An-Najah National University
College of Graduate Studies

The Speech Act of Thanking as a Compliment Response as used by the Arab Speakers of English –a Comparative Intercultural Study

By
Sana' Mohammed Ibrahim Al-Khateeb

Supervised by
Dr. Ayman Nazzal
Dr. Ahmed Awad

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Applied Linguistics and Translation, Faculty of Graduate Studies, at An-Najah National University, Nablus, Palestine.
2009

The Speech Act of Thanking as a Compliment Response as used by the Arab Speakers of English –a Comparative Intercultural Study

By
Sana' Mohammed Ibrahim Al-Khateeb

This thesis was defended successfully on 3/6/2009 and approved by

Committee Members		Signature
Dr. Ayman Nazzal	(Supervisor)	----------
Dr. Ahmed Awad	(Co-supervisor)	----------
Dr. Fayez Aqel	(Internal Examiner)	----------
Dr. Omar An-Najjar	(External Examiner)	----------

Dedication

To the committee members: Dr. Ayman Nazzal, Dr. Ahmed Awad, Dr. Fayez Aqel and Dr. Omar An-Najjar; to my teachers, parents, sisters, brothers, students and all the Palestinians: with love and appreciation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Thanks are due to all those who helped directly or indirectly in the preparation of this thesis, from family and friends to professors and- why not- computers. My first debt of gratitude goes to my supervisors, Dr. Ayman Nazzal and Dr. Ahmed Awad, who have patiently and sincerely supervised this work from the refinement of the initial idea to the careful reading and commenting on all the drafts. I have to admit that the merits of this work are theirs and the inadequacies are mine. I wish also to thank them both for their continuous encouragement, advice and practical help. I would like to show my greatest appreciation to the external examiner Dr. Omar An-Najjar and the internal examiner Dr. Fayez Aqel whose comments and suggestions have greatly contributed to the refinement of this work. I would also like to pay thanks to Dr. Abdel Nasser Al-Qaddoumi who analyzed the data statistically. I also owe debt to all my teachers at An-Najah National University.

Special words of thanks are due to my family for their encouragement and unfailing support during the years of my study.

إقرار

أنا الموقع/ة أدناه، مقدم الرسالة التي تحمل العنوان: الشكر بمثابة الرد الإطرائي كما يستخدمه العرب المتحدثون بالإنجليزية_ دراسة ثقافية مقارنة. أقر بأن ما اشتملت عليه هذه الرسالة إنما هو نتاج جهدي الخاص، باستثناء ما تمت الإشارة عليه حيثما ورد، و إن هذه الرسالة ككل، أو أي جزء منها لم يقدم من قبل لنيل أية درجة أو لقب علمي أو بحثي لدى أية مؤسسة تعليمية أو بحثية أخرى.

Declaration

The work provided in this thesis, unless referenced, is the researcher's own work, and has not been submitted elsewhere for any other degree or qualification.

Student's Name: Sana’ Mohammed Ibrahim Al-Khateeb	اسم الطالب:
Signature: Sana'	التوقيع:
Date: 3/6/2009	التاريخ:

Table of Contents

	Content	Page No.
	Dedication	III
	Acknowledgement	IV
	Declaration	V
	Table of Contents	VI
	List of Tables	VIII
	Table of appendixes	XIV
	List of Phonetic Symbols	XV
	Abstract	XVI
	Chapter one	1
1.1	Introduction	2
1.2	Statement of the problem	4
1.3	Questions of the study	6
1.4	Aims of the study	7
1.5	Significance of the study	8
1.6	Limitations of the study	9
1.7	Definitions of the study terms	10
	Chapter two	14
2	Review of related literature	15
2.1	Theoretical background	16
2.2	Research on Pragmatic Transfer	18
2.3	Research on Compliment Responses	41
	Chapter three	46
3.1	Introduction	47
3.2	Methodology of the study	47
3.2.a	The tools	48
3.3	Population & Sample of the Study	48
3.4	Reliability and validity of the study	51
3.5	The procedures of the study	51
3.6	Statistical Analysis	52
	Chapter four	53
4	Findings	54
4.1	Findings related to the first question	56

4.1.a	The English version	56
4.2	Findings related to the second question	57
4.2.a	The Arabic version	58
4.2.b	The English version	59
4.3	Findings related to the third question	60
4.3.a	The Arabic version	60
4.3.b	The English version	61
4.4	Findings related to the fourth question	62
4.4.a	The Arabic version	62
4.4.b	The English version	63
4.5	Discussion of the study findings	65
4.5.a	Discussion of the findings on the first question	65
4.5.b	Discussion of the findings on the second question	71
4.5.c	Discussion of the findings on the third question	73
4.5.d	Discussion of the findings on the fourth question	75
4.6	The common semantic formulas of the speech act of thanking as a compliment response as used by native speakers of English	79
4.7	The common semantic formulas of the speech act of thanking as a compliment response as used by non-native speakers of English	81
	Chapter five	83
5.1	Summary and conclusions of the study	84
5.2	Recommendations of the study	86
5.3	Suggestions for further studies	87
	References	88
	Appendixes	99
	Abstract in Arabic	ب

Tables

Table	Table's subject	Page No.
1	Sample Distribution according to Independent Variables	49
2	Response types to the first situation according to the nationality variable	56
3	Response types to the second situation according to the nationality variable	110
4	Response types to the third situation according to the nationality variable	111
5	Response types to the fourth situation according to the nationality variable	112
6	Response types to the fifth situation according to the nationality variable	113
7	Response types to the sixth situation according to the nationality variable	114
8	Response types to the seventh situation according to the nationality variable	115
9	Response types to the eighth situation according to the nationality variable	116
10	Response types to the ninth situation according to the nationality variable	117
11	Response types to the tenth situation according to the nationality variable	118

12	Response types to the first situation according to the specialization variable	58
13	Response types to the second situation according to the specialization variable	119
14	Response types to the third situation according to the specialization variable	120
15	Response types to the fourth situation according to the specialization variable	122
16	Response types to the fifth situation according to the specialization variable	124
17	Response types to the sixth situation according to the specialization variable	125
18	Response types to the seventh situation according to the specialization variable	126
19	Response types to the eighth situation according to the specialization variable	127
20	Response types to the ninth situation according to the specialization variable	129
21	Response types to the tenth situation according to the specialization variable	130
22	Response types to the first situation according to the specialization variable	59
23	Response types to the second situation according to the specialization variable	131

24	Response types to the third situation according to the specialization variable	132
25	Response types to the fourth situation according to the specialization variable	134
26	Response types to the fifth situation according to the specialization variable	136
27	Response types to the sixth situation according to the specialization variable	137
28	Response types to the seventh situation according to the specialization variable	138
29	Response types to the eighth situation according to the specialization variable	139
30	Response types to the ninth situation according to the specialization variable	140
31	Response types to the tenth situation according to the specialization variable	141
32	Response types to the first situation according to the gender variable	60
33	Response types to the second situation according to the gender variable	142
34	Response types to the third situation according to the gender variable	143
35	Response types to the fourth situation according to the gender variable	144

36	Response types to the fifth situation according to the gender variable	145
37	Response types to the sixth situation according to the gender variable	146
38	Response types to the seventh situation according to the gender variable	147
39	Response types to the eighth situation according to the gender variable	148
40	Response types to the ninth situation according to the gender variable	149
41	Response types to the tenth situation according to the gender variable	150
42	Response types to the first situation according to the gender variable	61
43	Response types to the second situation according to the gender variable	151
44	Response types to the third situation according to the gender variable	152
45	Response types to the fourth situation according to the gender variable	153
46	Response types to the fifth situation according to the gender variable	154
47	Response types to the sixth situation according to the gender variable	155

48	Response types to the seventh situation according to the gender variable	156
49	Response types to the eighth situation according to the gender variable	157
50	Response types to the ninth situation according to the gender variable	158
51	Response types to the tenth situation according to the gender variable	159
52	Response types to the first situation according to the evaluation variable	62
53	Response types to the second situation according to the evaluation variable	160
54	Response types to the third situation according to the evaluation variable	161
55	Response types to the fourth situation according to the evaluation variable	162
56	Response types to the fifth situation according to the evaluation variable	163
57	Response types to the sixth situation according to the evaluation variable	164
58	Response types to the seventh situation according to the evaluation variable	165
59	Response types to the eighth situation according to the evaluation variable	166

60	Response types to the ninth situation according to the evaluation variable	167
61	Response types to the tenth situation according to the evaluation variable	168
62	Response types to the first situation according to the evaluation variable	63
63	Response types to the second situation according to the evaluation variable	169
64	Response types to the third situation according to the evaluation variable	170
65	Response types to the fourth situation according to the evaluation variable	171
66	Response types to the fifth situation according to the evaluation variable	172
67	Response types to the sixth situation according to the evaluation variable	173
68	Response types to the seventh situation according to the evaluation variable	174
69	Response types to the eighth situation according to the evaluation variable	175
70	Response types to the ninth situation according to the evaluation variable	176
71	Response types to the tenth situation according to the evaluation variable	177

Table of appendixes

No.	Subject	Page No.
1	Discourse completion test- the English version	100
2	Discourse completion test- the Arabic version	105
3	Herbert's Taxonomy of Compliment Responses	109
4	Findings related to the first question: The English version	110
5	Findings related to the second question: The English version	119
6	Findings related to the second question: The Arabic version	131
7	Findings related to the third question: The English version	142
8	Findings related to the third question: The Arabic version	151
9	Findings related to the fourth question: The English version	160
10	Findings related to the fourth question: The Arabic version	169
11	Graduate Studies Deanship's request to the Ministry of Education	178
12	The Ministry of Education's permission to conduct the study	179

List of Phonetic Symbols

ṭ = ط

' = ع, ء

h = ح, هـ

y = ي

The Speech Act of Thanking as a Compliment Response as Used by the Arab Speakers of English – a Comparative Intercultural Study

By

Sana' Mohammed Ibrahim Al-Khateeb

Supervised by

Dr. Ayman Nazzal

Dr. Ahmed Awad

Abstract

This pragmatic study investigated the speech act of thanking as a compliment response as used by non-native speakers of English. The study is an attempt to find whether different cultural backgrounds, specializations, levels of evaluation and the gender of the speakers affect their use of the speech act of thanking as a compliment response.

The researcher adopted a discourse completion test (DCT) in both Arabic and English as the tool of the study in order to reach the answers of the following questions:

1- Are there any significant differences in the ways people from different cultural backgrounds realize the speech act of thanking?

There are significant differences in the ways Arab learners of English and native speakers of English use the speech act of thanking due to the differences in their cultural backgrounds.

2- Are there differences in the way non-native speakers from different specializations (English majors, scientific stream students, literary stream students, and vocational stream students) use the speech act of thanking as a compliment response?

There are significant differences in the ways Arab learners of English use the speech act of thanking due to the differences in their specializations.

3- Does the gender of the speaker affect their use of the speech act of thanking as a compliment response?

There are no significant differences in the ways Arab learners of English use the speech act of thanking due to the gender of the speakers.

4- Does the level of evaluation affect the non-native speakers' use of the speech act of thanking as a compliment response?

There are significant differences in the ways Arab speakers of English use the speech act of thanking due to their proficiency levels.

The study falls into five chapters. Chapter one introduces the problem, the aims, the significance, the limitations and the methods of the study. Chapter two gives a review of literature written on the previous studies on pragmatics and speech acts, mainly compliments and thanking. Chapter Three provides the methodology and the tools used to find the results of the study. Chapter Four shows the findings of the Discourse Completion Test (DCT) in addition to discussing and comparing them to

the other studies in other languages. Chapter Five gives a summary and conclusions and provides recommendations and suggestions for further studies.

Chapter One

Chapter One

1.1 Introduction

Culture is communication, and vice versa because it influences social practices in general, and discourse in particular. Moreover, cultural factors play a role in the development of diverse ways of talking and communicating. For example, in some cultures it is considered very bad to speak when another person is talking, while in others, this is an expected part of a conversationalist's work. In general, we can say that there exists a certain, rule-governed linguistic behavior that allows us to deal with similar situations in similar ways across cultures, such as thanking, requesting and apologizing (Mey, 1998). However, when it comes to a certain speech act between two languages like English and Arabic, problems arise. Non-native language users including translators tend to face such problems when they use the speech acts that differ from their own language's in terms of cultural differences and expressions.

People from different cultures often respond to compliments in systematically different ways. Let us assume that in a particular situational context, speakers of a particular language X(e.g. English) (LX) accept compliments without showing modesty. In such cases a speaker might accept a compliment such as 'You did a really good job' with a simple expression of 'Thanks', i.e. without expressing any reservations about the validity or the importance of the compliment. Let us assume further that in

the same type of situation, native speakers of another language Y (e.g. Arabic) (LY) typically accept compliments, but play down (and are culturally expected to play down) their importance. It seems possible to assume that native speakers of LY who are learning LX may respond to compliments in LX in the same way as they would in LY. For example, they might respond to the compliment, ‘You did a really good job’ with an expression of modesty (e.g. haa a luṭfun mink ‘You are very kind’). If this happens, we have fairly good grounds for assuming that native speakers of LY have carried over some pragmatic knowledge associated with the culture of LY to the performance of compliments in LX. In other words, they have carried over the Ll cultural knowledge that an expression of modesty is an appropriate response to a compliment, where in fact an acceptance/agreement response is more usual.

Responding with an expression of modesty where an expression of acceptance is more suitable in the target language is a case of negative pragmatic transfer, because the L2 learner has mistakenly generalized from pragmatic knowledge of Ll to a L2 setting. Negative transfer may, but need not, lead to miscommunication. This type of transfer is called negative, not because of its adverse effect on communicative success, but because it involves an unwarranted generalization from L1 "culture-bound" pragmatic knowledge to a communicative situation in L2 (Zegarac& Pennington, 2000). Negative pragmatic transfer thus leads to imperfect pragmatic competence in L2, but imperfect pragmatic competence does not

necessarily cause communicative breakdown. For example, if native speakers of L2 realize that a non-native speaker's pragmatic knowledge of L2 is (or is likely to be) imperfect, they may make allowances (e.g. they might assume something like the non-native speaker is not being rude. He simply does not know that this type of answer is not appropriate in our culture). For example, in the Arabic culture, a person is expected to offer the watch he is wearing if another person pays a compliment over its elegance. However, an American is expected to say 'Thank you.' or ' My mother gave it to me on my birthday.' Therefore, if the American pays a compliment over the elegance of an Arab's watch and receives an offer, he may realize that the non-native speaker's pragmatic knowledge of English is imperfect and simply he does not know that this answer is not appropriate in the English culture. On the other hand, if the native speaker of English does not realize this, negative pragmatic transfer causes cross-cultural pragmatic failure. The native speaker may be shocked of the offer, which seems bizarre.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Communicating with speakers of other languages is a complex behavior that requires both linguistic and pragmatic competence. Whether we speak in a first or second language, we are influenced by sociocultural norms and constraints that affect the way we communicate. For example, what is considered appropriate in one language might not be so in another. Praising a girl for being fat, for instance in a Western African Community,

is considered a compliment; while in an American context, it is perceived as an insult (Rizk, 2003).

Most of the problems that learners of English as a foreign language (EFL learners) face in intercultural communication are mainly pragmatic. EFL teachers do not often stress pragmatic knowledge in their classrooms, focusing instead on linguistic knowledge. Eslami-Rasekh et al. (2004) warn that this might result in pragmatic failure when EFL learners actually communicate with native speakers (NSs), something that is attributed to some other cause. The only way to minimize pragmatic failure between NSs and non-native speakers (NNSs) is by acquiring pragmatic competence, that is, “the ability to use language effectively in order to understand language in context” (El Samaty, 2005). Arab EFL students are not exposed to the target community and culture and they find it extremely difficult to produce or sometimes understand a speech act. Furthermore, translators sometimes transfer such speech acts literally which leads to misunderstanding and pragmatic problems.

The speech act of thanking is there in two theories. It is one type of expressive, in Searle's (1969) terminology, ('acknowledgment' in Bach and Harnish's (1979), and 'behabitive' in Austin's (1962)) speech acts that differs considerably from Arabic to English. Native speakers of English might consider the way Arabic speakers respond to compliments offending

or bizarre, because they understood only the words without the cultural rules that govern them and vice versa.

The problem here is that Arabic learners of English do not produce target-like compliment responses ,and so pragmatic transfer can occur due to many factors one of which is culture. Hence, this study examines how compliment responses are used by Arab speakers of English and the differences between them and the ones used in the American culture.

1.3 Questions of the study

The concerns of this study will be addressed by searching for answers to the following research questions:

1) Are there any significant differences at the statistical scale of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the ways people from different cultural backgrounds realize the speech act of thanking? Therefore, what are the mostly used semantic formulas by the English and the Arabs in using the speech act of thanking as a compliment response?

2) Are there any significant differences at the statistical scale of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the way non-native speakers from different specializations (English majors, scientific stream students, literary stream students, and vocational stream students) use the speech act of thanking as a compliment response?

3) Does the gender of the speakers affect their use of the speech act of thanking as a compliment response at the statistical scale of significance (α= 0.05)?

4) Does the level of evaluation affect the non-native speakers' use of the speech act of thanking as a compliment response at the statistical scale of significance (α= 0.05)?

1.4 Aims of the study

This study aimed to explore the speech act of thanking as a compliment response by Arab learners of English in an attempt to bridge the gap between both languages under study in the context of communication. The aim of presenting the three groups of participants is to point out the differences in realizing the speech act of thanking as a compliment response in different cultures and problems posed to L2 learners when performing thanking in the target language. It also aimed to investigate the influence of the learner's proficiency and gender on their use of this speech act. Pragmatically speaking, the notion of speech acts is a recent field of study. Therefore, this study intended to find out whether Arab learners of English produce target-like compliment responses and whether pragmatic transfer occurs. Therefore, it aimed to:

1. Investigate the influence of the speaker's culture on the pragmatic performance when responding with the speech act of thanking. Therefore, what are the semantic formulas used by the English-speaking people and the Arabs in using the speech act of thanking as a compliment response?

2. Investigate the influence of the speaker's specialization on the pragmatic performance when responding with the speech act of thanking;

3. Investigate the influence of the speaker's gender on the pragmatic performance when responding with the speech act of thanking; and

4. Investigate the influence of the speaker's linguistic knowledge (language proficiency/ evaluation level) on the pragmatic performance when responding with the speech act of thanking.

1.5 Significance of the study

The significance of this study arises from focusing on the pragmatic aspect of speech. It considers investigating the speech act of thanking in context. Therefore, it will surely help raise the speaker's awareness of the ways of expressing thanks in the target language. Since it is an intercultural study, it will link the two languages Arabic and English together, in addition to avoiding communication breakdown because of

culture-bound knowledge. Moreover, this study is important in providing the speaker with the influence of linguistic knowledge, culture and gender on the pragmatic performance of the speech act of thanking. Being aware of the pragmatic aspects of this speech act will lead to successful communication. Furthermore, this study deals with an issue that is important to translators as part of their job of transferring all aspects of utterances among interlocutors.

1.6 Limitations of the study

This study is limited to the following limitations:

1- Investigating the expressive speech act of thanking pragmatically as a compliment response in both languages Arabic and English;

2- Studying the English spoken as a foreign language by the Palestinian Arabic speakers in Qalqilia Directorate of Education and at An-Najah National University; and

3- Investigating thanking as a speech act in terms of the influence of the linguistic knowledge (language proficiency), culture and gender of speakers.

1.7 Definitions of the study terms

Here are some of the terms that are helpful and related to this study.

1.7.1 Speech acts

A speech act is an utterance that serves a function in communication. By uttering a sentence, we can do things. A speech act is an action performed by means of language. We perform speech acts when we offer an apology, greeting, request, complaint, invitation, compliment, or refusal (Austin, 1962 and Searle, 1969).

1.7.2 Locutionary act

It is an act of uttering a sentence with a certain sense and reference, which is nearly equivalent to ‘meaning’ in the traditional sense i.e. 'the act of saying something' (Austin, 1962: 149).

1.7.3 Illocutionary act

It is an act of performing some action in saying something. The speaker may be performing the act of informing, claiming, guessing, reminding, warning, threatening, or requesting i.e. 'utterances which have a certain conventional force' (Austin, 1962:149).

1.7.4 Perlocutionary act

It is 'what speakers bring about or achieve by saying something. The speaker may be performing the act of thanking, claiming, guessing,

reminding, warning, threatening, or requesting by uttering an act' (Austin, 1962: 150).

1.7.5 Compliments

Olshtain and Cohen (1991) define compliments as 'one of the speech acts to express solidarity between speaker and hearer and to maintain social harmony'(145).

1.7.6 The speech act of thanking

In speech act theory, the speech act of thanking is defined as 'an expression of gratitude and appreciation in response compliments' (Searle, 1969:203).

1.7.7 Negative transfer

It refers to 'the influence from the learners' native language and culture on their interlanguage pragmatic knowledge and performance that differs from those of the target language'. This kind of transfer leads to communication breakdown (Kasper, 1993:82).

1.7.8 Positive transfer

It refers to the 'pragmatic behaviors and other knowledge displays that are consistent across the native and non-native languages. It usually results in communicative success. Positive transfer is very much related to

and cannot be disentangled from universal pragmatic knowledge' (Kasper, 1993: 83).

1.7.9 Pragmatic failure

It is 'the inability to understand and recognize the force of the speaker's intention'. It is also a field of 'cross-cultural communication breakdown' (Thomas, 1983: 91).

1.7.10 Pragmalinguistic failure

This occurs 'when the pragmatic force mapped by the speaker onto a given utterance is systematically different from the force most frequently assigned to it by native speakers of the target language, or when speech act strategies are inappropriately transferred from L1 to L2' (Thomas, 1983:99).

1.7.11 Sociopragmatic failure

This is used to refer to 'the social conditions placed on language use'. This failure stems from cross-culturally different perceptions of what constitutes appropriate linguistic behavior (Thomas, 1983: 99).

1.7.12 Pragmatic transfer

Kasper focused on pragmatic transfer and defined it as “the influence exerted by learners’ pragmatic knowledge of languages and

cultures other than L2 on their comprehension, production, and acquisition of L2 pragmatic information" (Kasper, 1992 and 1995: 17).

Chapter Two

Chapter Two

2- Review of Related Literature

This chapter is concerned with reviewing the literature that is relevant to this study which is about the speech act of thanking as a compliment response as used by Arab learners of English. So this study is an attempt to investigate the notion of speech act mainly that of the expressive act of thanking between the two languages which are Arabic as L1 and English as L2. Therefore, the researcher included theories and studies on related topics. For the sake of facilitation and organization, the researcher divided the material in this chapter into three subdivisions. The first part sheds light on the theoretical background on speech acts in general. The second one reviews studies on pragmatic transfer and the effect of the learner's culture and proficiency level on their performance of the speech act. Such factors may lead to pragmatic transfer which can result in pragmatic failure. The final section concentrates on the studies conducted on the speech act of thanking between different languages, in addition to those carried out to investigate the influence of gender on the speech act of thanking as a compliment response.

2.1 Theoretical Background

The notions of speech act and appropriate successful communication in context were investigated by different researchers, such as Grice (1975), Austin (1962), Searle (1969) and Bollinger and Sears (1981). As for Grice (1975), he discussed the cooperative principle and its maxims. Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) classified the speech acts into categories. The speech act of thanking, which is the core of this study, is an expressive speech act in Searle's terminology and a behabitive one in Austin's. They also stressed the importance of the illocutionary act over the locutionary and perlocutionary acts. Moreover, Searle (1969) and Bollinger and Sears (1981) provided an explanation of what makes the utterance felicitous.

The main aim of speech is to communicate a message or a meaning to the hearer. This message or meaning is intended by the speaker to be understood correctly by the hearer. If the intended force or effect of the message is misunderstood, this means that the speaker fails to convey the correct intended impression even if the speech is syntactically and semantically true. So it is not always possible to communicate a certain message successfully by just uttering a sentence that has a correct structure or word order and equivalent correct denotative meanings. In many cases it is the connotation associated with the utterance that counts in order to keep the social wheel running on and avoid communication breakdowns through what is generally called the 'communicative principle'. Moreover, speakers have to cooperate in order for communication to be carried out

successfully. This is called the 'cooperative principle' which was first devised by Grice (1975). Grice's theory is very much relevant to this study, so it is important to mention it here since it deals with the performance of speech acts and how to show the intended purpose of the message. Despite its importance, Grice's cooperative principle along with its four maxims: quantity, quality, manner and relation, has over the last decades received a great deal of criticism on account of its being too difficult to apply and on the overlap among the four maxims. First, interactants do not seem to give these maxims the same weight or value thus their perception seems to vary cross-culturally. Secondly, it is not always possible to find the four maxims in the same context of situation (Mey, 1998).

According to Austin (1962), uttering a sentence like 'Thank you!' is in itself an action since the speaker of that utterance makes a 'speech act' of thanking. Therefore, this 'performative' utterance is in itself a speech act with which interlocutors perform actions. Austin claims that the utterance conveys three kinds of acts; namely, the 'locutionary act' which is the 'communicative function' of the utterance is used by the speaker to convey his intended message thus establishing what is called the 'illocutionary force' of the speech act. The 'perlocutionary act' is the effect of uttering the speech act on the receiver. Austin's focus is primarily directed towards the illocutionary act since it includes the force via which the utterance conveys its performativity. Searle (1969) also maintains that the illocutionary act is the basic communicative unit in people's talk.

Austin classified the speech acts into 'verdictives', 'exercitives', 'commissives', 'behabitives' and 'expositives' which Searle modified into 'directives(request)', 'commissives(promise)', 'representatives(assertion)', 'expressives(apology)' and 'declaratives(changing a state)'. Moreover, Searle provided a taxonomy for 'felicity conditions' into 'preparatory', 'sincerity' and 'essential' conditions(e.g. To carry out the speech act of promising successfully, preparatory conditions have to e met before promising with the intention to promise under the obligation of carrying out the promised act), which were referred to by Bollinger & Sears (1981) as the 'appropriateness' conditions. Furthermore, these conditions are very much related to Grice's cooperative principle and maxims of quality, quantity, relation and manner. There are significant intercultural differences in cooperative behavior which means that Grice's cooperative principles are defined relative to a particular culture.

2.2 Research on Pragmatic Transfer

The present study focuses on a rather recent of study; namely, the pragmatic aspect of using language in context. Up to the researcher's knowledge, pragmatic studies have been conducted since the early 1980s concentrating on L1 in most cases, but then, intercultural studies have been introduced. This study deals with the speech act of thanking pragmatically and inter-culturally between English and Arabic.

Language consists of grammatical and pragmatic competences. Thomas (1983) differentiates between the two competences. The grammatical one is concerned with the de-contextual linguistic knowledge without giving importance to the context in which it occurs. This includes phonetics, phonology, syntax, semantics, etc. On the other hand, the pragmatic competence is concerned with conveying an intended meaning and grasping it in the context of situation when communicating with others. If L2 speaker's intended meaning is misunderstood by L1 speaker, this means that the utterance did not achieve L2 speaker's intended purpose. This results in pragmatic failure which may result in communicative breakdowns and other undesirable consequences (Beebe & Takahashi, 1989). The researcher in the present study focuses on the pragmatic knowledge which is very essential for communication to be carried out successfully. Cultural norms and styles are considered very important part of the pragmatic competence that speakers should be aware of.

Pragmatic transfer occurs when there is a difference in usage because of L1 norms and culture which affect L2 usages. Therefore, similarities and differences between languages and the speech acts of these languages have to be studied in order to realize what differences there are so as to avoid pragmatic transfer. The researcher of the present study hypothesizes that culture plays an important role in the way interlocutors communicate successfully. That is to say, being unaware of the cultural norms between languages may lead to pragmatic transfer which is possible to result in a

communicative breakdown. This means that language users have to get to know the uses of speech acts in the target culture because language functions are performed through speech acts, such as invitations, requests, refusals, apologies, expressions of gratitude and compliments. A number of these speech acts have been studied as pragmatic universals (Kasper, 1992).

Actually, the universality of a speech act does not necessarily suggest a similarity in the form used to express the same speech act. For example, accepting a compliment in English is different from accepting the same compliment in Arabic, thus an American might accept a compliment like 'Your yellow scarf looks great on you!' by saying 'Thanks. It's also my favorite!', whereas an Arab might say 'Yeh. It's because you are a nice person!' In the present study, the researcher hypothesizes that the existence of culture-bound peculiarities can lead to communicative breakdown if not recognized by the interlocutors.

Transfer generally occurs because of the L1 influences on the learner's L2. This can be understood in terms of what is known as a 'mental set'. Sometimes a person deals with a new situation using his own mental sets which are culturally specified in most cases (Steinberg, 1995). So according to this present study, the researcher believes that the mental sets of interlocutors from different cultures have a great influence on their use of speech acts. For example, saying 'Thank you!' in a certain context in a given culture might be used to show that the one who utters this speech act

has received help or been praised and that he is thankful for the giver. On the other hand, the same utterance in the same context might be understood differently; it can express an offense showing that the speaker does not need the giver's help i.e. 'rejection of an offer'. Repetition of an utterance could have different meanings in different cultures. Hence, being unaware of such differences between the interlocutors' cultural mental sets is likely to lead to misunderstanding and communicative breakdowns. Such breakdowns occur because the speaker transfers L1 culture-bound peculiarities from his own mental sets into an L2 situation. This is called 'pragmatic transfer' because, according to the 'thank you' example, the way of understanding the speech act of thanking differs in the context of a particular situation in two different cultures. The problem here does not lie in understanding the linguistic meanings of the words used; it lies in figuring out the intended message behind the speech act of thanking. Therefore, the researcher thinks that culture-specific knowledge has a great influence on the usage of the speech acts in general and the speech act of thanking in particular.

This leads to what is known as inter-language pragmatics (ILP) whose main focus is the way in which native and non-native speakers convey differences in understanding and performing the same speech act in the target language. Therefore, ILP researchers try to find such differences depending on the collected data. Depending on this, they continue their studies showing such differences in situations and the ways and formulas of

using the speech acts in the target language, in addition to other aspects, such as the illocutionary force and politeness strategies (Blum-Kulka et al, 1989; Kasper, 1992).

Such researches are conducted in the context of second language acquisition since pragmatic transfer occurs due to pragmatic aspects and not linguistic ones. Lack of L2 pragmatic knowledge leads mostly to intercultural miscommunication which occurs because learners transfer their L1 socio-cultural peculiarities into the realization of L2 speech acts which is known as pragmatic transfer. This can be defined as "the influence of learners' pragmatic knowledge of language and culture other than the target language on their comprehension, production, and acquisition of L2 pragmatic information"(Rizk, 2003: p.404).

Two kinds of pragmatic transfer can be identified here. The first one is the positive pragmatic transfer which occurs in the case of transferring similarities among languages. When transfer indicates universality in the social and cultural norms and in the pragmatic knowledge, it does not hinder understanding or successful communication. On the other hand, negative pragmatic transfer occurs in the case of the inappropriate fallback on L1 sociolinguistic norms and transferring them into L2. This leads to what is known as 'pragmatic failure' which results in misunderstanding and so communicative breakdowns (Liu, 2003). Therefore, in the case of the speech act of thanking, transferring universals and similarities between

English and Arabic results in positive pragmatic transfer of the function used like accepting a compliment, but not always the form used to accept it. However, when it comes to differences due to culture-bound peculiarities, negative pragmatic transfer may be at stake. L2 users tend to express the speech act of thanking in L2 by using their own ideas and styles. They may also use L1 semantic formulas to express thanking regardless to the illocutionary force associated to it in L2. According to Rizk (2003), negative pragmatic transfer occurs when a speaker expresses a speech act in L2 by translating the semantic formula used to express the same speech act in L1. So when an American complimented a Korean woman by saying 'You did a great job!', the Korean woman used her L1 style and said 'I don't believe you!'. This resulted in undesirable consequences, such as confusion and embarrassment.

The researcher of the present study considers another example to illustrate the point of pragmatic transfer that occurs by means of translating L1 expressions into the target language. An English speaking Arab may say 'I'm ashamed if complimented by an American which is considered a mere translation of the Arabic semantic formula used in such a situation. This may have negative connotations and create misunderstanding on the part of the American. This communicative breakdown is basically because of negative pragmatic transfer. Another example to illustrate the same point here is the Arabic response to a situation in which a speaker compliments the property of the hearer. Arabs usually respond to such compliments by

offering the complimented item to the person who complimented it. So Arabs might respond to such compliments by saying 'Take it. I swear!' which is a mere literal translation of the same Arabic formulaic expression used as a response in the same context in Arabic. This may seem bizarre for non-natives like Americans. El Samaty (2005:342) considers a point that is likely to affect the learners' perception of "what constitutes a language specific or a universal issue". If learners have in mind that a certain pragmatic feature in L1 in language specific, they will not transfer it to L2. Therefore, language users including translators could avoid negative pragmatic transfer by being exposed to such pragmatic and cultural peculiarities.

It has become obvious that investigating language universals is significant to find out what is a positive or a negative pragmatic transfer. It is also important to study what seems in L1 to be the same as the norms of L2. Such studies help compare the native and non-native language norms to find out the similarities and the differences. It is also worthwhile to study the effect of L1 norms and styles on L2 acquisition. All these subjects are very much related to the issue of pragmatic transfer (Kasper & Schmidt, 1996).

Some writers, such as Grice(1975) and Brown & Levinson (1987) have tried to investigate the use of universals among languages . For example, Grice (1975) claims that the speaker does not observe all the

'conversational maxims' intentionally in order to urge the receiver to figure out the intended meaning which is not necessarily expressed linguistically. This means that speakers do not express everything explicitly; violating a maxim can be an implicit sign of a hidden intended meaning. Brown & Levinson (1987) also have their own explanation of universality in the term of 'face'. If the person shows agreement with the speaker, this entails a positive face. On the other hand, trying to be independent entails a negative face.

Other linguists, such as Matsumoto (1988), Ide (1989) and Mao (1994) criticized the previous notion of 'social identity' as a very important one in Japanese and Chinese societies. Wierzbicka (1991) also criticized Grice's(1975) and Brown & Levinson's (1987) attempts of being 'ethnocentric'.

The notion of politeness and its universality has been dealt with by Leech (1983) who devised six politeness maxims to express language universals. These maxims are the 'tact' maxim, the 'generosity' maxim, the 'approbation' maxim, the 'modesty' maxim, the 'agreement' maxim, and the 'sympathy' maxim. Leech claims that these maxims operate side by side with the four maxims of Grice, but with different values associated to them in different cultures. For example, in the Japanese society the 'modesty' maxim exceeds that of 'agreement' when responding to a compliment. On

the other hand, the English-speaking societies try to be more polite using the 'agreement' maxim.

The present study suggests that universality attributes to similarities between languages, but the same intended function does not always match the semantic formula used to express the speech act among languages. On the other hand, cultural differences lead to pragmatic transfer since different forms are associated with different values in different cultures. This transfer of the different cultural norms and thus different force from L1 to L2 causes pragmatic failure during communication.

It is obvious now that it is difficult to generalize universal rules since languages have different culture-specific pragmatic features.

Concerning the notion of pragmatic failure, Thomas (1983) explains two types of this concept. When the non-native speaker assigns a force to an utterance which is different from the pragmatic force that is usually associated to it by native speakers, it is said that 'pragmalinguistic' failure is at stake. Another case in which pragmalinguistic failure might occur is when the non-native speaker transfers the norms and methods of L1 into L2 improperly. This type is concerned with the grammar of and beliefs about the language i.e. language specific. It occurs either because of the inappropriate transfer speech act strategies or because of transferring semantically and syntactically equivalents with a different pragmatic force.

The other type of failure is 'socio-pragmatic' which is caused due to the social circumstances surrounding the speech act, such as the social distance, politics, religion, morals, gender, power and the closeness of relationships between the interactants i.e. knowledge about the world. So, this type of transfer occurs when the speaker does not know what to say, when, why and to whom. For example, not knowing the pragmatic force of a 'thank you' might cause a pragmalinguistic failure, but cultural differences of when to say it, in which occasion and for what reason might cause sociopragmatic failure.

This means that language users including translators have to be aware of the context, the social conditions and the force of the utterance in addition to all other aspects related to it appropriately. This also means that L2 learners have to be exposed to the pragmatic aspects of L2 in addition to the linguistic competence.

Therefore, ESL teachers have to get to know the ways of developing the learners' L2 pragmatic competence and the educational approaches to increase the students' awareness of L2 pragmatic issues. Such topics of the pragmatic progress of L2 learners' abilities have been addressed by recent researches (Rose, 2000). Other researches have described the stages of 'developmental pragmatics' in addition to the pedagogy that should be used to increase the learners' abilities in the pragmatic aspects of the language (Kasper, 1997; Rose & Kasper, 2001).

Such topics on the learner's pragmatic development have been approached by researchers differently. There are researchers, such as Scarcella(1979), Trosborg (1987)and Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford (2005) who have considered Thomas' pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic differentiation in which the former is concerned with using linguistically proper speech acts and expressing the speech act using the suitable form and function; whereas the latter is concerned with using the speech act properly in context taking in consideration the cultural and social norms. Those researchers have shown opposing ideas concerning which component is first acquired. Some have found that the linguistic formulas are acquired earlier than the ways of using such formulas appropriately in context (Scarcella, 1979; Trosborg, 1987). Other researchers like Bardovi-Harlig & Hartford (2005) have reported the opposite i.e. learners tend to acquire the socio-pragmatic competence while the pragmalinguistic one is still in need of development.

The following is a review of the literature on the studies conducted to show how L2 learners express and use speech acts under the influence of L1 linguistic formulas and cultural norms. Therefore, this is likely to cause pragmatic transfer that is negative in most cases according to some researchers, such as Cohen & Olshtain (1981), Olshtain (1983), House (1996), Garcia (1989), Takahashi & Beebe (1993), Blum-Kulka (1982; 1983; 1989), House and Kasper (1987), Trosborg (1987), Faerch & Kasper (1989), Takahashi & Dufon (1989), DeCapua (1989), Beebe, Takahashi &

Uliss-Weltz (1990) and Bergman & Kasper (1993). Moreover, other studies showed how other factors, such as L2 learners' proficiency affect their use of speech acts. For example, Takahashi & Beebe (1987, 1993) reported that high level learners were more prone to commit negative pragmatic transfer; however, Takahashi & Dufon (1989), Robinson (1992), Takahashi (1996) and Maeshiba et al(1996) stated that beginners showed more cases of negative pragmatic transfer. On the other hand, El Samaty (2005) and Eslami-Rasekh et al (2004) found that linguistically proficient learners were the ones who transferred the acts negatively. Therefore, most of these studies approve that the culture and proficiency variables have a great effect on the L2 learner's performance of the speech acts in general with some slight differences here and there.

In the present study, the researcher hypothesizes that culture influences the use of speech acts greatly since Arab learners of English are not exposed to the target language sociocultural norms and styles. Consequently, they tend to refer back to those of L1 which leads to pragmatic transfer. Concerning proficiency, the researcher of this present study refers to linguistically proficient informants since they lack the pragmatic one due to the kind of education that stresses the linguistic part over the pragmatic one. On the other hand, this study sheds light on the great importance and influence of the pragmatic knowledge related to the social and cultural styles and norms.

One of the studies that displayed the transfer of L1 norms into L2 was conducted by Cohen & Olshtain (1981) on the Hebrew learners of English as L2 concerning the speech act of apology. The study showed that L2 learners transferred the Hebrew feature of using less apology semantic expressions into their apologies in English. Another study was conducted by Olshtain (1983) on apology in Hebrew as L2. Her informants who were English and Russian showed different degrees of transfer. The English informants conveyed the highest degree of transfer, then came the Russians. The English informants transferred their language styles and formulaic expressions in using the speech act of apology. These forms were not used in the same context by the Hebrew. Therefore, this supported the claim of negative pragmatic transfer because of the learner's L1 influence on the production of L2 speech acts.

Such findings prove that cultural and linguistic norms and styles have great influence on the learner's performance in other target languages, mainly on the use of the speech acts. When L2 speakers fall back onto their L1to express L2 speech acts, they are likely to commit pragmatic transfers which are sometimes the reason behind communicative breakdown.

Other researchers proved that there exists some kind of universality that leads to positive pragmatic transfer. Scarcella (1979)(as cited in Kasper, 1992) found that Spanish learners of English as L2 shifted the discourse accent styles into English appropriately which meant that what

was considered proper in this communicative aspect in L1 was the same in L2, thus leading to positive pragmatic transfer and successful communication.

Another observation was made by House (1996) in her study on German learners of British English in the speech act of apology. The German learners shifted their native language norms to English since they were not exposed to apology styles in the target language such as 'sorry'. Her informants also apologized in situations where it was not necessary to do so. This over-use of using apologies which was quite common in German led to the transfer of this style to British English as L2.

Garcia (1989) conducted a study on the use of the strategies of politeness in the speech act of apology as used by Venezuelan speakers of Spanish as L2. She found that Venezuelans applied more positive styles in apologies, while Spanish speakers used negative strategies in expressing their speech act of apology. This means that the lack of the learners' L2 pragmatic knowledge caused negative pragmatic transfer from their L1 styles and norms.

In their studies on Japanese learners of English as L2, Takahashi & Beebe (1993) supported the previous claim of negative pragmatic transfer among languages because of the learner's negative language influence on the styles of expressing speech acts in L2. For example, they used to reject

and use formulaic expressions more than Americans did. They also employed the Japanese style of shifting depending on the factor of status. So it was clear that the strategies used to convey L2 speech acts such as correction were largely affected by transferring of L1 socio-pragmatic styles and norms. This also reflected the tendency of using positive politeness in American conversational actions and depending on the interlocutor's status in that of the Japanese.

Blum-Kulka (1982; 1983; 1989) found evidence of pragmatic transfer and universality in expressing speech acts in L2. She took as her informants the English learners of Hebrew as L2 to study the speech act of request as conveyed in Hebrew by the English. Universality was apparent in positively transferring some kinds of the request questions by using common styles of expressing such questions. So if universality guarantees a similarity in expressing the function of the speech act in a certain form in context, this leads to positive pragmatic transfer. However, this similarity between the two languages did not prevail in all contexts. For example, there was some kind of pragmalinguistic transfer carried out negatively in expressing the ability questions without the appropriate pragmatic force. Moreover, they transferred their indirect styles of these questions instead of direct ones that the Hebrew language required.

House and Kasper (1987) conducted their study on both German and Danish learners of British English in the field of directness concerning the

speech act of request. The informants had to respond to five situations in British English, but it was obvious that they both transferred their own languages' styles and expressions of directness in two of the requests they used. Evidence of negative pragmalinguistic transfer was apparent in the learners' use of fewer syntactic down-graders and more direct imperatives. Such usages were not preferred by the British unlike the German and the Danish. Another observation concerning the differences between the German and the Danish learners was that the former used consultative devices; whereas the latter showed more supportive trends in the same situations.

According to Trosborg (1987), transfer is inevitable even if it is not that perspicuous. In his study on Danish learners of English concerning the speech act of apology, he found that negative pragmalinguistic transfer was not that obvious in the Danish learners' responses in the given role-play situations. On the other hand, he referred to the presence of L1 apology semantic formula in the Danish learners' responses which proves the existence of L1 speech norms and styles' influence on the realization of L2 speech acts.

Similar results were concluded by Faerch & Kasper (1989) in their study of request as performed by Danish learners of English and German. The informants of this study were observed to transfer their L1 modals and 'consultative devices' into both languages German and English. Moreover,

L1 way of negation was found to be transferred negatively into German as L2.

Negative pragmatic transfer was present in some aspects of the speech act when the Japanese learners of English used the role-play to request something. Takahashi & Dufon (1989) had this conclusion in their study concerning the speech act of request. Their Japanese informants shifted their L1 norms of showing more directness than Americans when requesting something that they wanted strongly. That was an evidence of negative transfer of L1 pragmalinguistic styles.

The same problem of negative pragmalinguistic transfer was in DeCapua's (1989) study on the German learners of English as L2. Her informants used the speech act of complaining to respond to some situations. Their responses reflected negative pragmatic transfer of their L1 norms into English.

Beebe, Takahashi & Uliss-Weltz (1990) found that some factors such as place, time and parties affected the Japanese learners' uses of the speech act of excusing in that they were less specific in asking for an excuse. Moreover, they reached similar conclusions in their study concerning the speech act of refusals as used by Japanese learners of English as L2. Japanese learners showed more concern towards the status of difference in using the speech act. On the other hand, the Americans did

not show concern for any differences despite the fact of their presence. Negative pragmalinguistic transfer was prevalent in the speech act of refusals when used by Japanese learners of English as L2. This showed that the expression's form and meaning decided the degree of negative pragmalinguistic transfer.

In an exploration about expressing the speech act of apology in English, Thai learners of English showed transfer features in half of their answers to the situations. The Thai learners negatively transferred into English the Thai verbal redress which was considered specific to the Thai norms and culture (Bergman & Kasper, 1993). This proves that negative pragmatic transfer occurs because of transferring L1 norms and culture-bound peculiarities in form and function into L2. Because of transferring linguistic and cultural differences negatively, pragmatic failure will be the result which will cause communicative breakdowns.

L2 learners may show different degrees of pragmatic transfer according to their proficiency levels. Some researchers studied the influence of learners' proficiency in L2 on their performance and realization of the speech acts and the pragmatic failure it may lead to. What is meant by proficiency or fluency in the following studies is the pragmatic aspect of language. Some learners are linguistically proficient in L2 which is not always enough to convey their intentions appropriately in L2. The result of this is that linguistically proficient learners try to transfer their L1

norms and expressions by means of mere translation into L2 which is not all the time a suitable resort for language users.

Concerning the notion of proficiency and its effects on speech act usages, researchers have two points of view. Takahashi & Beebe (1987; 1993) explained that L2 proficiency level affects pragmatic transfer positively, which means that it is very possible for highly proficient learners to transfer their L1 cultural and social styles into L2 since they show a great ability to use L2 and express their L1 feelings pragmatically. Therefore, their own language's norms are transferred into L2 by means of their L2 knowledge. They proved such findings by means of their study on fluent Japanese learners of English who applied their L1 formal tones of refusing in L2 speech act of refusing.

Others, such as Takahashi & Dufon (1989), Robinson (1992) and Takahashi (1996) adopted a different point of view from the previous one. Takahashi & Dufon (1989) proved that beginners transfer their L1 norms and styles in the realization of L2 speech acts, while advanced learners do not. That prevailed in their study on Japanese learners of English concerning the speech act of request. High level Japanese did not use L1 hinting styles in requests, but they were more direct similar to the English styles in requests. On the other hand, Japanese beginners used indirect strategies similar to those used by the Japanese in requesting.

Similarly, Robinson (1992) reached the same results in her study on refusals by Japanese learners of English. All informants were aware of the fact that there existed differences in the ways people from the two languages use the speech act of refusing properly. The problem was that Japanese beginners' L1 norms and styles affected their English refusals since they were not pragmatically proficient. However, advanced learners had control on using the speech act of refusals in English as they had acquired the necessary pragmatic knowledge that helped them to express the speech act properly.

Takahashi (1996) supported these results and refuted those of Takahashi & Beebe (1987; 1993). Takahashi (1996) found that negative transfers were less committed by pragmatically proficient learners. However, other researchers, such as Maeshiba, Yoshinaga, Kasper and Rose (1996) did not find evidence of negative pragmatic transfer in proficient learners' usages of speech acts in L2. So Takahashi and Beebe (1987, 1993) supported the claim that proficient learners commit negative pragmatic transfer because of their ability to express their L1 thoughts, feelings and sentiments in L2 easily. This claim was supported by El Samaty (2005) Eslami-Rasekh (2004) who found that linguistically proficient learners tend to transfer L1 norms and styles into L2 because they have control over the linguistic competence of L2.

However, Takahashi & Dufon (1989), Robinson (1992) and Takahashi (1996) supported the claim that beginners commit more pragmatic transfers since they are not exposed to the pragmatic competence of L2.

The researcher of the present study is concerned with linguistic proficiency rather than the pragmatic one. The informants of this study who are English-speaking Arabs lack the pragmatic knowledge of English because teachers in high schools emphasize the denotative meanings and not the connotative ones; the de-contextualized meaning of vocabulary and sentences is stressed over the ways of using them, when, where and why to use them and who says them to whom. This is due to the kind of education which concentrates on the linguistic competence rather than the pragmatic one. This leads to the learners' inability to use language appropriately in context. Therefore, the researcher of the present study is in favor of the second claim as her advanced level informants are linguistically proficient. It is perspicuous that the second claim supposes that advanced learners are pragmatically proficient. If so, there would be no problem for them since they have already acquired the pragmatic competence.

Blum-Kulka et al (1989) conducted a study on non-native learners of Hebrew at three proficiency levels which were low-intermediate, high-intermediate and advanced. It was discovered that learners from the second

level demonstrated negative transfer in their usage of longer requests than the other two groups.

According to El Samaty (2005), even if learners are proficient in L2 linguistically, it is still possible for them to transfer their L1 pragmatic norms and strategies into L2 causing negative transfer or pragmatic failure. Eslami-Rasekh et al (2004) also proposed a similar opinion saying that learners who are grammatically competent may not use L2 properly because of their L1 different norms. Moreover, being linguistically competent does not entail being pragmatically competent.

Different styles and norms of expressing a speech act in the target language might be perspicuous because of the different proficiency levels learners might have. Such differences are due to their different strategies of relating the form with its function, and the function to its context of situation. So achieving such matches is considered as establishing the highest point of the 'developmental continuum' (Rose & Kasper, 2001). Such issues have been the subject of many pragmatic studies in different speech acts such as requests (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986; Ellis, 1994; Schmidt, 1993; Trosborg, 1994, complaints and apologies (Trosborg, 1994), and compliments (Billmyer, 1990) which are the topic of the next section and the focus of the present study.

To conclude, this section stresses two main ideas. The first one is that the native culture and language of the learners affect their performance in L2, mainly when learners are not exposed to the cultural and linguistic norms and styles of L2. The second issue, which is very much related to the first, is the learner's level of proficiency. Concerning this, researchers have two different opinions. Some claim that pragmatic transfer is likely to be committed by high level proficiency learners since they impose more control on their linguistic performance than low level proficiency learners. Therefore, advanced learners would be able to transfer their own ideas and styles into L2 much more freely through literal translation of L1 formulaic expressions. On the other hand, other researchers(Takahashi & Dufon (1989), Robinson (1992) and Takahashi (1996)) state that pragmatic transfer occur in lower proficiency levels since beginners are not exposed to the pragmatic competence of L2.

For the researchers of the present study, the former point of view is more likely to be prevalent in this study since learners acquire the linguistic competence at an earlier stage. This is basically because of the kind of education that stresses linguistic matters over pragmatic ones.

2.3 Research on Compliment Responses

Compliments are defined by Olshtain & Cohen (1991) as a kind of speech acts used to convey strong relations between interlocutors and keep the social wheel running on. For Liu (2003), compliments are a type of speech acts through which a speaker expresses positive attitudes towards another speaker. Within the same culture, compliments have different types according to the ways of using them and their roles in context. The main target of using a compliment is not to lose one's face which is likely to be lost if a compliment is misused in context.

Pomerantz (1978) was the first researcher who investigated compliment responses pragmatically in context. The problem for Americans is that they have to agree with the speaker and at the same time avoid self-praise when giving a response to a compliment. The same idea is stressed by Urano (1998) saying that if a respondent to a compliment agrees with the speaker, it means he does not avoid self-praise which might not be acceptable socio-linguistically to the giver of the compliment. If the respondent reverses the situation by a non-agreement to avoid self-praise, it will cause a face threatening act. To find a solution to this dilemma, a number of responses can be used by respondents; acceptance, rejection and self-praise avoidance.

Pomerantz's work on compliment responses was modified by Herbert (1986) who carried out a three-year period study on American college students to investigate thousand samples of compliment responses. He

found out that only 36.35% of these compliment responses were considered as agreements. His classification of compliment responses included three categories and twelve types of those responses (See appendix 4).

Since then, many researchers have carried out contrastive studies between languages to find out differences and similarities between them concerning the performance of the speech act of thanking and compliments. Saito and Beecken (1997) carried out a study on American learners of Japanese to explain the pragmatic transfer in using compliments. The American learners' responses in Japanese varied from positive styles like gratitude to negative ones like denial and avoidance. On the other hand, Japanese native speakers' responses to compliments were only denials or avoidance. Moreover, American speakers of Japanese used avoidance less than the Japanese themselves. Another important result was that of negative pragmatic transfer that resulted because of the differences between the two languages and cultures concerning the use of this speech act.

Urano (1998) conducted a study concerning compliment responses. He found out that Arabic and South African English speakers favored accepting compliments, while speakers of Asian languages preferred to reject them. Chen (1993) carried out a study in order to investigate the usage of the same speech act by Chinese learners of English and American native speakers of English. Most of the Chinese were discovered to reject

compliments. On the other hand, Americans showed acceptance and appreciation in their responses to compliments.

In another more recent contrastive study of compliment responses, Cedar (2006) compared the compliment responses of the Thai speakers of English and American native speakers. The study revealed that Americans were positive in their responses and accepted the compliments. On the other hand, Thai speakers of English turned to their native language and used formulaic expressions to respond to compliments. That was due to the Thai's low proficiency pragmatic level in English, so they were not able to accept the compliments positively.

The findings of the above studies underscore a set of invaluable conclusions. They show that negative pragmatic transfer occurs among languages due to the cultural and linguistic differences between the languages under study. Moreover, similarities sometimes lead to negative pragmatic transfer if the function is similar while the form is different. The level of proficiency also has an important impact on the learners' responses in L2 as discussed previously. In the present study, I support the findings of Takahashi and Beebe's (1978;1993), El Samaty's (2005) and Eslami-Rasekh's (2004) studies which showed that high level learners were more vulnerable to commit negative pragmatic transfer than their low proficiency level counterparts since they show a great ability to express their L1 feelings using L2. Others, such as Takahashi and Dufon (1989), Robinson

(1992), Rose (2000) and Takahashi (1996) adopted a different point of view from the previous one.

Furthermore, the gender of the speaker plays an important role in the use of the speech act of thanking as a compliment response. Some claim that females tend to use politeness strategies more than males do. Many research studies in this field of study have shown than women are more sensitive to being polite than men are, so women are expected to apply more politeness styles than men (Guodong & Jing, 2005). Liu (2003) emphasized that result by stating that females are more interested in personal matters, such as physical appearances, clothing, fashion, food and diet than males. The researcher of the present study is in favor of the finding of Liu's (2003) study. On the other hand, the researcher hypothesizes that politeness strategies are applied where appropriate regardless of being a male or a female.

From the material in the above sections, it is obvious that research on the speech act of thanking as a compliment response as used by the Arab speakers of English is still lacking in some way or another. Up to the researcher's knowledge, this present study deals with a newly investigated topic for the following reasons. First, it deals with the speech act of thanking as a compliment response in English as used by the Palestinian Arabs and the English-speaking people. Moreover, it is limited to the influence of certain variables on the type of thanking responses to

compliments. These variables are the culture, the linguistic and pragmatic knowledge and performance, the speaker's specialization and the speaker's gender. The researcher hypothesizes that these variables influence the use of the speech act of thanking as a compliment response in certain ways. For example, the Arab learners of English might not be exposed to the cultural and social norms of L2, so they use their English linguistic competence to express their own ideas and feelings which may lead to negative pragmatic transfer and thus communication breakdowns. Moreover, the speakers' specialization identifies the level and the kind of proficiency they have which will also affect their responses to compliments. Concerning the gender of the speaker, it has influence in specific occasions, but not in all as illustrated previously.

This chapter gave a review of literature that is relevant to the topic of speech acts and pragmatic transfer in general and the research on compliment responses and thanking in particular. Based on the findings of others, the researcher found out that there are studies conducted on various speech acts in different languages examining the influence of different variables on the learners' performance of the speech act under study. The researcher of the present study found that research on the speech act of thanking as used by Arab learners of English is lacking. Hence, the present study is an attempt to investigate the speech act of thanking as used by Arab speakers of English in terms of the culture, specialization, proficiency level and gender variables.

Chapter Three

Chapter Three

3.1 Introduction

This chapter includes a description of the methodology of study used by the researcher in order to investigate the use of the speech act of thanking as a compliment response used by Arab speakers of English. It also gives a description of the society and the sample of study. The tool used in collecting data is identified in terms of its contents in addition to the procedures followed to make sure of its reliability and validity. Moreover, the procedures of conducting the study are described after investigating the reliability and validity of the tool.

3.2 Methodology of the study

3.2.a The tools

The topic is approached by using quantitative data from Discourse Completion Test (DCT i.e. a tool used for collecting data through responding to real like situations). In addition to that, the researcher uses theories and background knowledge from other researchers and writers' studies, which contributes to leading the topic in the right way. The Discourse Completion Test (DCT) consists of 10 situations, in which participants are expected to respond to compliments in English using the speech act of thanking. Another version of the DCT in Arabic is also used to compare the use of thanking as a compliment response between the two languages and to examine the pragmatic transfer in compliment responses

by Arabic learners of English. This method of investigation was used by many researchers, for example, Takahashi and Beebe(1987) distributed Discourse Completion Tests (DCTs) consisting of written role-play situations to Japanese ESL learners living in the United States and EFL learners in Japan to investigate refusals and face-threatening acts. Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1986) also used Discourse Completion Tests (DCT) to analyze the utterance length of requesting strategies in Hebrew. They collected the data from non-native speakers of Hebrew at three proficiency levels. Therefore, the researcher observes that it is a suitable method for investigating these kinds of pragmatic studies, which cannot but be situated in a context. Thus, the researcher adopted a DCT of ten situations in two versions, Arabic and English.

3.3 Population & Sample of the Study

The population of the study consists of native as well as non-native (Arab) learners of English in Qalqilia Directorate of Education and An-Najah National University.

The samples of this study are male and female, native and non-native, and proficient and non-proficient participants divided into three groups. The first group is school (male & female) students in the second secondary classes (scientific, literary and vocational streams). They are all students in the schools of Qalqilia Directorate of Education. The total number of these students in the year 2007/2008 is (1967). The second group is male and female English majors at An-Najah National University

in Nablus. Therefore, the first and the second groups include language users of, at least, three proficiency levels (*high*, *mediate*, and *low*). The third group is one of native speakers used as an independent group in order to compare the two kinds of responses; the native and the non-native (English-speaking Arabs).

The researcher distributed 300 DCTs randomly to a stratified sample of non-native English speakers in the Qalqilia Directorate schools and An-Najah National University. The researcher retrieved 250 DCTs. For the sake of statistical analysis, 227 DCTs (214 non-natives & 13 natives) were analyzed after excluding 23 incomplete DCTs.

Table (1)

Sample Distribution according to Independent Variables

Gender Variable (1.a)

Variable	Level	Frequency no.	Percent %
Gender	Male	92	43.0%
	Female	122	57.0%
Total		214	100%

Evaluation Variable (1.b)

Variable	Level	Frequency no.	Percent %
Evaluation	excellent	25	11.7%
	good	155	72.4%
	not too good	34	15.9%
Total		214	100%

Specialization Variable (1.c)

Variable	Level	Frequency no.	Percent %
Specialization	English major	23	10.7%
	Scientific student	78	36.4%
	Literary student	89	41.6%
	Vocational student	24	11.2%
Total		214	100%

Nationality Variable (1.d)

Variable	Level	Frequency no.	Percent %
Nationality	Non-native(Arabic)	214	100%
Total		214	100%

3.4 Reliability and validity of the study

The researcher uses the tool of the study i.e. the DCT after showing it to four instructors at An-Najah National University, and two experienced English teachers. They suggested some changes on some of the DCT items. For example, the following item (If you are a non-native student of English, are you: *an English major *a scientific stream student *a literary stream student) was modified into the following two (If you are a non-native university student, are you: *specialized in English * not specialized in English) and (If you are a non-native school student, are you in the: *scientific stream *literary stream *vocational stream). Thus, another group was added to the sample of the study. This group is the vocational stream students. Other items were added and others omitted.

Moreover, language experts investigated the tool linguistically in both languages Arabic and English and suggested some changes in language.

The researcher used the Cron Bach Alpha correlation that was found with a percentage of (0.85), which suits this type of research.

3.5 The procedures of the study

After making sure of the reliability and validity of the instrument of the study i.e. the DCT, the following procedures were conducted by the researcher:

1- distributing the tool (i.e. discourse completion test-DCT) to the study samples through the Directorate of Education - Qalqilia and An-Najah national University.
2- Co llecting and classifying the data in order to be analyzed,
3- concluding, analyzing and discussing the study findings,
4- and finally, offering recommendations for readers, teachers, students, translators and foreign language users.

3.6 Statistical Analysis

In order to answer the study questions, the researcher analyzed the data statistically using the SPSS statistical program, specifically using the following statistics:

1- frequencies and percentages, and
2- Chi-square tests.

Chapter Four

Chapter Four

4-Findings

Introduction

This chapter demonstrates the findings of the Discourse Completion Tests (DCTs) distributed in both languages, Arabic and English. The researcher reached these findings and analyzed them using the statistical analysis mentioned in Chapter 3, in order to investigate the hypotheses of the study and to answer the study questions.

The present study investigates the speech act of thanking as a compliment response as used by the Arab speakers of English in an attempt to find the effect of the Arab culture, gender, evaluation and specialization variables on the previously mentioned speech act and to know if there are significant statistical differences due to the independent variables affecting the use and the type of the speech act of thanking as a compliment response. The findings will be displayed and analyzed as follows:

1- Findings of question number one in the English version, in addition to a comparison between native and non-native speakers of English. (Are there any significant differences in the ways people from different cultural backgrounds realize the speech act of thanking? Therefore,

what are the semantic formulas used by the English and the Arabs in using the speech act of thanking as a compliment response?)

There are significant differences in the ways Arab learners of English and native speakers of English use the speech act of thanking due to the differences in their cultural backgrounds.

2- Findings of question number two in both versions, Arabic and English.(Are there differences in the way non-native speakers from different specializations (English majors, scientific stream students, literary stream students, and vocational stream students) use the speech act of thanking as a compliment response?)

There are significant differences in the ways Arab learners of English use the speech act of thanking due to the differences in their specializations.

3 - Findings of question number three in both versions, Arabic and English. (Does the gender of the speaker affect their use of the speech act of thanking as a compliment response?)

There are no significant differences in the ways Arab learners of English use the speech act of thanking due to the gender of the speakers.

4- Findings of question number four in both versions, Arabic and English. (Does the level of evaluation affect the non-native speakers' use of the speech act of thanking as a compliment response?)

There are significant differences in the ways Arab speakers of English use the speech act of thanking due to their proficiency levels.

4.1 Findings related to the first question:

Are there any significant differences in the ways people from different cultural backgrounds realize the speech act of thanking? Therefore, what are the semantic formulas used by the English and the Arabs in using the speech act of thanking as a compliment response?

4.1.a The English version

Table (2) Response types to the first situation according to the nationality variable

nationality		appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	offense	total	k^2	Sig.
nonnative agreement	0	182	21	4	0	207		
neutral	4	0	0	0	0	4		
other	0	0	0	0	3	3		
total	4	182	21	4	3	214		
Percentage%	100%	93.3%	100%	100%	100%	94.3%	.25	.88
native agreement		13				13		
total		13				13		
Percentage%		6.7%				5.7%		

Table 2 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses to the first situation in the two cultures. The highest value was in favor of the appreciation token as one kind of agreement. (For more findings, see appendix 4)

4.2 Findings related to the second question

Are there differences in the way non-native speakers from different specializations (English majors, scientific stream students, literary stream students, and vocational stream students) use the speech act of thanking as a compliment response?

4.2.a The Arabic version

Table (12) Response types to the first situation according to the specialization variable

Specialization		request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	offense	total	k^2	Sig.
English major/ agreement Neutral total	0 1 1		17 0 17	4 0 4	1 0 1		22 1 23		
percentage	100%		9.8%	16.7%	9.1%		10.7%		
scientific stream/ agreement other total			54 0 54	13 0 13	8 0 8	0 3 3	75 3 78	9.9	.12
percentage			31%	54.2%	72.7%	100%	36.4%		
literary stream/ agreement other total		0 1 1	80 0 80	7 0 7	1 0 1		88 1 89		
percentage		100%	46%	29.2%	9.1%		41.6%		
vocational stream / agreement neutral total			22 1 23		1 0 1		23 1 24		
percentage			13.2%		9.1%		11.2%		

Table 12 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the first situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response. (For more findings, see appendix 5)

4.2.b The English version

Table (22) Response types to the first situation according to the specialization variable

Specialization		appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	offense	total	k^2	Sig.
English major/ agreement	0	17	4	1		22		
neutral	1	0	0	0		1		
total	1	17	4	1		23		
percentage	25%	9.3%	19%	25%		10.7%		
scientific stream/ agreement	0	53	16	3	0	72		
neutral	3	0	0	0	0	3		
other	0	0	0	0	3	3		
total	3	53	16	3	3	78	13.7	.03
percentage	75%	29.1%	76.2%	75%	100%	36.4%		
literary stream/ agreement		88	1			89		
total		88	1			89		
percentage		48.4%	4.8%			41.6%		
vocational stream / agreement		24				24		
total		24				24		
percentage		13.2%				11.2%		

Table 22 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the first situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response. (For more findings, see appendix 6)

4.3 Findings related to the third question

Does the gender of the speakers affect their use of the speech act of thanking as a compliment response?

4.3.a The Arabic version

Table (32) Response types to the first situation according to the gender variable

Gender		request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	offense	total	k^2	Sig.
male agreement	0		81	2	6	0	89		
neutral	1		1	0	0	0	2		
other	0		0	0	0	1	1		
total	1		82	2	6	1	92		
percentage	100%		47.1%	8.3%	54.5%	33.3%	43%	3.18	.20
female agreement		0	92	22	5	0	119		
other		1	0	0	0	2	3		
total		1	92	22	5	2	122		
percentage		100%	52.9%	91.7%	45.5%	66.7%	57%		

Table 32 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the first situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response. (For more findings, see appendix 7)

4.3.b The English version

Table (42) Response types to the first situation according to the gender variable

Gender		appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	offense	total	k^2	Sig.
male agreement	0	85	1	1	0	87		
neutral	4	0	0	0	0	4		
other	0	0	0	0	1	1		
total	4	85	1	1	1	92		
percentage	100%	46.7%	4.8%	25%	33.3%	43%		
female agreement		97	20	3	0	120	1.46	.48
other		0	0	0	2	2		
total		97	20	3	2	122		
percentage		53.3%	95.2%	75%	66.7%	57%		

Table 42 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the first situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response. (For more findings, see appendix 8)

4.4 Findings related to the fourth question

Does the level of evaluation affect the non-native speakers' use of the speech act of thanking as a compliment response?

4.4.a The Arabic version

Table (52) Response types to the first situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation		request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	offense	total	k^2	sig.
excellent agreement			13	11	1		25		
total			13	11	1		25		
percentage			7.5%	45.8%	9.1%		11.7%		
good agreement	0	0	131	12	6	0	149		
neutral	1	0	1	0	0	0	2		
other	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	2.35	.67
total	1	1	132	12	6	3	155		
percentage	100%	100%	75.9%	50%	54.5%	100%	72.4%		
not too good agreement			29	1	4		34		
total			29	1	4		34		
percentage			16.7	4.2%	36.4%		15.9%		

Table 52 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the first situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response. (For more findings, see appendix 9)

4.4.b The English version

Table (62) Response types to the first situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation		appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	offense	total	k^2	sig.
excellent agreement		12	12	1		25		
total		12	12	1		25		
percentage		6.6%	57.1%	25%		11.7%		
good agreement	0	139	8	2	0	149		
neutral	3	0	0	0	0	3		
other	0	0	0	0	3	3	1.54	.81
total	3	139	8	2	3	155		
percentage	75%	76.4%	38.1%	50%	100%	72.4%		
not too good agreement	1	31	1	1		34		
total	1	31	1	1		34		
percentage	75%	17%	4.8%	25%		15.9%		

Table 62 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the first situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response. (For more findings, see appendix 10)

4.5 Discussion of the study findings

4.5.a Discussion of the findings on the first question

It is obvious from the statistical analysis that there are no significant statistical differences in response types of thanking as a compliment response due to the nationality variable in situations one, two, five, seven and eight. It means that the responses to these situations are not culture-bound, and thus they are predictable in both the Arabic culture and the English culture. Therefore, we can say that there is some kind of universality here. Nevertheless, this universality does not prevent the appearance of some peculiarities in the non-native responses because of cross-cultural issues. For example; the native speakers' responses to the first situation were all appreciation tokens like 'thank you (very much)' and 'thanks'. Although non-native speakers used appreciation tokens, comment acceptances and acceptance formulas, they were also offensive and neutral. Moreover, their responses were mere translations from the Arabic and the Islamic culture. Therefore, positive and negative transfers occurred in universalities and culture-bound matters respectively. For instance, they used semantic formulas that showed their strong ties with religion and everyday life like 'May Allah bless you and give you a happy long life' and 'I promise I'll study hard and do my best to pass the exam by God's will'.

The second situation was nearly the same as the first with more response types by both natives and non-natives. The native used appreciation tokens, comment acceptances and praise upgrade as types of

agreement. The non-native used the same types in addition to acceptance formulas and return also as types of agreements. Similarly, the fifth situation received several types of agreements as responses to compliments by both native and non-native speakers. Non-natives responded with appreciation tokens (thanks a lot. I appreciate that), comment acceptances (thanks I also like it here), acceptance formulas (God bless you. It is just your eyes), comment history (it is a gift from my father) and returns (your eyes are very beautiful!). What is interesting about the Arabs concerning this situation and similar ones is that they interpreted complimenting their properties as a request for having them. That is why their immediate answer was to offer it, and if the offer is declined, they insist on giving it to the speaker and they swear that they must take it 'take it. I swear'(Arabic: m'addameh. Halafet!). On the other hand, none of the native speakers interpreted it in that way; they used appreciation tokens and comment acceptances to agree with their interlocutors. They also used questions and scale down expressions for non-agreements. Some also gave the comment history of the clock, which is a strategy used by natives more than non-natives in such a situation. When a non-native gave the history of the clock saying that it was his wedding gift from his father, it was because he did not want to offer it to the speaker (I wanted to give it to you, but it was my wedding gift from my father!).

As for the seventh situation, all natives used agreement responses, such as 'thank you' as an appreciation token, 'thanks, I really like it, too!' as

a comment acceptance, 'Yeh. It is very delicious, I know' as a praise upgrade, or 'It is a family recipe; I got the recipe from my aunt!' as a comment history. The non-natives used other more types, such as 'it is not that good' as a scale down, and 'Really?' as a question, 'it is not well-done this time' as a disagreement. Another important type that was only used by the Arabs was the offer. They usually interpret this kind of compliments as requests. In this situation, they interpreted complimenting the cake as a request for having more cake or taking the recipe. Some responses to this situation were 'you want more?', 'eat it all!', 'you can eat as much as you want!', 'bon appetite', 'you want the recipe?', and many similar others. Concerning the eighth situation, both natives and non-natives used different types of agreements and non-agreements, whereas the Arabs had another interpretation of the compliment as a request to offer help to other students in their presentations.

In general, the agreement response types, such as the appreciation tokens 'thanks, thank you, smile,…', the comment acceptances 'thanks, I like it, too. It is my favourite!' return 'so is yours' and the comment history 'I got it from …' are used in the two cultures as compliment responses using different words, but of similar functions. For instance, both natives and non-natives used the return as one type of the agreement responses, but when it comes to the semantic formula, a native may say 'So is yours' while a non-native say 'You're more beautiful!', 'Your eyes are very beautiful and see beautiful things!'. Therefore, the Arabs translated their cultural

semantic formulas and pragmatic competence literally into the English language. They have the English linguistic competence but not the pragmatic one. Thus, non-natives transferred utterances from the mother tongue to the target language inappropriately, and because of different 'interpretive bias', they lead to convey a different pragmatic force in the target language. This is known as pragmalinguistic failure. Thus, the natives will probably misunderstand the use of a return like 'your eyes are beautiful', which may lead to a communication breakdown.

On the other hand, there are significant statistical differences in the ways native and non-native speakers of English use different response types in situations three, four, six, nine and ten. As for the third situation, 97.5% of the agreement responses were non-native whereas 2.5% was native. The non-agreement, neutral and other interpretation responses were 89.2%, 33.3% and 94.7% respectively for non-natives, and 10.8%, 66.7% and 5.3% respectively for natives. This variance is due to the difference between the two cultures. The same can be said about the fourth situation in which the cultural differences between the speakers of the two languages affected their responses to situations in which the two interlocutors are not acquainted with each other; they are strangers. Moreover, some of them are females who are not supposed to converse with male strangers and vice versa. The issue of gender difference is sensitive in the Arabic and Islamic culture. Despite the difference between the two cultures, there is a trend among the Arab youth to imitate the west believing that they can appear

civilized and open-minded in the way they communicate with others. What is meant here is that an Arab female could easily say 'thank you very much. You are very kind!' to a male stranger when he complimented her, which was not accepted in the Arab world before two or three decades. The role of the media here is very effective on the youth that they try to appear civilized by adopting foreign superficial behaviors. They wrongly believe that English female native speakers would be happy to say 'thank you' to a male stranger because males are always gentle with females in their society and they are open-minded people. On the contrary, some native females refused the compliment from a male stranger and others were neutral or even offensive. Therefore, in general, there is a kind of misunderstanding in the Arabs' way of thinking about the natives, which leads to a misuse in the thanking response types.

The sixth situations' responses are also different between the two languages. 95.7% of the agreement responses were non-native and 4.3% were native. Half of the non-agreements were native and the other half was non-native. All neutral responses were native and other interpretations were non-native. The reason behind this difference is culture-bound. When an Arab compliments another's shirt, for example, a compliment return or an acceptance formula is predictable from the receiver of the compliment. Sometimes, it is interpreted as a request for the hearer to offer what is complimented which the hearer may offer despite being insincere.

However, an English native is expected to respond with a 'thank you' or a comment acceptance, history or question.

When a teacher is praised by the students for putting on a new suit, a suitable response is different from one culture to another. Concerning situation nine, 95.1% of agreements were Arabic and 4.9% were native English. As for disagreements, 80%of them were Arabic and 20% were English. All neutral responses were native. Concerning other interpretations, 92.9% were Arabic and 7.1% were native. This significant difference between the two cultures is due to the personality of the teacher. Some Arab teachers are not well-respected by the students , that is why some were offensive to the students and ordered them to go to the classroom or stop talking; others showed disagreement with the compliment. On the other hand, native speakers' responses revealed a strong confident teacher's personality. When a native teacher says, 'Thank you, but this won't help your grade!' it means that the teacher understands the students well and does not downgrade his status as a teacher. On the other hand, when an Arabic teacher says, 'It's because I had my salary yesterday!' it reveals a weakness in the teacher's personality at least a financial one, which downgrades his personality and leads to students' disrespect of teachers gradually.

In the tenth situation, more than one issue arises. Concerning agreements, 94.6% were Arabic and 5.4% were native. All neutral

responses were native, and all other interpretations were non-native. The difference here is due to the negative pragmatic transfer because of the literal translation of culture bound peculiarities on the part of non-native learners of English. Arabs' agreements were of many kinds other than appreciation tokens (thank you) which were also used by natives. Arabs were too talkative using comment acceptances, praise upgrades and acceptance formulas, such as 'Thank you very much for helping me. I hope all people are like you. I hope I can do you a favor. What is your name? I am… '.The issue of exaggeration on compliments as Arabs is a psychological one; they feel that they should express in too many words in order to show the receiver how much they are grateful for him even if they are not really sincere in all what they said. So the longer the response the more sincere it is for Arabs.

4.5.b Discussions of the findings on the second question

The respondents to the discourse completion test (DCT) were from four different specializations. They were 23, 78, 89, and 24 English majors, scientific stream students, literary stream students and vocational stream students respectively. In their responses to the Arabic version of the DCT, there were significant statistical differences in the third, fourth, fifth, sixth and eighth situations due to the specialization variable. In the English version, there were significant statistical differences in the first, third, fourth, sixth, seventh and eighth situations. In these situations, the

specialization of the respondents seems to affect their ways of thanking as compliment responses.

Literary and vocational stream students used lengthy compliment responses. On the other hand, English majors and scientific stream students sometimes used long compliment responses, but they used a variety of responses more than the former two groups did. It seems that the level of education plays an important role here. English majors and scientific stream students have a better linguistic proficiency level than that of the literary and vocational stream students. That is why English majors and scientific stream students have the ability to express their sentiments in various ways.

Students from all specializations did not produce target-like compliment responses save for a few English majors who said they lived in America for some time, which means that they acquired the pragmatic competence in addition to the linguistic one. English majors and scientific stream students used a wide variety of response from agreements (e.g. appreciation tokens, comment acceptances, praise upgrade, acceptance formulas, comment history and return expressions), to non-agreements (e.g. scale down, disagreements, questions and silence) to other interpretations (e.g. requests and offenses). Because they are linguistically competent in English as a second language, they are likely to transfer L1 pragmatic competence and rules in their L2 production. Vocational and literary stream

students used simple ways of thanking, such as appreciation tokens (thank you), return (So's yours), questions (Really?), requests (Take it!) or silence because of their limited linguistic competence in the target language.

Therefore, the more the students are exposed to the target language culture and norms, the closest their responses to the native they will be.

4.5.c Discussions of the findings on the third question

According to the statistical analysis, there is no significant statistical difference in the type of response used due to the gender variable except in situations three, five and seven in the Arabic version of the discourse completion test (DCT). Responses to the third situation ranged from agreements (56.9% male and 43.1%females), to non-agreements (15.4% males and 84.6% females), to other interpretations (20% males and 80 % females), to neutral responses (33.3% males and 66.7% females). In Arabic, males and females do not respond to a male stranger in the same way. Males who used the agreement responses are more than females, whereas females who responded with disagreements are much more than males. Furthermore, females responded with offenses as another interpretation to the compliment with a percentage of 80% in comparison with only 20% for males.

Similarly, there is a significant statistical difference in the type of response to the fifth situation due to the gender of the respondent. It is clear

from the statistics that males gave more agreements (59.8%), whereas females gave more disagreements (66.7%) and other interpretations (71.2%). Moreover, most of the males' agreements were appreciation tokens. On the other hand, most of the females' other interpretations were requests, so they offered the clock for the speaker. Even though those who offered it were not sincere, but it is the Arabs' habit to invite others to take the things they like. This goes with what Guodong and Jing (2005) predicted about women; women will use more politeness strategies than men do.

Gender also has significance in the seventh situation. Although the agreement responses were not that different between both sexes, females used more non-agreement responses than males. Similarly, females had other interpretations for the compliment more than males. The other interpretations used by females were requests for more cake or for the recipe, which were both offered by the respondents.

From the above discussion, it seems clear that gender does not have that significant effect in general situations faced by both sexes. For example, all students talk with their teachers about exams and other matters. Students also compliment each other's work. Moreover, all people receive help from others and they have to thank them. People also express their opinions in their friends' clothes and appearances. On the other hand, it is a feminine habit to express their opinions in the styles and the décor of

each other's houses, and the taste of the food they make. What is meant here is that such matters are feminine-specific in general. This finding supports Liu's (2003) in that he remarked that women are traditionally assumed to be more concerned than men with personal topics. Another issue here is that, male strangers rarely express their opinions in female strangers' appearances and clothes, especially in the Arab Islamic society. That is why there is a significant difference in situations three, five and seven.

Concerning the English version, there are no significant differences in all situations -save for the third- due to the gender variable. This means that the non-native responses to the same situations in English differ in one way or another from those in Arabic- their mother tongue. This means that other variables other than gender play a role in the difference between non-native responses in the Arabic version and the English one.

4.5.d Discussions of the findings on the fourth question

Concerning the evaluation level variable, there were significant statistical differences in situations five and seven in the Arabic version, whereas significant differences appeared in situations three, four, five and eight in the English version. There were three levels of proficiency in this study, high (25), mediate (155) and low (34). These differences between the three groups are due to their linguistic competence of the target language. Learners of different proficiency levels differ in their ways of

matching form with function, and function with context. Both kinds of pragmatic transfer are evident in the study. Positive pragmatic transfer is an evident of sociocultural and pragmatic universality in some situations. On the other hand, negative pragmatic transfer of sociolinguistic norms into L2 often results in pragmatic failure or communication breakdown. This kind used in the present study takes the form of translating some formulaic expressions or phrases functioning to express the equivalent speech act in L2. This goes on with Rizk's (2003) study. For example, an English speaking Arab learner responded with 'You are a liar! This is just a compliment. Swear!' to the person who complimented his/her shirt or cake. This may at least create a communication breakdown for an American or may have negative connotations thus creating a misunderstanding on the part of the American.

The present study has shown that negative pragmatic transfer increases with increasing proficiency. This finding supports the studies of Takahashi & Beebe (1987, 1993), El Samaty (2005) and Eslami-Rasekh et al (2004). They hypothesized that there is a correlation between L2 proficiency and pragmatic transfer. They argued that more proficient learners tend to transfer L1 sociocultural norms more than less proficient learners because they have enough control over L2 to express L1 sentiments at the pragmatic level. Linguistically competent learners do not necessarily possess comparable pragmatic competence. Furthermore, highly proficient learners produced utterances longer than less proficient

learners, which is considered a pragmatic failure. In other words, the more highly proficient learners have control over TL to express the NL speaker's sentiments of the pragmatic level, the more likely they would transfer their NL sociocultural norms than low proficient learners would. low proficient learners found it easier to say the simple expressions of 'thanks' and 'thank you' instead of expressing what they actually wanted to say which would be longer and more difficult for them to translate into English. However, Kasper et al (1996) and Takahashi (1996) failed to find evidence of higher frequency of negative pragmatic transfer in advanced learners.

This finding is opposing to studies by Takahashi & Dufon (1989), Robinson (1992) and Takahashi (1989) who reported that lower and higher proficient learners are both aware of the differences in appropriate native and target situations of the speech acts. However, lower proficient learners are more influenced by their NL style (Robinson, 1992). On the other hand, a learner with advanced pragmatic knowledge about TL would not be likely to commit more transfers (Takahashi, 1989).

These studies are about learners who are of different levels of pragmatic proficiency, while the resent study's participants are of different levels of linguistic proficiency. The problem for those learners is that they are taught to acquire the linguistic competence and not the pragmatic one.

Pragmatics does not receive the attention in language teaching that the other areas of language do. But the question is 'Can pragmatics be taught?'. Regardless of the answer, since pragmatics is a science there are certain aspects of pragmatic competence that can be taught. The studies of House (1996) and Olshtain& Cohen (1990) support the previous claim of the possibility of teaching pragmatics. Explicit instruction on pragmatics had more of an effect on learners' pragmatic competence than implicit instruction. It is also assumed that pragmatic competence is among the final linguistic skills acquired by learners who are already advanced in fluency, syntax, comprehension and semantic usage. This does not mean that lower level learners are not ready to acquire pragmatics; at least their awareness can be raised pragmatically. Some pragmatic knowledge that is universal is free, so non-natives can acquire a considerable amount of L2 pragmatic knowledge for free which leads to positive pragmatic transfer.

In general, this study supports the findings of some studies and refutes others partially and sometimes completely. It supports the claim that negative pragmatic transfer occurs because of the influence of L1 culture as stated in the study findings of Cohen & Olshtain (1981), Olshtain (1983), House (1996), Garcia (1989), Takahashi & Beebe (1993), Blum-Kulka (1982; 1983; 1989), House and Kasper (1987), Trosborg (1987), Faerch & Kasper (1989), Takahashi & Dufon (1989), DeCapua (1989), Beebe, Takahashi & Uliss-Weltz (1990) and Bergman & Kasper (1993). It also supports the study findings of El Samaty (2005) and Eslami-Rasekh et al

(2004) who found that linguistically proficient learners more prone to commit negative transfer. On the other hand, it refutes the findings of other studies which state that negative pragmatic transfer occur in lower proficiency level, such as those of Takahashi & Dufon (1989), Robinson (1992), Takahashi (1996) and Maeshiba et al(1996). Moreover, the researcher refutes the claim made by Guodong & Jing (2005) concerning gender. The researcher agrees that politeness strategies are applied where appropriate regardless of being a male or a female. On the other hand, the researcher is in favor of Liu's (2003) finding which emphasizes that females are more interested in personal matters than males.

4.6 The common semantic formulas of the speech act of thanking as a compliment response as used by native speakers of English

1- **Agreements**:

Appreciation tokens: Thanks! / Thank you very much! / I'll be very grateful for this! / I appreciate that very much! / Thank you for saying so! / Thank you for your help! / Glad you liked it! / (smile)/ (hug).

Comment acceptances: Thanks! How clever of you! That's exactly what I was looking for! / Thanks, it's one of my favourite recipes! / Great! I like it too! / I know. I've always liked that colour! / thanks. I think so too!

Praise upgrade: Yeh, I got lucky with this one! / I worked hard to do it!

Comment history: Thanks. I really got it at… (name of a shop)/ I got the recipe from… (name of a person)/ Yes, it's a present from my mother-in-law. / Really? My mother bought it for me.

Transfers:

Return: Thanks. I thought yours was good too./ thanks, it's nice of you to say so./ You are a big help./ That's very kind of you to stop./ Thanks! Your presentation was great too!

2- **Non-agreements**:

Scale-down: It only cost…/ God! I thought it was awful! / Don't go too far!

Question: Really? / Yes? / are you serious? / Do you think so? / What are you after? / Did you finish your homework?(when a student compliments a teacher)

Silence: (---)/ (stare at him in disbelief.)/ (Smile, but look severe.).

3- **Neutral**:

Maybe, I'll think about it. / I hope you are right. / Maybe! I don't know. / Oh, I don't know.

4- **Other interpretations**:

Request: Thanks! I'll give you one the same when I visit you soon.

Offense: Thanks! But it's not your business!/ This is not going to help your grade, you know!

4.7 The common semantic formulas of the speech act of thanking as a compliment response as used by non-native speakers of English

1- agreements:

Appreciation tokens: Thank you very *very* much! / Thank you for your wonderful present! / Thank you teacher for understanding my situation and I appreciate that! / Thanks, I'm glad to hear that. / thanks for your opinion. I really respect it.

Comment acceptances: Oh, yeh! I also noticed that! / I prefer it the most, thanks.

Praise upgrade: Yes, it's very delicious. / I like the blue colour in every thing because it fits me.

Comment history: It's my wedding gift, thanks! /It's a gift from my father, I really would like to give it to you, but I can't.

Return: Your eyes are more beautiful! / You are great! Thanks! / You are a nice person.

Acceptance formulas: What a day! It looks wonderful. Every body is happy with me. / Really, I don't know how to thank you! / Thanks, this is from your generosity! / Thanks, you were in my heart (or mind)/ you made me shy. / Stay a little bit longer. / It's just your eyes. / Bon appetite! / Thank you, God bless you, I hope there are many persons like you! / Thank you, I'll do my best to pass the exam by God's will.

2- **Non-agreements**:

Scale-down: It's very old. / It's the only shirt I have!

Question: Really? Thank you. / Really? Who are you? / You think so?

Disagreements: Wow, thanks! I was so stressed. / I don't like this colour!

Silence: (I keep silent and go away.) / (No answer, just look at him.) / (No response.)

3- **Neutral**:

I can't judge till I try it! / Thanks, but let me try it first.

4- **Other interpretations**:

Request: Take it! / Mmm! Want another one?! / I'll offer it for you. / If you love it, you can take it. / There is extra. If you want more, here you are. / You can take more and I'll teach you how to make it.

Offense: I don’t need your opinion. / How do you know? / Let us start the lesson. / Not your business.

Chapter Five

Chapter Five

5.1 Summary and conclusions of the study

The study investigated the speech act of thanking as a compliment response as used by non-native speakers of English using the DCT as the tool of the study. The data were analyzed statistically and the researcher had the following conclusions:

1- Non-native learners of English did not produce target-like responses. They brought about some L1 strategies and expressions, which might result in negative pragmatic transfer and thus communicative breakdown. They literally translated Arabic formulaic expressions, which were not always suitable for the compliment given in English. They intended their responses to be polite but they were not appropriate.
2- Compliments in the Arabic culture had turned into routine as a means of making people feel good and they are perceived to be insincere most of the time. That is why there were responses like 'oh, this not true, you are only complimenting me!'.
3- It was obvious that language proficiency did not play a role in producing target-like compliment responses. The responses were either simple ones or lengthy literal translations of the Arabic semantic formulas into English. This is because the Arab learners of English acquired only the linguistic competence and not the pragmatic one.

Even if they were proficient ones, they were linguistically proficient which is due to the quality of education that neglects the pragmatic side.

4- Gender did not have a great effect on the compliment responses since both males and females used politeness strategies when the situation requires a person to be polite. However, when it comes to the physical appearances, house decors, clothes styles, food and diet, women are more sensitive to compliments and thanking responses in such situations.

5- Compliment responses used by Arabs were lengthy because there is a general understanding that the longer the response to the compliment, the more sincere it is.

6- Some responses were mere transference of L1 pragmatic competence to the target language, which- if misunderstood by native speakers- might cause embarrassment to the non-native and offense to the native.

7- Because of their strong ties with religion, Arabs have their faith in God (Allah) deeply embedded within their speech acts. That is why most of the semantic formulas used as compliment responses are religious in content (e.g. Allah yes'edek 'May God make you happy'), (Allah ysallm edeake 'May God bless your hands').

8- Literal translation is not a suitable resort in the area of speech acts and culture bound peculiarities unless some expressions are universal ones in speech acts among languages.

5.2 Recommendations of the study

1- It is not enough to build the learners' linguistic competence, but it is also necessary to develop their sociocultural and pragmatic competence.

2- Raising the learners' awareness levels of pragmatics and appropriateness regardless of how proficient they are in the target language can be achieved by enriching the classroom input with real-world materials, such as recordings of native speakers' conversations and radio and television programs.

3- Syllabus developers should pay greater attention to this area of second language acquisition by providing authentic concrete lessons and activities and by focusing on learner-centered activities like role-plays and real discussions.

4- Team-teaching with native speakers is beneficial when learners cannot live among native speakers in order to acquire their sociocultural norms by interaction and observation.

5- Unless teachers also know about pragmatics and methods to evaluate students' progress in this field, they may be reluctant to focus on it in their teaching. Therefore, teachers have to take pragmatic training courses or educational training visits to the native countries' schools and colleges.

5.3 Suggestions for further studies

1. Further studies on the influence of social power, curriculum, age or social distance on the use of speech acts can be investigated between Arabic and English.

2. Other comparative-contrastive studies can be conducted to investigate the use of various speech acts, such as requests, refusals, promises, apologies…etc. between the two above-mentioned languages interculturally.

3. Studies should be conducted on how to incorporate teaching pragmatics in classrooms.

References

Austin, J. L.: (1962), **How to do Things with Words**. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Bach K. and Harnish R. M.: (1979), **Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts**. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. and Hartford, B.: (2005), **Intercultural Pragmatics: Exploring Institutional Talk**. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Beebe L. and Takahashi T.: (1989), "Sociolinguistic variation in face-threatening speech acts", in Eisenstein M. R. ed. **The Dynamic Interlanguage Empirical Studies in Speech Variation**. New York: Plenum Press.

Beebe L., Takahashi T. and Uliss-Weltz R.: (1990), "Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals", in Scarcella R., Andersen E., and Krashen S. eds**. On the Development of Communicative Competence in a Second Language**. New York: Newbury House.

Beebe L.M. and Takahashi T.: (1989), "Do you have a bag? Social status and patterned variation in second language acquisition"**,** in Gass S. M., Madden C., Preston D., and Selinker L. eds. **Variation in second**

language acquisition: Discourse and pragmatics. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bergman M. and Kasper G.: (1993), "Perception and Performance in Native and Nonnative Apology", in Kasper G. and Blum-Kulka S. eds. **Interlanguage Pragmatics**. Oxford: OUP.

Billmyer, K. (1990). "The effect of formal instruction on the development of sociolinguistic competence: the performance of compliments". **Dissertation in Education**. University of Pennsylvania.

Blum-Kulka S., House J., and Kasper G.: (1989), "Investigating cross-cultural pragmatics: an introductory overview", in Blum-Kulka S., House J., and Kasper G. eds**. Cross-cultural Pragmatics Requests and Apologies**. Norwood.: NJ Ablex.

Blum-Kulka S. and Olshtain E.: (1986), 'Too many words Length of utterance and pragmatic failure' **Studies in Second Language Acquisition**. Norwood, NJ.: Ablex.

Blum-Kulka, S.: (1982), "Learning how to say what you mean in a second language: a study of speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language". **Applied Linguistics**. by S. Blum-Kulka, J. House and G. Kasper, vol. XXXI, Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Blum-Kulka, S.: (1989**), "Playing it safe: The role of conventionality in indirect requests", in** S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper eds. **Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies**, 37~70. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Blum-Kulka, S.: (1983), "Interpreting and performing speech acts in a second language: a cross-cultural study of Hebrew and English", in Wolfson N. and Judd E. eds. **Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition**. Rowley.: MA Newbury House.

Bolinger D.L. and Sears D.A.: (1981), **Aspects of Language. 3rd ed. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.**

Brown, J. D. (1996). **Testing in Language Programs**. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S.D.: (1987), **Politeness: Some universals in language usage**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cedar, P.: (2006), "Thai and American Responses to Compliments in English". **The Linguistics Journal**, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 6-28. http://www.linguistics-journal.com/June%_pc.php.

Chen, R.: (1993), "Responding to compliments: a contrastive study of politeness strategies between American English and Chinese speakers" **Journal of Pragmatics** 20: 49-75.

Cohen A. D. and Olshtain E.: (1981), “Developing a measure of sociocultural competence: a case study”, in **Language Learning** 31, 113~134.

DeCapua, A.: (1989**),** "An analysis of pragmatic transfer in the speech act of complaints as produced by native speakers of German and English", **unpublished doctoral dissertation**, Columbia University.

Ellis, R.: (1994), **The study of second language acquisition**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

El Samaty, M.: (2005), "Helping foreign language learners become pragmatically competent", **Proceedings of the 10th TESOL Arabia Conference,9.**

Eslami-Rasekh Z., Eslami-Rasekh A. and Fatahi A.: (2004), **"The effect of explicit metapragmatic instruction on the speech act awareness of advanced EFL students"**. TESL-EJ (8), 2. Retrieved from http://www-writing.berkeley.edu/TESl-EJ/ej30/a2.html.

Faerch C. and Kasper G.: (1987), "Perspectives on language transfer". **Applied Linguistics**, 8, 111-136.

Garcia, C.: (1989), **"Apologizing in English. Politeness strategies used by native and non-native speakers"**. Multilingua: 8: 3-20.

Ghawi, M.: (1993), **“Pragmatic transfer in Arabic learners of English”.** El Two Talk, 1(1), 39-52.

Grice, H. P. (1975), ‘Logic and conversation’, in Cole P. and Morgan J. eds. **Syntax and Semantics III: Speech Acts**. New York: Academic Press.

Guodong and Jing, H.: (2005), **"A contrastive study on disagreement strategies for politeness between American English & Manderin Chinese"**. Asian EFL Journal (7), 1. Retrieved from: www.asian-efl-journal.com/march_07_lghj.phphttp.

Herbert, R. K.: (1986) "Say “thank you” or something". **American Speech,** 61(1), 76-88. Retrieved from the JSTOR database.

House, J.: (1989), **‘**Politeness in English and German: The functions of Please and Bitte’ in **Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies". In Journal of Pragmatics**, Vol. 21, No. 4.

House, J., & Kasper, G.: (1987), "Interlanguage pragmatics: requesting in a foreign language", in Loerscher W., & Schulze R., eds.: **Perspectives on Language in Performance.** Tuebingen: Narr.

House, J.: (1988), **"'Oh excuse me please': apologizing in a foreign language"**, in Kettemann, B., Bierbaumer, P., Fill, A., & Karpf, A., eds.: English als Zweitsprasche, 303-27. Tuebingen: Narr.

House, J.: (1996**),** 'Developing Pragmatic Fluency in English as a Foreign Language: Routines and Metapragmatic Awareness", **Studies in Second Language Acquisition**, 18, pp.225-252.

Ide, S.: (1989), **"Formal forms and discernments: two neglected aspects of linguistic politeness",** Multilingua 8,223-48.

Kasper G. and Schmidt R.: (1996), "Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics". **Studies in Second Language Acquisition**, 18, 149-169.

Kasper, G. (1993), **"A bilingual perspective on interlanguage pragmatics"**. Keynote held at the 10th AILA Congress, Amsterdam.

Kasper, G. (1997), **'Can pragmatic competence be taught?"** NFLRC Network (6) Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.

Kasper, G.: (1992), **"Pragmatic transfer"**. Second Language Research, 8(3), 203-231.

Kasper, G.: (1995), "Interlanguage pragmatics", in Verschueren J., stman J.-O, and Blommaert J. eds. **Handbook of pragmatics**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Leech, G.: (1983), **Principles of Pragmatics**. London: Longman.

Leech, G.: (1992), 'Pragmatic Principles in Shaw's You Never Can Tell", in Toolan M. ed. **Language, Text and Context**. Routledge: London.

Levinson, P.: (1983), **Pragmatics.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Liu, S.: (2003), 'Studies on negative pragmatic transfer in international pragmatics". **Guangxi Normal University Journal**. Retrieved from http://www.gxnu.edu.cn/Personal/szliu/negative%20pragmatic%20transfer.doc.

Maeshiba N., Yoshinaga N., Kasper G. and Rose S.: (1996), "Transfer and proficiency in interlanguage pragmatics", in Neu J. and Gass S. eds.: **Speech Acts across Cultures**. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mao, R. L.: (1994), 'Beyond Politeness Theory: "Face" Revisited and Renewed'. In **Journal of Pragmatics**, Vol. 21, No. 4.

Matsomoto, Y.: (1988), "Re-Examination of the universality of face: politeness phenomena in Japanese ", **Journal f pragmatics** 12.

Mey, J. L.: (1998), **Pragmatics**: **An Introduction**, Oxford UK and Cambridge USA: Blackwell Publishers.

Olshtain, E. and A. Cohen.: (1983), 'Apology: a speech act set' in Wolfson N. and Judd E. eds., **Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition.** Rowley, MA Newbury House.

Olshtain, E. and Cohen, A.D.: (1991), "Teaching Speech Act Behavior to Non-native Speakers", in: Celce-Murcia M. ed. **Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language**. New York: Newbury House/ Harper Collins.

Olshtain, E.: (1983), "Sociocultural competence and language transfer: the case of apology", in Gass, S., & Selinker, L., eds.: **Language Transfer in language Learning**. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Pomerantz, A.: (1978), "Compliment responses: Notes on the cooperation of multiple constraints", in Schenkein J. ed. **Studies in the organization of conversational interaction**. New York: Academic Press.

Rizk, S.: (2003), **"Why say "NO!" when you refuse?"** TESOL Arabia 2002 Conference Proceedings, 7.

Robinson, M. S.: (1992) "Introspective methodology in interlanguage pragmatics research", in Kasper G. ed. **Pragmatics of Japanese as**

Native and Target Language. Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center: University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Rose, K. R.: (2000), "An exploratory cross-sectional study of interlanguage pragmatic development". **Studies in Second Language Acquisition**, 22 (1), 27-67.

Rose K. and Kasper G.: (2001), **Pragmatics and language teaching**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saito H. and Beecken M.: (1997), **"An Approach to Instruction of Pragmatic Aspects: Implications of Pragmatic Transfer by American Learners of Japanese"** The Modern Language Journal, 3.

Scarcella, R.: (1979), "On speaking politely in a second language", in Yorio, et al. eds., On TESOL '79: **The Learner in Focus**. Washington DC: TESOL.

Schmidt, R.: (1993), "Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics", in Kasper G. & Blum-Kulka S. eds. **Interlanguage pragmatics**, Cambridge: CUP.

Searle, J. R.: (1969), **Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Steinberg Du, J.: (1995), "Performance of face-threatening acts in Chinese: Complaining, giving bad news, and disagreeing", in Kasper G. ed.,

Pragmatics of Chinese as native and target language. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center.

Takahashi T. & Beebe L.: (1987), **"The development of pragmatic competence in Japanese learners of English"**, JALT Journal, (8).

Takahashi T. and Beebe L. M.: (1993), "Cross-linguistic influence in the speech act of correction", in Kasper G. and Blum-Kulka S. eds. **Interlanguage Pragmatics**. New York: Oxford University Press.

Takahashi, S. and Dufon, M.A.: (1989), **'Cross-linguistic influence in indirectness: the case of English directives performed by native Japanese speakers"**, unpublished paper, University of Hawaii at Monoa.

Takahashi, S.: (1996), "Pragmatic transferability" **Studies in Second Language Acquisition**, 18, 189-223.

Thomas, J.: (1983), "Cross-cultural pragmatic failure" **Applied Linguistics**. New York: Oxford University Press.

Trosborg, A.: (1987), **"Usage" Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trosborg, A.: (1994), **Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies.** Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Trosborg, A.: (1987), “Apology strategies in natives/non-natives”, in **Journal of Pragmatics** 11, 147-67.

Urano, K.: (1998), **"Negative pragmatic transfer in compliment responses by Japanese learners of English"**. Unpublished manuscript, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu. Retrieved from http://www2.hawaii.edu/~urano/research/esl660.html.

Wierzbicka, A.: (1991), Cross-cultural pragmatics: **The semantics of human interaction.** Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Zegarac, V., and Pennington, M.C.: **(2000), Pragmatic transfer in intercultural communication**. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), Culturally speaking - Managing rapport through talk across cultures (pp. 165-190). London: Continuum.

Appendixes

Appendix 1

In the Name of Allah, the Most Gracious the Most Merciful

Dear recipient,

The researcher is conducting a research entitled "The speech act of thanking as a compliment response used by Arab speakers of English- a comparative intercultural study". Therefore, she is collecting the necessary data and information using the Discourse Completion Test (DCT) as the tool of the study. The DCT consists of two parts: personal information and research information. Please read the test parts carefully and fill in with the personal information, and then give your response to the ten situations realistically.

The researcher hopes you are confident that the purpose of the study is purely for scientific research and not for any other purposes. That is why, it is not necessary to write your name.

Thanks a lot for being cooperative,

The researcher

Sana' Mohammed Al-Khateeb

An-Najah National University

College of Graduate Studies

Applied Linguistics & Translation

The Speech Act of Thanking as a Compliment Response

Used by the Arab Speakers of English – a Comparative Intercultural Study

---

The Discourse Completion Test (DCT)

Personal Information

Gender: Male ⬭ Female ⬭

English Speaking: Native ⬭ Non-native ⬭

***If you are a non-native speaker of English, is your level in English*:**

excellent ⬭ good ⬭ not too good ⬭

***If you are a non-native university student, are you*:**

specialized in English ⬭ not specialized in English ⬭

***If you are a non-native school student, are you in the*:**

scientific stream ⬭ literary stream ⬭ vocational stream ⬭

Research Information

**** How would you respond to speakers in such situations?***

Situation 1:

You were very tired yesterday and you did not study for the exam. You ask your teacher to postpone the exam and the teacher says, "I'll just postpone it because you are a good student!" You answer _____

Situation 2:

Your new friend visits you on your birthday and gives you a precious present that you wanted to buy before. You answer _____

Situation 3:

You were shopping for a shirt and a (male) stranger approaches you and says, “This would look amazing on you!” You answer _____

Situation 4:

You were shopping for a shirt and a (female) stranger approaches you and says, “This would look amazing on you!” You answer _____

Situation 5:

Some friends are over at your house. One of them looks at a clock hanging on the wall and says, “I love your clock. It looks great in your living room!” You answer _____

Situation 6:

You are wearing a new shirt and a colleague looks at you and says, “This shirt looks great on you! Blue is a great color for you.” You answer _____

Situation 7:

You have some friends and relatives over for tea and cake that you baked. Someone says, “Tastes Yummy!” You answer _____

Situation 8:

You have just finished presenting your research paper. At the end of the class (when you were just leaving the classroom), one of your classmates says, “You did an excellent job! I really enjoyed your presentation”. You answer _____

Situation 9:

You are a teacher wearing a new suit today, and one of your students says, “Your suit fits you well and looks great on you”. You answer _____

Situation 10:

You are walking, and your papers are blown by the wind. A male/ female stranger helps you collect them. You answer _____

Thanks a lot for being cooperative,

The researcher

Appendix 2

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

عزيزتي المتلقية/عزيزي المتلقي

تقوم الباحثة بدراسة موضوع "الشكر بمثابة الرد الإطرائي كما يستخدمه العرب المتحدثون بالإنجليزية_ دراسة ثقافية مقارنة"، وبذلك فإنها تقوم بجمع المعلومات والبيانات اللازمة باستخدام أداة "اختبار تكميل الحوار" التي تنقسم إلى قسمين: بيانات شخصية وبيانات بحثية. يرجى قراءة فقرات الاختبار بدقة، وملأ البيانات الشخصية، ومن ثم الرد على المواقف العشرة بواقعية تامة.

راجية أن تكون على ثقة بان المعلومات المطلوبة هي لأغراض البحث العلمي، و ليست لأية أغراض أخرى، و لذلك فليس هناك حاجة لكتابة اسمك.

شاكرة لكم حسن تعاونكم

الباحثة

سناء محمد الخطيب

جامعة النجاح الوطنية

كلية الدراسات العليا

اللغويات التطبيقية و الترجمة

الشكر بمثابة الرد الإطرائي

كما يستخدمه العرب المتحدثون بالإنجليزية_ دراسة ثقافية مقارنة

The Speech Act of Thanking as a Compliment Response

Used by the Arab Speakers of English – a Comparative Intercultural Study

---

اختبار استكمال الحوار

البيانات الشخصية

الجنس: ذكر ○ أنثى ○

إذا كنت عربيا" متحدثا" بالإنجليزية، فكيف تقييم مستواك فيها:

ممتاز ○ جيد ○ متدني ○

إذا كنت طالبا جامعيا، فهل أنت:

متخصص في الإنجليزية ○ غير متخصص في الإنجليزية ○

المدرسة، فهل أنت:

طالب في الفرع العلمي ○ طالب في الفرع الأدبي ○ طالب في الفرع المهني ○

البيانات البحثية

كيف ترد على المتحدثين في المواقف الآتية؟

الموقف الأول:

البارحة، كنت متعبا، و لم تدرس الامتحان، واليوم طلبت من المعلم تأجيل الامتحان، فرد بالقول: "سأقوم بتأجيله لك لأنك طالب جيد". فترد قائلا":_____

الموقف الثاني:

في يوم ميلادك، يزورك أحد الأصدقاء ويعطيك هدية ثمينة كنت تود شراءها من قبل. فترد قائلا":_____

الموقف الثالث:

توجهت إلى السوق لشراء قميص، فاقترب منك رجل قائلا: "سيكون هذا القميص مذهلا" عليك!"، فترد قائلا":_____

الموقف الرابع:

توجهت إلى السوق لشراء قميص، فاقتربت منك فتاة قائلة: "سيكون هذا القميص مذهلا" عليك!"، فترد قائلا":_____

الموقف الخامس:

في منزلك اليوم أصدقاء. ينظر أحدهم إلى ساعة حائط ويقول:"أحب هذه الساعة، تبدو رائعة في مكانها!"، فترد قائلا":_____

الموقف السادس:

تلبس اليوم قميصا جديدا، فينظر إليك أحد الأصدقاء ويقول:"يبدو رائعا! اللون الأزرق لون رائع عليك!"، فترد قائلا": _____

الموقف السابع:

دعوت اليوم بعض الأصدقاء و الأقارب لشرب الشاي وتناول كعكة من صنعك، فيقول أحدهم:"، طعمها رائع!"، فترد قائلا": _____

الموقف الثامن:

لقد أنهيت للتو شرح ورقة بحث، وفي النهاية (عندما كنتم تغادرون قاعة الصف) قال لك أحد زملائك:"قمت بعمل ممتاز !لقد استمتعت حقا بشرحك!" فترد قائلا": _____

الموقف التاسع:

أنت معلم وترتدي اليوم ملابس جديدة، فيقول لك أحد طلابك:"إنها تناسبك وتبدو رائعة عليك!" فترد قائلا": _____

الموقف العاشر:

بينما كنت تمشي، هبت رياح وتناثرت أوراقك، فقام شخص(رجل/فتاة) بمساعدتك في جمعها. فترد قائلا": _____

شكرا لتعاونكم

الباحثة

Appendix 3

Herbert's Taxonomy of Compliment Responses

(Herbert, 1986:79)

Response Type	Example
I. *Agreement*	
A. Acceptances	
1. Appreciation Token	Thanks; thank you; (smile)
2. Comment Acceptance	Thanks, it's my favorite too.
3. Praise Upgrade	Really brings out the blue in my eyes, doesn't it?
B. Comment History	I bought it for the trip to Arizona.
C. Transfers	
1. Reassignment	My brother gave it to me.
2. Return	So's yours.
II. *Non-agreement*	
A. Scale Down	It's really quite old.
B. Question	Do you really think so?
C. Non-acceptances	
1. Disagreement	I hate it.
2. Qualification	It's alright, but Len's is nicer.
D. No Acknowledgment	(silence)
III. *Other Interpretations*	
A. Request	You wanna borrow this one too?

Appendix 4

Findings related to the first question: The English version

Table (3) Response types to the second situation according to the nationality variable.

nationality	appreciation token	comment acceptance	Praise upgrade	acceptance formula	offense	disagreement	return	total	k^2	Sig.
Non-native agreement	143	34	3	27	0	0	3	210		
non agreement	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2		
other	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2		
total	143	34	3	27	2	2	3	214		
Percentage%	94.7%	89.5%	75%	100%	100%	100%	100%	94.3%		
native agreement	8	4	1					13	.31	.95
total	8	4	1					13		
Percentage%	5.3%	10.5%	25%					5.7%		

Table 3 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses to the second situation in the two cultures. The highest value was in favor of the appreciation token as one kind of agreement**.**

Table (4) Response types to the third situation according to the nationality variable

nationality		request/ scale-down	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	offense/ question	disagree	return	silence	total	k^2	sig.
Non-native agreement non agreement neutral other total	0 0 5 0 5	0 4 0 4 8	112 0 0 0 112	7 0 0 0 7	6 0 0 0 6	10 0 0 0 10	0 5 0 14 19	0 9 0 0 9	20 0 0 0 20	0 16 0 0 16	155 34 5 18 212		
Percentage%	50%	100%	96.6%	100%	100%	100%	81.9%	100%	100%	88.9%	94.3%		
native agreement non agreement neutral other total	0 0 5 0 5		4 0 0 0 4				0 1 0 1 2			0 2 0 0 2	4 3 5 1 13	45	.00
Percentage%	50%		3.4%				18.1%			11.1%	5.7%		

Table 4 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses to the third situation in the two cultures.

Table (5) Response types to the fourth situation according to the nationality variable

nationality		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	offense/ question	disagree	return	silence	total	k^2	sig.
Non-native agreement non agreement neutral other total	0 0 2 0 2	0 2 0 3 5	125 0 0 0 125	8 0 0 0 8	2 0 0 0 2	15 0 0 0 15		0 2 0 5 7		38 0 0 0 38	190 13 2 8 211		
Percentage%	50%	100%	94.7%	88.9%	100%	100%	77.8%	100%	97.4%	100%	94.3%		
native agreement non agreement neutral total	0 0 2 2		7 0 0 7	1 0 0 1			0 2 0 2		1 0 0 1		9 2 2 13	2.5	.46
Percentage%	50%		5.3%	11.1%			22.2%		2.6%		5.7%		

Table 5 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses to the fourth situation in the two cultures. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (6) Response types to the fifth situation according to the nationality variable

nationality	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	comment history	return	total	k^2	Sig.
nonnative agreement	0	102	7	13	9	12	143		
non agreement	2	0	0	0	0	0	2		
other	66	0	0	0	0	0	66		
total	68	102	7	13	9	12	211		
Percentage%	98.6%	95.3%	87.5%	100%	60%	100%	94.3%	5.70	.12
native agreement	0	5	1		5		11		
non agreement	0	0	0		1		1		
other	1	0	0		0		1		
total	1	5	1		6		13		
Percentage%	1.4%	4.7%	12.5%		40%		5.7%		

Table 6 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses to the fifth situation in the two cultures. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (7) Response types to the sixth situation according to the nationality variable

nationality		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	comment history	return	total	k^2	Sig.
nonnative agreement		0	124	14	8	2	54	202		
non agreement		2	0	0	0	0	0	2		
other		7	0	0	0	0	0	7		
total		9	124	14	8	2	54	211		
Percentage%		81.9%	95.4%	87.5%	100%	83.3%	98.2%	94.3%		
native agreement	0	0	6	2		0	1	9		
non agreement	0	2	0	0		1	0	3		
neutral	1	0	0	0		0	0	1		
total	1	2	6	2		1	1	13	38.7	.00
Percentage%	100%	18.1%	4.6%	12.5%		16.7%	1.8%	5.7%		

Table 7 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses to the sixth situation in the two cultures. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (8) Response types to the seventh situation according to the nationality variable

nationality		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	comment history/ question	disagree	return	total	k^2	Sig.
Non-native agreement non agreement neutral other total	0 0 2 0 2	0 3 0 22 25	117 0 0 0 117	8 0 0 0 8	7 0 0 0 7	39 0 0 0 39	1 4 0 0 5	0 3 0 0 3	5 0 0 0 5	177 10 2 22 211		
Percentage%	100%	100%	93.6%	72.7%	87.5%	100%	83.3%	100%	100%	94.3%		
native agreement total			8 8	3 3	1 1		1 1			11 13	2.5	.46
Percentage%			6.4%	27.3%	12.5%		16.7%			5.7%		

Table 8 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses to the seventh situation in the two cultures. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (9) Response types to the eighth situation according to the nationality variable

nationality	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	question	disagreement	return	total	k^2	Sig.
nonnative agreement	0	149	6	21	0	0	12	192		
non agreement	7	0	0	0	6	1	0	14		
other	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5		
total	12	149	6	21	6	1	12	211		
Percentage%	92.3	96.1%	85.7%	100%	75%	100%	85.7%	94.3%		
native agreement	0	7	1		1		2	11	1.7	.42
non agreement	1	0	0		1		0	2		
total	1	7	1		2		2	13		
Percentage%	7.7%	3.9%	14.3%		25%		14.3%	5.7%		

Table 9 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses to the eighth situation in the two cultures. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (10) Response types to the ninth situation according to the nationality variable

nationality		appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	question/ offense	disagreement	return	total	k^2	Sig.
nonnative agreement non agreement other total		164 0 0 164	4 0 0 4	8 0 0 8	0 1 12 13	0 2 0 2	18 0 0 18	194 4 13 211		
Percentage%		94.3%	100%	100%	86.7%	100%	100%	94.3%		
native agreement non agreement neutral other total	0 0 1 0 1	10 0 0 0 10			0 1 0 1 2			10 1 1 2 13	18.4	.00
Percentage%	100%	4.9%			13.3%			5.7%		

Table 10 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses to the ninth situation in the two cultures. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (11) Response types to the tenth situation according to the nationality variable

nationality		appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	offense	return	total	k^2	Sig.
nonnative agreement other total		180 0 180	10 0 10	1 0 1	11 0 11	0 2 2	7 0 7	209 2 211		
Percentage%		94.2%	100%	100%	100%	100%	87%	94.3%		
native agreement neutral total	0 1 1	11 0 11					1 0 1	12 1 13	16.4	.00
Percentage%	25%	5.8%					12.5%	5.7%		

Table 11 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses to the tenth situation in the two cultures. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Appendix 5

Findings related to the second question: The English version

Table (13) Response types to the second situation according to the specialization variable

Specialization	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	offense	disagree	return	total	k^2	Sig.
English major/ agreement total	2 2	5 5	1 1	15 15				23 23		
percentage	1.9%	13.5%	50%	25%				10.7%		
scientific stream/ agreement non agreement other total	30 0 0 30	14 0 0 14	1 0 0 1	26 0 0 26	0 0 2 2	0 2 0 2	3 0 0 3	74 2 2 78		
percentage	27.8%	37.8%	50%	43.3%	100%	100%	100%	36.4%	7.1	.31
literary stream/ agreement total	57 57	14 14		18 18				89 89		
percentage	52.8%	37.8%		30%				41.6%		
vocational stream / agreement total	19 19	4 4		1 1				24 24		
percentage	17.9%	10.8%		1.7%				11.2%		

Table 13 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the second situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (14) Response types to the third situation according to the specialization variable

Specialization		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	offense/ question	disagree	return	silence	total	k^2	Sig
English major		0	2				0	0	9	0	11		
agreement		2	0				1	3	0	3	9		
non agreement		0	0				3	0	0	0	3		
other total		2	2				4	3	9	3	23		
percentage		33.3%	3.1%				10.8%	25%	23.7%	15%	10.7%		
scientific stream	0	0	9	2	4	6	0	1	20	0	42		
agreement	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	8	19		
non agreement	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		
neutral	0	2	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	15		
other total	2	4	9	2	4	6	15	7	21	8	78		
percentage	100%	66.7%	13.8%	22.2%	100%	28.6%	40.5%	58.3%	55.3%	40%	36.4%	34.3	.00
literary stream			52	6		15	0	0	1	0	74		
agreement			0	0		0	0	1	0	5	6		
non agreement			0	0		0	1	0	0	0	1		
neutral other			0	0		0	8	0	0	0	8		
total			52	6		15	9	1	1	5	89		
percentage			80%	66.7%		71.4%	24.3%	8.3%	2.6%	25%	41.6%		
Vocational stream			2	1			0	0	7	0	10		
agreement			0	0			0	1	0	4	5		
non agreement			0	0			9	0	0	0	9		
other total			2	1			9	1	7	4	24		
percentage			3.1%	11.1%			24.3%	8.3%	18.4%	20%	11.2%		

Table 14 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the third situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (15) Response types to the fourth situation according to the specialization variable

ecialization		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	offense/ question	disagree	return	silence	total	k^2	sig.
English major/ agreement non agreement total		0 1 1	4 0 4	1 0 1		2 0 2	0 1 1	0 4 4	10 0 10		17 6 23		
percentage		8.3%	5.3%	8.3		6.9%	7.7%	44.4%	17.2%		10.7%		
scientific stream agreement non agreement neutral other total	0 0 3 0 3	0 0 0 5 5	15 1 0 0 16	4 0 0 0 4		9 0 0 0 9	0 1 0 9 10	0 2 0 0 2	28 1 0 0 29		56 5 3 14 78	53.1	.00
percentage	%	41.7%	21.3%	33.3%		31%	76.9%	22.2%	50%		36.4%		
literary stream agreement non agreement other total		0 1 1 2	50 0 0 50	4 0 0 4	1 0 0 1	17 0 0 17	1 0 1 2		12 0 0 12	0 1 0 1	85 2 2 89		
percentage		16.7%	66.7%	33.3%	100%	58.6%	15.4%		20.7%	50%	41.6%		
Vocational stream agreement non agreement total		0 4 4	5 0 5	3 0 3		1 0 1		0 3 3	7 0 7	0 1 1	16 8 24		
percentage		33.3%	6.7%	25%		3.4%		33.3%	12.1%	50%	11.2%		

Table 15 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the fourth situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (16) Response types to the fifth situation according to the specialization variable

Specialization	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	history/ question	disagree	return	total	k^2	Sig.
English major/ agreement	0	3	1		2	1		2	9		
non agreement	3	0	0		0	1		0	4		
other	10	0	0		0	0		0	10		
total	13	3	1		2	2		2	23		
percentage	11.8%	5.9%	16.7%		25%	18.2%		9.1%	10.7%		
scientific stream/ agreement	0	3	2	5	2	3	0	15	30		
non agreement	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3		
other	43	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	45	25	.00
total	45	3	2	5	2	5	1	15	78		
percentage	40.9	5.9%	33.3%	100%	25%	45.5%	100%	68.2%	36.4%		
literary stream/ agreement	0	38	3		4			3	48		
other	41	0	0		0			0	41		
total	41	38	3		4			3	89		
percentage	37.3%	74.5%	50%		50%			13.6%	41.6%		
vocational stream / agreement	0	7				0		2	9		
other	11	0				4		0	15		
total	11	7				4		2	24		
percentage	10%	13.7%				36.4%		9.1%	11.2%		

Table 16 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the fifth situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (17) Response types to the sixth situation according to the specialization variable

Specialization	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	history/ question/ offense	disagree	return	total	k^2	Sig.
English major/ agreement	0	3	1	2	2	0	0	10	18		
non agreement	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3		
other	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		
total	3	3	1	2	2	1	1	10	23		
percentage	14.6%	4.2%	6.3%	14.3%	16.7%	25%	20%	13.3%	10.7%		
scientific stream	0	10	7	5	4	2	0	35	63		
agreement	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5		
non agreement	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	10	14.4	.02
other	9	10	7	5	4	3	3	37	78		
total											
percentage	52.9%	14.1%	43.8%	35.7%	33.3%	75%	60%	49.3%	36.4%		
literary stream agreement	0	51	8	2	6		0	16	83		
non agreement	0	0	0	0	0		1	0	1		
other	5	0	0	0	0		0	0	5		
total	5	51	8	2	6		1	16	89		
percentage	29.4%	71.8%	50%	14.3%	50%		20%	21.3%	41.6%		
vocational stream		7		5				12	24		
agreement		7		5				12	24		
total											
percentage		9.9%		35.7%				16%	11.2%		

Table 17 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the sixth situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (18) Response types to the seventh situation according to the specialization variable

Specialization	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	question	disagree	return	total	k^2	Sig.
English major/ agreement	0	4		3	8		0	2	17		
non agreement	0	0		0	0		3	0	3		
other	3	0		0	0		0	0	3		
total	3	4		3	8		3	2	23		
percentage	9.4%	4..5%		33.3%	14.5%		33.3%	18.2%	10.7%		
scientific stream agreement	0	16	5	2	30	0	0	7	60		
non agreement	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	9		
other	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	3.78	.70
total	11	16	5	2	30	3	4	7	78		
percentage	34.4%	21.6%	62.5%	22.2%	54.5%	50%	44.4%	63.6%	36.4%		
literary stream agreement	0	48	2	4	17	0			71		
non agreement	1	0	0	0	0	3			4		
other	14	0	0	0	0	0			14		
total	15	48	2	4	17	3			89		
percentage	46.9%	64.9%	25%	44.4%	30.9%	50%			41.6%		
vocational stream agreement	0	6	1		10		0	2	19		
non agreement	0	0	0		0		2	0	2		
other	3	0	0		0		0	0	3		
total	3	6	1		10		2	2	24		
percentage	9.4%	8.1%	12.5%		18.1%		22.2%	18.2%	11.2%		

Table 18 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the seventh situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (19) Response types to the eighth situation according to the specialization variable

Specialization		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	question	disagree	return	total	k^2	sig.
Eng. major agreement non agreement other total		0 1 1 2	8 0 0 8		2 0 0 2	2 0 0 2	0 2 0 2	0 4 0 4	3 0 0 3	15 7 1 23		
percentage		16.7%	7%		28.6%	6.4%	40%	50%	13.6%	10.7%		
scientific str. agreement non agreement neutral total	0 0 2 2	0 3 0 3	32 0 0 32	7 0 0 7	4 0 0 4	16 0 0 16	0 3 0 3		11 0 0 11	70 6 2 78	28.8	.00
percentage	100%	25%	28.1%	53.8%	57.1%	51.6%	60%		50%	36.4%		
literary str. agreement non agreement other total		0 2 5 7	58 0 0 58	6 0 0 6	1 0 0 1	13 0 0 13			4 0 0 4	82 2 5 89		
percentage		58.3%	50.9%	46.2	14.3	41.9%			18.2%	41.6%		
vocational str. agreement non agreement total			16 0 16					0 4 4	4 0 4	20 4 24		
percentage			14%					50%	18.2%	11.2%		

Table 19 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the eighth situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (20) Response types to the ninth situation according to the specialization variable

Specialization	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	question/ offense	disagree	return	total	k^2	Sig.
English major/ agreement non agreement other total	0 2 1 3	8 0 0 8			1 0 0 1	0 1 1 2		9 0 0 9	18 3 2 23		
percentage	37.5%	6.8%			4.2%	14.3%		22%	10.7%		
scientific stream agreement non agreement other total	0 0 1 1	35 0 0 35	3 0 0 3	1 0 0 1	11 0 0 11	1 0 5 6	0 3 0 3	18 0 0 18	69 3 6 78	6.7	.34
percentage	12.5%	29.7%	75%	50%	45.8%	42.9%	100%	43.9%	36.4%		
literary stream agreement non agreement other total	0 2 2 4	58 0 0 58	1 0 0 1	1 0 0 1	12 0 0 12	0 0 4 4		9 0 0 9	81 2 6 89		
percentage	50%	49.2%	25%	50%	50%	28.6%		22%	41.6%		
vocational stream agreement other total		17 0 17				0 2 2		5 0 5	22 2 24		
percentage		14.4%				14.3%		12.2%	11.2%		

Table 20 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the ninth situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (21) Response types to the tenth situation according to the specialization variable

Specialization	appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	offense	return	total	k^2	Sig.
English major/ agreement	8	1	14			23		
total	8	1	14			23		
percentage	5.6%	4.8%	33.3%			10.7%		
scientific stream/ agreement	54	3	17	0	1	75		
other	0	0	0	3	0	3		
total	54	3	17	3	1	78		
percentage	37. %5	14.3%	40.5%	60%	50%	36.4%		
literary stream/ agreement	60	16	10	0	1	87	1.9	.59
other	0	0	0	2	0	2		
total	60	16	10	2	1	89		
percentage	41.7%	76.2%	23.8%	40%	50%	41.6%		
vocational stream agreement	22	1	1			24		
total	22	1	1			24		
percentage	15.3%	4.8%	2.4%			11.2%		

Table 21 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the tenth situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Appendix 6

Findings related to the second question: The Arabic version

Table (23) Response types to the second situation according to the specialization variable

Specialization	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	offense	disagree	return	total	k^2	Sig.
English major/ agreement total	5 5	12 12	2 2	4 4				23 23		
percentage	3.5%	35.3%	66.7%	16.7%				10.7%		
scientific stream/ agreement non agreement other total	44 0 0 44	10 0 0 10	1 0 0 1	14 0 0 14	0 0 2 2	0 2 0 2	2 0 0 2	71 2 2 75		
percentage	30.8%	29.4%	33.3%	58.3%	100%	100%	66.7%	36.4%	8.7	.46
literary stream/ agreement total	71 71	11 11		6 6			1 1	89 89		
percentage	49.7%	32.4%		25%			33.3	41.6%		
vocational stream / agreement total	23 23	1 1						24 24		
percentage	16.1%	2.9%						11.2%		

Table 23 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the second situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (24) Response types to the third situation according to the specialization variable

Specialization		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	offense/ question	disagree	return	silence	total	k^2	Sig
English major/		0	8	1			0	0	1	0	10		
agreement		2	0	0			3	2	0	3	10		
non agreement		2	0	0			1	0	0	0	3		
other		4	8	1			4	2	1	3	23		
total													
percentage		50%	7.1%	14.3%			19%	22.2%	5%	18.8%	10.7%		
scientific stream	0	0	20	1	6	5	0	0	16	0	48		
agreement	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	8	16	28.	.00
non agreement	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	
neutral	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	9		
other	5	2	20	1	6	5	10	5	16	8	78		
total													
percentage	%	25%	17.9%	14.3%	100%	50%	47.6%	55.6%	80%	50%	36.4%		
literary stream		0	64	50		5	0	0	2	0	76		
agreement		1	0	0		0	0	1	0	5	7		
non agreement		1	0	0		0	5	0	0	0	6		
other		2	64	5		5	5	1	2	5	89		
total													
percentage		25%	57.1%	71.4%		50%	23.8%	11.1%	10%	31.3%	41.6%		
vocational stream			20				0	0	1		21		
agreement			0				0	1	0		1		
non agreement			0				2	0	0		2		
other			20				2	1	1		24		
total													
percentage			17.9%				9.5%	11.1%	5%		11.2%		

Table 24 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the third situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (25) Response types to the fourth situation according to the specialization variable

Specialization		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	question	disagree	return	silence	total	k^2	Sig
Eng. major agreement non agreement other total		0 1 1 2	9 0 0 9	1 0 0 1		2 0 0 2	0 1 0 1	0 3 0 3	5 0 0 5		17 5 1 23		
percentage		40%	7.3%	12.5%		13.3%	14.3%	50%	13.2%		10.7%		
scientific str. agreement non agreement neutral other total	0 0 6 0 6	0 1 0 1 2	22 0 0 0 22	3 0 0 0 3	2 0 0 0 2	5 0 0 0 5	0 1 0 5 6	0 2 0 0 2	28 0 0 0 28	0 2 0 0 2	60 6 6 6 78	27.9	.00
percentage	85.7%	40%	17.9%	37.5%	100%	33.3%	85.7%	33.3%	73.7%	66.7%	36.4%		
literary str. agreement total			72 72	4 4		8 8			5 5		89 89		
percentage			58.5%	50%		53.3%			13.2%		41.6%		
vocational str. agreement non agreement other total	1 0 0 1	0 0 1 1	20 0 0 20					0 1 0 1		0 1 0 1	21 2 1 24		
percentage	14.3%	20%	16.3%					16.7%		33.3%	11.2%		

Table 25 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the fourth situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (26) Response types to the fifth situation according to the specialization variable

Specialization	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	history/ question	return	total	k^2	Sig.
English major/ agreement	0	3	4	1	1		9		
non agreement	1	0	0	0	1		2		
other	12	0	0	0	0		12		
total	13	3	4	1	2		23		
percentage	19.1%	2.9%	57.1%	7.7%	22.2%		10.7%		
scientific stream agreement	0	18	1	7	7	10	43		
non agreement	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		
neutral	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	30.4	.00
other	30	0	0	0	0	0	30		
total	31	19	1	7	7	10	75		
percentage	45.6%	18.6%	14.3%	53.8%	77.8%	83.3%	36.4%		
literary stream agreement	0	58	2	5		2	67		
other	22	0	0	0		0	22		
total	22	58	2	5		2	89		
percentage	32.4%	56.9%	28.6%	38.5%		16.7%	41.6%		
vocational stream agreement	0	21					21		
neutral	0	1					1		
other	2	0					2		
total	2	22					24		
percentage	2.9%	21.6%					11.2%		

Table 26 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the fifth situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (27) Response types to the second sixth according to the specialization variable

Specialization	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	history	return	total	k^2	Sig.
English major/ agreement	0	7	4			8	19		
non agreement	1	0	0			0	1		
other	3	0	0			0	3		
total	4	7	4			8	23		
percentage	50%	5.6%	28.6%			14.8%	10.7%		
scientific stream agreement	0	31	4	6	2	27	70		
non agreement	0	0	0	0	0	2	2		
other	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	15.8	.01
total	2	31	4	6	2	29	74		
percentage	25%	25%	28.6%	75%	100%	53.7%	36.4%		
literary stream agreement		65	6	2		16	89		
total		65	6	2		16	89		
percentage		52.4%	42.9%	25%		29.6%	41.6%		
vocational stream agreement	0	21				1	22		
other	2	0				0	2		
total	2	21				1	24		
percentage	25%	17.1%				1.9%	11.2%		

Table 27 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the sixth situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (28) Response types to the seventh situation according to the specialization variable

Specialization		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	history/ question	disagree	return	total	k^2	Sig.
Eng. major agreement	0	0	3	4	1	3	0	0		11		
non agreement	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1		3		
neutral	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		2		
other	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	0		7		
total	2	7	3	4	1	4	1	1		23		
percentage	100%	28%	2.6%	50%	14.3%	10.3%	20%	33.3%		10.7%		
scientific str. agreement		0	33	1	2	27	1	0	2	66		
non agreement		2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4		
other		5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5		
total		7	33	1	2	27	2	1	2	75	34.7	.00
percentage		28%	28.2%	12.5%	28.6%	69.2%	40%	33.3%	40%	36.4%		
literary str. Agreement		0	62	3	4	6	0	0	2	77		
non agreement		0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3		
other		9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9		
total		9	62	3	4	6	2	1	2	89		
percentage		36%	53%	37.5%	57.1%	15.4%	40%	33.3%	40%	41.6%		
vocational str. agreement		0	19			2			1	22		
other		2	0			0			0	2		
total		2	19			2			1	24		
percentage		8%	16.2%			5.1%			20%	11.2%		

Table 28 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the seventh situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (29) Response types to the eighth situation according to the specialization variable

Specialization	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	question	disagree	return	total	k^2	Sig.
Eng. major agreement non agreement other total	0 3 0 3	10 0 1 11	2 0 0 2	1 0 0 1	2 0 0 2	0 3 0 3	0 1 0 1		15 7 1 23		
percentage	25%	7.4%	33.3%	25%	9.5%	50%	100%		10.7%		
scientific str. agreement non agreement total	0 3 3	42 0 42	2 0 2	2 0 2	15 0 15	0 2 2		9 0 9	70 5 75	31.1	.00
percentage	25%	28.2%	33.3%	50%	71.4%	33.3%		75%	36.4%		
literary str. Agreement non agreement other total	0 1 5 6	72 0 0 72	2 0 0 2	1 0 0 1	4 0 0 4	0 1 0 1		3 0 0 3	82 2 5 89		
percentage	50%	48.3%	33.3%	25%	19%	16.7%		25%	41.6%		
vocational str. agreement total		24 24							24 24		
percentage		11.2%							11.2%		

Table 29 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the eighth situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (30) Response types to the ninth situation according to the specialization variable

Specialization	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	question/ offense	disagree	return	total	k^2	Sig.
English major agreement		15	1		0	0	4	20		
non agreement		0	0		1	1	0	2		
other		0	0		1	0	0	1		
total		15	1		2	1	4	23		
percentage		9.1%	25%		15.4%	50%	22.2%	10.7%		
scientific stream agreement		55	1	4	0	0	8	68		
non agreement		0	0	0	0	1	0	1		
other		0	0	0	6	0	0	6		
total		55	1	4	6	1	8	75		
percentage		33.5%	25%	50%	46.2%	50%	44.4%	36.4%	7.33	.29
literary stream agreement	0	71	2	4	0		6	83		
non agreement	1	0	0	0	0		0	1		
other	1	0	0	0	4		0	5		
total	2	71	2	4	4		6	89		
percentage	100%	43.3%	50%	50%	30.8%		33.3%	41.6%		
vocational stream agreement		23			0			23		
other		0			1			1		
total		23			1			24		
percentage		14%			7.7%			11.2%		

Table 30 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the ninth situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (31) Response types to the tenth situation according to the specialization variable

Specialization	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	offense	return	total	k^2	Sig.
English major/ agreement total	17 17	2 2		2 2		2 2	23 23		
percentage	9.4%	20%		18.2%		28.6%	10.7%		
scientific stream/ agreement other total	63 0 63	3 0 3		5 0 5	0 2 2	2 0 2	73 2 75		
percentage	35%	30%		45.5%	100%	28.6%	36.4%		
literary stream/ agreement total	78 78	5 5	1 1	2 2		3 3	89 89	3.66	.30
percentage	43.3%	50%	100%	18.2%		42.9%	41.6%		
vocational stream / agreement total	22 22			2 2			24 24		
percentage	12.2%			18.2%			11.2%		

Table 31 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the tenth situation due to the specialization variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Appendix7

Findings related to the third question: The English version

Table (33) Response types to the second situation according to the gender variable

Gender	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	offense	disagree	return	total	k^2	Sig.
male agreement	64	9	1	16	0		1	91		
other	0	0	0	0	1		0	1		
total	64	9	1	16	1		1	92		
percentage	59.3%	24.3%	50%	26.7%	50%		33.3%	43%		
female agreement	44	28	1	44	0	0	2	119		
non agreement	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	1.55	.45
other	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1		
total	44	28	1	44	1	2	2	122		
percentage	40.7%	75.7%	50%	73.3%	50%	100%	66.7%	57%		

Table 33 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the second situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (34) Response types to the third situation according to the gender variable

Gender		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	offense	disagree	return	silence	total	k^2	sig.
male agreement	0	0	47	2	4	3	0	0	22		78		
non agreement	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	0		6		
neutral	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		1		
other	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	0		7		
total	1	3	47	2	4	3	7	3	22		92		
percentage	50%	50%	72.3%	22.2%	100%	14.3%	18.9%	25%	57.9%		43%	30.6	.00
female	0	0	18	7		18	0	1	15	0	59		
agreement	0	2	0	0		0	2	8	1	20	33		
non agreement	1	0	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	2		
neutral	0	1	0	0		0	27	0	0	0	28		
other	1	3	18	7		18	30	9	16	20	122		
total													
percentage	50%	50%	27.7%	77.8%		85.7%	81.1%	75%	42.1%	100%	57%		

Table 34 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the third situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (35) Response types to the fourth situation according to the gender variable

Gender		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	history/ question/ offense	disagree	return	silence	total	k^2	sig.
male agreement non agreement neutral other total	0 0 2 0 2	0 2 0 2 4	45 1 0 0 46	4 0 0 0 4		11 0 0 0 11	0 0 0 5 5	0 5 0 0 5	14 0 0 0 14	0 1 0 0 1	74 9 2 7 92	.70	.87
percentage	66.7 %	33.3%	61.3%	33.3%		37.9%	38.5%	55.6%	24.1%	50%	43%		
female agreement non agreement neutral other total	0 0 1 0 1	0 4 0 4 8	29 0 0 0 29	8 0 0 0 8	1 0 0 0 1	18 0 0 0 18	1 2 0 5 8	0 4 0 0 4	43 1 0 0 44	0 1 0 0 1	100 12 1 9 122		
percentage	33.3 %	66.7%	38.7%	66.7%	%100	62.1%	61.5%	44.4%	75.9%	50%	57%		

Table 35 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the fourth situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (36) Response types to the fifth situation according to the gender variable

Gender	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	history/ question/ offense	disagree	return	total	k^2	sig.
male	0	40	2	5	1	3		7	58		
agreement	1	0	0	0	0	1		0	2		
non agreement	30	0	0	0	0	2		0	32		
other	31	40	2	5	1	6		7	92		
total											
percentage	28.2%	78.4%	33.3%	%100	12.5%	54.5%		31.8%	43%	20.4	.00
female	1	11	4		7	1	0	15	39		
agreement	3	0	0		0	0	1	0	4		
non agreement	75	0	0		0	4	0	0	79		
other	79	11	4		7	5	1	15	122		
total											
percentage	71.8%	21.6%	66.7%		87.5%	45.5%	%100	68.2%	57%		

Table 36 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the fifth situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (37) Response types to the sixth situation according to the gender variable

Gender	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	history/ question/ offense	disagree	return	total	k^2	sig.
male agreement	0	45	5	5	2	2	0	24	83		
non agreement	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	5		
other	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		
total	5	45	5	5	2	3	2	25	92		
percentage	29.4%	63.4%	31.3%	35.7%	16.7%	75%	40%	33.3%	43%		
female agreement	0	26	11	9	10	0	0	49	105	3.31	.19
non agreement	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4		
other	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	13		
total	12	26	11	9	10	1	3	50	122		
percentage	70.6%	36.6%	68.8%	64.3%	83.3%	25%	60%	66.6%	57%		

Table 37 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the sixth situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (38) Response types to the seventh situation according to the gender variable

Gender	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	question	disagree	return	total	k^2	sig.
male agreement	0	47	2	1	22		0	8	80		
non agreement	1	0	0	0	0		4	0	5		
other	7	0	0	0	0		0	0	7		
total	8	47	2	1	22		4	8	92		
percentage	25%	63.5%	25%	11.1%	33.8%		44.4%	72.7%	43%		
female agreement	0	27	6	8	43	0	0	3	87	7.55	.02
non agreement	2	0	0	0	0	6	5	0	13		
other	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22		
total	24	27	6	8	43	6	5	3	122		
percentage	75%	36.5%	75%	88.9%	66.2%	100%	55.6%	27.3%	57%		

Table 38 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the seventh situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (39) Response types to the eighth situation according to the gender variable

Gender		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	question	disagree	return	total	k^2	sig.
male agreement		0	64	1	5	4	0	0	12	80		
non agreement		3	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	5		
other		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7		
total		4	64	1	5	4	1	1	12	92		
percentage		33.3%	56.1%	7.7%	71.4%	12.9%	20%	12.5%	54.5%	43%		
female agreement	0	0	50	12	2	27	0	0	10	101	6.04	.10
non agreement	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	14		
neutral	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		
other	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5		
total	2	8	50	12	2	27	4	7	10	122		
percentage	100%	66.7%	43.9%	92.3%	28.6%	87.1%	80%	87.5%	45.5%	57%		

Table 39 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the eighth situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (40) Response types to the ninth situation according to the gender variable

Gender	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	history/question/ offense	disagree	return	total	k^2	sig.
male agreement	0	62	1		10	0		11	84		
non agreement	1	0	0		0	1		0	2		
other	2	0	0		0	4		0	6		
total	3	62	1		10	5		11	92		
percentage	37.5%	52.5%	25%		41.7%	35.7%		26.8%	43%		
female agreement	0	56	3	2	14	1	0	29	105	1.94	.37
non agreement	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	7		
other	2	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	10		
total	5	56	3	2	14	9	3	30	122		
percentage	62.5%	47.5%	75%	100%	58.3%	64.3%	100%	73.2%	57%		

Table 40 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the ninth situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (41) Response types to the tenth situation according to the gender variable

Gender	appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	offense	return	total	k^2	Sig.
male agreement	72	2	16	0	1	91		
other	0	0	0	1	0	1		
total	72	2	16	1	1	92		
percentage	50%	9.5%	38.1%	20%	50%	43%	1.10	.29
female agreement	72	19	26	0	1	118		
other	0	0	0	4	0	4		
total	72	19	26	4	1	122		
percentage	50%	90.5%	61.9%	80%	50%	57%		

Table 41 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the tenth situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Appendix 8

Findings related to the third question: The Arabic version

Table (43) Response types to the second situation according to the gender variable

Gender	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	offense	disagree	return	total	k^2	sig.
male agreement	74	7	2	4	0		1	88		
other	0	0	0	0	1		0	1		
total	74	7	2	4	1		1	89		
percentage	51.7%	20.6%	66.7%	16.7%	50%		33.3%	43%		
female agreement	69	27	1	20	0	0	2	119		
non agreement	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2.26	.52
other	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1		
total	69	27	1	20	1	2	2	122		
percentage	48.3%	79.4%	33.3%	83.3%	50%	100%	66.7%	57%		

Table 43 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the second situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (44) Response types to the third situation according to the gender variable

Gender		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	question/ offense	disagree	return	silence	total	k^2	sig.
male agreement non agreement neutral other total	0 0 4 0 4	0 2 0 3 5	53 0 0 0 53	2 0 0 0 2	6 0 0 0 6	7 0 0 0 7	0 3 0 2 5	0 1 0 0 1	9 0 0 0 9		77 6 4 5 92	12.6	.00
percentage	80%	62.5%	47.3%	28.6%	100%	70%	23.8%	11.1%	45%		43%		
female agreement non agreement neutral other total	0 0 1 0 1	0 2 0 1 3	59 0 0 0 59	5 0 0 0 5		3 0 0 0 3	0 2 0 14 16	1 7 0 0 8	11 0 0 0 11	0 16 0 0 16	79 27 1 15 122		
percentage	20%	37.5%	52.7%	71.4%		30%	76.2%	88.9%	55%	100%	57%		

Table 44 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance (α= 0.05) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the third situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (45) Response types to the fourth situation according to the gender variable

Gender		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	question/ offense	disagree	return	silence	total	k^2	sig.
male agreement	0	0	55	1	2	8	0	0	10	0	76		
non agreement	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	6		
neutral	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		
other	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	5		
total	2	2	55	1	2	8	4	4	10	1	89		
percentage	100%	40%	44%	12.5%	100%	53.3%	57.1%	66.7%	26.3%	33.3%	43%	4.41	.22
female agreement		0	70	7		7	0	0	28	0	112		
non agreement		1	0	0		0	2	2	0	2	7		
other		2	0	0		0	1	0	0	0	3		
total		3	70	7		7	3	2	28	2	122		
percentage		60%	56%	87.5%		46.7%	42.9%	33.3%	73.7%	66.7%	57%		

Table 45 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the fourth situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (46) Response types to the fifth situation according to the gender variable

Gender	Scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	history/ disagree	return	total	k^2	sig.
male agreement	0	50		6	7	3	66		
non agreement	1	0		0	1	0	2		
other	21	0		0	0	0	21		
total	22	50		6	8	3	89		
percentage	32.4%	49%		46.2%	88.9%	25%	43%		
female agreement	0	50	7	7	1	9	74	6.51	.08
non agreement	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		
other	45	2	0	0	0	0	47		
total	46	52	7	7	1	9	122		
percentage	67.6%	51%	100%	53.8%	11.1%	75%	57%		

Table 46 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the fifth situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (47) Response types to the sixth situation according to the gender variable

Gender	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	history	return	total	k^2	sig.
male agreement	0	57	4	5	2	17	84		
non agreement	1	0	0	0	0	0	2		
other	2	0	0	0	0	0	2		
total	3	57	4	5	2	17	88		
percentage	37.5%	45.9%	28.6%	62.5%	100%	31.5%	43%		
female agreement	0	67	10	3		37	116	1.26	.53
non agreement	0	0	0	0		0	1		
other	5	0	0	0		0	5		
total	5	67	10	3		37	122		
percentage	62.5%	54.1%	71.4%	37.5%		68.5%	57%		

Table 47 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the sixth situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (48) Response types to the seventh situation according to the gender variable

Gender		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	history/ question	disagree	return	total	k^2	sig.
male agreement		0	59	1	1	16	0	0	2	79		
non agreement		0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2		
other		7	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	8		
total		7	59	1	1	17	1	1	2	89		
percentage		28%	50%	12.5%	14.3%	43.6%	20%	33.3%	40%	43%		
female	0	0	58	7	6	22	1	0	3	97	452	.21
agreement	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	8		
non agreement	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		
neutral	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15		
other	2	18	58	7	6	22	4	2	3	122		
total												
percentage	100%	72%	49.6%	87.5%	85.7%	56.4%	80%	66.7%	60%	57%		

Table 48 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the seventh situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (49) Response types to the eighth situation according to the gender variable

Gender	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	question	disagree	return	total	k^2	sig.
male agreement	0	65	1	3	4	0	0	10	83		
non agreement	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4		
other	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		
total	3	66	1	3	4	1	1	10	89		
percentage	25%	44.3%	16.7%	75%	19%	16.7%	100%	83.3%	43%	1.38	.50
female agreement	0	83	5	1	17	0		2	108		
non agreement	5	0	0	0	0	5		0	10		
other	4	0	0	0	0	0		0	4		
total	9	83	5	1	17	5		2	122		
percentage	75%	55.7%	83.3%	25%	81%	83.3%		16.7%	57%		

Table 49 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the eighth situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (50) Response types to the ninth situation according to the gender variable

Gender	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	question/ offense	disagree	return	total	k^2	sig.
male agreement		75	1	3	0	0	5	84		
non agreement		0	0	0	1	1	0	2		
other		0	0	0	3	0	0	3		
total		75	1	3	4	1	5	89		
percentage		45.7%	25%	37.5%	30.8%	50%	27.8%	43%		
female agreement	0	89	3	5	0	0	13	110	2.14	.34
non agreement	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2		
other	1	0	0	0	9	0	0	10		
total	2	89	3	5	9	1	13	122		
percentage	100%	54.3%	75%	62.5%	69.2%	50%	72.2%	57%		

Table 50 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the ninth situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (51) Response types to the tenth situation according to the gender variable

Gender	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	offense	return	total	k^2	sig.
male agreement	80	1		5	0	2	88		
other	0	0		0	1	0	1		
total	80	1		5	1	2	89		
percentage	44.4%	10%		45.5%	50%	28.6%	43%		
female agreement	100	9	1	6	0	5	121		
other	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	.05	.82
total	100	9	1	6	1	5	122		
percentage	55.6%	90%	100%	54.5%	50%	71.4%	57%		

Table 51 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the tenth situation due to the gender variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Appendix 9

Findings related to the fourth question: The English version

Table (53) Response types to the second situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	offense	disagree	history comment	total	k^2	sig.
excellent agreement total	6 6	10 10	1 1	8 8				25 25		
percentage	5.6%	27%	50%	32%				11.7%		
good agreement non agreement other total	80 0 0 80	24 0 0 24		44 0 0 44	0 0 2 2	0 2 0 2	3 0 0 3	149 2 4 155	1.55	.81
percentage	74.1%	64.9%		73.3%	100%	100%	100%	72.4%		
not too good agreement total	22 22	3 3	1 1	8 8				34 34		
percentage	20.4%	8.1%	50%	13.3%				15.9%		

Table 53 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the second situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (54) Response types to the third situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation 3		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	history/ question/ offense/	disagree	return	silence	total	k^2	sig.
excellent		0	3			5	0	0	5	0	13		
agreement		2	0			0	0	2	0	5	9		
non agreement		0	0			0	3	0	0	0	3		
other		2	3			5	3	2	5	5	25		
total													
percentage		33.3%	4.6%			23.8%	8.1%	16.7%	13.2%	25%	11.7%	9.52	.14
good agreement	0	0	58	6	1	16	0	1	24	0	106		
non agreement	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	11	22		
neutral	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2		
other	0	2	0	0	0	0	23	0	0	0	25		
total	1	3	58	6	1	16	27	8	24	11	155		
percentage	50%	50%	89.2%	66.7%	25%	76.2%	73%	66.7%	63.2%	55%	72.4%		
not too good	0	0	4	3	3		0	0	8	0	18		
agreement	0	1	0	0	0		0	2	1	4	8		
non agreement	1	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	1		
neutral	0	0	0	0	0		7	0	0	0	7		
other	1	1	4	3	3		7	2	9	4	34		
total													
percentage	50%	16.7%	6.2%	33.3%	75%		18.9%	16.7%	23.7%	20%	15.9%		

Table 54 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the third situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (55) Response types to the fourth situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	history / question/ offense/	disagree	return	silence	total	k^2	sig
excellent		0	6	1		3	0	0	7		17		
agreement		2	0	0		0	1	1	0		4		
non agreement		2	0	0		0	2	0	0		4		
other		4	6	1		3	3	1	7		25		
total													
percentage		33.3%	8%	8.3%		10.3%	23.1%	11.1%	12.1%		11.7%	9.7	.13
good agreement	0	0	62	7	1	21	1	0	41	0	133		
non agreement	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	5	0	1	11		
neutral	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		
other	0	3	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	9		
total	2	6	63	7	1	21	8	5	41	1	155		
percentage	66.7%	50%	84%	58.3%	100%	72.4%	61.5%	55.6%	70.7%	50%	72.4%		
not too good	0	0	6	4		5	0	0	9	0	24		
agreement	0	1	0	0		0	0	3	1	1	6		
non agreement	1	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	1		
neutral	0	1	0	0		0	2	0	0	0	3		
other	1	2	6	4		5	2	3	10	1	34		
total													
percentage	33.3%	16.7%	8%	33.3%		17.2%	15.4%	33.3%	17.2%	50%	15.9%		

Table 55 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the fourth situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (56) Response types to the fifth situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	history/ question/ offense/	disagree	return	total	k^2	sig
excellent agreement	0	2				1	0	3	6		
non agreement	2	0				1	1	0	4		
other	15	0				0	0	0	15		
total	17	2				2	1	3	25		
percentage	15.5%	3.9%				18.2%	100%	13.6%	11.7%		
good agreement	1	45	5	1	8	2		15	77	21.9	.00
non agreement	1	0	0	0	0	0		0	1		
other	75	0	0	0	0	2		0	77		
total	77	45	5	1	8	4		15	155		
percentage	70%	88.2%	83.3%	20%	100%	36.4%		68.2%	72.4%		
not too good	0	4	1	4		1		4	14		
agreement	1	0	0	0		0		0	1		
non agreement	15	0	0	0		4		0	19		
other	16	4	1	4		5		4	34		
total											
percentage	14.5%	7.8%	16.7%	80%		45.5%		18.2%	15.9%		

Table 56 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the fifth situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (57) Response types to the sixth situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	history/ question/ offense/	disagree	return	total	k^2	sig.
excellent agreement	0	6	1	3	1			10	21		
non agreement	1	0	0	0	0			0	1		
other	3	0	0	0	0			0	3		
total	4	6	1	3	1			10	25		
percentage	23.5%	8.5%	6.3%	21.4%	8.3%			13.3%	11.7%		
good agreement	0	59	12	6	10	2	0	49	138	1.83	.76
non agreement	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	7		
other	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	10		
total	9	59	12	6	10	4	5	50	155		
percentage	52.9%	83.1%	75%	42.9%	83.3%	100%	100%	66.6%	72.4%		
not too good	0	6	3	5	1			14	29		
agreement	0	0	0	0	0			1	1		
non agreement	4	0	0	0	0			0	4		
other	4	6	3	5	1			15	34		
total											
percentage	23.5%	8.5%	18.8%	35.7%	8.3%			20%	15.9%		

Table 57 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the sixth situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (58) Response types to the seventh situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	question	disagree	return	total	k^2	sig
excellent agreement	0	6	1	1	6	0	0	1	15		
non agreement	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	6		
other	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		
total	6	6	1	1	6	1	3	1	25		
percentage	18.8%	8.1%	12.5%	11.1%	9.3%	16.7%	33.3%	9.1%	11.7%		
good agreement	0	58	6	7	46	0	0	7	124	9.58	.04
non agreement	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	10		
other	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21		
total	22	58	6	7	46	5	4	7	155		
percentage	68.8%	78.4%	75%	77.8%	70.7%	83.3%	44.4%	63.6%	72.4%		
not too good	0	10	1	1	13		0	3	28		
agreement	0	0	0	0	0		2	0	2		
non agreement	4	0	0	0	0		0	0	4		
other	4	10	1	1	13		2	3	34		
total											
Percentage	12.5%	13.5%	12.5%	11.1%	20%		22.2%	27.3%	15.9%		

Table 58 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the seventh situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (59) Response types to the eighth situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	question	disagree	return	total	k^2	sig.
excellent agreement		0	9	3	1	7	0			20		
non agreement		1	0	0	0	0	3			4		
other		1	0	0	0	0	0			1		
total		2	9	3	1	7	3			25		
percentage		16%	7.9%	23.1%	14.3%	22.6%	60%			11.7%		
good agreement	0	0	87	9	6	24	0	0	13	139		
non agreement	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	11		
neutral	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4.6	.59
other	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	
total	1	9	87	9	6	24	1	5	13	155		
percentage	50%	75%	76.3%	69.2%	85.7%	77.4%	20%	62.5%	59.1%	72.4%		
not too good	0	0	18	1			0	0	9	28		
agreement	0	0	0	0			1	3	0	4		
non agreement	1	0	0	0			0	0	0	1		
neutral	0	1	0	0			0	0	0	1		
other	1	1	18	1			1	3	9	34		
total												
percentage	50%	8.3%	15.8%	7.7%			20%	37.3%	40.6%	15.9%		

Table 59 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the eighth situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (60) Response types to the ninth situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	history/ question/ offense	disagree	return	total	k^2	sig
excellent agreement	0	12	1		2	0		7	22		
non agreement	1	0	0		0	0		0	1		
other	1	0	0		0	1		0	2		
total	2	12	1		2	1		7	25		
percentage	25%	10.2%	25%		8.3%	7.1%		17.1%	11.7%		
good agreement	0	89	2	2	16	1	0	28	138	4.77	.31
non agreement	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	8		
other	2	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	9		
total	5	89	2	2	16	9	3	29	155		
percentage	62.5%	75%	50%	100%	66.7%	64.3%	100%	70.7%	72.4%		
not too good agreement	0	17	1		6	0		5	29		
other	1	0	0		0	4		0	5		
total	1	17	1		6	4		5	34		
percentage	12.5%	14.4%	25%		25%	28.6%		12.5%	15.9%		

Table 60 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the ninth situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (61) Response types to the tenth situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation	appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	offense	return	total	k^2	sig.
excellent agreement	18	1	6			25		
total	18	1	6			25		
percentage	12.5%	4.8%	14.3%			11.7%		
good agreement	102	17	29	0	2	150		
other	0	0	0	5	0	5		
total	102	17	29	5	2	155	1.94	.37
percentage	70.8%	81%	69%	100%	100%	72.4%		
not too good agreement	24	3	7			34		
total	24	3	7			34		
percentage	16.7%	14.3%	16.7%			15.9%		

Table 61 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the tenth situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Appendix 10

Findings related to the fourth question: The Arabic version

Table (63) Response types to the second situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	offense	disagree	return	total	k^2	sig.
excellent agreement total	9 9	10 10	1 1	5 5				25 25		
percentage	6.3%	29.4%	25%	20.8%				11.7%		
good agreement non agreement other total	105 0 0 105	23 0 0 23	1 0 0 1	17 0 0 17	0 0 2 2	0 2 0 2	5 0 0 5	151 2 2 155	1.94	.92
percentage	73.4%	67.6%	25%	70.8%	100%	100%	100%	72.4%		
not too good agreement total	29 29	1 1	2 2	2 2				34 34		
percentage	20.3%	2.9%	50%	8.3%				15.9%		

Table 63 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the second situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (64) Response types to the third situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	question / offense	disagree	return	silence	total	k^2	sig.
excellent		0	8				0	0	4	0	12		
agreement		2	0				1	2	0	7	12		
non agreement		1	0				0	0	0	0	1		
other		3	8				1	2	4	7	25		
total													
percentage		37.5%	7.1%				4.8%	22.2%	20%	43.8%	11.7%		
good	0	0	91	6	1	8	0	1	12	0	119		
agreement	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	9	18	24.1	.00
non agreement	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4		
neutral	0	2	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	14		
other	3	3	91	6	1	8	16	5	12	9	155		
total													
percentage	60%	37.5%	81.3%	85.7%	16.7%	80%	81%	55.6%	60%	56.3%	72.4%		
not too good	0	0	13	1	5	2	0	0	4		25		
agreement	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0		3		
non agreement	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		2		
neutral	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0		4		
other	2	2	13	1	5	2	3	2	4		34		
total													
percentage	40%	25%	11.6%	14.3%	83.3%	20%	14.2%	22.2%	20%		15.9%		

Table 64 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the third situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (65) Response types to the fourth situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	question/ offense	disagree	return	silence	total	k^2	sig
excellent		0	9	3			0	0	7	0	19		
agreement		1	0	0			1	1	0	2	5		
non agreement		1	0	0			0	0	0	0	1		
other total		2	9	3			1	1	7	2	25		
percentage		40%	7.3%	37.5%			14.3%	16.7%	18.4%	66.7%	11.7%		
good agreement	0	0	100	4		12	0	0	25		141		
non agreement	0	1	0	0		0	1	3	0		5		
neutral	4	0	0	0		0	0	0	0		4	13.7	.03
other total	0	2	0	0		0	3	0	0		5		
	4	3	100	4		12	4	3	25		155		
percentage	57.1%	60%	81.3%	50%		80%	57.1%	50%	65.8%		72.4%		
not too good	0		14	1	2	3	0	0	6	0	26		
agreement	0		0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3		
non agreement	3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		
neutral	0		0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2		
other total	3		14	1	2	3	2	2	6	1	34		
percentage	42.9%		11.4%	12.5%	100%	20%	28.6%	33.3%	18.5%	33.3%	15.9%		

Table 65 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the fourth situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (66) Response types to the fifth situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	history/ question	return	total	k^2	sig.
excellent agreement	0	4	1	4	1	1	11		
non agreement	1	0	0	0	1	0	2		
other	12	0	0	0	0	0	12		
total	13	4	1	4	2	1	25		
percentage	19.1%	3.9%	14.3%	30.8%	22.2%	8.3%	11.7%		
good agreement	0	82	5	7	3	9	106	17.2	.00
neutral	0	1	0	0	0	0	1		
other	46	0	0	0	0	0	46		
total	46	83	5	7	3	9	153		
percentage	67.6%	81.4%	71.4%	53.8%	33.3%	75%	72.4%		
not too good agreement	0	14	1	2	4	2	23		
non agreement	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		
neutral	0	1	0	0	0	0	1		
other	8	0	0	0	0	0	8		
total	9	15	1	2	4	2	33		
percentage	13.2%	14.7%	14.3%	15.4%	44.4%	16.7%	15.9%		

Table 66 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the fifth situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (67) Response types to the sixth situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	history	return	total	k^2	sig
excellent agreement	0	11	2			10	23		
non agreement	1	0	0			0	1		
other	1	0	0			0	1		
total	2	11	2			10	25		
percentage	25%	8.9%	14.3%			18.5%	11.7%		
good agreement	0	96	10	7	3	31	147	2.46	.65
non agreement	0	0	0	0	0	1	1		
other	5	0	0	0	0	0	5		
total	5	96	10	7	3	32	153		
percentage	62.5%	77.4%	71.4%	87.5%	100%	59.3%	72.4%		
not too good agreement	0	17	2	1		11	31		
non agreement	0	0	0	0		1	1		
other	1	0	0	0		0	1		
total	1	17	2	1		12	33		
percentage	12.5%	13.7%	14.3%	12.5%		22.2%	15.9%		

Table 67 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the sixth situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (68) Response types to the seventh situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation		scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	history/ question	disagree	return	total	k^2	sig
excellent agreement non agreement other total		0 2 5 7	7 0 0 7	1 0 0 1		8 0 1 9		0 1 0 1		16 3 6 25		
percentage		28%	6%	12.5%		23.1%		33.3%		11.7%		
good agreement non agreement neutral other total	0 0 4 0 4	0 1 0 14 15	93 0 0 0 93	7 0 0 0 7	7 0 0 0 7	20 0 0 0 20	1 4 0 0 5	0 1 0 0 1	3 0 0 0 3	131 8 2 14 155	9.72	.13
percentage	80%	60%	79.5%	87.5%	100%	51.3%	100%	33.3%	60%	72.4%		
not too good agreement non agreement other total	1 0 0 1	0 0 3 3	17 0 0 17			10 0 0 10		0 1 0 1	2 0 0 2	30 1 3 34		
percentage	20%	12%	14.5%			25.6%		33.3%	40%	15.9%		

Table 68 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the seventh situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (69) Response types to the eighth situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	question	disagree	return	total	k^2	sig.
excellent agreement	0	10			8	0	0		18		
non agreement	3	0			0	2	1		6		
other	0	1			0	0	0		1		
total	3	11			8	2	1		25		
percentage	25%	7.4%			38.1%	33.3%	100%		11.7%		
good agreement	0	115	6	4	12	0		5	142		
non agreement	4	0	0	0	0	3		0	7	14.2	.00
other	4	0	0	0	0	0		0	4		
total	8	115	6	4	12	3		5	153		
percentage	66.7%	77.2%	100%	100%	57.1%	50%		41.7%	72.4%		
not too good	0	23			1	0		7	31		
agreement	0	0			0	1		0	1		
non agreement	1	0			0	0		0	1		
other	1	23			1	1		7	33		
total											
percentage	33.3%	15.4%			4.8%	16.7		58.3%	15.9%		

Table 69 shows that there are significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the eighth situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (70) Response types to the ninth situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation	scale-down/ request	appreciation token	comment acceptance	acceptance formula	question/ offense	disagree	return	total	k^2	sig.
excellent agreement other total		19 0 19	1 0 1		0 1 1		4 0 4	24 1 25		
percentage		11.6%	25%		7.7%		22.2%	11.7%		
good agreement non agreement other total	0 1 1 2	118 0 0 118	3 0 0 3	6 0 0 6	0 1 9 10	0 2 0 2	12 0 0 12	139 4 10 153	1.82	.76
percentage	100%	72%	75%	75%	76.9%	100%	66.7%	72.4%		
not too good agreement other total		27 0 27		2 0 2	0 2 2		2 0 2	31 2 33		
percentage		16.5%		25%	15.4%		11.1%	15.9%		

Table 70 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the ninth situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

Table (71) Response types to the tenth situation according to the evaluation variable

Evaluation	appreciation token	comment acceptance	praise upgrade	acceptance formula	offense	return	total	k^2	sig.
excellent agreement total	21 21	2 2		2 2			25 25		
percentage	11.7%	20%		18.2%			11.7%		
good agreement other total	130 0 130	6 0 6	1 0 1	8 0 8	0 4 4	6 0 6	151 4 155	0.76	.68
percentage	72.2%	60%	100%	72.7%	100%	85.7%	72.4%		
not too good agreement total	29 29	2 2		1 1		1 1	33 33		
percentage	16.1%	20%		9.1%		14.3%	15.9%		

Table 71 shows that there are no significant statistical differences according to the statistical scale at significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in the responses of the non-native speakers of English to the tenth situation due to the evaluation variable. The highest value was in favor of the agreement response.

National University
Faculty of Graduate Studies
Dean's Office

النجـــاح الوطنيه
كليـــة الدراســـــات العليـــا
مكتب العميد

التاريخ : 2008/4/9

حضرة الاخت الاستاذة سعادة قدومي المحترمة
نائب مدير عام التعليم العام /الادارة العامة للتعليم العام
وزارة التربية والتعليم العالي
فاكس: 2983222 – 2 – 00972
رام الله

تحية طيبة وبعد،

الموضوع : تسهيل مهمة الطالبة / سناء محمد ابراهيم الخطيب (رقم تسجيل 10452179)

الطالبة سناء محمد ابراهيم الخطيب / رقم تسجيل 10452179 في تخصـص ماجستير لغويات تطبيقية وترجمـة، بصدد العمل على أطروحتها الماجستير والتي تحمل عنوان:

(The Speech of Thanking as a Compliment Response used by Arab Speakers of English: A –Comparative- Intercultural Study)

يرجى من حضرتكم تسهيل مهمتها في تعبئة الاستبانة على طلبة المرحلة الثانويـة فـي المـدارس الحكومية في محافظة قلقيليه.

شاكرين لكم حسن تعاونكم.

مع وافر الاحترام والتقدير ،،،

عميد كلية الدراسات العليا
د. سـائد الكوني

جامعة النجاح الوطنية
كلية الدراسات العليا
نابلس - فلسطين

204

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

Palestinian National Authority
Ministry of Education & Higher Education
Directorate of Education – Qalqilia

السلطة الوطنية الفلسطينية
وزارة التربية والتعليم العالي
مديرية التربية والتعليم- قلقيلية

الرقم : 1126 /11/2008 م س
التاريخ : 16 / 04 /2008م

حضرات مديري ومديرات المدارس .المحترمين

تحية طيبة وبعد

الموضوع : الباحثة " سناء محمد إبراهيم الخطيب "

تقوم الباحثة المذكورة أعلاه بتوزيع استبانه حول " **الشكر بمثابة الرد الإطرائي**" – كما يستخدمه العـرب المتحدثون بالإنجليزية – دراسة مقارنة , وذلك ضمن رسالة الماجستير الخاصة بها .

أرجو التعاون معها وتسهيل مهمتها .

مع الاحترام

أ. يوسف عودة

/ مدير التربية والتعليم

السلطة الوطنية الفلسطينية – وزارة التربية والتعليم العالي – مديرية التربية والتعليم – قلقيلية

نسخة / الملف
نسخة / التعليم العام
ن . خ / . ت

جامعة النجاح الوطنية
كلية الدراسات العليا

الشكر بمثابة الرد الإطرائي كما يستخدمه العرب المتحدثون بالإنجليزية_ دراسة ثقافية مقارنة

إعداد
سناء محمد إبراهيم الخطيب

إشراف
الدكتور أيمن نزال
الدكتور أحمد عوض

قدمت هذه الأطروحة استكمالاً لمتطلبات نيل درجة الماجستير في برنامج اللغويات التطبيقية و الترجمة، كلية الدراسات العليا، جامعة النجاح الوطنية، نابلس، فلسطين.
2009

الشكر بمثابة الرد الإطرائي كما يستخدمه العرب المتحدثون بالإنجليزية_ دراسة ثقافية مقارنة

إعداد

سناء محمد إبراهيم الخطيب

إشراف

الدكتور أيمن نزال

الدكتور أحمد عوض

الملخص

تركز هذه الدراسة على موضوع الشكر بمثابة الرد الشكر بمثابة الرد الإطرائي كما يستخدمه العرب المتحدثون بالإنجليزية، و هذه الدراسة هي محاولة لمعرفة فيما إذا كان لمتغيرات اختلاف الثقافة و التخصص ومستوى التقييم و الجنس تأثير على استخدام المتحدثين للشكر بمثابة الرد الإطرائي.

و لهذا الغرض، قامت الباحثة بتطوير اختبار استكمال الحوار بالعربية و الإنجليزية كأداة الدراسة بهدف التوصل لإجابات عن الأسئلة الآتية:

1- هل توجد فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في طرق إدراك المتحدثين من خلفيات ثقافية مختلفة للشكر كرد إطرائي؟

توجد فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في طرق إدراك العرب المتحدثين بالإنجليزية و المتحدثين الأصليين بالإنجليزية للشكر كرد إطرائي بسبب الاختلاف في الخلفيات الثقافية لهم.

2- هل توجد فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في طرق استخدام العرب المتحدثين بالإنجليزية الشكر كرد إطرائي تبعاً لمتغير التخصص (تخصص لغة إنجليزية، طلبة الفرع العلمي، طلبة الفرع الأدبي، طلبة الفرع التجاري)

توجد فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في طرق استخدام العرب المتحدثين بالإنجليزية للشكر كرد إطرائي تبعاً لمتغير التخصص.

3- هل توجد فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في طرق استخدام العرب المتحدثين بالإنجليزية للشكر كرد إطرائي تبعاً لمتغير الجنس؟

لا توجد فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في طرق استخدام العرب المتحدثين بالإنجليزية للشكر كرد إطرائي تبعاً لمتغير الجنس.

4- هل توجد فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في طرق استخدام العرب المتحدثين بالإنجليزية للشكر كرد إطرائي تبعاً لمتغير مستوى التقييم؟

توجد فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في طرق استخدام العرب المتحدثين بالإنجليزية للشكر كرد إطرائي تبعاً لمتغير مستوى التقييم.

تقع هذه الدراسة في خمسة فصول: الأول يعطي تمهيداً عن مشكلة الدراسة و أهدافها و أهميتها و حدودها وطرق دراستها. أما الثاني فيستعرض الأدب السابق المكتوب عن موضوع الدراسة وما يتعلق به في حقل الكلام و المقامية خاصة الإطراء و الشكر. و الفصل الثالث يعطي توضيحاً لمنهج الدراسة و الأداة المستخدمة للتوصل إلى نتائج الدراسة. أما الرابع فيعرض نتائج اختبار استكمال الحوار بالإضافة إلى مناقشتها بالمقارنة مع دراسات في لغات أخرى. و أخيراً يحتوي الفصل الخامس على ملخص الدراسة ونتائجها و عدد من التوصيات و اقتراحات لدراسات أخرى.

This document was created with Win2PDF available at http://www.win2pdf.com.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.
This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.