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This cross-cultural study investigates whether the compliment response realization patterns are universal across languages or cultural-specific. To achieve this goal, this project investigated how the compliment response speech act was performed by native speakers of American English, native speakers of Saudi Arabic, and by Saudi EFL learners in light of the effects of the complimenter’s social status, the complimenter’s social distance, the respondent’s gender and the respondent-complimenter gender-pairing.

The data for this study were collected by the means of triangulation methodology: naturalistic observation, elicitation, and interviews. Discourse completion tests (DCT), the main data collection instrument, were completed by 150 subjects (50 in each group). The collected data were sorted and categorized according to a response categorization scheme prepared by the researcher for this purpose.

The DCT distribution of compliment response types across language groups indicate that while Americans accepted and rejected slightly more than Saudis did, Saudis deflected more frequently than Americans. Only the Deflection response category of both American and Saudi response types was significantly affected by both the complimenter’s social status and social distance. Specifically, the higher the complimenter’s social status and the closer the complimenter’s social distance, the more frequently both Americans and Saudis deflected. In respect to the effect of gender, only the Acceptance response category of both American and Saudi response types was significantly affected by the respondent’s gender and the gender-pairings of respondent and complimenter. However, Saudis accepted more and rejected less when the respondent and complimenter were of the same sex, and vice versa, whereas Americans behaved in exactly the opposite way.

Regarding pragmatic transfer, the results suggest that the Saudi EFL learners group respondents transferred the frequency patterns of Saudis in performing bald acceptance, formulaic acceptance, duty, and return response types. Similarly, they transferred some of the distinguishing cultural modes of Saudi Arabic to their compliment responses expressed in English.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Throughout the various stages of writing this thesis, I have been assisted by several unforgettable people who deserve my sincerest gratitude and appreciation. On the top of the creditors' list comes my advisor, Dr. Peter Martin whose careful readings, critical comments, and constructive pieces of advice made my task more enjoyable and much easier. Without his guidance and constant encouragement, this dissertation would not have been completed.

I also would like to thank Dr. Daniel Robertson, my ex-adviser under whose auspices I prepared the discourse completion test (DCT) and the early stages of this research. His criticism was quite supportive and insightful.

I feel indebted to all American and Saudi subjects who participated in providing the data of this study as well as the administrators and trainees of ARAMCO training centers who were involved in collecting the data of the Saudi EFL learners group.

My special thanks are due to a group of friends and colleagues who extended indispensable assistance in distributing as well as collecting DCTs, and analyzing their data. The group includes Mr. Abu Humaidan, Mr. And Mrs. Simpson, Mr. Abu Muailesh, Mr. Abu Samra, and my close friends Abu Waa'il, Abu Bilal, and Abu Rashid.

Jerry, the clerk who typed this thesis as well as all my course assignments, deserves my appreciation for the cooperation and accuracy he showed in implementing my non-stop amendment requests and for completing a well-done job on time.

The ones whose efforts represent the cornerstone in materializing the proposal of this thesis are my brother Hasan and his wife Fadwa in U.S.A. and my brother Mousa and his wife Amal in Jordan. The four of them have exerted incredible efforts in availing the references needed for this study and helping in handling the statistical part of the data analysis. I think that no
expression of gratitude would pay off their debt. However, I feel that the fatherly love and care I have engulfed my brothers and sisters with since they were babies in their cradles was the most rewarding endeavor I have ever attempted in my life.

Last but not least, my heartfelt thanks go to my wife and children who have sacrificed the outdoor fun of weekend picnics and the indoor warmth of family evening gatherings due to my constant involvement in the Ed.D program for the last forty months. Without their limitless affection and unconditioned support, I would not have been able to complete this study.
DEDICATION

TO
THE EXALTED SOUL
OF MY FATHER
WHO
SPARKED AMBITION IN ME
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ONE: INTRODUCTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 BACKGROUND</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 GOALS OF THE STUDY</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 THE SUBJECTS</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 LIMITATIONS</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 STRUCTURE OF THESIS</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 SPEECH ACT THEORY AND PRAGMATICS</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 PRAGMATIC TRANSFER</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 COOPERATION AND POLITENESS AS PRAGMATIC PHENOMENA</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 POLITENESS IN ISLAM</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 STUDIES OF COMPLIMENT INTERACTIONS</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THREE: METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1 ETHNOGRAPHY</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2 ELICITATION</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3 DISCOURSE COMPLETION TEST (DCT)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 SPECIFIC PROCEDURES</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1 INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2 THE OBSERVATION PHASE</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.3 THE DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE DCT PHASE</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.4 THE INTERVIEW PHASE</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3 COMPLIMENT RESPONSE TYPE CATEGORIZATION SCHEME</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1 ACCEPTANCE</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2 DEFLECTION</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3 REJECTION</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.4 NO ANSWER</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOUR: ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION | 90 |
| 4.1 DISTRIBUTION OF COMPLIMENT RESPONSE TYPE BY LANGUAGE GROUPS | 91 |
| 4.2 FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TYPES BY COMPLIMENTER'S SOCIAL STATUS | 106 |
| 4.3 FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TYPES BY COMPLIMENTER'S SOCIAL DISTANCE | 113 |
| 4.4 FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TYPES BY RESPONDENT'S GENDER | 118 |
| 4.5 FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TYPES BY GENDER-PAIRING OF RESPONDENT AND COMPLIMENTER | 122 |

FIVE: PRAGMATIC TRANSFER IN THE SAUDI EFL LEARNERS GROUP DATA | 132 |
| 5.1 INTRODUCTION | 132 |
| 5.2 PRAGMATIC TRANSFER OF RESPONSE TYPES AND FORMULAS | 133 |
| 5.3 PRAGMATIC TRANSFER OF CULTURAL MODES | 143 |
TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAPTER</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.4 FACTORS CAUSING PRAGMATIC TRANSFER</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1 LOVE OF LANGUAGE</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2 RELIGION</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3 POLITICAL BACKGROUND</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.4 PURPOSE OF LEARNING ENGLISH</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.5 LINGUISTIC DIFFICULTY</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.6 LACK OF EXPOSURE TO NATIVE SPEAKERS</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SIX: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS | 156 |
| 6.1 INTRODUCTION | 156 |
| 6.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS | 157 |
| 6.3 PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS | 164 |
| 6.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH | 171 |

| APPENDIXES | 175 |
| APPENDIX I | DCT - ENGLISH VERSION - ALT. A | 176 |
| APPENDIX II | DCT - ENGLISH VERSION - ALT. B | 182 |
| APPENDIX III | DCT - ARABIC VERSION - ALT. A | 188 |
| APPENDIX IV | DCT - ARABIC VERSION - ALT. B | 192 |
| APPENDIX V | RESEARCH APPROVAL | 196 |
| APPENDIX VI | CONDUCTING DOCTORAL THESIS RESEARCH | 197 |
| APPENDIX VII | INTERVIEW ON COMPLIMENT RESPONSES/ENGLISH VERSION | 198 |
| APPENDIX VIII | INTERVIEW ON COMPLIMENT RESPONSES/ARABIC VERSION | 200 |
| APPENDIX IX | SUMMARY TABLE OF TWO-WAY ANOVA RESULTS | 202 |
| APPENDIX X | TRANSLITERATION SYSTEM FOR ARABIC LANGUAGE | 204 |

| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 206 |
# INDEX OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>POMERANTZ’S (1978) TAXONOMY OF COMPLIMENT RESPONSE</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>COMPLIMENT RESPONSE TYPE CATEGORIZATION SCHEME</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>DISTRIBUTION OF SINGLE AND COMPOUND RESPONSES</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>DISTRIBUTION OF DCT COMPLIMENT RESPONSE TYPES ACROSS LANGUAGE GROUPS</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>DISTRIBUTION OF INTERVIEW COMPLIMENT RESPONSE TYPES ACROSS LANGUAGE GROUPS</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>DISTRIBUTION OF THE MOST COMMON APPRECIATION COMBINATIONS</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>MEAN FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TYPES BY COMPLIMENTER’S SOCIAL STATUS</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TYPES BY COMPLIMENTER’S SOCIAL STATUS</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>MEAN FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TYPES BY COMPLIMENTER’S SOCIAL DISTANCE</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TYPES BY COMPLIMENTER’S SOCIAL DISTANCE</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>MEAN FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TYPES BY RESPONDENT’S GENDER</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>MEAN FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TYPES BY GENDER-PAIRING OF RESPONDENT-COMPLIMENTER</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>FREQUENCY OF COMPLIMENT RESPONSES ACCORDING TO GENDER-PAIRING OF RESPONDENT AND COMPLIMENTER</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## INDEX OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURE</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>CONTINUUM OF COMPLIMENT RESPONSE CATEGORIES</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>MEAN FREQUENCY OF DCT RESPONSE TYPES ACROSS LANGUAGE GROUPS</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>MEAN FREQUENCY OF INTERVIEW RESPONSE TYPES ACROSS LANGUAGE GROUPS</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>MEAN FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TYPES BY COMPLIMENTER’S SOCIAL STATUS</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>MEAN FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TYPES BY COMPLIMENTER’S SOCIAL DISTANCE</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>MEAN FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TYPES BY RESPONDENT’S GENDER</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>MEAN FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TYPES BY GENDER-PAIRING OF RESPONDENT AND COMPLIMENTER</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Abbreviations and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Agreement Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Conflict Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Cooperative Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>College Preparatory Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCT</td>
<td>Discourse Completion Test (Task)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFL</td>
<td>English As Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Face Threatening Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILP</td>
<td>Inter-Language Pragmatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>First Language, Native Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Second Language, Learned Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Modesty Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>Non-Native Speaker(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pbuh</td>
<td>Peace be upon him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Politeness Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC</td>
<td>Special Training Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOEFL</td>
<td>Test of English as a Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

1.2 GOALS OF THE STUDY

1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

1.4 THE SUBJECTS

1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1.6 LIMITATIONS

1.7 STRUCTURE OF THESIS
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Every culture develops a set of patterned, routinized utterances that its speakers use to perform a variety of speech functions such as compliments, complaints, apologies, requests, greetings and so forth. Speech behaviors or sociolinguistic rules are governed by culturally-specific social constraints or norms which inform speakers as to what to say, to whom and under what conditions. Thus, when people from diverse cultural backgrounds interact, they consciously as well as unconsciously bring with them their culturally inherited sets of constraints to monitor and evaluate their own speech and that of their interlocutors.

Face-to-face interaction involves communication. The degree to which any communication or exchange of meaning can serve its intent depends on the mutual understanding of its participants. Within similar cultural backgrounds, understanding often occurs. On the contrary, different backgrounds often lead to communication breakdown and conflict among interlocutors. For example, in an analysis of Egyptian-American diplomatic relations over the last 30 years, Cohen (1987) concludes that the values of different communication styles of those two cultures have resulted in serious political conflicts that could have been avoided if both parties had a better understanding of each other’s interactional patterns. To be more specific, the values of collectivism and conformity in Egyptian culture influence the use of indirect
communication style, while the values of individualism and self-assertion in the American culture lead to the use of direct “cut-and-dry style” in U.S. diplomatic relations. As we have seen, different cultures have distinct communication styles, and these differences may cause serious communication failures at the interpersonal as well as the international levels.

The problem of cultural misunderstanding becomes even more complicated when a second or foreign language learner attempts to use his\textsuperscript{1} learned language to communicate with the native speakers of the language. Since one cannot separate a language from its own culture, nor can one distance oneself from one’s own culture, a second or foreign language learner finds the task of sending and receiving appropriate messages using the learned language to be of great challenge which often ends in unfavorable consequences. For instance\textsuperscript{2}, a graduate student from Jordan studying in U.S.A. complimented his female American classmate by saying “Your hair looks as straight as that of an Arabian horse”! One can imagine how she felt. In explaining this serious communication failure, we assume that the Jordanian student replaced the target culture norms of complimenting with those of his own. The result was an insult instead of a compliment. What he did was a transfer of his native norms of speaking which did not serve its intent in this particular situation. His speech behavior resulted in what is called “pragmatic failure”.

A number of cross-cultural speech act pragmatic studies have concluded that second and foreign language learners may fail to communicate effectively (i.e., commit pragmatic failures) even when they have an excellent grammatical and lexical command of the target

\textsuperscript{1} The pronoun ‘he’ will be used throughout the thesis to refer to both ‘he’ and ‘she’.

\textsuperscript{2} Both the complimenter and complimentee were classmates of mine at University of Detroit in 1976.
language (Eisenstein and Bodman, 1986; Robinson, 1992; Bouton, 1994). Furthermore, it was found that the lack of knowledge in the L2 sociolinguistic rules may lead to transfer of the L1 norms of speaking to the target language risking committing pragmatic failures. This kind of transfer can be avoided or at least minimized if language learners reach higher levels of acquiring what is called pragmatic competence, or what Wolfson (1986b) referred to as sociolinguistic competence, a component of what Hymes (1972) termed communicative competence.

Acquiring pragmatic competence comprises a number of sub-tasks such as learning new speech act categories, new contextual distributions of speech acts (such as when to compliment and how to respond to compliments), new procedures and means for speech act realization as well as how principles of politeness operate in the target language culture (Kasper, 1989).

A compliment, according to Holmes (1988b: 446), is a speech act in which a speaker attributes credit to an addressee for some good appearance, skill, possession or characteristic that is recognized and highly valued by both the speaker and the hearer. She perceives them as positive speech acts used to express friendship and increase rapport between interlocutors. In line with the aforementioned definition, Olhstain and Cohen (1991) define a compliment as a speech act that expresses solidarity between a speaker and a hearer and maintains social harmony.

Compliments have several basic functions which are summarized by Tammam (1999: 9) as a means of encouraging, pleasing, and persuading, as a means of recognition, as a means of conversational opener, as a means of acknowledgment and as a means of attracting attention. Tammam adds that compliments represent a psychological
comforting touch that furnishes some of the attention and support an individual badly needs to maintain and improve his/her self-image. This matches a positive politeness strategy that supports the hearer's positive face and reinforces his feeling that he is desired and approved by others.

A speech act interaction consists of at least two turns, such as a question-answer, a request-grant/deny and a compliment-accept/reject. Such sequences were called "adjacency pairs" by Sacks (1972). Flowerdew (1988:72) defines them as stereotypical pairs of speech acts which are a recurrent feature of conversation. Thus, the compliment exchange comprises two closely related parts - adjacency pairs - linked by temporal and relevancy conditions. That is, it is made up of a compliment and a response. The response type completely depends on the hearer's interpretation of the speaker's utterance. Upon internalizing the message of the speaker, the hearer gives his/her response which can be an acceptance, a rejection, or an avoidance according to Pomerantz's (1978) taxonomy.

Let us consider this example given by Manes (1983:101).

**Example 1.1**  
A: Boy, that's nice work. I don't know how you do it.  
B: It's easy when you have good tools.

As we have seen, the recipient gave an indirect response to the compliment, shifting the credit from himself to the tools as a compromise solution to the dilemma of being accused of self-praise. Had the respondent accepted the compliment he might have been accused of impoliteness, and had he rejected the compliment, he could have seemed to be threatening the face of his complimenter.
The speech act of compliment has received an increasing interest among pragmatic theoreticians and researchers for the last two decades. The study of compliments contributes valuable information concerning when, how, and to whom one may offer a compliment as well as how to interpret implicit social and cultural meanings, and how to respond appropriately when one receives a compliment (Gajaseni, 1994).

Compliment responses have been researched not only for varieties of English, for instance Wolfson (1983) for American English, Holmes (1988a) for New Zealand English, Herbert and Straight (1989) for American and South African English and Creese (1991) for American English and British English, but also for other languages such as Chinese (Chang, 1988; Chen 1993; Yang 1987), Japanese (Barnlurd and Araki, 1985; Daikuhara, 1986), Korean (Yoon, 1991), Polish (Lewandowska-Tomasczyk, 1989), Thai (Gajaseni, 1994) and Syrian Arabic (Nelson et al, 1996). However, no research on compliment responses in Saudi Arabic has been located in the literature. Therefore, this study is an attempt to shed some light on the norms and patterns of compliment responses in Saudi Arabic and to contrast them with those of American English speakers.

There are several factors that influence the way people respond to compliments. Wolfson (1989a) highlights the status relationship between the complimenter and the complimentee as the decisive factor in determining the type of compliment response. Both Holmes (1988b) and Herbert (1990) attribute many of the differences in compliment responses to the gender factor. This study will investigate the effects the complimenter's social status, the social distance between complimenter and respondent, the respondent's sex, and the respondent-
complimenter gender-pairing have on the mean frequency of compliment responses initiated by speakers of Saudi Arabic and American English. It is expected that the findings of this study will lead to implications for teaching compliment responses in both American English and Saudi Arabic. Besides, the teachers and administrators of Saudi EFL centers may find the outcomes of this study helpful in bridging some of the pragmatic competence gaps their curricula may have.

1.2 GOALS OF THE STUDY

This study aims to accomplish the following six main goals:

1. To investigate the performance of compliment responses given by three different groups of speakers: speakers of American English residing temporarily in Saudi Arabia as expatriates, native speakers of Saudi Arabic residing in their home country of Saudi Arabia, and Saudi Arabic speakers who are EFL learners currently enrolled at the ARAMCO College Preparatory center and the ARAMCO Special Training Center. Differences and similarities in the compliment response performance of these three groups will be investigated through a triangulation of naturalistic observation, discourse completion test, and interview in terms of three different variables: social status, social distance, and gender.

2. To investigate evidence of pragmatic transfer in the collected data of the Saudi EFL learner group respondents. If pragmatic transfer does exist in the compliment responses of this group, which are given in English, then another minor purpose of this study is to reveal the factors responsible for motivating such a transfer.
3. To contribute to the scarce empirical cross-cultural, pragmatic and cross-linguistic research on speech acts. The need for empirical-based research on cross cultural pragmatics has been recognized in the field of applied linguistics not only for the purpose of language teaching, but also for enhancing cross-cultural understanding. An understanding of how compliment responses are performed by the linguistically and culturally diverse speakers of Saudi Arabic and American English will help the speakers of the two languages become more aware of their cross-cultural differences, avoid potential pragmatic failures between interlocutors of the two cultures and thus lead to a smooth flow of communication and better relations between the two nations.

4. To explore possible applications and implications to the teaching of English as a foreign language to speakers whose first language is Arabic. Furthermore, the findings of this study will provide valid information on the role of social status, social distance, and gender in the production of compliment responses. Teachers of Arab EFL learners may, then, make use of this model and utilize it in their classes for the purpose of promoting pragmatic awareness in speech act performance.

5. To provide pertinent data on the common compliment response types used by both Saudis and Americans and their cultural implications. The results of this study are expected to provide valuable information not only about the linguistic formulas and patterns used in the compliment responses of Saudi Arabic and American English but also about the social aspects and features
specific to each of the two cultures that contribute to the production of such forms and patterns.

6. To inspire and motivate more researchers to do more research that investigates the various aspects of the pragmatic competence of Arab EFL learners. According to Nelson et al. (1996), though much research has been done on compliments as a speech act, few studies have been done on responses to compliments. ESL and EFL students face more situations when they have to respond to compliments rather than initiate them. More studies on ESL and EFL students' responses to compliments are needed. Few, if any, cross-cultural studies have been done on compliment responses in the Arabic speaking countries. Since different types of research methods are used in this study, it is hoped that the implications for future research in this area will inspire other researchers to generate more research in the area of Arab EFL learners' pragmatic competence.

1.3 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Speech acts are governed by social and contextual rules which determine how they are performed. Rubin (1983) points out that speech acts reflect fundamental cultural values that may be specific to a speech community. Cultures have been shown to vary drastically in their interactional styles, leading to different preferences for modes of speech act behaviors. As a result, lack of knowledge of speech act realization patterns and strategies across cultures can lead to breakdowns in intercultural and inter-ethnic communication.
Though much cross-cultural research has been done on speech acts, there are some basic issues related to their theoretical approaches and methodological frameworks that have not been answered yet. One of those still unanswered central issues is that of universality in a speech act realizations. That is, to what extent are speech act realization patterns governed by universal pragmatic principles of cooperation and politeness and to what extent do they vary in conceptualization and verbalization across languages and cultures (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989).

A second unanswered issue relates to the notion of pragmatic transfer of the native language (L1) norms to the target language (L2). This transfer is a main cause of communication breakdown. Although available research on pragmatic transfer (Cohen & Olshtain 1981; Olshtain 1983; Beebe et al. 1990; Trenchs, 1995) provides us with significant evidence that transfer of this kind is an inescapable phenomenon in L2 speaker's production of speech acts, it does not explain what motivates such transfer.

A third central issue that has not been answered empirically is the role of the notion of face in the realization of responding to compliments. That is, why and when do the speakers of a certain language give acceptance or rejection responses to the compliments addressed to them. Though some socially based justifications were suggested, such as the openness and individualism of Americans as a reason for their over acceptance of compliments and the modesty and over politeness of Japanese and Chinese as a reason for their over the rejection of compliments, no solid explanations based on factual and empirical evidence are available yet.
A fourth unanswered issue concerns methodology. That is, what is the best method to collect representative speech act data? There is no consensus among researchers on an "ideal way" of collecting such data. While some researchers (e.g., Wolfson, 1983) prefer ethnographic data, other researchers (e.g., Cohen & Olshtain, 1994; Cohen, 1996a) call for a combination of ethnographic and elicitation data techniques to achieve a clear picture of the speech data in question.

In conclusion, there are obvious gaps and shortcomings in the available research dealing with cross-cultural speech act pragmatics in general and cross-cultural pragmatic transfer in particular. I think this is due to two reasons. First, speech act research, as discussed in the chapter which reviews the literature, was originated by philosophers of language rather than linguists. Second, linguistic phenomena (i.e., syntactic and phonological) were the main focus of research concerning transfer in the speech of non-native speakers (henceforth NNS). The field of interlanguage pragmatics (henceforth ILP), which is concerned with non-native speakers' pragmatic competence in their learned language, is still in its infancy.

It is hoped that this study will contribute additional knowledge to this area of inquiry, more especially, on pragmatic transfer in the production of compliment responses by Saudi EFL learners. Such information might be beneficial to EFL teachers as well as to cross-cultural researchers.

1.4 THE SUBJECTS

The data for this study was collected from three different groups of ARAMCO employees. An intentionally selected sample (50 in each group) was chosen according to the following criteria:
1. **Native Speakers of American English:** This group consisted of 50 American citizens (25 males and 25 females) coming from different states of USA and residing in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia as expatriate employees occupying various professional jobs in different ARAMCO departments. American English is the native language (L1) of subjects in this group. The majority of American subjects are middle-aged and holders of university degrees.

2. **Native Speakers of Saudi Arabic:** This group comprised 50 Saudi citizens (25 males and 25 females) coming from all provinces of Saudi Arabia and residing in Dhahran Metropolitan Area, Saudi Arabia. All of them are native Saudi ARAMCO employees occupying various professional jobs in different ARAMCO departments. Saudi Arabic is the native language (L1) of all subjects in this group. The majority of subjects in this group are middle-aged and holders of university degrees.

3. **Saudi EFL Learners:** This group consisted of 50 Saudi citizens (25 males and 25 females) coming from all provinces of Saudi Arabia and residing in Dhahran Metropolitan Area, Saudi Arabia. All subjects of this group are ARAMCO candidate employees enrolled as full time trainees at ARAMCO training centers in an intensive college preparatory program for one year. Upon successful completion of all courses (mainly EFL), they sit for the TOEFL test. Those who pass this English proficiency test are sent to U.S. universities on full scholarships to obtain university degrees in various technical and administrative majors and come back to join ARAMCO as senior professionals. Those who successfully complete ARAMCO training courses but fail TOEFL join the company as junior (intermediate) employees occupying clerical jobs.
in its various departments. Due to religious and social restrictions, males and females study at separate training centers. Males study at the College Preparatory Center (CPC) and females study at the Special Training Center (STC). The fifty subjects of this group were chosen from trainees enrolled in the terminal EFL course at their training centers to ensure their academic and linguistic homogeneity as well as a good level of EFL. Saudi Arabic is the native language (L1) and American English is the target language (L2) of all subjects in this group. All subjects in this group are high school graduates, and their ages range between 19 and 22.

As noted, the three groups of subjects are related to ARAMCO in the sense that they are all employed and sponsored by this huge oil company which has been the world’s leading oil producer since 1938. The company houses more than eighty thousand employees of 42 different nationalities, together with their dependents totalling about half a million people. Aramco is distinctive not only in its oil enterprises but also in the educational, training, and medical services it provides for all its employees and their dependents. As expected, having worked in the same technically outstanding business atmosphere and enjoying the same luxurious living and up-to-date recreational facilities for many years, Aramco employees have developed common practices and social activities despite their different nationalities and the drastically different backgrounds they come from. Being an Aramco employee for the last 23 years, it was convenient for the researcher to seek his subjects from Aramco in conducting the three phases of his data collection process.
1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study will address the following three major questions:

1. How is the speech act compliment response performed in Arabic by native speakers of Saudi Arabic?
2. How is the speech act compliment response performed in English by native speakers of American English?
3. How is the speech act compliment response performed in English by Saudi EFL learners at Aramco College Preparatory Center and Special Training Center?

The following six sub-questions will complement the aforementioned major ones:

A. What effects do complimenter's social status, complimenter's social distance, and the gender of respondent and complimenter have on the type of compliment responses given by
   (a) native speakers of Saudi Arabic;
   (b) native speakers of American English;
   (c) Saudi EFL learners?

B. How do the compliment responses given by the native speakers of Saudi Arabic compare and contrast to those of the native speakers of American English?

C. Do the compliment responses given by Saudi EFL learners correspond more closely to the compliment responses of the Saudi group or to those of the American group?

D. Can any pragmatic transfer of the Saudi Arabic norms of complimenting behavior be detected in the compliment responses given by Saudi EFL learners in American English? If yes, what are the factors that cause such a transfer?
E. What pedagogical implications do teachers and learners of Arabic and English as foreign languages get from understanding the differences and similarities in American and Saudi Arab compliment response behaviors?

F. What effect does promoting consciousness-raising of Saudi Arabic and American English compliment response realization patterns have on the communication between foreign learners and native speakers of the two languages?

1.6. LIMITATIONS

- The data for this study come from a group of middle-class Saudis working for ARAMCO - a huge Saudi oil producing company with American roots - who are residents of the Dhahran Area; a group of Saudi high school graduates enrolled at ARAMCO College Preparatory Center and Special Training Center in Dhahran where they study intensive American English courses for one year; and a group of middle-class Americans who work for ARAMCO and live in the Dhahran Area as expatriates. Though the Saudi employees of ARAMCO come from different provinces of Saudi Arabia and the American employees come from various U.S.A states, it is difficult to generalize the findings of this study to all other parts of Saudi Arabia, the U.S. or to other Arabic speaking or English speaking countries.

- The ages of subjects of the two main groups (Saudis and Americans) range between 35 and 50. That is, the subjects of both groups are middle-aged and thus homogeneous in the age factor which adds to the credibility of the results of comparing and
contrasting their performance. However, the ages of the Saudi EFL learners range between 19 and 22. Thus, the big difference between the average age of the Saudi EFL learners group subjects and that of the other two groups limits the significance of comparing and contrasting the performance of Saudi EFL learners to those of the other two groups and the outcomes that it may lead to.

• Since the discourse completion test (DCT) is the main research instrument used in collecting the data, the given compliment responses might be what the subjects think they would rather say than what they naturally say in real daily life situations. This issue is discussed in detail in Chapter 3.

• Due to the strict religious conventions prevailing in Saudi Arabia, the researcher had to overcome immense difficulties in order to make arrangements for meeting the female subjects of the Saudi group. Even while completing the DCTs, and taking part in the interviews, some of the Saudi female subjects were still tense, shy and not at ease. Therefore, making generalizations regarding gender among the Saudi subjects may be problematic.

• The research elicitation instruments, such as DCTs and interview scripts are in two versions: Arabic and English. Though every possible precaution was taken to minimize translation discrepancies and to make the Arabic and English versions fully equivalent, some slight imperfections might exist in the cross-cultural equivalence of the two versions which might shed some doubt on the quality of the research findings.
1.7. STRUCTURE OF THESIS

This thesis is divided into six chapters. Following the present introductory chapter, Chapter Two reviews the literature. Due to the nature of the thesis, the literature review comprises a number of interrelated areas, such as the speech act theory, cooperation and politeness principles, politeness in Islam, pragmatic transfer, and studies on compliment interactions. Chapter Three provides the methodology and research design for the study. It not only focuses on the actual methodology and procedures carried out as part of the research, it also discusses the methodological considerations and implications of such a study. In Chapter Four, the collected compliment responses of the three language groups are categorized according to a scheme prepared for this purpose and analyzed to bring into account the frequencies of four variables. In addition, the results provided by American and Saudi informants are compared and contrasted to find out the similarities and differences in the complimenting behaviors in the two cultures. The compliment responses given by the Saudi EFL learners are compared with those of Saudis and Americans in the next chapter to determine whether or not there is evidence of pragmatic transfer from Saudi Arabic to the English of the Saudi EFL learners. In the last chapter of this thesis, the findings of the study are summarized. The chapter concludes with pedagogical implications for concerned teachers and learners of Arabic and English as foreign languages and suggestions for further studies that might be conducted by interested researchers in cross-cultural speech acts.
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CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, I review literature related to the speech act compliment response which is the main topic of this thesis. Due to the importance of attaining speech act realization patterns which are described by Goffman (1974:228) as "the traffic rules of social interaction", this chapter begins with a discussion of the speech act theory and how it is related to pragmatic competence.

The chapter also provides a discussion of pragmatic transfer which can be defined simply as transfer of native language norms to the foreign or second language. Since investigating the existence of pragmatic transfer in the responses given by Saudi EFL learners is one of the goals of this study, it is important to familiarize the reader with what positive and negative pragmatic transfer mean.

Since the performance of compliment responses given by all participants in this study is investigated to find out to what principles of cooperation and politeness they match, it is useful to briefly review the cooperative principle of Grice, the maxims of Leech and the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson. This review may be found in section three of this chapter.

In order to better understand the religious expressions and implications included in the compliment responses given by the Native Saudi subjects, a brief section about politeness in Islam is provided.

This chapter ends with a review of the studies done on compliment interactions in general and those on compliment responses in particular. A special emphasis is given to compliment response studies researching the effect of social status, social distance and gender
variables on the frequency of response types because they are the same variables investigated in this study. That is, some of the models available to the researcher in the conduct of this research enable him to compare and contrast the findings of this study with those of similar ones.

2.1 SPEECH ACT THEORY AND PRAGMATICS

As a reaction to the views of Moore (1959) and Russel (1956) about the relationship between language and philosophy, Austin (1962) initiated his theory of illocutionary acts in which he explores issues, such as what we do when we speak, how we perform our acts, and how they succeed or fail.

Austin (1962) began by observing that some utterances are in themselves acts. He called them "performative" utterances. By his "performative hypothesis", Austin argued that people use language not only to make statements about the world but also to perform actions that may change it in some way. For example, with utterances like "I do" in a wedding ceremony or "I name this ship Queen Elizabeth", the speaker is explicitly performing an act through speaking (1962:49).

Austin defines speech acts as all the things we do with words when we speak, such as requesting, complimenting, apologizing, greeting, refusing, etc. For Austin, each speech act has three dimensions: locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary. The locutionary dimension corresponds to the propositional meaning of the utterance, that is, what the utterance is about - for example, "I am thirsty" is a statement that the speaker is experiencing thirst. The illocutionary dimension is the "value" that the speaker gives to the locutionary act.
For example the utterance “I am thirsty” may simply be intended as statement about the speaker’s physical state, or it may be intended as a request for something to drink. What the speaker intends the sentence to mean is referred to as illocutionary meaning. It is sometimes call illocutionary force. The perlocutionary act is the effect that the illocutionary act has on the hearer. In this specific instance, after hearing the above statement “I am thirsty”, the hearer may offer the speaker something to drink.

Austin proposed a tentative classification of explicit performative verbs. He distinguished five categories based on the notion of illocutionary force (1962: 150-163):

1. **Verdictives** are verbs which express verdicts or evaluations, such as to estimate, to appraise, to condemn, etc.
2. **Exercitives** are verbs which express the exercising of powers and rights. This category includes verbs like to vote, to appoint, to communicate and to order.
3. **Behabitives** are verbs which have to do with accident and the reaction to it, such as to thank, to compliment, to apologize and to refuse.
4. **Commissives** are verbs which express commitments, such as to promise, to commit, to contract and to guarantee.
5. **Expositives** are verbs which are used to explain and give reasons, such as to argue, to reply and to assume.

Austin’s taxonomy of speech was criticized by Searle (1976:9). He detected the following six flaws in Austin’s taxonomy. First, there is a confusion between illocutionary verbs and illocutionary acts. Second, not all verbs are illocutionary verbs. Third, there is much overlap
among the categories. Fourth, there is much heterogeneity within the categories. Fifth, many of the verbs which are used to exemplify the given categories do not fit the category they are listed under. Sixth, there is no consistent principle of classification.

Trying to overcome the aforementioned shortcomings of Austin's classification, Searle (1976) proposed a new taxonomy of speech acts as follows:

1. **Representatives** which have a word-to-world fit are acts which describe states or events in the world. This category includes verbs like 'hypothesize' and 'suggest'.

2. **Directives** which have a world-to-word direction of fit are acts which attempt to get the hearer do something, such as 'command' and 'request'.

3. **Commissives** which have a world-to-world direction of fit are acts which commit the speaker to doing something in the future, such as 'promise' and 'threaten'.

4. **Expressives** which have no direction of fit are acts in which the speaker expresses feelings regarding a state of affairs that an expressive refers to. This category includes verbs like 'congratulate' and 'compliment'.

5. **Declaratives** which have both a word-to-world and a world-to-word direction of fit are acts whose uttering change the world, such as 'declare' and 'name'.

Furthermore, Searle pointed out that any speech act can be performed indirectly. Indirect speech acts are those speech acts which express certain literal meanings but are intended as something else. For
instance, the utterance "It is cold here" is frequently explained as an indirect speech act to request that a door be closed or a heater be turned on, which is performed by means of a direct statement of fact. Also, a response such as "how about next week" is frequently explained as an indirect refusal to an immediate invitation to visit a friend.

Speech act theory attempts to capture all the possible functions of language by classifying the kinds of action that can be performed by speech. However, it has several major limitations. First, and most important, is its ethnocentric bias characteristic. In part, this is due to the fact that its assertions were based on its authors' own speech conventions, namely Anglo-Saxon speech conventions. This meant that traditional speech act theory was not necessarily able to account for speech data from other cultures (Wierzbicka, 1991). Second, utterances frequently serve more than one function at the same time depending on the speaker's intention. Wolfson (1989b: 57) notes "among speakers of middle-class American English, a compliment, for example, may well serve as a greeting or an expression of gratitude".

A third limitation is that traditional speech act theory according to Cohen (1996a: 385) was an intuitively based anecdotal approach rather than an empirical one. Olshtain and Cohen (1983:20) pointed out that traditional speech act theory, especially the work of each Austin and Searle, does not provide an adequate definition of the notion of speech act. Therefore, they expanded the notion of speech act and suggested the term "speech act set" that consists of "the maximal potential set of semantic formulas for each act".

Due to the aforementioned shortcomings of speech act theory, linguists have developed it within the field of what has come to be
known as pragmatics. Pragmatics is the study of aspects of meaning not covered in semantics. It includes all the inferences that can be made from both what is said and all the available facts about the world known to participants. It is thus concerned with “utterance” meaning rather than with “sentence” meaning. Let us consider this illustrative example:

Example 2.1  
A: Can you tell me the time?
B: I’m not sure, but the morning coffee break bell has rung.

A means: Do you have the ability to tell me the time of the present moment as indicated by a watch? If so, please tell me.

B means: No, I don’t know the exact time of the present moment, but I can provide some information from which you may be able to deduce the approximate time: namely, the morning coffee break bell has rung sometime prior to the time of speaking. In this example, the underlined part is the semantics; the rest is the pragmatics.

Speech act theory, despite its several limitations, has contributed significantly to motivating a considerable amount of research in speech act pragmatics. Additionally, and with the development of the notion of communicative competence (Hymes, 1972; Canale and Swain, 1980), the influence of Austin’s and Searle’s theories has spread to the areas of TESOL and applied linguistics. Evidence of this can be seen in the area of syllabus design (Wilkins 1976); in the area of classroom interaction (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975); and in the area of interlanguage pragmatics in research focusing on the ways speech acts are selected and realized by non-native speakers (Kasper and Dahl, 1991).

Researchers in interlanguage pragmatics are especially concerned with investigating the choices that L2 learners make when initiating and
responding to speech acts using the learned language as well as the reasons behind such choices.


All the studies in this area concluded that non-native speakers might fail to comprehend or produce pragmatically appropriate utterances in spite of having a relatively good grammatical and lexical command of the target language. In order to become competent second or foreign language users, non-native speakers need to develop their pragmatic skills in speech act realization. It has also been suggested that lack of such pragmatic skills may cause non-native speakers to inappropriately transfer their native sociolinguistic rules of speaking into the learned language thus increasing the chances for producing pragmatic failures. This important sociolinguistic feature of pragmatic transfer is the topic of the next section. The two types of positive and negative pragmatic transfer in addition to a brief review of the cross-cultural studies carried out on pragmatic transfer are discussed in the next section of this chapter.
2.2 PRAGMATIC TRANSFER

There is no single definition of pragmatic transfer. This is due to disagreement among researchers about how to define the scope of pragmatics (Kasper, 1992); and available definitions therefore vary according to their authors' stance. For example, Olshtain (1983) refers to pragmatic transfer as a learner's strategy of incorporating native-language-based elements in target language production and behavior. Beebe et al. (1990:56) define pragmatic transfer as "transfer of the L1 sociocultural competence in performing L2 speech acts or any other aspects of L2 conversation where the speaker is trying to achieve a particular function of language". On the other hand, Kasper (1992:207) looks at pragmatic transfer as "the influence exerted by learners' pragmatic knowledge of languages and cultures other than L2 on their comprehension production and learning of L2 pragmatic information".

Wolfson (1989b: 141) uses the terms pragmatic transfer and sociolinguistic transfer interchangeably. She states, "the use of rules of speaking from one's own native speech community when speaking or writing in a second language is known as sociolinguistic or pragmatic transfer". Wolfson's (1989a) definition of pragmatic transfer resonates with the findings of this study of pragmatic transfer made by the Saudi EFL learners. They, as will be shown, transfer some of their native language norms of compliment response strategies to the English in which they give compliment responses.

Pragmatic transfer may either be positive or negative. Positive transfer occurs when a language learner succeeds in achieving his/her intended message as a result of transferring language-specific convention of usage shared by L1 and L2.
Kasper (1992) points out that positive transfer has been given somewhat short shrift by interlanguage pragmatists for two reasons: The first is the methodological difficulty of distinguishing positive transfer from the application of general pragmatic knowledge on one hand, or from generalizations about their interlanguage pragmatics on the other. The second reason seems to be a concern with miscommunication, or pragmatic failure. Positive transfer will be a causal factor in miscommunication only if native speaker-like pragmatic behavior is deemed inappropriate for non-native speakers.

Negative pragmatic transfer, on the other hand, is the inappropriate transfer of native sociolinguistic norms and conventions of speech into the target language. This process usually ends in pragmatic failure. The term "pragmatic failure" is borrowed from Thomas (1983, 1984) and is said to occur on any occasion in which the hearer perceives the force of the speaker’s utterance as other than the speaker intended she/he should receive it. Here are some of the situations in which a pragmatic failure occurs as listed by Thomas (1983: 94):

a. The hearer perceives the force of the speaker’s utterance as stronger or weaker than the speaker intended she/he should perceive it.
b. The hearer perceives as an order an utterance which the speaker intended she/he should perceive as a request.
c. The hearer perceives the speaker’s utterance as ambivalent where the speaker intended no ambivalence.
d. The hearer expects the speaker’s utterance to be able to infer the force of his/her utterance, but is relying on a system of knowledge or beliefs which the speaker and the hearer do not share.
Thomas then distinguished two kinds of pragmatic failure: pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic. Pragmalinguistic failures occur when the non-native speaker tries to perform or respond to the right speech act but uses the wrong linguistic means (i.e. deviates with regard to appropriateness of form which usually results in failure to convey the intended illocutionary or pragmatic force). These errors according to Thomas (1983:101) are due to "inappropriate transfer of speech act strategies from one language to another, or the transferring from the mother tongue to the target language of utterances which are semantically/syntactically equivalent, but which, because of different "interpretive bias" tend to convey a different pragmatic force in the target language".

Other kinds of pragmalinguistic errors were committed by the subjects of Eisenstein and Bodman’s (1986) study of expressions of gratitude. They indicated that their advanced non-native subjects had both syntactic and lexical problems in their written responses.

In another study using role plays instead of written questionnaires, Bodman and Eisenstein (1988) found that lower-proficiency learners of English (Arab and Punjabi) used literal translations of formulaic phrases which function as conventionalized expressions of gratitude in their native languages. For example, in thanking someone for a loan, some learners responded by saying “May God increase your bounty”.

Sociopragmatic failures or errors, on the other hand, are the “mismatch which arises from cross-culturally different assessments within the social parameters affecting linguistic choice, size of
imposition, social distance between speaker and hearer, relative rights and obligations" (Thomas, 1984:226). Such errors occur when the non-native speaker fails to perform or respond to the illocutionary act required by the situation (i.e. deviates with regard to appropriateness of meaning). For example, a native speaker of Arabic offering a regret in a situation where an American would offer thanks is due to different perceptions of which behavior requires an expression of gratitude and which behavior entails the expression of appreciation. As an illustrative example¹, a Saudi EFL learner once approached his American teacher who was in the process of locking the classroom door at 7:01 a.m. in accordance with the strict regulations of the training center he works at that prohibit late trainees from entering once the door is locked at 7:00. The teacher unwillingly let the late trainee come in but wanted to warn him of repeating it in future.

Example 2.2 Teacher: You hardly made it this time, Mohammed
Trainee: Thank you very much. I am a hard runner.

As this example demonstrates, the trainee took his teacher's warning as a compliment, thanked him for it and made a bald acceptance of what he supposed to be a compliment. Instead he should have apologized and promised not to do it again. That is, the trainee was unable to recognize his teacher's warning and understood it as a compliment. Socio-pragmatic errors are therefore social in nature and come as a result of non-native speakers having not yet learned the sociolinguistic rules governing their learned language.

¹ This example is based on a real interaction between an American colleague teaching at the training center where I teach and one of his Saudi trainees.
Evidence of non-native speakers' pragmatic transfer (sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic) is frequently mentioned in the literature of interlanguage pragmatists. For instance, Jaworski (1994) found that advanced Polish learners of English had great difficulties in recognizing and using formulaic expressions in greetings and therefore considered a greeting such as "how are you doing" as a question instead of a greeting.

Beebe et al. (1990) claimed that Japanese learners of English retained certain features of Japanese communication style in their refusal responses in English (e.g., they used formulaic structure with little specific semantic content, leaving much room for inferences). Besides, Japanese respondents were more sensitive to social status than Americans, which indicated that such sensitivity was transferred from Japanese native culture.

Thomas indicated that pragmatic failure is more serious than linguistic error in the sense that pragmatic failure may reflect badly on the speaker as a person, while linguistic error indicates only that the speaker is less than proficient in the language. Linguistic errors are apparent in the surface structure, that is, the hearer is aware that the speaker is a less than adequate user of the language. Pragmatic failure, on the other hand, results in the hearer's attributing normative violations on the part of the speaker not to linguistic deficiency but to rudeness or disrespect.

In conclusion, although it has been shown by many researchers that language learners are more likely to transfer their sociolinguistic rules of speaking when performing speech acts in their learned language, the factors motivating such a transfer are not yet clearly
known. I believe that knowledge of these factors will help us clearly understand the notion of pragmatic transfer in L2 speech act production. This is an area that is investigated further in Chapter Five.

In the next section of this chapter, the cooperation and politeness theories used in explaining speech acts will be discussed. This brief discussion will include Grice’s (1975) cooperation principle. It also touches on Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness theory and a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of this theory.

2.3 COOPERATION AND POLITENESS AS PRAGMATIC PHENOMENA

In his “Cooperative Principle” (henceforth CP), Grice (1975) suggests the following four conversational maxims that help the hearer in recovering an “implicature”, that is, drawing inferences that will connect what is said to what is mutually assumed or what had been said before:

1. Quantity: Give just the needed information, no more no less.
2. Quality: Say only what is proven to be true.
3. Relation: Say only what is relevant.

Sperber and Wilson (1986) argue that “Relevance” is the most important of all Grice’s maxims because it is more economical and easier to conform to than the rest of the set. Lakoff (1973) reduces Grice’s maxims to two: “Be clear” and “Be polite”. For her, these two maxims are sufficient to guarantee “pragmatic competence”. She concentrates on the following three rules of politeness: 1. Don’t impose on your hearer or embarrass him with the citation of “unmentionables”. 2. Give hearer
options and let him make his own decisions. 3. Make hearer feel good. Be friendly and establish rapport by using solidary forms of address.

This maxim of "Be Polite" suggested by Lakoff (1973) was developed by Leech (1977, 1980, 1983a) who thought that politeness plays a very important role in explaining deviations from Grice's Cooperative Principle. He introduced the "ambivalence" strategy in which an unfavorable message is conveyed to the hearer in a way that does not cause him any offence.

Leech initiated the "Politeness Principle" (henceforth PP) which complements the Gricean "Cooperative Principle". It explains why speakers sometimes do not comply with the Gricean maxims. In 1983, Leech introduced a group of maxims that provide an explanation of the relationship between "sense" and "force" in human conversation. Pragmatic parameters are necessarily used in interpreting Leech's maxims. The term "other" which can be a "stranger" or an "intimate" is important in understanding Leech's maxims. A brief survey of Leech's (1983:131-150) six main maxims follows:

1. The Tact Maxim states "minimize the expression of beliefs which imply benefit to other". The maxim emphasizes softening the effect of a request by giving options. 'Optionality' is in the center of what Thomas (1995:160) calls the Western mentality; it is quite the opposite of the Chinese mentality. This maxim is based on the cost/benefit scale. In contrast, if something is beneficial to the hearer, it can be expressed directly.

2. The Generosity Maxim states "minimize the expression of cost to other; maximize the expressions of benefit to other" or "minimize the expression of benefit to self". To exemplify this principle, it is
advisable to say “You must come and dine with us”, while it is unfavorable to say “We will come and dine with you”.

3. The Approbation Maxim reads “minimize the expression of beliefs which express dispraise of other; maximize the expression of beliefs which express approval of other”. That is, direct criticism is disfavored. You either say something nice or remain silent.

4. The Modesty Maxim reads “minimize the expression of praise to self; maximize the expression of dispraise to self”. Compliance with this maxim varies from one culture to another. For instance, the Japanese and Chinese cultures give great importance to this maxim, while most other cultures do not.

5. The Agreement Maxim reads “minimize the expression of disagreement between self and other; maximize the expression of agreement between self and other”. Speakers should be indirect in expressing disagreement, while it is favorable to express agreement directly.

6. The Pollyana Maxim states “Put the best possible gloss on what you have to say”. Some of the recommended strategies to achieve this goal is using “minimizers” such as the word “bit”. e.g., the quiz you gave us is a bit difficult.

Leech’s politeness principle raised much argumentative discussion. Some linguists, such as Brown and Levinson (1987) and Fraser (1990) criticized it on the grounds that it does not provide a restriction to the number of maxims it may produce. That is, it might lead to a limitless list of maxims needed to explain every regularity in linguistic behavior. On the other hand, Thomas (1995) points out that
Leech’s PP remains to date the best available politeness approach to explain and compare cross-cultural politeness strategies. To offset the drawbacks of Leech’s PP, Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) introduced their politeness theory which is based on the concept of face.

The concept of face in pragmatics relates to one’s publicly required self-image. This is the emotional and social sense of self that every person has and expects everyone else to recognize. According to Goffman (1974), in a conversational interaction, speakers appear to have two points of view, a defensive orientation toward saving their own face and a protective orientation toward saving the other’s face. Goffman (1974:228) explains this behavior:

He may want to save his own face because of his emotional attachment to the image of self which it expresses, because of his pride or honor, because of the power his presumed status allows him to exert over the other participants and so on. He may want to save the other’s face because of his emotional attachment to an image of them, or because he feels that his co-participants have a normal right to his protection, or because he wants to avoid the hostility that may be directed toward him if they lose their face.

In an elaborated extension of Goffman’s theory of face, Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) put forward a detailed universal theory of politeness. According to this theory, the concept of face consists of two aspects: positive face orientation and negative face orientation. The first refers to the desire of each individual to be approved, liked and admired, and the latter refers the individual’s basic claim to territories,
to freedom of action and to freedom from imposition. Thus, positive politeness is used by the speakers to satisfy the hearer's positive face; the speaker indicates solidarity with the hearer's positive self image to fulfill the hearer's need for approval and belonging. Negative politeness, on the other hand, is used by a speaker to satisfy a hearer's negative face. It functions to avoid or minimize the imposition of a face-threatening act on a hearer.

Positive-face oriented strategies, according to Brown and Levinson, are more indirect, stress the common ground between speaker and hearer, and do not show undue concern for the hearer's negative face. Negative-face oriented strategies are more direct and show concern for the hearers, without putting demand on them. Brown and Levinson show, however, that both politeness orientations can interact with each other in very complicated ways depending on the nature of the speech act performed, and the social status and the social distance of the speaker and the hearer.

Based on their analysis of different languages and cultures, Brown and Levinson (1987) proposed a list of positive and negative politeness strategies speakers use when involved in face-to-face interactions. Positive strategies include noticing or attending to hearer's interests, wants, and needs; using in-group identity markers; being optimistic and seeking agreement; offering, promising; exaggerating interest, sympathizing with and approving the hearer; giving or asking for reasons. Negative politeness strategies include among others: being conventionally indirect; minimizing the numerical value representing the estimated degree of the imposition (Rx); avoiding personalizing the hearer; questioning, hedging; apologizing; being pessimistic; giving deference; offering options; stating the face threatening act (FTA) as a
general rule; going on record as incurring a debt or as not indebting the hearer.

Brown and Levinson claimed that their politeness theory can offer a framework for comparing cross-cultural differences in politeness. They proposed that the amount of face-threat carried by a particular speech act in a particular situation is determined by the sum of the power the hearer has over the speaker (P), the social distance between the speaker and the hearer (D), and the absolute imposition inherent to the speech act (R). Wx is a numerical value representing the estimated degree of the face-threatening act (FTA). It is composed of the value assigned to D, P and R: Wx = D (S, H) + P (H, S) + Rx (the numerical value representing the estimated degree of the imposition). Since different cultures have different values attached to P, D and R, each culture has a different assessment of the seriousness of the FTA, even in the same speech act.

In sum, the concept of face and the politeness theory derived from it is very relevant when analyzing speech acts as performed by linguistically as well as culturally diverse people.

While Leech claims that speech acts are inherently polite, Brown and Levinson believe that some of them are inherently face threatening. This clash of opinion leads to the conclusion that some utterances pose no face threat at all. Contrary to Brown and Levinson's assumption, a simple utterance can affect positive and negative face simultaneously. For example, a woman is addressing an importunate man, "Do me a favour-piss off!" (Thomas: 1995: 176). In this example, the speaker gives a small dose of encouragement to the face of the hearer by the seemingly polite request in the first part of the utterance, but simultaneously she directs a smashing blow to his face by the bald-on-record order to get lost in the second part.
Meier (1997:22) identifies a number of drawbacks and deficiencies in Brown and Levinson's theory: 1. It is quite difficult to ascertain unifying traits of the so-called "polite phenomenon". 2. The constituents of "face" especially "individual territorial rights" differ from one culture to another. 3. Marking whole cultures as polite, less polite, or more polite on the basis of directness is invalid and groundless. 4. The criteria followed in classifying speech act strategies are hazy and unconvincing. In addition to the above-mentioned criticism directed by Thomas and Meier to Brown and Levinson's politeness theory, I think that its main weakness lies in the fact that it ignores other cultures' conceptions of politeness. That is, it is Anglo-Saxon biased in its conception of politeness. For example, it ignores the Chinese conception of humbleness and modesty which underlies the frequent scaledown and rejection responses given by Chinese speakers and unfairly marks them as face threatening acts. The Islamic conception of politeness and how it relates to Leech's maxims and Brown and Levinson's politeness theory is discussed in the next section.

2.4 POLITENESS IN ISLAM

In a Moslem Arab culture, face plays a major role in regulating people's speech behaviors. Religious beliefs and emotional attachment to self-image and to the image of others cause individuals to make continuous conscious and unconscious attempts to take face into consideration in their interactions. For example, Moslem Arabs find it very difficult to refuse a request bluntly by saying 'No' or 'I can't'. Instead, they usually respond with elaborate, lengthy, and convincing explanations not only to save their own face but also to protect the face
of others. Moslems feel obliged to meet the need of those who request help in compliance with their Islamic beliefs. Prophet Mohammed - Peace be upon him, henceforth (Pbuh) - said¹, "There are two characteristics which are not combined in a believer, miserliness and bad character". Thus, even the well-known generosity of Arabs is explained as a protective act of the host's face as well as the other's (guest) face. Helping the weak and the grieved is another characteristic of Moslem Arabs that matches with Brown and Levinson's positive face notion. Moslems feel obliged to help the weak in accordance with their Prophet Mohammed's (Pbuh) teaching, "He is not one of us who does not respect the elderly and has no mercy on the youngsters". Implementing this teaching, Moslems are supportive of weak others (the elderly and the youngsters) as well as maintaining their own good face by being looked on as helpful and merciful brother citizens.

Islam emphasizes the notion of humbleness and modesty and expects its believers to be humble and modest in all their interactions. For instance, Prophet Mohammed - Pbuh - warns those who violate this expected behavior code, "Allaah will be angry with whoever exalts himself and walks proudly". In another saying, He - Pbuh - elaborates on the notion of humbleness in order to explain its advantage, "Allaah the Most High has revealed to me that you should be humble, so that no one transgresses against another, or boasts to the other". This Islamic mode of humbleness matches with Leech's Maxim of Modesty which is based on minimizing praise to self. By behaving humbly, a Moslem would not create threat to his own face. On the contrary, he feels

¹ Most of Prophet Mohammed's - Pbuh - sayings are memorized by heart by most Moslem Arabs, and they are frequently used in their daily life interactions. Also, they are always found in newspapers, textbooks, wall posters and almost everywhere in all Moslem Arab communities. Thus, it was deemed unnecessary to provide full details of the citations from Prophet Mohammed (Pbuh).
elevated and self-satisfied because he has won God’s contentment and the respect of other believers and their appreciation of his behavior.

A good Muslim is also expected to be nice, friendly, and considerate to others’ feelings in all his daily life interactions. For instance, a Muslim is supposed to be smiling whenever meeting an acquaintance. There is a direction by Prophet Mohammed - Pbh - in this regard, “Meeting your brother in humanity with a smile is a deed of charity”. Another saying by Prophet Mohammed - Pbh - that urges his followers to take the initiative in behaving politely with others is about the speech act of greetings. It reads, “Once you are greeted, you have to respond with a better greeting or at least with an equal one”. In these two directives, the support of the others’ face is central to the conduct of a Muslim. Of course by meeting others with smiles and responding to a greeting with a higher scale one, a Muslim elevates both the face of others and his own. Thus, the expected result would be success in performing the speech act and a smooth flow of communication between the interlocutors.

Islam is distinguished among other religions in its focus on conforming to gentleness and the politeness codes adopted by its believers. How great, far-sighted, and wise the message of the following teaching of Prophet Mohammed - Pbh - , “Always find an excuse for your seemingly misbehaving brothers”. That is, be conscious of the other’s negative face. Do not threaten his face by blaming or holding him accountable for an unproven offense. This Islamic behavior pattern can be equated to both Leech’s Approbation Maxim which is based on the notion “do not criticize others; you either say something nice or keep silent” and Brown and Levinson’s notion of avoiding or minimizing negative face threat.
In line with the previous Islamic directives of keeping good relationships among performers of social interactions by being considerate to and supportive of each other's face, I would like to end this brief review of some examples of politeness in Islam with this enlightening piece of advice by Prophet Mohammed – Pbuh – about the best way to win others' contentment, "You cannot satisfy people with your wealth, but satisfy them with your cheerful faces and good characters". In my opinion, the underlying message of this saying represents the core of politeness in Islam, if not in many known philosophical and pragmatic ideologies. That is, whereas money is incapable of satisfying all people, a big smile on a cheerful face can please all interactors by elevating their morale, protecting their face and supporting their self-images. In conclusion, these few examples discussed in this review represent just a sample of the large number of Islamic behavior modes that can be explained by the pragmatic politeness theories and maxims discussed in this chapter.

As we have seen in this section, Grice (1975) initiated his 'Cooperative Principle' which was complemented by Leech's (1977, 80) 'Politeness Principle'. In 1983, Leech introduced his maxims to explain the relationship between 'sense' and 'force' in human conversation. Initiated in 1978 and developed in 1987, Brown and Levinson's politeness theory, which is based on the FTA notion, received much publicity and criticism. In my opinion, despite the criticism of Leech's maxims as being infinite regarding the number of maxims it may add and the criticism of Brown and Levinson's politeness theory as being
Anglo-Saxon biased in its conception, they are, to date, the best available politeness tools for explaining and analyzing speech acts performed by culturally different subjects like the ones participating in this study. This section is concluded with a discussion of politeness in Islam. From the various quoted sayings of Prophet Mohammed (Pbuh), we may infer that the concept of face is central to politeness in Islam. Islam promotes the ‘positive face’ of others asking its believers to comply with certain teachings, such as helping the needy, welcoming guests, showing humbleness and modesty in dealing with others, and meeting others with smiling cheerful faces. In addition, Moslems are urged to protect the ‘negative face’ of others by not drawing attention to their mistakes but by finding excuses for others’ unfavored behavior.

Following this section on politeness as a pragmatic phenomenon, I am going to end his chapter with a review of compliment interactions in general and compliment responses in particular. In reviewing related studies carried out on compliment responses, those measuring the effects of variables such as social status, social distance and gender on the frequency of response types will be given special emphasis.

STUDIES ON COMPLIMENT INTERACTIONS

This section consists of a review of important studies on the speech acts of compliments and compliment responses. First, there is a review of Pomerantz’s (1978) concept of the dilemma a compliment respondent encounters and the taxonomy she prepared to categorize the responses she collected. As part of this, she included a self-praise avoidance strategy as a solution to the dilemma of choosing between the
self-praise of Acceptance and the face threat of Rejection. Following this discussion, a number of contrastive cross-cultural studies of compliment interactions in American English and in other English varieties as well as in other languages are reviewed briefly. The effect of the social status and gender on response type frequency is also discussed in a few related studies. This short review includes a discussion of two studies in which Arabic compliment interactions are compared and contrasted to American ones. In one of them, compliments in Egyptian Arabic are compared with compliments in American English. In the other, compliment responses in Syrian Arabic are compared with those in American English.

The act of responding to compliments represents, according to Pomerantz (1978), a dilemma in the sense that the respondent might be accused of self-praise and conceit if he accepts the compliment addressed to him, while rejecting the compliment might be considered as a face threatening act to the complimenter. The safest solution to this problem among native speakers of English, as pointed out by Manes (1983), Herbert and Straight (1989) and Herbert (1990), is to respond with a simple “Thank you” which accepts the compliment without explicitly agreeing with its content.

In her taxonomy of compliment responses (see Table 2.1 below), Pomerantz (1978) identifies a self-praise avoidance strategy which is accomplished by accepting the compliment but avoiding self-praise by either downgrading its value or shifting the reference from oneself to somebody or something else.
Table 2.1: Pomerantz’s (1978) Taxonomy of Compliment Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE TYPE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. ACCEPTANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Appreciation Token</td>
<td>SA: That’s beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB: Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Agreement</td>
<td>SA: Oh, it was just beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB: I thought it was quite nice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. REJECTION</td>
<td>SA: You did a great job cleaning the house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Disagreement</td>
<td>SB: Well, I guess you haven’t seen the kids’ room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. SELF-PRASE AVOIDANCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Praise Downgrade</td>
<td>SA: That’s beautiful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Agreement</td>
<td>SB: Isn’t it pretty?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Disagreement</td>
<td>SA: Good shot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB: Not very, solid though.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Referent Shift</td>
<td>SA: You’re a good rower, Honey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Reassignment</td>
<td>SB: These are very easy to row. Very light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Return</td>
<td>SA: Ya’ sound real nice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB: Yeah, you soun’ real good too.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several other taxonomies of compliment responses have been developed by other pragmatists. For example, Holmes (1988a) developed one based upon three major categories of responses: acceptance, rejection and deflection, whereas the scheme of Nelson et al. (1996) comprises four types: accept, mitigate, reject, and no answer. Also, Herbert (1990) expands Pomerantz’s taxonomy by adding several categories to it. In Chapter Three of this study, I develop my own framework (see Table: 3.1) based mainly on the frameworks of Nelson et al. (1996), Herbert (1990), and Holmes (1988a).
Several cross-cultural studies carried out on the act of compliment response contrast the compliment responses given by native speakers of American English to those given by speakers of other varieties of English as well as speakers of other languages. For example, Americans were found to be less positive in accepting compliments than South Africans in the study carried out by Herbert (1988). That is, in his cross-cultural study on compliment responses, Herbert compared the compliment responses given by American university students to those given by South African university students. Whereas 88% of the South African responses were found to be Agreements, 66% of the American responses were categorized so.

Americans are thought to be more frequent complimenters than many speakers of the other English varieties and other languages. For instance, in their contrastive study of the complimenting behavior of Americans and Egyptians, Nelson et al. (1993) found that an American is complimented as frequent as once every 1.6 days, while an Egyptian is complimented at a frequency rate of once every 8.6 days. Besides, in their contrastive study of the complimenting behavior of Americans and South Africans, Herbert and Straight (1989) found that though Americans were less frequent accepters of compliments than South Africans, they were more frequent compliment givers.

The choice of the compliment response type and strategy are highly affected by the status relationship between the complimenter and the complimentee. Among American English speakers, it was found that when the interlocutors are equals, respondents would rather avoid self-praise in their responses, but when compliments are given by
strangers or higher status complimenters, the safest response would be a simple “thank you” (Wolfson: 1989a).

Both Wolfson (1983) and Holmes (1988a) report that compliments usually take place between status-equal interlocutors. When compliments occur between status unequals, they mainly flow from the higher status person to the lower status one, for he/she is the one who needs the encouragement of his/her superior. In line with this finding, Gajaseni (1994) notes that more compliments are accepted when they are initiated by higher status complimenters than from equal status.

Explaining why fewer compliments are forwarded from lower status to higher status individuals than vice versa, Holmes (1988a) argues that complimenting people of higher status requires special confidence and bravery, for the complimenter is taking the risk of being accused of flattery or being interpreted negatively by the complimentee. Thus, compliments directed at higher status individuals are usually aimed at women than men because they are usually perceived as less intimidating and more receptive (Holmes, 1988b).

Accepting a compliment is the usual response behavior in American culture, whereas rejecting a compliment is the common norm in some South East Asian cultures, such as Japan and China cultures. The outcomes of several cross-cultural studies on compliment responses support the aforementioned generalizations. For instance, Chang (1988) comes to the conclusion that the Chinese tend to reject compliments especially from higher status complimenters. They usually downgrade themselves attributing the credit to someone else’s effort. Chen (1993) conducted a cross-cultural study on how compliment responses were performed by 50 American college students and 50 Chinese college
students. Subjects representing both cultures were given a four-situation questionnaire to complete. Respondents were asked to give as many responses as they thought appropriate. In their responses, American subjects adopted 10 politeness strategies governed by Leech's Agreement Maxim, while the Chinese used 5 strategies motivated by Leech's Modesty Maxim. Then, Chen contrasted the compliment response strategies given by American English speakers with those of Chinese speakers. He found a striking difference between the two cultures. Specifically, 95.73% of the Chinese compliment responses were rejections, whereas only 12.70% of the American respondents rejected the compliments they received. Chen attributes this sizeable difference to the assumption that Americans comply with Leech's (1983) Agreement Maxim which states "maximize agreements between self and others, and minimize disagreements between self and others". On the other hand, the Chinese comply with Leech's Modesty Maxim which reads "minimize praise of self, and maximize dispraise of self." Upon his finding that only Leech's maxims are capable of explaining all the strategies used by subjects of both cultures, Chen implies that it is inappropriate to apply Brown and Levinson's politeness responses. Chen argues that the "face" concept is not applicable to the Chinese compliment interactions because it is Anglo-Saxon biased in its conception. The Chinese conception of politeness is different from that of Europeans and Americans. Westerners see acceptance of compliments as polite behavior, whereas Chinese see rejection of compliment as a mode of behavior that signals humbleness and modesty. The Chinese complimenter would not feel hurt by such a behavior; he would even esteem his interlocutor more.
In my opinion, politeness phenomena vary from one culture to another depending on the social norms of each culture. For example, the Chinese are known for their modesty and oversensitivity to self-praise. Thus, when they reject compliments, they do not mean to be rude and threaten the complimenter's face. They would like to be seen as humble. Besides, they believe that attaining the merit of humility entails not only feeling humble but also behaving humbly. This leads them to reject compliments as a demonstration of their humble behavior that qualifies them to be renowned as humble. Chen points out that the Chinese respondents elevate themselves by following the rejection and self-denigration strategies.

Not only Americans were found to be mainly accepters of compliments, but also 61% of the New Zealanders in Holmes' (1988) study and 71.5% of the Malaysians in David's (1999) study, and 67% of the Syrians in Nelson et al's (1996) study were found to be so too.

In respect to the gender factor, Holmes (1998) argues that men and women perceive compliments differently. While women think of them as means of establishing and strengthening social bonds, men doubt their effectiveness as positive politeness devices; they even see them as face-threatening acts. Thus, it is normal to find that more women than men compliment. In Holmes' (1988b:450) study, it was reported that women gave 67.7% and received 74.3% of all recorded compliments. Women's well recognized positive attitude toward compliments could be one reason for the high female involvement in initiating and receiving compliments. Another possible justification, according to Holmes (1988:451,2), could be the social hierarchy where women occupy subordinate roles. Keeping in mind that the flow of compliments is
usually downward since with a superior providing solidarity to a lower, it is not surprising to find women receiving more compliments than men. The finding that most compliments are initiated by women rather than by men can be explained by the fact that while men perceive complimenting as a “societal politeness” requirement, women consider it as means of expressing friendship and solidarity. As for compliment responses, the findings of Holmes’ (1988b) study indicate a negligible difference between men and women in the acceptance/rejection of compliments. However, she notes that men give more evasive responses than women. They tend to avoid a verbal response altogether by ignoring the compliment or by shifting the focus to other objects.

An example of pragmatic transfer of the complimenting behavior norms in the subjects’ native language to their learned language is found in Azman’s (1986) study which was cited by Holmes (1988a: 504). The researcher analyzed the compliment responses given by Malaysian students studying in New Zealand. The analysis led to the finding that most compliment responses given in English by Indian Malaysian students in New Zealand followed the complimenting behavior patterns used in their mother tongue.

The only cross-cultural study contrasting compliment responses in American English to those in Arabic was Nelson, Al Batal and Echols’ (1996) study in which they compared and contrasted the compliment responses given by American English speaking subjects with those given by Syrian Arabic speaking subjects. The researchers found that both Americans and Syrians were very similar in the choice and frequency of compliment response types. For instance, both groups tended to either accept or mitigate compliments rather than reject them.
Nevertheless, a few differences in responding to compliments were reported between the American and Syrian subjects. For example, Syrians used formulaic expressions which were specific to their culture more often than the Americans did. These observations match with the findings of another contrastive study done by Nelson et al. (1993) where American English compliments were compared with Egyptian Arabic compliments. Both Egyptian and Syrian compliment interactions were found to be longer than American ones in addition to their frequent use of metaphors and formulaic/proverbial expressions. Frequent use of formulaic expressions and repeating the same meaning in several ways are characteristic pragmatic patterns of the Arabic culture. This might be attributed to the fact that Arabs have been fond of eloquence throughout their history. Wolfson (1986) noted that Iranian and Arabic speakers tend to use proverbial and precoded ritualized expressions, whereas Americans rarely used such expressions.

Unfortunately, to date there has been no single specific study on the compliment responses given by native speakers of Saudi Arabic nor on the pragmatic transfer Saudi EFL learners may make in performing speech acts, including responding to compliments in English. That is, there are no studies of compliments or compliment responses in Saudi Arabic as used in everyday interactions are found. Therefore, this study is the first to explore this area. It is hoped that the present cross-cultural study will contribute to the question of whether speech act realization patterns are universal across languages or cultural specific. This study will investigate the types and strategies of compliment responses in American English, Saudi Arabic and the English of Saudi EFL learners. The methodology to be followed in collecting investigation data, the procedures to be carried out in this cross-cultural speech act research,
and the components of the response type categorization scheme to be used in sorting and categorizing the collected compliment responses are the topics of the next chapter.
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CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

This chapter consists of three main parts: Methodological Considerations, Specific Procedures, and Compliment Response Type Categorization Scheme. The first part of this chapter reviews the methodologies that have been used in research into speech acts. It gives an overview of the two main methods used by most researchers in the speech act domain, that is ethnography and elicitation. Then, the Discourse Completion Test (DCT), the most commonly used data elicitation technique, is discussed in detail with emphasis on its advantages and disadvantages as a tool for collecting sociolinguistic data for research purposes. The purpose of the second part of this chapter is to introduce the specific procedures used to collect the data for the study. It covers the three phases of the procedure followed in collecting the data. This includes the observation phase, the DCT administration phase, and the interview phase. The third part of this chapter discusses the four main categories of the Compliment Response Type Categorization Scheme used in sorting and analyzing the data of this study.

3.1 METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Researchers on speech acts have used different methods for data collection. The decision about which method to use usually depends on the specific objectives of the researcher. The investigation of speech act performance has been carried out through both ethnography, which is based on naturalistic observation of everyday life interactions, or
elicitation in which researchers utilize objective instruments to gather data. In the following pages, these two methodological perspectives will be discussed in detail with a special focus on the advantages and disadvantages of each approach. At the end of the discussion of the elicitation approach in general, there is a detailed discussion of the Discourse Completion Test (DCT) as the most common elicitation technique used in speech act studies. It is worth noting that the methodologies discussed in this section are the ones usually used in this type of research, but not the actual methodology used in my study. The actual procedures used in my study are discussed in the next section.

3.1.1 Ethnography

Ethnographic data are data observed and collected naturally as they occur in real life interactions. Hymes' (1962, 1974) work on the ethnography of speaking was one of the early studies that utilized the natural inquiry of data. Wolfson (1981, 1983) has been the main advocate of the ethnographic approach in speech act pragmatics research. Using an ethnographic method to investigate compliments in American English, Wolfson (1983: 95) notes "...ethnographic field work is the only reliable method of collecting data about the way speech acts function in interaction". She justifies her preference for the observational method over other methods by saying that it is the only way in which we can capture the true intention and meaning of people's speech. Wolfson (1989a) points out that ethnographic study aims to uncover the speaker's unconscious cultural knowledge which relates the interpretation of old reaction to experiences. She adds that a speaker and a hearer not only share cultural knowledge but also use it to construct a social and communicative environment as they speak and respond to one another.
Ethnographic data are taken directly from real interactions observed by researchers or their assistants, or from interactions in which the researcher is a participant. To record data, researchers use notebooks, tape recorders, or videotapes, or a combination of these means. Beebe & Cummings (1985) argue that such an approach reflects the actual use of language even when the subjects are not aware of their own behaviors. In addition, during the process of collecting and analyzing ethnographic data, new ideas and hypotheses can be developed (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991).

Another advantage of this method is that it enables the researcher to sample as large a variety of speech situations as possible. It also enables him to observe interactions where speakers and addressees represent both sexes drawn from various ages and backgrounds.

A good number of speech act theorists have used the ethnographic method in collecting data. The list includes Pomerantz (1978) in her study of compliment responses; Manes and Wolfson (1981) for compliments in American English; Wolfson, Reisner and Huber (1983) for invitations in American English; Blum-Kulka, Danet and Gherson (1985) for requests in Hebrew; Holmes (1988a) for compliments in New Zealand English; and Holmes (1990) for apologies in New Zealand English.

The ethnographic method of data collection, on the other hand, has its disadvantages. For one thing, certain types of speech acts may not occur frequently enough to allow researchers adequate instances of observation over a reasonable period of time. It is not always easy to be in the right place at the right time. Since not all speech acts occur with equal frequency in real life situations, naturalistic data may not provide enough systematic data about the speech act in question. In addition, a
and relatives, being biased by short exchanges and being biased to exchanges that are specially atypical, or non-native sounding.

Despite all the aforementioned shortcomings of ethnographic data, they still have the potential to provide information that help in understanding the behaviors as well as the physical, social and psychological backgrounds of the people involved. Ethnographic data can provide researchers with rich insights through first-hand experience between the subjects and researchers.

3.1.2 Elicitation

The second main methodological technique used in collecting speech act data is elicitation. Researchers on speech acts utilize specially designed instruments in both oral and written forms such as closed and open role-plays, multiple choice questionnaires, and discourse completion tests (DCT) to elicit the data they need.

When the aim of the research is to obtain dialogues which are as spontaneous and natural as possible, data can be elicited through role plays. This method of data collection was used by Trosborg (1987) in her study of apology strategies.

The role-play technique was used in eliciting data by Rintell (1979) who studied aspects of the communicative competence of second language learners, namely, their language variations with respect to deference when the age and sex of the addressee are systematically manipulated. Also, House and Kasper (1981) followed this approach in their study of politeness markers in English and German.

The role-play method has some drawbacks. First, it may be difficult for the person who constructs the roles to imagine all the social situations in which the intended speech act is expected to appear. Even
if he is able to do so, it will consume a large amount of time to write them down and the participants to act them out. Second, we can not expect all subjects to be aware of the assumed social setting or to know what one might say in such situations. Third, the data elicited may not be as natural and spontaneous as the data extracted from everyday interactions.

Another method used to elicit data for speech act analysis is role enactment. This method is in all ways similar to role-plays except that the subjects here have to perform roles that are part of their normal life or personality. This means that the subjects are not expected to imagine themselves as other people or to act roles which they have never experienced or which they may never go through.

I think the role enactment method is very advantageous, for the enactments have to be tailor-made for the participants, or, at least, contain problems and characters which are familiar to those involved. This facilitates the process for learners of a foreign language considerably, especially if they are not used to performing in this kind of situation.

A third method of eliciting data to be used in speech act analysis is the use of videotape/cassette recordings. Videotape recordings can best be used when the setting of the interaction is limited with respect to interaction as, for example, in the studies of classroom interactions, or in studies of doctor-patient communications, and so on. Griffin and Mehan (1981) followed this method when they studied sense and ritual in classroom discourse. Also, Holmes (1984) used a videotaped natural dinner conversation to study explicit-implicit address forms.

Videotape and cassette recordings may accompany the other two methods, that is, role plays and role enactment. House and Kasper
(1981) taped all the conversations that were elicited by role-plays. The subjects in Trosborg study (1987) were also videotaped in dyadic face-to-face conversation lasting approximately five minutes. One limitation of this approach is that if the subjects are aware that they are being observed, this may inhibit their ability to provide data which is as natural and spontaneous as everyday interactions.

3.1.3 **Discourse Completion Tests (DCTs)**

One of the most widely used elicitation techniques is the discourse completion test (DCT). DCTs are written questionnaires that present brief descriptions of given situations followed by incomplete short dialogues. Situations usually specify the setting, the social distance between interlocutors and their status relative to each other in addition to other variables such as age, familiarity and sex for both the speaker and the addressee (Blum-Kulka, et al. 1989). Subjects are asked to read the situations and complete the dialogues by writing down the responses that are relevant to the speech act in question.

Blum-Kulka (1982) was the first advocate of this procedure when she used it to investigate how requests are performed by English native speakers and learners of Hebrew. The same DCT design used by Blum-Kulka (1982) was then utilized in the CCSARP (Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project) to collect cross-linguistic data on selected speech acts.

Though the DCT was described by Bilmyer and Varghese (2000) as the most convenient and dependable tool used in collecting sociolinguistic data, it has been criticized on the ground of its artificial nature and the fact that data collected using this procedure may not reflect actual speech behavior. Moreover, in all studies derived from the
CCSARP, researchers employing DCT restrict their respondents to one-sentence utterances in their performance of speech acts. Bonikowska (1988), for example, strongly attacked the DCT procedures used in the CCSARP for restricting their respondents to one-sentence utterances and to responding to situations. That is, the DCT design did not allow respondent to "opt out", thereby contradicting real life language use where people have the option to respond or to remain silent.

In terms of the construction of DCT, researchers involved in the CCSARP as well as others who have used the same method did not explicitly mention procedures for selecting their DCT situations other than to say that the situations "reflect everyday occurrences of the type expected to be familiar to speakers across Western cultures specifically the student population tested" (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989:14). Methodologically, however, this is not enough to ensure the authenticity of the DCT situations for speech act studies. That is, authenticity of the DCT situations should be validated not only from the researcher's own perspective (as in the case of the CCSARP) but also from the respondents' point of view. This can be done only if the researcher interviews the participants with regard to the authenticity of the DCTs used. Besides, in order for the DCTs to be authentic they must be designed and further developed based on naturalistic data obtained via observation.

Despite all its limitations, the DCT procedure is a very useful method of investigating speech acts across languages and cultures. It has certain advantages over the naturalistic observational method. As Wolfson (1986b:70), acknowledges, "one great advantage of this type of data collection is that it permits the researcher to control for specific variables of the situation, thus giving a coherence to the findings which
may be very difficult to achieve otherwise”. In other words, by using the DCT procedure, the researcher can easily control and test the effect of social status, social distance, gender, etc. of the participants in a given speech context by including such variables in the description of the situations, thus leading the subjects to take this factor into account in their responses. Such control of variables cannot be obtained by naturalistic observation.

DCTs also allow subjects enough time to prepare more organized responses than those collected by interviews. As noted by Eisentein and Bodman (1986), nonnative speakers often become nervous when tested orally. Thus, these researchers suggest that a written method of data collection such as DCTs eliminates that element of anxiety and may therefore reflect more closely what the nonnative speaker would produce in a normal interaction.

Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1993) compared the data collected by DCTs to those collected by open questionnaires and found that the number of semantic formulas was bigger in DCT responses than those given by open questionnaires. That is, the DCT with the first utterance given provides longer responses than open questionnaires where the first utterance is not given.

As cited by Hinkel (1997), DCTs have been employed as elicitation instruments in studies for comparative analyses of NS and NNS sociopragmatic behaviors (Blum-Kulka 1989; Kasper 1989; Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford 1993; Bergman and Kasper 1993) because they allow a researcher to collect data quickly and classify speech act realizations (Wolfson, Marmor, and Jones, 1989). Finally, another advantage of DCTs is that they allow researchers to collect a considerable amount of data of a given speech act behavior within a relatively short time and to
create initial classifications of semantic formulas for the speech act in question.

In sum, neither elicitation (including DCT) nor observation procedures used in speech act pragmatic research are immune to criticism. Each has its own advantages as well as disadvantages. Therefore, I strongly believe that the complexity of speech act realization requires a multi-method approach of investigation. This approach should include both observation and elicitation procedures. Such an approach is employed in this study.

3.2 SPECIFIC PROCEDURES

3.2.1 Introduction

I ended the previous section with a statement stressing the need for a multi-method approach to the study of speech act realization patterns. This is backed up by Wolfson et al (1989: 194) who state that "research into human behavior is notoriously "squishy" and requires multiple approaches in order to reach a level of validity which will give our analyses both predictive power and generalizability". A call for multiplicity in research approaches has been echoed by other scholars in the field of speech act pragmatics such as Cohen and Olshtain (1994) and Cohen (1996a).

According to Wolfson (1981), ethnographic fieldwork is the only reliable method of collecting data on how speech acts function in interaction. Ideally, all data should come from 'natural' conditions. This is true when the researcher is investigating how a speech community uses language in general. In this study, however, I am interested in getting a large sample of one specific speech act (compliment response) as used by culturally and linguistically diverse
groups. Furthermore, I am investigating compliment responses among these groups under the same conditions. This would be virtually impossible to accomplish under field conditions.

I do agree with other researchers that any research dealing with speech act behaviors should at least begin with a collection of the speech act as used in natural situations. Such data are useful in leading the researcher toward generating hypotheses about speech act behavior. Based on the collected naturalistic data and the insights obtained from them, a controlled elicitation instrument, such as a DCT, can be designed. Such an instrument must be used in order to limit the numerous variables which will be present in a natural context (Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986). Otherwise, a systematic analysis of the obtained data will be impossible, especially for comparison purposes. Olshtain and Blum-Kulka (1985) have the same idea when they stated that the DCT provides the researcher with a means of controlling for various variables and thus establishing statistically which variables are particularly significant intralinguistically as well as cross-culturally. When a DCT is developed from data collected by natural observation, it can be very effective. That is, the social and pragmatic variables can be manipulated systematically in order to isolate their specific impact. Moreover, as pointed out by Olshtain (1993), DCTs can be administered to a large number of people enabling the researcher to work with frequencies of realization patterns and their relation to the manipulated variables.

Following these recommendations, the design of this study employs descriptive research techniques: naturalistic structured observation, structured interviews, and an elicitation controlled instrument, namely a written discourse completion test (DCT). Such a
design will help qualitatively as well as quantitatively to answer the researcher questions proposed in this study by capturing the complexity of the pragmatics of the speech act compliment response as it is realized and performed by three culturally and linguistically diverse groups of subjects. Last but not least, the interviews in which the subjects interacted with the interviewer as freely and spontaneously as possible, are meant to offset the possible limitations of the written responses given in the DCTs as well as to validate any results based on their contents.

To sum up, the data collection process was divided into three different phases: the naturalistic phase (observation), the DCT phase and the interview phase. The data collection process began in January, 2000 and ended in August of the same year.

3.2.2 The Observation Phase

Similar to the study of Eisentein and Bodman (1986) on gratitude, a structured-observation method using field-notes was used throughout the naturalistic phase of this study. Wolfson (1989a) recommends that ethnographic data collectors should go out into the community to public places which are frequented by people of different ages, occupations and socio-economic levels to make sure that a relationship between these collectors and participants has not been established. She contends that such places provide rich sources of speech behavior. In line with this recommendation, I made a good number of visits to such places for several weeks. I intended to be present at ARAMCO cafeterias, clinics, snack bars, sport courts, swimming pools, commissaries, libraries, bus-stops, parks, beaches, teachers' and trainees' lounges as frequently as possible during the observational data collection process which took
place during the first three months of the year 2000. Being an unobtrusive observer (overhearing compliment interactions occurring nearby), I was able to collect data which was drawn from casual interactions held in public. I was specifically looking for situations in which compliment/compliment response interactions were likely to occur. The ultimate outcome of these compliment/compliment response interaction hunting errands was a total of 30 samples, 10 compliment/compliment response interactions from the sector each group belongs to.

Data collected throughout this phase helped me to identify situations and various contextual variables in real life interactions which bring about the use of the particular speech act being investigated (compliment responses). This early investigation served as a basis for the development of the scenarios used in the DCT. That is, the collected data of this early phase of the research fed into the later phase. They had a guiding role in the design and wording of the DCT items.

3.2.3 The Discourse Completion Test (DCT) Phase: Development and Administration of the DCT.

Using the data I collected from the naturalistic phase, I then designed 16 different situations (see Appendices I & II) which elicit spontaneous compliment responses from respondents. The first ten situations were constructed to investigate the social status variable. Compliments in situations 1-4 are issued by complimenters of high social status to recipients of low social status. Thus, the compliment response will flow from Low (L) status to High (H) status. Compliments in situations 5-8 are issued by complimenters of low social status to recipients of high social status. That is, the compliment response will
flow from High (H) status to Low (L) status. The characters chosen to represent a person of high social status included a boss at work, a coach of a club soccer team, a college dean, a department store manager, a company division superintendent, a university professor, a surgeon, and a company unit supervisor. Low status characters were represented by a soccer player, a university student, a store clerk, a secretary, and a patient. Compliments and compliment responses in situations 9 & 10 are interchanged between friends. Thus, the compliment response will flow horizontally between colleagues and peers, that is, between two persons of equal social status.

The situations 9-16 were constructed to investigate the social distance variable. In situations 9-12, compliment interactions are interchanged between people of close social relationships. Close social relationships are represented by those between friends (9, 10) and relatives (11, 12). In situations 13-16, compliment interactions take place between people of distant social distance, that is, between strangers who have never met before.

The DCT was designed in two alternates, Alternate A and Alternate B (See Appendices I & II) in order to facilitate investigating the gender variable. In each alternate, the complimenter in eight situations are given by males, while compliments in the other eight situations are issued by females. The distribution of males and females in both alternates was done randomly; however, it was taken into consideration that in each alternate there are 4 female-female (F-F) interactions, 4 female-male (F-M) interactions, 4 male-male (M-M) interactions, and 4 male-female (M-F) interactions.

The first version of the DCT consisted of 20 situations. This version was piloted in order to determine whether it reflected authentic
real life situations and whether the situations included were clear and comprehensive. It was distributed to fifteen persons representing the three groups of subjects who were asked to compete it, and their responses were analyzed to determine items of difficulty and vagueness. Also, it was helpful in deciding how much time it would take the subjects to complete the DCTs. Participants in the pilot study were encouraged to make suggestions and comments to improve the authenticity as well as the clarity of the DCT items. Based on the suggestions made by some participants as well as on the valuable advice offered by the researcher's adviser, the DCT was shortened to 16 situations and the wording of few items was amended to make them more comprehensive.

The modified version of the English DCT was then translated into Arabic by the researcher, who is a native speaker of Arabic. For accuracy of translation, the Arabic version of the DCT was checked and translated back to English by two highly qualified translators at the ARAMCO Translation Unit. The original English version written by the researcher was compared with the versions translated by the two professional translators and few modifications were made in the original. Cultural as well as linguistic appropriateness were major concerns when checking the Arabic version of the DCT. Fortunately, since the DCT situations were carefully designed to fit easily in both cultures, the translation went smoothly, which in turn produced identical DCTs in two different languages (see Appendices III & IV).

As soon as both Arabic and English versions of the DCT had been finalized, the actual administration of the DCT began. The Arabic version was distributed to 50 native speakers of Saudi Arabic, 25 males and 25 females. All of them were ARAMCO employees working in
various departments, such as Accounting, Education, Medical, Purchasing, Training and so on. The researcher visited the subjects in their offices, got the consent of each participant, explained the DCT objective and procedure to each one, set the time (40 minutes) needed for the completion of the DCT, and instructed the participants where to submit the completed DCTs, at the information desk near the entrance of Administration Building. To keep balance in the gender variable, an equal number of Alternate A and Alternate B (25 of each) were distributed to the Saudi males and females respectively.

Fifty copies of the English version (25 Alternate A and 25 Alternate B) were distributed to 50 native speakers of American English, 25 males and 25 females respectively. All the American subjects were expatriate ARAMCO employees working in the same aforementioned departments the Saudi subjects belonged to. Similar to the procedure followed with the Saudi group, the researcher visited the American subjects in their offices, got their approval to participate, explained the objectives and procedures of DCT, set the test time (40 minutes), and instructed the participants to hand in their completed DCTs at the information desk near the entrance of Administration Building, where the researcher would be waiting to collect them.

After obtaining the approval of the Superintendent of the ARAMCO Central Academic Training Department (see Appendix V) to conduct research on 50 trainees enrolled at the training centers belonging to his department, the researcher coordinated the administration procedures of the DCTs on 25 male trainees in the terminal EFL course with the Principal and English Senior Teacher of the College Preparatory Center (CPC) in Dhahran. Similarly, the researcher coordinated the administration procedures of the DCTs on 25
female trainees in the terminal EFL course with the Principal and English Senior Teacher of the Special Training center (STC) in Dhahran (see Appendix VI). Accompanied by the English Senior Teachers in both centers, the researcher explained the DCT objectives and procedures to all participating trainees. One study hall class period (40 minutes) was utilized to complete the DCTs in both CPC and STC. Upon their completion, the DCTs were handed in to the researcher by the English Senior Teacher in each center. Fifty copies of the DCT English version (25 Alternate A and 25 Alternate B) were completed by the Saudi EFL learners in both centers. At a later stage, the compliment responses given by the subjects of each group were transferred to and typed up in a separate handy book to facilitate their analysis.

3.2.4 The Interview Phase

As cited by Cohen & Manion (1994), Cannell and Khan (1968) define an interview as “a two-person conversation initiated by the interviewer for the specific purpose of obtaining research - relevant information, and focused by him on content specified by research objectives of systematic description, prediction, or explanation”. Cohen & Manion (1994) add that the interview may serve three purposes: a principal means of collecting data directed by research objectives, a device to test given hypotheses or suggest new ones, and a supplementary tool to validate the results given by other research methods. The final purpose is identified by Cohen and Manion (1994). It is used to validate the results obtained by the analysis of the DCT data. There are four types of interview used as research tools: the structured interview, the unstructured interview, the non-directive interview, and the focused interview. The structured interview which
the researcher used in this study is one in which the content and procedures are prepared and organized in advance. That is, the interviewer has little freedom to modify the structure or content of the interview during the actual interview.

In addition to the use of naturalistic observation and DCTs, structured interviews are adopted in this study in order to minimize the researcher's bias in interpreting the data (Grotjahan, 1987). According to Berg (1995), an interview is an effective method of collecting information for certain types of assumptions, particularly when investigators are interested in understanding the perceptions of participants and learning how participants come to attach certain meanings to phenomena or events.

Thirty participants where chosen from the three sectors represented by the three groups. None of these participants had taken part in the DCT. Five males and five females from each sector were interviewed, and all thirty informants agreed to the interviews been audiotaped. The interviews were very casual. A good rapport was first established with the interviewees. At the beginning of the interview, I thanked the participants for their time and assured them of anonymity and confidentiality. Each interviewee was given a copy of the interview questions to read for a couple of minutes. This was to make sure the questions were comprehensible, as well as to put the interviewee at ease before the recording started.

The interview consisted of 5 main questions (see Appendix VII). The first two questions were about the job and the educational level of the interviewee. The next three questions were about the last compliment response the interviewee had given, the last compliment response the interviewee had received, and the last compliment response the interviewee had observed. Each one of the last three main
questions was followed by three secondary questions about the gender and the job of the other interlocutor and the type of relationship the two interlocutors had.

There were of course two versions of the interview questions, the English version and Arabic translation (see Appendix VIII). The Arabic version was used for interviewing the 10 Native Speakers of Saudi Arabic, the English version was used in interviewing the 10 participants of the Native Speakers of American English group as well as the 10 participants of the Saudi EFL Learners. The interviews of each group were recorded on a separate cassette. At a later stage, a transcript was made of each interview.

Upon transferring the DCT and interview responses of each group into a well-organized typed book\(^1\), the researcher started preparing the compliment response categorization scheme to be utilized in categorizing and analyzing the accumulated data. This scheme is the subject of the next section.

### 3.3 COMPLIMENT RESPONSE TYPE CATEGORIZATION SCHEME

Having completed a thorough study of the accumulated data, I considered categorizing them according to some of the well known taxonomies designed by prominent researchers of compliment interactions, such as Pomerantz (1978), Holmes (1989), and Nelson et al (1996). However none of those schemes was able to cover all the responses given by the subjects of this study. Therefore, I prepared my own compliment response categorization scheme (see Table 3.1 on next page). I was, however, influenced by the general frames of the three above-mentioned taxonomies. The scheme prepared comprises two

---

\(^1\) The transcripts are too bulky to be provided as appendixes.
main columns, the one on the left is for the response type and the one on the right is for an example corresponding to the type. All the examples used in the scheme are taken from the data in this study. The categorization scheme consists of four main response categories and each one of them comprises some subtypes as follows: I. Acceptance Category has the following subtypes: a. Bald Acceptance b. Agreement c. Appreciation, d. Formulaic Acceptance e. Concern f. Job Commitment g. Duty h. Return. II. Deflection Category has the following subtypes: a. Shift Credit b. Doubting c. Joking d. Evasion. III. Rejection Category has the following subtypes: a. Scaledown b. Disagreement. IV. No Answer.

The credibility of the scheme was tested by asking a Native American English teacher, a native Saudi Arabic teacher, and a bilingual Arabic/English teacher teaching English to Saudi EFL learners to categorize sample data from the corpus of the three language groups: Native speakers of American English, native speakers of Saudi Arabic, and Saudi EFL learners. The categorizations made by the three aforementioned teachers were compared with the ones made by the researcher. The reliability percentages were as follows: Speakers of American English data 92.35%, Speakers of Saudi Arabic data 94.8%, and the Saudi EFL learners data 96.3%. However, it should be highlighted that there is no scheme that can be described as infallible. Thus, I would claim that this scheme is appropriate for categorizing the data of this study, but it is still far from perfection. Moreover, the suggested categorizations are not entirely fixed. That is, one response might fall under more than one category. For example, "Do you really think so?" might be categorized as 'Doubting' or 'Formulaic Acceptance', depending on the context it is used in and the relationship between the two interlocutors.
### TABLE 3.1: COMPLIMENT RESPONSE TYPE CATEGORIZATION SCHEME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE TYPE</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. ACCEPTANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Bald Acceptance</td>
<td>1C: Your article is impressive. You have a promising future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R: I put a lot of effort into that paper and it paid off.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Agreement</td>
<td>C: You are very fair. You always reward hard workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R: You are correct. I try hard to be fair.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Appreciation</td>
<td>C: Your article is impressive. You have a promising future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R: Thank you. I appreciate your compliment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Formulaic Acceptance</td>
<td>C: Oh! You look great. You have become incredibly fit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R: Don't envy me. May God protect me from your evil eye.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Concern</td>
<td>C: The food is really delicious. You are a good cook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R: I'm glad you like my cooking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Job Commitment</td>
<td>C: You've done a splendid job. I've never seen anybody more efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R: Just doing my job.</td>
<td>than you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Duty</td>
<td>C: God bless you. You're such an honest kind-hearted fellow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R: I have behaved in accordance with the teachings of our religion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R: You look fit too.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. DEFLECTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Shift Credit</td>
<td>C: I'm proud of your excellence. You set a good model for your brothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R: The credit is due to God and to the good way you and my father followed in raising us.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Doubting</td>
<td>C: It's so beautiful. You look attractive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R: Do you really think so?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Joking</td>
<td>C: The food is really delicious. You are a good cook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R: Yes, because the cockroaches added this special flavor to the food.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Evasion</td>
<td>C: It's so beautiful. You look attractive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R: So, would you marry me?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. REJECTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Scaledown</td>
<td>C: God bless you. You're such an honest kind-hearted fellow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R: It's not big deal. I just returned something that doesn't belong to me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Disagreement</td>
<td>C: That's nice of you. You would make a great tourist guide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2R: No, I would rather be a doctor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. NO ANSWER</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 C = Complimenter
2 R = Respondent
While sorting the collected responses, the researcher found out that only 36.87% of the given responses were single responses whereas the rest (63.12%) were compound ones (see Table 3.2). By a compound response, I mean the combination of two or more responses. That is, a respondent gives a compound response combining two response types such as Appreciation and Shift Credit. For example, he may respond to somebody complimenting his new sweater, “Thanks a lot, but my wife was the one who gave it to me on my birthday”. To make it easier for statistical purposes, the researcher decided to give all responses, whether single or part of compound responses, equal weight. That is, a compound response with two parts is calculated as two responses, and so on. As a result, the number of the collected responses totaled 3838 instead of the accrued 2400 responses.

TABLE 3.2: Distribution of Single and Compound Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Group</th>
<th>Single Response</th>
<th>Compound Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Saudis</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>37.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>35.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi EFL Learners</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>37.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>36.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These 3838 responses were sorted and categorized according to the categorization scheme in Table 3.1. The four main categories of this scheme and their subtypes were ordered according to a continuum of compliment response categories based on the concept of Direct Acceptance versus Direct Rejection which is based mainly on the concept utilized by Gajaseni (1994). Each response category or subtype is placed on the continuum according to how far or close it is from the Direct Acceptance or Direct Rejection ends of the continuum (see Figure 3.1).
FIGURE 3.1: Continuum of Compliment Response Categories

| Direct Acceptance                        | Direct Rejection
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCEPTANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bald Acceptance</td>
<td>e.g. You’re not the first and won’t be the last to complement it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>e.g. You are correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>e.g. Thank you for your compliment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulaic Acceptance</td>
<td>e.g. It’s due to your lovely eyes that see everything nice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>e.g. I’m glad you liked it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Commitment</td>
<td>e.g. I have to do a job I’m paid for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>e.g. Our Prophet has instructed us to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return</td>
<td>e.g. Your haircut looks nice too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEFLECTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift Credit</td>
<td>e.g. The credit goes to the coach and my teammates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubting</td>
<td>e.g. I am afraid you exaggerate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joking</td>
<td>e.g. It seems you need to change your eyeglasses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evasion</td>
<td>e.g. How about going to a movie?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REJECTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaledown</td>
<td>e.g. It’s made of cheap material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreement</td>
<td>e.g. No, I don’t think so.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following pages, each one of the compliment response categories and types shown in Table 3.1 and Figure 3.1 is discussed briefly with regard to its surface meaning as well as its underlying meaning, location on the Direct Acceptance versus Direct Rejection continuum, and how it is related to common politeness maxims and principles. This overview discussion of the components of the categorization scheme adopted in this study paves the way for the discussion of the results and analysis of response types given by the
three language groups in the next two chapters. That is, it will familiarize the reader with the various response types that have been chosen. I think it is important to provide this information in the present chapter as the analysis of the data is dependent on the categorization scheme.

3.3.1 ACCEPTANCE

The Acceptance category of this scheme comprises eight subtypes. Two of them, Bald Acceptance and Agreement, are direct Acceptance responses; the other six are considered indirect ones. All Acceptance responses are placed on the top end of the continuum and match with Leech's Agreement Maxim one way or another. The two direct Acceptance responses violate Pomerantz's (1978) principle of self-praise avoidance, whereas the indirect ones avoid self-praise and face-damaging rejection at the same time.

A. Bald Acceptance

This is the most direct Acceptance response type, and thus it is placed on the top of the continuum. The respondent using this type of response is accepting the compliment without any reservation, maneuvering, or deflection. He does not only accept the compliment but also boasts about his capabilities as exemplified in this response given in response to situation six of the DCT.

Example 3.1: One of your students is appreciative of the remarks and comments you've made throughout his research.

C: You have been so helpful. I wouldn't have been able to make it without your assistance.
R: I know I am very smart.
The respondent exaggerates in praising himself on the surface of his response, but by making fun of himself he implies that he doubts his praise worthiness. In this sense, it can be interpreted as a joking or disagreement response which indicates that there are no fixed borders separating the response types of the categorization scheme. In addition, it indicates how difficult it is to categorize some responses because they are sometimes located on the borderlines of two or more categories. In such cases, the definite categorization of the response is possible only after knowing some important contextual details, such as intonational features and the relationship between the two interlocutors.

B. Agreement

This is the second response type in the Acceptance category. In this type, the respondent simply agrees with the content of the compliment, repeats it making only a little change in its wording, or just approves it by saying that the compliment is right or correct. Herbert (1988:12) comments on this saying that when the respondent is giving an agreement response it is usually semantically fitted into the compliment. This type of response is placed next to bald acceptance on the continuum because both of them represent direct acceptance responses. The only distinguishing difference between the two is that a bald accepter usually brags about something he has or does, whereas an agreement-respondent just accepts the content of the compliment objectively. Responding with an agreement saves the complimenters face, and thus is consistent with Leech’s Agreement Maxim and Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness theory. However, by using an agreement response, the respondent violates Pomerantz’s (1978) principle of avoiding self-praise
C. Appreciation

This response type is usually expressed by some appreciation token, such as 'thanks', 'thank you very much', and 'I appreciate it'. It usually comes as an initial part of the compound response and it is normally followed by a return, shift credit, or scaledown response. In this type, the respondent accepts the compliment indirectly. By thanking the complimenter for what he said, the respondent is implying his agreement with the content of the compliment but avoiding the embarrassment of self-praise at the same time. It is placed next to bald acceptance and agreement on the continuum, and thus it is located on the border of direct and indirect acceptance responses. It can be explained by Leech’s Maxim of Approbation because the appreciative respondent pleases the complimenter and saves the complimenter’s face by expressing appreciation and gratitude for what was said. This matches with Leech’s Approbation Maxim which is based on minimizing dispraise and maximizing praise to your interlocutor.

D. Formulaic Acceptance

This type of response comprises the formulaic or ritualistic responses which are frequently repeated patterns of everyday talk. Such responses should not be interpreted as literal meanings but according to their functions that are familiar to most members of a community. Under this type comes the use of proverbs and idioms as responses to corresponding compliments. That is, the respondent does not accept the compliment directly but gives a common saying or expression that is
applicable to the situation and is taken as an indirect acceptance response to the compliment. By doing so, the respondent, as in the case of appreciation, is trying to avoid both self-praise and rejection. The respondent is able to achieve this goal by attributing the complimented object or behavior to the complimenter’s sharp sense of noticing, good manners, or good taste and by shifting the focus of the interaction to anything other than himself. This is illustrated in the following formulaic response given in response to the compliment of situation five in the DCT. In this interaction, the complimenter is complimenting his interlocutor on his elegance upon wearing a new suit.

Example 3.2: C: You look so elegant today!
R: halaalak. Maa taghlaa galayk.
[You can have it. It’s not too much for you.]

As we have seen, the respondent shifted the focus of the compliment from himself to the complimenter by offering him his new suit. Of course this is not a realistic offer, it is just one of the formulaic acceptance responses said in such a situation to dilute the concentration of the compliment and thus to achieve the objective of avoiding both self-praise and compliment rejection. That is, the respondent does not expect the complimenter to take the offered object; he just intends to be polite. Offering the complimented object to the complimenter can be explained by Leech’s Tact Maxim which is based on maximizing benefit to others.

Another tactic that a user of a formulaic acceptance response utilizes to shift the focus of the compliment from himself is expressing fear from the complimenter’s ‘evil eye’. In some Mideastern cultures such as Arabic and Hebrew, there is a common belief that the complimented person or object can be harmed if viewed with envy, with
an evil eye. The evil eye is acknowledged, if not feared, by most Arabs though to a less extent by the highly educated. Islam has acknowledged and confirmed the existence of the evil eye which has pre-Islamic roots. Prophet Mohammed - Pbuh - warned his followers of envy, “Avoid envy, for envy devours the good deeds as fire devours fire wood”. The harm of the evil eye can be offset by offering blessings and statements of good will, such as Allaah yihfazu [May God protect him] or maa shaa Allaah [What God has willed]. Here is a response given in return to the compliment of the DCT’s situation ten that exemplifies the use of Formulaic Acceptance.

Example 3.3: You have come across a friend you haven’t seen for the last two years. He is impressed by your fitness.

C: Oh! You look great. You’ve become incredibly fit.
R: gaynak galaya baardah [May your evil eye be cool on me].

Since he expresses fear of being envied, the respondent gives an implied approval that his complimented thing or behavior is praiseworthy. Therefore, the fear of evil eye can be explained by Leech’s Agreement Maxim. The complimenter’s face is not threatened by the seeming accusation of being envious because it is not taken literally. Besides, the complimenter is not held accountable for his thought-to-be evil eye, for it is something out of his hand in case it exists.

E. Concern
In this type of response, the respondent usually expresses his gladness that the complimenter likes his complimented object or behavior. By doing so, the respondent is implying his indirect
agreement with the content of the compliment in addition to the explicitly expressed concern about the complimenter’s opinion of the complimented thing or behavior. The underlying agreement with the compliment this response type implies is confirmed by Brown and Levinson (1987) who consider ‘concern’ a case in which agreement is assumed rather than expressed. Chen (1993) points out that expressing gladness establishes a common ground between the two interlocutors, and thus demolishes any potential threat to complimenter’s face. That is, it can be explained by Leech’s Agreement Maxim which is based on maximizing agreement and minimizing disagreement between self and others.

F. **Job Commitment**

This is another Acceptance response in which the respondent neither rejects the compliment, nor does he accept it directly. He accepts it indirectly by saying that he has just fulfilled a commitment towards a job he is paid for. However, the underlying message reads: Yes, I agree with you that what I have done is praiseworthy, but there is no need to compliment me for a well done job I am hired to do. Since this type of response belongs to the Acceptance category and implies an underlying agreement with the complimenter, it can be explained by Leech’s maxim of Agreement.

G. **Duty**

This is another indirect acceptance strategy in which the respondent usually says that he has done the complimented behavior because it is his duty. Thus, he indirectly admits that his complimented behavior is praiseworthy, but he implies that there is no need for him to
be complimented because he has just done a duty he is supposed to do. This duty might be religious, social, humane, professional, etc. By attributing the reason for doing the complimented behavior to being sincere to duty obligations, the respondent shifts the focus of the interaction from himself to the reason standing behind his complimented behavior, and thus he avoids self-praise. This is an indirect acceptance response, which can be explained by Leech’s Agreement Maxim. To illustrate how this type of response is used, let us look at this response given in response to the compliment in Situation 14 of the DCT.

**Example 3.4:** You have just returned a lost wallet with some money and credit cards you found in a public park to a middle-aged stranger.

C: God bless you. You’re such an honest kind-hearted fellow.
R: haathaa waajibii. haathaa maa yumliihi galaya damiiiri waa diinii [This is my duty. This is what my conscience and religion dictate on me.]

**H. Return**

In this type of response which was identified as ‘return compliment’ by Holmes (1988a), the respondent directs an equal or even a better compliment to the complimenter in an attempt to shift the focus from himself to his interlocutor, and thus to avoid self-praise. Therefore, it can be explained by Pomerantz’s (1978) principle of self-praise avoidance. Also, it matches with Leech’s Agreement Maxim because the underlying message of the return response reads: Yes, I agree with you that my complimented object or behavior is praiseworthy but yours is equally good or even better than mine. By returning the
compliment, the respondent establishes an atmosphere of equal relationship and rapport between interlocutors. In this sense, the respondent is expressing his regard for the complimenter’s positive face as predicted in Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness principle.

3.3.2 DEFLECTION

This category consists of the following four subtypes: Shift Credit, Doubting, Joking, and Evasion. The four of them are located near the center of the continuum between the Acceptance and Rejection ends of the continuum. The respondent finds in this category a solution to the dilemma of choosing between self-praise and rejection which was first highlighted by Pomerantz (1978). In the Deflection category, the respondent neither accepts nor rejects the compliment. He shifts the focus of the compliment from himself by following one of these tactics: attributing the credit of the complimented behavior to some agent other than himself, questioning the truthfulness and praiseworthiness of the complimented object or behavior, giving a funny response that deflates the seriousness of the compliment, or ignoring the compliment and introducing an unrelated topic.

A. Shift Credit

I am in total agreement with the views of Pomerantz (1978), Holmes (1988a), Herbert (1989), Chen (1993), Gajaseni (1994) that this strategy represents a nice solution to the conflict of being cooperative while adhering to Leech’s Modesty Maxim. In other words, the respondent indicates that the complimented object is worth praising, but at the same time avoids the trap of self-praise by attributing the credit to
somebody else. That is, this type of response represents a compromise between Leech’s Maxims of Agreement and Modesty.

B. Doubting

This is another deflective strategy in which the respondent neither accepts nor rejects the compliment. Instead, he raises doubts about its truthfulness and praiseworthiness. According to Chen (1993), doubting is located in the middle of a continuum whose poles are full agreement with the compliment and self-praise. That is, it is a compromise between agreeing with the complimenter and praising one’s self. The underlying message, as spelled out by Chen (1993), is “I am grateful to your compliment and want to agree with you, but I don’t want to praise myself”. In this sense, the underlying agreement with the complimenter can be explained by Leech’s Agreement Maxim and refraining from praising one’s self by Modesty Maxim. This type of response can not be explained by Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory because it has no place for all self-praise avoidance strategies.

This deflective response type which is usually expressed by interrogative patterns such as “Do you really think so?” or “Really?” can be interpreted as doubting responses or confirmation - request responses in which the respondent is requesting the complimenter to confirm the conveyed compliment, to say whether he really means it or not. That is, the complimenter might be showing false modesty on the surface, but deep down he is soliciting more praise. Thus, we can not determine the intention of the respondent unless we know his character. In both interpretations, the respondent is avoiding being cornered into giving a definite response of either acceptance or rejection.
C. Joking

This is an interesting Deflection strategy in which the respondent provides a funny comment about himself which typically consists of bald acceptance on the surface but also implies self-mockery. The respondent is making fun of himself as a technique to avoid self-praise or threat to the complimenter's face. Some joking responses begin as an acceptance with rising intonation and end with a falling intonation to suggest irony. In other words, the respondent gives an unrealistic exaggerated flattery of himself to cover his modest achievement. In this sense, the underlying meaning of the joking strategy can be explained by Leech's Modesty Maxim which promotes maximizing dispraise of one's self, while the surface meaning presupposes Leech's Agreement Maxim. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), joking is a strategy often used to establish a 'shared background' or 'shared values' between the respondent and the complimenter. By doing so, the respondent is trying to create an atmosphere of familiarity and informality between the complimenter and himself. That is, he is preparing the complimenter to absorb a possible rejection of the compliment without being offended because it is coming from a friend.

D. Evasion

In this type of Deflection response, the respondent avoids accepting and rejecting the compliment by giving an unrelated response aiming at shifting the focus from the complimented thing to an unrelated topic requiring the complimenter to give an opinion about it. By doing so, the perplexed complimentee gets out of the tough choice between self-praise and compliment rejection by involving a new topic of discussion. Some researchers such as Ylamme-McEwen (1993)
identify this type of response as 'No Acknowledgment' implying that the respondent ignores and gives no acknowledgment of the compliment addressed to him. The underlying message of the Evasion response could be: I agree with the content of your compliment, but in order to avoid self-praise, let us talk about another topic. In this sense, it can be identified as a compromise between Leech's Maxims of Agreement and Modesty.

3.3.3 REJECTION

This response category is placed at the bottom end of the Direct Acceptance - Direct Rejection continuum. It comprises two subtypes: Scaledown and Disagreement. One of them, Disagreement is a direct Rejection response, while the other one, Scaledown, is an indirect Rejection response. Since in both subtypes, the respondent either entirely rejects or downgrades the worthiness of the complimented thing, the Rejection category responses can be explained by Leech's Modesty Maxim. However, they cause a damaging effect to the face of the interlocutor, and thus they contradict with Leech's supposition that speech acts are inherently polite and match with Brown and Levinson's formula which suggests they usually present a face threat act.

A. Scaledown

Though Scaledowns are categorized as indirect rejection responses in the categorization scheme of this study, Pomerantz (1978:95) considers them as simultaneously indirect acceptance and indirect rejection, depending on the face you look at. She comments on this concept, "although scale-downs are formatted within agreement turns, they may display some sequential features of disagreements".
Using the Scaledown strategy, the respondent rejects the compliment indirectly in the sense that he downgrades it, and thus implies that what complimented is not as praiseworthy as it seems. The respondent diminishes the praiseworthiness of the complimented object or behavior in several ways. If it were an object, then it would be treated as of an inferior quality than expressed by the complimenter. If it were a complimented behavior, then it would be just one of the ordinary routinely done daily life chores. Besides, the respondent sometimes scales down the complimented object/behavior by attributing its achievement to an outside force such as pure luck. In this sense, the response could be interpreted as a shift credit response. Thus, the strategy of downgrading a compliment by attributing its credit to a third party could be interpreted as either a scaledown or a shift credit depending on what angle one is looking at it from.

Even though the scaledown response is considered by Brown and Levinson (1987) as damaging to the interlocutor's face, Chen (1993) believes that this assertion is unfair and inapplicable to the Chinese culture. By downgrading himself, a Chinese is upgraded in the eyes of his complimenter. He adds that in the Chinese culture you need to appear humble to others not just to think of yourself as humble. Thus, downgrading yourself is one way to provide others with the chance of recognizing your humbleness.

B. Disagreement

This is a response of direct 'total rejection' as defined by Gajaseni (1994). It is located at the bottom end of the continuum of which bald acceptance is the opposite dimension. In this strategy, the respondent openly disagrees with the content of the compliment addressed to him.
That is, he refuses to accept the compliment because he asserts that it is in error.

Of course Disagreement is very damaging to the complimenter’s face because it is a bald-on-record rejection beginning with ‘No’ and without any softeners to dilute the extent of the rejection and reduce the damaging effect of the face threatening act. By doing so, the respondent violates Pomerantz’s (1978) Principle One (Agree with or accept compliment) as well as Leech’s (1983) Agreement Maxim. Thus, Disagreement is considered the most damaging response type to the solidarity between the complimenter and the complimentee.

Believing that Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory is unable to explain the rejection strategy, Chen (1993) concludes that it can be explained only by Leech’s Modesty Maxim. That is, the respondent ignores the Agreement Maxim completely and finds ‘safe motivation’ in the Modesty Maxim which is based on minimizing praise and maximizing dispraise of one’s self.

3.3.4 NO ANSWER

In this category, the respondent opts not to give a spoken or written response. There are two possible reasons for not responding verbally or in writing to a compliment. Firstly, the respondent may opt to keep silent, smile, or nod. These are quite realistic modes of behavior because everyone of us encounters some real daily life situations such as being complimented for lending a pen to a person standing near him in a public place, or complimented for having a new haircut or wearing a new cloth garment, and the response he sometimes gives for such compliments is to smile, nod, or just keep silent. Secondly, the
respondent to an interview or DCT compliment sometimes does not respond because he is against the whole situation of the compliment interaction which might constitute a social or religious taboo in his culture. For instance, it would be understandable that an American opts not to respond to a situation that assumes his giving ride to a stranger on a highway because American city residents wouldn't take such a risk in the first place. Furthermore, it would be expected that an extremist Moslem Saudi would opt not to respond to a compliment interaction with a stranger from the opposite sex because such a behavior is unacceptable according to his Islamic codes.

After sorting the data according to the previously discussed categorization scheme, I analyzed the data and produced in tables and graphs from results revealing the mean frequency of each response category and the effects of the complimenter's social status, the complimenter's social distance, the respondent's gender, and the gender-pairing of respondent and complimenter on the frequency of each response category. I also conducted a comparative/contrastive discussion of how the language groups performed each response type. These are the topics that are going to be presented and discussed in detail in the next chapter.
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CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The last chapter looked at three main topics: methodological considerations which covered the common methods usually used in collecting data by speech act researchers, the actual methodology used in collecting the data of this study, and the compliment response categorization scheme prepared to sort and analyze the collected compliment responses.

This present chapter comprises five sections. In the first section, the DCT distribution of the compliment response types will be compared and contrasted among the three language groups to find out whether there are significant differences in the frequency of each response category. In the second section, the responses given by the three language groups will be analyzed to find out whether or not the frequency of the presented response types is significantly affected by the complimenter’s social status. Section three will provide an analysis of the collected compliment responses in advance to determine whether the complimenter’s social distance has a significant effect on the frequency of the provided response types. The fourth section provides an analysis of the collected compliment responses in advance to determine whether or not the respondent’s gender has a significant effect on the frequency of provided response types. In the last section of this chapter, the compliment responses given by the three language groups will be analyzed in order to find out whether or not the gender-pairing has a significant effect on the frequency of particular response types. To sum up, the collected compliment responses will be analyzed using ANOVA through analysis of variance to determine the effects of response category, complimenter’s social status, complimenter’s social distance, respondent’s gender, and gender-pairing of respondent and complimenter.
4.1 DISTRIBUTION OF DCT RESPONSE TYPES ACROSS LANGUAGE GROUPS

Table 4.1 (shown below) consists of four main columns. The left-hand column shows response type comprising the four main response categories and their subtypes. In the columns to the right, there are the three language group columns. Each one of them is divided into two sub-columns, one is for the number and the other for the percentage of each response type.

Table 4.1: Distribution of DCT Compliment Response Types Across Language Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Type</th>
<th>Native Saudis</th>
<th>Native Americans</th>
<th>Saudi EFL Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Bald Acceptance</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Agreement</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Appreciation</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>18.22</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Formulaic Acceptance</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Concern</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Job Commitment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Duty</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>14.45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Return</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>81.30</td>
<td>1060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>64.69</td>
<td>66.25</td>
<td>62.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Deflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Shift Credit</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Doubting</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Joking</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Evasion</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rejection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Scaledown</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Disagreement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Bald Acceptance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Agreement</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Appreciation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Formulaic Acceptance</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Concern</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Job Commitment</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Duty</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>14.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Return</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>81.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>64.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ANOVA results (see Appendix IX) show that the response type has significance ($F=1171.011 > F_{critical}=6.94$) whereas the language group has no significance ($F=0.37725 < F_{critical}=6.9$). This means that the response types differ from each other significantly, while there are only negligible differences among the language groups. For example, there are slight differences among the Native Saudis (64.69), Saudi EFL learners (62.94) and Native Americans (66.25) in the mean frequency of their Acceptance responses. On the other hand, the differences between the main response types within the same language group are great; for instance, the Native Saudis' mean frequency of Acceptance (64.69) is much bigger than their mean frequency of Deflection (12.38) and even greater than that of their Rejection (2.19). The same is true of the Saudi EFL learners; the mean frequency of their Acceptance (62.94) is considerably greater than their mean frequency of Deflection (9.38), and that of their Rejection (3.31). Similarly, the Native Americans' mean frequency of Acceptance (66.25) is significantly higher than their mean frequency of Deflection (8.56), and that of Rejection (2.44).

Figure 4.1: Mean Frequency of DCT Response Types Across Language Groups
These significant differences between Acceptance, Deflection and Rejection as well as slight but not significant differences between the three language groups are illustrated in Figure: 4.1 above.

These DCT response type results are validated and reinforced by the results of the distribution of interview compliment response categories which are shown in Table 4.2 below in the sense that the distribution of response categories in both the DCT and interview followed the same order of hierarchy: Acceptance - Deflection - Rejection.

Table 4.2: Distribution of Interview Compliment Response Types Across Language Groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Type</th>
<th>Native Saudis</th>
<th>Native Americans</th>
<th>Saudi EFL Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Bald Acceptance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Agreement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Appreciation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Ritualistic Accept Comment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Concern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Job Commitment/Duty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. Social/Religious Duty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Return</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>74.36</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Deflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Shift Credit</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Doubting</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Joking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Evasion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.07</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rejection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Scaledown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Disagreement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No Answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ANOVA results of the interview compliment responses (see Appendix IX) show that the response type has significance, $F=50.5 > F_{\text{critical}}=6.9$. This means that, matching with the results of the DCT compliment responses, there are significant differences among the three major response types of the interview compliment responses. Similar to the result of the DCT compliment response, the difference among three language groups in the interview compliment responses are insignificant according to ANOVA results, $F=0.207 < F_{\text{critical}}=6.9$. These results of the analyzed interview compliment responses which match those of the DCT analyzed compliment responses are shown in Figure 4.2.

Figure 4.2: Mean Frequency of Interview Response Types Across Language Groups

The results suggest that there are insignificant differences among the three language groups of subjects, but there are significant differences among the three main DCT compliment response categories. I now provide some brief discussion of these differences among the compliment response categories as well as the differences among the
language groups. A quick look at the numbers and percentages in Table 4.1 and their illustrations in Figure 4.1 leads to the assertion that Acceptance is the leading response among the three groups, far leading the other two main response categories of Deflection and Rejection. It represents more than four fifths of the corpus in each group. Native Americans were more frequent acceptors (85.20%) than Native Saudis (81.30%).

In the discussion below I contrast the responses made by Native Americans with those made by Native Saudis. Though the analysis of the results of the Saudi EFL learners’ responses appear on the tables and graphs of this chapter, I defer a discussion of this group, and how they compare with the other two groups, until the following chapter, which looks at pragmatic transfer. I had to keep the results of the Saudi EFL learners in the tables and graphs of this chapter in order to avoid repeating them in the next chapter which would have been redundant and boring to the reader.

I begin the discussion here with Bald Acceptance. Native Americans were found to use the Bald Acceptance strategy twice as often as Native Saudis did. For example, 20.17% of the Native Americans’ DCT responses were categorized as Bald Acceptance, compared to only 9.90% of the Native Saudis’ responses. This might be attributed to the common supposition that the American culture is based on openness and individualism, while the Saudi Arabic culture identifies the individual by the tribe he descends from and the family he belongs to. Thus, an American is expected to be more confident and proud of himself than a Saudi Arab who usually brags more about his history and family influence than about his personal merits and achievements.
Similar to the American-Saudi ratio of Bald Acceptance, the Native Americans gave almost twice as many Agreement responses as Native Saudis did; the Americans accumulated 32 Agreement responses, while Saudis made only 17 responses of this type.

Appreciation was found to be by far the most common response in the Acceptance category by both Americans and Saudis according to the DCT compliment response type data shown in Table 4.1. However, Native Americans gave Appreciation responses much more frequently than Native Saudis did. While Americans totaled 442 Appreciation responses, Saudis issued only 232 responses of this type. Nelson et al. (1996) argue that Arabs avoid using Appreciation tokens as often as Americans do because they find them flat, awkward and insufficient to express a lengthy and meaningful appreciation response that satisfies their fondness for lengthy eloquent texts.

Appreciation was used both as a single response and as an initial part of a compound response. The most common Appreciation - combination responses were Appreciation - Bald Acceptance, Appreciation - Shift Credit, Appreciation - Concern, and Appreciation - Return according to data shown in Table 4.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>Apprec-Bald Accept. No.</th>
<th>Apprec-Bald Accept. %</th>
<th>Apprec-Return No.</th>
<th>Apprec-Return %</th>
<th>Apprec-Shift Credit No.</th>
<th>Apprec-Shift Credit %</th>
<th>Apprec-Concern No.</th>
<th>Apprec-Concern %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Saudis</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24.13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>32.35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi EFL Learners</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20.66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the numbers and percentages displayed in Table 4.3, we can conclude that, with the exception of the Apprec.-Return combination,
Native Americans were more frequent givers of the aforementioned Appreciation combinations than Native Saudis.

Formulaic Acceptance comprises the ritualistic and frequently repeated everyday expressions that usually imply acceptance of the compliment content. Native Saudis were found to be much more frequent users of these formulaic expressions than Native Americans. Table 4.1 shows that Saudis accumulated 199 Formulaic Acceptance responses representing 15.63% of the total, whereas Native Americans gave 123 responses of this type representing 9.88% of the total.

Arabs generally tend to use proverbs and idioms abundantly in their daily interactions as a demonstration of wisdom and eloquence. In addition to these idiomatic expressions, the Arabic culture is rich in religious expressions, frequently enlightening sayings of Prophet Mohammed – Pbuh. The Saudi subjects made extensive use of these religious sayings in their responses. On the other hand, the use of proverbial expressions and religious sayings by American subjects was quite limited.

In the following example, three Formulaic Acceptance responses different in their wording but almost identical in their content were given by three different Native Saudi subjects in response to the compliment given in situation nine of the DCT in which a host’s food and cooking are complimented by his guest.

Example 4.1: C: The food is really delicious. You are a good cook.
R₁: haniian laka [I wish you enjoyed it]
R₂: bilhana wa ashifa [I wish it would give you enjoyment and recovery]
R₃: sahtayn wa gaafiyah [I wish it would give you sound health]
All three above Formulaic Acceptance responses give almost the same meaning when translated into English: “May you find it tasty and healthful”.

The two responses in the next example were given by American subjects in response to the compliment of situation four of the DCT in which a clerk’s dedication to work is complimented by his boss.

Example 4.2: C: Your hard work and dedication are highly appreciated.
R1: I enjoy working with people.
R2: We are all part and parcel of a team.

As shown in Examples 4.1 and 4.2, both Saudi and American respondents gave Formulaic Acceptance responses in which they indirectly accepted the compliment but avoided self-praise at the same time.

Concern is another indirect Acceptance response in which the respondent expresses his gladness that the complimented object or behavior was liked by the complimenter. Native Saudis used Concern responses almost as frequently as Native Americans. Native Saudis gave 109 Concern responses representing 8.56% of their data, and Native Americans issued 91 responses of this type representing 7.31% of their data. This indicates that the strategy of expressing gladness that your complimenter liked your highly valued object or behavior is a cultural mode shared by both American and Saudi cultures. The popularity of this response type in both cultures might be due to the fact that it both satisfies a psychological need in a respondent to be liked by others and helps to avoid the embarrassment of self-praise.

In the next example, two Concern responses (one by a Saudi and the other one by an American) were given in response to the compliment
of situation one of the DCT in which an employee's distinctive performance is complimented by his boss.

Example 4.3: C: You've done a splendid job. I've never seen anybody more efficient than you.
R₁ (Native Saudi): agtazu bimadiihika wa agtabiruhu wisaman tiwaala gumrii [I am proud of your praise and consider it a life-long medal.]
R₂ (Native American): I'm glad that my hard work is coming through.

Both responses expressed concern in the complimenter's recognition of the complimented behavior; however, the Saudi respondent showed a recognizable exaggeration for effect in his Concern response which is typical of Arabic, whereas the American respondent expressed his concern objectively.

Native Americans gave twice as many Job Commitment responses as Native Saudis did; Americans totaled 36 Job Commitment responses representing 2.89% of their data whereas Saudis issued only 18 responses of this type representing 1.41% of their data. On the other hand, Native Saudis gave 184 Duty responses, while Native Americans gave only 10 responses of this type. That is, Saudis used Duty responses eighteen times more frequently than did Americans. Thus, the difference between Saudis and Americans in using the 'Duty' and 'Job Commitment' responses is due to their different conceptions of 'Job' and 'Duty'.
In order to better understand the backgrounds that might have caused Americans to extensively use in their responses the concept of 'Job' and Saudi Arabs to frequently use the concept of 'Duty', an explanatory discussion of those two concepts is presented below.

**American "Job" Versus Arabic "Waajib" [Duty]**

America has always been a nation of immigrants. Though some of these immigrants retain their distinguishing cultural modes for more than a generation, America is still like a melting pot in which distinctive ethnicities are dissolved and a composite emerges. These newly arrived citizens are impressed by the immense economic opportunities they find in their new society, but the price they pay in being partially cut off from their roots is quite high. In an industrialized society relatively free of intermediary influences, the newly naturalized citizens have to take the challenge of reaching their goal in the land of opportunities depending on their hardwork only. Everyone has an equal chance to succeed. It is a fair system; those who work hard and exert their maximum efforts are the ones who succeed and live in luxury, whereas those who perform poorly have nobody to blame but themselves for their modest rewards. As we have seen, one's performance at work is the path that leads to prestige and social respect in society. Consequently, it is not surprising that an American individual shows so much dedication to his job whether he is a student at school, a technician in a workshop, a babysitter at a nursery, or a scientist at a research center. Gradually over the years, this has become a distinguishing characteristic of the American character. Thus, an American usually attributes his complimented behavior to being committed to his job by saying "It's my job" or "I'm just doing my job".
On the other hand, Arabs complimented for doing their homework, taking good care of their families, being nice to customers at work, or returning a found item to its owner would hastily and spontaneously respond: "I am agmal siwaa waajibii [I've done nothing but my duty]. Attributing the reason behind doing every complimented behavior to duty by Saudi Arabs is understandable if we keep in mind that all Saudis are Moslems and that there are many duties good Moslems should do to the best of their ability. Islam affects one's whole way of life; therefore, Moslems have to observe their duties in all walks of life. For example, it is the duty of Moslems to take good care of all their family members and financially support female relatives whenever they are in need in accordance with Prophet Mohammed's - Pbh - warning "The one who severs ties of relationship will not enter Paradise". Furthermore, good Moslems have a firm belief that they are observed by God all the time; consequently, they are honest and sincere in fulfilling every job they are assigned to do to the best of their knowledge and ability even in the absence of all kinds of supervision. Prophet Mohammed - Pbh - said, "It's God's instruction that once you are assigned a job, you have to accomplish it with distinction". Another unavoidable duty of a good Moslem is to extend help to the elderly, the poor, the weak, the orphaned and the needy in abidance by Prophet Mohammed's - Pbh - saying "Allah helps His slave as long as he helps his brother".

To sum up, an American frequently attributes the reason for doing a complimented behavior to 'job commitment' because doing one's job is highly valued in the American culture. On the other hand, a Saudi Arab almost always gives 'duty' as the reason for doing a complimented behavior because as a Moslem, he does his best to fulfill the duties of a good Moslem in order to win God's contentment.
The last Acceptance subtype is Return, in which the respondent directs to his complimenter an equal or even a better compliment than the one addressed to him. Saudi Arabs used the Return strategy much more frequently than did Americans. For example, Saudis accumulated 150 Return responses representing 11.78% of their data, whereas Americans gave only 75 responses of this type representing 6.02% of the data. The ratio of Return responses given by Saudis and Americans in the interviews matches with that of their Return responses in the DCT. For instance, while Return responses comprised 33.33% of Saudi's interview responses, they represented only 12.12% of Americans' interview responses. This considerable difference between Native Saudis and Native Americans in the frequency of using Return response might be attributed to the fact that Saudis are highly influenced by their religious aspirations which instruct them to be considerate to their interlocutor's face and to do their best to please others by ignoring their negative side and praising their positive side. Moreover, it is the duty of good Moslems to return greetings or compliments addressed to them with one of equal or higher value. Moslems are supposed to behave in this way in compliance with Prophet Mohammad's - Pbuh - recommendation, "Once you are greeted, you have to respond with a better greeting, or at least an equal one". Consequently, it is no wonder that Saudis give many more Return responses than do Americans.

The Deflection strategy, which is a compromise between Acceptance and Rejection responses, is located near the center of the Acceptance - Rejection continuum (see Figure 3.1). The mean frequency of Deflection responses is less than that of Acceptance and more than that of Rejection in the data of both Saudis and Americans. The mean frequency of Saudis' Deflection responses is 12.38, while the mean frequency of Americans' Deflection responses is 8.56. That is, Saudis were found to be significantly more frequent givers of Deflection responses than Americans.
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When the subtypes of the Deflection category shown in Table 4.1, are studied, it is found that with the exception of the Joking response, Saudis gave more responses in all Deflection subtypes than did Americans. For example, the Native Saudis accumulated 151 Shift Credit responses representing 11.86% of their data, while Native Americans totaled 100 responses of this type representing 8.03% of their data. The numbers and percentages of Shift Credit responses given by Saudis and Americans in the interviews and shown in Table 4.2 match with those shown in the DCT table. In their interviews, Saudis gave 9 Shift Credit responses representing 23.07% of their data, whereas Americans gave only one Shift Credit response representing 3.03% of their data. This big difference in the given number of Shift Credit responses between Saudis and Americans might be due to the assumption that Saudis, as Moslems, tend to avoid Bald Acceptance of compliments, and thus frequently use the Shift Credit strategy which is a commonly used tactic to avoid self-praise. In other words, a good Moslem is supposed to be humble and modest in all interactions with others in compliance with Prophet Mohammed's - Pbuh - warning, "Allah will be angry with whoever exalts himself and walks proudly". Therefore, it is no wonder that Saudis use bald acceptance less frequently but are more frequent users of Shift Credit responses than Americans.

According to the number and percentages shown in Table 4.1, the frequency of the deflective response of Doubting was almost the same in the American and Saudi Arab groups. That is, Native Saudis gave 22 Doubting responses representing 1.73% of their data, and Americans gave 21 Doubting responses representing 1.69% of their data. This indicates that there is a similarity in the understanding and use of Doubting as a deflective strategy in the two cultures.
Both Americans and Saudis gave Joking responses as another deflective strategy of avoiding self-praise. However, Americans were more frequent users of Joking responses than Saudis. That is, Americans gave 13 Joking responses representing 1.04% of their data, while Saudis gave only 8 responses of this type representing 0.63 of their data.

Saudis were found to be much more frequent users of Evasion, which is listed as the last Deflection subtype in Table 4.1, than Americans. Saudis gave 17 Evasion responses representing 1.33% of their data, whereas Americans gave only 3 Evasion responses representing 0.24% of their data.

Being represented by only 2.75% of the Saudi group's data and 3.13% of the American group's data, Rejection which is a face-damaging response category was treated as an unfavorable choice by both Saudis and Americans. Therefore, the mean frequency of Rejection responses in both groups was very modest. However, Americans gave a few more Rejection responses than did Saudis. While Americans gave 39 Rejection responses with a mean frequency of 2.19, Saudis issued 35 responses of the same type with a mean frequency of 2.44.

In line with their ratios in the Rejection category, Saudis were less frequent users of Scaledown responses than Americans. That is, Saudis gave 23 Scaledown responses representing 1.80% of their data, while Americans accumulated 30 responses of this type representing 2.41% of their data.

The ratio of Saudis and Americans in the Scaledown response was reversed in the Disagreement response. This is the most face threatening act because it constitutes bald rejection without any softeners to dilute its concentration. According to the data shown in Table 4.1, Saudis gave 12 Disagreement responses representing 0.94% of
their data, while Americans gave 9 Disagreement responses representing 0.72% of their data.

Only 5 Saudis opted not to give a response to some DCT situations. Each instance was in interaction between interlocutors of opposite sexes. This might be an understandable behavior if we take into consideration the strict Islamic codes that prohibit interaction between a Moslem female and any males other than her husband and her male family members. On the other hand, 8 American respondents refrained from giving responses to some DCT situations. Six of them opted not to respond to situation 16 of the DCT which assumes the respondent received a compliment for a ride he had given to a stranger. Since many motorists have been victimized by strangers whom they gave rides to in some American towns, it is understandable that some American respondents considered such a situation taboo and decided not to respond to it. The other two American respondents wrote down 'smile' and 'nod' as responses to two of the DCT compliments. These are realistic responses because now and then we experience situations in which we are complimented for a small favor we did, and we just smile or nod in return.

The significant differences between the main response categories as well as the ways Saudis and Americans performed each response subtype have been discussed. In the next section, the effect of social status on the mean frequency of each response category as performed by Saudis and Americans is presented and discussed in detail. In other words, the next section discusses whether or not the mean frequency of each response category is affected by the complimenter's social status, that is whether he is of higher, lower, or equal social status to the complimentee.
4.2 FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TYPE BY COMPLIMENTER'S SOCIAL STATUS

By complimenter's social status I mean whether he is of higher, lower, or equal social status to the complimentee. That is, does it make a difference in the mean frequency of response categories whether the complimenter is a boss, a subject, or a peer of the complimentee? A clerk being complimented by his boss is an example of the complimenter having higher social status. A teacher being complimented by his student is an instance of the complimenter having lower status. An employee being complimented by his office colleague is an example of the complimenter and complimentee having equal social status.

The ANOVA results shown in Appendix IX demonstrate that complimenter's relative social status had no significant effect on the frequency of Acceptance Category, \( F = 0.989 < F \text{ critical } = 6.94 \). Similarly, the language group to which informants belonged had no significant effect on the frequency of Acceptance responses, \( F = 0.919 < F \text{ critical } = 6.94 \). This means that among the three language groups the complimenter's social status did not make a significant difference in the frequency of Acceptance responses.

Though the complimenter's social status had no significant effect on the mean frequency of Acceptance responses given by Native Saudi and Native American respondents according to ANOVA results (see Appendix IX), it is noticeable that both Native Saudi and Native American respondents gave more Acceptance responses when the compliment came from a complimenter of lower or equal status than when it came from a complimenter of higher status (see Table 4.4). Thus, Americans and Saudis share this compliment response behavior. There is more than one hypothesis to explain why Americans and Saudi
Arabs tend to accept more compliments from lower status than higher status complimenters. First, the respondents may feel insecure and lack self-confidence to accept a compliment issued by a superior having the brightness of success and the threat of authority. Secondly, they may suspect the sincerity of a superior’s compliment; he might be saying it just to please one of his subjects or trying to be nice to him without really meaning it. Third, accepting a compliment from a superior might be more embarrassing than accepting a compliment from a lower status complimenter because a respondent usually feels more at ease with inferiors than with superiors. One or more of these assumptions might stand behind the Saudi and American subjects’ tendency to disfavor accepting compliments from superiors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Type</th>
<th>Social Status</th>
<th>Native Saudis</th>
<th>Native Americans</th>
<th>Saudi EFL Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>60.25</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deflection</td>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4.4 above, the Saudis’ mean frequency of Acceptance responses in the case of a lower-status complimenter was 69.5, while in case of higher-status complimenter it was 57.7, a difference of about 12. Similarly, the Americans’ mean frequency of Acceptance responses in the case of a lower-status complimenter was 73, whereas in case of higher-status complimenter it was 62, a difference of 11. That is,
Saudis and Americans are very similar in the ratio of lower-status to higher-status complimenter Acceptance response frequency. Based on the data in Table 4.4, both Saudis and Americans tend to accept more compliments from lower and equal-status complimenters than from higher-status complimenters. This behavior might be due to the common supposition that one usually feels more at ease when dealing with subjects and peers than when dealing with his superiors.

In the Rejection Category, the ANOVA results (see Appendix IX) showed that the complimenter's social status had no significant effect, F=0.009 < F critical = 6.94. Similarly, the complimenter's language group had no significant effect on the Rejection category according to the ANOVA results, F = 0.606 < F critical = 6.94. In other words, based on the data shown in Table 4.5, both Saudis and Americans had a total of 30 Rejection responses in the three categories of complimenter's social status. However, there were slight differences within each language group in the mean frequency among the three ranks of social status. Both Saudis and Americans gave the highest mean frequency of Rejection responses in the case of equal-status complimenters. This might be due to the assumption that a Rejection response would be less face damaging to equal-status complimenters, such as peers and colleagues than to higher or lower status complimenters. That is, equal-status complimenters would feel less offended when the Rejection responses came from peers and colleagues because they may think of them as friends who are unlikely to intend to embarrass them. Saudis and Americans handled compliments from unequal status complimenters differently. Saudis gave more rejection responses to the complimenters of lower status than to those of higher status, whereas Americans did the opposite according to the data in tables 4.4 and 4.5.
Table 4.5: Frequency of Response Types by Complimenter’s Social Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Type</th>
<th>Complimenter’s Social Status</th>
<th>Native Saudis</th>
<th>Native Americans</th>
<th>Saudi EFL Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M*</td>
<td>SD**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>17.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>60.25</td>
<td>7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deflection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td>10.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>7.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* M = Mean
** SD = Standard Deviation

The ANOVA results (see Appendix IX) showed that the complimenter’s social status had a significant effect on the frequency of Deflection responses, $F=11.197 > F_{critical} = 6.94$, regardless of language group and that the language group had no significant effect on the frequency of Deflection responses, $F=6.049 < F_{critical} = 6.94$.

According to the data displayed in Table 4.5 above, the complimenter’s social status, whether higher, lower, or equal to that of the complimentee, had a considerable effect on the mean frequency of Native Saudis’ Deflection responses. These were found to be the most frequent when the complimenter’s status was higher (19.25) representing 24.3% of the total, followed by those of equal status (17.25) representing 21.3% of the total, and last came those of complimenter’s lower status (11.5) representing 13.8% of the total as the least frequent.

Based on the data in Table 4.5, the effect of the complimenter’s social status on the mean frequency of Americans’ Deflection response is illustrated in the following order: complimenter of higher status...
Deflection responses were most frequent (14.5) representing 18.4% of the total, while the complimenters of equal status were next in deflective frequent (11.0) representing 12.5% of the total, and the complimenters of lower status were the least frequent (6.5) representing 8% of the total.

In an overall survey of the effect of the complimenter's social status on the three response categories of Acceptance, Rejection and Deflection, it was found that - based on data displayed in table 4.4 and 4.5 - both Saudis and Americans were most frequent acceptors with lower-status complimenters, most frequent rejectors with equal-status complimenters, and most frequent deflectors with higher-status complimenters. From these conclusions, we might be able to infer that both Saudi and American subjects of this study responded similarly to the effect of complimenter's social status in deciding whether to accept, reject, or deflect. Trying to give a possible justification for this shared behavior of Saudis and Americans, I think that they accepted compliments most frequently from lower-status complimenters because it might be relatively the safest and the least embarrassing choice to accept compliments from your inferiors on the grounds that it is usually the lower-status individual who is impressed by his superiors and directs compliments to them. Besides, both Saudis and Americans tended to direct more rejection responses to complimenters of equal status than to those of lower status because in everyday interactions we expect a person to be less offended by a Rejection from a peer on the grounds that interactions between equal interlocutors usually flow smoothly, informally and with the least sensitivity and suspicion of intentions. Last, they deflected most with higher-status complimenters because it would be relatively more embarrassing to accept a superior's compliment as well as more face damaging to reject a superior's
compliment. Thus, the safest and smartest choice would be to deflect a superior's compliment on the grounds that you are saving yourself the embarrassment and your higher-status complimenter face threat, and thus pleasing both involved parties.

To sum up, the variable of complimenter's social status had a significant effect on the mean frequency of Deflection responses, whereas it had a non-significant effect on the mean frequency of Acceptance and Rejection responses. This significant effect on Deflection as well as the slight effects of social status on the response categories of Acceptance and Rejection are illustrated in Figure 4.3 on the next page.

In the next section, the effect of the complimenter's social distance, whether he is of close or far social distance to the complimentee, will be investigated, and the results of the analysis will be discussed, tabulated and represented in graphs in the same way as the results of the complimenter's social status were presented in this section.
Figure 4.3: Mean Frequency of Response Types by Complimenter's Social Status
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4.3 FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TYPE BY COMPLIMENTER’S SOCIAL DISTANCE

By complimenter’s social distance I mean whether the complimenter has a close or distant relationship with the complimentee. That is, whether they are familiar or unfamiliar with each other, and thus whether they have a formal or informal relationship.

According to the ANOVA results (see Appendix IX), the variable of the complimenter’s social distance had no significant effect on the mean frequency of Acceptance responses, \( F = 0.304 < F_{\text{critical}} = 18.51 \) in all three language groups because the effect of language group was of no significance in the Acceptance response category according to ANOVA results, \( F = 0.440 < F_{\text{critical}} = 19.00 \). This means that whether the complimenter was of close or not so close, social distance had no significant effect on the Acceptance responses of both Saudis and Americans.

However, the Saudis had a slight tendency below the level of significance to accept more compliments when the complimenter was a stranger than when he was familiar. It might be they felt more psychological pressure to be considerate to strangers than to associates as a result of the religious conditioning they receive that instructs them to be friendly to strangers. In contrast, the Americans felt pressure to accept more compliments of familiar interlocutors than of strangers according to data in Table 4.6 below. That is, Saudis and Americans behaved differently depending on the social distance.

Table 4.6: Mean Frequency of Response Types by Complimenter’s Social Distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Type</th>
<th>Soc. Distance</th>
<th>Native Saudis</th>
<th>Native Americans</th>
<th>Saudi EFL Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>60.25</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Far</td>
<td>71.25</td>
<td>62.75</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Far</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deflection</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Far</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Rejection response category, the ANOVA results (see Appendix IX) showed that the compliments' social distance, being an associate or a stranger, had no significant effect on the mean frequency of Rejection responses, \( F = 0.160 < F \text{ critical} = 18.51 \). Similarly, the language group was of no significant effect on Rejection responses according to the ANOVA results, \( F = 0.480 < F \text{ critical} = 19.00 \). This means that whether the complimenter was close to or distant from the complimenter did not have a significant effect on the mean frequency of Rejection responses in the three language groups.

Nevertheless, both American and Saudi respondents shared the tendency to give more rejection response when their complimenter were close to them than when they were distant from them. According to the figures in Table 4.7 below, the Americans gave 15 Rejection responses to complimenter of close social distance representing 4.2% of the total, whereas the Saudis gave 13 Rejection responses to complimenter of close social distance representing 4% of the total. On the other hand, the Americans gave 13 Rejection responses to complimenter of far social distance representing 4.8% of the total, while the Saudis issued 13 Rejection responses to the same type of complimenter representing 3.6% of the total. Thus, the Americans were insignificantly more frequent givers of Rejection responses to familiares as well as to strangers than Saudis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Type</th>
<th>Social Distance</th>
<th>Native Saudis</th>
<th>Native Americans</th>
<th>Saudi EFL Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>60.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Far</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>71.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Far</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deflection</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>17.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Far</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ANOVA results (see Appendix IX) showed that the complimenter's social distance - being of close or distant relationship to the respondent - had a significant effect on the frequency of compliment responses in the Deflection response category, $F=41.009 > F\text{ critical} = 18.51$. However, the language group was found to be of no significance according to ANOVA results, $F = 0.892 < F\text{ critical} = 19.00$.

Based on the data displayed in Table 4.6 and Table 4.7, it is noted that the closer the complimenter is to the respondent, the more Deflection responses he gave in all three language groups. However, the difference between deflections to familiars and strangers was much greater in the Saudi group than in the American group. For instance, the difference in the mean frequencies of Deflection responses between complimenting associates and complimenting strangers was 15.28 in the Saudi group and 8.75 in the American group. In other words, the effect of complimenter's social distance on the mean frequency of Deflection responses was greater on Saudis than on Americans.

To sum up, not only Saudis but also Americans were significantly affected by the social distance of the complimenter in their Deflection responses. Besides, both of them gave significantly more Deflection responses to familiars than to strangers. That is, both groups followed the same pattern in their deflection behavior, but Saudis deflected more often in their responses to familiars and less often in their responses to strangers than did Americans. All these differences in the compliment-responding behavior in the Acceptance, Rejection, and Deflection categories caused by the social distance variable in all three language groups are illustrated in Figure 4.4 below.
Figure 4.4: Mean Frequency of Response Types by Complimenter's Social Distance
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From the data displayed in Table 4.6 and 4.7, we can conclude that Saudis tend to be more sensitive to saving the face of strangers than associates; they were found to be accepting and deflecting more frequently but rejecting less frequently the compliments from strangers than familiar interlocutors. On the contrary, Americans were accepting and deflecting less frequently but rejecting more frequently the compliments from strangers than associates. I think that the obvious tendency of Saudi Arabs to be more sensitive to saving the face of strangers than familiars can be explained as a direct compliance with their Islamic teachings, such as Prophet Mohammed’s instruction, "If anyone removes one of the anxieties of this world from a believer, Allah will remove one of the anxieties of the Day of Resurrection from him; if one smoothens the way for one who is destitute, Allah will smoothen the way for him in this world and in the next”.

In this section, the effect of the complimenter’s social distance, whether he is close or distant to the complimentee, on the mean frequency of Acceptance, Rejection and Deflection responses has been analyzed and contrastively studied for both Saudi and American subjects. In the next section, the effect of the respondent’s gender (whether male or female) on the mean frequency of Acceptance, Rejection, and Deflection responses is investigated and analyzed. A contrast of how Saudis and Americans behaved in response to the effect of the respondent’s gender will be discussed.
4.4 FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TYPE BY RESPONDENT’S GENDER

In this section, the effect of respondent’s gender on the mean frequency of the various response categories is investigated. In addition, a contrast of the ways the Saudis and the Americans behave in response to the respondent’s gender is discussed. The results of the analysis are tabulated and presented in graphs the same way as the previous sections of this chapter.

The gender of the respondent was found to have a significant effect on the mean frequency of compliment responses in the Acceptance category in all three language groups according to the ANOVA results (see Appendix IX), $F = 75.919 > F_{\text{critical}} = 18.51$. However, language group had no significant effect on the frequency of Acceptance responses, $F=12.111 < F_{\text{critical}} = 19.00$.

Based on the information in Table 4.8 below, both Saudi and American females gave more Acceptance responses than males. For example, Saudi females’ mean frequency of Acceptance responses was 33.69, whereas the mean frequency of males was 30.31. On the other hand, the mean frequency of American females’ Acceptance responses was 35.06, while the mean frequency of males was 32.44. That is, the difference between the two sexes in both groups was almost the same. In other words, Saudis and Americans behaved similarly in response to the effect of respondent’s gender on the frequency of Acceptance responses. However, both American males and females accepted more frequently than did Saudi males and females. The difference in the mean frequency of females was 1.37 in favor of American females, and the difference in the mean frequency of males was 2.13 in favor of the American males.
The ANOVA results showed that the respondent's gender had no significant effect on the frequency of Rejection responses, $F = 7.367 < F_{\text{critical}} = 18.51$. Furthermore, the language group was found to have no significant effect on the frequency of Rejection compliment responses, $F = 4.583 < F_{\text{critical}} = 19.00$. That is, it made no significant difference to the frequency of Rejection compliment responses in all three-language groups whether the respondent was male or female.

Based on the data in Table 4.8, both Saudi and American males and females followed the same pattern in handling Rejection responses. That is, in both groups, males were more frequent rejectors than females though to a less extent in the American group.

The ANOVA results showed that the respondent's gender had no significant effect on the mean frequency of compliment responses in the Deflection category, $F = 3.528 < F_{\text{critical}} = 18.51$. Similarly, the language group had no significant effect on the mean frequency of Deflection responses, $F = 1.768 < F_{\text{critical}} = 19.00$. That is, the differences between male and female Deflection responses in all three-language groups were negligible.

According to the data in Table 4.8, American males and females behaved similarly as deflectors (i.e 4.31 for both), while Saudi males...
(7.00) gave more deflective responses than did their native females (5.25). This resonates with Holmes’ (1988) conclusion that men give more evasive responses than women do.

To sum up, it can be concluded that the respondent’s gender had a significant effect on the Acceptance responses of all language groups, but it had no significant effect on the Rejection and Deflection responses from the language groups. These effects of the respondent’s sex on the Acceptance, Rejection, and Deflection responses are shown in table 4.8 and are illustrated graphically in Figure 4.5 on the next page.

In the next section, to complement what has been discussed in this section and to cover all sides of the effect of gender on the mean frequency of response types, an investigation of the effect of the four gender-pairings (F-F, F-M, M-M, M-F) on Acceptance, Rejection and Deflection responses as performed by Saudis and Americans will be discussed.
Figure 4.5: Mean Frequency of Response Types By Respondent's Gender
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Rejection</th>
<th>Deflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.5 FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE TYPE BY GENDER-PAIRING OF RESPONDENT AND COMPLIMENTER

There are four possible gender-pairings: female responding to female (F-F), female responding to male (F-M), male responding to male (M-M), and male responding to female (M-F). In this section, the effect of these four gender-pairings on the mean frequency of Acceptance, Rejection, and Deflection responses is investigated and analyzed. The results of these analyses are tabulated and represented in graphs the same way as in the previous sections of this chapter.

According to ANOVA results (see Appendix IX), the gender-pairing had a significant effect on the mean frequency of Acceptance responses, \( F = 4.963 > F_{\text{critical}} = 4.76 \). Nevertheless, the language group had no significant effect on Acceptance responses, \( F = 2.313 > F_{\text{critical}} = 5.14 \). This means that it made a significant difference in the mean frequency of Acceptance responses whether the respondent/complimenter was male or female in all three-language groups. The Saudi gender-pairings had this descending order in their Acceptance response frequency according to the data displayed in Table 4.10: F-F was the most frequent acceptor (17.31), followed by F-M (16.43), then M-M (16.0), and last M-F (14.8) as the least frequent initiator of Acceptance responses. The Americans had a different order: F-M (18.06); F-F (17.68); M-F (16.5); M-M (16.06).
Table 4.9: Mean Frequency of Response Types By Gender-Pairing of Respondent-Complimenter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Type</th>
<th>Respondent - Complimenter</th>
<th>Native Saudis</th>
<th>Native Americans</th>
<th>Saudi EFL Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F - F*</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F - M**</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>16.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M - M</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.06</td>
<td>15.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M - F</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>14.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>F - F</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F - M</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M - M</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M - F</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>F - F</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F - M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M - M</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M - F</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* F = Female  ** M = Male

Based on the data shown in Table 4.9 and Table 4.10, it can be concluded that female-respondents gave more Acceptance responses than male-respondents in both Saudi and American groups. Another conclusion that can be derived from the tabulated data is that both Saudi females and males gave fewer Acceptance responses when responding to complimenters from the other sex than when responding to a complimenter of the same sex. For example, when Saudi females were responding to each other their mean frequency of Acceptance was 17.31, whereas when responding to males it was 16.43. Though the difference is not significant, it is indicative of a distinction between the two sexes. Similarly, when Saudi males were responding to complimenters of the same sex, they had an Acceptance mean frequency of 16.00, while they had an Acceptance mean frequency of 14.18 when responding to females.
Table 4.10: Frequency of Compliment Responses According to Gender-Pairing of Respondent-Complimenter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Type</th>
<th>Respondent-Complimenter</th>
<th>Native Saudis</th>
<th>Native Americans</th>
<th>Saudi EFL Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acceptance</strong></td>
<td>F - F*</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>17.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F - M**</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>16.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M - M</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M - F</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>14.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rejection</strong></td>
<td>F - F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F - M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M - M</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M - F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deflection</strong></td>
<td>F - F</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F - M</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M - M</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M - F</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* F = Female  ** M = Male

On the other hand, American gender-pairings behaved differently in giving their Acceptance responses according to the data displayed in tables 4.9 and 4.10. That is, American females as well as males gave fewer Acceptance responses when responding to complimenters of the same sex than when responding to complimenters of the opposite sex. For instance, when females were responding to complimenters of the same sex, they had an Acceptance mean frequency of (17.6), whereas when responding to complimenters of the opposite sex, they had an Acceptance mean frequency of (18.06). Though the difference is slightly significant, it is indicative of a distinction between the two sexes. Similarly, American males had an Acceptance mean frequency of (16.06) when responding to complimenters of their sex, while they had an Acceptance mean frequency of (16.5) when responding to complimenters of the opposite sex.
I suggest that Saudis feel at ease and behave more freely in performing their compliment responses when they are responding to complimenters of the same sex than when they are responding to complimenters of the opposite sex because Saudi males and females (with the exception of those who have been westernized and enjoyed bicultural backgrounds) have been conditioned to live separately due to the prevailing Islamic codes that are against all forms of mixed gatherings. Thus, it is not surprising that Saudis are more frequent acceptors when interacting with complimenters of the same sex than when interacting with complimenters of the opposite sex. On the other hand, it is not surprising that Americans who live in an open and liberal society in which sex discrimination — as well as all kinds of discrimination — is unacceptable behave in the opposite way.

According to ANOVA results (see Appendix IX), the gender-pairing of respondent and complimenter had no significant effect on the mean frequency of Rejection responses, $F = 1.189 < F_{\text{critical}} = 4.76$. Also, the language group had no significant effect on the Rejection responses according to ANOVA results, $F = 0.902 < F_{\text{critical}} = 5.14$. This means that changing the gender of the respondent, the complimenter, or both parties of the gender-pairing had no significant effect on the mean frequency of Rejection responses in all three-language groups.

Based on the data shown in Table 4.9 and 4.10, with the exception of the M – F gender-pairing, Saudi gender-pairings gave fewer Rejection responses than American ones. Another observation that can be derived from the tabulated data is that Saudi female respondents gave fewer Rejection responses than did Saudi male respondents. On the other hand, American females and males gave more Rejection responses when responding to complimenters of the same sex than when responding to complimenters of the opposite sex.
The mean frequency of Deflection responses was not affected by the gender-pairing of respondent and complimenter, $F = 1.427 < F \text{ critical} = 4.76$. Similarly, the language group had no significant effect on the frequency of Deflection responses, $F = 1.593 < F \text{ critical} = 5.14$. This means that changing the sex of respondent, complimenter, or both in a gender-pairing would not significantly affect the mean frequency of Deflection responses in the three language groups.

According to the data shown in Table 4.10, both Saudi females and males gave fewer deflective responses when responding to complimenters of the same sex than when responding to complimenters of the opposite sex. For example, the Saudi F-F pairing gave 36 deflective responses, whereas the F-M pairing gave 48 responses of the same type. In addition, the Saudi M-M pairing gave 48 deflective responses, while the M-F pairing gave 57 responses of the same type. From these numbers, we can also conclude that Saudi male respondents gave deflection responses more frequently than Saudi female respondents.

American female and male respondents behaved in the opposite way in their pattern of deflective responses. That is, both American females and males gave deflective responses more frequently when responding to complimenters of the same sex than when responding to complimenters of the opposite sex. For example, the American F-F pairing gave 33 deflective responses, while the F-M pairing gave 31 responses of the same type. In addition, the American M-M pairing gave 41 deflective responses, whereas the M-F pairing gave 28 responses of the same type.

Based on the data in tables 4.9 and 4.10, it can be concluded that in all their four gender-pairings of respondent and complimenter, Saudis
were more frequent deflectors than Americans. To be more specific, the Deflection mean frequency ratio of Saudi to American gender-pairing was as follows: F-F (2.37 - 1.93), F-M (3 - 1.93), M-M (2.75 - 2.56), and M-F (3.62 - 1.75). These gender-pairing ratios of language groups are illustrated in Figure 4.6 below. I suggest that the fact that Saudis' were more frequent deflectors than Americans might be explained by the common supposition that Americans, in general, are clear-cut and straightforward in their dealings and interactions. On the other hand, Arabs are generally thought of as frequent users of evasive expressions that have more than one interpretation. Patai (1973: 60-65) comments on the Arabs' mentality saying that an Arab does not always mean what he says. For example, he expresses intentions that he does not intend to carry out, but once uttered they give him psychological relief and reduce pressure on him to engage in any act. Anderson (1991: 101) quotes Gudykunst & Kim's contrast of American and Arab cultures, "American culture places greatest emphasis on explicit meaning. Arab cultures, on the other hand, make greater use of subtle, contextual clues in interpreting messages". This might explain why Americans are more frequent acceptors and rejectors but less frequent deflectors than Saudi Arabs.

As has been discussed in this section, the gender-pairing of respondent and complimenter had a significant effect at a low level of significance on the mean frequency of Acceptance responses, but it had no significant effect on the mean frequency of Rejection and Deflection responses. Generally speaking, American females and males - singles as well as pairings - were more frequent acceptors and rejectors but less frequent deflectors than Saudi Arabs.
Figure 4.6: Mean Frequency of Response Types By Gender-Pairing Of Respondent-Complimenter
In this chapter, Saudis and Americans have been compared and contrasted regarding the distribution of their DCT response types and how they performed each response type. In addition, the effects of complimenter’s social status, the complimenter’s social distance, the respondent’s gender, and the gender-pairings of respondent-complimenter on the mean frequency of Acceptance, Rejection and Deflection responses of Saudis and Americans have been discussed in detail.

To sum up the findings of this chapter, both Americans and Saudis were found to be highly frequent acceptors. Whereas Americans had ‘Bald Acceptance’ and ‘Appreciation’ as their favorite response types in the Acceptance category, Saudis showed an obvious tendency to strikingly use the ‘Duty’ and ‘Formulaic Acceptance’ response types in the same category. Additionally, females in both American and Saudi groups were more frequent acceptors than males in their native groups. Moreover, Saudis tended to accept more and reject less when responding to an interlocutors of the same sex, while Americans behaved in the opposite way.

The variables of complimenter’s social status and social distance had significant effects only on the response type frequency in the Deflection category, while the variables of respondent’s gender and respondent-complimenter gender-pairing had significant effects only on the response type frequency in the Acceptance category of both Americans and Saudis. Both Americans and Saudis accepted most from lower status complimenterers, rejected most with equal status complimenterers, and deflected most with higher status complimenterers. Furthermore, both Americans and Saudis deflected more frequently to close relationship complimenterers than to ones of far relationship.
In the next chapter, the results of the Saudi EFL learners group data analyses will be discussed in relation to those of Native Saudis and Native Americans in order to investigate the extent to which there is evidence of pragmatic transfer from Saudi Arabic to the English of the Saudi EFL learners. Additionally, a discussion of the possible factors causing pragmatic transfer will follow.
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CHAPTER FIVE

PRAGMATIC TRANSFER IN THE SAUDI EFL LEARNERS GROUP DATA

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In the last chapter, the collected data from Native Saudis and Native Americans were analyzed contrastively with regard to the distribution of response types, and the mean frequencies of Acceptance, Rejection and Deflection responses in relation to the complimenter's social status, the complimenter's social distance, the respondent's gender, and the gender-pairing of respondent and complimenter.

In this chapter, the results of the Saudi EFL learners group will be analyzed and compared to the results of the other two groups. The ultimate goal of this comparative study of the Saudi EFL learners group data is to investigate pragmatic transfer from Saudi Arabic to the English compliment responses and the factors leading to such pragmatic transfer.

Though it was defined in Chapter Two of this study, it may be useful to recall the working definition of pragmatic transfer. Pragmatic transfer applies to the use of rules of speaking found in the native language in a second or foreign language. To put it in a more practical way for this study, any similarities between the Arabic responses given by Native Saudis and the English responses given by the Saudi EFL learners will be considered in this study as evidence of pragmatic transfer.
The analysis of the Saudi EFL learners group data is done at two levels:

1. Comparing and contrasting the frequency and content of response types given by Saudi EFL learners with those of the Native Americans and the Native Saudis.

2. Comparing and contrasting the effects of the four variables investigated in this study on the mean frequencies of response types given by Saudi EFL learners with those given by Saudis and Americans. By these means, the researcher was able to determine whether or not there was evidence of pragmatic transfer from Saudi Arabic to the English of Saudi EFL learners.

5.2 PRAGMATIC TRANSFER OF RESPONSE TYPES AND FORMULAS

The DCT mean frequency in the Acceptance category for the Saudis is 64.69, and 66.25 for the Americans (see Table 4.1 p. 91). The mean frequency in the Acceptance category for the Saudi EFL informants was 62.94 according to data tabulated in the same table. Thus, the Saudi EFL learners’ strategy of Acceptance responses is closer to that of the Saudi informants than to that of American informants. That is an indication that there is evidence of the transfer of Acceptance response strategy from Saudi Arabic to the English of the Saudi EFL learners group.

Pragmatic transfer in the strategy of Acceptance category is confirmed by the Saudi EFL learners Acceptance subtypes when compared to those of the Saudis and the Americans. For example, in the subtype of Bald Acceptance, Saudis, according to the data in Table 4.1 (p.91), gave 126 responses representing 9.90% of their data, whereas
Americans gave 251 responses representing 20.17% of their data. The Saudi EFL learners gave 174 responses representing 14.35% of their data. In addition, 15.15% of Americans' spoken responses in the interviews, according to data displayed in Table 4.2 (p.93), were Bald Acceptance ones, whereas Saudis gave no spoken Bald Acceptance responses. Saudi EFL learners gave only 2 spoken Bald Acceptance responses representing 5.55% of their data according to data of the same table. That is, from the numbers and percentages of DCT Bald Acceptance responses it appears that Saudi EFL learners transfer the Bald Acceptance response strategy from Saudi Arabic to the English they used in giving their responses.

It seems that the Saudi EFL learners are not only transferring the strategy but also the content of the responses to their English. This is exemplified in the following response given by a Saudi EFL learner in response to the situation one in which his boss compliments his distinguished performance at work.

Example 5.1\textsuperscript{1} C: You've done a splendid job. I've never seen anybody more efficient than you.
R: I'm not an exception in my family. All brothers and sisters are dedicated to their jobs.

The respondent is equally proud of his family members as of himself. This is an apparent case of cultural transfer from Saudi Arabic culture in which an individual identifies himself by his family ties. An American would probably boast of his personal merits and achievements more than of his family members.

Another example of cultural transfer from Saudi Arabic to the English of the Saudi EFL learners group is found in the responses given by

\textsuperscript{1} All examples used in this chapter are specimen examples taken from the data given by the Saudi EFL learners.
two Saudi EFL learners in response to situation eleven in which a parent compliments his son on his excellence at school.

Example 5.2

C: I'm proud of your excellence. You set a good model for your brothers and sisters.

R1: I plan to be a doctor to take care of you and mother when you get old.

R2: I'll be faithful and reward you for your efforts when I graduate and get a job.

The respondents are transferring typical cultural features of Arabic society, that is, supporting their parents fully when they get old and become helpless in the absence of a social welfare system. Thus, most parents in the Arab World look at spending generously on their children as an investment that will pay off when they become old and helpless.

As discussed earlier in Chapter Four, Native Americans used the Appreciation strategy (35.53%) almost twice as much as Saudis (18.22%). The Saudi EFL learners' use of the Appreciation strategy (24.75%) matches more closely that of native Saudis than that of Native Americans. This indicates that Saudi EFL learners followed the Saudis' relatively low frequency in the use of the Appreciation strategy in the English used in their compliment responses.

According to data displayed in Table 4.1 (p.91), there is obvious evidence of pragmatic transfer in the Saudi EFL learners' high frequency of Formulaic Acceptance responses (14.10%) which is closer to the frequency of this type of response in the Native Saudi group (15.63%) than in the Native American group (9.88%). It is useful to look at other responses given by Saudi EFL learners in response to situation eleven in which a parent is impressed by his son's performance at school.
Example 5.3  

C: I'm proud of your excellence. You set a good model for your brothers and sisters.  
R1: You have showed me the roads to success.  
R2: I am stepping on your steps, father.  
R3: Plant palm trees, you harvest dates.  

These responses exemplify the cultural transfer of formulaic and proverbial expressions from Saudi Arabic to the English of the Saudi EFL learners. Since the contents of all three responses appear to be translations of Saudi Arabic proverbial and formulaic sayings, they represent unquestionable evidence of pragmatic transfer from Saudi Arabic in the English of the Saudi EFL learners.  

Similarly, some of the Saudi EFL learners transferred other cultural patterns from Saudi Arabic, such as the use of blessings to offset the supposed harm of the 'evil eye' and the offer of the complimented object to the complimenter. The pragmatic transfer of these two cultural features from Saudi Arabic to the responses expressed in English by the Saudi EFL learners is illustrated in the two following examples. The first set of responses are given by Saudi EFL learners to the compliment of situation ten in which the complimenter is impressed by his friend's fitness.  

Example 5.4  

C: Oh! You look great! You've become incredibly fit.  
R1: Don't envy me. May God protect me from your evil eye.  
R2: May your eyes be cool on me.  

In the other example, we find responses given by two Saudi EFL learners in response to situation five in which a male boss is complimented by his secretary upon his wearing an elegant suit.
Example 5.5  C: You look so elegant today!
R1: Nothing is too much for you. You can have it.
R2: It's yours. Have it.

These two cultural features, the fear of 'evil eye' and offering the complimented object to the complimenter, do not exist in the American culture. Thus, they represent definite evidence of pragmatic transfer from Saudi Arabic to the American English of the Saudi EFL learners.

While Native Americans had only 10 Duty responses representing 0.80% of their data, Native Saudi Arabs accumulated 184 Duty responses representing 14.45% of their data according to information provided in Table 4.1 (p.91). Saudi EFL learners provided 90 Duty responses representing 7.43% of their data. That is, the Saudi EFL learners' frequent use of Duty responses is transferred from Saudi Arabic to their English. Once again pragmatic transfer does not exist only in the frequency of this response type but also in its content. In the next example, while Americans understand helping a lost stranger as a civic duty, Saudis think of it as a religious duty, a compliance with Islamic teachings in order to win God's contentment. The Saudi EFL learners were transferring the Saudi conception of Duty to the responses they gave in English, as illustrated in the following example from situation thirteen in which the respondent is complimented by a lost stranger to whom he had given directions.

Example 5.6  C: That's nice of you. You would make a great tourist guide.
R1 (Native American): It's my civic duty to help a lost stranger.
R₂ (Native Saudi): haathaa huwa waajibu almoslimi nahwa al aakhariin
[This is the Moslem's duty towards others.]

R₃ (Saudi EFL learner): Our religion emphasizes helping others who are in need.

I think this is a clear case of pragmatic transfer in which the Saudi EFL learner is transferring the Saudi Arabs' tendency to attribute complimented behaviors to compliance with their Islamic teachings.

Native Americans were found to be less frequent users of Return responses than Native Saudis. To be more specific, Saudis accumulated 150 Return responses representing 11.78% of their data, while Americans issued only 75 Return responses representing 6.02% of their data according to information provided in Table 4.1 (p.91). Being greatly influenced by their Islamic teachings that urge them to return greetings and compliments, the Saudi EFL learners gave 146 Return responses representing 12.04% of their data according to the information provided in the same table. That is, while the Saudi EFL learners gave almost twice as many Return responses as Native American respondents, they gave a very similar number of Return responses to those given by Native Saudi respondents. This demonstrates that the Saudi EFL learners' frequent use of Return responses is transferred from Saudi Arabic to their English.

No pragmatic transfer was detected in the effect of complimenter's social status on the Acceptance and Rejection responses. However, in the Deflection category, Saudis gave 69 responses to equal-status complimenters representing 21.3% of their data, whereas Americans gave 44 responses of the same type representing 12.5% of their data.
according to the information provided in Table 4.5 (p.109). Saudi EFL learners gave 64 deflective responses to equal-status complimenter's representing 22.3% of their data. Furthermore, while the mean frequency of deflective responses to equal-status complimenter's was 17.25 in the Saudi group and 16.00 in the Saudi EFL learners group, it was only 11.00 in the American group. Thus, it can be concluded that the Saudi EFL learners group respondents were transferring the highly frequent use of deflective responses to equal-status complimenter's from Saudi Arabic to their English.

The Saudi EFL learners were also found to be transferring the Native Saudis' Acceptance and Deflection response behavior to close-distance complimenter's. According to the data in Table 4.6 (p.113), the Saudis' mean frequency of Acceptance and Deflection responses to familiar complimenter's were 60.25, 17.28 respectively and those of Saudi EFL learners to the same class of complimenter's were 54, 16 respectively, whereas the mean frequency of Americans' Acceptance and Deflection responses to close-distance complimenter's were 73.00 and 11.00. From these figures it can be noted that the mean frequency of Acceptance responses by the American informants to familiar complimenter's was higher than that of Saudis and Saudi EFL learners; moreover, the mean frequency of Deflection responses by the American informants to familiar complimenter's was lower than that of Saudis and Saudi EFL learners. Therefore, this is an indication that the Saudi EFL learners were pragmatically transferring the relatively less frequent use of Native Saudis' Acceptance responses to familiar complimenter's as well as the relatively frequent use of Deflection responses to familiar complimenter's.
According to the data in Table 4.8 (p.120) which shows the effect of the respondent’s gender on response types in the three language groups, female and male Saudi EFL learners’ Acceptance mean of frequencies matched more closely those of female and male Saudis than those of female and male Americans. That is, while female and male Saudi respondents’ Acceptance mean of frequencies were 33.69 and 30.31 and those of females and males in the Saudi EFL learners group were 33.56 and 29.63, those of the American females and males were 35.06 and 32.44 respectively. From these figures, we can deduce that both American females and males were more frequent givers of Acceptance responses than females and males of the other two groups. It can also be concluded that both female and male respondents in the Saudi EFL learners group transferred the rates of Acceptance response frequencies used by Saudi females and males to their English.

Similarly, the male respondents in the Saudi EFL learners group transferred the Saudis’ more frequent use of Deflective responses according to data shown in Table 4.8 (p.119). To be more specific, while the mean frequency of Saudi male deflective responses was 7.00 and that of male Saudi EFL learners was 6.5, the mean frequency of American male deflective responses was 4.31, far lower than those of males in the other two groups.

In the Acceptance category, the four gender-pairings of respondents in the Saudi EFL learners group as well as respondents in the Native Saudi group had consistently lower mean of frequencies than those of respondents in the Native American group according to data in Table 4.10 (p.124) which shows the effect of gender-pairing on response-type frequency. However, it is worth noting that all these differences
between the performance of the Saudi and American gender-pairings in
the Acceptance category are quite slight and do not attain a level of
significance. In the F-F gender-pairing, the Acceptance mean frequency
in the groups of Saudis, Saudi EFL learners, and Americans were
respectively as follows: 17.31, 17.37, and 17.68. That is, the three means
were close to each other, but those of the Saudis and Saudi EFL learners
were lower than that of Americans. In the F-M gender-pairing, the
Acceptance mean frequencies in the three groups were respectively as
follows: 16.43, 16.87 and 18.06. Again the American Acceptance mean
frequency for this gender-pairing is higher than those of Saudis and
Saudi EFL learners. In the M-M gender-pairing, the Acceptance mean
frequencies in the three groups were respectively as follows: 16.00, 15.31,
and 16.06. The American Acceptance mean frequency for this gender-
pairing is a little higher than those of the other two groups. Last, in the
M-F gender-pairing, the Acceptance mean frequencies of the three
groups were respectively as follows: 14.18, 14.43, and 16.5. That is, the
Americans’ Acceptance mean frequency in the M-F gender-pairing is
higher than those of Saudis and Saudi EFL learners. To sum up, the
Acceptance mean frequencies of Saudis and Saudi EFL learners in the
four gender-pairings of F-F, F-M, M-M, and M-F were consistently
lower than that of Americans, which leads to the conclusion that the
Saudi EFL learners were transferring the Acceptance strategies with
respect to gender-pairings from Saudi Arabic to English.

In the Rejection category, Saudi EFL learners were detected
transferring the Saudis’ Rejection mean frequency of F-F and M-F
gender-pairings, but not those of the F-M and M-M gender-pairings.
According to data in Table 4.10 (p.124), in the F - F gender-pairing, the Rejection mean frequencies of the Saudis, Saudi EFL learners and Americans groups were respectively as follows: 0.31, 0.56, and 0.93. That is, the American Rejection mean frequency for the F-F gender-pairing was higher than those of the other two groups. In the M-F gender-pairing, the Rejection mean frequency of the three groups were respectively as follows: 1.18, 1.18, and 0.75. That is, the American Rejection mean frequency for the M-F gender-pairing was noticeably lower than those of the Saudi and the Saudi EFL learners. This indicates that the Saudi EFL learners transferred the Saudi rejection patterns of the F-F and M-F gender-pairings because their behavior in these two gender-pairings matched more closely that of Saudis than that of Americans.

In the Deflection category, according to the data displayed in Table 4.10 (p.124), the behavior of the Saudi EFL learners group in the F-F and the M-F gender-pairings matched more closely to the behavior of Saudis than to that of Americans. To be more specific, in the F-F gender-pairing, the Deflection mean frequency for the groups of Saudis, Saudi EFL learners and Americans were respectively as follows: 2.37, 2.25, and 1.93. That is, the American Deflection mean frequency for the F-F gender-pairing was considerably lower than that of the other two groups. Besides, in the M-F gender-pairing, the Deflection mean frequency of the three groups were respectively as follows: 3.62, 3.43, and 1.75. That is, the American Deflection mean frequency for the M-F gender-pairing was significantly lower than those of Saudis and Saudi EFL learners. In other words, the Saudi EFL learners were pragmatically
transferring the ways Saudis handled Deflection responses in the F–F and M–F gender-pairings.

5.3 **PRAGMATIC TRANSFER OF CULTURAL MODES**

It seems that the Saudi EFL learners were greatly affected by the rich cultural heritage they had acquired in parallel with their mother tongue. They transferred many of the cultural modes they had learned with their Saudi Arabic to the compliment responses they gave in English in this study. This section looks at some of these transferred cultural modes in the data of the Saudi EFL learners.

1. **The utilization of religious expressions and concepts.** In more than forty responses, the Saudi EFL learners referred explicitly to God, religion, Islam, Holy Quraan, Prophet Mohammed, Moslem, religious duty, Islamic teachings, and so on. This shows how central religion is in their responses to compliments which refer to religious duty, abidance by Islamic teachings, or an attempt to attain God’s contentment. These are some of the illustrative responses given by Saudi EFL learners:

- “Our religion encourages hard work”.
- “Our religion emphasizes helping others who are in need”.
- “It’s what I have learned from Holy Quraan: Return found things to their owners”.
- “I am a good Moslem; I like to do my job perfectly”.
- “As a Moslem, I’ll be rewarded for every help I extend to needy old people”.
- “God is merciful and asks us to show mercy to each other”.
- “God promised to forgive ten sins in return of every good deed we do”.
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• "If you are assigned a job, God expects you to do it perfectly”.
• "If you don’t observe me, God does”.
• "Every bite of food you offer, gets you one step closer to Paradise”.

It seems that the Saudi EFL learners are transferring this cultural mode of excessive utilization of religious expressions and concepts from Saudi Arabic to their compliment responses given in English.

2. Most Saudis still live within extended families, and family loyalty and obligations take precedence over other commitments. The Saudi EFL learners seem to be representing this closeness and loyalty to family members in the compliment responses they produce in English. These are some of their responses that exhibit transferred values:

• “Not only me, all my brothers and sisters are elegant too”.
• “That is my duty towards my dear family”.
• “I’m like your son. Don’t hesitate to ask me for any help”.
• “You are like my grandmother; I am happy to help you”.
• “I see my father in you. You remind me of my affectionate father”.
• “It’s the duty of brothers and cousins to help each other”.

3. Being affectionate to family members as well as respectful to relatives, Saudi Arabs frequently use the relative and family members’ titles in addressing others, even strangers, to show care, concern and affection. The Saudi EFL learners appear to be transferring this cultural mode from Saudi Arabic to their learned English as illustrated in the following examples:

• “That’s my job, Son”.
• “You’re such a complimenter, Uncle”.
• “Thank you for such sweet words, Auntie”.
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"Don't forget to pray for me, Father".
"No problem, Mother".
"I'm glad to help you, poor Uncle".
"Anytime, Brother".

4. Despite a developed infrastructure and a high standard of living Saudi Arabs, still live in a conservative and conventional way which is manifested in various aspects of their lives, especially the excessive use of formulaic, ritualistic and proverbial expressions in their speech act interactions. The Saudi EFL learners transferred this cultural and linguistic mode from their Saudi Arabic to the compliment responses they gave in English. Some examples of these responses follow:

- "Feed the months, you capture the hearts".
- "May God keep you safe and healthy".
- "If all bosses are fair, love and peace will prevail".
- "Justice is justice, no compromise".
- "Your eyes are lovely and see things so".
- "May God protect me from your evil eye".
- "Plant palm trees, you harvest dates".
- "Men love via their stomachs before their hearts".

5. Arabs are well known for their generosity and hospitality. A guest in Arab homes is always treated lavishly and warmly. He is served big quantities of food and drink on his arrival. Even as a tourist in an Arab city, one will be met hospitably and provided with any assistance one asks for. This Saudi Arab cultural mode is transferred by Saudi EFL learners from their mother language to the compliment responses they gave in American English, as seen in these examples:

- "It's a tradition to help guests of our town".
• "This is the Arab way of dealing with their visitors".
• "Here is my mobile phone number in case you need an urgent help".
• "How about lodging? If you don't have one, you're most welcomed at my home".

6. As previously mentioned, Saudi Arab society is still conservative in the sense that most Saudis still abide by the social codes and religious prescriptions that regulate their daily lives, especially in the relationship between men and women. In general, men and women are separated in all public gatherings. Women take care of their children, husbands and homes. Men support and defend their female family members till they get married. The role of women as caretakers of their children and pleasers of their husbands as well as the role of men as supporters and defenders of their female family members are represented in the learned English of the Saudi EFL learners, as exemplified in these responses:

• "If my brother hears you, he might smash your face".
• "You embarrass me. You know I am a shy girl".
• "Anyone with the minimum of manhood and dignity would have done the same thing".
• "I am doing my duty toward an innocent lady in adverse conditions".

7. Arabs have a firm belief that their language is superior to all other languages because it was the medium in which the Holy Quraan was revealed directly from God. Besides, Arabic is pleasing to listen to when recited aloud because its structure lends itself to rhyme and rhythm (Nydell, 1996). Arabs are fond of eloquence which is exhibited in their use of exaggeration and repetition for effect, and their selection of
eloquent vocabulary items that emphasize non-materialistic values, such as freedom, dignity, nobility, manhood, etc. The Saudi EFL learners appear to transfer the use of this linguistic and cultural mode from their native language (Saudi Arabic) to the English in which these responses were written:

- "Goodness will beat evil in the end".
- "You have a sweet tongue. What comes out of it is sweet, too".
- "Helping a stranger is an indication of nobility".
- "My tongue is tied; I don’t know what to say".
- "Teachers are the prophets who live among us".

5.4 FACTORS CAUSING PRAGMATIC TRANSFER

The examples discussed in section 5.2 in which the Saudi EFL learner group respondents were found to be transferring the content and frequency of some compliment response types from Saudi Arabic to English represent valid evidence that pragmatic transfer exists in the data given by these respondents. Besides, the seven cultural modes discussed and illustrated by samples in section 5.3 provide evidence that confirms the existence of pragmatic transfer in the responses given by the Saudi EFL learners participating in this study.

However, it is not sufficient to demonstrate the existence of pragmatic transfer in an EFL or ESL learner’s text; we also need to know why such a transfer is prevalent. Such an attempt to discover the reasons for pragmatic transfer in the English of Saudi Arabs adds to the importance of this study which is the first of its kind to investigate this sociolinguistic phenomenon in the compliment responses of Saudi EFL
learners. It is hoped that this will benefit teachers of Saudi EFL learners in enabling them to raise their trainees' level of consciousness-raising of pragmatic competence of the compliment interactions they produce in English.

Findings based on the DCT and interview data suggest that several important factors play a role in the pragmatic transfer of compliment responses given by Saudi EFL learners in English. In the paragraphs below I provide a brief discussion of these factors.

5.4.1. Love of Language

As mentioned in section 5.3 of this chapter, Arabs feel proud of their language and have a firm belief that it is superior to all other languages, mainly because the Holy Quraan (God's direct revelation to Prophet Mohammed) is written in Arabic. According to Hamady (1960:204), "there is a dignity attached to the Arabic language, mainly because it is the chosen vehicle of God's ultimate message. The Quraan was the first prose work in Arabic and has ever remained the model". It is, therefore, not surprising that all Arabs love their native language and take pride in it because their love for it comes from their love of their Holy Book. They do not only love it but also try to imitate the beauty and eloquence of its words.

Arabic is not just a means of communication to its speakers, it is a language which sends history and success. As Hamady (1960:204) points out, "it arouses the passion of the people. The Arabs love their language as vividly today as they did thirteen hundred years ago". Arabs feel that their language was a tool of identification and unification for them in the past, and they still have hope and yearning that it will have an effective role in their reunification in the near future. Consequently, I
believe that their love of their native language and their desire to imitate the style of their Holy Book was one reason why the Saudi EFL learners transferred some of their Arabic compliment responses to English.

5.4.2. Religion

The role of Islam in a Moslem's life is different from the role other religions play in the lives of their believers. Islam has an all-encompassing place in the lives of all Moslems and plays a directional role in all daily life activities of its followers. Most of their responses to daily speech act interactions begin with *inshaa Allah* [God willing] because they firmly believe that God's will controls and directs all humans events. All Moslems, at least Arab Moslems, begin most of their letters, reports, speeches and invitation messages by *bismillahi ar rahman ar rahiim* [In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate]. Also, Moslem Arabs often pepper their interactions with the phrase *wallaahi* [Swear to God] whenever they want their interlocutors to believe what they say, or end an argument in favor of their declared statement or decision. All three aforementioned ritualistic religious expressions were used in the Saudi EFL learners group compliment responses which indicates that religion was an important factor in prompting pragmatic transfer from their native language to their target language.

One of the misconceptions some Moslem extremists have is that being fluent in Western languages and mastering the pragmatic styles of Western civilization mean imitating the Western way of life to the extent that leads to deterioration in the prevalent Islamic values. This misconception results in lack of interest in proficiency in English and other Western languages among Moslem learners, and thus indirectly
promotes the pragmatic transfer of mother tongue norms to the foreign language they are learning.

5.4.3. Political Background

By political background I mean the perceptions Arabs have of themselves and of foreigners, especially Westerners. The Middle East has been the field of so many wars and invasions throughout history which have resulted in deeply rooted malice, hatred, and hard feelings among the inhabitants of the area and intruders. Beginning with the massacres committed by the Crusaders in the East Mediterranean region and ending with the conspiracy of the British government that plotted with the Jews to establish the state of Israel in Palestine, the Arabs keep in mind bitter memories of the West and never trust their intentions. Parker (1994:94-101) comments on this concept: “Distrust of foreigners runs deep in the Middle East, where history reflects endless wars, invasions and occupations”. Students living in such a region, with the constant reminder of British and American intrusion into their land, find it difficult to justify learning English for any purpose other than instrumental ones, such as helping them in getting better employment opportunities.

On the other hand, Arabs feel that they have a rich cultural heritage and that they have contributed greatly to human civilization during the dark ages (Middle Ages) of Europe in various fields of knowledge such as mathematics and medicine, but most of their contributions and accomplishments are unacknowledged and unappreciated in the West. This feeling of being victimized, exploited,
and wrongly characterized has resulted in bitter feelings of frustration towards the West (Nydell, 1996).

To sum up, the Arabs' feeling that they are misunderstood and exploited by the West in addition to the daily tension of the Palestinian dilemma and the Iraqi crisis are examples of the recent encounters between Arabs and the West that may lead to lack of interest in attaining fluency in Western languages in general and English in particular.

5.4.4. Purpose of Learning English

The purpose of learning a foreign language is an important factor in determining the success or failure of its learner. That is, the incentive to learn a language is affected by a student's perception of its ultimate utility to him or her (Beebe, 1985; McGroarty, 1996).

The Saudi EFL learners at ARAMCO training centers are learning English for instrumental reasons only; they hope to win university scholarships to get higher degrees that qualify them for promotions and higher posts in ARAMCO. That is, they are not learning English in order to integrate or assimilate into a society of English speakers. Having this in mind, the subjects of the Saudi EFL learners group of this study look at learning English as a stepping-stone in their career and do not exert sufficient efforts to master the pragmatic competence of the English, and thus frequently transfer pragmatic styles. In other words, the pragmatic transfer detected in the compliment responses given by the Saudi EFL learners of this study may be due to lack of integrative ambition and motivation.
5.4.5. Linguistic Difficulty

As a result of their inability to express themselves well in the target language, many learners of foreign languages tend to translate expressions and imitate linguistic patterns of their native language. The Saudi EFL learners translated several common sayings and formulaic expressions from Saudi Arabic to English as a result of their inability to give the proper response of Americans in such situations. Here are some examples that exemplify this pragmatic transfer: A complimentee in the Saudi EFL learners group is responding to his boss who had complimented his efficiency at work by replying “I am a student in your school” which is a translation of a common formulaic saying in Arabic. Another response given to the same compliment was “I feel my tongue is tied”. A third respondent responded to his father who complimented his excellence at school by saying “You showed me the roads to success”. As previously noted, all three responses and many other ones are translations of equivalent Arabic sayings. The Saudi EFL learners might have given such responses because they were unable to give the appropriate responses used by native speakers of English in such situations. In brief, one of the reasons why Saudi EFL learners appeared to fall back on their native language norms of speaking was their inability to express themselves fully in English though they are categorized as advanced EFL learners.

5.4.6 Lack of Exposure to Native Speakers

Lack of exposure to native speakers is one of the most common problems learners of foreign languages suffer from when they are living outside the country whose language they are learning. Living such a
situation deprives the learner of the indispensable advantage of natural daily interactions with native speakers of the target language. Though the Saudi EFL learners are mainly taught by native speakers of English, they live separately, and thus they miss the chance of daily interaction with native speakers of English.

It seems that much of the Saudi EFL learners' deviations from American speech act norms were due to a lack of knowledge of the sociocultural norms governing American speech behavior. Thus, pragmatic transfer is believed to be used by Saudi EFL learners as a strategy to compensate for their lack of knowledge of American speech act norms.

In conclusion, the findings presented in this section show that factors such as the Saudi EFL learners' love of Arabic, their perceptions of native speakers of English, the difficulties of learning English as a foreign language, their purpose in learning English, and their limited exposure to native speakers of the target language seem to contribute to the presence of pragmatic transfer in the compliment responses they provided. However, determining to what extent each factor contributed to the existence of pragmatic transfer in the texts of Saudi EFL learners needs further study.

In summary, Saudi EFL learners were found to be transferring some of the response type strategies from their native language to the target language they used in responding to the DCT situations. For example, they transferred the Saudi frequent use of 'Formulaic Acceptance', 'Duty', and 'Return'. In addition, they transferred the use of some common cultural modes of Saudi Arabic, such as the excessive use of religious expressions and quotations, the dedication to family
bonds and commitments, the abidance by social and religious codes that allocate the roles of both sexes in society, and they frequent use of proverbial and idiomatic sayings in their daily life interactions.

In the next chapter, the researcher presents a summary of the results and the discussion presented in this chapter and the one before. This final chapter will comprise three main sections: a summary of the findings, a discussion of the pedagogical implications, and suggestions for further research. In the section summary of findings, the conclusions based on the results of data analysis are discussed briefly. A discussion of the pedagogical implications of the findings and how they can be useful to teachers of Saudis studying English as a foreign language and Americans studying Arabic as a foreign language is presented in the second part. They may enable students of both languages understand the cultural differences between Arabic and English, and thus facilitate their attainment of the pragmatic competence and the avoidance of potential pragmatic failures that American learners of Saudi Arabic and Saudi learners of American English may encounter. The third section of the next chapter will provide suggestions for further research in topics related to this study.
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CHAPTER SIX
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The first section of this chapter discusses the outcomes of the study and includes a summary of the similarities and differences between the ways Native Saudis and Native Americans performed compliment response types and the effects of the complimenter’s social status, the complimenter’s social distance, and the gender of respondent and complimenter on the mean frequency of the response types of these two language groups. In addition, the findings will include a few conclusions about pragmatic transfer found in the compliment responses given by the Saudi EFL learner group respondents and hypothesize as to the possible factors prompting this pragmatic transfer.

The second section of this chapter comprises mainly a consideration of the pedagogical implications of the results and their potential benefits to teachers. That is, based on the findings of this study, some recommendations will be made that might be beneficial to teachers of Saudi EFL learners and teachers of Americans studying Arabic as a foreign language. Such benefits include helping students avoid pragmatic failures and attain a sufficient degree of pragmatic competence to ensure a smooth flow of communication between native speakers of American English and Saudi EFL learners on one side and the American learners of Saudi Arabic and its native speakers on the other side.

The third section of this chapter will include some suggestions for further study to bridge existing gaps and find solutions for some of the problems mentioned in the field of cross-cultural pragmatics.
6.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

In line with the finding of Nelson et al (1996) that both Americans and Syrian Arabs tend to either accept or mitigate the force of the compliment rather than to reject it, both the Americans and the Saudi Arabs were found to be high acceptors, moderate deflectors, and rare rejectors. In percentage terms, Acceptance responses represented 85.20%, Deflection 11.01%, and Rejection 3.13% of the American data, and 81.30%, 15.40%, and 2.75% of the Saudi data.

Though Americans gave proportionately more Acceptance responses than the Saudis, both groups can be categorized as high acceptors who belong to the Agreement Culture (AC), according to Chen’s (1993) categorization of world cultures into 3 main categories: Agreement Culture (AC) in which agreement with compliments is the most prevalent response type, Modesty Culture (MC) in which rejection of compliments is the dominant response type as in Chinese culture, and Conflict Culture (CC) in which there is a conflict between the Agreement and Modesty maxims, and thus respondents tend to give deflective responses as a compromise between the two conflicting maxims.

The Americans were more frequent givers of Acceptance as a main category in general and Bald Acceptance as a subtype in particular than were Saudis. For example, the Americans gave 251 Bald-Acceptance responses representing 20.17% of their data, whereas Saudis issued only 126 responses of the same response type representing 9.90% of their data. This striking difference might be due to the American culture that emphasizes individualism and allows a hard worker to boast about his
personal achievements and accept compliments baldly; on the other hand, the Saudi culture based on the dominant Islamic values of cooperation and group work among believers expects individuals to be humble and modest when talking about themselves and attribute all their successes and failures to God's will. An Arab Moslem goes through conditioning to believe in these values at home, at school and at mosque. He is conditioned to behave modestly and humbly and thus avoids accepting compliments baldly in accordance with Prophet Mohammed's instructions, "Whoever exalts himself and walks proudly, Allah will be angry with him when he meets Him" and "Allah the Most High has revealed to me that you should be humble, so that no one transgresses another, or boasts to the other".

Being conditioned to refrain from accepting compliments baldly in order to meet the requirements for being a good Moslem and to avoid being arrogant by praising oneself, the Saudi Arab subjects frequently used the Shift Credit response type in which they attributed the credit of the complimented behavior or thing first of all to God and then to other agents directed by His will to accomplish this complimented achievement. Therefore, it is not surprising that they accumulated 151 Shift Credit responses representing 11.86 of the data a vitally larger proportion than the Americans who gave 100 responses of this type representing 8.03% of their data.

While the Americans accepted and rejected (66.25 and 3.13) very slightly more than the Saudis did (64.69 and 2.19), Saudis deflected (12.38) significantly more than the Americans (8.56). This might be due to the common supposition of Americans as individualistic, open, confident people. That is, being direct in their responses, Americans
tend to give more Acceptance and Rejection responses than Deflection ones. On the other hand, Saudi Arabs, being influenced by their Islamic teachings, tend to be too considerate to reject and too modest to accept an interlocutor's compliment. Thus, they find a safe solution in giving more deflective responses that suit people who want to please all concerned parties by avoidance of the direct responses of Acceptance and Rejection.

Eight Americans, five Saudis, and two Saudi EFL learners opted not to give responses to some of the DCT given compliments. Most of those who chose not to respond did so because they refused some of the situations due to social or religious taboos in their cultures; others thought that those few situations in which verbal responses were not provided.

In all three language groups, the social status of complimenter had no significant effect on the mean frequency of Acceptance and Rejection responses according to ANOVA results. That is, it did not make any difference in the mean frequency of Acceptance and Rejection responses whether the complimenter was of higher, lower, or equal status to the complimentee.

However, the ANOVA results showed a significant effect of complimenter's social status on the frequency of Deflection responses in all three language groups. Comparing the effect of the complimenter's social status variable on the Americans and the Saudis, we can conclude that both of them followed the same pattern of frequency: Higher status - equal status - lower status. However, the effect of the social status on hierarchical difference was greater in the case of the Saudis than the Americans.
In line with the effect of complimenter's social status on Acceptance and Rejection responses, the complimenter's social distance variable (whether familiar to or distant from the complimentee) had no significant effect on the mean frequency of both Acceptance and Rejection responses in all three language groups. That is, the ANOVA results showed that in all three language groups, it made no difference to the mean frequency of Acceptance and Rejection response types whether the complimenter was complimenting familiars or strangers.

Nevertheless, the ANOVA results showed that the complimenter's social distance had a significant effect on the mean frequency of Deflection response types in all three language groups. The effect of social distance on the Deflection mean frequency followed the same pattern in all three language groups; that is, the closer the complimenter was to the respondent, the more frequent a giver of deflective responses he became.

Investigating the effect of the respondent's gender on the frequency of the responses he gives led to the following outcome. The respondent's sex had a significant effect on the mean frequency of Acceptance response types in all three language groups. For example, the Acceptance mean frequency of Saudi females was 33.56 whereas the males' mean was 29.63. While American females had an Acceptance mean frequency of 35.06, the American males' mean was 32.44. These numbers lead to the conclusion that both American and Saudi females were more frequent acceptors than males.

Not only the respondent's gender but also the gender-pairings of respondent and complimenter had a significant effect on the mean frequency of compliment response in the Acceptance category. This
means that whether the respondent/complimenter was a female or male would have a significant effect on the mean frequency of Acceptance responses.

Furthermore, it is noted that the Saudis accepted more and rejected less when the complimenter and respondent were of the same sex than when they were of opposite sexes, and vice versa. This might be a result of the strict religious regulations that hinder or prohibit interactions between the two sexes outside the family circle. On the other hand, the Americans behaved differently. American females responding to each other gave fewer Acceptance responses than females responding to males. In addition, the Acceptance mean frequency of American males interacting with each other and males interacting with the other sex was almost the same. Of course, this appears to be due to the openness of American society that allows interactions between the two sexes.

Having detected similarities between the response types of the Saudi EFL learners and those of the Native Speakers of Saudi Arabic, it was found that the written as well as the spoken Bald Acceptance and Appreciation responses of the Saudi EFL learners matched more closely to the corresponding responses of the Native Saudis than to those of the Native Americans. This is an indication that the respondents in the Saudi EFL learner group were transferring the Saudis' relatively low rate of Bald Acceptance and Appreciation responses to their English compliment responses.

In addition, evidence was found that Saudi EFL learners transferred the Saudis' frequent use of ritualistic, formulaic, and proverbial Acceptance comments to English. This pragmatic transfer
included the offering the complimented object to the complimenter and offsetting the supposed harm of the 'evil eye'.

Being influenced by their native cultural heritage, the Saudi EFL learners group respondents transferred the Saudis' frequent use of Duty responses from Saudi Arabic to English. In regard to content, Saudi EFL learners used religious expressions extensively in their responses. This transferred feature is manifested in the frequent reference to God's will, God's credit, and Prophet Mohammed's (Pbuh) sayings.

Comparing the way they performed the last Acceptance subtype of Return with that of Native Saudis, the Saudi EFL learners group respondents were found to be transferring the feature of excessive use of the Return response type from Saudi Arabic to their learned English; they matched very closely the number of Native Saudi responses (150) accumulating 146 Return responses.

Investigating the effect of the complimenter's social status on the frequency of response types given by the three language groups, the Saudis were found to be less frequent users of Acceptance responses than were the Americans in both cases of complimenter's lower and equal social status. Saudi EFL learners matched very closely the relatively low rate of Saudi Acceptance responses in both cases, which indicates pragmatic transfer of this feature from Saudi Arabic to their learned English.

Trying to detect pragmatic transfer by Saudi EFL learners with respect to the social distance, it was found that both Native Saudis and Saudi EFL learners had a lower Acceptance mean frequency but a higher Deflection mean frequency than Native Americans when they were responding to complimenters of close social distance. That is, the Saudi EFL learners group subjects transferred these two socio-linguistic features from Saudi Arabic to the responses they expressed in English.
Looking for evidence of pragmatic transfer with respect to gender-pairing, it was found that both Native Saudi and Saudi EFL learner males had a relatively low frequency of Acceptance responses when they responded to females compared to the relatively higher frequency of Native American male responses. This is an indication that Saudi EFL learners were transferring this feature from Saudi Arabic to their learned English.

The Saudi EFL learners group respondents were found to be transferring not only response types but also the content of these responses. In other words, they transferred common cultural modes in Saudi Arab society, such as the extensive use of religious expressions as well as formulaic sayings, frequent reference to family members, bragging about one’s generosity, and the stereotyped roles of males and females. For example, while Native Saudis mentioned the word ‘God’ 164 times in their responses, Native Americans mentioned it only once. These numbers show the strikingly different role religion plays in American and Saudi Arab cultures. Thus, the Saudi EFL learner group who mentioned ‘God’ more than 40 times besides frequent reference to Prophet Mohammed’s (Pbuh) quoted sayings transferred this extensive use of religious reference in their compliment responses from Saudi Arabic to their learned English.

Moreover, many of the responses given by the Saudi EFL learners group included extensive reference to strong family ties, and the precedence of family loyalty over other obligations and commitments which is an essential part of Saudi Arab societal structure. This provides evidence that the Saudi EFL learners transferred this prevalent
cultural mode from Saudi Arabic to their learned English, for such a mode does not exist in American culture.

Related to the strong family ties found in Saudi Arab culture, Saudi EFL learners extensively used the titles of family members, such as son, father, uncle, auntie, brother, and mother in addressing their interlocutors and even stranger interactors as a means of showing care and concern in the interaction. This linguistic and cultural mode is quite common in Saudi Arab culture, but not existant in American culture. That is, it must have been pragmatically transferred from Saudi Arabic to the learned English of the Saudi EFL learners.

As another example of transferring cultural modes from Saudi Arabic to the American English of Saudi EFL learners, a wide variety of Saudi Arabic proverbial expressions, ritualistic and formulaic responses were also transferred to English and assimilated in the compliment responses Saudi EFL learners gave in English.

In addition, the responses given by Saudi EFL learners that refer to taking pride in being generous to guests constitute further evidence of pragmatic transfer from Arabic to the English they used in giving their responses.

6.3 PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Though both Americans and Saudi Arabs were found to be, in general, high acceptors, moderate reflectors and rare rejectors in their responses to the sixteen given compliment situations of the DCT, there were a few differences in the way each group accepted, deflected and rejected which increases the potential for pragmatic failures to occur. For example, the Arabs tended to give lengthy responses as a result of
their fondness for eloquence and their belief that a longer response sounds more sincere. However, if an Arab gives a lengthy response to an American complimenter, it is likely that the American will consider it an 'overindulgence in words', and this may lead to a pragmatic failure between the two interlocutors (Blum-Kulka & Olshtain, 1986: 175). On the other hand, if an American responds with a short, clear-cut response to a Saudi Arab complimenter, he might be thought of as insincere and unfriendly and this way perhaps create misunderstanding and hinder the establishment of good relations and successful business transaction between interlocutors from the two cultures.

A reverse situation in which a pragmatic failure is likely to occur is when a Saudi Arab male responds to a complimenting American female with a warning that it is sinful for a woman to compliment a man other than her husband or a first relative. We can imagine what a shock such a response would cause to the American female. This very serious pragmatic failure is due to the complimenter's lack of cultural awareness represented in the complimenter's ignorance of Saudi Arab social and religious codes that do not allow dealings of familiarity between the two sexes.

The few examples of pragmatic failure and the unfavorable results they lead to mentioned above show the importance of teaching pragmatic competence to foreign language learners. By the same token, they show the importance of this study and how it might open new avenues to understanding the sources of pragmatic errors committed by Saudi EFL learners.

Most studies on cross-cultural pragmatics end with conclusions that take the form of recommendations to teachers of foreign/second
languages about how to help their students attain a degree of pragmatic competence to enable the flow of communication and prevent the occurrence of pragmatic failure between them and the native speakers of those languages. The present study is not an exception to this practice.

The results of the present study indicate that though the speech act of compliment response is universal, ways of expressing it are cultural-specific. In line with the findings of this study, many studies in the field of cross-cultural pragmatics (e.g. Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986; Holmes & Brown, 1987; Bouton, 1994; Cohen 1996a, 1996b) concluded that in order to be communicatively competent in the target language, foreign language learners need to become knowledgeable not only in the rules of grammar but also in the sociolinguistic rules of language use. As the results of this study indicate, even advanced foreign language learners were found to resort to native speech norms when using their learned language. In most cases, such a fall-back results in deviations from what are considered socially and culturally appropriate speech norms in the target language. Such deviations may cause cross-cultural misunderstandings and communication breakdown.

In addition, the findings of this study suggest that pragmatic transfer in the Saudi EFL learners group texts is caused by several factors, such as the learner’s perception of the target language and its native speakers, the purpose of learning the target language, the lack of exposure to the target language and its native speakers, religious beliefs, and the degree of attachment to the learner’s native language.

Realizing the serious consequences that may result from inappropriate pragmatic transfer, the key question is how can foreign language teachers, and particularly EFL teachers, become more
successful in promoting pragmatic competence in speech act performance among their students? Answers to this question will definitely help foreign language learners make more appropriate use of the foreign language. Besides, answers to this question may lead to a better understanding of the issue of the teachability of pragmatic knowledge; that is, whether or not explicit instruction has a positive effect on learners' pragmatic awareness and whether or not pragmatic competence can be increased as a result.

Unfortunately, the teaching of pragmatic competence in an EFL setting is not simply a matter of prescribing what constitutes appropriate speech act behavior in the target language. Holmes and Brown (1987) elaborate:

By being too prescriptive in terms of what constitute appropriate linguistic behavior, teachers may deprive learners of the opportunity to find ways of using the second language which they personally find comfortable. Teaching about sociolinguistic competence requires sensitivity, since sociopragmatic decisions are social before they are linguistic, and while foreign language learners are fairly amenable to corrections which they regard as linguistic, they are justifiably sensitive about having their social judgment called into questions (p. 543).

The teaching of communicative competence is a highly sensitive issue. The reason is that teaching how to become communicatively competent in a foreign language involves drawing attention to foreign cultural and social norms. Some learners therefore may perceive it as an attempt to replace what they already know and as a result resistance may
occur. Of course this does not mean that teachers are excused from not finding ways to help their students achieve higher levels of communicative skill. The point I am trying to make here is that a successful approach for developing foreign language learners' communicative competence should emphasize awareness of cross-cultural differences and sensitivity to what learners already know. The inclusion of these two components is necessary in any foreign language teaching program and has been suggested by many researchers interested in interlanguage pragmatics (e.g. House & Kasper, 1981; Thomas, 1983; Nelson et al., 1993; Bardovi-Harlig et al., 1991; Olshtain, 1993; Kasper, 1997).

As Gajaseni (1994) suggests, the continuum of compliment responses is an appropriate topic for discussion in a class of EFL/ESL learners being taught awareness of cross-cultural norms. Students may work in groups, and each group comes up with a different arrangement of the continuum of compliment responses. Then, they may discuss with their teacher which response types are more common and why they are so. Besides, they may compare and contrast the mean frequency of compliment responses frequently used in the native language and the target language.

There are other techniques available for teachers to teach speech act behavior. One of them is the use of role plays. Utilizing the DCT situations of this study, teachers might ask students to take on the roles of the interlocutors involved in each of the situations. Teachers may also be encouraged to design their own role play scenarios and ask students to act them out in the classroom. The follow-up class discussion can contribute significantly to a better understanding of
compliment response strategies and the different variables which determine the selection of these strategies (e.g., gender, social status, social distance, etc.).

Another technique that can be effective in promoting pragmatic consciousness-raising, especially in an EFL setting such as in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, is the use of films (see Bardovi-Harlig et al., 1991; Rose, 1993, 1997). Films provide a rich source of information on how native speakers of a particular language perform speech acts and this information can make up, to some extent, for the lack of exposure to native speakers of the target language. Teachers can choose short film segments and prepare activities to accompany them. For instance, while they are watching the film, the students can write down what speech acts the film strip included and how they have been performed. Another activity would be to describe the relationship between the interlocutors regarding social status, social distance, gender, age, etc.

A third technique that can be useful in promoting pragmatic and cultural consciousness-raising is the “cross-cultural problem-solving technique” (Gebhard, 1996). This technique is effective in showing that interacting among culturally diverse people is complex and therefore often results in communication breakdowns. One way to use this technique in an EFL setting is to design imaginary scenarios that involve cross-cultural problems. Here is an imaginary scenario as an example.

**Situation:** Ali is a Saudi Arab student complimented on his new calculator by his American teacher, Mr. Carter. Ali spontaneously responds: “It’s yours. You can have it”. Mr. Carter hesitantly took the calculator and excitedly thanked Ali saying, “Oh, that’s too
much! You are so generous, Ali". Ali kept quiet but he was
stunned by what happened!

**Follow-up Questions:** There was a pragmatic failure in this
interaction. What was it? Did Ali really mean Mr. Carter to take the
calculator? How did Mr. Carter understand Ali’s offer? Why was
Ali surprised by Mr. Carter’s behavior? Do you think that there was
a communication misunderstanding caused by Ali and Mr. Carter’s
lack of awareness of each other’s culture?

By teaching some imaginary scenarios of pragmatic failure like the
aforementioned one to Saudi EFL learners, the teacher can help his
students become more conscious of their own cultural speech behaviors.
The benefit of such an activity is reinforced by Gebhard’s (1996:127)
view on this matter. He believes that since acquiring one’s own cultural
behaviors and values is an unconscious process, studying them in a
classroom in order to be aware of them is beneficial in promoting one’s
awareness of the cultural behavior crossed in the foreign language the
student is trying to master.

Teachers can also look for new teaching techniques and modify
existing ones to fit the needs of their students. Whatever technique they
may use, teachers should always keep in mind that the teaching of
pragmatic and cultural awareness does not mean enforcing new rules of
conduct. Rather, it means expanding the students’ knowledge and
helping them become more aware of the existence of the cultural
component reflected in their linguistic mastery, and the way this may
differ from one society to another.

In conclusion, the findings of this study add some knowledge to
our understating of differences and similarities in American and Saudi
Arab compliment response behaviors which may lead to cross-cultural misunderstandings and communication breakdowns. Awareness of the appropriate speech act behaviors in American English would help Saudi EFL learners master it successfully, prevent the potential negative feelings they may have toward their target language and its native speakers, and build up cross-cultural understanding between Americans and Saudi Arabs. Thus, the insights obtained from this study will hopefully have a positive impact on those involved in learning and teaching both English and Saudi Arabic as foreign languages. If cultural sensitivity is a prerequisite to successful foreign language learning and teaching, and I believe it is, then the findings of this study are a step in that direction.

6.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Since this study is limited to investigating the similarities and differences in the way Americans and Saudi Arabs perform the speech act of compliment response and detecting the existence of pragmatic transfer in the compliment responses given by Saudi EFL learners, in this final section I would like to make the following suggestions that may draw the attention to understudied areas. In doing so, it may be possible to add insights to the compliment response and pragmatic competence domains.

1. Since all the subjects of this study share the business background of ARAMCO, it is recommended that future contrastive studies of American and Saudi speech acts include subjects from all walks of life with a wider range of subjects in term of age, education, and socio-
economic background in order to give the research findings more credibility and generalizability.

2. The controlled variables in this study were the complimenter’s social status, the complimenter’s social distance, and the gender of respondent and complimenter. Including other variables such as age and educational level in future studies would add strength to the reliability and generalizability of the findings.

3. Since the main tool of collecting data was the DCT (interview data were used to provide a supplementary perspective), it was written responses that were investigated. Giving more weight to spoken responses (including intonation and other phonological features) and gestures including smiling, nodding and hugging in future studies might widen the range of data and lead to a set of unpredicted findings in the area of spoken compliment responses.

4. The continuum used in categorizing the compliment responses in this study is based on Gajaseni’s (1994), and thus consists of one dimension, Direct Agreement versus Direct Rejection. Further studies may add other dimensions such as implicit versus explicit compliment responses.

5. Even though the researcher of this study, when analyzing the data, had in mind the assumption that perceptions of the social and the contextual factors of the DCT situations were different for measures of the two investigated cultures, no measures were taken to investigate the extent of this hypothesized perception of difference. Therefore, I would strongly recommend that future research in cross-cultural speech act pragmatics considers more closely how the members of each cultural group view the variables implied in the DCT situations.
6. Some of the distinguishing sociolinguistic modes of the Saudi Arab culture, such as the formulaic and ritualistic expressions used in offering the complimented object and offsetting the assumed harms of the 'evil eye', would be an interesting topic in an anthropological investigation of the origin and the frequency of their use in various Arab communities.

7. Similarly, the Moslem Arab conception of duty is a large topic that would benefit from the collaborative efforts of sociologists, Islamic theologians and pragmalinguists who might together investigate this phenomenon and perhaps show its effects on a Moslem Arab's speech acts, daily life behavior and interactions, attitude towards others, and religious practices.

8. An early intention of this study was to contrast both compliments and compliment responses in American English and Saudi Arabic, but at a later stage - under the pressures of time - it was decided to give up studying compliments and confine the study to compliment responses. This also involved studying pragmatic transfer in the compliment responses of Saudi EFL learners. Therefore, a contrastive study of the way Americans and Saudis compliment is still needed and would add insights that complement the findings of the present study.

9. In the discussion of the factors that prompt pragmatic transfer, the student's love of language, religious beliefs, political background, purpose of learning English, the linguistic difficulty of L2 and the lack of exposure to native speakers were mentioned. However, to what extent each factor contributed to the existence of pragmatic transfer was not determined. Thus, a further study to determine each factor's contribution to of pragmatic transfer is urgently required, and would help EFL teachers in their planning.
10. In order to complement the findings of this research concerning pragmatic transfer by Saudi EFL learners, a study that investigates pragmatic transfer by Americans studying Saudi Arabic is called for and might lead to findings that help Americans studying Arabic attain their target level of pragmatic competence. It might also pave the way for a related contrastive study of pragmatic transfer by Saudi EFL learners and pragmatic transfer by Americans studying Arabic as a foreign language.
APPENDIXES
DISCOURSE COMPLETION TEST
ENGLISH VERSION

ALTERNATE A

DIRECTIONS: Please read the following short descriptions of situations you might find yourself in. In the following incomplete interactions, you take the part of the respondent. Please complete the missing part of each interaction with the actual compliment response you would make if you encountered the given situation and received the provided compliment. Please give the response that comes to your mind first.

SEX: __________________________ (Male/Female)

JOB: __________________________

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL: ______________ (High School/University Degree)

1. Your boss is impressed by your distinctive performance at work. She compliments you saying: You've done a splendid job. I've never seen anybody more efficient than you.

You: __________________________________________

________________________________________
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2. You are a distinguished player at your club soccer team. Your coach is proud of the two goals you scored in the final match and enabled your team to win the tournament cup. He compliments you saying: You were marvelous! We owe you our victory.

You: __________________________________________________

3. The dean of your college is impressed by your winning the First Place Award at the last annual Writing Competition of your college. She compliments you saying: Your article is impressive. You have a promising future.

You: __________________________________________________

4. You are a clerk at the customer counter of a big department store. Your manager is impressed by your efficiency in serving customers. She compliments you saying: Your hard work and dedication are highly appreciated.

You: __________________________________________________
5. You are the superintendent of a division in a well-established company. Your secretary is impressed by the new suit you are wearing. He compliments you, saying: You look so elegant today!

You: _______________________________________________

6. You are a professor at a university. One of your students is appreciative of the remarks and comments you’ve made throughout her research. She compliments you saying: You have been so helpful. I wouldn’t have been able to make it without your assistance.

You: _______________________________________________

7. You are a surgeon. You have operated successfully on one of your patient’s legs. He compliments you saying: You’ve done a great job. You are very skillful.

You: _______________________________________________
8. You are a supervisor at a company unit. You have promoted one of your diligent employees. She compliments you saying: You are very fair. You always reward hard workers.

You:

9. A friend has had dinner at your home. He has enjoyed the meal. He compliments you saying: The food is really delicious. You are a good cook.

You:

10. You have come across a friend you haven't seen for the last two years. He is impressed by your fitness. He compliments you saying: Oh! You look great. You've become incredibly fit.

You:

11. Your mother is proud of you as your name has been on the honor roll of your class for several consecutive months. She compliments you saying: I'm proud of your excellence. You set a good model for your brothers and sisters.

You:
12. You have a new haircut. One of your cousins is impressed. He compliments you saying: It’s so beautiful. You look attractive.
You:

13. You have just given directions on how to get to a nearby amusement park to a stranger who was lost in the downtown area of your hometown. He compliments you saying: That’s nice of you. You would make a great tourist guide.
You:

14. You have just returned a lost wallet with some money and credit cards you found in a public park to a middle-aged stranger. He compliments you saying: God bless you. You’re such an honest kind-hearted fellow.
You:

15. An old person gets on the bus. All the seats are occupied. You volunteer to give your seat to this old stranger. She compliments you saying: That’s kind of you. You are very courteous.
You:
16. You gave a ride to a stranger who was waiting at a bus stop on a chilly day. She compliments you saying: Thank you very much. You are very kind.

You: ____________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________
DIRECTIONS: Please read the following short descriptions of situations you might find yourself in. In the following incomplete interactions, you take the part of the respondent. Please complete the missing part of each interaction with the actual compliment response you would make if you encountered the given situation and received the provided compliment. Please give the response that comes to your mind first.

SEX: __________________________ (Male/Female)

JOB: __________________________

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL: ________________ (High School/University Degree)

1. Your boss is impressed by your distinctive performance at work. He compliments you saying: You’ve done a splendid job. I’ve never seen anybody more efficient than you.

You: ________________________________________________
2. You are a distinguished player at your club soccer team. Your coach is proud of the two goals you scored in the final match and enabled your team to win the tournament cup. She compliments you saying: You were marvelous! We owe you our victory.

You: 

3. The dean of your college is impressed by your winning the First Place Award at the last annual Writing Competition of your college. He compliments you saying: Your article is impressive. You have a promising future.

You: 

4. You are a clerk at the customer counter of a big department store. Your manager is impressed by your efficiency in serving customers. He compliments you saying: Your hard work and dedication are highly appreciated.

You: 


5. You are the superintendent of a division in a well-established company. Your secretary is impressed by the new suit you are wearing. She compliments you, saying: You look so elegant today!
You: _____________________________________________

6. You are a professor at a university. One of your students is appreciative of the remarks and comments you’ve made throughout his research. He compliments you saying: You have been so helpful. I wouldn’t have been able to make it without your assistance.
You: _____________________________________________

7. You are a surgeon. You have operated successfully on one of your patient’s legs. She compliments you saying: You’ve done a great job. You are very skillful.
You: _____________________________________________
8. You are a supervisor at a company unit. You have promoted one of your diligent employees. He compliments you saying: You are very fair. You always reward hard workers.

You: ____________________________________________________

9. A friend has had dinner at your home. She has enjoyed the meal. She compliments you saying: The food is really delicious. You are a good cook.

You: ____________________________________________________

10. You have come across a friend you haven’t seen for the last two years. She is impressed by your fitness. She compliments you saying: Oh! You look great. You’ve become incredibly fit.

You: ____________________________________________________

11. Your father is proud of you as your name has been on the honor roll of your class for several consecutive months. He compliments you saying: I’m proud of your excellence. You set a good model for your brothers and sisters.

You: ____________________________________________________
12. You have a new haircut. One of your cousins is impressed. She compliments you saying: It’s so beautiful. You look attractive.
You: ______________________________________________________

13. You have just given directions on how to get to a nearby amusement park to a stranger who was lost in the downtown area of your hometown. She compliments you saying: That’s nice of you. You would make a great tourist guide.
You: ______________________________________________________

14. You have just returned a lost purse with some money and credit cards you found in a public park to a middle-aged stranger. She compliments you saying: God bless you. You’re such an honest kind-hearted fellow.
You: ______________________________________________________

15. An old person gets on the bus. All the seats are occupied. You volunteer to give your seat to this old stranger. He compliments you saying: That’s kind of you. You are very courteous.
You: ______________________________________________________
16. You gave a ride to a stranger who was waiting at a bus stop on a chilly day.

He compliments you saying: Thank you very much. You are very kind.

You: ___________________________________________

____________________________________________
 Eidat Mถอนات

DCT
ARABIC VERSION

Alternate A

• الجنس:  (ذكر , أنثى)
• الوظيفة:  
• المستوى التعليمي:  (شتمة ثانوية، شهادة جامعية)

1. رسمت في العمل معجبة بقدراتك المتميزة لو لايفتاك الوظيفية. هل ترى عليك قائلة: لقد أدت عملا رائعاً. لم أصادف شخصاً بمثلك ناهيك من قبل.

انت:  

2. انت لاعب متميز في فريق كرة القدم التابع لنادي الذي تتمي إليه. مدربك فخور بالهدفين الذين سجلهما في المباراة النهائية لأنهما مكنتك من الفوز بكأس الدورة. هل رأيت بك قائلة: لقد كنت رائعاً. نحن مدينون لك بالفوز الذي حققنا.

انت:  
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3. عودة الكلية التي تدرس فيها مجهزة بجذور العرض الأولى في مسابقة التعبير السنوية التي تنظمها الكلية. ها هي تجربتك قائلة: مقالتك لاكتشاف للنظر. ينتظرنا مستقبلًا واعدًا في الكتابة.

4. أنت موظف في مكتب خدمات العمل لدى أحد المتاجر الكبرى. مدير المتجر معجب بكفاءتك في خدمة العملاء. ها هي تجربتك قائلة: عمل جيد وتفانيك في سبيل مصلحة العمل موضع تقديرًا.

5. أنت ناظر لأحد الأقسام في إحدى الشركات المرتبطة. مسؤول السكرتارية في مكتبك معجب بالبدل (الطقم) الجديد الذي تلبسه. ها هو تجربتك قائلًا: تلك تبدو في غاية الأناقة هذا اليوم.

6. أنت أستاذ جامعي. أحد طلابك ممتدثًا (شاكرًا) لملاحظاتك وتوجيهاتك التي زودتها بها طوال فترة البحث الدراسي الذي قام به. ها هي تفريطي عليك قائلة: لقد كنت عونًا لي طوال فترة البحث. ما كان بإمكانك انجاز هذا البحث لولا مساعدتك.

7. أنت طبيب جراح. لقد أجريت عملية جراحية ناجحة لتمدد أحد مرضىك. ها هو تجربتك قائلًا: لقد كنت بعمل عظيم. أنت ماهر جدًا.
8. أنت مشرف قسم في إحدى الشركات. لقد قمت بترقية إحدى موظفيك الجادين في عملهم. ما هي نظري علىك قائلة: "إليك نصف جداً اناك دوّاً تكافئ الأشخاص الجادين في عملهم.

أنت:

9. صديق لك تناول العشاء في بيتك. لقد استمتع هذا الصديق بالوجبة التي قدمتها له. ما هو يجملك قائل؟

أنت:

10. لقد قابلت بالصدفة صديقاً لم ترمه منذ سنتين. فسه محبب برشاقةك. ما هو يجملك قائل؟: "أوه! تبدو رائعاً. لقد أصبحت رشيقة إلى حد لا يوصف.

أنت:

11. والذلك فخورة بك نظراً لأن اسمك ظل على لوحة الشرف في صفلك لعدة شهور متتالية. ما هي الذي يحمل قائلة: "أنتي فخور بتبوقلك! لنكدود جيدة لأخوائك وآخواتك.

أنت:

12. لقد حصلت على قصة شعر جديدة. أحد أبناء عمومتك معجب بقصة شعرك. ما هو يجملك قائل: "تتاء قصة جميلة للغاية. إنك تبدو جذاباً.

أنت:
12 لقد قمت للتو بإعطاء توجيهات لشخص غريب ضع طريقة في وسط مدينتك كيف يصل إلى أحد حدائق الملاهي القريبة من المنطقة. هل هو يعاملك قائلًا: هذا لطف منك. بإمكانك أن تكون ديلاً سياحياً ناجحاً.

أنت:

13 لقد قمت للتو بإعادة محفظة تحتوي بعض النقود وبطاقات الإئتمان وجدتها في أحد الحدائق العامة لشخص غريب متوسط العمر. هل هو يخبرك على قائلًا: بارك الله فيك. أنت شخص إمين وطيب القلب.

أنت:

14 سيئة مسلة تصعد إلى الياض. كافة مقاعد الياض مشغولة. نستطيع ونعطي مقعدك لهذه السيدة الغريبة. هل هي تشيد بك قائلة: هذا لطف منك. فلك لعله خلقك ورقي رفيع.

أنت:

15 لقد قمت بتوصل سيئة غريبة كانت تنتظر في أحد مواقف الياضات في يوم شديد البرودة إلى الوجهة التي تقصدها في سيارتك الخاصة. هل هي تمدحك قائلة: شكراً جزيلاً لك. أنت طبيب جدًا.

أنت:
تعاليم:
أرجو أن تقرأ الوصف المختصر لكل من المواقف التالية التي قد تجد نفسك طرفا فيها. في المواقف المختصرة والناقصة التي ستملئهن، من المفروض أنك الشخص الذي سيتبرد على ما صدرت له. أرجو أن تقرأ الورقة في كل حوار كما لو كنت فعلًا قد وجدت نفسك في ذلك الموقف وأمديت لك المهمة المعطاة أعلى كل فقرة: في جو تمام الهدوء الذي يحضر ذهلك أولا.

• الجنس: __________ (ذكر، أنثى)
• الوظيفة: __________
• المستوى التعليمي: __________ (شهادة ثانوية، شاهدة جامعية)

1. رجاءك في العمل معجب بذاتك المتميز لواجباتك الوظيفية. ها هو بطاري علك قطالة: لقد أديت عملا رائعا. لم أصدف شخصًا يمثل كفتك من قبل.

______________________________

__________________________________________________________

______________________________

2. أنت لاعب مميز في فريق كرة القدم التابع لنادي الذي تنتمي إليه. مدربك فخورة بالهدف الذي لذي تستحق، ففي المباراة النهائية للاكتفاء هي مكنا فريقك من الفوز بكأس الدورة. ها هي نسبي بك قاتلة: لقد كنت رائعا. نحن مديونون لك بالفوز الذي حققته.

______________________________

__________________________________________________________

______________________________
3. عيد الكلية التي تدرس فيها موجب بفوزك بالمتحورة الأولى في مسابقة التعبير السنوية التي تنظمها الكلية. هو يجلوك قائلًا: مقالتك لافقة للنظر. ينتظرنا مستقبلّ واعدًا في الكتابة.

أنت:

4. أنت موظف في مكتب خدمة العملاء لدى أحد المتاجر الكبرى. مدير المتجر موجب بكفاءتك في خدمة العملاء. هو يمتلك قائلًا: عملك الجاد وتفانيك في سبيل مصلحة العمل موضع تقديرنا.

أنت:

5. أنت ناظر لأحد الأقسام في إحدى الشركات العريقة. مسؤولة السكرتارية في مكتبي موجب بالبذالة (الطقم) الجديدة التي تلبسها. هي تجملتك قائلة: فك تبدو في غاية الأناقة هذا اليوم!

أنت:

6. أنت مستاذ جامعي. أحد طلابك مكتنّ (شاكرو) للاهتماماتك وتوجيهاتك التي زودته بها طوال فترة البحث الدراسي الذي قام به. هو يجري عليك قائلًا: لقد كنت أعزًا لي طوال فترة البحث. ما كان بإمكاني تجاوز هذا البحث لولا مساعدتك.

أنت:

7. أنت طبيب جراح. لقد أجريت عملية جراحية ناجحة لدائم أحد مريضاتك. هي تمتلكك قائلة: لقد قمت بعملٍ عظيم. أنت ماهر جدًا!

أنت:
أنت مشرف قسم في أحد الشركات. لقد قمت بترقية أحد موظفيك الجادين في عملهم. هو يطري:

عليك قال: أنا منصف جداً. لن تؤثر في الأشخاص الجادين في عملهم.

أنت:


6. صديقتك كانت تتناول الطعام في بيتك. لقد استمتعت بهذا الوجبة التي قدمتها لها. ما هي تجاملك:

قابلة: أنا طبخ جيد.

أنت:


10. لقد قالتيني بالصدفة صديقتين لم ترها منذ سنين. إنها متعبة بشربتك. ما هي تجاملك قائلة: أوه! تبدو رائعة. لقد أصبحت رشيقة إلى حد لا يوصف.

أنت:


11. والنك فخور بك نظراً لأن أسلوك ظل على لوحة الشرف في صفلك لمدة شهور متتالية. ما هو يشيد بك قائلة: أنا فخور بتفوقك. أنا قدوة جيدة لأخواتك وأخواتك.

أنت:


12. لقد حصلت على قصة شعر جديدة. إحدى بنات عمومتك معجبة بقصة شعرك. ما هي تجاملك قائلة:

إليها قصص جميلة للغاية. إنك تبدو جذابًا.

أنت:
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13- لقد قمت للتو بإعطاء توجيهات لمدينة غريبة ضالت طريقها في وسط مدينتك كيف تصل إلى أحد حدائق
الملاهي القريبة من المنطقة. هذه تجاربك قائلة: هذا لطف منك. بامكانك أن تكون نليلًا سياحيا
ناجحا.


14- لقد قمت للتو بإعادة محظية تحتوي بعض النقود وبطاقة الإقامة وجدتها في أحد الحدائق العامة لمدينة
غربية متوسطة العمر. هذه تجاربك قائلة: بارك الله فيك. أنت شخص أمين وطيب القلب.


15- رجل مسن يمشي إلى الباص. كلّفة مقاعد الباص مشغولة. تتطوع وتتطوع مساعد لهذا الرجل الغريب.


16- لقد قمت بتوصيل رجل غريب كان ينتظر في أحد مواقف الباصات في يوم شديد البرودة إلى الوجهة
التي يقصدها في سيارتك الخاصة. هذا هو مساعد قائل: شكراً جزيلاً بك، أنت طيب جداً.
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I would like to request your approval to conduct a part of my doctoral thesis research on 50 trainees in the CAATD using questionnaire and interview techniques to investigate how compliments are exchanged by native speakers of Saudi Arabic in contrast to native speakers of American English. Furthermore, the research will detect any transfer of Arabic speech act norms to the learned English performed by our CAATD EFL learners. Thus, the findings of this study are expected to spot any flaws our English curricula may have in respect to speech act realization.

Of course, any collected data will be handled with top confidentiality and used for research purposes only. At the end of my research, I will avail its findings to the CAATD Administrators hoping that they may contribute to the on-going process of our operation development.

Your assistance in conducting this academic research whose outcomes may benefit all concerned parties is highly appreciated.

A.S. SALAMEH, Sr. ITC Teacher
DH N English Units

Attachments: (3)
CONDUCTING DOCTORAL
THESIS RESEARCH

CAATD PRINCIPALS,

Your help is solicited to facilitate conducting A. Salameh’s doctoral thesis research, which has been authorized by the CAATD Superintendent on April 12, 2000.

This research is about how compliments are exchanged in Saudi Arabic and American English. Furthermore, this study is going to investigate whether or not the Saudi EFL learners at CAATD training centers transfer some of their LI speech act norms to the L2 compliment exchanges they perform and if yes, what are the motives for such a transfer.

It is expected that the findings of this study will help in spotting any flaws our curriculum may have in respect to speech act realization. Consequently, recommendations on how to bridge any deficiencies the speech act interactions performed by our students may have will be contributed by the researcher.

Enclosed, you’ll find 26 copies of Discourse Completion Test (DCT) and 26 copies of the interview. Please instruct your English Senior Teacher to have a teacher of the English terminal level (or highest level you have) distribute 25 DCT copies to two groups and ask them to complete the missing parts with the responses that come to their minds first. The teacher may utilize a period of the study hall/free study/library skills classes to accomplish this task.

In respect to the taped interviews, the teacher of these two groups may interview 5 students a day over one week time span, or at any convenient pace.

Upon completion of these DCT and interview sessions, you are kindly requested to return the whole package to the undersigned researcher.

Your assistance in conducting this research is highly appreciated and will be acknowledged in the finalized thesis.

A.S. Salameh, Sr. Teacher
DH North ITC

All CAATD Principals,

Please extend any required help to facilitate conducting Mr. Salameh’s research.

CAATD Superintendent:
DIRECTIONS: You are going to be asked two personal questions followed by three questions on compliment responses. Please listen carefully, understand the question and answer with the response that comes to your mind first. The more spontaneous and accurate your responses are, the more reliable the findings of this study will be.

1. What is your job?

2. What is your educational level?

I. What is the last compliment response you have initiated?

Is the complimenter a male or female?

What is the complimenter's job?

How is the complimenter related to you?
II. What is the last compliment response you have received?

Is the respondent a male or a female?

What is the respondent’s job?

How is the respondent related to you?

III. What is the last compliment response you have observed?

What are the complimenter’s sex and job?

What are the respondent’s sex and job?

How are the complimenter and respondent related to each other?
مقابلة عن ردود المجاملات
النسخة العربية

INTERVIEW ON COMPLIMENT RESPONSES
Arabic Version

تعليمات: استمع إلى سؤالين شخصيين متبوعين بثلاثة أسئلة عن ردود المجاملات. أرجو أن تستمع للسؤال جيداً، أن تفهمه وترد عليه بالرد الذي يحضر ذهلك أولاً، حيث فه كلما كتبت إجابتك أكثر عفوية ودقة، كلما زادت مصداقية نتائج هذا البحث.

1. ما هي وظيفتك؟

2. ما هو مستوى التعليم؟ (شهادة ثانوية، شهادة جامعية)

3. ما هو آخر رد أعطيته لمجاملة وجيته إليك؟

هل المجامل ذكر لم أقشي؟

ما هي وظيفة المجال؟

ما هي طبيعة علاقتك بالمجال؟
4. ما هو آخر رد حصلت عليه جواباً لمجالسة أصدرتها؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رد موجه الدّرّ</th>
<th>نّكّر أم أتّنثّي؟</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ما هي وظيفة موجه الرّد؟</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>طبيعة علاقتك بموجه الرّد؟</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. ما هو آخر رد على مجالسة بين شخصين شهدتهما؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>جنس ووظيفة المجالس؟</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>جنس ووظيفة موجه الرّد على المجالسة؟</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>طبيعة العلاقة بين المجالس وصاحب الرّد على المجالسة؟</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### SUMMARY TABLE OF TWO-WAY ANOVA RESULTS

**Complimenter's Social Status By Language Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares (SS)</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom (df)</th>
<th>Mean Squares (MS)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>Deflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Status (Factor A)</td>
<td>1500.222</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>1428.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language (Factor B)</td>
<td>1392.889</td>
<td>56.889</td>
<td>771.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Random Effect)</td>
<td>3032.444</td>
<td>187.778</td>
<td>255.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5925.556</td>
<td>245.556</td>
<td>2454.889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For Factor (A), $F_{\text{critical}} = F(0.05, 4) = 6.94$

**Complimenter's Social Distance By Language Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares (SS)</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom (df)</th>
<th>Mean Squares (MS)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>Deflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Distance (Factor A)</td>
<td>384.000</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>3800.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language (Factor B)</td>
<td>1109.333</td>
<td>16.000</td>
<td>165.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Random Effect)</td>
<td>2524.000</td>
<td>33.333</td>
<td>158.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4017.333</td>
<td>52.000</td>
<td>5140.833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For Factor (A), $F_{\text{critical}} = F(0.05, 1, 2) = 18.51$

**Respondent's Sex By Language Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares (SS)</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom (df)</th>
<th>Mean Squares (MS)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>Deflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent's Sex (Factor A)</td>
<td>4213.500</td>
<td>170.667</td>
<td>840.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language (Factor B)</td>
<td>1344.333</td>
<td>212.333</td>
<td>842.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Random Effect)</td>
<td>111.000</td>
<td>46.333</td>
<td>476.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6668.833</td>
<td>429.333</td>
<td>2158.833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For Factor (A), $F_{\text{critical}} = F(0.05, 1, 2) = 18.51$

**Gender-Pairing By Language Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares (SS)</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom (df)</th>
<th>Mean Squares (MS)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>Deflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-Pairing (Factor A)</td>
<td>3676.917</td>
<td>99.667</td>
<td>397.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language (Factor B)</td>
<td>1142.375</td>
<td>50.375</td>
<td>296.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (Random Effect)</td>
<td>1481.625</td>
<td>167.625</td>
<td>557.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6300.917</td>
<td>317.667</td>
<td>1250.917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For Factor (A), $F_{\text{critical}} = F(0.05, 3, 6) = 4.76$

**Appendix IX**
### DCT Compliment Response Types Across Language Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares (SS)</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom (df)</th>
<th>Mean Squares (MS)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DCT Response (Factor A)</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language (Factor B)</strong></td>
<td>566.550</td>
<td>283.275</td>
<td>37725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error (Random Effect)</strong></td>
<td>3003.600</td>
<td>750.904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For Factor (A), \( F_{critical} = F_{0.05,2,4} = 6.94 \)

** For Factor (B), \( F_{critical} = F_{0.05,2,4} = 6.94 \)

---

### Interview Compliment Response Types Across Language Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares (SS)</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom (df)</th>
<th>Mean Squares (MS)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Response (Factor A)</strong></td>
<td>1468.140</td>
<td>734.070</td>
<td>50.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language (Factor B)</strong></td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error (Random Effect)</strong></td>
<td>57.860</td>
<td>14.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1532.000</td>
<td>191.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For Factor (A), \( F_{critical} = F_{0.05,2,4} = 6.94 \)

** For Factor (B), \( F_{critical} = F_{0.05,2,4} = 6.94 \)
## Transliteration System for Arabic Language

### Appendix X

#### 1. Symbols of Consonants *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic symbols</th>
<th>Specifications</th>
<th>Roman symbols</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ﺟ</td>
<td>Voiceless glottal stop</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺠ</td>
<td>Voiced bilabial stop</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>Voiceless alveolar stop</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺘ</td>
<td>Voiceless interdental fricative</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺙ</td>
<td>Voiced alveolar affricate</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺘ</td>
<td>Voiceless pharyngeal fricative</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>Voiceless uvular fricative</td>
<td>kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺘ</td>
<td>Voiced alveolar stop</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺙ</td>
<td>Voiced interdental fricative</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>Voiced alveolar flap</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>Voiced alveolar fricative</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>Voiceless alveolar fricative</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>Voiceless alveopalatal fricative</td>
<td>sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>Voiceless alveolar emphatic fricative</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>Voiced alveolar emphatic stop</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>Voiceless alveolar emphatic stop</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>Voiced interdental emphatic fricative</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>Voiced pharyngeal fricative</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>Voiced uvular fricative</td>
<td>gh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>Voiceless labio-dental fricative</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>Voiceless uvular stop</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>Voiceless velar stop</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>Voiceless alveolar lateral</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>Voiced bilabial nasal</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>Voiced alveolar nasal</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>Voiced glottal fricative</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TRANSLITERATION SYSTEM FOR ARABIC LANGUAGE

### 2. Symbols Of Vowels *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic symbols</th>
<th>Specifications</th>
<th>Roman symbols</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short vowels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatha</td>
<td>Front half-open unrounded</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damma</td>
<td>Back close rounded</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasra</td>
<td>Front open spread</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long vowels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>آ</td>
<td>Front open unrounded</td>
<td>aa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>او</td>
<td>Back close rounded</td>
<td>uu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إي</td>
<td>Front close unrounded</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-vowels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ي</td>
<td>Non-syllabic palatal approximant</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>و</td>
<td>Non-syllabic labio velar approximant</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This system of both consonants and vowels was adopted from Jamal Husain's (1991) _Invitations in Arabic and English_, Al Istiqal Publishing Co., Amman, JORDAN.
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