double meanings in conversation, which allows for all parties to feel good and not lose face. Such use shows the practitioner to be a person of culture.

2.20.4 Do not Talk Loudly

Use the right hand to eat. The left is generally regarded as unclean. Expect the actual eating of a meal to come at the conclusion to an evening’s festivities. Touch food and pass it with your right hand only. In some areas, Middle Easterners consider it impolite to eat everything on one’s plate. Leaving food becomes a symbol of abundance and serves to compliment the host.
2.20.5 Outward Affection and Gestures

Take off your shoes at the entrance and leave them there before going in. Sometimes oversize slippers are provided for you to put on. Men should not go into mosque wearing shorts, and women should not go there wearing short sleeves or sleeveless dresses. Do not talk loudly. Do not walk directly in front of people praying. Do not take pictures of people in a mosque, particularly women. Mosques are considered to be shelters for homeless people. Do not be surprised to find mosques without furniture, except for the carpet. The Islamic religion advocates a simple way of life for its followers.

2.21 Previous Studies

There are a number of studies which have handled cross cultural differences in politeness in Arabic and English languages. There are some researchers conducted in these areas which aim to serve certain issues such as developing teaching and learning process, help learners to improve their behaviours or attempt to how the affect of politeness on teaching and learning process. The following are some of these studies:

Hamza Etheb (2015) Using Address Terms in showing Politeness with Reference to Their Translation from Arabic into English University of Glasgow, UK

This paper aims to investigate the translation of address terms between Arabic and English. Those terms belong to different systems in both languages. Certain characteristics of an address term in one culture tend to be lost when translated into another. Therefore, politeness theory will be used in order to find out whether the politeness intended by using an address term is transferred into the target language or not. For this study, a number of address terms are selected from a novel, Madiq Alley. Those terms are delivered to a number of subjects in a questionnaire. The analysis points out the use of such systems and how each system applies different politeness strategies to show respect and deference. The findings indicate that some patterns of face-work are lost in the translation process and that the relational terms of address are more challenging to translate than the absolute ones.

AbdulWahed Osman Ghaleb (2010) Apologies in Arabic and English: An inter-language and cross-cultural study, King Saud University. Kigdom of Saudi Arabia
This paper focuses on the investigation of English apology strategies as employed in various social situations by Arab learners of English studying in India. These strategies are compared and contrasted against the strategies elicited in the same situations from Indian English speakers, American English speakers, and British English speakers. Pragmatic transfer from Arabic is also examined. The study findings reveal that the religious beliefs, concepts and values are responsible for many deviations in the Arab learners’ language from that of the native speakers. Moreover, Arabs using English are more keen on taking on responsibility, whereas the English native speakers are more keen on formulaic offers of repair or verbal redress. Interesting similarities in the selection of arrangement patterns of the major apology strategies are found between the Arab learners’ data and the data elicited from Indian English speakers. This is interpreted as a result of some aspects of cultural similarities. Finally, some pedagogical implications are highlighted.


This article examines the notions of (in)directness and politeness in the speech act of requests among Saudi Arabic native speakers as compared to American English native speakers. To elicit data on the requestive strategies that the two groups employed, a randomly chosen group of 30 Saudi and American undergraduate students were given a discourse completion test that consisted of twelve written context-enriched situations. The results revealed that conventional indirectness was the most prevailing strategy employed by the American sample. On the other hand, the Saudi sample varied their request strategies depending on the social variables of power and distance. The results also showed that the level of directness differed cross-culturally. American students used direct requests when addressing their friends on the condition that the request was not weighty; however, directness was the most preferred strategy among Saudi students in intimate situations where directness is interpreted as an expression of affiliation, closeness and group-connectedness rather than impoliteness.

Takwa Bosuwon (2014) Linguistic Politeness – A major Tool for Cross Cultural Requests
In an era of growing internationalization, requesting—a demand made by a requester asking a favor of another person (Nelson et al 2002) -- has played a vital role in cross-cultural interactions. Since making requests involves the speaker’s effort to get assistance from the hearer, it is intrinsically face-threatening (Brown and Levinson 1987). The use of politeness strategies then comes into play to soften the face threats. Moreover, since the notion of politeness is perceived differently across cultures (Blum-Kulka 1987), politeness strategies become helpful only when formulated in a socially and culturally appropriate way. This article explores linguistic politeness in requests based on politeness theories, linguistic politeness across cultures, shortcomings of universal politeness theories, studies of culture-specific politeness, and teaching linguistic politeness to EFL requesters.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This section shows the method of data collection, provides a description of the sample of the study and the analysis of the questionnaire statements. Also, it investigates the responses of the teachers to whom the questionnaire have been distributed, and to find the validity, reliability of the questionnaire and analysis the data.

3.1 Population of the Study

The population of this study are English language teachers at secondary level schools in Hasahisa Locality, Gezira State, Sudan. There are hundred English teachers, fifty of them were taken as a sample to fit this study.

3.2 Sample of the Study

The sample of the study has been selected randomly from teachers of secondary schools, Hasaheisa Locality, Gezira State, Sudan. The questionnaire has been distributed to fifty of them to fill the options.

3.3 The Tool of the Study

The study used a questionnaire as a tool for data collection. It composed of twenty sixteen statements for teachers. Each statement has three options, they are: agree, neutral, and disagree. The study used SPSS program for analyzing the data collected. For the presentation of the results the researcher used percentages, tables and figures for more explanation. This tool will be analyzed statistically with SPSS Program.

3.4 The Procedures

The questionnaire is designed and used as a tool to collect data for investigating the topic. Cross Cultural Pragmatics and Politeness Strategies in English and Arabic, at secondary level this questionnaire is distributed to the EFL teachers at secondary schools
level. The questionnaire statement options are: agree, agree, neutral, and disagree to obtain information which related to the research.

3.5 Reliability and Validity of the Questionnaire

The study used the statistical package for social sciences to analyze the data collected. The researcher used Pearson's correlation and the results obtained as follows: In this study the researcher used Pearson correlation through half-methods. According to the equation below it is found that the validity is:

\[ r_{xy} = \frac{N(\Sigma XY) - (\Sigma X\Sigma Y)}{\sqrt{[N(\Sigma X^2) - (\Sigma X)^2][N(\Sigma Y^2) - (\Sigma Y)^2]}} \]

Where
r = correlation
R: Reliability of the test
N: number of all items in the test
X: odd scores
Y: even scores
\( \Sigma \): Sum

\[ R = \frac{2 \times r}{1 + r} \]

\[ \text{Val} = \sqrt{\text{reliability}} \]

Correlation = 0.90

\[ \frac{2 \times r}{1 + r} = \frac{2(0.90)}{1 + 0.90} = \frac{1.8}{1.90} \]

Reliability = 0.95

\[ \text{Val} = \sqrt{0.95} \]

Validity = 0.97
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

This chapter describes data analysis. For presentation of the results the researcher used SPSS percentages, tables and figures for more explanation. The questionnaire statement are shown in the analyses according to their order in the questionnaire.

4.1 The Analysis of the Questionnaire Statements

Statement (1) EFL learners need to develop awareness about cultural aspect of the target language.

Table (4.1) Learners’ awareness about cultural aspect of the target language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (4.1) shows that, EFL learners need to develop their awareness about cultural aspect of the target language. According to the statistical analysis of statement one most respondents (88%) agree, (6%) neutral and (6%) disagree that, EFL learners need to develop their awareness about cultural aspect of the target language.

**Statement (2) Being Polite helps showing respect in an interactional act**

Table (4.2) Showing respect in an interactional act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4:2) shows that, most respondents (78%) agree, (12%) neutral and (10%) disagree agree that, being polite helps in showing respect in an interactional act.
Statement (3) It is important to keep a positive face when addressing people

Table (4.3) The importance of keeping a positive face when addressing people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table and diagram (4.3) show that, most respondents agree that, it is important to keep a positive face when addressing people. According to the statistical analysis of statement (4.3) most respondents (86%) agree with the statement, (8%) neutral and (6%) disagree. Therefore, this statement is accepted.
Statement(4) When communicating with people, face images reflect a positive or negative attitudes in communication.

Table (4.4) face images during communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the statistical analysis of table (4.4), most respondents (78%) agree, (12%) neutral and (10%) disagree, when communicating with people, face images reflect a positive or negative attitudes in communication, this statement is accepted.
Statement (5) It is crucial for the translator from a language into another one to recognize the motive that led the speaker to be polite.

Table (4.5) translation awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4.5) shows that most respondents (88%) agree, (8%) neutral and (4%) disagree that, it is crucial for the translator from a language into another one to recognize the motive that led the speaker to be polite. According to the statistical analysis of statement this statement is accept.
Statement (6) Classroom discourse reflects social nature and culture

Table (4.6) Reflecting social nature and culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the statistical analysis of statement most respondents (76%) agree, (16%) neutral and (8%) disagree that, classroom discourse reflects social nature and culture, this statement is accepted.
Statement (7) Positive politeness is to show solidarity and it is directed to the positive face of the addressee

Table (4.7) Showing solidarity and it is directed to the positive face of the addressee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4.7) shows that, positive politeness is to show solidarity and it is directed to the positive face of the addressee. Most respondents (78%) disagree, (14%) neutral and (8%) agree that, positive politeness is to show solidarity and it is directed to the positive face of the addressee, thus this statement is not accepted.
Statement (8) Negative face leads to apology and indirectness

Table (4.8) Leading to apology and indirectness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4.8) shows that, most respondents (86%) agree, (10%) neutral and (4%) disagree that, negative face leads to apology and indirectness. According to the statistical analysis of statement (8) most respondents agree. Therefore this statement is accepted.
Statement (9) Terms of address usually accompany a person to identify their status, class, rank or position in a particular community or society

Table (4.9) Terms of address indication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4.9) shows that, terms of address usually accompany a person to identify their status, class, rank or position in a particular community or society, (78%) of respondents disagree, (12%) neutral and (10%) agree the statement. According to the statistical analysis of statement (4.9) most respondents disagree with it, so that this statement is not accepted.
Statement (10) Addressing people requires the choice of the most suitable form of address according to the social interaction.

Table (4.10) Addressing requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram and table (4.10) show that most respondents (82%) disagree, (6%) to some extent and (12%) agree that addressing people requires the choice of the most suitable form of address according to the social interaction. This statement is not accepted.
Statement (11) Some types of teaching aids increases EFL learners’ language skills

Table (4.11) Increasing EFL learners’ language skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram and table (4.11) shows that most respondents (80%) agree, (14%) disagree, and (6%) to some extent that, some types of teaching aids increases EFL learners’ language skills. According to the statistical analysis of table (4-11), this statement is accepted.
Statement (12) The degree of formality, the social status and the relationship between the participants are always manifested in an interactional act.

Table (4.12) Manifesting in an interactional act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4.12) shows that, the degree of formality and relationship between the participants are always manifested in an interactional act. According to the statistical analysis of table(4.12) most respondents (82%) agree (10%) neutral and (8%) disagree ,so it is accepted.
Statement(13) In conversation, participant cooperate to each other to establish a dialogue under certain socially organized oral activities

Table (4.13) Establishing an oral activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the statistical analysis of table (4.13) most respondents (86%) agree, (8%) to some extent and (6%) disagree that, in conversation, participants cooperate to each other to establish a dialogue under certain socially organized oral activities. Thus this statement is accepted.
Statement (14) The use of address forms expresses the functional part of language

Table (4.14) Expressing the functional part of language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the statistical analysis of table (4.14) most respondents (78%) agree, (12%) neutral and (10%) disagree that, the use of address forms expresses the functional part of language. Therefore this statement is accepted.
Statement (15) Socio-cultural context influences what we say and how we say it.

Table (4.15) Factors influencing what we say and how we say it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the statistical analysis of table (15) most respondents (84%) agree, (6%) neutral and (10%) disagree that, socio-cultural context influences what we say and how we say it. Therefore this statement is accepted.
Statement(16) Showing politeness is differ cross-culturally.

Table (4.16) Showing politeness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table and diagram( 4.16 )show that, showing politeness is differ cross-culturally.(84%) of the sample agree,(10%)neutral and (6%)disagree that, showing politeness is differ cross-culturally. So this statement is accepted.
4.3 Testing Hypotheses

The topic tries to ensure and test the hypotheses that may answer previous question

Hypothesis one: Showing politeness is differ cross-culturally

According to the statistical analysis of table (4.5) most of the sample agree that, showing politeness is differ cross-culturally. (88%) of the sample agree. So the hypotheses is accepted.

Hypothesis Two: Power, distance and weight of imposition are factors influencing politeness in Arabic and English.

According to the statistical analysis of table (3.8) most respondents (86 %) agree with the hypothesis,(10%) to some extent, so this hypothesis is accepted

Hypothesis Three: There are cultural differences in politeness behavior between Arabic and English languages.

According to the statistical analysis of table(4.16) most respondents (84%) agree with this topic, so it is accepted.

Hypothesis Four: Request strategies that emerge in Arabic and English are differs

According to the statistical analysis of table( 4.12) most respondents agree (82%) with this hypothesis.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

In this chapter the researcher states the findings, conclusion and recommendations.

5.1 Conclusion

The degree of politeness is differ cross-culturally and thus the different perceptions on politeness may lead to misunderstandings and conflicts in international communication. Moreover, every language offers different terms or lexemes to refer to polite behavior which help us understand culture-specific concepts of politeness, it is important to shed a light on the semantic meanings of the word 'politeness in Arabic as compared to English. Speech act, utterances of language are not simply information, but rather equivalent to actions. All speech acts such as requests are meaningful and that they are rule-governed. For that reason, in interactions, participants ought to be aware of their actions and thus consider what named 'face', defined as "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact" and that face can be lost, maintained or enhanced during interactions with others. This study investigates the differences in politeness between native and non-native. EFL teachers responded the a questionnaire about cross cultural differences in showing politeness between Arabic and English languages.

5.2 Findings

After analyzing the data, the study has received the following results:

1. EFL learners need to develop their awareness about cultural aspect of the target language.
2. Being Polite helps in showing respect in an interactional act.
3. It is important to keep a positive face when addressing people.
4. When communicating with people, face images reflect a positive or negative altitudes in communication.
5. It is crucial for the translator from a language into another one to recognize the motive that led the speaker to be polite.
6. Classroom discourse reflects social nature and culture of the speakers.
7. Positive politeness is to show solidarity and it is directed to the positive face of the addressee.
8. Terms of address usually accompany a person to identify their status, class, rank or position in a particular community or society.
9. Addressing people requires the choice of the most suitable form of address according to the social interaction.

5.3 Recommendations

1. EFL learners should develop awareness about cultural aspect of the target language.
2. EFL learners should learn how to keep a positive face when addressing people.
3. Communication should be done through positive face in EFL teaching and learning.
4. Classroom discourse should reflect social nature and culture.
5. EFL learners should avoid negative face practice.
6. Terms of address should be used according to people status, class, rank or position in a particular community or society.
7. A suitable form of address should be used for people in social interaction.
8. The use of address forms should express the functional part of language.
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Appendix

Questnaire

Dear colleague,

This Questionnaire is designed to elicit information about differences in politeness strategies in Arabic and English languages. You are invited to indicate your views about this topic by ticking the most appropriate box. Thank you,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EFL learners need to develop their awareness about cultural aspect of the target language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Being Polite helps in showing respect in an interactional act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is important to keep a positive face when addressing people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>When communicating with people, face images reflect a positive or negative attitudes in communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It is crucial for the translator from a language into another one to recognize the motive that led the speaker to be polite.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Classroom discourse reflects social nature and culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Positive politeness is to show solidarity and it is directed to the positive face of the addressee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Negative face leads to apology and indirectness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Terms of address usually accompany a person to identify their status, class, rank or position in a particular community or society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Addressing people requires the choice of the most suitable form of address according to the social interaction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Teacher talk should facilitate learning and promote communicative a polite interaction in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The degree of formality, the social status and the relationship between the participants are always manifested in an interactional act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>In conversation, participants cooperate to each other to establish a dialogue under certain socially organized oral activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The use of address forms expresses the functional part of language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Socio-cultural context influences what we say and how we say it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Showing politeness is differ cross-culturally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>