Cross Cultural Pragmatics Requests' Use of Strategy and Level of Directness in Palestinian Arabic and British English

المقامية عبر الثقافات: استراتيجية الطلب ومستوى المباشرة بين العربية والأنجليزية

Sufyan Abuarrah*, Katja Lochtman** & Madeline Lutjerhams**

سفيان أبو عرة، وكاتيا لوختمان، ومادلين لوتجرهام

* Department of English Language and Linguistics, An-Najah National University. **Department of Language and Literature, Vrije Universiteit Brussel

E-mail: sabuarrah@najah.edu

Abstract

This paper examines the performance of request pragmalinguistically, sociopragmatically and in relation to culture in Palestinian Arabic (PA) and British English (BE). Pragmalinguistically, the study tries to identify the level of directness and the kind and amount of strategies in both languages. Sociopragmatically, the study relates the general level of directness to the factors of status, distance and degree of imposition. The study tries to explain the differences between both languages with reference to some cultural concepts, such as individualism, collectivism, negative politeness and positive politeness. For data collection, a discourse completion task was used. The findings show that the languages are significantly different in the use of direct strategies and conventionally indirect strategies. The factors of status, distance, and degree of imposition influence the performance of request in both languages, however to a larger extent in PA. This might be attributed to different schemas of culture. Speakers of BE used more strategies that show individualism and negative politeness, speakers of PA, on the other hand, used more strategies connected to collectivism and positive politeness.

Keywords: Speech acts, politeness, directness, pragmalinguistics, sociopragmatics.

ملخص

تتناول هذه الدراسة ممارسة الطلب في اللغتين العربية والانجليزية من حيث البناء المقامي، العامل الاجتماعي المقامي والثقافة السائدة في كلتا اللغتين. من حيث البناء المقامي اللغوي تحاول الدراسة الكشف عن درجة المباشرة في ممارسة الطلب والتعرف إلى أساليبه من حيث الكم والنوع. أما بالنسبة للعامل الاجتماعي المقامي، فتحاول الدراسة معرفة مدى تأثير درجة المباشرة وآلية التعبير عن الطلب بعوامل المكانة ودرجة القرب ومستوى الاحراج في اللغتين. ثقافياً، تحاول هذه الدراسة التعرف إلى توجهات اللغتين نحو التأدب الفردي أو الجماعي في ممارسة الطلب. دلت النتائج على فروق ذات دلالة احصائية بين اللغتين من حيث درجة المباشرة واستخدام بعض اساليب الطلب. أما بالنسبة لعوامل المكانة ودرجة القرب والإحراج، فقد كان لها أثراً في ممارسة الطلب في كلتا اللغتين ولكن بدرجة أكبر في اللغة العربية، ثقافياً، عكست الطرق المستخدمة في اللغة العربية توجها أكبر نحو التأدب القائم على اعتبار الفرد جزأ من الكل (الجماعي)، وفي اللغة الانجليزية توجها أكبر نحو نظرية التأدب الفردي القائم على مركزية الفرد. النتائج التي توصلت أليها هذه الدراسة يمكن أن تكون ذات أهمية كبيرة في مجال التواصل الثقافي والتعليم والترجمة وذلك باستخدامها لزيادة ادراك العاملين في هذه المجالات ببعض الخصائص المقامية لكلتا اللغتين.

Introduction

Cross-cultural pragmatics (CCP, henceforth) studies differences in language production and comprehension. In the adjective cross-cultural, a reference is made to the social organization and group practices, not to culture as artistic or intellectual heritage (Jaszczolt, 2002). Speech acts theory was developed by John Austin and John Searle in their books *How to Do Things with Words* (Austin, 1962) and *Speech Acts* (Searle, 1969). In this paper, a speech act is considered to be a unit for the study of language and of cultural differences in Palestinian Arabic and British English. Speech acts theory is becoming increasingly important in CCP. Some assumptions were proposed by Wolfson et al. (1989), such as the translatability of speech acts from one language into another; their insightfulness into social values and relationships, and their ability to show the role pragmatic competence plays in a specific spoken language.

The speech act of requesting is chosen for different reasons. Firstly, requests are used very frequently in everyday communication to give orders, instructions, do favours, etc. (cf. Jae-Suh, 1999; Barron, 2003; Achiba, 2003). Secondly, this speech act is performed in different

formulas (elliptical phrases, imperatives, conventional strategies etc.) and makes use of different levels of directness that show different personal and interpersonal relations (cf. Achiba, 2003). Furthermore, a request is a face-threatening act (Brown and Levinson, 1987). This speech act is vulnerable to certain parameters, such as status, distance, and degree of imposition. Such parameters influence the choice of formula and the level of directness in different languages.

Palestinian Arabic and British English are different from word order to sound system. The difference becomes more transparent when culture is considered in language meaning and function. Arabic is usually described as collective, high context and ingroup, where religion and family are given priority (cf. Barakat, 1993; Hofstede, 2001; Joseph, 2003; Zaharna, 1995 and 2009). English on the other hand is described as a low context culture, less collective and more individualistic with a more egalitarian perspective and a marginal role for religion and family relations (cf. Schwartz, 1999; Cragan, 2009; Deardorff, 2009). This study tries to show the differences between British English and Palestinian Arabic in the performance of request strategies and level of directness. The study treats the two languages from three different perspectives. The first perspective relates to the use of strategy and level of directness (pragmalinguistics); the second perspective relates to the effect status, distance and degree of imposition have on the kind of strategy and on the level of directness (sociopragmatics). The third perspective is concerned with the cultural value in the performance of request strategies and the level of directness in both languages (cultural).

This study aims to explore the following research questions:

1. Are there any significant differences in the use of request strategies between PA and BE?

2. What are the most frequent strategies in PA and BE performance of request?

3. How do the variables of status, distance, and degree of imposition affect the level of directness of requests by speakers of either language?

4. How does culture affect the performance of request in both languages?

Review of Related Literature

Several comparative studies have investigated performance of request in different languages. The Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP, henceforth) is considered one of the most extensive empirical investigations in the field of CCP. Some prominent scholars (Eija Ventola, Ellen Rintell, Gabriele Kasper, Juliane House and Shoshana Blum-Kulka among others) studied the realization of speech acts in different languages, such as English, French, Hebrew, German, Danish and Spanish (cf. Blum-Kulka and Olshtain, 1984). The main concerns of the project were to study the shared characteristics and points of difference in the realization patterns of the different speech acts, mainly of request and apology (cross-cultural variation), to study the impact social variables such as power and distance have on the realization patterns of the given speech acts within specific speech communities (sociopragmatic variation), and to explore the similarities and differences between non-native speakers' and native speakers' realization patterns within the same languages and relative to the same social limits (interlanguage variation) (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989). The instrument used in the CCSARP for data elicitation is the Discourse Completion Task (DCT). The task was translated to all of the concerned languages while keeping to their cultural and social peculiarities. The coding system used for data analysis is a scale of indirectness proposed in Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) and Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) and that ranges from the most direct, as in imperatives, to the most indirect as in mild hints.

One of the project's studies was Weizman's (1989). The study discussed the use of requestive hints in three different languages: Australian English, Canadian French and Hebrew. Weizman classified her findings of the use of hints in the three languages according to the degree of opacity ranging from relatively transparent as in referring to the speech act and questioning hearer's commitment, to extremely opaque as

in making no hints (opting out) and choosing potential grounders and feasibility questions. According to Weizman (1989), by using hints for the realization of requests, the speaker gets the hearer to carry out the requested act in such a way that the recognition of his or her intention is not explicit in the utterance meaning of the hint. This gives both the addresser and the addressee the chance to opt out at some stage of interaction. The use of hints' strategies, as Weizman holds, seems universal as no significant differences were found in the performance of hints in the three languages in different situations.

House (1989) conducted a study that examined the differences in the use of English *please* and its German equivalent *bitte* when performed by the native speakers of English (NSs-E), native speakers of German (NSs-G) and German learners of English (GLs-E). The study investigated the amount of *please/bitte*, the choice of request strategy in relation to the amount of *please/bitte* markers, and situational variation in relation to the amount of *please/bitte* markers. Some important differences were found in the use of *please* between female German learners in comparison to male German learners and British females; yet such differences were not significant or systematic, and so the first hypothesis that females would use *please/bitte* more frequently than males could not be proven. NSs-E used *please* less frequently than NSs-G *bitte*. The finding that GLs-E used more *please* was attributed, according to House, to mother tongue interference.

A later study by Van Mulken (1996) investigated the social norms and their effect on the use of politeness markers in Dutch and French. The study found conventionally indirect strategies to be the most frequent in both languages. Other languages such as German and Turkish were studied by Marti (2006), who investigated indirect speech acts theory and politeness theory in the realization of requests as used by Turkish native speakers and Turkish-German bilingual returnees. She wanted to find out whether Turkish German bilingual returnees are more direct than Turkish monolinguals and how direct Turkish speakers are in comparison to speakers of other languages and cultures? The findings showed monolingual Turkish speakers' preference for direct requests in

comparison to Turkish-German speakers. No significant differences between Turkish monolinguals' and Turkish-German bilinguals' level of indirectness were found except for two situations, where Turkish-Germans chose more indirect strategies; a finding considered to be a form of pragmatic transfer from German to Turkish based on previous CCSARP findings.

Others like Sifianou (1999) and Wierzbicka (2003) undertook a more qualitative research of request strategies in English, Polish and Greek. Wierzbicka found that English speakers make use of a set of interrogatives in the formation of requests not developed in the same way in Polish which tends to use more imperative constructions. Even when interrogatives are used in Polish, such as 'would you like to, do you want to', they seem formal, elaborately polite, tentative and lacking in confidence (Wierzbicka 2003, p.34). Her genuine contribution is that she did not relate her findings to politeness theory, trying to avoid the intricacy of claiming politeness/impoliteness. This is contrary to what Atawneh and Sridhart (1993) and Sifianou (1999), among others, did in their studies of, respectively, English and Arabic, and English and Greek. Directness and politeness show a clear distinction in Polish and English. In Wierzbicka's words, "it is interesting to note that the flat imperative, which in English cultural tradition can be felt to be more offensive than swearing, in Polish constitutes one of the milder, softer options in issuing directives" (2003, p. 36). Sifianou (1999) studied requests in drama and used her own examples. She related differences in speech performance to politeness theory as proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). Greek was found to be more direct than English as it gives more value to social relations and favours solidarity and familiarity between individuals.

Very few studies were done on Arabic on making requests. Most of the request studies relevant to this research investigated requests in interlanguage pragmatics (El-Shazly, 1993; Al-Zumor, 2003; Al-tayib Umar 2004). The study conducted by Atawneh and Sridhart (1993) is one of the very few studies that shows more relevance to making requests in a cross-cultural context. Other studies as the ones conducted by Bataineh, 2008; Nureddeen, 2007; Nelson et al. 1996; Nelson et al. 2002 studied

apologies, compliments and refusals in Jordanian Arabic, Sudanese Arabic, Syrian Arabic and Egyptian Arabic respectively.

Atawneh and Sridhart (1993) empirically examined requestive strategies as used by American native speakers of English, English-Arabic bilinguals living in the United States, English-Arabic bilinguals living in Palestine, Arabic native speakers living in Palestine and Arab learners of English as a foreign language. Atawneh used a DCT with twelve role-play situations manipulated according to social status, social distance and degree of imposition. The study examined politeness strategies as used in Arabic and English with regard to cultural influence on the kind of pragmatic norms used in request performance. It investigated the effect of the degree of imposition, power, and distance on the performance of request strategies in the different groups. Risk of imposition was found to have the highest effect on degree of politeness, followed by power and distance as the least to affect degree of politeness. The study claimed American English as the most polite following Brown and Levinson's theory, with bilinguals living in the United States in the second place and bilinguals living in Palestine in the third. This could be one of the weaknesses of this study. Therefore, this research will not consider the notions of politeness and indirectness as symmetrical or even proportional. The concept of politeness in this research will be approached carefully; it will not be discussed in terms of directness/indirectness; however, it will be used only to show if there is any cultural orientation in the use of strategy and level of directness, as in the different orientations towards positive politeness and negative politeness.

Methodology

Participants

The participants in this study were Palestinians living in Palestine and speaking Palestinian Arabic and British living in the UK and speaking British English. Native speakers of Palestinian Arabic were 90 with an age range between 18 and 26 (mean average 19.6 years). The participants in this group came from different places in Palestine, such as

Jerusalem, Nablus, Hebron, and Jenin, to study at the Arab-American University (AAUJ).They were students in different disciplines and in different years of study. Most of the participants in this category were students in the faculty of Arts and Sciences. Native speakers of British English were 88 participants. All were students at Lancaster University and the University of Cumbria. They came from different places in the UK (London, Manchester, Glasgow, Birmingham, and Liverpool) to study for B.A and M.A degrees in different disciplines. The age of participants in this group ranged from 18 to 30 (mean average 20.7 years).

Instrument

The data were collected using a DCT. As pointed out in previous studies, data should be collected naturally in authentic conversations (cf. Wolfson, 1981, 1986; Kasper, 2000; Bella, 2011). However, authentic observation may yield some disadvantages with respect to 1) status and distance relations between interlocutors as they would be difficult to manipulate; 2) there is no guarantee that authentic data yield enough responses of the speech acts under investigation; 3) data, if collected naturally, would be too time consuming; and 4) data, if collected naturally, will not be comparable between the languages (English and Arabic), which is a condition highly required given the cross cultural focus of this research (cf. Beebe and Cumming, 1996, Kasper, 2000). Some examples from ordinary conversations were used where available to support the DCT findings, particularly in Palestinian Arabic.

The DCT used in this study consists of nine scenarios (see table 1 below). Each scenario is fully elaborated with the contextual details necessary for a speaker to give possible, natural, and communicative request responses. The tasks' scenarios were evaluated for occurrence and appropriacy in both languages. I used the questions proposed by Hymes (1972), about naturalness and appropriacy as given in his article 'On Communicative Competence' in order to assure the occurrence, naturalness and appropriacy of the situations before the native speakers in both languages had to respond to them. A professional translator back translated the Arabic version into English while two native speakers of

English read this translation and compared it with the English version (see Appendices *A* and *B*). The two versions showed to be culturally and linguistically acceptable and comparable. The variables of status, distance and degree of imposition were evaluated by the participants after they responded to the test scenarios.

Table (1): Request situations according to status and distance distribution.

Situation
A friend asking his/her friend for money to pay his/her share of bill (or taxi fare in the Arabic version).
A student asking his/her supervisor to slow down, and explain some technical terms.
A student asking his/her professor for a term paper deadline extension.
A student asking his/her classmate for some paper.
A team leader asking two of his/her team members for a pen.
Asking a friend's friend to move aside in a cinema/in a cafeteria (in the Arabic version).
A private tutor asking his/her teenage student for a glass of water.
A lecturer asking one of his/her students to turn off his/her mobile phone.
A student asking his/her professor to be allowed to leave an hour earlier.

Results

The participants' responses in both languages were analysed in order to show the mean difference between both languages' use of strategy and level of directness (pragmalinguistics). The linear regression analysis and Spearman's correlation coefficients were performed in order to show the relationship between level of directness and the variables of status, distance, and degree of imposition (sociopragmatics).

Pragmalinguistics: Level of Directness and Use of Strategy

In this section, the mean difference of the main request strategies in PA and BE is presented. Data analysis will be concerned with the five basic categories of request; namely direct strategies (elliptical phrases, imperatives, performatives and obligation statements); desire strategies (want/need statements, wish statements and suggestory formulas), conventionally indirect strategies (permission, willingness and ability), impersonal constructions (inclusive *we*, *it/there*) and non-conventionally indirect strategies (availability and hints).

Table (2): Request strategies in PA and BE.

	Mean English	Mean Arabic	Sig
Directness	10.35	8.36	.000
Elliptical Phrases	.01	0.11	.000
Imperatives	0.03	0.12	.000
Performatives	.00	0.01	.218
Obligation	0.01	0.02	.000
Want Statements	0.02	0.07	.000
Wish Statements	.00	0.02	.000
Suggestory Formulas	.00	.01	.021
Permission	0.42	0.10	.000
Willingness	0.01	.00	.000
Ability	0.25	0.40	.000
We Constructions	0.03	0.06	.000
It/There Structures	0.16	.00	.000
Availability	0.01	0.03	.001
Hints	0.04	0.05	.161

Level of directness is significantly different between the languages as shown in table 2 above. BE is less direct than PA (respectively, M = 10.35 and 8.36). The analysis also shows that both languages are significantly different in the use of all request strategies except

performatives and hints. PA uses more elliptical phrases and imperatives. Following table 2 given above, elliptical phrases were used frequently only in PA. Imperatives on the other hand were used more frequently than elliptical phrases in BE although they were used less frequently than elliptical phrases and imperatives in PA. The use of wish statements and suggestory formulas as more direct strategies comes second to elliptical phrases and imperatives in PA although they hardly occur in BE. Conventionally indirect strategies have been used more frequently in both languages. Permission and ability, but not willingness, are the most frequently used strategies in BE and PA. Whereas BE favours permission over ability strategies (respectively, M = .42 and .25); PA shows a considerable tendency towards using ability structure over permission (respectively, M = .40 and .10). Both languages have also shown a difference in the kind and amount of impersonal structures in the situations judged by the participants as belonging to this category. BE speakers uses fewer *we* constructions (M = .03) and more *it/there* structures (.16). PA speakers on the other hand used more *we* structures (.06) and almost no *it/there* structures. With regard to non-conventional indirect strategies, the languages concerned are found to be significantly different in the use of availability statements. Speakers of PA used approximately twice the number of availability responses than those of BE (respectively, M = .03 and .01).

Sociopragmatics

The variables of status, distance and degree of imposition play a more important role in the level of request directness in PA than in BE following the performance of a linear regression analysis (respectively, r = .256, sig = .000 and .192, sig = .000). According to table 3 given below, status, degree of imposition and distance relations respectively affect the way request is performed particularly in PA. With regard to status relations, both languages are comparable in the direction and amount of correlation between the speaker's status and the level of directness. The higher the speaker's status, the more direct his request tends to be in PA and BE. Degree of imposition comes second to status relations. Similarly to status, the degree of imposition is positively

correlated to the level of directness. PA shows a stronger and more significant correlation between the degree of imposition and level of directness. Distance has not shown any significant role in the level of directness in BE. However, distance comes third to status and degree of imposition as it only positively and significantly affected the level of directness in PA.

Table (3): Status, distance and degree of imposition in relation to level of directness.

Groups		BE	PA
Status	Correlation	0.172	0.178
	Sig.	0	0
Distance	Correlation	0.038	0.121
	Sig.	0.342	0.004
Imposition	Correlation	0.106	0.167
	Sig.	0.008	0

Discussion

The statistical analysis shows that the languages concerned are different in the amount of level of directness and strategy. This section will further investigate the differences in the kind of these strategies in relation to language culture and the impact the variables of status, distance and degree of imposition have on the level of directness in either language. The following analysis will consider some of the examples collected in the DCT from both languages.

Direct strategies

The lower proportion of elliptical phrases in BE is not surprising. According to Sifianou (1999), English tends to use requests in more elaborate and long forms in order to conceal its abruptness and make it more polite. In PA, the use of elliptical phrases is constrained by a network of interpersonal and contextual factors such as the formality of situation and the status of interlocutors. This language group used most of elliptical phrases in situations four (a classmate asking for a piece of

paper), five (a team leader asking for a pen), six (asking a friend's friend to move aside), and to a larger extent in situation seven (a private tutor asking for a glass of water). Power relations could justify the use of elliptical phrases in situations five and seven, but not in situations four and six. A common feature between all the given situations is that none of them is institutionalized; in other words, request in these situations is not performed in a formal context where certain conventionalized forms are more appropriate. Requesting for a small favour (a pen, a glass of water and moving aside) makes a second good reason for using elliptical phrases in PA; the given situations are service situations where a compact use of language could be more appropriate (Al-Zumor, 2003; Al-Marrani and Sazalie, 2010). Another justification could be the urgency for compliance. Formulating a request in urgent situations using more elaborate requesting formulas could be considered tautological and unnecessary (cf. Ervin-Tripp, 1976; Brown and Levinson, 1987; Sifianou, 1999). Typical examples from situations five and six are:

[law samaħt **mumkin qalam**?]

　(If you please, **a pen, if possible**?)

　[**mumkin ilqalam** ∫wayah?]

　(**Any possibility for a pen for a while**?)

[**law samaħt**?]

　(**If you please**?)

[ilbab, Manar!]

　(The door, Manar) (as used by one of my colleagues in a classroom before he starts a class)

Implications as to culture are present through the amount of elliptical phrases in both languages. The use of elliptical phrases indicates positive politeness; that is the need for inclusion, solidarity, closeness, and social approval between language interlocutors. The main difference between the two languages is in the degree of orientation as could be noticed in the number of elliptical phrases. The preference for elliptical phrases in

PA usually corresponds to a short social distance between language interlocutors. In collectively oriented societies like PA, the interpersonal bonds are close, and that explains why many things can go unsaid (cf. Ervin-Tripp, 1976). The concept of alʕaʃam which roughly translates as the right to impose due to closeness is part of the short distance relations in the Arab world. This concept has more value between familiar interlocutors. One possible explanation for the overuse of this strategy by PA speaker could be the speaker's certainty of the hearer's compliance due to alʕaʃam, which leaves the requestive forms more straightforward and more explicit. That claim could be substantiated by the significant correlation between distance relations and level of directness only in PA as shown in table 2 above.

The use of imperatives is another form of direct strategies. BE usually provides imperatives as appropriate structures for issuing commands and instructions (Lyons, 1968; Marquez-Reiter, 2000). The minimal use of imperatives in BE could be justified following Lakoff's (1973), Searle's (1975) and Leech's (1983) views about politeness in English. Lakoff (1973) considered the overt use of orders 'like imperatives' to be impolite as they express the "assumption of the speaker's superior position to the addressee, carrying with it the right to enforce compliance." Searle (1975) and Leech (1983), similarly, favoured indirect constructions more than flat imperatives for the realization of directives because of restrictions of conversational politeness in English, their violation of the principle of tactfulness and their higher risk of non-compliance. Imperatives in BE, particularly in situations six, seven and eight (asking a student to turn off his mobile phone), are used with the assumptions of status and emergency (see elliptical phrases above). Other assumptions such as deliberate face threat, intimacy, and endearment could also be considered as factors for the use of imperatives in BE and PA. Consider the following utterances:

Turn the phone off, show some respect.

(Name), **move your head**, I can't see! (Assuming that I have met the person before).

Move your head. I can't see. (jokingly)

It should be noted that the illocutionary force of the action verb in imperatives is determined by the context of speech and other linguistic and paralinguistic features, such as tone of voice and facial expressions. The first response, for example, is confrontational. The emergency of situation eight (a phone ringing continuously, disturbing a crowded class short on time) makes the speaker's reaction to such behaviour more important than the risk of losing face or non-compliance. The use of imperatives in this utterance is a deliberate use of power in reaction to the face-threat made by the requestee. In responses *b* and *c*, imperatives are used to convey solidarity and intimacy between interactants. Response *b* assumes that both speakers have met before and that would be enough for them to initiate a conversation using imperatives. In *c,* the speaker implies friendship. In this utterance, the flattering use of language 'jokingly' downgrades any possible coerciveness.

PA, on the other hand, as other languages (Chinese, see Lee-Wong, 1994; Japanese, see Fukushima, 1996, and Spees, 1994; Greek, see Sifianou, 1999; Polish, see Weirzbicka, 2003; Russian, see Larina, 2008) finds the use of imperatives more appropriate. According to Taha (2006, p.359) "requests in the imperative forms are perfectly acceptable in Arabic as long as there is something in the tone of the expression that reduces the imperative force." Investigating the pragmalinguistic features of some PA responses, imperatives are marked more normally than not with some mitigating expressions, such as [baʕid iðnak]] (after your permission), (law samaħt] (if you please), [ʔardʒuːk] (I plea you), the use of some titles like [ya ʃabaab, ya sabaya] (guys) (the last are some of my observations during in-class and out-class communication between some of my colleague teachers and their students).

Desire/Need Statements

The use of *want and need* is considered a direct request strategy as it implies an explicit revelation of the speaker's requestive intention (Blum-Kulka et al. 1989; Haverkate, 1992; Achiba, 2003; Biesenbach-Lucas, 2006). They are effective ways of getting compliance (Achiba, 2003).

Want or *need* statements are used more frequently in order to express the necessity for compliance, particularly in situation nine (asking a professor for an hour earlier leave for a doctor's appointment). The use of *want* and *need* in both languages shows the speakers' unconstrained cultural preference for expressing desire and personal opinion. According to Weirzbicka (2003), want statements encourage the 'uninhibited self-assertion'. Both languages could be contrasted with Japanese, for example, which shows more restraint through the employment of the concept of *enryo* (it roughly translates into *restraint*, Bowe & Martin, 2007). In both languages, a person can say freely what he/she wants/does not want. However, as is clear from the examples given below, speakers in the languages concerned are not expected to be blunt, and that is evident in the number of downgraders used in the utterance head act (. In PA, self-assertion is confirmed by the number of responses in this strategy and preference for the verb [bidi] (want) to express a personal need for the performance of the action. English responses on the other hand use the verb *need.* The difference between the verbs *want* and *need* is substantial; *want* shows personal desire; however *need* shows necessity. For example:

[law samaħt, ?na bidi ?tlub talab, ?ana nisiit maħfaðti, **bidi ?udʒrit ?isayara** wbardʒiʕha bokra, asef] ....

(If you please, I **want** to ask for a favour, I forgot my wallet. **I want the taxi fare** and I will give it back tomorrow, sorry...)

[miss **bidi** ?a?adʒil ?ilmawʕid ʕaʃaːn ?aratib ħali wmawduʕi biʃakel aħsan]

(Ms. I **want** to postpone the deadline to organize myself and make my work better.)

I **need** to leave an hour early today.

[doctor, kunt bidi ?sajil fi ʃuʕbit 8-9 ʕaʃaan ʕindi taʕarud]

(doctor, I wanted to register in the section from 8-9 because I have a conflict with another section) (my observation)

I'm really sorry mate, but I **need** to borrow 20 pounds till tomorrow, I have left my wallet at home.

PA speakers demonstrated more variation in using wish statements and suggestory formulas across the different interpersonal relations; however with more frequency in the situations where the hearer has the higher status, particularly situations two, three and four. Wish statements, like want and need statements, express personal need for compliance, nevertheless, more tentatively. BE uses only one verb form to show wish; that is *hope*. PA on the other hand uses different formulas, such as [yari:t] (wish), [yatamana] (hope), [yardd**ʒ**u] (plea) and [lau] (if). In PA, [yari:t] (I wish) keeps compliance conditioned by the context circumstances and not by the requestee's personal desire. The use of wish statements keeps the hypothetical conditions for compliance a part of the head act illocutionary force. The use of this formula shows negative politeness as it keeps distance between language interlocutors due to status differentials. Some examples from both languages are:

[law samaħti, ʔana ʕindi mawʕid maʕ doktor ilʔasnan, **yari:t tismaħili ʔatlaʕ qabel ilwaqit bisaʕa**]

(If you please, I have an appointment with the dentist, **I wish you allow me to leave an a hour earlier**.)

<name>, I am really feeling under the weather and **hope you can grant me an extra day or two for the assignment, please**?

Suggestory formulas are used more frequently in PA; mainly in situations five and seven. In BE, they are used only in situation eight. Speakers in those situations use requestive formulas to distance themselves from the act of requesting. In situations five and seven, the requester is asking for a personal service and he/she is not certain that the requestee will comply. Besides, the requester in such situations has less right to make his/her interlocutor carry out the actions for the former's advantage or benefit. A choice of suggestory formula in such situations gives more space to the addressee to comply and conceal any coercive

effect of requesting through a choice of a different illocutionary effect (suggesting instead of requesting).

The larger number of these strategies and the use of different formulas for their realization in PA show PA's availability of tools for keeping the hierarchy of relations between interlocutors and the status of the addressee. This confirms the findings reported in other studies (Barakat, 1993; Feghali, 1997; Hofstede, 2001; Al-Ali, 2006) that Arabic culture exhibits higher levels of loyalty towards power distance and paternalism where family and religion play a major role in substantiating such interpersonal relations between the individuals of the community.

Conventionally Indirect Strategies

Conventionally indirect strategies or preparatory conditions include conventionalized requesting strategies, specifically permission, willingness, and ability (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989). In the coding of my data, I have distinguished between request for permission, which is essentially a speaker-based strategy (Van Mulken, 1996), and request for ability, which is essentially a hearer-based strategy. The difference between them is in perspectivization. PA requestive behaviour tends to be more hearer-based, whereas in BE, it is more speaker-based. The difference is not only linguistic; the perception of politeness in this strategy is also different. Speaker-based responses are less impinging on the hearer's face wants and therefore less face threatening. Hearer-based responses on the other hand encourage solidarity by making the hearer part of action performance. PA is more oriented towards positive politeness where the notions of solidarity, informality, and familiarity are more valued. Speaker-based request strategies are oriented towards the hearer's negative face; they involve more restraint, less familiarity and more formality. Overall, conventionally indirect strategies are more oriented toward negative politeness when compared to the imperatives and elliptical phrases discussed before. Hearer-based strategies (ability constructions), however, imply a sense of solidarity, which is an essentially positive politeness feature.

Willingness is completely absent from the PA data. The modal *will* has an equivalent only in formal Arabic [sawfa]; it does not occur in PA data as the data reflect everyday communication. Willingness is rarely considered in my BE data (M = .01). In a study by Hendriks (2008) on requests in Dutch and English, willingness is found to occur less frequently in English than ability. However, it should be considered that the frequency of willingness in Hendriks' study is much higher than frequency of willingness in this study. The main reason is that the structure *would you mind* is considered as a form of willingness in her study. In the present study, however, *mind* constructions are taken as instances of permission; requests with the structures *will you* or *would you* are the only cases taken as forms of willingness.

These findings roughly confirm what I expected based on previous literature (consider Blum-Kulka et al. 1989; Atawneh and Sridhart, 1993; Trosborg, 1995 and Van Mulken, 1996 among others) that conventionally indirect strategies are by far the most frequent request strategies in both languages. According to Trosborg (1995), preparatory requests are favoured for different reasons. Firstly, there are more effective ways of requesting available in this category than in any other request strategies given in direct or non-conventionally indirect strategies. Secondly, the agent and the desired act are mentioned explicitly with a higher degree of politeness. Thirdly, preparatory conditions make the hearer feel that compliance is not taken for granted, thus protecting the speaker's face and giving the hearer the choice not to comply. In Trosborg's words (1995, p.235), "the choice of these strategies affords the requester the possibility of lowering his/her expectations to the outcome of the request considerably, which reduces the discrepancy between a blunt statement of desire and what would be regarded as a good manner". The reasons given by Trosborg (1995) are compatible with what Ervin-Tripp (1976) found in her study of directives in American English. She considered conventionally indirect strategies as satisfying to some degree as they simultaneously compromise the desire for non-imposing on the requestee and the need for explicitness. Another important reason why conventionally indirect strategies are used more

frequently is their suitability for situations with different status and distance relations. This last reason explains why conventionally indirect strategies spread across the different situations in both languages with less regard to the interpersonal relations of status, distance, and degree of imposition.

Impersonal Structures

In PA, the *it/there* structure is not used frequently, because the structure itself is not part of Arabic grammar. The highest frequency of *it/there* structures is scored in situations three and nine in English. These situations are status differential with the speaker in a lower status (S<H). An explanation for the overuse of the *it/there* structure in these two situations is that the speaker wants to distance himself/herself from the action to be performed through reference to some supposed conditions. This structure makes the requestive behaviour more polite and tactful, and less face threatening to the speaker and hearer. For the speaker, if his/her request is refused, then because of the supposed conditions of the request concerned, and not because of the request itself. For the hearer, the *it/there* structure makes the request less imposing and gives him/her more optionality for refusal through refusing the supposed conditions of the request, and not the request itself.

The use of *we* implies a shared responsibility or advantage by the speaker and the hearer for the performance of the action. According to Haverkate (1992, p. 519), "inclusive *we* shows modesty on the part of the speaker; it also reflects a form of in-group solidarity by suggesting that the hearer shares the attitude given by the speaker." Inclusive *we* makes language all-oriented. The overuse of the *we* structure in PA manifests itself in the discussion over collective-individual or ingroup-outgroup discrepancies. Arabic responses through the frequent use of *we* add evidence to previous literature (cf. Cohen, 1987; Feghali, 1996; Hofstede, 2001) on PA (as one part of the Arab world) being a collective and ingroup culture. The frequent use of the *it/there* structure in BE does not necessarily imply that English goes totally in the opposite direction; however BE prefers markers that show more distance between

interlocutors, thus showing a tendency to individualism and negative politeness.

Non-conventionally Indirect Strategies

In both languages, availability is employed to perform a request for a service, which entails a higher expenditure on the part of the requestee, and therefore a higher chance for refusal. Therefore, through using availability, the hearer is given a chance to opt out or, according to Ervin-Trip (1976), an escape route in order to terminate the act of requesting. The highest incidence of hints in the PA data occurs in situation two (asking a supervisor to slow down). In using a hint for the realization of request, the speaker gets the hearer to carry out his/her request in such a way that the speaker's intention is not recognized in the form of the request itself (Weizman, 1989). In accordance with other studies (cf. Félix-Brasdefer, 2005; Hendriks, 2008) hints are not used frequently in either language. According to Blum-Kulka et al. (1989, p.68) the use of hints is pragmatically open ended, therefore, if used, hints might involve higher chances of miscommunication. The use of hints in either language does not follow a systematic pattern such as in imperatives. Nevertheless, it should be noted that hints are common in communal groups (findings in Ervin-Tripp, 1976) in order to allude to shared knowledge and solidarity enhancement such as in groups' jokes. In my data, hints are also used to show sarcasm in reaction to ill behaviour such as in situation eight in BE (asking a student to turn off his mobile phone), for example:

We've all been there, haven't we? Tell them unless Michael Jackson died again, it'll have to wait.

Conclusion

The two languages differ in their performance of request pragmalinguistically, sociopragmatically and in terms of cultural value. Pragmalinguistically, PA employs more direct strategies (elliptical phrases, imperatives, performatives, obligation statements, want statements, suggestory formulas and wish statements). BE on the other hand uses more conventionally indirect strategies and impersonal structures. Other differences are found between PA and BE, mainly in the

kind of strategy used. While PA prefers ability structures and inclusive *we*, BE prefers permission and *it/there* constructions. As to the use of strategy, the level of directness in both languages is significantly different. PA performs more direct requests than BE.

The social variables of status, distance, and degree of imposition affect level of directness in both languages similarly, however to different extents. PA is more vulnerable to the sociopragmatic parameters of status, distance and degree of imposition. Status in the first place, and degree of imposition and distance in the second affect the level of directness in PA to a larger extent than in BE. Despite the variation between the languages, still they show very similar directions in level of directness according to status, distance, and degree of imposition. In both languages, higher status speakers used more direct requests than lower status speakers, communication with strangers is more indirect than communication with familiar interlocutors, imposing situations generate more indirect requests than non-imposing situations. Other factors such as institutionalization (formality of situation), weight of request (light request vs. difficult ones), emergency of situation and degree of certainty affect use of direct strategies, particularly elliptical phrases, imperatives, and level of directness to a larger extent in PA.

The reflection of culture is significant in the use of strategy and level of directness. The two languages displayed different orientations towards dichotomous notions such as positive politeness and negative politeness and collectivism-individualism. As to positive politeness the use of elliptical phrases and imperatives show solidarity and endearment. Contrary to Brown and Levison (1987) and Leech (1983) and in accordance with Blum-Kulka (1987, 1990), Félix-Brasdefer (2005),and Marquese-Reiter (2002), directness can be considered as a marker of closeness and affiliation in both languages. The difference between BE and PA use of positive politeness in such strategies is a matter of degree; as could be shown by the overuse of these strategies in PA. Another difference in orientation toward positive and negative politeness is manifested in preferences for speaker-based and hearer-based conventionally indirect strategies. While BE favours speaker-based

conventionally indirect requests, which show negative politeness and avoidance of impingement on the speakers' face wants, PA favours more hearer-based conventionally indirect strategies that show more involvement. PA exhibits more collective behaviour than BE, such as in its overuse of inclusive *we* in the performance of impersonal constructions. Such a finding seems to be contradicted by the same language group's preference for want statements that show more self-assertion in the performance of desire and wish statements. The use of such formulas leading to contradicting reflections on different cultural norms comes in accordance with some studies in the field of intercultural communication, which emphasized the hybrid and double-oriented Arab culture towards collectivism and individualism (cf. Barakat, 1993; Joseph, 2003; Ayish, 2003; Zaharna, 2009). In the Arab world, according to Zaharna (2009), a strong sense of individuality exists which is expressed within the context of social group.

References

– Achiba. Machiko. (2003). "Learning to Request in a Second Language: A Study of Child Interlanguage Pragmatics". Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

– Al-Ali. Mohammed, A. (2006). "Religious Affiliation and Masculine Affiliation in Jordanian Wedding Invitation Genre". Discourse and Society. 17(6). 691-714.

– Al-Marrani, Yahya. & Sazalie, Azimah. (2010). "Polite Requests Strategies by Yemini Females: A Sociopragmatic Study". MJAL. 2. 478-516.

– Al-Zumor, Abdul Wahed. (2003). "A Pragmatic Analysis of Speech Acts as Produced by Native Speakers of Arabic". Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Department of Linguistics. Aligarh Muslim University. Aligarh. India.

– Atawneh, Ahmad. & Sridhar, Shikaripur. (1993). "Arabic-English Bilinguals and Directive Speech Acts". World Englishes. 12(3). 279-297.

– Austin, John. (1962). "How to Do Things with Words". Oxford: Clarendon.

– Aysih, Muhammad. (2003). "Beyond Western-Communication Theories: A Normative Arab-Islamic Perspective". The public. 10(2). 79-92.

– Barakat, Halim. (1993). "The Arab World: Society. Culture and State". Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

– Barron, Ann. (2003). "Acquisition in Interlanguage Pragmatics. Learning How to Do Things with Words in a Study Abroad Context". Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

– Bataineh, Rula. & Bataineh, Ruba. (2008). "A cross cultural analysis of apologies by native speakers of American English and Jordanian Arabic". Journal of Pragmatics. 40 (4). 792-821.

– Bella, Spyridoula. (2011). "Mitigation and Politeness in Greek Invitation Refusals: Effects of Length of Residence in the Target Community and Intensity of Interaction of Non-native Speakers' Performance". Journal of Pragmatics. (43). 1718-1740.

– Biesenbach-Lucas, Sigrun. (2006). "Making Requests in E-mail: Do Cyber-Consultations Entail Directness? Towards Conventions in a New Medium". In: K. Bardovi-Harlig. J. Fe'lix-Brasdefer & A. Omar (eds.) Pragmatics and Language Learning. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press. 81-194.

– Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. & Olshtain, Elite. (1984). "Request and Apologies: A Cross-cultural Study of Speech Realization Patterns (CCSARP)". Applied Linguistics. 5 (3). 196-213.

– Blum-Kulka, Shoshana. House, Juliane. & Kasper, Gabriele. (1989). "Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies". Norwood. NJ: Ablex.

– Brown, Penelope. & Levinson, Stephen. (1987). Politeness: "Some Universals in Language Usage". New York: Cambridge University Press.

– Burkhardt, Armin. (1990). Speech Act Theory – "The Decline of a Paradigm". In: Armin Burkhardt (ed.). Speech Acts. Meaning and Intention. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 91-129.

– Cohen, Raymond. (1987). "Problems of Intercultural Communication in Egyptian-American Diplomatic Relations". International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 11. 29-47.

– Cohen, Andrew. (1996). "Speech Acts". In S. McKay and N. Hornberger (eds): Sociolinguistics and Language Teaching. New York: Language University Press. 383-420.

– Cragan, John. Wright, David. & Kasch, Chris. (2009). "Communication in Small Groups. Theory. Process. Skills". Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

– Deardorff, Darla. (2009). "Intercultural Competence. A Summary of Emerging Themes". In Darla Deardorff (ed.) The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence. London: Sage Publications Co.

– Ervin-Tripp, Susan. (1976). "Is Sypil There?" Some American English Directives. Language in Society. 5. 25-66.

– Fe'lix-Brasdefer, Caeser. (2005). Indirectness and Politeness in Mexican Requests. Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium. D. Eddington (ed.). Somerville. MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. 66-78.

– Feghali, Ellen. (1997). "Arab Cultural Communication Patterns". International Journal of Intercultural Relations. 21 (3). 345-378.

– Fukushima, Saeko. (1996). "Request Strategies in British English and Japanese". Journal of Pragmatics. 18(3-4). 671-688.

– Haverkate, Henk. (1992). "Deictic Categories as Mitigating Devices". Pragmatics. 4(2). 505-522.

– Hendriks, Berna. (2008). "Dutch-English Requests: A Study of Requests Performance by Dutch Learners of English". In: P. Martin & J. Neff-van Aertselaer (eds.). Developing Contrastive Pragmatics.

Interlanguage and Cross-cultural Perspectives. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 335-354.

– Hofstede, Geert. (2001). "Cultural Consequences: Comparing Values. Behaviours. Institutions. and Organizations across Nations". California: Sage publications.

– House, Juliane. (1989). "Politeness in English and German: The Function of Please and Bitte". In: S. Blum-Kulka. J. House & G. Kasper (eds.). Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Cooperation. 96-116.

– Jae-Suk. Suh. (1999). "Pragmatic Perception of Politeness in Requests by Korean Learners of English as a Second Language". International Review of Applied Linguistics. 37. 195-213.

– Jaszczolt, Katarzyna. (2002). "Semantics and Pragmatics: Meaning in Language and Discourse". London: Longman.

– Joseph, Suad. (2003). "Gender and Family in the Arab World". In: S. Sabbagh. Arab Women between Restraint and Defiance. Massachusetts: Olive Branch Press. pp. 194-202.

– Kasper, Gabriele. (2000). "Data collection in Pragmatics Research". In: H. Spencer-Oatey (ed.). Culturally Speaking: Managing Rapport Through Talk Across Cultures. London/NY: Continuum. 316-41.

– Lakoff, Robin. (1973). "Language and Women's Place". Language in Society. 2(1). 45-80.

– Larina, Tatiana. (2008). "Directness. Imposition and Politeness in English and Russian". University of Cambridge. ESOL. 33. 33-38.

– Leech, Geoffrey. (1983). "Principles of Pragmatics". London: Longman.

– Lee-Wong, Song. (1994). "Imperatives in Requests: Direct or Impolite Observations from Chinese". Pragmatics. 4 (4). 491-515.

– Lyons, John. (1968). "Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics". Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Marquez-Reiter, Rosina. (2000). "Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Uruguay". Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Marti, Leyla. (2006). "Indirectness and Politeness in Turkish-German Bilingual and Turkish Monolingual Requests". Journal of Pragmatics. 38(11). 1836-1869.

- Nelson, Gayle. Carson, Joan. Al Batal, Mohammad. & El Bakary, Waguida. (2002). "Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Strategy Use in Egyptian Arabic and American English Refusals". Applied Linguistics. 23 (2). 163-189.

- Nelson, Gayle. Al-Batal, Mohammad. & Echols, Erin. (1996). "Arabic and English Compliment Responses": Potential for Pragmatic Transfer. Applied Linguistics. 17(4). 411-432.

- Nureddeen, Fatima. (2007). "Cross-cultural Pragmatics. Apology Strategies in Sudanese Arabic". Journal of Pragmatics. 40(2). 279-306.

- Schwartz, Shalom. (1999). "A Theory of Cultural Values and Some Implications for Work". Applied Psychology: An International Review. 48(1). 23-47.

- Searle, John. (1969). "Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language". Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Searle, John. (1975). "Indirect Speech Acts". In: P. Cole & J. Morgan (eds.). Syntax and Semantics. New York: Academic Press.

- Sifianou, Maria. (1999). "Politeness Phenomena in England and Greece; A Cross-cultural Perspective". Clarendon Press: Oxford.

- Spees, Hiroko. (1994). "A Cross-Cultural Study of Indirectness". Issues in Applied Linguistics. 5(2). 231-253.

- Taha, Zeinab. (2006). "Towards Pragmatic Competency in Arabic". In: K. Wahba. Z. Taha & L. England (eds.). Handbook for Arabic Language Teaching Professionals in the 21st Century. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum. 353-363.

‒ Trosborg, Anna. (1995). "Interlanguage Pragmatics. Requests. Complaints and Apologies". New York: Mouton De Gruyter.

‒ Umar, Amat. (2004). "Request strategies as used by advanced Arab learners of English as a foreign language". Umm Al-Qura University Journal of Education & Social Sciences & Humanities. 16(1). 41-86.

‒ Van Mulken, Margot. (1996). "Politeness Markers in French and Dutch Requests". Language Sciences. 18 (3-4). 689-702.

‒ Weizman, Elda. (1989). "Requestive Hints". In: S. Blum-Kulka. J. House & G. Kasper (eds.). Cross-cultural Pragmatics: "Requests and Apologies". New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Cooperation. 71-95.

‒ Weirzbicka, Anna. (2003). "Cross-Cultural Pragmatics". The Semantics of Human Interaction. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

‒ Wolfson, Nessa. (1981). "Invitation. Compliments and the Competence of the Native Speakers". International Journal of Psycholinguistics. 25. 7-22.

‒ Wolfson, Nessa. (1986). "Research methodology and the question of validity". TESOL Quarterly 20(4). 689-699.

‒ Wolfson, Nessa. Marmor, Thomas. & Jones, Steve. (1989). "Problems in Comparison of Speech Acts across Cultures". In: S. Blum-Kulka. J. House & G. Kasper (eds.). Cross-Cultural Pragmatics. New Jersey: Alex Publishing Company. 174-197.

‒ Zaharna, Rs. (1995). "Understanding cultural preferences of Arab communication patterns". Public Relations Review. 21. 241–255.

‒ Zaharna, Rs. (2009). "An Associative Approach to Intercultural Communication Competence in the Arab World". In: D. Deardorff (ed.). The Sage Handbook of Intercultural Competence. California: The Sage Publications Inc.

Appendix A: Requests (BE)

"REQUEST" SITUATIONS

You are at a restaurant with your boss and colleagues, and you discover that you must have left your wallet at home because you were rushing to get to the restaurant on time. You don't have enough money to pay for your share of the bill and you are reluctant **to ask your friend for £20**; of course you would pay the money back as soon as possible, but he had just been complaining about his current cash flow problem. You mull it over in your mind for a while and finally decide to ask your friend for money in order not to feel embarrassed in front of your boss. You say:

Who is of higher status? You □ 2. Your friend □ 3. Equal □

How familiar do you think you are with him? Choose on the scale from 1 to 5

     Very familiar **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5** Not familiar at all (stranger)

How much of an imposition do you think the request is?

     Very high 1   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5** Not high at all

You are discussing an assignment with your **new supervisor, who has just moved to your department** in your university. **It is the first time you have met him**. He speaks very fast and uses a lot of technical terms that you don't understand. Unfortunately, you can't follow everything he says, yet you can't just drop the subject as he is talking about material to be included in the final exam. You feel self-conscious about interrupting him, but as you are becoming increasingly worried about failing the exam, you decide to ask him to slow down.

1. Who is of higher status? You □ 2. Your supervisor □ 3. Equal □

2. How familiar do you think you are with him? Choose on the scale from 1 to 5

     Very familiar **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5** Not familiar at all (stranger)

3. How much of an imposition do you think the request is?

Very high **1   2   3   4   5** Not high at all

You have to hand in your assignment paper within two days; however, you don't feel very well. So you want to call your professor **whom you know very well** and ask her to extend your paper deadline for one or two days more. You say

```



```

1. Who is of higher status? You □ 2. Your supervisor □ 3. Equal □

2. How familiar do you think you are with her? Choose on the scale from 1 to 5

Very familiar **1   2   3   4   5** Not familiar at all (stranger)

3. How much of an imposition do you think the request is?

Very high **1   2   3   4   5** Not high at all

You are attending a lecture when you find that you have run out of paper and you need to take some important notes. You ask your friend, Harry, for some spare paper but he doesn't have any either. On looking behind you, you notice a new classmate who has just transferred to your department. You don't know her name but you need some paper, so you have no choice but to ask her for some. You say:

```



```

1. Who is of higher status? You □ 2. Your classmate □ 3. Equal □

2. How familiar do you think you are with her? Choose on the scale from 1 to 5

Very familiar **1   2   3   4   5** Not familiar at all (stranger)

3. How much of an imposition do you think the request is?

Very high **1   2   3   4   5** Not high at all

You are a team leader and working on a new project when you get an urgent phone call from a friend. You really need to take a note and a phone number but don't have a pen. **A couple of girls who joined your team very recently** have a pen on their table. You really need that pen and decide to interrupt them and ask if you can borrow it. You say:

```



```

1 Who is of higher status? You (as a group leader) □ 2. The girls □ 3. Equal □

2. How familiar do you think you are with them? Choose on the scale from 1 to 5

     Very familiar **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5** Not familiar at all (stranger)

3. How much of an imposition do you think the request is?

     Very high **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5** Not high at all

You are sitting in a cinema with a group of friends. Several of them are sitting in a row in front of you. **One of your friend's best friends, an acquaintance,** is blocking your view. You are trying hard to watch the film, but he is completely blocking your view. You say:

```



```

1. Who is of higher status? You □   2. Your friend's friend □ 3. Equal □

2. How familiar do you think you are with him? Choose on the scale from 1 to 5

     Very familiar **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5** Not familiar at all (stranger)

3. How much of an imposition do you think the request is?

     Very high **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5** Not high at all

You are giving private tuition to **a female teenager who you know very well** in the subject you are studying at university. Because you have been explaining things to her for 30 minute, you are feeling thirsty; getting a dry a mouth. You ask your student for a glass of water, you say

```



```

1. Who is of higher status? You □   2. Your student □ 3. Equal □

2. How familiar do you think you are with her? Choose on the scale from 1 to 5

     Very familiar **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5** Not familiar at all (stranger)

3. How much of an imposition do you think the request is?

     Very high **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5** Not high at all

You are a fourth-year student and have been asked to speak to a class of new students on your course about what the course is all about. You only have half an hour to explain everything; that's why you get annoyed when the mobile phone of **one of the male students who you have met for the first time** rings for several times. You say:

```
┌──────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                    │
│                                                    │
│                                                    │
└──────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

1. Who is of higher status? You □   2. Your student □ 3. Equal □

2. How familiar do you think you are with her? Choose on the scale from 1 to 5

Very familiar **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5** Not familiar at all (stranger)

3. How much of an imposition do you think the request is?

Very high **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5** Not high at all

You made an appointment with your dentist to have your teeth polished, there was no other available time, however the time slot you were allocated coincides with your three-hour lecture and so you may have to leave an hour earlier. You ask your professor (female) who has just been teaching you only for one week for permission. You say:

```
┌──────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                    │
│                                                    │
│                                                    │
└──────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

1. Who is of higher status? You □   2. Your supervisor □ 3. Equal □

2. How familiar do you think you are with her? Choose on the scale from 1 to 5

Very familiar **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5** Not familiar at all (stranger)

3. How much of an imposition do you think the request is?

Very high **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**   **5** Not high at all

Appendix B: Request (PA)

الطلب:

عزيزي الطالبَ. بعدَ قراءتك لكل موقف من المواقف التالية, أرجو أن تتفضل\ي بملء الفراغ بما يناسبه باللغة الدارجةَ، مستذكرأً/ةً مواقف مشابهة حدثت معك، ومسترشداً/ةً بما قلته في تلك المواقف.

أُنا كنتُ مِستعجل/ة كثير؛ عشان عِندي مُحاضَرة كَمان نص ساعة في الجامعة. وفي التكسي ألتقيت مَع واحد من زُملائي بِدرُس مَعي بِنَفس التَخَصُصْ مِن فترة طَويلة كان قاعِد بِجَنبي. وأنا بَحاول أَدفع أُجرِة التكَسي إتْذَكرتْ إني نْسِيتْ مَحفظتي في البيت . الظاهر مفيش حل إلا إني أدَيْنْ الأجرة مِن زَميلي, وبعد هيك بَرجعُلوا إياها. آلمشكله إنّه انا بعرف أوضاعة المادية صعبة؛ علشان هوَ دايماً كان بيحكيلي عنها, بس كمان أنا ما بَدي أحرِج نَفسي قدام الركاب، واللي كان منهم أُستاذي في الجامعة, فقلت لزميلي:

١. من صاحب المكانة العليا؟ ١. انا ٢. زميلي ٣. متساويان

٢. الى أي حد يمكن ان تصنّف درجة المعرفة بينك وبين زميلك؟

قريبة جداً ١ ٢ ٣ ٤ ٥ غريبة

٣. ما درجة الإحراج التي يمكن أن يسببها طلبي للمال؟

محرجة جداً ١ ٢ ٣ ٤ ٥ غير محرجة على الإطلاق

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                             │
│                                             │
│                                             │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

أنا بَناقِش بِمَشروع آلتَخرج مع آستاذ جديد عنا في آلدائره بِلتقي معاه لأول مَره. آلمشكله إنه آلاستاذ بِحكي بِسُرعَه، وبِيستَخدِم اكثير من المصطلحات إلّي ما بعرَفْ مَعناها, بَس آنا مش حابب آقاطعُه، وبنفسْ آلوقت إلّيْ بحكِّية آلأستاذ مهم كثير، ومُمكِن يكون من أسئلَة آلامتحان, فقلت :

١. من صاحب المكانة العليا؟ ١. انا ٢. أُستاذي ٣. متساويان

٢. الى أي حد يمكن ان تصنف درجة المعرفة بينك وبين الاستاذ؟

قريبة جداً ١ ٢ ٣ ٤ ٥ غريبة

٣. ما درجة الإحراج التي يمكن أن يسببها هذا الطلب؟

محرجة جداً ١ ٢ ٣ ٤ ٥ غير محرجة على الإطلاق

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                             │
│                                             │
│                                             │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

لازم أسلّم ورقة بَحث خِلال أربعَ وعِشرين ساعة، ولكن المشكله إني شاعر بتعب ومن الصعب أَنْهي المطلوب خلال هالفترة القصيرة, عَشان هيك أنا شعرت إنة لازم أحكي مع أستاذت المادة اللي بعرفها كثير منيح، وأطلُبْ مِنْها تأجيل آلموعد إلنهائي يوم أويومين. فَقلت:

١. من صاحب المكانة العليا؟   ١. انا   ٢. مدرسة المادة   ٣. متساويان

٢. الى أي حد يمكن ان تصنف درجة المعرفة بينك وبين مدرسة المادة؟

قريبة جداً   ١   ٢   ٣   ٤   ٥   غريبة

٣. ما درجة الإحراج التي يمكن أن يسببها هذا الطلب؟

محرجة جداً   ١   ٢   ٣   ٤   ٥   غير محرجة على الإطلاق

```

```

أنا حالياً بمحاضرة في الجامعة، وطلب الأستاذ من الطلاب إنهم يكتبوا الملاحظات الموجودة على اللوح؛ لإنها مهمة كثير. المشكله إنه ما معي أوراق فاضيه، ودفتر الملاحظات مليان. طلبت من زميلي أوراق فاضية, كمان هوي ما معه. وأنا بحاول الاقي حد يساعدني, لقيت طالبة جديده في التخصص أول مرة بشوفها, بس أنا مُضطر أطلب منها شوية أوراق, فقلت:

١. من صاحب المكانة العليا؟   ١. انا   ٢. الطالبة ٣. متساويان

٢. الى أي حد يمكن ان تصنف درجة المعرفة بينك وبين الطالبة؟

قريبة جداً   ١   ٢   ٣   ٤   ٥   غريبة

٣. ما درجة الإحراج التي يمكن أن يسببها هذا الطلب؟

محرجة جداً   ١   ٢   ٣   ٤   ٥   غير محرجة على الإطلاق

```

```

أنا رَئيس\ة لَجنِة طُلابية، وبشتغل على مشروع خاص بالجامعة مع مجموعة من الطلاب. إجتني مكالمه ضَروريه من واحد من أصدقائي، وكان لازم أكتُبْ مُلاحظة مُهمة، وأسجّل رقم تَلَفونْ ضَروري. بس المشكله ما معي قلم. في طالبتين انْضَمينْ للمجموعة اللي انا مسؤول عنها من فترة قصيرة،وأنا بعرفهم معرفة سطحية قاعدات على أحد المقاعد وقدامهن قلم. فقلت:

١. من صاحب المكانة العليا؟   ١. انا   ٢. الطالبات ٣. متساويان

٢. الى أي حد يمكن ان تصنف درجة المعرفة بينك وبين الطالبتين؟

قريبة جداً   ١   ٢   ٣   ٤   ٥   غريبة

٣. ما درجة الإحراج التي يمكن أن يسببها هذا الطلب؟

محرجة جداً   ١   ٢   ٣   ٤   ٥   غير محرجة على الإطلاق

```

```

أنا في العادة بَلتقي مع بَعضُ أصدِقائي وقت الغدا, كان على آلتلفزيون آلموجود في الكفتيريا خبر مهم. أنا بَحاوُل أشوف آلتلفزيون, بس آلمشكلة إنه واحِد من أصدقاء اخوي الكبير واقف قدامي، ومش قادِر أشوفُ مِنهُ الخبر, فقلت:

١. من صاحب المكانة العليا؟ ١. انا ٢. صديق أخوي الكبير ٣. متساويان

٢. الى أي حد يمكن ان تصنف درجة المعرفة بينك وبينه؟

قريبة جداً ١ ٢ ٣ ٤ ٥ غريبة

٣. ما درجة الإحراج التي يمكن أن يسببها هذا الطلب؟

محرجة جداً ١ ٢ ٣ ٤ ٥ غير محرجة على الإطلاق

```




```

أنا طالب\ة سنة رابعة وخريج\ة هذا الفصل انشاء الله. انا بدرّس طالبة توجيهي بعرفها كثير ومنيح نفس المادة الّي بَدرُسها في آلجامعة. عشان إلّي بشرح أكثر من نص ساعة, شعرت بالعطش، وبدي أطلب كاسة ميِّ, فقلت:

١. من صاحب المكانة العليا؟ ١. انا ٢. الطالبة ٣. متساويان

٢. الى أي حد يمكن ان تصنف درجة المعرفة بينك وبين الطالبة؟

قريبة جداً ١ ٢ ٣ ٤ ٥ غريبة

٣. ما درجة الإحراج التي يمكن أن يسببها هذا الطلب؟

محرجة جداً ١ ٢ ٣ ٤ ٥ غير محرجة على الإطلاق

```




```

أنا طالب/ة سنة رابعة، وانطلب مني أحكي لِبعض آلطلبة آلجدد عن محتوى بعض المواد المطلوبه منهم في آلتخصص. آلمشكلة إنو ما معي إلا نص ساعة حتى أوَضِّح كل شي و في كثير من الأشياء لِسَه ما مريت عليها. واحد من الطلاب الجدد بشوفه لإول مرة رن جواله أكثر من مره، فكان آلأمر فيه تضيع وقت كثير ومزعج جدا بالنسبة إلي, فقلت:

١. من صاحب المكانة العليا؟ ١. انا ٢. الطالب ٣. متساويان

٢. الى أي حد يمكن ان تصنف درجة المعرفة بينك وبين الطالب؟

قريبة جداً ١ ٢ ٣ ٤ ٥ غريبة

٣. ما درجة الإحراج التي يمكن أن يسببها هذا الطلب؟

محرجة جداً ١ ٢ ٣ ٤ ٥ غير محرجة على الإطلاق

```




```

في عندي مَوعِد مع دُكتور الأسنان, بس المشكله إنه هذا الموعد بتعارض مع المحاضرة الوحيده في الأُسبوع من الساعة(١-٤) وأنا لازم أغادر المحاضرة الساعة(٣), أي قبل نهايتها بساعة, على شان هيك قررت أحكي مع مدرسة المادة، واطلب منها اذن مغادرة قبل نهاية المحاضرة بساعة , فقلت:

١. من صاحب المكانة العليا؟   ١. انا   ٢. مدرسه المادة   ٣. متساويان

٢. الى أي حد يمكن ان تصنف درجة المعرفة بينك وبين مدرسة المادة ؟

قريبة جداً   ١   ٢   ٣   ٤   ٥   غريبة

٣. ما درجة الإحراج التي يمكن أن يسببها هذا الطلب؟

محرجة جداً   ١   ٢   ٣   ٤   ٥   غير محرجة على الإطلاق

<div style="border:1px solid black; height:60px;"></div>