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Introduction and Theoretical Framework

Introduction:

English: an International Language

English has gained the status of an international language. It is probably used by two billion people worldwide (Crystal, 1985). Nevertheless, those for whom it is the mother tongue fall to a fifth or less of this total (Strevens, 1990). Where it is not the mother tongue, English can be either a foreign or a second language. English is a foreign language within a community when it has no special standing but is simply “just another language”; whereas English is a second language when it has special standing, such as being acceptable in the courts of law, being the medium of instruction in major sectors of the educational system, being used in regional or national administration, being commonly used on radio or television, and where there are major newspapers published in English.

Status of English in the Arab World

In the Arab world, Arabic is the first language. It is the medium of day-to-day communication, education, administration, mass media, legal procedures, and business transactions. English, however, is a foreign language. Its spheres of use in everyday communication are very limited.

The early exposure of Arab students to English takes place in the early stages of their school education. It is a compulsory subject in both government and private schools. At the university level, Arab students have the chance to join the English department which is of prestigious position in the Arab universities compared to other specializations. The non-specialized students who major in other courses have to take English for one or two years as a requirement course. In the schools of Science, Engineering, and Medicine some of the materials are
introduced to students in English. Therefore, English in the Arab world is mainly used for educational purposes which maintains its status as a foreign language. Although in some of the Arab countries, there are some TV and radio programs as well as newspapers which are in English, the audience and readership are still small segments of the Arab communities.

Recently, it has been observed that with the advances of modern technology, people's interest in learning English through both formal and informal education has increased and, therefore, English is now spreading more rapidly. The domain of English use is expanding and day by day this language attains steady progress which may lead it to take its position as a second language. Arab students' awareness of the importance of learning English leads some of them to leave their countries and go abroad to further their education and learn English as well. India is one of the destinations and the Arab students, who study there, are the subjects under investigation in this research. In India English is widely used as a second language.

The early limited spheres of English use in the Arab world evoked the researchers to study the Arab students' English interlanguage almost at the grammatical level. Studies concerned with error analysis, comparative and contrastive studies at the level of phonology, morphology, and syntax have been the most dominant areas of research into the English of Arabs. Research into the different aspects of communicative competence, particularly the pragmatic competence, has not been given the same attention.

**Current Trends**

In recent years, there has been a shift of emphasis in second and foreign language teaching and learning theories from a 'grammatical' or 'structural' approach to a communicative one (Widdowson, 1987 Canale and Swain, 1980). This shift results from the generally shared assumption that effective communication depends on more than knowing the rules of lexicon, grammar and phonology of the language or languages spoken in one's speech community.
The notion of ‘communicative competence’ was introduced by Hymes (1964) to refer to the kinds of knowledge a fluent speaker of a language must possess in order to produce and understand contextually appropriate and comprehensible utterances in that language. Some of the sociolinguistic studies (Ervin-Tripp, 1976) have since demonstrated that the kinds of knowledge required for effective communication involve processing of social as well as linguistic knowledge.

According to Widdowson (1984), “It will be generally acknowledged that the ultimate aim in language learning is to acquire communicative competence......” The pragmatic knowledge is considered as one of the major components of a theory of communicative competence. Johnson and Johnson (1999) point out that “pragmatic competence is an aspect of communicative competence and refers to the ability to communicate appropriately in particular contexts of use. It contrasts with linguistic competence which refers to the mastery of the general rules of language abstracted from its use.”

The shift of emphasis from grammatical to communicative competence suggests that researchers who work on the English interlanguage of Arabs have to follow the same direction. The definition of ‘pragmatic competence’ above indicates the importance of investigating the problem of appropriateness in the production of second and foreign language learners. The interlanguage pragmatics of Arabic-speaking learners of English has to be investigated with the view of gaining more insights into how to make them more effective learners and users of the target language. The present study is an attempt in this direction and to examine this important aspect of their communicative competence in English, four speech acts have been selected for research, namely requests, invitations, apologies and corrections. Before we start analyzing the data on these speech acts, a theoretical background to the study and a review of the previous literature on the topic have to be introduced.
Theoretical Background

Pragmatics: Definition and Scope

Various definitions of pragmatics are found in the literature. In one of its early definitions the term is used to refer to one of the three major divisions of semiotics along with semantics and syntax, (Charles Morris, 1938). In other words, 'pragmatics' is one of the three branches of semiotics, which in turn is the systematic study of linguistic and non-linguistic signs, and which has been elaborated by many disciplines: philosophy, psychology, sociology, anthropology and linguistics. From a philosophical point of view, semiotics comprises:

- Pragmatics: the study of how signs and symbols are used by humans for communication in a particular language,
- Semantics: the study of the relationships between the symbol and its referent, and
- Syntactics: the study of symbols in relation to each other.

Therefore, as the third major component of any semiotic theory, 'pragmatics' would have the task of studying ‘the relationships between signs and their users’.

Recently, ‘pragmatics’ has come to be applied to the study of language from the point of view of the users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on the other participants in an act of communication. The field focuses on an ‘area' between semantics, sociolinguistics, and extra-linguistic context, but the boundaries with these other domains are as yet incapable of precise definition, (David Crystal, 1985:240). According to the most influential citation authorities, Geoffrey Leech and Stephen S. Levinson, pragmatics concerns ‘ the study of meaning in relation to speech situations’, dealing with ‘utterance meaning’ (rather than sentence meaning, which is the
domain of semantics), Leech (1983:6,14) ; it comprises 'the study of language usage' Levinson (1983:5). In their receptive books on pragmatics, both authors explicate these very general definitions, partly discussing the relative merits of alternative explications, Levinson (1983:5ff), partly delimiting pragmatics from neighboring disciplines, Leech (1983:5ff). A still broader concept of pragmatics is suggested by Verschueren (1987), who argues that rather than regarding pragmatics as defined by a specific research object, it should more appropriately be viewed as a perspective on language. In Chomskyan theory, ‘pragmatic competence’ has been opposed to ‘grammatical competence’, the latter referring to ‘the knowledge of form and meaning’ and the former to ‘knowledge of conditions and manner of appropriate use, in conformity with various purposes’ (Chomsky, 1980:224). Put simply to suit the purpose of this study, the study of pragmatics is “the study of what speakers mean to convey when they use a particular structure in context”, (Evelyn Hatch, 992:260). In other words, I use the term pragmatics in this study to refer to the selection and correlation of linguistic forms in accordance with the social context of a speech situation or event. The social context includes such factors as social status of the speaker and the hearer, familiarity, politeness in the sense given by Brown and Levinson, Grice’s conversational maxims, the notion of ‘face’, or the presentation of self in specific public situations.

**Focus and Content of Pragmatics:**

Pragmatics, as a subfield of linguistics, deals with some of the aspects of language like deixis, presupposition, performatives, implicature, speech acts, linguistic politeness, and can assume either of the following approaches: interlanguage or cross-cultural pragmatics, etc. which are vital notions in the domain of language in use.

**Deixis:**

The term refers to those features of language which refer directly to the personal, temporal or locational characteristics of the situation within which an
utterance takes place, whose meaning is thus relative to the situation; e.g. *now/then, here/there, I/you, this/that* are deictics. The term is also used for words which refer to backwards or forwards in discourse (anaphora and cataphora respectively), e.g. *the, the following, the former*, etc.

**Presupposition:**

It refers to the logical meaning of a sentence or meanings logically associated with or entailed by a sentence. It can also be defined as a relation between sentences or propositions with their interpretations. The pragmatic presupposition refers to the interlocutors’ shared background knowledge of the situation under question. It is "a four-place relation between persons (the speakers), sentences (or utterances), propositions and contexts (or sets of beliefs), (Aejaz Sheikh, 1998).

**Implicature:**

It is the indirect or implicit meaning of an utterance derived from context that is not present from its conventional use. According to David Crystal (1985: 153), “implicature is a term derived from the work of the philosopher H.P. Grice (1957) and now frequently used in linguistics as part of the study of conversational structure. Conversational implicatures refer to the implications which can be deduced from the form of an utterance, on the basis of certain cooperative principles which govern the efficiency and normal acceptability of conversations, as when the sentence: “*There is some chalk on the floor*” is taken to mean ‘you ought to pick it up’.

**Performatives:**

The term implies that by each utterance a speaker not only says something but also does certain things: giving information, stating a fact, or hinting an attitude. This term is "used by the philosopher J.L. Austin (1971) , and now found in grammatical and semantic analysis, to refer to a type of sentence where an action is 'performed' by virtue of the sentence having been uttered,
e.g., I apologize, I promise, ..... “The original distinction was drawn between performative utterances and constative utterances: the later are descriptive statements which can be analyzed in terms of truth-values; performatives, on the other hand, are expressions of activity which are not analyzable in truth-value terms. Performative verbs (apologize, etc.) have a particular significance in speech-act theory as they mark the illocutionary force of an utterance in an explicit way.” Crystal, 1985: 225.

**Speech Acts:**

Speech acts refer to actions that are carried out through language. The term is derived from the work of the philosopher J.L. Austin (1962) and now used widely in linguistics to refer to a theory which analyses the role of utterances in relation to the behaviour of the speaker and hearer in interpersonal communication. It is not an 'act of speech' (in the sense of parole), but a communicative activity (a locutionary act), defined with reference to the intentions of the speaker while speaking (the illocutionary force of his utterance) and the effects he achieves on his listener (the perlocutionary effect of his utterance). Crystal, (1985: 285). What is usually meant by saying that we do something when we make an utterance is that we accomplish some specific social act, e.g., making a promise, a request, giving advice, etc. such social acts are usually, illocutionary acts.

The notion of speech acts as developed by Austin (1962) captures an essential aspect of language use: the fact that an utterance, which expresses some propositional content, may at the same time count as the performance of a communicative act. Thus, a mother telling her son 'It’s late' at the time when he usually goes to bed, on the one hand states the element of real time but on the other hand performs a directive telling the boy to go to bed. The same utterance ‘It’s late’ uttered by a wife in reaction to her husband’s suggestion to go to the movies, may be intended as a rejection of the suggestion.

The performance of the speech act depends on the context within which
the utterance occurs; context consisting of all the relevant information relating to the participants, and the temporal and spatial parameters of the speech event. Leech (1983:13) refers to context as “any background knowledge assumed to be shared by s and h and which contributes to h’s interpretation of what s means by a given utterance.” An utterance can, therefore, provide propositional content and at the same time perform an interactional function. On the other hand, a speech act can be realized in a variety of ways. If Mrs. x wants her husband to close the window, she has at her disposal various possibilities to realize the speech act starting with the direct request ‘Close the window, darling’ or the more conventional variant ‘Would you close the window?’ to the indirect form ‘Don’t you think it is rather chilly in here?’ Successful speech act performance depends, therefore, on a rather elaborate mapping among situational conditions, linguistic means and social variables.

Research in speech acts achieves various objectives. Two of the main objectives are: (a) to provide us with a better understanding of how human communicative interaction is carried out via linguistic realization, and (b) to describe similarities and differences in the way in which such interactions are carried out under similar circumstances across languages and cultures.

Classifications of Speech Acts:

Many taxonomies of speech acts have been proposed, but they will not be discussed or compared in the present study as that is not of the major concern of this study. The various kinds of speech acts which have been identified, chiefly, by philosophers taking a functional approach to sentences in use are presented below.

- Speech acts that represent a state of affairs are called ‘representatives’, e.g., assertions, statements, claims, hypotheses, descriptions, corrections, and suggestions. Representatives can generally be characterized as being true or false.
Speech acts that commit a speaker to a course of action are called 'commissives', e.g., promises, pledges, threats, and vows.

Speech acts intended to get the addressee to carry out an action are called 'directives', e.g., commands, requests, challenges, invitations, entreaties and dares.

Speech acts that bring about the state of affairs they name are called 'declarations', e.g., blessings, firings, baptisms, marrying, declaring a mistrial.

Speech acts that indicate the speaker's psychological state or attitude are called 'expressives', e.g., greetings, apologies, congratulations, condolences, and thanksgivings.

Speech acts that make assessments or judgments are called 'verdictives', e.g., assessing, appraising, condoning, etc. Because some verdictives (such as calling a baseball player "out") combine the characteristics of declarations and representatives, these are sometimes called representational declarations. (Finegan and Besnier, 1989: 328-329).

This taxonomy of speech acts is presented by Searle (1976). It presents the clearest classification. For Searle, the basis for classification is 'illocutionary point' or purpose of the act, from the speaker's perspective.

Speech Acts and Language Teaching & Learning Research:

The study of the role of speech acts in second language learning could make a useful contribution to our knowledge of how second and foreign languages are acquired. Speech act theory, defining proficiency with reference to communicative rather than linguistic competence, looks beyond the level of the sentence to the question of what sentences do and how they do it when language is used. It thus broadens the scope of inquiry in linguistics to include
the study of how second language learners use sentences to perform speech acts and to participate in speech events. Moreover, the relevance of speech act theory and research to language teaching is through its contribution to the theory of communicative language teaching (Schmidt & Richards, 1980).

**Pragmatic Principles:**

Pragmaticians are concerned with exploring why and how interlocutors can successfully converse with one another in a conversation. A basic idea is that interlocutors obey certain principles in their participation so as to sustain the conversation. One such principle is 'the cooperative principle' which assumes that interactants cooperate in the conversation by contributing to the ongoing speech event (Grice: 1975). Another assumption is 'the politeness principle' (Leech, 1983) that maintains interlocutors behave politely to one another, since people respect each others’ face (Brown and Levinson, 1978). A cognitive explanation to social interactive speech events was provided by Sperber and Wilson (1986) who hold that in verbal communication people try to be relevant to what they intend to say and to whom an utterance is intended.

**Linguistic Politeness:**

Politeness is one of the central subfields of pragmatics which has attracted the attention of researchers for the last two decades. According to Thomas,(1995), in the past twenty years within pragmatics there has been a great deal of interest in 'politeness', to such an extent that politeness theory could almost be seen as a sub-discipline of pragmatics. Though much literature exists on this linguistic phenomenon, it is still “definitionally fuzzy and empirically difficult”, Held (1992). The concept of politeness has been depicted in the literature in a great variety of ways: as formality, as deference, as indirectness, as appropriateness, as etiquette, as tact (Fraser, 1990; Kasper, 1994; Meier, 1995; Thomas, 1995). The complex nature of politeness results from the fact that this linguistic phenomenon has many facets: it is both the every day term, everyone is familiar with and the pragmatic concept researchers are dealing with; it is
manifested on many levels: lexical, syntactic, pragmatic, socio-cultural non-verbal, kinesthetic; it also displays significant differences across cultures. Despite its obvious real-life significance and some early studies e.g. Shils (1968), Lakoff (1973), it was not until the late 1970s that politeness became a major concern in pragmatics.

Approaches to politeness:

According to Fraser (1990:220), there is a four-fold classification of politeness (the social norm-view, the conversational-maxim view, the face-saving view, and the conversational-contract view). This is the most comprehensive approach to different conceptualizations of politeness. This four-fold classification can, in fact, be further collapsed into two categories: one category comprises ‘the social norm view’ and ‘the conversational contract view’ which can be termed first-order politeness approaches (i.e., they deal primarily with politeness as an everyday concept, as the matter of etiquette and protocol, and as the more general sense of appropriateness). The second category comprises the conversational maxim view’ and ‘the face-saving view which focus on politeness as a theoretical and a pragmatic concept represent second-order politeness (E. D. Glacazi 2002).

The four major perspectives on the treatment of politeness are identified and explicated in brief in the following:

A. The Social-Norm View:

This view refers to the normative view of politeness seen as the social standards of behavior in any society. The status of this approach within approaches to politeness is controversial in the literature. One extreme view argues that the interpretation of politeness as the desire to be pleasant to others "has no place within pragmatics", (Thomas, 1995:150). Fraser (1990) states that: "the social-norm approach has few adherents among current researchers." The social-norm view assumes social standards similar to discernment politeness in
that it refers to the use of the standard in a social setting. In this respect, this approach to politeness has its place in pragmatic research.

B. The Conversational-Contract View:

This view is proposed by Fraser and Nolen (1981) and later elaborated by Fraser (1990). It places politeness in the realm of terms and conditions of a conversational contract (CC) existing between participants. Fraser (1990) states that, ‘we enter into a conversation and continue within a conversation with the (usually tacit) understanding of our current conversational contract (CC) at every turn. Within this framework, being polite constitutes operating within the then current terms and conditions of the CC.” In this approach, politeness is virtually the same as using language appropriately. In this sense, Fraser’s understanding of politeness is similar to Watts (1992) notion of polite behaviour, which involves maintaining the equilibrium in a relationship. According to Fraser (1990, 233), “politeness, on this view is not a sometime thing. Rational participants are aware that they are to act within the negotiated constraints and generally do so. When they do not, however, they are then perceived as being impolite or rude. Politeness is a state that one expects to exist in every conversation ; participants note not that someone is being polite – this is the norm – but rather that the speaker is violating the CC. Being polite does not involve making the hearer “feel good”, a la Lakoff or Leech, nor with making the hearer not “feel bad”, a la B & L. It simply involves getting on with the task at hand in light of the terms and conditions of the CC.”

This approach is general enough and its view of politeness is virtually the same as using language appropriately, a position that can be seen both as a strength and a weakness. Its strength lies in its universal applicability; at the same times it does not elaborate enough to adequately address the complexity of the phenomenon. Another undoubted strength of this approach is the elaboration of the notion of communicative contract not as a static entity, but as a dynamic concept which is subject to change as the interaction unfolds.
C. The Conversational-Maxim View:

The theoretical framework of this view is based on Grice’s cooperative principle (1967, published in 1975). The cooperative principle (CP) is assumed to be of key importance in regulating conversation and is based on the general assumption of cooperation in a conversation between interlocutors. This principle implies that there is an unspoken pact that people will cooperate in communicating with each other. The explanation for the pact is simple: unless speakers cooperate in the endeavor to communicate reliably and efficiently, the communicative process will break down harming both interlocutors. Grice argued that conversationalists are rational individuals who are primarily interested in the efficient conveying of messages. To this end, he proposed his general cooperative principle which provides that: “make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of talk exchange in which you are engaged.” (1975:45). Grice associates with this CP a set of maxims (quantity, quality, relevance, and manner) and sub-maxims, which he presumes that speakers follow. These conversational maxims are guidelines for the ‘rational’ use of language. Violation of a conversational maxim may be accepted as signaling certain speaker intentions.

Lakoff, (1973), adopts and extends Grice’s construct of CP in an effort to account for politeness. She states that, “we should like to have some kind of pragmatic rules, dictating whether an utterance is pragmatically well-formed or not, and the extent to which it deviates if it does”, (1973:296). In her early works of politeness, she never actually says what she takes politeness to be. Later she became more explicit, referring to politeness as “a device used in order to reduce friction in personal interaction.”, (Lakoff, 1979). In her model she suggests two rules of pragmatic competence: (a) Be clear (essentially Grice’s maxims) and (b) Be polite. In addition she proposes sub-maxims (1. Don’t impose, 2. Give options and 3. Make a feel good.) However, this model does not explicitly give any clues as to how the three proposed levels of politeness (sub-maxims) are to
be understood and how interlocutors decide on a particular strategy (Fraser, 1990), thus coming short of having adequate “explanatory power”.

As a reaction to the shortcomings of Lakoff’s proposal of politeness principle, Leech (1983) formulated a more comprehensive framework. Once again politeness is never explicitly defined, but is located within the domain of Interpersonal Rhetoric which contains at least three sets of maxims: those falling under the terms of Grice’s Cooperative Principle (CP), those associated with a Politeness Principle (PP), and those associated with an Irony Principle (IP). CP and its associated maxims used to explain how an utterance may be interpreted to convey indirect messages, and the PP and its maxims used to explain why such indirectness might be used. Leech’s ‘Principle of Politeness’ can be stated as the following: “Other things being equal, minimize the expression of beliefs which are unfavorable to the hearer and at the same time (but less important) maximize the expression of beliefs which are favorable to the hearer.” Therefore, the focus in this approach is on the speaker’s social goals rather than his /her illocutionary goals. Formulating the PP in a very general way as a way to “minimize the expression of impolite beliefs” (Leech, 1983:81), the author divides it into six interpersonal maxims (Tact, Generosity, Approbation, Modesty, Agreement, and Sympathy) and goes on to suggest that each of these maxims is associated with an independent pragmatic scale of values.

Although this approach to politeness appears to have impressive body of details and elaborations, it has led to claims that there seems to be no clear-cut way of restricting the number of maxims, thus leading to an “ad hoc ......and open-ended” taxonomy (Jucker 1988). Following Leech’s (1983) theory, it would be possible to produce a new maxim for every single small pattern in language, a condition with questionable value for linguistic theory. As Brown and Levinson (1987) state, “If we are permitted to invent a maxim for every regularity in language use ...we [will] have an infinite number of maxims.” In fact, new maxims have been added to the existing list by other researchers, which is evidence of the open-ended nature of this approach. Gu (1990), for example,
formulates the 'self-denigrating' maxim and 'the address' maxim.

Despite the criticism, Lakoff's (1973) and Leech's (1983) Models of Politeness have undergone, they represent perhaps the most suitable approach for cross-cultural comparisons due to their explanatory power in the realm of cross-cultural differences in the perception and use of politeness strategies (O'Driscoll, 1996).

D. The Face-saving View:

Perhaps, the most thorough treatment of the concept of politeness is that of Brown and Levinson, which was first published in 1978 and then revised in 1987 with the addition of a 50 pages introduction. Their approach was termed the face-saving view (Fraser, 1990). As a starting point for their theory, Brown and Levinson link three basic notions: (a) the view of communication as rational activity, (b) the general correctness of Grice's (1975) CP and maxims of conversation, and (c) Goffman's (1967) notion of 'face', i.e., "the public self-image that every member [of a society] wants to claim for himself. In this sense, speakers are endowed with rationality, defined as "a precisely definable mode of reasoning from ends to the means that will achieve those ends" (Brown and Levinson, 1978). According to cooperative principle, people operate on the assumption that ordinary conversation is characterized by "no deviations from rational efficiency without a reason" (Brown and Levinson, 1978, P.5). It is considerations of politeness and face that provide reasons for those deviations, "Politeness is then a major source of deviation from (the) rational efficiency [of speaking in accordance with Grice's maxims], and it is communicated precisely by that deviation." Brown and Levinson, 1987:95.

The notion of face is a term for two separate sets of human wants: positive face "the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others" (Brown and Levinson, 1987:62)..... [the] perennial desire that his wants (or the actions/acquisitions, values resulting from them should be thought as desirable" (P.101), and negative face, "the want of every 'competent adult
member' that his action be unimpeded by others, (Brown and Levinson, p.62) .......[the] want to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded" (p.129). The rational actions people take to preserve both kinds of face for themselves and the people they interact with essentially add up to politeness. They also argue that in human communication, either spoken or written, people tend to maintain one another’s face continuously, because “face is something that can be lost, maintained or enhanced, and any threat to face must be continually monitored during an interaction. And, since face is so vulnerable, and since most participants will defend their face if threatened, the assumption is made that it is generally in every one's best interest to maintain each other’s face and to act in such ways that others are made aware that this is one’s intention.” Fraser, 1990:229.

Either or both of the two types of face can be threatened by certain inherently face threatening acts (FTAs), which are defined both in terms of whose face, Speaker's (S's) or Hearer's (H's), is at stake and which face want is threatened. The undesirable state of threatened face engendered by an FTA brings politeness into play in the form of positive and negative politeness strategies, which are viewed as ways of performing a primary (face threatening) act by serving to redress or mitigate its threat to H's face. Brown and Levinson posit a taxonomy of possible strategies for performing FTAs, summarized as follows (1987:91):

* don't do the FTA  
least threatening to hearer's face

* do the FTA off record

* do the FTA on record with negative politeness

* do the FTA on record with positive politeness

* do the FTA baldly on record  
most threatening to hearer's face
According to Fraser (1990:230) redressive strategies may involve positive politeness (roughly, the expression of solidarity, e.g., I am sorry to hear that...) or negative politeness (roughly, the expression of restraint, e.g., I hate to bother you like this, but.....). Off-record politeness, (roughly the avoidance of unequivocal impositions) requires a more complicated inference, e.g., 'It would help me if no one were to do anything for just a moment.' Use of an off-record strategy may be motivated by factors other than politeness, for example, evading giving a direct answer to a question, or playing with language. Performing an act on-record involves being most direct without any redress, e.g., 'Pass the salt.' Which strategy should be applied depends on the weight of the FTA, which, according to Brown and Levinson involves the following factors in many and perhaps all cultures: (1) social distance (D) between the speaker and the hearer; in effect the degree of familiarity and solidarity they share; (2) relative power (P) of the speaker with respect to the hearer; in effect, the degree to which the speaker can impose will on the hearer; (3) absolute ranking R of impositions in the culture, both in terms of the expenditure of goods and/or services by the hearer, the right of the speaker to perform the act, and the degree to which the hearer welcomes the imposition. (1987:74)

The seriousness or weightiness of a particular FTA is the sum of these three factors. When the FTA is extremely serious, the least direct strategy (don't do FTA) should be employed. When the FTA is not serious at all, the most direct (bald on record) strategy can be used.

In conclusion, according to Brown and Levinson's model, a face-bearing rational agent will tend to utilize the FTA-minimizing strategies according to a rational assessment of the face rest to participants.

As the most influential framework to date, Brown and Levinson's model has attracted a lot of attention and has been espoused and critiqued from many angles, leading Van De Walle (1993) to make the apt analogy that "high trees catch a lot of wind." Most of the criticism can be summarized as pertaining to the
following issues:

1. The underlying interrelationship between rational strategy and face.

2. The claims for the universality of face.

3. The notion of FTA.

4. The sociolinguistic variables that determine the production and interpretation of politeness.

Many researchers have tried to reconcile the four approaches to politeness pointing out that they are not separate categories, but interrelated concepts. The need for combining these views is clear in the search for a unified, universal theory of politeness. In this synthesis, the split between first- and second-order politeness again becomes pertinent and politeness will, therefore, involve, on the one hand, the interlocutor’s use of intentional strategies (conversational-maxims view and face-saving view), and on the other, the interlocutor’s expression of the expected and prescribed norms of speech (the conversational-norm view and conversational-contract view).

In the present study, the model adopted is mainly that of Brown and Levinson “the face-saving view” as it seems eligible for analyzing and accounting for politeness features in the Arabic-English interlanguage.

**Approaches to Pragmatic Studies:**

**Contrastive Pragmatics:**

This type of study within pragmatics identifies cross-cultural and cross-linguistic pragmatic differences and similarities. The underlying assumption behind triggering research explorations in this area is that the pragmatic principles people abide by in one language are often different in another. Thus, there has been a growing interest in how people in different languages observe a certain pragmatic principle. Cross-cultural studies reported what is considered
polite in one language is sometimes not polite in another. Contrastive pragmatics, however, is not confined to study a certain pragmatic principles. Cultural break-downs, pragmatic failure, among other things, are also components of cross-cultural pragmatics.

A major part of this thesis is devoted to highlighting cross-cultural and cross-linguistic differences and similarities between three various varieties of languages: 1) English as used by native speakers, 2) Arabic as used by native speakers, 3) Indian English that bears some features of the Indian culture. The interlanguage of Arabs using English is investigated under the rubric 'interlanguage pragmatics.

**Interlanguage Pragmatics:**

Another focus of research in pragmatics -which is the main concern of this study-, is learner language or interlanguage. ILP identifies learner-specific pragmatic behaviors and their relationship to learner’s L1 and L2. Interlanguage pragmatics is a branch of pragmatics which specifically discusses how nonnative speakers comprehend and produce a speech act in a target language and how their pragmatic competence develops over time. (Kasper & Blum-Kulka, 1993). In other words, interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) is defined as the study of nonnative speakers' use and acquisition of linguistic action patterns in second language (L2). It is a branch of second language research contrasting with interlanguage phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics. It is also a subset of pragmatics where it figures as a sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, or simply linguistic enterprise, following the definition of pragmatics as the study of people’s comprehension and production of linguistic action in context.

In this research, the major concern is to study the interlanguage pragmatic features of English as used by Arabs in India with special reference to four speech acts: requests, invitations, apologies and corrections. Their linguistic behaviors will be examined in the light of both English and Arabic.
Domains of Interlanguage Pragmatics:

1. **Pragmatic Comprehension:** This area of investigation focuses on learners' attribution of illocutionary force and perception of politeness. Attribution of illocutionary force centers on the comprehension of indirect speech acts, factors contributing to ease or difficulty of pragmatic comprehension, the role of linguistic form and context information and learner variables influencing force attribution. The second focus of this domain - perception of politeness – examines how learners assess the politeness value of different speech act realization strategies.

2. **Production of Linguistic Action:** It has been argued that learners have access to the same range of realization strategies for linguistic action as native speakers and demonstrate sensitivity to contextual constraints in their strategy choice. However, the main reasons behind learners' deviations from native use at different levels of proficiency appear to be: (1) their restricted L2 linguistic knowledge, (2) difficulty in accessing it smoothly, (3) negative transfer of pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic norms from L1, (4) nonnative perceptions of L2 sociopragmatic norms, or even (5) purposeful loyalty to L1 cultural patterns. The universality claims (about learners' having access to the same range of realization strategies for linguistic action as native speakers) have to be voiced with caution until the scope of target languages has been considerably broadened, (Kasper, 1993).

   The variation in the learners' realization patterns of various speech acts as well as the reasons behind similarities and deviations from native use has been of primary concern under this domain of interlanguage pragmatics.

3. **Pragmatic Transfer:** This field of investigation is one of the major concerns of ILP studies. It is mainly concerned with the influence from learners' native language and culture on their IL pragmatic knowledge and
performance. Negative transfer is the influence of L1 pragmatic competence on IL pragmatic knowledge that differs from the target language (L2). This kind of transfer has a potential risk to communicative success. Positive transfer, on the other hand, refers to pragmatic behaviors or other knowledge which displays consistency across L1, IL and L2. It has received less attention because it can lead to communicative success rather than communicative breakdowns.

The Pragmatic Component in Models of Communicative Competence:

In the course of discussing the types of knowledge the second language learners require for mastering a language Larsen-Freeman (1980) states that “The acquisition of pragmatic knowledge must also be taken into account if we want to understand what it means to say a learner has truly acquired a second language.” Kasper (1997), points out that “Pragmatic ability in a second or foreign language is part of a nonnative speaker’s communicative competence and therefore has to be located in a model of communicative ability”. In Bachman’s model, 1990), ‘language competence’ is subdivided into two components, ‘organizational competence’ and ‘pragmatic competence’. Organizational competence comprises knowledge of linguistic units and the rules of joining them together at the levels of sentence (‘grammatical competence’) and discourse (‘textual competence’). Pragmatic competence subdivides into ‘illocutionary competence’ and ‘sociolinguistic competence’. ‘Illocutionary competence’ can be glossed as ‘knowledge of communicative action and how to carry it out’. The term ‘communicative action’ is often more accurate than the more familiar term ‘speech act’ because communicative action is neutral between the spoken and written mode, and the term acknowledges the fact that communicative action can also be implemented by silence or non-verbally. ‘Sociolinguistic competence’ comprises the ability to use language appropriately according to context. It thus includes the ability to select communicative acts and appropriate strategies to implement them depending on the current status of the ‘conversational contract’ (Fraser, 1990).
Kasper (1989, 42) proposes to conceive of pragmatic knowledge as a component of language users' communicative competence in the sense of Hymes (1972) and Canale & Swain (1980). Given the idea that the notion of speech act (SA) is central to pragmatic theory, Kasper proposes that acquiring pragmatic knowledge in L2 comprises the following subtasks:

1) Learning new speech act categories, e.g. in communication domains with highly culture-specific content and organization, as in games, religious and profane ceremonies, legal trials, and other institutionalized events. These subtasks interact with the acquisition of sociocultural knowledge about the target society.

2) Learning new contextual and distributions of speech acts, such as when to thank whom for what.

3) Learning new procedures and means for speech act realizations. This task is largely dependent on the learner's linguistic L2 knowledge, as it requires availability of and access to at least two types of linguistic knowledge: (a) 'productive' grammatical, lexical and prosodic structures, which for the purpose of realizing illocutionary intent can attain 'acquired meanings'. For instance, the past perfect of the modal shall can be used to express a reproach, given the pragmatic conditions for this illocution are satisfied (i.e. H did event that is at a cost to S): You should have switched off the printer before going to bed. (b) 'Frozen' routines functioning as conventionalized realizations of specific speech acts, such as (in English) routines for greeting, thanking, apologizing, interrupting.

4) Learning how these realization procedures and means are contextually and co-textually distributed. This involves knowledge of how principles of politeness operate in the target culture, and what politeness values pertain to the alternative realization procedures— in other words, how face-work is carried out in accordance with target sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic norms.
Kasper further elaborates the point suggesting that which of these tasks require new learning for the NNS depends to a large extent on the distance between the culture(s) familiar to the learner, and the target culture.

**Significance of the Study**

The primary concern of the present research is to report on: 1) how Arabs using English perform in these four types of speech acts: requests, invitations, apologies and corrections. 2) Another major focus this thesis deals with is relating the various realization patterns of these speech acts to the politeness strategies as proposed by Brown and Levinson. 3) The last main linguistic phenomenon desired to be explored is ‘pragmatic transfer’.

The investigation of the objective in (1) is highly important. Its significance lies in that such study can help in testing the following assumption: “Every language makes available the same set of strategies – semantic formulas – for performing a given speech act.” The practical significance of testing this hypothesis is to draw the attention of material designers and syllabus preparers to focus on what strategies (semantic formulas) are appropriately performed in what situation and to whom in a given language.

The theoretical implications of examining the point (2) above is to test the universality of face, face wants and politeness strategies which are the key terms in the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson (1987). Pedagogically, the findings drawn from analyzing and describing the interlanguage data with reference to politeness phenomenon can help in incorporating some socio-cultural concepts to L2 and FL materials presented to second and foreign language learners with the view of avoiding potential communication breakdowns between native and non-native speakers of both English and Arabic.

Finally, examining ‘pragmatic transfer’ By Arabs EL2 learners can bring about some similarities and differences between languages at the level of discourse and pragmatics. The findings drawn could help SL and FL teachers
highlight these similarities and differences to their students. Similarities, if any, would facilitate teaching/learning processes. Differences, on the other hand, once identified, could be given more emphasis while introducing them to learners.
Chapter 2

Experimental Design

Research Questions:

The central research questions that will be examined in this study are:

1. Patterns of realizations with respect to four speech acts - apologies, requests, corrections, and invitations – as demonstrated in Arabic-English interlanguage data, relative to different social constraints.

2. Similarities and differences in the realization patterns of the four speech acts across Arabic L1, IL, English L1 and Indian English.

3. Highlighting the concept of politeness and politeness strategies as employed in the data of Arabs using English and comparing that conceptualization cross-linguistically with the other three data sets.

4. The influence from Arabic language and culture on the learners’ interlanguage pragmatic performance.

5. The influence from Indian English and Indian culture on the Arab learners’ interlanguage pragmatic performance.

6. The practical pedagogical implications this study can provide for both learners of English and learners of Arabic as a foreign and a second language.

Subjects:

In this study, we shall consider data from four sets of responses:

(a) English as a second language as used by Arabs in India (70 respondents),

(b) English as a second language as used by Indians ‘base group-1’ (20
respondents),

(c) English as a native language as used by native speakers of British English 'base group-2' (16 respondents).

(d) Arabic as a first language as used by most of the respondents in (a) 'base group-3' (63 respondents).

The main focus of this study is the data collected from the Arabs interlanguage users of English. Seventy adult Arabic-speaking learners of English participated in this study as subjects. All are enrolled in different university programmes at different Indian universities and colleges.

They belong to different Arab states: Jordan, Oman, Palestine, Sudan and Yemen. The demographic data collected reveals that the participants range in age from twenty to forty. Sixty three of them served as informants of the Arabic (L1) data. The Arab learners group had studied English for six or seven years in schools (6th to 12th grade), then they came to India to further their education as well as to develop their English. Therefore, they had been exposed to native English through the curriculum materials, movies, news on TV, newspapers, etc; and Indian English through their teachers, syllabus materials and social contact with people. So, in India, the learning context they are exposed to is both naturalistic and instructed. The base or control group consists of sixteen native speakers of British English. In order to test the influence of Indian English on Arab learners’ production, a group of twenty Indians using English participates in the study. All the base group members are university students.

Instrumentation:

Discourse Completion Questionnaire:

In order to obtain the data on the Arab learners’ production of speech acts in English, a discourse completion questionnaire was designed so as to elicit four types of speech acts in a series of socially differentiated situations. "Discourse
Completion Tasks are written questionnaires including a number of brief situational descriptions, followed by an empty slot for the speech act under study. Subjects are asked to fill in a response that they think fits into the given context, (Kasper, 1991). (see the appendix).

The four types of speech acts to be examined in the present study are: apologies, requests, corrections, and invitations; each is represented by three situations in the questionnaire except requests (four situations) and invitation speech act which is represented by two situations. The respondents were asked to put themselves in each situation and to assume that in each case they would say something. They were asked to write down in English what they would say. At a later time, Arab learners were asked to respond in Arabic. Before commencing with the situations, the respondents were asked to provide background as well as demographic information about themselves. The appendix contains a sample questionnaire.

The four elicited speech acts belong to different categories. Apologies are 'expressives' or 'acknowledgements' (Bach & Harnish, 1979:51) because they express certain feelings toward the hearer. Requests are directives. They express the speaker's attitude toward some prospective action by the hearer (Bach & Harnish, 1979:47). Correction is a representative act (Kasper & Blum-Kulka 1993:59) because they can be analyzed in terms of truth-value. Invitations are a commissive/directive hybrid (Bach & Harnish, 1979:50). They involve both commitment and a directive act.

The four speech acts under investigation in this research can also be categorized differently. They are of two kinds: pre-event acts and post-event acts according to whether they take place before or after the events they call for them. Requests and invitations are both pre-event acts. Corrections and (generally) apologies are post-event acts. The most important social factor tested in all the speech acts is the influence of the type of social relationships (familiarity and status) on the determination of a certain linguistic pattern that realizes a specific
speech act.

The advantages of using discourse completion questionnaires are many. For example, they allow the researcher to collect a large sample at one setting, (Krashen and Scarcella, 1983,'foreword by Evelyn Hatch', p.xv). Moreover, ‘this type of questionnaire enables researchers to reach large numbers of respondents and statistically control for variables and analyze the data accordingly, (Olshtain & Blum-Kulka, 1985). This elicitation format was first developed by Levenston and Blum (1978) to study lexical simplification, and first adopted to investigate speech act realizations by Blum-Kulka (1982).

The main disadvantage of this elicitation technique in interlanguage pragmatics is that, the responses elicited may not represent what exactly would happen in a naturally occurring situation.

The Role-play Interview:

This elicitation technique differs from the earlier one in that the researcher elicits the responses orally and not in writing. The investigator introduces the topic to the respondent, explains the aim of the interview and then reads out the situations to them. Both interviewer and interviewee role-play the characters in the situation. The respondents are given the chance to tell what they would say if they encountered the same situations in the real life. This technique was carried out with some of the subjects. The interviews were tape-recorded and at a later stage were transcribed and analyzed.

On-line Elicitations:

Due to the difficulty of easy access to the native speakers of English in the place where the research was conducted, the researcher resorted to find out subjects to represent the base group through the internet chat-rooms facility. The same questionnaire was administered to a group of 16 British English native speakers. The first step in elicitation was to introduce the topic of chatting. Then, the participants were asked to provide their demographic information. After
accepting to participate, situations were sent to them one by one and when the whole on-line interview was over, it was saved in a floppy disk to be analyzed later.

**Type of Analysis:**

The present study consists of 1992 responses elicited from four participating groups who served as subjects. Eight hundred and forty responses represent the Arabs' English interlanguage, seven hundred and twenty responses are in Arabic (L1), two hundred and forty responses were elicited from a group of Indian English users and one hundred and ninety two responses comprise the data elicited from the native speakers of British English. The last three groups are called the control or base groups.

The responses for each of the four speech acts under discussion were analyzed in terms of realization patterns which in turn were related to politeness strategies as proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987).

a. **Requesting Speech Act:** This speech act was analyzed in terms of strategy types and modifications. First, the descriptive categories discussed were: query preparatory, mood derivable, want statements, hedged performatives, direct questions for information, declarative conditional clauses, and hints (strong & mild). The strategy (opting out) was also highlighted. Then, the modifications which a request speech act could undergo were discussed under two rubrics: perspective and internal modifications (please, if clause hedges, sorry, excuse me, pardon me, sir etc). The next step in the analysis was concerned with relating request patterns to Brown and Levinson's superstrategies of politeness.

b. **Inviting Speech Act:** Interlanguage invitations were similarly discussed in terms of Head Acts and Supporting Moves, connecting both to the notion of politeness and face. Head acts were classified into: imperative mood invitations, statements of personal desire, performatives, bald-on-record
reminders, obligation statements, conditionally hedged invitations, interrogative invitations and tacitly declarative invitations. The second part of the chapter analyzes the supportive moves which accompany the head acts intensifiers of the illocutionary force. Three types of supportive moves were identified: multiple invitations/repetition of the head act, expressing pleasure/appreciation over compliance and expressing anger over potential non-compliance.

c. Apologizing Speech Act: The analysis of this speech act follows the framework of Olshtain and Cohen (1983) and the CCSARP coding manual (Blum-Kulka et al, 1989). The data was analyzed on the basis of availability or absence of the following basic categories and subcategories:

1- Illocutionary force indicating devices (IFIDs)
   - An expression of regret, e.g. I'm sorry
   - A request for forgiveness and accepting the apology, e.g. Please forgive me/please accept my apology.

2- Explanation or Account:-Any external mitigating circumstances, “objective” reasons for the violation, e.g.
   i. Explicit: The traffic was terrible.
   ii implicit: Traffic is always so heavy in the morning.

3- Taking on Responsibility
   a) Explicit self-blame, e.g. It is my fault/my mistake
   b) Lack of intent, e.g. I didn’t mean it
   c) Expression of self-deficiency, e.g. I was confused / I didn’t see you / forgot
d) Expression of embarrassment, e.g. I feel awful about it

e) Self-dispraise, e.g. I'm such a dimwit!

f) Justify hearer, e.g. you're right to be angry

g) Refusal to acknowledge guilt
   - Denial of responsibility, e.g. It wasn't my fault
   - Blame the hearer, e.g. it's your own fault
   - Pretend to be offended, e.g. I'm the one to be offended.

4- Concern for the hearer, e.g. I hope I didn't upset you /Are you all right?

5- Offer of repair, e.g. I'll pay for the damage.

6- promise of Forbearance, e.g. It won't happen again

d. **Corrections Speech Act:** In analyzing the data for the speech act of correction, I have followed the model of Takahashi and Beebe (1993) with some modifications. Correction sequences were analyzed in terms of adjuncts (positive remarks), softeners (hedges, questions, and other expressions intended to lighten the gravity of the interlocutor's mistake or to defend the interlocutor) and the main body of the act. The realization patterns of the main body of the act (not mentioned in Takahashi and Beebe's model) were classified by the investigator into four: stating the occurrence of a factual error, disagreement statements, interrogative statements and direct corrections.

**Statistical Measures:**

The frequency of occurrence of each of the linguistic realization patterns (be it a main head act, internal or external modifications) were obtained by calculating the percentage. The next step was comparing the percentage which
demonstrates the frequency of distribution of the same strategy in the same situation across the four data sets in order to measure the similarities and differences in performing the same strategy across the languages involved. In order to test the influence of the sociological variables (familiarity vs. distance and status of the interlocutors) on the performance of the language users, the same calculations were done within the same group across the various situations demonstrating social variability. Similarities and differences within the same data set or across the four groups were accounted for depending on the statistical significance of the occurrence of a specific strategy.

Transfer was measured on the basis of its operational definition adopted from Kasper (1992). “According to this definition, lack of statistically significant differences in the frequencies of a pragmatic feature in the first language, second language, and interlanguage can be operationally defined as positive transfer. Statistically significant differences in the frequencies of a pragmatic feature between interlanguage-second language and first language-second language and lack of statistically significant difference between interlanguage and first language can be operationally defined as negative transfer”, Maeshiba, Yoshinaga, Kasper and Ross, (1996,167).
Chapter 3

Review of Literature

Requests:

The early studies of request speech act strategies date back to the late seventies. One of the earliest works reported is the one conducted by Walters (1979). The focus of the research is to highlight the strategies used for requesting in both Spanish and English. It reports on the acquisition of pragmatic competence in a second language. The study centers on the semantic strategies for conveying requests in both languages through a contrastive analysis. The findings show that, while basically the same request strategies are available to speakers of Spanish and English, the use of those strategies differs pragmatically. More polite strategies are employed in speaking Spanish, while more neutral strategies are used in English. Rintell (1981) takes ahead the research on requests one further step by studying the effects of some sociological variables (age and sex) of the addressee on the level of their utterances’ deference. The subjects under study are Spanish learners of English. They are first asked to role-play four request situations in English. The same procedure is repeated later in Spanish. The comparison of the content of the utterances collected is made in an attempt to identify the variety of forms employed by the learners in this study and to look at the relationship between specific components of the utterance and level of deference conveyed by the utterance. The findings of the study are that the general arrangement of the requesting utterance is the same in Learner English as it is in Spanish, but it cannot be concluded that English equivalents of Spanish forms are used in the same contexts. While some components of the request seemed to contribute to deference to approximately the same extent in both languages, others differ markedly.

Carrell and Konneker (1981) investigate the judgments of politeness made
by both native speakers of American English and nonnative ESL learners with varied language backgrounds. The judgments are made on eight different request strategies in English using the method of rank orderings in a contextualized condition. Results indicate that the responses of both native speakers and ESL learners fall into a hierarchy similar to that hypothesized. There is also a high and significant correlation between the natives and nonnatives in their politeness judgment, a finding similar to that of Walters (1980). However, the ESL learners tend to perceive more distinctive levels of politeness than the native speakers, reflecting a kind of “over-sensitivity” to syntactic/semantic form distinctions. Examination of the native politeness hierarchy shows each of the three syntactic/semantic features contributing differently to politeness; this suggests that in teaching the pragmatics of politeness, different grammatical patterns should not be given equal teaching emphasis. A similar study investigates the notion of politeness with reference to native speakers’ and advanced interlanguage users’ requests is done by Tanaka and Kawade (1982). The results of the study support both the findings reported by Carrell and Konneker (1981) and Lakoff’s (1973) theory of politeness. Other results of the study generally confirm the distance-politeness hypothesis. Further suggestions made on the basis of the results are that the second language learner’s ability of judging politeness in the target language does not necessarily mean that he/she can use it appropriately in actual communication situations. This in turn suggests the necessity of further investigating the relation between the perception of politeness and its actual production by second language learners.

A seminal work by Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984) reports on a project concerned with a cross-cultural investigation of speech act realization patterns. The goals of the project are to compare across languages the realization patterns of two speech acts -requests and apologies- and to establish the similarities and differences between native and non-native speakers’ realization patterns in these two acts in each of the languages studied within the project. The findings of the study with regard to requests are: (a) in requesting behavior it is possible to
distinguish among central phenomena such as strategy types as different from internal and external modification; (b) requesting behavior is inherently based on choices from a variety of options ranging from direct to indirect ones; (c) the scale of indirectness encompasses at least three main types of options (direct, conventionally indirect, and non-conventionally indirect). The same authors investigate the theoretical and applied domains of pragmatic failure (1986). With respect to theory, their study clarifies pragmatic failure both in native and non-native speech, and with respect to the applied domain, the work compares request realizations of native and non-native speakers in terms of length of utterance. The findings of this research include: (1) some interlanguage features likely to cause pragmatic failure characterize learner’s speech independent of language transfer. Thus, lengthening of speech act patterns and the addition of external modifiers seem related to the learner’s lack of confidence and eagerness to ensure that the message gets across irrespective of L1 norms; (2) learners at high intermediate and advanced levels tend to be more verbose than their native counterparts because they are more concerned with the effectiveness of their speech act. However, learners at lower level of proficiency tend to avoid verbosity since their knowledge of the language is so limited, which ironically keeps them closer to the native norm in terms of utterance length. Blum-Kulka and Edward Levenston (1987) explored another aspect of the interlanguage pragmatics of learners of Hebrew and English, i.e., the use of pragmatic indicators, both lexical (please) and grammatical (e.g., the difference between *could I borrow* and *could you lend*), with particular reference to deviations from native-speaker norms in the speech of non-native speakers. The results suggest that non-native speakers’ misuse of pragmatic indicators can have serious interactional consequences, ranging from inappropriateness to pragmatic failure.

In an attempt to re-examine the notions of indirectness and politeness as applied to requests, Blum-Kulka (1987) argues that (contrary to current theories of politeness), the two notions do not represent parallel dimensions; indirectness does not necessarily imply politeness. The relationship between the two is examined in a series of experiments designed to tap native speakers’
perceptions of politeness and indirectness in Hebrew and English. The results indicate that the two notions are perceived as different from each other: The most indirect request strategies are not judged as the most polite.

Requests as performed by Japanese learners of English are highlighted by Fukushima (1990). The primary concern of the study is to investigate how Japanese university students perform in English when making requests (and offers) in situations where the addresser and the addressee are equal in status, and the degree of closeness between them are different. The major findings of the study include: (1) the Japanese subjects could not use appropriate expressions according to situations, even when they want to be more polite to the addressees; and (2) the expressions used by the Japanese subjects are too direct in most situations, and sound rude. This means that the Japanese subjects cannot express their intentions in English, when they want to differentiate expressions under various situations. The results of this study reveal that the pragmatic competence of Japanese learners of English needs to be reinforced in their language instruction.

The sociopragmatic competence of second language learners is examined by Harlow (1990) with reference to requests (as well as expressing gratitude and apologies) as performed by natives and advanced learners of French. The influence of the sociable variables of sex, age and familiarity on the production of these speech acts is explored. A second goal of the study is to derive pedagogical implications based on the research findings. The results suggest that the age of the addressee plays a role in determining the components of some requests (e.g., a title of respect is used with older strangers but not with younger ones). This linguistic patterning is attributed to the French value system of respect form for their elders manifested by the use of a higher degree of politeness. In this study, familiarity between speakers appears to affect the length of the statements made to make requests. Requests addressing someone unfamiliar are longer, hence more polite. The length of the utterance is achieved by the addition of syntactic and lexical downgraders. Attention getters are found
to be necessarily used with the unfamiliars. They are perceived to render the request more polite. The study ends with some pedagogical implications which recommend paying attention to the effect of social variables on the performance of some speech acts while preparing and presenting teaching materials to second and foreign language learners.

Arabs appear in the scene for the first time in a study conducted by Atawneh and Sridhar (1993). This is the only study found to deal in some detail with politeness strategies of Arabic in the performance of the request speech act contrasting them with those in English. The study also aims at testing the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson (1978) with Arabic-English bilinguals and Arabic monolinguals. Moreover, their research explores the cultural determination of pragmatic norms in language. The analysis of results shows a strong support for the politeness theory with regards to requests. Further, descriptive analysis suggests that Arabic has fewer modals than English and, therefore, different politeness strategies are used to make up for the politeness function of modals in English. The applied part of the study shows that the culture in which a second or a foreign language is learned shapes the pragmatic norms of that language.

In a further development in the research on requests, Garcia (1993) investigates the strategies used by Peruvian Spanish speakers when participating in two speech events: making a request for a service and responding to it. The study, moreover, looks at cross-gender similarities and/or differences. The analysis suggests that the strategies used by Peruvian Spanish speakers when making a request show a marked preference for the expression of deference over camaraderie. However, when responding to the request, they prefer the establishment of camaraderie with the interlocutor. It also shows that although there are some differences between male and female participation, this difference is not statistically significant.

The concentration on single request strategies is illustrated by the work of
Weizman (1993) which is concerned with investigating the use of requestive hints by learners. The findings suggest that second language learners seem well able to use 'hints' for the realization of requests, hence the use of nonconventional indirectness seems to be one of the pragmalinguistic essentials with which learners come to L2 and which, therefore, they need not acquire anew. The study further implies that learners' tendency toward redundancy is no doubt a strategy of communication. This peculiarity is related to earlier findings concerning learners' preference for verbosity.

Chinese request strategies are explored by Wei Hong (1996) who examines the use of linguistic politeness in Chinese requests. The analysis of the data based on a questionnaire administered in Gansu Province shows that the choice of polite linguistic usage in requests depends greatly on the social distance (D) between the speaker and hearer and their relative power relation (P). Besides these sociolinguistic variables which may affect request behavior, Chinese culture, the social system, and public relations under socialism are also of weight in the choice of request strategies. The study offers empirical support for Brown and Levinson's politeness theory and concrete Chinese evidence for their models of politeness strategies. Hong points out that the results of the study may also be of importance for the teaching of Chinese requests.

Research on request strategies develops one step further by Goldschimdt (1998) study which investigates the linguistic realization patterns of 'favor asking' speech act among speakers of American English. Favor asking belongs to the directive type of speech acts, of which the request is prototypical and is a manipulation of language which attempts to accomplish a goal through another's action. The study focuses on the choices people make when asking and responding to favors in terms of their rights and obligations to one another.

ESL Korean learners’ perception of politeness in requests is investigated by Jae-Suk (1999). The focus in the study is on determining the differences between the English native speakers and the ESL Korean learners in the use of
politeness strategies under a variety of situations where social and psychological factors are variables. The findings suggest that in spite of many similarities between the two groups, Korean learners are not always able to use politeness strategies in a manner similar to the native speakers of English. The study has some implications for the teaching of politeness strategies in requests in EFL classrooms in Korea.

Al-Hamzi's (1999) is the second study encountered in this review of literature which pays some detailed attention to the interlanguage pragmatics of requests as produced by Arabic-speaking learners of English as a foreign language. His thesis is mainly concerned with pragmatic transfer and pragmatic development in the interlanguage of Yemeni learners of English. The findings of the research suggest that Yemeni learners of English at both higher and lower proficiency levels are found to rely heavily on their L1 pragmatic features. The results of the study further imply that explicit instruction on English pragmatics can help to develop pragmatic awareness in EFL learners. According to Al-Hamzi, "The findings of this research do not yield any support to the notion of universality of politeness as proposed by Brown and Levinson (1978). Politeness is a culture-specific convention. What is perceived as polite in Arabic may not be considered so in English and vice versa. The learners in all the situations did not mean to be rude by resorting to their native style of being polite and thus resembling to their Arabic counterparts in being more direct in their requests than their native English counterparts. They were not violating their sociocultural rules. However, when evaluated by someone standing outside their sociocultural circle, they may be viewed as being impolite. This is because of the differences in sociocultural parameters from one culture to another."

Another study that focused on requests in EFL context is Takahashi (2001) which examines the effects of input enhancement on the development of English request strategies by Japanese EFL learners at a Japanese university using four input conditions – explicit teaching (detailed information on requests + a composition exercise packet with J-E translation exercises, hi-lo status and
social distance noted), form-comparison (respondents to compare their utterances with those of native speakers’ and determine differences), form-search (comparing NS with NS utterances, but not their own), and meaning-focused (reading transcripts of interaction and having to answer comprehension questions addressing the content) conditions. The degrees of input enhancement are found to influence the acquisition of request forms, with the explicit teaching having the strongest impact, then form-comparison, form-search and meaning focused.

Apologies:

One of the early studies which referred to apologies is that of Goffman (1971). Goffman views an apology as ‘a remedial interchange (wok) with the function of changing the meaning that otherwise might be given into an act, transforming what could be seen as offensive into what can be seen as acceptable (Goffman, 1971)’. Owen (1983) interprets remedial interchanges including apologies and accounts as those concerned specifically with repairing damage to face, where face preservation itself becomes the object of the conversation for a time, however short. The earliest study that reports on the potential inappropriate use of the apology strategies (Excuse Me and I’m Sorry) by non-native speakers of English is conducted by Borkin and Reinhart (1978). They point out to the importance of cultural knowledge for the accurate interpretation of generalizations about these formulas. They finally argue that, in the current enthusiasm for developing communicative competence, the use of basic linguistic research in preparing materials for teachers and students should not be ignored. Cohen and Olshtain’s study on apologies in Hebrew and English (1981) shows that it is possible to identify culturally and stylistically inappropriate L2 utterances in apology situations. The authors feel, since their results provide at best a crude measure of sociocultural competence, there is a need for further work with this speech act and with others. Blum-Kulka and Olshtain, (1984) in a study that reports on the theoretical framework for the cross-cultural speech act realization patterns (CCSARP) find that in apologies it is possible to delimit
linguistic markers of pragmatic force (IFIDs) and that apologies can be realized by reference to a set of specific propositions cross-culturally. Other empirical studies concerning the nature of apologies in a variety of languages and cultures have been conducted (for example, Olshtain 1983; Olshtain and Cohen 1983) and as a result, there is considerable information on the basic strategies for apologizing. The following is a description of the apology speech act set according to its development in Olshtain and Cohen (1983) (based on Fraser 1980): (a) an expression of an apology, (b) an explanation or account of the situation, (c) acknowledgement of responsibility, (d) an offer of repair, and (e) a promise of forbearance. Cohen, Olshtain and Rosenstein (1986) in a speech act study look at the differences in linguistic strategies used by advanced nonnative English language learners and native speakers in apology behavior, and whether the differences result from the severity of the offense or the familiarity of the interlocutors. The findings indicate that nonnatives lack sensitivity to certain distinctions that natives made between forms for expressing apology such as ‘excuse me’ and ‘sorry’ and between intensifiers such as ‘very’ and ‘really’, with nonnative tendency being to overgeneralize or use a variety of forms. It is also found that nonnatives tend to avoid interjections and curses, and do not consistently produce comments providing the appropriate social lubricant in difficult situations. Holmes (1989) investigates how apologies are illuminating sources of information on the sociocultural values of a speech community, including differences between male and female values. These sex differences are examined in the distribution of apologies in order to shed light on the complexities encountered by language learners in acquiring communicative competence. In another study, Holmes (1990) examines the syntactic, semantic, and sociolinguistic features of a corpus of 183 apologies in New Zealand English, within the context of an interaction model with two intersecting dimensions, affective and referential meaning, attempting to relate the relative “weightiness” of the offense to the features of the apology. Holmes identifies a range of strategies in the New Zealand data which confirm the value for the categorization of naturalistic data of the system devised for elicitation data by Olshtain and
Cohen (1983). She also emphasizes the importance of the investigation of the combination of strategies. Further, Holmes predicts that apologies would increase in politeness with the size of the offense they address. The study also explores the extent to which the kind and number of strategies adopted reflect the gravity of the offense in context. Her results are in consistency with Brown and Levinson (1987) with regard to the influence of three aspects of the context, which have been widely recognized as relevant in pragmatic and sociolinguistic analyses, on the strategy selection: the ranking of the imposition on the victim (i.e., the seriousness of the offense in the case of an apology), the social distance between the apologizer and the victim, and the power relations between the participants.

Pragmatic failure in the production of interlanguage apologies is explored by Wildner-Bassett (1994). Her study in the field of German-English interlanguage pragmatics investigates pragmatic declarative and procedural knowledge as realized by routine formulas and conversational strategies. The results of this empirical study show a typology of deficits and characteristic pragmatic aspects of American learners' German interlanguage. These findings and further studies of the pragmatics of the native, target and interlanguages of the subjects, according to the author, would help successfully in teaching students to make the right polite noises appropriate for achieving their personal communication goals in the target language.

Suszczynska (1999) argues that much of the cross-cultural research into the speech act of apologizing have focused on the phenomenon of non-native communicative competence and less on cross-cultural data for their own sake. She presents an analysis of a small portion of data from a corpus from English, Hungarian and Polish written responses to a discourse completion test, with the goal of highlighting differences in the realizations of apologetic responses that can be found not only in the choice and sequential arrangement of strategies but also in the content and in the choice of linguistic form. The findings of the study demonstrate that a more detailed analysis of cross-cultural data would produce a
clearer picture of differences in apologetic responses and help understand the nature of different communicative styles. Suszczynska emphasizes the need for much more data to validate the findings of the small scale analysis presented in the study.

Rose (2000) reports the results of an exploratory cross-sectional study of pragmatic development among three groups of primary school students in Hong Kong who complete a cartoon oral production task designed to elicit requests, apologies, and compliment responses in EFL or in Cantonese -- the first two speech acts being in their curriculum but not the third. They found little evidence of pragmatic transfer from Cantonese. The subjects are approximately 40 children at levels P-2, P-4, and P-6 respectively, half receiving the prompts in English, half in Cantonese. They are to tape-record what they think the character in the cartoon would say. In apologies, all three levels have similar responses regarding the strategy of expressing an apology. However, P-6 demonstrates more control over intensifiers. They also acknowledge responsibility more and offer repair - a pattern that is not found in the Cantonese data. There is little evidence of situational variation, however. The most frequent strategy is acceptance of the apology - in Cantonese as well, so the patterns are similar. There is a marked increase in both frequency and range of strategies used with the P-6 group.

Tateyama (2001) studies the effects of explicit and implicit instruction in the use of attention getters, expressions of gratitude, and apologies to beginning students of Japanese as a foreign language. The groups receive treatments four times over an 8-week period, with the treatment for the explicit group (N=13) including explicit metapragmatic information, whereas that for the implicit group (N=14) withhold it. Participants are engaged in role-play and multiple-choice tasks as well as two different forms of self-report (retrospective verbal report from the students and the raters' comments as well). There are no differences between the two groups in the multiple-choice and role-play tasks. However, close examination of the errors in the multiple-choice tasks indicates that the
participants in the explicit group are more successful in choosing the correct answers in items that required higher formality of the linguistic expressions. It seems that these participants benefit from explicit teaching on how the degree of indebtedness in thanking situations, the severity of offense in the apology contexts, and such factors as age, social status, and in-group/out-group distinction intricately influence the choice of routine formulas. This suggests that some aspects of interlanguage pragmatics are teachable to beginners before they develop analyzed second language knowledge.

Correction:

The only work reported to have explored the speech act of correction of a factual error by ESL learners is that of Takahashi and Beebe (1993). The study looks at American and Japanese performance on the speech act of correction in status unequal (professor-student: low to high, high to low) situations where one knows the other has made a factual error. The study had 55 subjects - 15 Americans, 15 Japanese responding in English, and 25 Japanese responding in Japanese (in Tokyo) - fill out a 12-situation discourse completion task. It finds that positive remarks are an important adjunct to face threatening acts in English - "I agree with you, but..." 64% of Americans do this while only 13% of the Japanese in Japanese did so (AE>JE>JJ). All groups use softeners, "I believe," "I think," questions, "Did you say...?" and expressions to lighten the gravity of the mistake or defend the interlocutor, "You made one small error in the date." Japanese also used softeners but not as frequently in ESL (50% of time vs. 71% of time for E1 group). Both groups use verbal indications of correction in English more than in Japanese (only 26%) (Professor to student: AE>JE>JJ, student to professor: JJ>JE>AE). The reason is that in Japanese paralinguistic means such as facial expressions, tone of voice, sighs, hesitating serve that function. Japanese are more overt in their consciousness of status and in not covering it up in their use of language. Americans harbor a polite fiction that you and I are equals.
Invitation:

The speech act of invitation has received very little attention by researchers; however, it is in a better position than the correction speech act. The number of studies found in the review of literature on this speech act is five. Two of them involve Arabs using English, two discuss American invitations and the last focuses on social invitations in Croatian Serbian. The behavioral patterns of invitations in American English are explored in a study by Wolfson, D'Amico-Reisner and Huber (1983). They argue that an unambiguous invitation should have the following properties present: (1) reference to time and/or mention of place or activity and (2) a request for a response. The syntactic forms of the request for response (kernels) are analyzed into six syntactic patterns. Similarly, the material which makes up the opening to invitation negotiations (the lead) is divided into sub-types. The authors explain that leads are not invitations in themselves but can be used as steps toward the accomplishment of social commitments. One interesting finding reported in this study is that whether an invitation is likely to be negotiated or not depends upon the social identity of the participants and their positions relative to one another.

Ostensible invitations (invitations which are not intended to be taken seriously) are investigated by Isaacs and Clark (1990). They argue that ostensible invitations require: a pretense of sincerity by the speaker; mutual recognition of the pretense by speaker and addressee; collusion on the pretense by the addressee; ambivalence by the speaker about its acceptance; and off-record purpose by the speaker. They, moreover, describe seven techniques speakers use in fulfilling these requirements. The authors finally argue that ostensible invitations are part of a class of ostensible speech acts, and these in turn are related to other types of nonserious language use.

The earliest study on invitations by second language learners is that of Scarcella and Brunak (1981) which specifically focuses on the use, or perhaps misuse, of politeness features in adult first and second language performance.
The subjects (20 native speakers of Arabic and 6 native English speakers) are asked to participate in three role-play situations. These situations are specifically designed to reveal the subjects’ use of politeness features when inviting superiors, equal familiars and subordinates to a party. The findings include: (1) while some politeness features appear to emerge quite early in adult second language acquisition (e.g., ‘presequences to directives’ such as ‘sorry’ and ‘please’), others, (e.g., slang, ellipsis and inclusive ‘we’) do not; (2) the acquisition of politeness forms appears to precede the acquisition of the sociolinguistic-interactional rules and mechanisms underlying the use and distribution of these forms. That is, adult L2 performers seem to use politeness features before they have acquired their co-occurrence rules and appropriate variation; (3) the use of politeness features varies according to the status of the addressee and that L2 performers are limited in both their range of politeness features and their capacity to vary their use according to the social context. The second study that deals with invitations as performed by Arabs is the one reported in Atawneh and Sridhar’s work (1993). The subjects who participated in this study were: thirty native speakers of American English, thirty Arabic-English bilinguals of Palestinian origin living in the USA, thirty monolingual Arabs and twenty Arab bilinguals who use English as a foreign language, both groups living in Palestine. The findings of the study include: (1) there is support for the theory of Brown and Levinson’s politeness determinants R,D,P and superstrategies; it is proved that if the level of any determinant goes higher, politeness goes higher in the direction of higher ranking strategy, and vice versa; (2) Brown and Levinson’s theory ignores the cost/benefit factor in determining politeness in cases where the addressee benefits from the directive, i.e., invitations; Leech’s (1983) generosity maxim is found to solve this problem. Arabs came out with a tendency to use less avoidance (hints or silence) than Americans in invitations and consequently are more polite than the Americans, following Leech’s model; (3) there is a clear indication that native cultural norms of Arabic are transferred into the performance of English as a foreign language spoken by the Arabs. On the other hand, American norms seem to be more reflected in the English spoken by
The subjects (20 native speakers of Arabic and 6 native English speakers) are asked to participate in three role-play situations. These situations are specifically designed to reveal the subjects’ use of politeness features when inviting superiors, equal familiars and subordinates to a party. The findings include: (1) while some politeness features appear to emerge quite early in adult second language acquisition (e.g., ‘presequences to directives’ such as ‘sorry’ and ‘please’), others, (e.g., slang, ellipsis and inclusive ‘we’) do not; (2) the acquisition of politeness forms appears to precede the acquisition of the sociolinguistic-interactional rules and mechanisms underlying the use and distribution of these forms. That is, adult L2 performers seem to use politeness features before they have acquired their co-occurrence rules and appropriate variation; (3) the use of politeness features varies according to the status of the addressee and that L2 performers are limited in both their range of politeness features and their capacity to vary their use according to the social context. The second study that deals with invitations as performed by Arabs is the one reported in Atawneh and Sridhar’s work (1993). The subjects who participated in this study were: thirty native speakers of American English, thirty Arabic-English bilinguals of Palestinian origin living in the USA, thirty monolingual Arabs and twenty Arab bilinguals who use English as a foreign language, both groups living in Palestine. The findings of the study include: (1) there is support for the theory of Brown and Levinson’s politeness determinants R,D,P and superstrategies; it is proved that if the level of any determinant goes higher, politeness goes higher in the direction of higher ranking strategy, and vice versa; (2) Brown and Levinson’s theory ignores the cost/benefit factor in determining politeness in cases where the addressee benefits from the directive, i.e., invitations; Leech’s (1983) generosity maxim is found to solve this problem. Arabs came out with a tendency to use less avoidance (hints or silence) than Americans in invitations and consequently are more polite than the Americans, following Leech’s model; (3) there is a clear indication that native cultural norms of Arabic are transferred into the performance of English as a foreign language spoken by the Arabs. On the other hand, American norms seem to be more reflected in the English spoken by
FTAs than the Americans, showing a tendency to use a higher degree of redress instead of using 'silence'. Moreover, there is more tendency in Arabic, more than in English, to use higher ranking politeness strategies in addressing superiors. One of the major findings of the study is that native cultural norms of Arabic are transformed into the performance of English as a foreign language spoken by the Arabs. On the other hand, American norms are found to be more reflected in the English spoken by the Arabs living in the USA. Generally speaking, the study demonstrates that politeness strategies in Arabic are different from those of English. This conclusion carries important pedagogical implications.

In an attempt to explore the concept of face in Arabic culture, Kharraki (2001) investigates bargaining speech event in Moroccan Arabic. The study demonstrates that men use more solidarity linguistic devices than women. Women are found to be more likely to look at bargaining as a manifestation of one's housekeeping skills and that their more extensive use of insisting strategies of bargaining is seen as a daring act of assertiveness. Men feel that such strategies could be face-threatening and reduce their inherited social power and superiority. Kharraki argues that bargaining is a negative politeness act since it impedes the freedom of the bargainee.

The earliest study that approached the concept of 'politeness formulas', with reference to Arabic is that of Ferguson (1976). In his study he points out that routines are a universal phenomenon of human languages. However, there is considerable variation between different cultures, which often do not agree in having equivalent formulas for similar situations. Ferguson examines examples from Syrian Arabic and American English. “In discussing problems of variation, use, and acquisition as well as diachronic characteristics of routines, he argues that they constitute ‘a set of facts about human language’ which are not only a cardinal interest to the ethnographer of communication, but also need to be accommodated in linguistic theory.”, Coulmas (1981).

Politeness formulas in Arabic (Moroccan) are contrasted with those in
English in a study conducted by Davies (1987). Politeness formulas are the kinds of formulaic expressions used by speakers of a language as markers of politeness, a knowledge of which, the researcher argues, is indispensable to the acquisition of communicative competence in the language. This study illustrates the variety of levels at which formulas in two languages may contrast, and the ways in which a superficial similarity between two formulas may obscure quite complex differences. Davies argues that learners who are not conscious of these differences may get into many difficulties. In their productive language behavior, they may appear awkward, eccentric, impolite, or ridiculous if they fail to use formulas where appropriate, or try to use them in accordance with the rules of their first-language formulas, and in interpreting the language behavior of others, they may make quite inappropriate and unjustified assumptions about their attitudes, intentions and personality if they fail to grasp the true significance of the formulas they hear. El-Sayed (1989) examines politeness formulas in English and Arabic in a contrastive study with particular reference to Egyptian Arabic. The study is similar to that of Davies and yields similar results.

Justification for the Present Study:

The present research differs from other studies in the area of second language speech acts in that English in the learning context is neither a foreign nor a native language. The English of the subjects under investigation is rather acquired in an environment where it is used as a second language or as a variety of English called Indian English. Therefore, learners are under the impact of two kinds of input: Indian English and native English. They use English when they interact with the Indians in their day-to-day life as well as in their academic involvements. In addition, the role of English as a native language in shaping the interlanguage of Arabs cannot be denied. All the subjects who participate in this study acquire their English background knowledge from materials prepared by English native speakers and introduced to them during their school education. No doubt some elements of the western culture are reflected through the presentation of the teaching materials introduced to learners. Similarly, in the
Indian context, English learners acquire some language skills through their exposure to different native English resources such as T.V, electronic media, educational materials, etc.

The interlanguage pragmatics of Arab learners of English in the Indian context has never been approached by any other researcher. Requests as performed by Arab learners of English are examined by Atawneh and Sridhar (1993). The learning environment is USA (for the users of English as a second language) and Palestine (for the users of English as a foreign language). Very significant conclusions are drawn out of the study which are related to politeness. However, it is geographically confined to the Palestinians. The subjects who participate in the current study belong to five Arab states, namely Jordan, Oman, Palestine, Sudan and Yemen. Involving greater number of participants who belong to different geographical locations in the Arab world may yield some deeper insights into the interlanguage pragmatics of Arabs using English requests and other speech acts.

While surveying the literature, I did not find any study that has reported on the performance of apology speech act by Arab learners of English. Therefore, the present research attempts to explore apology strategies by Arabs using English taking into consideration the effect severity of the offense and familiarity of the participants have on the selection of the appropriate apologetic pattern.

Interlanguage invitations by Arabic-speaking learners of English are introduced in the literature for the first time by Scarcella and Brunak (1981) and then by Atawneh and Sridhar (1993). The realization patterns and the transfer from Arabic L1, which are not examined in detail in the former studies, are presented in the current research more elaborately. Atawneh and Sridhar argue that Brown and Levinson theory of politeness fails to account for invitations by Arabs and, therefore, they adopt the generosity maxim of Leech (1983). In this study, invitations, however, are investigated within the framework of Brown and Levinson theory and their concept of 'pre-emptive invitations'. 
The speech act of correction has been found to be explored in only one study by Takahashi and Beebe (1993). The languages involved are Japanese and American English and the main focus is English as used by Japanese. The chapter reporting on this speech act has used the same prompts mentioned in Takahashi and Beebe's study with the addition of one more situation that aims at highlighting how this speech act is realized by Arab learners of English when the participants are of equal status. The different realization patterns of the main body of the act of correction are elaborated. The study of Takahashi and Beebe does not shed light on these different realization patterns of the main body of the speech act.

Highlighting the linguistic realization patterns employed in the four speech acts is a starting point that would guide the research to explore the interlanguage pragmatics of Arabs and to some generalizations about the linguistic phenomenon of politeness in both Arabic and second language acquisition research in general.