

**Republic of Yemen  
Ministry of Higher  
Education & Scientific Research  
Alandalus University for  
Science & Technology  
Deanship of Postgraduate Studies**



**Pragmatic Competence of Yemeni EFL Learners: A Study  
on the Speech Act of Gratitude**

**A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master  
Degree of English in Applied Linguistics**

**By**

**Ashawk Mokbel Ali Ahmed ALZabidi**

**Supervisor**

**Ass. Prof. Abdullah Ali Al-Eryani**

**Sana'a – Yemen**

**2022-2023**

## **Dedication**

To my beloved mother whose love knew no boundaries

To beloved my father

To my dear sisters and friends, Nawal, Alia'a, Samiha, Rania'a, Ghadeer, Malak who always stood beside me and pushed me forward in my moments of weakness,

To my dear brothers and their wives

Fars and Manal

Ala'a and Hend

To all my loyal friends, who do not know how lucky and grateful I am to

have them in my life

With all my love

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the people who supported and encouraged me over the past few years of my study. It has been a privilege working with my supervisor: Dr. Abdullah Al-Eryani, who was always generous with his time, attention and feedback. He has helped me to shape mountains of complex materials into a logical argument; and I can honestly say that without his support, I would never have made it to the end of what turned out to be a more meaningful quest than I originally anticipated. He has always been kind and has provided me valuable assistance to complete this project. I would also like to express my deep gratitude to the experts involved in the statistical analysis of my research data. I would also like to thank all of the participants in the study, both in Yemen and in the United States, for their time and commitment. This dissertation could not have been completed without their generous help. I highly appreciate their enthusiastic participation. Most importantly, I would like to thank my parents. Throughout my graduate study at the University, there has been no one more supportive than my father, Moqbil Al-Zubedi and mother Hosen Omar. They are an indispensable source of encouragement to me, and consistently provide additional strength through their pride in my accomplishments. I will always feel grateful from the bottom of my heart to those who helped me ultimately put this dissertation together. My deep appreciation is expressed to my brothers and sisters who always believed in me and pushed me forward in my moments of weakness, who always had the time to listen to me, who always told me that I can do it. I am fortunate to have such brotherhood who were always there whenever and wherever I needed.

# **Pragmatic Competence of Yemeni EFL Learners: A Study on the Speech Act of Gratitude**

## **Abstract**

The present study aimed to investigate the pragmatic competence of Yemeni EFL learners (YEFLLs) in relation to their production of gratitude speech act in English language. It attempted to explore gratitude speech acts patterns as performed by American Native Speakers of English (AENSs), Yemeni Arabic Native Speakers (YANSs) and Yemeni Speakers of English as a Foreign Language (YEFLLs). In addition, it tended to investigate the influence of mother tongue on performing the speech act of gratitude. The study included three groups of participants: Seventy YEFLLs, thirty-two YANSs and thirty AENSs. The data were collected through a Discourse Completion Test designed by Eisenstein and Bodman (1993). The collected data were analyzed using Cheng's (2005) eight thanking strategies coding system. The quantitative method was used for descriptive analysis of data, along with statistical processes (SPSS and Chi-square) to decide on the significance of similarities and differences between the three group's performance. The results showed that there are some similarities and differences between the three groups of participants. While some strategies seemed to be common among these groups, some other strategies such as "gratitude to God", "saying prayers", "thanking + idioms or hadeeth" and "expressing hope" were culturally specific to Arabic. The study also revealed deficiency in YEFLLs' pragmatic competence in terms of the use of gratitude strategies. This pragmatic incompetence was reflected in constructing gratitude combinations and in their use of more direct and simpler gratitude strategy. YEFLLs and AENSs showed significant differences in most of the gratitude strategy combinations. In addition, the findings revealed that mother tongue had a

noticeable impact on the performance of YEFLLs. The study concluded with some recommendations for developing pragmatic competence of YEFL learners.

## Abbreviations

AENSSs	American English Native Speakers
AG	Attention Getter
AP	Apology
APP	Appreciation
CC	Communicative Competence
CCSARP	Cross-Cultural Speech Acts Realization Patterns
DCT	Discourse Completion Task
DNF	Stating or Diminishing the Need for the Favor
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
EPFA	Expressing Positive Feeling to Action
EPRP	Expressing Positive Reaction to Person
ESL	English as a Second Language
FL	Foreign Language
FSL	Foreign second Language
FTA	Face-threatening Act
IL	Interlanguage
ILP	Interlanguage Pragmatics
L1	First Language / Native language
L2	Second Language
LT	Leave Talking
NNSs	Non- Native Speakers
NSs	Native Speakers
PC	Pragmatic Competence
REP	Repayment
SAT	Speech Act Theory
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences

ST	Small Talk
TH	Thanking
TL	Target Language
YANSs	Yemeni Arabic Native Speakers
YEFLLs	Yemeni Learners of English as a Foreign Language

## **List of Tables**

Table 4.1: Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation One .....	54
Table 4.2: Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Two.....	57
Table 4.3: Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Three .....	60
Table 4.4: Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Four .....	63
Table 4.5: Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Five .....	65
Table 4.6: Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Six .....	68
Table 4.7: Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Seven .....	71
Table 4.8: Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Eight .....	47
Table 4.9: Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Nine .....	77
Table 4.10: Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Ten .....	80
Table 4.11: Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Eleven .....	83
Table 4.12: Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Twelve .....	85
Table 4.13: Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Thirteen .....	87
Table 4.14: Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Fourteen .....	89
Table 4.15: Gratitude Strategy Combinations Made AENSs, YANSs and YEFLLs...	95

## **List of Appendices**

Appendix I: Discourse Completion Task (English version) .....	131
Appendix II: Discourse Completion Task (Arabic version) .....	136
Appendix III: The Overall Distribution of the Frequency of Using Single Gratitude Strategy .....	140
Appendix IV: All Gratitude Strategy Combinations Used by YANSs, AENSs and YEFLLs in All Situations .....	141

# Contents

<b>Dedication</b> .....	I
<b>Acknowledgement</b> .....	II
<b>Abstract</b> .....	III
<b>Abbreviations</b> .....	V
<b>List of Tables</b> .....	VII
<b>List of Appendices</b> .....	VIII
<b>Contents</b> .....	IX
<b>Chapter One: Introduction</b> .....	1
1.1 Background .....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem .....	2
1.3 Significance of the Study .....	3
1.4 Objectives of the Study .....	4
1.5 Questions of the Study .....	4
1.6 Limitations of the Study .....	5
1.7 Definition of Term.....	5
1.8 Chapterization .....	7
<b>Chapter Two: Literature Review</b> .....	8
2.1 Introduction .....	8
2.2.1 Pragmatics .....	8
2.2.2 Pragmatic Competence .....	12
2.2.3 Communicative Competence .....	13
2.2.4 Pragmatics Transfer .....	16
2.2.4.1 Negative/ Positive Transfer .....	18
2.2.5 Pragmatic Failure .....	20
2.3 Speech Acts Theory .....	20
2.3.1 The Speech Act of Gratitude.....	22
2.3. 1) Gratitude in American English .....	28
2.3.2 Strategies of Thanking... ..	29
2.3.2.1 Aijmar's Thanking Strategies .....	29

2.3.2.2 Farina and Sulieman's Thanking Strategies .....	30
2.3.2.3 Chang's (2005) Gratitude Taxonomy .....	31
2.4 Previous Studies .....	34
<b>Chapter Three: Research Methodology .....</b>	<b>42</b>
3.1 Introduction .....	42
3.2 Method of Study .....	42
3.3. The Population the Study.....	43
3.3.1 The Sample of the Study.....	43
3.4 Data Collection Instrument (Discourse Completion Task) .....	44
3.5 Validity of the Instrument .....	46
3.6 Data Collection Procedure.....	47
3.7 Data Analysis Procedures .....	48
3.7.1 Gratitude Strategies Taxonomy .....	49
<b>Chapter Four: Results and Discussion .....</b>	<b>52</b>
4.1 Introduction .....	52
4.2 Data Analysis .....	52
4.2.1 Kinds of Gratitude Strategies Used by AENSs, YANSs and YEFLLs.....	53
4.2.1.1 Summary of the Types of Gratitude Strategies Used by AENSs and YEFLLs and YANSs.....	91
4.2.2 YEFLL's Pragmatic Competence in Producing the Speech Act of Gratitude.....	94
4.2.3 The Influence of YEFLLs' Mother Tongue on Producing Gratitude Strategies in English.....	109
4.3 Conclusion .....	113
<b>Chapter Five: Main Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>114</b>
5.1 Introduction .....	114
5.2 Summary of the Study .....	114
5.3 Main Findings of the Study .....	115
5.3.1 Finding Pertaining to the Types of Gratitude Strategies Used by AENSs and YEFLLs and YANSs .....	115
5.3.2 Finding Pertaining to YEFLL's Pragmatic Competence in Producing the Speech	

Act of Gratitude .....	116
5.3.3 Finding Pertaining to the Influence of YEFLLs' Mother Tongue on Producing Gratitude Strategies in English .....	118
5.4 Conclusions .....	119
5.5 Pedagogic Recommendations .....	121
5.6 Suggestions for Further Research .....	122
<b>References</b> .....	123
<b>Appendices</b> .....	131
<b>Abstract in Arabic</b> .....	143

# **Chapter One**

## **Introduction**

### **1.1 Background**

The significance of communicative competence has been successfully investigated as a main aim of language learning and teaching in the area of second language acquisition since the idea of communicative competence was proposed by Hymes (1971). Hymes (1971) also introduced that learner should learn how to speak correctly not only grammatically, but also by achieving the convenient communicative goals. In addition, language learning includes acquiring pragmatic competence which dictates appropriate ways of conveying communicative intent in various situations. Accordingly, learners must learn not only linguistic rules such as morphology, syntax, phonology, and vocabulary, but they must also learn about sociocultural rules of language use (Anderson, 1990; Olshtain & Cohen, 1983; Wolfson, 1981).

Bardovi-Harlig et al. (1991) described pragmatic competence as the speaker's realization and usage of rules of appropriateness and politeness which determine the way the speaker will recognize and formulate speech acts. Speech acts are one of key areas of pragmatics. Specific speech acts include apology, complaint, compliment, refusal, request, suggestion etc. Research on pragmatics competence indicated that even higher-level nonnative speakers often lack native-like pragmatic competence in a range of speech acts. In other words, speakers who may be considered fluent in a second language due to their mastery of the grammar and vocabulary of that language may still be unable to produce language that is socially and culturally appropriate.

Fauzia (2016) argued that Yemeni learners face some problems in pragmatics; for example, in greetings learners cannot use appropriate form to address their English lecturer outside of the classroom. Learners use the form "greeting + *Mr. (mister)*" to address the lecturer. They find difficulties in making abbreviation, i.e., *Mister* into *Sir*. Also, when learners meet a new person on a shelter or bus they use a question to start a conversation such as '*Hi, where will you go?*', '*How long you've been waiting? Where are you going?*' But, for native speakers, this question is not commonly used. In apologizing, EFL learner's reaction and response is not much different. For example, when a student came late to class with class time to end in five minutes, the lecturer said: "*come in, we just started this class*". The student came in without saying a word. Students think that the sentence is not a satire sentence with real intent spoken by the lecturer. The teacher's response conveys that the student is late enough from the start of the class. The student is expected to begin with a statement of apology such as '*Sorry Sir / Mom, I'm late*'. Also, in complimenting and thanking, when someone is complimented in an occasion as a great writer, the student's response is '*Thank you, do not mention that*' or '*Oh, thanks. But I think this is not good enough*' *Thank you, but I'm still studying*". By saying those sentences, he / she (EFL learners) tries to give impression that he/she is not really a good writer.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

The different usage of dialogues patterns sometimes causes confusions or embarrassment between the interlocutors. Misunderstanding and miscommunication happen because of the cultural gaps between them. A sufficient knowledge of pragmatics can help to avoid these gaps. Yemeni learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) face

some problems when they are involved in communicative tasks. They fail to communicate effectively in particular situations, and sometimes they might find communication with native speakers a negative experience. Most of the problems that learners of English as a foreign language (EFL learners) face in intercultural communication are mainly pragmatic. EFL teachers do not often stress pragmatic knowledge in their classrooms, focusing instead on linguistic knowledge. Eslami-Rasekh et al. (2004) alerted that this can result in pragmatic failure when EFL learners actually communicate with native speakers (NSs), something that is attributed to some other cause. El Samaty (2005) proved that pragmatic failure between NSs and non-native speakers (NNSs) can be minimized only by acquiring pragmatic competence, which is the proficiency to use language effectively in order to understand language in context. Arab EFL learners are not exposed to the target community and culture and they find it extremely difficult to produce or sometimes understand a speech act. The problem here is that Arab learners of English do not produce target-like gratitude responses, and so pragmatic transfer can occur due to many factors one of which is culture. Hence, this study aims to investigate the use of gratitude strategies by Yemeni learners of English as a foreign language in comparison to the strategies used by American English native speakers and Yemeni Arab native speakers. It also intends to examine the pragmatic competence of Yemeni learners of EFL in English and the influence of their mother tongue in performing the speech act of gratitude.

### **1.3 Significance of the Study**

The results to be obtained from this study can contribute in increasing the theoretical and practical understanding of pragmatic competence at different levels. In relation to theoretical value, the results of this study can add more to pragmatic competence

literature, in general, and the speech act of gratitude, in particular. Regarding the practical value, this study can help English language teachers to realize the importance of improving the pragmatic competence of their students in English as it demonstrates what norms govern the production of speech acts, gratitude speech act in this case, and to what extent EFL learners stick to these norms and principles. In addition, it can help English language departments and syllabus designers to recognize the need for integrating pragmatics as an essential component in the courses of learning English language.

#### **1.4. Objectives of the Study**

This study intends to examine the pragmatic competence of YEFL learners in English and the influence of their mother tongue in performing the speech act of gratitude. More specifically, it aims at achieving the following objectives:

1. Identifying the use of gratitude strategies by YEFLLs, AENSs, and YANSs.
2. Investigating the pragmatic competence of YEFLLs in English.
3. Finding out to what extent pragmatic transfer occurs when YEFLLs make gratitude in English.

#### **1.5 Questions of the Study**

This study seeks to find answers to the following questions:

1. What are the types gratitude strategies used by YEFLLs, AENSs and YANSs?
2. Do YEFLLs show pragmatic competence in producing the speech act of gratitude in English?

3. To what extent does pragmatic transfer occur when YEFLLs make gratitude in English?

## **1.6 Limitations of the Study**

The present study has the following aspects of limitation. First, in terms of topic, it is limited to examining the pragmatic competence of YEFLLs in English and the influence of their mother tongue in performing the speech act of gratitude. Second, considering the study subjects, the present study findings are applicable to undergraduate students of English as a foreign language at the Faculty of Education, Sana'a university. Finally, the temporal limitation of this study is that it was conducted in the academic year 2022-2023.

## **1.7 Definition of Term**

### **Pragmatics**

Yule (1996, p.3) defined pragmatics as "the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader)". Taking a modern definition of pragmatics, Murray (2010, p. 293) stated that pragmatics is "an understanding of the relationship between form and context that enables us, accurately and appropriately, to express and interpret intended meaning".

### **Pragmatic Competence**

According to Bachman and Palmer (1996), pragmatic competence is interested in two important components of communicative language use, the connection between signs and referents, and the language users and the contexts of communication. Moreover, he divided pragmatic competence into two sub-components, illocutionary competence and

sociolinguistic competence. Illocutionary competence involves knowledge of the pragmatic conventions for carrying out acceptable language function. Sociolinguistic competence refers to the knowledge of the sociolinguistic conventions for performing language functions appropriately in a given context.

### **Pragmatic Transfer**

Pragmatists have many conceptions to defining the term of pragmatics transfer. Kasper (1992) introduced pragmatics transfer as an influence which causes from learner' applying their pragmatics knowledge on how to investigate the speech act in languages and cultures which have been acquired other than L2 when they comprehend, produce or learn L2 pragmatics information. Cheng (2005) stated that pragmatic transfer is related to a condition in which learners use their L1 rules of speaking when speaking in L2.

### **Speech Acts**

Searle (1969, p.16) introduced speech acts as “the basic or minimal units of linguistic communication”. Schmidt and Richards (1980, p. 129) clarified that speech acts are “all the acts we perform through speaking, and all the things we do when we speak”. According to Austin (1962), speech acts are speakers’ utterances which carry meaning and make listeners do specific things.

### **Speech Act of Gratitude**

Eisenstein and Bodman (1986, p. 167) defined speech act of gratitude as “An illocutionary act performed by a speaker which is based on a past act performed by the hearer. This past act benefits the speaker and the speaker believes it to have benefited him

or her. The speaker feels grateful or appreciative, and makes a statement which counts as an expression of gratitude".

## **1.8 Chapterization**

This study consists of five chapters. Chapter one introduces the statement of the problem, the significance of the study, the objectives, the questions, the limitations, and definition of terms. Chapter two introduces the theoretical background of this study. It discusses the relevant literature on pragmatics, pragmatics competence, pragmatics transfer, communicative competence, speech act theory, speech act of gratitude, scholar's taxonomies of thanking strategies, thanking in American English, and the previous studies. Chapter three presents the study methodology, data collection procedures, participants of the study, data collection instrument, validity of the instrument, data analysis procedures and gratitude strategies taxonomy. Chapter four discusses the results of the study in a detailed manner by providing comprehensive analysis of data. Chapter five concludes the study with a summary, main findings, conclusion, and it supplies with some pedagogic recommendations. Finally, it provides suggestions for further research on this topic.

## **Chapter Two**

### **Literature Review**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents a review of literature related to the topic of the present study. Description of the literature is divided into three parts. The first part introduces pragmatics and deals with some related issues such as pragmatic competence, communicative competence, pragmatic transfer and pragmatic failure. The second part is an overview of the notion of speech acts theory, followed by a detail examination of the speech act of gratitude and some scholar's taxonomies of thanking strategies. Finally, the third part presents the previous studies in relation to the topic of the current study.

#### **2.2.1 Pragmatics**

Pragmatics is a relatively new division of linguistics. The term "Pragmatics" was established in (1970) by the Ancient Greece and Rome. The word "Pragmatics" in Latin and Greek both means "Practical". The modern usage and correct practice of pragmatics is credited to the impact of the American Philosophical Doctrine of Pragmatism. Moreover, pragmatics as a branch of linguistics has its origin in Philosophy especially philosophy of language.

The history of the term pragmatics in modern usage is recognized by Charles Morris (1938) who at initial stage of the discipline related it to the signs of semiotics. Morris differentiated between three separate branches of inquiry: syntactic; the study of formal relations of signs to one another, semantics; the study of signs in relation to the object to which they are applied (designated), and pragmatics: the study of signs in relation to the

interpreters. Moreover, Morris (1946) defined pragmatics as the study of the origin of the first use of the signs. From 1930 up to the present time, pragmatics have continued to grow as an emergent branch of the huge tree of linguistics study, while Yule (1996, p. 3) defined pragmatics in his study as the following:

1. "Pragmatics is the study of speaker meaning".
2. "Pragmatics is the study of contextual meaning",
3. "Pragmatics is the study of how more gets communicated than is said",
4. "Pragmatic is the study of the expression of relative distance".

Leech (1983, p.34) argued that interlocutors cannot really realize the nature of language itself unless they understand pragmatics. Comparing pragmatics to phonology, morphology and syntax, pragmatics is a moderately new linguistic discipline. Linguistic pragmatics has its basis in language philosophy and advanced as a result of thoughts concerning the functions and use of language by philosophers such as Austin (1962), Searle (1969, 1975, 1976) and Grice (1975). It was initially located within philosophy of language (Morris, 1938), but has been moved from this field to be related to sociolinguistics. In the 1960s, pragmatics was not a recognized discipline and it enclosed topics that could not be positioned into other areas of linguistics (Leech, 1983). Later on, language use and context captured more attention in the 1970s and consequently, pragmatics as a branch of linguistics was acknowledged.

Levinson (1983) is one of the first researchers who tried to resolve the issue of indistinctness adjoining the concept of pragmatics. In an effort to offer a specific definition of pragmatics, pragmatics appears to be a particularly difficult concept to define, a number

of scholars including pragmatists, linguists and applied linguists have tried to offer their definitions of this term considering their own viewpoints.

Leech (1983) argued that pragmatics is the study of meanings in relation to speech situation. Pragmatics refers to the language in use, or the relationship between language and meaning, which is central to an account of language comprehension, through drawing inferences that relate what is said to what is mutually believed or what has been said previously. Hence, Kasper and Blum-Kula (1993) regarded pragmatics as the study of the qualifications of human language uses as these are determined by the context of society. On the other hand, Leech (1983) added that pragmatics involves problem solving both from the speaker's point of view and from the hearer's point of view.

Crystal (1985) argued that Pragmatics is the study of the characteristics of the meaning and the language use that are dependent on the speaker, the hearer and other features of the context of utterance, while Wijana (1996, p.2) stated that "pragmatics is a branch of linguistics that explores the meaning of linguistic units outwardly and the meaning according to context". The main aspect studied in pragmatics is the speaker's intension. In addition, Pragmatics, according to Wijana (1996) is a sub-discipline of linguistics that studies the usage of language in social communication that takes into account the factors of the situation, the purpose of the conversation and the status of the interlocutor. Based on the definitions above, Pragmatics is regarded a branch of linguistics which studies the usage of language in relation to the meaning of linguistic units and paying attention to the context of communication.

Pragmatics commonly studies the intended acts of the speakers at specific times and places. According to Korta and Perry (2006), the facts which pragmatics deals with are the following:

- Facts about the objective facts of the utterance, including who the speaker is, when the utterance occurred, and where it took place.
- Facts about the speaker's intentions.
- Facts about beliefs of the speaker and of the text receivers, and the conversation they are engaged in.
- Facts about social institutions, such as marriage ceremonies, courtroom procedures, and the like, which affect what a person accomplishes in or by saying what he does.

According to Brown and Levinson (2008) Pragmatics is the study of the connections between language and context which is encoded in the structure of language. Focus is on the context which determines the meaning of speech and the choice of language structure which determines including choice of intonation, words, sentence structure used and morphological structure. Moreover, Brown and Levinson (2008, p. 507) explained that "Pragmatics is the study of the relationships between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding (the context dependent)". From definition above, it can be suggested that pragmatics cannot be realized without the context.

Crystal (2010) claimed that pragmatics is not a comprehensible field of study since it intersects with many other linguistic areas and comprises several different facts of language use. Consequently, linguists incline to define it according to their own interests and research intentions. Similarly, Kasper and Rose (2001) suggested that pragmatics has been defined differently in relation to authors' theoretical orientation and audience.

### **2.2.2 Pragmatic Competence**

The word 'pragmatics' is used in the TL acquisition "pragmatic competence" which is one of the abilities considered by the overarching the concept of communicative competence. The concept of pragmatic competence is described by Chomsky (1965) as the realization of the conditions and the manner of appropriate use of the language in conformity with different purposes. Canale and Swain (1980) realized that this view in opposition to grammatical competence that in Chomskyan terms as the knowledge of form and meaning. Therefore, in a more contextualized fashion, Canale & Swain (1980) included pragmatic competence as one of the important components of their model of communicative competence. Pragmatic Competence is identified as sociolinguistic competence and defined as the knowledge of contextually appropriate language use (Canale & Swain,1980; Canale, 1983). Later on, Canale (1988, p.90) developed this definition, and clarified that pragmatic competence includes “illocutionary competence, or the knowledge of the pragmatic conventions for performing acceptable language functions, and sociolinguistic competence, or knowledge of the sociolinguistic conventions for performing language functions appropriately in a given context”.

Besides, Coulmas (1981) specified that routine formulae are a severe problem for non-native speakers, and this claim was supported by many of interlanguage pragmatic studies (e.g., Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986; House, 1988). The study of the form and structure of language use is indivisible from the study of pragmatic competence since it is through the various linguistic codes that one displays his pragmatic competence.

Bachman (1990) categorized language knowledge into organizational competence and pragmatic competence. Organizational competence involves controlling the formal

structure of language in order to produce or recognize grammatically correct sentences, to understand their prepositional content and to order them to form texts, whereas pragmatic competence is related to two important aspects of communicative language use, the relationship between these signs and referents, and the language users and the contexts of communication. The pragmatic competence is divided by Bachman (1990) into illocutionary competence and sociolinguistic competence. He explained that illocutionary competence can be used for expressing the language to be taken with certain illocutionary force and for interpreting these language illocutionary forces.

### **2.2.3 Communicative Competence**

Chomsky (1965, p. 24) defined linguistic competence as "terms of the grammatical knowledge of an idealized native speaker". He described the idealized native speaker as someone who realizes his language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors in using his knowledge of the language in actual performance. However, a number of linguists introduce the concept of pragmatic/communicative competence which led to revolutionary changes in learning theories and teaching methodologies of the TL.

Chomsky (1965, p. 4) differentiated between the term of *competence* (the speaker-hearer's knowledge of his language) and the term of *performance* (the actual use of language in concrete situations). According to Chomsky(1965), deviations from the ideal in actual performance do not reflect competence: "A grammar of a language purports to be a description of the ideal speaker and hearer's inherent competence". Chomsky's interpretation is that any errors in production may therefore be related to one of many elements, including competence, that affect performance.

One of the first scholars who use the term communicative competence is Hymes (1971). He showed that language teaching and learning includes issues more than targeting grammatical or lexical systems. For him, communicative competence is not only an inherent grammatical competence, but also the ability to use grammatical competence in a diversity of communicative contexts. In this way, Hymes (1971) added the sociolinguistic perspective into Chomsky's linguistic view of competence. According to Hymes (1971), the ability to speak competently involves both the grammatical knowledge of a language and knowing what and how to utter something in any situations. He also stated that utilizing rules of using language without which the rules of grammar would be useless.

Moreover, major of applied linguistics research refers to Hymes' work as being seminal to CC. Hymes (1971) reacted against Chomsky's definition, because he thought that Chomsky neglects almost everything of sociocultural significance. Knowing how to form grammatically correct sentences is not enough to have CC. Instead, Hymes (1971, p. 286) advanced "the goal of a broad theory of competence can be said to show the ways in which the systematically possible, the feasible, and the appropriate are linked to produce and interpret actually occurring cultural behavior". Communicative interference, caused by socio-linguistic differences such as register, lexico-syntax, or pragmatics between dialects of a language or between distinct languages can cause well-intended, grammatically correct locutions to be misunderstood. When an L2 speaker does not understand how a native language (L1) speaker will take up a message, the intent of the encoded message and the impact of the decoded message will not be the same.

Canale and Swain (1980) specifically addressed CC's definition and development in an article focuses on second language teaching. They used CC to represent the connection and interaction between grammatical competence and sociolinguistic competence. In addition, Canale and Swain (1980) stated that the purpose in asserting this definition is to provide guidelines for how to develop communicative course syllabi, namely that grammar and sociolinguistics features must both be included in second language coursework and both must be assessed, as well. This is in sharp contrast to the grammar-centered syllabi found in most course work.

The complexity of the notion of communicative competence increases by the development of the term Communicative Language Ability by Bachman (1990). Bachman (1990, p. 107) added that this term refers to both "knowledge, or competence, and the capacity for implementing or executing that competence in appropriate contextualized communicative language use". He also suggested a framework for 'Communicative Language Ability' consists of three components including language competence, strategic competence and psychological mechanisms. He defined the 'sociolinguistic competence' as the control of the conventions of language use that are determined by the features of the specific language use context.

Macaro (1997) stated that four popular beliefs between language teachers that facilitate the realization of the level of 'communicative competence'. The four beliefs include: giving more attention to listening skills and speaking than reading and writing, practicing more in communicating new information rather than 'already known' information, enhancing students' involvement to overcome passive learning and focusing on practicing the language in meaningful situations rather than on producing well-formed

sentences or in individual words. However, it should be observed that looking for the objective of developing students and communicative competence should not lead to focusing more on speaking and listening than reading and writing skills. The good command of any language requires reaching enough understanding of all the language skills.

Moore (2009, p. 9) explained that the field of language communicative competence “is dependent on more than the knowledge of and ability to use a given field language in ways that are grammatical and sociocultural appropriate”. This argument might put the goal of developing language learners’ communicative competence in terms of native speakers through formal education which does not involve field language experience into question.

#### **2.2.4 Pragmatic Transfer**

While interlanguage transfer was bi-directional and concerned to transfer from one language to another, the notion of interlanguage pragmatic transfer indicated to the use of one’s L1 rules of speaking when communicating in the target language which was the process of 'freezing' of the transition between the L1 and L2 was regarded as the last step of interlanguage development. It formed even between motivated learners who were exposed to their L2 or had adequate learning support. Therefore, language transfer had been an essential issue in SLA and the area of pragmatic competence was no exception. Occurrences of pragmatic transfer might be influenced by various factors including L2 learners’ perception of language distance between their L1 and L2 (Takahashi, 1996), learning context (Takahashi & Beebe, 1987), instructional effect (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001;

Kasper, 1982), L2 proficiency (Takahashi & Beebe, 1987), and length of time in the L2 community (Félix-Brassier, 2004).

Kasper (1992) described pragmatic transfer as the effects that exerted by learners' pragmatic knowledge of languages and cultures other than L2 on their understanding, performing and learning of L2 pragmatic information. In addition, she classified pragmatic transfer into two types named positive pragmatic transfer and negative pragmatic transfer. Positive transfer refers to shared conventions between a language learner's native tongue and target language, which allows language learners to convey their intention across interlocutors with success. On the other hand, negative transfer happens when L1 pragmatic knowledge varies from L2 pragmatic knowledge and in which case, the communication procedure turns into a "pragmatic failure".

Transfer influences had been occurred at the two levels of sociopragmatic and pragmalinguistic. Sociocultural transfer appears to regulator learners' perceptions of contextual factors such as interlocutors' relative social distance (Beebe, Takahashi & Uliss-Weltz, 1990), and assessment of appropriateness in carrying out a particular speech act (Blum-Kulka, 1982). Beebe et al. (1990) revealed that L1 influenced patterns of style for Japanese learners of English in contexts where speakers were of higher or lower status than the hearer, whereas for Americans, the significant distinction was between status-equal and status-unequal relationships, regardless of the direction. On the other hand, pragmalinguistic transfer occurred in learners' use of conventions of means and form, affecting the illocutionary force and politeness value of interlanguage utterances (Bodman & Eisenstein, 1988; Eisenstein & Bodman, 1986, 1993; House & Kasper, 1987).

Takahashi and Beebe (1987) investigated the refusals Japanese English learners and American English native speakers through discourse completion test. They tended to examine the differences in language production and the extent of L1 pragmatic transfer. They revealed that the transfer of Japanese refusal strategies was more prevalent among EFL than ESL learners. Most of the studies confirmed the intuitive claim that as learners' proficiency develop, the occurrence of negative pragmatic transfer from their L1 decreases (Bouton, 1994; Trosborg, 1987). However, Takahashi and Beebe's (as cited in Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka, 1993) study revealed that transfer was greater among high proficiency learners than low proficiency learners at the discourse level. They assumed that second language proficiency is positively correlated with pragmatic transfer because low proficiency level learners do not have the linguistic ability to transfer L1 forms such as indirect request strategies. Thus, it was concluded that transferring pragmatic aspects requires learners to possess sufficient TL resources.

#### **2.2.4.1 Negative / Positive Pragmatic Transfer**

Liu (2003) argued that there are two types of pragmatic transfer. The first one is the positive pragmatic transfer which appears in the case of transferring similarities between languages. When transfer denotes universality in the social and cultural norms and in the pragmatic knowledge, it does not obstruct understanding or successful communication. On the other hand, negative pragmatic transfer happens in the case of the inappropriate fallback on L1 sociolinguistic norms and transferring them into L2. This is known as 'pragmatic failure' which affects misunderstanding and so communicative breakdowns (Liu, 2003). Therefore, in the case of the speech act of thanking, transferring universals and similarities between English and Arabic outcomes in positive pragmatic transfer of the function used

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

According to Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993), the transfer of pragmatic knowledge and pragmatic norms which are shared by both L1 and L2 is referred to as positive transfer while the transfer of pragmatic knowledge and pragmatic norms which are inconsistent across L1 and L2 refers to negative transfer. Maeshiba et al. (as cited in Gass & Neu, 1996, p. 155), stated that "positive pragmatic transfer refers to the projection of first language-based socio-pragmatic and pragma-linguistic knowledge where such projections result in perceptions and behaviors consistent with those of second language users". In addition, negative pragmatic transfer has been defined as "the projection of first language based socio-pragmatic and pragma-linguistic knowledge onto second language contexts where such projections result in perceptions and behaviors different from those of second language users".

### **2.2.5 Pragmatic Failure**

Regarding the concept of pragmatic failure, Thomas (1983) described two types of this concept. When the non-native speaker assigns a force to an utterance which is different from the pragmatic force that is usually connected to it by native speakers, it is said that 'pragma-linguistic' failure is at stake. Another case in which pragma-linguistic failure might appear is when the non-native speaker transfers the norms and methods of L1 into L2 improperly. This type is concerned with the grammar and beliefs about the language i.e., language specific. It occurs either because of the inappropriate transfer of speech act strategies or because of transferring semantically and syntactically equivalents with a different pragmatic force. The other type of failure is 'socio-pragmatic' which is caused due to the social circumstances surrounding the speech act, such as social distance, politics, religion, morals, gender, power and the closeness of relationships between the interactors i.e. knowledge about the world. So, this type of transfer occurs when the speaker does not know what to say, when, why and to whom. For example, not knowing the pragmatic force of a 'thank you' might cause a pragma-linguistic failure, but cultural differences of when to say it, in which occasion and for what reason might cause socio-pragmatic failure.

### **2.3 Speech-Act Theory**

The perception of speech act and appropriate successful communication in context were investigated by different researchers, such as Grice (1975), Austin (1962), Searle (1969). Grice (1975), he stated the cooperative principle and its maxims. Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) classified the speech acts into groups. The speech act of thanking, which is the center of this study, is an expressive speech act in Searle's terminology and a

behabitive one in Austin's. They also stressed the importance of the illocutionary act over the locutionary and perlocutionary acts.

Austin (1962) established the speech act theory in "how to do things with words", then it was improved by Searle (1969). Speech act theory focuses on three categories of utterances: locutionary act (a meaningful statement, saying something is understood by the hearer), illocutionary act (saying some words or utterances with purpose, such as to inform), and perlocutionary act (saying words or utterances to make someone to act).

In cross-culture communication, it is important to realize the intended meaning of the utterances by recognizing the differences between these three categories. In cross-culture setting, the speaker's statement might not be understood by the hearer, which cause miscommunication toward the speaker's intention (Johansen, 2008). Accordingly, Austin (1962) explained that meaning can be explained as a description of the relationship between the uttered words or sentences and the situation where the speaker says the utterance to the hearer in addition to the intentions of the speaker while performing an act of the utterance". The most studied act among the three acts of the speech act theory is the illocutionary act, so the term "speech act" is generally used to refer to the illocutionary act.

In (1969), Searle developed Austin's theory into a more elaborate concept of speech acts. The notion of speech acts, according to Searle (1969), is the basic unit of language used to express meaning or an utterance that expresses intention. He classified illocutionary speech acts into five types:

a) Representatives (or assertive), the speaker states the truth of the content of an utterance (i.e., asserting, claiming, reporting, concluding);

b) Directives, the acts in which the speaker attempts to get the hearer to do something (i.e., ordering, commanding, requesting, begging);

c) Commissive, dealing with the speaker to do some future action (i.e., promising, offering, threatening)

d) Expressive, the acts to express a psychological state of the speaker to the hearer (i.e., thanking, apologizing, complimenting).

e) Declarations, which bring out the correspondence between the propositional content and reality (i.e., firing an employee, nominating a candidate, marrying a person).

### **2.3.1 The Speech Act of Gratitude**

Searle (1969) clarified that thanking happens as a result of past act performed by the hearer (propositional content); this act benefits the speaker, and the speaker believes that this past act benefits himself or herself (preparatory rule); the speaker wants to express his or her being grateful or appreciative for the act (sincerity rule); and thanking “counts” as an expression of gratitude or appreciation (essential rule). For example, in using the expression ‘thank you’, a speaker is not only stating some utterances but is also performing an act of thanking. When expressing thanking, the speaker expresses his gratitude to the hearer’s involvement in a previous action that was advantageous to the speaker. Expressive illocutionary acts, including thanking, concern the condition where the speaker must be experiencing some particular psychological state because of a state of affairs.

Eisenstien and Bodman (1986) described the speech act of thanking as an illocutionary act performed by a speaker as it is based on a past act performed by the hearer. This past act benefits the speaker and so he feels grateful. Therefore, he makes a statement

which counts as an expression of gratitude. Yule (1996, p. 47) defined thanking as “the feeling of gratefulness directed towards others”. From this, it becomes obvious that thanking is one of the effective ways to maintain social rapport. Thanking can express emotions, gratitude, sarcasm, irony, and blame as well. It is also used to open, change, and close conversations

Bach and Harnish (1979) supplied another analysis of the speech act of thanking as follows: In uttering *e* (an expression), *S* thanks *H* for *D* if *S* expresses:

- i. Gratitude to *H* for *D*.
- ii. The intention that *H* believes that *S* is grateful to *H* for *D*.
- iii. The intention that his utterance satisfies the social expectation that one express gratitude at being benefited.
- iv. The intention that *H* takes *S*'s utterance as satisfying this expectation. “No thanks”: *S* thanks *H* for offering *D* and rejects the offer.

(*e* refers to an expression, *S* the speaker, *H* the hearer, and *D* the particular type of occasion requiring acknowledgment, such as receiving something.)

The distinctive definition reveals the fact that genuine feeling of gratitude is not essential, but rather the expression of gratitude should meet social expectation; in other words, it should happen within pre-established models and at a specific time. In either case, the act is known as thanking. Furthermore, bold thanks (i.e., use of the word without further elaboration in a phatic form of utterance) is often considered mechanical and without true meaning. Bach and Harnish (1979, p. 54) clarified the difference in the following example including a gift of sort:

The existence of the relevant occasion is presumed, not asserted, by the speaker, and it is often unnecessary for him to mention the occasion explicitly: if someone gives you a cigarette, it is enough to say “Thank you.” But if someone sends you a box of cigars, it is necessary to say, when you next see the donor, “Thanks for the nice cigars,” or something to that effect.

Leech (1983) argued that thanking is from the social perception. He defined thanking as a friendly function, and its aim of stating appreciation is to create and maintain a polite and friendly social atmosphere. Leech further described thanking as expressive for the reason that it makes known the speaker’s psychological attitude. Likewise, Van Ek (1977) classified the words *thank you* as expressing an emotional attitude, and lists certain alternative phrases when used in thanking.

Hymes (1971) indicated that the British *thank you* is different from the American *thank you*. British *thank you* seems to be on its way to marking formally the segments of certain interactions, with only residual attachment to ‘thanking’ in some cases. Okamoto and Robinson (1997) realized that British *thank you* is often used when interacting with high-status interlocutors. Apte's (1974) study on verbalization of gratitude in South Asian languages, such as the languages of Marathi and Hindi, revealed that expressions of gratitude differ from those which are used by Americans. No verbalization of gratitude takes place in situations including the exchange of goods, nor in interactions with family members and close friends in Marathi and Hindi; however, expressing gratitude in these situations is expected in American culture.

Norrick (1978) investigated speech acts in further analysis by introducing the notion of the social function of expressive illocutionary acts which is not Searle’s main

focus. He also described that the acts express emotion, and its expressions are communicated following the prevailing social function in the society.

In the case of thanking, Norrick (1978) declared that the social function of thanking is the acknowledgement of speaker's having advantage from the action of the hearer. When the speaker expresses his gratitude for the past act of the hearer, thanking can have the intention of compliment or flattery, in some cases it can be a hope of receiving future favors. It may also function as an indication that the hearer has done an appropriate favor to the speaker. In addition, thanking usually indicates that there is someone having been complimented or a signal of one's polite response to greetings.

In (1981), Coulmas declared that thanking is the same as apologizing, regarded them as a pragmatic universal. He explained that each language has a range of conventional devices to perform such an act: Apologies and thanks are strategic devices whose most important function is to balance politeness relations between interlocutors. For expressing gratitude, the standards of social relationships between people in different cultures plays an important role in defining some common situations. According to Coulmas (1981, p. 75), "the social relationship between the participants and the inherent properties of the object of gratitude work together to determine the degree of gratefulness that should be expressed in a given situation. Differences, in this respect, are subject to cultural variation". Coulmas's (1981) taxonomy of thanks is presented as follows:

- (i) - thanks ex ante (for a promise, offer, invitation)
  - thanks ex post (for a favor, invitation afterwards)
- (ii) - thanks for material goods (gifts, services)

- thanks for immaterial goods (wishes, compliments, congratulations, information)

(iii) - thanks for some action initiated by the benefactor

- thanks for some action resulting from a request/wish/order by the beneficiary

(iv) - thanks that imply indebtedness

- thanks that do not imply indebtedness.

Coulmas (1998) alerted that this taxonomy is not definitive, that other criteria are conceivable (e.g., the scale of weightiness), and that the criteria in the taxonomy are not mutually exclusive. Moreover, he indicated that the idea of the object of gratitude is just one factor of the other factors which determines the choice of a gratitude expression. The quality of the interpersonal relation between the interlocutors is equally significant.

Eisenstein and Bodman (1986) introduced thanking as an illocutionary act following Searle's (1969) classification of speech acts. They categorized the expression of gratitude as an illocutionary act done by the speaker as result of the hearer's past act. The speaker gets a benefit from this past act so he /she believes that the act has benefited the hearer. Then the speaker expresses his emotion of gratefulness by saying a statement that counts as an expression of gratitude. In addition, Eisenstein and Bodman (1993) clarified that the social function of gratitude expression is to fortify the relation between the members of society. They confirmed that when this function is acted appropriately, the expression of gratitude creates feelings of warmth and solidarity, maintaining and enhancing social cohesion and social bonding among the people.

According to Verschueren and Ostman (2009), the speech act theory has two arguments that underlie it. The first one is the distinction between the meaning

communicated by an utterance and the way in which the utterance is used (i.e., its force). The second argument is that the utterances of every kind (assertion included) can be considered as acts. By introducing an utterance as an act, the production of words or sentences can be considered as the performance of a speech act, which is the unit of linguistic communication (Jaszczolt, 2002). On the other hand, the smallest unit of human communication is not a linguistic expression, but rather the performance of several types of communication acts, such as asking for information, giving orders, making requests, conveying information, making threats, giving warning, making bets, giving advice, complaining, thanking someone, making a promise and so on. Most of the expressions of gratitude in English involve the word *thank*, *thank you so much*, *thank you*, *thank you very much*, *thanks*, *thanks a lot*. Yet, as indicated by Siregar (2011), the expression *thank* conveys the following purposes: 1) to express the feeling of generosity at an act accepted by a speaker, 2) to reject a gift or a present given by someone in a polite way, 3) as a courtesy to maintain a relationship, 4) to end a conversation, 5) to praise. Siregar (2011) further declared that the forms of *thank* are linguistically simple, but pragmatically the forms are complicated because it includes sociocultural standards which are varied from one language to another.

In terms of formal and situational thanking, Aijmer (1996) differentiated between simple and intensified *thank you/thanks* in the case of formal and situational features. Accordingly, it can be indicated that formality and situation are two contextual features in which responses to thanking speech act may be understood differently. In other words, the relationship between speakers, social distance, social status, conditions at a particular time

in a particular place constitute factors that cause how speakers express in relation to responding gratitude.

### **2.3.1.1 Gratitude in American English**

Gratitude has significant social value in American English and is employed commonly and widely of interpersonal relationships: among the close friends, strangers, acquaintances, and with superiors and subordinates. When people express gratitude successfully, they will have warm feelings about and solidarity with others; though, when they fail to express gratitude or express it incompetently, the relationship between the speaker and listener may be in danger.

Apte (1974) argued that the expressions of gratitude consider more extensive in American culture than in South Asian societies. Americans express their gratitude for all types of big and small favors, gifts, and compliments, and they apply those expressions in different situations. For example, the exchange of goods, with friends, and at parties. Most of the expressions of gratitude contain the word *thank*, as in *many thanks, thank you, thank you very much, thanks, thanks a lot*. In addition, Apte pointed out that since the high frequency of the use of these expressions of gratitude in the American speech community, it has come to be used more often perhaps in a mechanical rather than in a sincere way.

For the reason that the expressions of gratitude are essential in American culture, one of the first words that American children are taught at a very early age is *thank you*. Grief and Gleason (1980), scholars of first language acquisition, indicated that thanking habits are among the earliest which young English-speaking children are educated. In Eisenstein and Bodman's (1986) study of the expressions of gratitude which are used by native speakers of American English, they revealed that language patterns use in interactions

between equals and unequal status are the same. However, they also found out that thanks are restrained, or unelaborated in situations where the interlocutors are of unequal status while expressions of gratitude among friends contain not only the formulaic thanks, but also considerable elaboration. As Eisenstein and Bodman (1986) declared in their conclusion that shorter thanking episodes sometimes reveal greater social distance between participants.

### **2.3.2 Strategies of Thanking**

According to Johansen (2008), the word “strategy” has two different meanings. The first one indicates a realization of a speech act, while the second is the measurement that enables the interlocutor to keep harmonious relationships.

#### **2.3.2.1 Aijmer’s Thanking Strategies**

Aijmer (1996) investigated the functions and the strategies of gratitude expressions in her study. Her study is based on the London-Lund Corpus of spoken English. she described thanking as an expressive speech act which has “illocutionary force”. The results show various formulas for gratitude expressions which they are accounted for in terms of the stem they involve. Aijmer (1996, p. 37) classified thanking strategies as follows:

#### 1. Explicit thanking:

##### A. Emotional

a. Thanking somebody explicitly: "Thanks/ thank you."

b. Expressing gratitude: "I am grateful"

##### B. Non-emotional

b. Acknowledging a debt of gratitude:

c. I owe a debt of gratitude to you.

## 2. Implicit thanking:

- a. Emotional
  - b. Expressing appreciation of the addressee: "That is kind of you" and " That is nice of you."
  - c. Expressing appreciation of the act: " It is lovely", and "It is appreciated"
  - d. Stressing one's gratitude: "I must thank you."
  - e. Expressing emotion: "Oh, thank you."
- a. Non-emotional
  - a. Commenting on one's own role by suppressing one's own importance (self-denigration): "I am an ingrate, I'm so careless."

### 2.3.2.2 Farina and Suleiman's Thanking Strategies

Farina and Suleiman (2009) categorized thanking expressions into six strategies and the speaker has to choose one or more of them to convey the sense of indebtedness:

#### 1. Thanking

- a. By using the word "thank": for example, "Thanks a lot" and "Thank you very much."
- b. Thanking and stating the favour: for example, " Thank you for your help".
- c. Thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favour: for example, "Thank you for helping me to collect the papers."

#### 2. Appreciation

- a. Using the word appreciate: for example, " I appreciate it. "
- b. Using the word appreciate and mentioning the imposition caused by the favour: for example, " I appreciate the time you spent for me."

**3. Positive feeling:**

- a. Expressing a positive reaction to the favour giver (hearer): "You are a life saver.
- b. Expressing a positive reaction to the object of the favour: " This book was really helpful."

**4. Apology**

- a. Using apologizing words: "I am sorry for the problem I made."
- b. Criticizing or blaming one's self: "I'm such a fool."
- c. Expressing embarrassment: "It is so embarrassing."

**5. Recognition of the problem**

- a. Acknowledging the imposition: "I know that you are not allowed to give me extra time."
- b. Stating the need for the favour: "I try not to give extra time but this time I need it."
- c. Diminishing the need for the favour : "You did not have to do that."

**6. Repayment**

- a. Offering or promising service, money, food, or goods: "Next time, it's my turn to pay."
- b. Indicating indebtedness. "I owe you one."
- c. Promising future self-restrained of self-improvement: "It will not happen again"

### **2.3.2.3 Cheng's (2005) Gratitude Taxonomy**

In (2005), Cheng's study employed a Discourse Completion Test which includes eight situations. The DCT is directed to three groups of the participants. The participants' responses are coded in accordance with a coding scheme proposed by Chang. It based on eight strategies for expression of gratitude as follows:

#### **1. Thanking**

The Participants say “thank you” in three ways:

- a. Thanking only by using the word “thank you” (e.g., Thanks a lot! Thank you very much!)
- b. Thanking by stating the favour (e.g., Thank you for your help!)
- c. Thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favour (e.g., Thank you for helping me collect the papers.)

#### **2. Appreciation**

- a. Using the word appreciate (e.g., I appreciate it!)
- b. Using the word “appreciate” and mentioning the imposition caused by the favour (e.g., I appreciate the time you spent for me.)

#### **3. Positive feelings**

- a. By expressing a positive reaction to the favour giver (hearer) (e.g., You are a life saver!)
- b. By expressing a positive reaction to the object of the favour (e.g., This book was really helpful!)

#### **4. Apology**

- a. Using only apologizing words (e.g., I'm sorry)
- b. Using apologizing words and stating the favour or the fact (e.g., I'm sorry for the problem I made!)
- c. Criticizing or blaming oneself (e.g., I'm such a fool!)
- d. Expressing embarrassment (e.g., It's so embarrassing!)

#### **5. Recognition of imposition**

- a. Acknowledging the imposition (e.g., I know that you were not allowed to give me extra time!)
- b. Stating the need for the favour (e.g., I try not to ask for extra time, but this time I need it!)
- c. Diminishing the need for the favour (e.g., You didn't have to do that!)

#### **6. Repayment**

- a. Offering or promising service, money, food or goods (e.g., Next time it's my turn to pay!)
- b. Indicating indebtedness (e.g., I owe you one!)
- c. Promising future self-restraint or self-improvement (e.g., It won't happen again!)

#### **7. Others**

The expressions which are not included in the above strategies are classified as other strategies. There are four subcategories under the other strategy:

- a. Here statement (e.g., Here you are!)

- b. Small talk (e.g., Your face is very familiar to me but I can't remember where I saw you. What do you study?)
- c. Leave-taking (e.g., Have a nice day!)
- d. Joking (e.g., Don't forget to pay again next time)

### **8. Attention getter**

In the thanking situations, attention getter and address term are likely to occur in the same utterance. The alerters include:

- a. Attention getter (e.g., Hey, Hi, Well)
- b. Title (e.g., Dr., Professor! Sir!)
- c. Name (e.g., John, Mary)

### **2.4 Previous Studies**

Eisenstain and Bodman (1993, 1986) conducted most of the studies on the speech act of gratitude. They observed native and nonnative speakers of American English (Chinese, Korean, Spanish, Japanese and Russian) in expressing gratitude using observation of naturally occurring interactions, ethnographic methods, and also taking field notes. They supplied fifteen situations in their questionnaire and then interviewed speakers. They stated that foreign language learners are unaware of underlying rules of expressing gratitude, assuming that these expressions are universal; and therefore, ignoring the differences in the realization of this speech act between cultures. They indicated in their study that in expressing gratitude both positive and negative feelings are present on the part of giver and receiver.

Eisenstain and Bodman (1993) conducted a study with four experiments (utilizing integrating written, oral questionnaire, role playing, and naturally observation). The results

of the study reflected that thanking as a speech act developed mutually; the giver and the thanker collaborate in the improvement of a successful thanking situations. The variances were clear in both pragma-linguistics and socio-pragmatics level; that is, they included both kinds of events and the extent speakers are familiar with the context. Their finding also presented that even higher-level learner had difficulty in expressing gratitude, so they required more information on the nature of what to say, the language used to express it, and the context in which it was needed.

Hinkel (1994) examined the cultural variances in the attitudes toward the speech act of expressing gratitude. The study investigated NNSs' use of thanking with respect to NSs' norms in English. The participants were two hundred thirty-three graduate and undergraduate learners at Ohio State University, with one to five years of residence in U.S. The study showed that NNSs who have resided in U.S. for long time stilled unable to convey gratitude appropriately. The results indicated that there were differences between nonnative English language groups (i.e., Chinese, Indonesian, Korean, Japanese, Spanish, and Arabic) and native English speakers in consciousness of the appropriateness of some expressions of thanks.

Takashi Naito et al. (2005) investigated the cultural similarities and differences in gratitude. They surveyed two hundred twelve university students in Japan and two hundred eighty-four university students in Thailand, using a multi-aspect questionnaire. It included the items involved in hypothetical helping situations: (a) perceived gains of recipients, cost to benefactors, and obligation to help as antecedent variables of gratitude; (b) both positive feelings of gratitude and feelings of indebtedness; and (c) requital to benefactors and increased prosocial motivation of recipients as an outcome of gratitude. The findings

showed that both Japanese and Thai students had a positive feelings correlation between facial and verbal expressions of gratitude and increased prosocial motivation. However, the variable of feelings of indebtedness was positively related to increased prosocial motivation only in Japanese male students.

Cheng (2005) also investigated the similarities and differences between native speakers of Chinese and native speakers of English in expression of gratitude by examining their use of strategies and the length of their utterances, using a discourse completion test questionnaire. He also examined development of pragmatic and the influence of their first language on producing the expressions of gratitude in the speech act behavior among Chinese learners. The findings showed that Chinese and English NSs had different preferences for thanking strategies. There were significantly different in the length of speech and use of strategies. In addition, there was a positive effect of the length of residence in the United States on English learners' pragmatic development. The results also showed evidence of pragmatic influence from L1 Chinese. Moreover, contextual variables, social status, familiarity and imposition, had a significant influence on the length of speech and the use of strategies.

Al-Khateeb (2009) studied the speech act of thanking as a compliment response by Arab learners of English adopting Discourse Completion Test. The study aimed to investigate the differences in realizing the speech act between Arab and English cultures (the influence of speaker's culture on the pragmatic performance) and to see the influence of gender and proficiency on the use of this speech act. The findings of the study revealed that Arab speakers were not able to produce target-like responses due to negative pragmatic transfer. They tended to generalize their first language strategies and expression to second

language situations. This testified to the fact that they only acquired the linguistic competence in classroom, and the pragmatic competence was ignored. They simply translated the utterances regardless of the illocutionary force associated to them in second language. Most of the utterances used by Arabs were lengthier indicating that the Arabs were sincerer in their thanking. The proficiency and gender did not play a significant role in producing target like responses.

Farina and Suleiman (2009) examined the speech act of gratitude among Iranian EFL learners. Data were collected from two groups of Iranian EFL learners at intermediate and advanced levels of language proficiency, using a written Discourse Completion Test (DCT). The participants were a group of Iranian native speakers of Farsi and a group of American native speakers of English. The data were also analyzed in terms of whether EFL learners' L2 pragmatic competence was towards or away from the target language as the level of proficiency increases. The findings of this study suggested that language proficiency did not affect EFL learners' use of strategies when expressing gratitude in the English language.

De Pablos-Ortega (2010) examined the difference between Spanish and British conventions, for the purpose of this investigation, a corpus of sixty-four coursebooks, which included two hundred fifty situations representing the speech act of thanking, was used. Situations were analyzed in order to design the classification of gratitude which took into consideration the relationship between interlocutors, and the object and the action for which this speech act was performed. The use of thanking sequences was explored by means of a questionnaire administered to one hundred Spanish native speakers. The questionnaire results were then contrasted with the thanking formulae found in the

coursebooks. The findings of the investigation provided a classification of thanking which consisted of four main categories, subsequently divided into twelve subcategories. The results also revealed the socio-pragmatic representation of thanking in the coursebooks for teaching Spanish as a Foreign Language and the most frequent specific thanking formulae used by native speakers.

Morsi (2010) investigated the speech act of thanking in the Egyptian Arabic dialect. She stated that Egyptian speakers employed different strategies in expressing gratitude. She pointed out that Egyptian speakers used repetition, redundancy and a lot of formulaic expressions in order to express sincerity and gratitude to the hearer. The findings reflected that Egyptian speakers showed their politeness by using: “formulaic expressions whether explicit mention of thanks, e.g. ‘thanks a million’, ‘don’t mention it’ or blessings, e.g. ‘bless your hand’, ‘bless your heart’, ‘may God reward you’, or other non- religious formulas including good wishes, e.g. ‘may we hear good things about you’.

Cui (2012) investigated expressions of gratitude by American English native speakers and Asian advanced EFL and ESL students. The participants of study were ten native-English speakers who were born and raised in the United States, and ten Filipinos who were ESL learners, and twenty-eight EFL learners with Chinese, Korean, Indonesian, and Japanese background who had lived in the Philippines at least one year. The written data from native and non-native speakers were coded and analyzed. The findings of the study showed that native speakers’ expression of gratitude was appropriately a speech act set. On the other hand, non-native speakers’ data showed that advanced-level non-native learners of English, to some extent, had difficulty in expressing gratitude successfully.

Farashaiyan and Hua (2012) investigated the gratitude strategies of Iranian EFL learners with their Malaysian ESL counterparts. Data were cumulated from twenty Iranian and twenty Malaysian postgraduate university students having the same language proficiency through a DCT questionnaire. The results revealed significant differences in communicative ways of Iranian and Malaysian postgraduate students reflecting insights into understanding the differences in cultural values and norms in two non-western cultures and also showed that the pragmatic performance of the students were pertinent to certain factors other than language proficiency because the participants had more or less the identical level of language proficiency, but in certain situations they dealt with the same thanking situations to some extent differently. Iranian students responded in a polite way but their responses were not appropriate based on the social norms of American society.

Al-Zubaidi (2013) investigated speech acts of thanking produced by native speakers of American English, native speakers of Iraqi Arabic and Iraqi EFL learners. In addition, he investigated the perception and the production of speech act of thanking by the three groups as well as the pragmatics transfer on Iraqi EFL learners. Al-Zubaidi collected the data using two elicitation techniques: a discourse completion test (DCT), and a scaled-response test (SRT). Regarding the participants, there were three groups with fifty subjects in each. First, the Iraqi Arabic native speakers group consisted of thirty undergraduate students and twenty university instructors. Second, the American English native speakers group consisted of thirty undergraduate students and twenty university instructors. Finally, the Iraqi EFL learners group consisted of thirty undergraduate students and twenty university instructors majoring in either English literature or English linguistics. According to the result of the study, nine super-strategies were identified: thanking, complimenting,

expressing benediction, apologizing, acknowledging the imposition, reciprocating, expressing intimacy, alerting and other (swearing, here-statement, opting-out, non-verbal communication, refusal, stating results, expressing liking). On the other hand, there were seven strategies employed by the preformats of the study: minimizing the debt, expressing pleasure, reciprocating, acknowledging the thanks, expressing intimacy, alerting and other (reassuring, wishing, non-verbal communication, opting-out and greeting). The results also showed that Iraqi native speakers used repetitions and formulaic expressions such as blessing in order to show sincerity and politeness.

Al-Khawaldeh and Žegarac (2013) also investigated Jordanian and English native speakers' awareness of the speech act of thanking. The main aim of this study was to explore the similarities and the differences between Jordanian and English perceptions of expressing speech acts of thanking. The participants were male and female native speakers of Arabic and English. They included twenty British and twenty Jordanian postgraduate students studying at universities in Jordan. The data of this study were collected during semi-structured audio-taped interviews. The results of the study showed that there were few similarities and many noticeable differences in the perception of the speech act of thanking in the cultures of Jordan and England. The researchers pointed out that both native groups were consistent in their use of thanking expressions in relation to cultural norms and values. For example, English participants stressed the idea that expressing gratitude was a sign of politeness as well as being a conventional social norm and cultural value. They also stated that thanking was a matter of common decency and manners taught at home and school from an early age. On the other hand, Jordanian participants said that thanking was a good indication of politeness and a reflection of the personal image which

facilitates establishing and maintaining good social relations. Sixteen out of twenty Jordanian participants stated that their deep commitment to thanking was related to some religious beliefs such as Those who do not thank humans do not thank God.

Altalhi (2014) studied production of gratitude of Saudi Arabia EFLs. She employed quantitative method in order to achieve the purpose of the study. She analyzed texts of local females' exchanges in Hijazi dialect (spoken in west Saudi Arabia). The participants were provided with a written questionnaire that consists of different social situations in which the participants were expected to express their gratitude or to respond to someone else's expression of gratitude. The findings confirmed that the proposed hypotheses in that females employed distinct gratitude semantic formulae to express thanks for a favor, meal, gift and help. As a whole, the gratitude was lengthier than expected.

Al-Momani et al. (2017) explored the Jordanian EFL learners' semantic and politeness strategies in terms of type and number. The study compared the learners' strategies with the Americans'. The production level was investigated using DCT. The results yielded that the learners produced more gratitude expressions than the English natives. Unlike the American native speakers of English, the learners' strategies were highly influenced by the interlocutors' social status.

## **Chapter Three**

### **Research Methodology**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents the methodology of the present study. It discusses the method of the study, participants of the study, data collection instrument and the validity of data collection tool. It also discusses data collection procedures and the procedures of data analysis, and provides a detailed description of each procedure along with the rationale behind its use.

#### **3.2 Method of the Study**

This study aimed to investigate YEFLLs' pragmatic competence in relation to the production of speech act of gratitude and the influence of their mother tongue on producing gratitude. Three main groups of participants YEFLLs, ANSs and AENSs were involved to investigate the use of gratitude strategies and to determine to what extent pragmatic competence and pragmatic transfer occur when YEFLLs express gratitude in English by comparing the performance of the three groups. For this purpose, the current study followed the quantitative method. The quantitative nature of the study stemmed from the numerical calculations and statistical processes (SPSS and Chi-square) made to count the frequency of gratitude strategies used by all the groups of participants.

### **3.3 The Population of the Study**

In order to examine the pragmatic competence of YEFLLs in relation to the speech act of gratitude, The population of this study involved Yemeni English foreign language learners, Yemeni Arabic native speakers who don't have any English background and American English native speakers in USA.

#### **3.3.1 The Sample of the Study**

The present study involved one hundred and thirty-two participants as sample. All of them were selected voluntarily. On the basis of the comparative nature of this study, the participants were divided into three groups as follows: The first group consisted of thirty-two Yemeni native speakers of Arabic (YANSs) from different major at Sana'a university. They aged between twenty to thirty, including 20 male and 12 female students who didn't have any English language background. They were selected voluntarily. The second group consisted of seventy Yemeni learners of English as a foreign language (YEFLLs). They were in level four in the English Department at the Faculty of Education, Sana'a University. They aged between twenty-one to thirty-five. The third group were thirty American native speakers of English (AENSs) who were of different ages and academic backgrounds. This group included ten males and twenty females (twelve freshmen, thirteen sophomores and five juniors) from some universities in Michigan, USA. They were contacted by the help of a Yemeni fellow who resides in the same place and works as assistant researcher in an American research office. The responses of the three groups were compared to each other to attain the objectives of the current study.

The purpose behind selecting YEFLLs at university as a source of data was the intention to investigate the pragmatic competence of participants who have been, fairly, studying English language for a long time (about ten years: first at school and then as their major at the faculty). In addition, a vast majority of the previous studies on speech acts employed university students as data collecting samples.

### **3. 4 Data Collection Instrument (Discourse Completion Task (DCT)):**

Leech (1989) described discourse completion test (DCT) as the most prevalent tool for data collection in pragmatics investigations. It was firstly promoted by the influential CCSARP (Cross- Cultural Speech Act Realization Project) research program in the 1980s. It was formed as a means of comparing members of a number of cultural societies and speakers of different languages given the same task of speech-act production. Researchers have revealed that the DCT was a proper methodology with the quality and the ability of producing a large amount of closely targeted data with comparatively little effort, as compared with other instruments. Researcher controlled the test which was subsequently coded and statistically analyzed, for a large number of respondents. This test can enable a number of related variables to be investigated with significant results (such as respondents' age, gender, and L1 background; power, distance, and cost-benefit variables in the DCT items). A DCT can even be managed by making the questionnaire available on the internet, getting a large number of respondents who can complete the test and submit it in their own time. On the other hand, the researcher could manage the DCT under classroom circumstances, where factors such as time and the demographic composition of the respondent group can be strictly controlled.

The current study adopted the DCT designed by Eisenstein and Bodman (1993) as a tool for data collection from the participants. This DCT constituted two main parts. In the first part, the participants were asked to give some information about their age and gender and their educational background. The second part consisted of a number of situations, with a description of the contextual features, followed by a short dialog and requires the participants to determine what they would say if they were in those situations. The DCT consisted of fourteen situations for (friend, stranger, superior and subordinate). Two versions of the instrument were used, one in English (Appendix I, p. 114) and the other in Arabic (Appendix II, p. 119). In order to ensure that these two versions were equivalent in translation, the technique of back translation was employed. After the original instrument was prepared in English, it was translated into Arabic language by the researcher. Then, a proficient Arabic-English bilingual did a back translation of the instrument into English. Finally, a native speaker of English checked the reliability of the translation by comparing the original version with the back-translated English version. The YANSs were given the Arabic version, and the AENSs and YEFLLs groups were given the English version. The participants were asked to picture themselves in the situations and write down their responses according to what they think they would say in these imaginary situations.

These are some examples of the situations in the DCT used in this study.

*1. It is Friday. You look into your wallet and notice that you only have \$2.00. Your good friend at work notices this and hears you say, ' I'll have to go to the bank.' Your friend asks if you need money, and you say that you forgot to*

*go to the bank. Your friend says, 'I have plenty. How much do you need?' You say, 'Could you lend me \$5.00? I'll pay you back on Monday.' Your friend says, 'Sure. Are you sure you don't need more than that?' You say you don't. Your friend gives you the \$5.00.*

***You would say:*** .....

***You would say nothing because:*** .....

*2. You board the bus, pay your money and take a seat near the front of the bus. Just before your stop, you guess that the driver is not going to stop. You move to the front, and ask the driver to stop and he stops.*

***You would say:*** .....

***You would say nothing because:*** .....

*3. It is your birthday, and you're having a few people over for dinner. A friend brings you a present. You unwrap it and find a blue sweater that you wish to have.*

***You would say:*** .....

***You would say nothing because:*** .....

### **3.5 Validity of the Instrument**

The validity of data collection instrument used in this study stemmed from the fact that it has been already proved reliable and valid in the earlier researches from which the current study data collection tool was adopted. The DCT was designed and used by Eisenstein and Bodman (1993) as a tool for data collection. Hulleberg (2008) employed

the same DCT in his comparative study of gratitude expressions in Norwegian and English. Fage et al. (2019) also employed this DCT to investigate the use of thanking speech act strategies in English realized by Kurdish EFL learners at Soran University. Similarly, Bakirci and Özbay (2020) investigated EFL speakers' gratitude strategies using the same DCT in their study.

### **3.6 Data Collection Procedures**

This study involved seventy YEFLLs, thirty AENSs and thirty-two YANSs. All the participants were asked to respond by writing down their responses to the fourteen situations comprising the DCT.

The DCT was distributed to the YEFLLs group by the researcher herself with explaining the purpose of the study. After that, they were requested to fill in the personal information and then respond to the fourteen situations in the DCT after reading the introductory instructions carefully. They were also informed that they had to react to these imaginary situations as if they were real and to provide their responses as realistically and honestly as possible. The participants were given an hour to write down their responses before the papers were submitted to the researcher. The same DCT was sent to the native-group participants by e-mails. The electronic copies were distributed to the native participants with the help of Yemeni friends living in the USA, and it took approximately one month to get the responses. The Arabic version (Appendix II) of the DCT was distributed to YANSs participants by researcher and they were requested to fill in the personal information and then respond to the fourteen situations. They were given the same time to write down their responses (an hour).

### 3.7 Data Analysis Procedures

The data was collected by means of the DCT and getting the data from the participants by writing down as many words or utterances as they wanted to express their gratitude towards the speaker. In order to analyze the collected data, a descriptive analysis as well as some statistical processes (SPSS and Chi-square) were employed. In order to answer the first question of the present study, pertaining the types of thanking strategies used by AENSs, YANSs and YEFLLs, Cheng's (2005) gratitude coding system was adopted to find out what gratitude strategies were used by the three groups of participants. Gratitude strategies of Cheng (2005) are classified into eight main strategies in which every main strategy is subdivided into sub-strategies constituting different forms of the main strategy. For example, when a participant responded to a situation saying: "thank you", this response was coded as "*simple thanking*" but if the participant responded to a situation saying: "I owe you one" it was coded as "repayment" and so on. However, an extra strategy "no expression" was added in the present study because some participants thought that there was no need to express their gratitude in some situations, specifically if their interlocutors were friends. For Aijmer (1996), "no expression" is the seventh strategy in his taxonomy. The types and frequencies of thanking strategies used by the three groups were calculated and displayed in tables per situation to obtain the average score of each strategy, and then a descriptive analysis of the results was provided.

### **3.7.1 Gratitude Strategies Taxonomy**

Cheng's (2005) taxonomy of gratitude strategies was based on eight strategies for the expressing of gratitude as follows:

#### **1) Thanking**

This category is the most explicit way of thanking because the expressions show the direct acknowledgment of the speaker's gratefulness toward the hearer's favor. The speakers nearly always use this strategy as the easiest thanking expressions to be recognized (Aijmer, 1996) and it becomes the primary category employed in thanking classifications developed by Aijmer (1996), Cheng (2005), and Jautz (2013). The 'thanking' strategy consists of the following three subcategories:

A. simple thanking by only using the word "thank you".

B. thanking by stating the favor (thank you for your help, and thank you for your notice exemplify this sub-strategy).

C. thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor (Thank you for helping me cleaning the room).

#### **2) Appreciation**

A. using the word "appreciate" (e.g., I appreciate it!).

B. using the word "appreciate" and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor (e.g., I appreciate the time you spent for me).

### **3) Repayment**

- A. offering services, food... (next time is my turn).
- B. feeling indebted (I owe you one).
- C. promising future self-improvement (it won't happen again).

### **4) Recognition of imposition**

- A. by acknowledging the imposition (exemplified by statements such as I know you are not allowed to give me extra time).
- B. stating or diminishing the need for the favor (you shouldn't do that).

### **5) Apology**

Cheng (2005) classified apology as one of thanking strategies, while Aijmer (1996) and Jautz (2013) did not include it in their categorization of thanking. In some cases, apology is usually used to express the feeling of gratitude as a response to the gratitude situations. There are three sub-categories in the 'apology' strategy:

- A. Using the apologizer words (I am sorry).
- B. Using apology by stating the favor (I am sorry for the problem I made).
- C. Expressing embarrassment (I feel embarrassed).
- D. Criticizing oneself (I am such a fool...).

## **6) Positive feeling**

Cheng's (2005) description of 'positive feeling' strategy is similar to the explanation of the strategy of 'appreciation' in Aijmer's (1996) taxonomy study. However, the researcher preferred to choose the term 'positive feelings' because it was more descriptive in capturing the related data in this category. This strategy is divided into two sub-categories:

- A. Expressing positive reaction to a person (You are a life saver).
- B. Expressing positive feeling to action (such as: This book was really helpful).

## **7) Others**

Expressions that do not belong to the mentioned strategies are categorized as other strategies comprising:

- A. Here statements (here you are).
- B. Small talk.
- C. Leave taking (good bye, have a nice day).
- D. Joking.

8) **Alerter**: by using titles and names, attention getter in addition to the other strategies forms the alerter strategy.

- A. Attention getter (e.g., Hey, Hi, Well).
- B. Title (e.g., Dr., Professor! Sir!).
- C. Name (e.g., John, Mary).

## **Chapter Four**

### **Results and Discussion**

#### **4.1 Introduction**

This chapter provides a discussion and a detailed analysis of the data and results obtained from the three groups of participants, AENSs, YANSs and YEFLLs regarding their use of gratitude strategies in the fourteen situations composing the DCT in order to achieve the objectives and answer the questions of the present study. For this purpose of data analysis, the participants' responses are classified on the basis of Cheng's (2005) classification of gratitude speech act strategies. The frequencies and percentages of the gratitude strategies used by the participants in each situation are calculated and demonstrated in tables, and followed by illustrative discussion.

#### **4.2 Data Analysis**

This section presents the analysis of the results collected from the participants' responses. In accordance with the current study objectives, the analysis includes the discussion of the gratitude strategies used by AENSs, YANSs and YEFLLs to figure out the extent to which YEFLLs approximated AENSs' norms of gratitude, and to explore the extent to which pragmatic transfer from L1 occurs when YEFLLs express gratitude in English, respectively. The results are coded into two categories; the first one is analysis of the main gratitude strategies proposed by Cheng (2005), and the second one is the analysis of the combination of gratitude strategies used by the three groups.

#### **4.2.1 Types of Gratitude Strategies Used by AENSs and YEFLLs and YANSs**

In relation to the first objective of the present study, the types and frequencies of gratitude strategies used by AENSs and YEFLLs and YANSs were calculated and displayed in tables per situation, then a descriptive analysis of the results was provided after each table. It is worth mentioning that the analysis in this subsection focuses on the type of and occurrence frequency of main gratitude strategies used independently (with no other adjunct strategies), as a base criterion to achieve the first objective.

##### **Situation 1:**

*"It is Friday. You look in your wallet, only to notice that you only have no more than 10\$. One of your good friend notices this and hears you say, "I have to ask money to my family". Upon that, your friend offers to lend you the money you need for shopping".*

Table 4.1 Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation One (\$ small Loan):

No.	Gratitude strategies	Gratitude Sub - strategies	AENSs (30)		YANSs (32)		YEFLLs (70)	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Thanking	Simple thanking by only using the word "thank you".	6	20.0%	14	43.7%	32	45.7%
		Thanking by stating the favor.	1	3.3%	7	21.9%	5	7.1%
		Thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor.	4	13.3%	2	6.3%	6	8.6%
2	Appreciation	Using the word "appreciate"	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
		Using the word "appreciate" and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
3	Positive feeling	Expressing positive reaction to a person .	3	10.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
		Expressing positive feeling to action.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4	Apology	Using the apologizer words (I am sorry)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Using apology by stating the favor.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Expressing embarrassment.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Criticizing oneself	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5	Recognition of imposition	Acknowledging the imposition	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Stating or diminishing the need for the favor.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
6	Repayment	Offering services, (next time is my turn)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	4.3%
		Feeling indebted (I owe you one)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Promising future self-improvement.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
7	Other	Here statements (here you are)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Small talk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Leave taking (good bye, have a nice day)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Joking	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8	Alerter	Attention getter (e.g. Hey, Hi, Well)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Title (e.g. Dr., Professor! Sir!)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Name (e.g. John, Mary)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
9	No expression		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
10	Combination		16	53.4%	9	28.1%	16	22.9%
	Total		30	100%	32	100%	70	100%

Table (4.1) provides an overview of the frequencies of the occurrence of the strategies used in situation one. Across all expressions in situation one, it is noted that the AENSs used only three strategies in this situation. The first preferred strategy for this group was "combination", significantly used as the most frequent strategy (53.4%). The second preferred strategy was "thanking" (36.6%) with its sub-strategies as follows. They used 'simple thanking by only using the word 'thank you' more than the other sub-strategies (20%), whereas the sub-strategy of 'thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor' was used (13.3%) more than 'thanking by stating the favor' (3.3%). The third preferred strategy for the AENSs was "positive feeling" by only using the sub-strategy 'expressing positive reaction to the person' (10.0%). On the other hand, the YANSs used only the strategy of " combination" and "thanking" with its sub-strategies to express their gratitude in this situation. To illustrate, the sub-strategy of 'simple thanking by stating the word "thank you"' was used for (43.7%), more than 'thanking by stating the favor' (21.9%) while the strategy of 'thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor' was the least used sub-strategy (6.3%). The strategy of "combination" was used (28.1%) by YANSs. In comparison to the aforementioned groups of participants, it is found that YEFLLs used all gratitude strategies in this situation except "recognition of the imposition" and "no expression". The overuse of different gratitude strategies by YEFLLs occurred as follows. First, the sub- strategy of 'simple thanking by stating the word 'thank you' was the most frequent expressions by (45.7%) much more than 'thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor' (8.6%) and 'thanking by stating the favor' (7.1%). Second, the strategies of "Positive feeling" by 'expressing positive reaction to a person' and "Appreciation" by using the word 'appreciate' were employed with the same frequencies

(2.9%). Similarly, the strategy of "Apology" by 'expressing embarrassment', the strategy of 'small talk', 'appreciation by 'mentioning the imposition caused by the favor' and 'alterer by using a title' shared almost the same number of occurrences (1.4 %). Third, the strategy of 'repayment by offering service' was applied in this situation by (4.3%). Finally, (22.9%) of YEFLLs participants used "combination" to express their gratitude in this situation.

Example for YANSs responses in situation one:

- شكراً لك على وقتك معي

Thank you for helping me in this situation. (Thanking)

- شكراً جزيلاً لك أنا حقاً ممتناً لك

Thank you, I am really appreciate it. (combination)

- شكراً لك سوف أعيدها لك في أقرب وقت

Thank you, I will bring it back as soon as I can. (combination)

- شكراً جزيلاً وبارك الله فيك يا صديقي الغالي

Thank you so much, my best friend. May God bless you. (combination)

### **Situation 2:**

*"You board the bus, pay your money and take a seat near the front of the bus. Just before you stop, you signal the driver to stop. You move to the front, the bus comes to a stop, and the doors open."*

Table 4.2 Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Two (bus drop):

No.	Gratitude strategies	Gratitude Sub – strategies	AENSs (30)		YANSs (32)		YEFLLs (70)	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Thanking	Simple thanking by only using the word "thank you"	12	39.9%	16	50.0%	21	30.0%
		Thanking by stating the favor.	3	10.0%	4	12.5%	3	4.3%
		Thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor	6	20.0%	4	12.5%	0	0.0%
2	Appreciation	Using the word "appreciate"	3	10.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Using the word "appreciate" and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
3	Positive feeling	Expressing positive reaction to a person.	4	13.3%	1	3.1%	0	0.0%
		Expressing positive feeling to action.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4	Apology	Using the apologizer words (I am sorry)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Using apology by stating the favor.	0	0.0%	1	3.1%	1	1.4%
		Expressing embarrassment .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Criticizing oneself	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	8.6%
5	Recognition of imposition	Acknowledging the imposition	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Stating or diminishing the need for the favor .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	21	30.0%
6	Repayment	Offering services, (next time is my turn)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Feeling indebted (I owe you one)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Promising future self-improvement.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
7	Other	Here statements (here you are)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Small talk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Leave taking (good bye, have a nice day)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	8.6%
		Joking	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8	Alerter	Attention getter (e.g. Hey, Hi, Well)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Title (e.g. Dr., Professor! Sir!)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Name (e.g. John, Mary)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
9	No expression	0	0.0%	4	12.5%	7	10.1%	
10	Combination	2	6.7%	2	6.3%	1	1.4%	
	Total	30	100%	32	100%	70	100%	

According to the results presented in Table (4.2), it is found that the AENSs used only four strategies "thanking", "Positive feeling", "combination" and "Appreciation". They, significantly, used the strategy of "thanking" by using the word 'thank you' as the first preferred sub-strategy of thanking (39.9%), followed by the sub-strategy of 'thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor' as the second preferred sub-strategy (20.0%). The third preferred sub-strategy of gratitude used by AENSs was of "positive feeling" by 'expressing positive reaction to person' (13.3%). In addition, the AENSs employed the sub-strategies of 'thanking by stating the favor' and 'appreciation by using the word *appreciate*' with the same percentage (10.0%) while the strategy of "combination" was used as the least one by (6.7%). The YANSs, on the other hand, used five strategies of gratitude with different percentages in situation two, including "thanking", "no expression", "positive feeling", "apology" and "combination". They used the strategy of "thanking" by using word 'thank you' with high percentage (50.0%) more than the other sub-strategies of "thanking". The sub-strategies of 'thanking by stating the favor', 'mentioning the imposition caused by the favor' and the strategy of "no expression" shared the same frequency of occurrence (12.5%). Similarly, the sub-strategies of 'positive feeling by expressing positive reaction to a person' and 'apology by stating the favor' shared the same percentage (3.1%). This group thought that there was no need to express their gratitude explicitly in such a situation like this one, so the strategy of 'no expression' was frequently used by (12.5%). In addition, YANSs used the strategy of "combination" by (6.3%). The YEFLLs used the strategy of "thanking" by using the word 'thank you' (30.0%) and 'thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor' (4.3%) less than YANSs and AENSs. In this situation, YEFLLs used the three sub-strategies of "apology",

"combination" and the strategy of "alerter" by using 'attention getter' with almost the same frequency of occurrence (1.4%). The fourth sub-strategy of "apology" by 'criticizing oneself' and the sub-strategy of 'leave taking' were used with the same low percentage (8.6%). Quite similar to YANSs, (10.0%) of the YEFLLs participants used the strategy of "no expression" as they thought that this situation is a normal act that does not require any verbal representation of thanking.

To put it together, "thanking" was the most frequent strategy of expressing gratitude among all the three groups of participants in this situation, more specifically by the AENSs and YANSs. The YEFLLs were similar to AENSs only in the use of the sub-strategy of 'using the word appreciate', though with noticeable low frequency.

Example for YANSs responses in situation two:

- شكراً جزيلاً.

Thank you so much. (Thanking)

- أعتذر منك و شكراً لك

Thank you, and I do apologize for that. (combination)

- شكراً على حسن تعاملك مع زبائنك وسأدعو لك بالخير

Thank you for good treatment with your customers, my heartfelt wishes for you.  
(combination)

- فتح الله عليك بالخير

May Allah bless you with good. (prayers)

- شكراً جزيلاً وانظر الية مبتسماً

Thank you so much, with a smiling look. (combination)

**Situation 3:**

*"It is your birthday, and you're having a few people over for dinner. A friend brings you a present. You unwrap it and find a blue sweater that you wish to have".*

Table 4.3 Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Three (birthday gift)

No.	Gratitude strategies	Gratitude Sub - strategies	AENSs (30)		YANSs (32)		YEFLs (70)	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Thanking	Simple thanking by only using the word "thank you"	0	0.0%	10	31.3%	11	15.7%
		Thanking by stating the favor .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
2	Appreciation	Using the word "appreciate"	0	0.0%	1	3.1%	3	4.3%
		Using the word "appreciate" and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
3	Positive feeling	Expressing positive reaction to a person .	11	36.7%	2	6.3%	2	2.9%
		Expressing positive feeling to action.	0	0.0%	1	3.1%	4	5.7%
4	Apology	Using the apologizer words (I am sorry)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Using apology by stating the favor .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Expressing embarrassment .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Criticizing oneself	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5	Recognition of imposition	Acknowledging the imposition	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Stating or diminishing the need for the favor.	0	0.0%	1	3.1%	0	0.0%
6	Repayment	Offering services, (next time is my turn)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Feeling indebted (I owe you one)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Promising future self-improvement.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
7	Other	Here statements (here you are)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Small talk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Leave taking (good bye, have a nice day)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Joking	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8	Alerter	Attention getter (e.g. Hey, Hi, Well)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Title (e.g. Dr., Professor! Sir!)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Name (e.g. John, Mary)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
9	No expression	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%	
10	Combination	19	63.3 %	17	53.1%	45	64.2%	
		Total	30	100%	32	100%	70	100%

Remarkably, in situation three (birthday gift) the participants of the three groups used the strategy of "combination" as the first preferred strategy. YEFLLs and AENSs used the strategy of "combination" with approximately the same high percentage (64.2%) and (63.3%), respectively, while the YANSs used it for (53.1%). The AENSs used the strategy of "positive feeling" by 'expressing positive reaction to person' (36.7%) as the second preferred strategy. While YANs and YEFLLs second preferred strategy was "thanking" by 'stating the word thank you' (31.3%) and (15.7%), respectively. The third preferred strategy was "positive feeling" by 'expressing positive reaction to person' (6.3%) for YANSs. In addition, they used the sub-strategies of 'expressing positive feeling to action', 'appreciation by using the word *appreciate*' and 'recognition of the imposition by diminishing the need for the favor' with the same percentage (3.1%). On the other hand, The third preferred sub-strategy for the YEFLLs was 'expressing positive feeling to action' (5.7%) and the forth frequent sub-strategy was 'appreciation by using the word *appreciate*' (4.3%). They also used the sub-strategies of 'appreciation by using the word *appreciate*', 'thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor', 'expressing positive reaction to person' and "no expression" with the same percentage of occurrence (2.9%).

To sum up, it appears that the YEFLLs were more similar to the YANSs in using gratitude strategies for situation three as the AENSs shared with them only two strategies, i.e., "positive feeling" and "combination".

Example for YANSs responses in situation three:

- سوف أقدم له الاحترام والتقدير

Respect and appreciation will be shown/offered to her/him. (combination)

- شكراً على ذوقك الرفيع. لقد أعجبني القميص

Thank you, you have a good taste in selecting clothes. for your nice chose. I have really like it. (combination)

- شكراً لقد أعجبتني هديتك

Thank you, I like your gift. (combination)

- سأقوم باحتضانه وتقيله

I will give him a hug and then a kiss. ( positive feeling)

#### **Situation 4:**

*"You work for a large company, which is usually very busy. You send your manager a request for some days off. The vice-president of personnel calls you into his office. He tells you to sit down. You feel a little nervous, because you have only been working there for six months. The vice-president says, You're doing a good job. In fact, we are so pleased with you that I am going to give you a raise"*

Table 4.4 Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Four (raise in a company)

No.	Gratitude strategies	Gratitude Sub - strategies	AENSs (30)		YANSs (32)		YEFLs (70)	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Thanking	Simple thanking by only using the word "thank you"	2	6.7%	5	15.6%	18	25.7%
		Thanking by stating the favor.	0	0.0%	1	3.1%	1	1.4%
		Thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor	9	30.0%	3	9.4%	10	14.3%
2	Appreciation	Using the word "appreciate"	0	0.0%		0.0%	6	8.6%
		Using the word "appreciate" and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor .	2	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
3	Positive feeling	Expressing positive reaction to a person	2	6.7%	1	3.1%	2	2.9%
		Expressing positive feeling to action.	3	10.0%	1	3.1%	6	8.6%
4	Apology	Using the apologizer words (I am sorry)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Using apology by stating the favor	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Expressing embarrassment	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Criticizing oneself	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
5	Recognition of imposition	Acknowledging the imposition	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
		Stating or diminishing the need for the favor.	0	0.0%	1	3.1%	7	10.0%
6	Repayment	Offering services, (next time is my turn)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Feeling indebted (I owe you one)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Promising future self-improvement.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
7	Other	Here statements (here you are)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Small talk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Leave taking (good bye, have a nice day)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Joking	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8	Alerter	Attention getter (e.g. Hey, Hi, Well)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Title (e.g. Dr., Professor! Sir!)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Name (e.g. John, Mary)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
9	No expression	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%	
10	Combination	12	39.9%	20	62.6%	15	21.3%	
	Total	30	100%	32	100%	70	100%	

In situation four, AENSs and YANSs preferred the strategy of "combination" more than the other strategies while YEFLs preferred the strategy of "thanking" more than the strategy of " combination" (AENSs 39.9% and YANSs 62.6% vs. YEFLs 21.3%). The YEFLs and YANSs participants preferred the sub-strategy of ‘simple thanking by only using the word thank you’ more than the AENSs (YEFLs 25.7%, YANSs 15.6% and AENSs 6.7%). In contrast, the AENSs preferred the sub-strategy of ‘thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor’ more than the YEFLs and YANSs (AENSs 30.0% vs. YEFLs 14.3% and YANSs 9.4%). The sub-strategy of ‘thanking by

stating the favor' was used only by the YEFLLs (1.4%) and YANSs (3.1%). In addition, 'recognition the imposition by diminishing the need for the favor' was employed only by the YEFLLs (10.0%) and YANSs (3.1 %). Although, the AENSs and YEFLLs used different sub-strategies of "appreciation", the YANSs made no use of it at all. The YEFLLs used the sub-strategy of 'using the word appreciate' (8.6%) whereas the AENSs preferred 'mentioning the imposition caused by the favor' (6.7%). The sub-strategy of 'positive feeling by expressing positive reaction to a person' was used by the AENSs for (6.7%), more than by the YEFLLs (2.9%) and YANSs (3.1 %). Similarly, the AENSs employed the second sub-strategy of "positive feeling", i.e., 'expressing positive feeling to action' (10.0%) more than the YEFLLs (8.6%) and YANSs (3.1 %). Nevertheless, the two strategies of "no expression "and "apology" by 'criticizing oneself' were used only by the YEFLLs, (2.9%) and (1.4%) respectively.

Example for YANSs responses in situation four:

- شكراً جزيلاً على ما فعلت من أجلي

Thank you so much for everything you have done for me. (Thanking)

- اشكرك يا مديري، أنت رائع وتستحق ما أقدمه من أجل شركتك

Thank you, sir. you are really a great manager, and you deserve what I do for your company. (combination)

- لم أكن متوقع ذلك. شكراً على الترقية وسأكون عند حسن ظنك

I would n't expect that. Thank you for promoting me and I will do my best to live up to your expectations . (combination)

- شكراً كثيراً، وسأكون مجدداً أكثر

Thank you so much, and I promise to be or diligent. (Thanking)

- شكراً لك على حسن تقديرك وسأكون عند حسن ظنك

Thank you for your appreciation, and I will try to be at your expectation. (combination)

**Situation 5:**

*"In the supermarket, you ask the cashier to bag your groceries. He does this, and then turns to begin serving the next customer. You pay and pick up your bags to leave".*

Table (4.5) Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Five (cashier)

No .	Gratitude strategies	Gratitude Sub - strategies	AENSs (30)		YANSs (32)		YEFLLs (70)	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Thanking	Simple thanking by only using the word "thank you"	9	30.0%	7	21.9%	27	38.6%
		Thanking by stating the favor.	3	10.0%	8	25.0%	5	7.1%
		Thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor	5	16.7%	5	15.6%	1	1.4%
2	Appreciation	Using the word "appreciate"	4	13.3%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Using the word "appreciate" and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor .	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
3	Positive feeling	Expressing positive reaction to a person.	5	16.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Expressing positive feeling to action.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	4.3%
4	Apology	Using the apologizer words (I am sorry)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Using apology by stating the favor.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Expressing embarrassment.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Criticizing oneself	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5	Recognition of imposition	Acknowledging the imposition	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Stating or diminishing the need for the favor .	0	0.0%	5	15.6%	0	0.0%
6	Repayment	Offering services, (next time is my turn)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Feeling indebted (I owe you one)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Promising future self-improvement.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
7	Other	Here statements (here you are)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Small talk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	7.1%
		Leave taking (good bye, have a nice day)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Joking	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8	Alerter	Attention getter (e.g. Hey, Hi, Well)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Title (e.g. Dr., Professor! Sir!)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Name (e.g. John, Mary)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
9	No expression	0	0.0%	5	15.6%	24	34.4 %	
10	Combination	3	10.0%	2	6.3%	3	4.3 %	
		Total	30	100%	32	100%	70	100%

Table (4.5) demonstrates the occurrence frequency of gratitude strategies in situation five. It shows that the AENSs used only four strategies to express their gratitude in this situation. The strategy of "thanking" via its three sub-strategies was the most frequent by this group as follows. The sub-strategy of 'simple thanking by using the word thank you' occurred for (30.0%) more than 'thanking by stating the favor' (10.0%) and 'thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor' (16.7%). They also used the sub-strategy of 'positive feeling by expressing positive reaction to the person' for (16.7%), followed by "appreciation" with its two sub-strategies which were used by (13.3%) and (3.3%). AENSs used the strategy of "combination" and the sub strategy of 'thanking by stating the favor' with the same percentage (10.0%). On the other hand, the YANSs used the following four strategies in this situation; "thanking", "recognition of imposition", "no expression" and "combination". The sub-strategy of 'thanking by stating the favor' was the most preferred sub-strategy for this group (25.0%), followed by 'simple thanking by stating the word thank you' (21.9%). Besides, they used the sub-strategies 'thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor', 'stating or diminishing the need for the favor' and the strategy "no expression" with the same percentage of frequency (15.6%) and the strategy of "combination" was the least frequent strategy by YANSs (6.3%). In the case of the YEFLLs, they employed seven strategies in this situation: "thanking", "appreciation", "positive feeling", "no expression", "apology", "combination" and "small talk". Their most preferred sub-strategy was 'simple thanking by only using the word thank you' (38.6%), followed by the strategy of "no expression" (34.4%). The sub-strategies of 'thanking by stating the favor' and 'small talk' were also used with the same frequency (7.1%). Moreover, they employed the sub-strategy of 'expressing positive feeling to action'

and the strategy of "combination" with the same percentage (4.3%) while the remaining sub-strategies 'thanking and mention the imposition caused by the favor', 'using the word appreciate' and 'expressing embarrassment' were the least frequent ones with the same percentage (1.4%).

To sum up, it is observed that in situation five "thanking" was the most preferred strategy for all the three groups with different percentage (YANSs (62.5%) against YEFLLs (47.1%) and AENSs (56.7%)). However, the YEFLLs used "no expression" for (34.4%) more than the YANSs (15.6%) while none of the AENSs used it at all. For the YANSs and YEFLLs, it seems that they are of the view that in such a situation where the favor is done as a part of interlocutor's job, there is no need to express gratitude.

Example for YANSs responses in situation five:

- ابتسم في وجهه وأشكره

I will smile at him and offer him my thanks. (Thanking)

- اشكرك يا أخي على مساعدتك وعلى تواضعك معي

Thank you brother for helping me humbleness.

- لا يتوجب علي شكره، لأنه جزء من عمله

It doesn't need to thank him because what he does is part of his job. (Recognition of imposition)

- اشكرك على لطفك

Thank you for your kindness. (Thanking)

- شكراً لتعاونك

Thank you for your cooperation. (Thanking)

**Situation 6:**

*"At the table in a restaurant a friend says, you have something on your face.' You ask where. Your friend tells you. You rub your face and ask, 'Is it off?' your friend says that it is".*

Table (4.6) Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Six (face)

No.	Gratitude strategies	Gratitude Sub - strategies	AENSs (30)		YANSs (32)		YEFLLs (70)	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Thanking	Simple thanking by only using the word "thank you"	4	13.3%	12	37.4%	31	44.5%
		Thanking by stating the favor.	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	5	7.1%
		Thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor	6	20.1%	10	31.3%	7	10.0%
2	Appreciation	Using the word "appreciate"	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Using the word "appreciate" and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
3	Positive feeling	Expressing positive reaction to a person.	8	26.7%	2	6.3%	1	1.4%
		Expressing positive feeling to action.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4	Apology	Using the apologizer words (I am sorry)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Using apology by stating the favor.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Expressing embarrassment.	0	0.0%	1	3.1%	5	7.1%
		Criticizing oneself	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5	Recognition of imposition	Acknowledging the imposition	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Stating or diminishing the need for the favor.	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
6	Repayment	Offering services, (next time is my turn)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Feeling indebted (I owe you one)	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Promising future self-improvement.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
7	Other	Here statements (here you are)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Small talk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Leave taking (good bye, have a nice day)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Joking	1	3.3%	1	3.1%	5	7.1%
8	Alerter	Attention getter (e.g. Hey, Hi, Well)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Title (e.g. Dr. Professor! Sir!)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Name (e.g. John, Mary)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
9	No expression	0	0.0%	2	6.3%	7	10.0%	
10	Combination	8	26.7%	4	12.5%	7	10.0%	
Total			30	100%	32	100%	70	100%

From the results given in Table (4.6) above, it can be noted that the strategy of "thanking" with its sub-strategies was the most preferred by the three groups of

participants. The YEFLLs used 'simple thanking by using the word thank you' for (44.5%) more than the other two groups YANSs (37.4%) and AENSs (13.3%). In addition, the strategy of 'thanking by stating the favor' was used by the YEFLLs (7.1%) more than AENSs (3.3%) while YANSs didn't use it. The sub-strategy of 'thanking and mention the imposition caused by the favor', on the other hand, was used by the YANSs (31.3%) more than AENSs (20.1%) and YEFLLs (10.0%). Similarly, the strategy of "positive feeling" by 'expressing positive reaction to a parson' was employed by the three groups with different percentages, (26.7%) by the AENSs, more than YANSs and YEFLLs who used it for (6.3%) and (1.4%) respectively. Furthermore, "joking" strategy was used by the YEFLLs for (7.1%) more than YANSs (3.1%) and AENSs (3.3%). In addition, the strategy of "combination" was used by AENSs more than YEFLLs and YANSs (26.7% vs. 10.0% and 12.5%), respectively.

To conclude, the results presented above show that the YEFLLs expressed their gratitude in this situation by using eight different strategies while both the AENSs and YANSs used six strategies only. Moreover, it is observed that the strategy of "no expression" and the sub-strategy of 'apology by expressing embarrassment' were employed only by the YEFLLs and YANSs.

Example for YANSs responses in situation six:

- شكراً جزيلاً يا صديقي، لأنك المرآة الحقيقية لي

Thank you so much, dear friend. You are like are a reflecting mirror for me through which I can see my real personality. (combination)

- تسلم، نعم الصديق أنت

Thank you, you are such a good friend. (Combination)

- شكراً لك

Thank you. (Thanking)

- شكراً لك لأنك، أخبرتني بذلك

Thank you for telling me about that. (Thanking)

- شكراً على ملاحظتك الجيدة

Thank you for your good note. (Thanking)

#### **Situation 7:**

*"You find yourself in sudden need of money \$500. You mention this to a friend. Your friend immediately offers to lend it you. At first you say, 'Oh no, I didn't mean it as a request. I couldn't take it.' Your friend says, 'Really, it's all right. What are friends for?' Your friend insists again, and you take the check".*

Table 4.7 Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Seven (\$500 loan)

No.	Gratitude strategies	Gratitude Sub – strategies	AENSs (30)		YANSs (32)		YEFLLs (70)	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Thanking	Simple thanking by only using the word "thank you"	2	6.7%	9	28.1%	19	27.2%
		Thanking by stating the favor	0	0.0%	1	3.1%	5	7.1%
		Thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor	6	20.0%	4	12.5%	2	2.9%
2	Appreciation	Using the word "appreciate"	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	7.1%
		Using the word "appreciate" and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor .	2	6.7%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
3	Positive feeling	Expressing positive reaction to a person.	5	16.7%	0	0.0%	10	14.3%
		Expressing positive feeling to action.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4	Apology	Using the apologizer words (I am sorry)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Using apology by stating the favor.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Expressing embarrassment.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
		Criticizing oneself	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5	Recognition of imposition	Acknowledging the imposition	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Stating or diminishing the need for the favor .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
6	Repayment	Offering services, (next time is my turn)	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	5	7.1%
		Feeling indebted (I owe you one)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Promising future self-improvement.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
7	Other	Here statements (here you are)	2	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Small talk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Leave taking (good bye, have a nice day)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Joking	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8	Alerter	Attention getter (e.g. Hey, Hi, Well)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Title (e.g. Dr., Professor! Sir!)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Name (e.g. John, Mary)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
9	No expression		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
10	Combination		12	39.9%	18	56.3%	19	27.2%
	Total		30	100%	32	100%	70	100%

According to the results obtained from the participants in situation seven, it appears that "combination" was the first preferred strategy for AENSs and YANSs, it is used by YANSs (56.3%) and AENSs (39.3%) more than YEFLLs (27.2%). While the first

preferred strategy for YEFLLs was "thanking" with its sub-strategies. To illustrate, the YEFLLs and YANSs employed the sub-strategy of 'simple thanking by only using the word thank you' with approximately the same high percentage (28.1%) and (27.2%) respectively, the AENSs used it only for (6.7%). In addition, the sub-strategy of 'thanking by stating the favor' was used only by the YEFLLs (7.1%) and YANSs (3.1%) whereas none of the AENSs used it at all. On the other hand, the AENSs employed the sub-strategy of 'thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor' with a quite high percentage (20.0%) against the YEFLLs (2.9%) and YANSs (12.5%). Besides, the strategy of "positive feeling" by 'expressing positive reaction to a person' was the third preferred strategy for the AENSs and YEFLL with approximately the same percentage (16.7%) and (14.3%) respectively while no one of the YANSs used it. Similarly, the strategy of "appreciation" by 'mentioning the imposition caused by the favor' was used only by the YEFLLs for (1.4%) and AENSs (6.7%). In addition, the strategy of 'repayment by offering services' was used by the YEFLLs (7.1%) more than AENSs (3.3%) whereas the YANSs did not employ this strategy. The sub-strategy of 'here statements' was employed only by the AENSs for (6.7%) while the sub-strategies of 'no expression' and 'stating or diminishing the need for the favor' were employed only by the YEFLLs with the same percentage of occurrence (1.4%). Moreover, the YEFLLs employed the sub-strategies of 'apology by expressing embarrassment' and 'appreciation by using the word appreciate' with different frequencies, but no one of the AENSs and YANSs used these sub-strategies. Furthermore, it can be noted that while the YEFLLs used ten sub-strategies to express their gratitude in this situation, the AENSs employed only five sub-strategies and the YANSs used only four.

Example for YANSs responses in situation seven:

- شكراً لك لأنك دائماً بجانبى بدون مصالح

- Thank you, for being always by my side without looking for personal interest.  
(Thanking)

- الله يحفظك

May Allah protect you. (prayers)

- شكراً لك، انه شيء محرج

Thank you, it's an embarrassing situation. (combination)

- أشكراً لك، وجزاك الله خيراً، حقاً الصديق وقت الضيق

Thank you, may Allah reward you. It is true that 'Friend in need is friend indeed'.  
(combination)

- شكراً لك وأنا سوف أكون عون لك في وقت حاجتك لي يا عزيزي

Thank you my dear, I will help you when you need that. (combination)

### **Situation 8:**

*"You are studying in another city. Both you and your roommate work. You come home late from work and find that your roommate has done some work around the house that you had promised to do, but had not a chance to do".*

Table 4.8 Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation eight (house work):

No.	Gratitude strategies	Gratitude Sub - strategies	AENSs (30)		YANSs (32)		YEFLs (70)	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Thanking	Simple thanking by only using the word "thank you"	2	6.7%	6	18.8%	15	21.3%
		Thanking by stating the favor.	1	3.3%	2	6.3%	2	2.9%
		Thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor	3	10.0%	4	12.5%	1	1.4%
2	Appreciation	Using the word "appreciate"	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Using the word "appreciate" and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
3	Positive feeling	Expressing positive reaction to a person.	3	10.0%	4	12.5%	4	5.7%
		Expressing positive feeling to action.	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4	Apology	Using the apologizer words (I am sorry)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	4.3%
		Using apology by stating the favor .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	4.3%
		Expressing embarrassment .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
		Criticizing oneself	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5	Recognition of imposition	Acknowledging the imposition	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	4.3%
		Stating or diminishing the need for the favor .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
6	Repayment	Offering services, (next time is my turn)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	11.4%
		Feeling indebted (I owe you one)	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Promising future self-improvement.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
7	Other	Here statements (here you are)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Small talk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Leave taking (good bye, have a nice day)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Joking	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8	Alerter	Attention getter (e.g. Hey, Hi, Well)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Title (e.g. Dr., Professor! Sir!)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Name (e.g. John, Mary)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
9	No expression	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%	
10	Combination	17	56.8%	16	49.9%	23	33.0%	
Total			30	100%	32	100%	70	100%

In situation eight, the three groups showed higher frequency in using the strategy of "combination" more than the other strategies. AENSs and YANSs employed this strategy more than YEFLLs (56.8% and 49.9% vs. 33.0%), respectively. The three groups preferred the strategy of "thanking" with its sub-strategies as the second preferred strategy. Nevertheless, while the YEFLLs and YANSs showed more preference for using 'simple thanking by only using the word thank you' (21.3%) and (18.8%) respectively, the AENSs preferred more to use 'thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor' employed (10.0%) against the other sub-strategies of "thanking". In addition, the sub-strategy of 'expressing positive reaction to a person' was used by the YANSs for (12.5%) and AENSs for (10.0%) whereas the YEFLLs used it only for (5.7%). Moreover, the sub-strategies of 'appreciation by using the word appreciate', 'expressing positive reaction to action' and 'apology by criticizing oneself' were employed by the AENSs with the same percentage (3.3%) whereas no one of the YEFLLs and YANSs used them at all. A noticeable gap in the use of gratitude strategies in this situation can be observed in the number of strategies employed by the YEFLLs against the other two groups. While the YEFLLs used all the strategies except "appreciation" and "alserter", only three strategies were employed by the YANSs and six strategies by the AENSs.

Example for YANSs responses in situation eight:

- شكراً لك، ولكن لا يتوجب عليك عمل ذلك

Thank you, but you don't have to do that. (combination)

- شكراً لك، سوف اعوضك في المرة القادمة

Thank you, I will make it up for you next time. (combination)

- شكراً لك، أقدر ما تعمل من أجلي

Thank you, I appreciate what you do for me. (combination)

- شكراً جزيلاً

Thank you so much.

- شكراً جزيلاً، أعتذر على الإزعاج

Thank you, I am really sorry for bothering you.

**Situation 9:**

*Your friend suggests going out to lunch. You say that you'd like to go, but you only have \$2. Your friend says. 'Ah, don't worry. I'll treat you today.' Your friend takes you to a very nice restaurant –a much more expensive one than you usually go to. You have a wonderful meal. Your friend pays, and you get up to leave.*

Table 4.9 Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation nine (lunch):

No.	Gratitude strategies	Gratitude Sub - strategies	AENSs (30)		YANSs (32)		YEFLLs (70)	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Thanking	Simple thanking by only using the word "thank you"	2	6.7%	8	25.0%	14	20.0%
		Thanking by stating the favor	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
		Thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor	4	13.3%	6	18.8%	9	12.9%
2	Appreciation	Using the word "appreciate"	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Using the word "appreciate" and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
3	Positive feeling	Expressing positive reaction to a person .	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Expressing positive feeling to action.	2	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4	Apology	Using the apologizer words (I am sorry)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Using apology by stating the favor .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Expressing embarrassment	0	0.0%	1	3.1%	1	1.4%
		Criticizing oneself	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5	Recognition of imposition	Acknowledging the imposition	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Stating or diminishing the need for the favor .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
6	Repayment	Offering services, (next time is my turn)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	12.9%
		Feeling indebted (I owe you one)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Promising future self-improvement	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
7	Other	Here statements (here you are)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Small talk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Leave taking (good bye, have a nice day)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Joking	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8	Alerter	Attention getter (e.g. Hey, Hi, Well)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Title (e.g. Dr, Professor! Sir!)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Name (e.g. John, Mary)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
9	No expression		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	4.3%
10	Combination		21	70.0%	17	53.1%	27	38.5%
	Total		30	100%	32	100%	70	100%

The results displayed in Table (4.9) reflect a remarkable hint about YEFLLs' low level of pragmatic competence in producing gratitude in English. While both of AENSs and of YANSs employed only three strategies in situation nine, YEFLLs used eight strategies. The strategy of "combination" was the first common strategy by the three groups, which was used by AENSs more than YANSs and YEFLLs (70.0% vs. 53.1% and 38.5%), respectively. Although, the strategy of "thanking" was the second common strategy among the three groups, there was a divergence in the use of its sub-strategies. For example, 'simple thanking by only using the word thank you' was used by YANSs (25.0%) and YEFLLs (20.0%) more than AENSs (6.7%), whereas 'thanking by stating the favor' was used only by YEFLLs (2.9%). Moreover, the sub-strategy of 'thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor' was employed more frequently by YANSs (18.8%) and AENSs (13.3%) than YEFLLs (12.9%). YEFLLs appeared more similar to YANSs as the sub-strategy of 'apology by expressing embarrassment' was employed by these two groups (1.4% and 3.1% respectively), but not by AENSs. However, the sub-strategy of 'expressing positive reaction to person', on the other hand was applied by AENSs and YEFLLs, but not by YANSs. While the sub-strategies of 'appreciation by using appreciate', 'repayment by feeling indebted', 'repayment by offering services', 'recognition the imposition by diminishing the need for the favor' and the strategy of "no expression" was used only by YEFLLs.

Example for YANSs responses in situation nine:

- أنا محرج جداً

I really feel too embarrassed. (Apology)

- شكراً يا صديقي، وأنت مدعو للغداء على حسابي في المرة القادمة

Thank you dear my friend. You are invited for dinner next time on me. (combination)

- شكراً سأعوضك عنها في المرة القادمة

Thank you, I will make it up for you next time. (combination)

- شكراً جزيلاً ومعتذرة على الازعاج

Thank you so much and I am really sorry for bothering you. (combination)

- شكراً من القلب معروفاً لك لن أنساه مهما عشت

Please accept my heartfelt thanks. I will never forget your favor forever. (Thanking)

#### **Situation 10:**

*"You have just gotten an admission from a foreign university. A close friend in the university tells you she has organized a farewell party for you".*

Table 4.10 Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Ten (farewell party)

No.	Gratitude strategies	Gratitude Sub- strategies	AENSs (30)		YANSs (32)		YEFLLs (70)	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Thanking	Simple thanking by only using the word "thank you"	0	0.0%	7	21.9%	31	44.3%
		Thanking by stating the favor .	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor	5	16.7%	8	25.1%	4	5.7%
2	Appreciation	Using the word "appreciate"	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Using the word "appreciate" and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
3	Positive feeling	Expressing positive reaction to a person .	2	6.7%	5	15.6%	7	10.0%
		Expressing positive feeling to action.	0	0.0%	1	3.1%	2	2.9%
4	Apology	Using the apologizer words (I am sorry)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Using apology by stating the favor .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
		Expressing embarrassment .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Criticizing oneself	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5	Recognition of imposition	Acknowledging the imposition	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Stating or diminishing the need for the favor .	0	0.0%	1	3.1%	4	5.7%
6	Repayment	Offering services, (next time is my turn)	0	0.0%	1	3.1%	0	0.0%
		Feeling indebted (I owe you one)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Promising future self-improvement.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
7	Other	Here statements (here you are)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Small talk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Leave taking (good bye, have a nice day)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Joking	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8	Alerter	Attention getter (e.g. Hey, Hi, Well)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Title (e.g. Dr., Professor! Sir!)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Name (e.g. John, Mary)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
9	No expression	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%	
10	Combination	22	73.3%	9	28.1%	14	20.0%	
		Total	30	100%	32	100%	70	100%

The results obtained from the participants in situation ten provide more clues on the low level of pragmatic competence exhibited by YEFLLs in the formation of gratitude speech in English. To witness, according to the results presented in Table (4.10) above, the strategy of "combination" was used more frequently by AENSs (73.3%) rather than YEFLLs (20.0%) and YANSs (28.1%). In addition, the sub-strategy of 'simple thanking by only using the word thank you' was used more frequently by YANSs (21.9%) and YEFLLs (44.3 %) only; whereas the sub-strategy of 'thanking by stating the favor' was used less frequently by AENSs (3.3%) and YEFLLs (1.4%) only. Moreover, the sub-strategy of 'thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor' was employed more frequently by YANSs (25.1%) and AENSs (16.7%) than YEFLLs (5.7%). Similarly, the strategy of "positive feeling" was employed more frequently by YANSs (18.7%) and YEFLLs (12.9%) but less frequently by AENSs (6.7%). On the other hand, the sub-strategy of 'repayment by offering services' was employed only by YANSs (3.1%), the sub-strategies of 'appreciation by using the word appreciate', 'apology by using the apologizer words I am sorry', 'expressing embarrassment', 'apology by using Apology by stating the favor' and the strategy of "no expression" were employed by YEFLLs only.

Example for YANSs responses in situation ten:

- أعانق صديقي بحرارة وأقول له شكراً لك على المفاجأة وأنا أيضاً حزين لفراقك

I will warmly hug my friend and thank him for the surprise. I will also express my sadness for leaving him /her. (Combination)

- شكراً لك يا أعز الناس

Thank you, my dear friend. (Thanking)

- أنت صديق رائع، سأشتاق لك كثيراً

You are such a great friend. I will really miss you so much. (Positive feeling)

- الفرح الشديد، والامتنان

I will express my great happiness and deepest gratitude. (Combination)

- شكراً لك، ربي ما يجرمني منك

Thank you, may God save our friendship. (Combination)

### **Situation 11:**

*"You have just gotten your hair cut in a new style, and you like it better than the old one. Your friend sees it and you ask him what he thinks. He says, `Hey, you`ve got a new haircut. It looks nice"*

Table 4.11 Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation eleven (Hairstyle)

No.	Gratitude strategies	Gratitude Sub - strategies	AENSs (30)		YANSs (32)		YEFLLs (70)	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Thanking	Simple thanking by only using the word "thank you"	7	23.4%	7	21.9%	27	38.6%
		Thanking by stating the favor .	1	3.3%	1	3.1%	1	1.4%
		Thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor	6	20.0%	9	28.0%	7	10.0%
2	Appreciation	Using the word "appreciate"	0	0.0%	6	18.8%	11	15.7%
		Using the word "appreciate" and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
3	Positive feeling	Expressing positive reaction to a person .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Expressing positive feeling to action.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4	Apology	Using the apologizer words (I am sorry)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Using apology by stating the favor .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Expressing embarrassment .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Criticizing oneself	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5	Recognition of imposition	Acknowledging the imposition	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Stating or diminishing the need for the favor .	0	0.0%	2	6.3%	0	0.0%
6	Repayment	Offering services, (next time is my turn)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Feeling indebted (I owe you one)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Promising future self-improvement.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
7	Other	Here statements (here you are)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Small talk	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	7	10.0%
		Leave taking (good bye, have a nice day)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Joking	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8	Alerter	Attention getter (e.g. Hey, Hi, Well)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Title (e.g. Dr., Professor! Sir!)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	4.3%
		Name (e.g. John, Mary)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
9	No expression	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	8	11.4 %	
10	Combination	15	50.0%	7	21.9%	6	8.6%	
	Total	30	100%	32	100%	70	100%	

Table (4.11) reveals that "thanking" remains the dominating strategy among YANSs and YEFLLs participants in producing the speech act of gratitude. Despite the variation in sub-strategy selection, the responses presented approximate frequencies of occurrence in the total use of thanking sub-strategies, AENSs (46.7%), YANSs (53.1%) and YEFLLs (50.0%). However, YANSs and YEFLLs were different from AENSs in the use of 'using the word appreciate' which was used for (18.8%) by YANSs and (15.7%) by YEFLLs, but

never used by AENSs. Whereas the strategy of "combination" was used more frequent by AENSs (49.5%), but less frequently by YANSs (21.9%) and YEFLLs (8.6%). Here, YEFLLs showed more adherence to the norms of their native language rather than the target language, reflecting their low level of pragmatic competence in expressing gratitude. Moreover, the sub-strategy of 'small talk' was more frequently employed by YEFLLs (10.0%) than by AENSs (3.3%). Nevertheless, only the YEFLLs group used the strategies of "alerter" (4.3%) and "no expression" (11.4%).

Example for YANSs responses in situation eleven:

- شكراً جزيلاً هذا من ذوقك وحسن حبك لي

Thank you very much, this is out of your good sense and love for me. (Combination)

- هذا من ذوقك وملاحظتك الجميلة

This is out of your good sense and right notice about me. (Positive feeling)

- شكراً على ذوقك الرفيع والجميل

Thank you, this reflects the good sense you have. (Combination)

- أشكرك من أعماق قلبي

Thank you from the bottom of my heart. (Thanking)

### **Situation 12:**

*"You share an apartment with a friend. You're both sitting and relaxing in the living room. You ask your friend to hand you the newspaper which is nearby. Your friend gives you the newspaper".*

Table 4.12 Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Twelve (newspaper)

No.	Gratitude strategies	Gratitude Sub - strategies	AENSs (30)		YANSs (32)		YEFLLs (70)	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Thanking	Simple thanking by only using the word "thank you"	21	70.0%	19	59.4%	46	65.7%
		Thanking by stating the favor .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor	0	0.0%	4	12.5%	3	4.3%
2	Appreciation	Using the word "appreciate"	2	6.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Using the word "appreciate" and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
3	Positive feeling	Expressing positive reaction to a person	4	13.3%	3	9.4%	0	0.0%
		Expressing positive feeling to action.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4	Apology	Using the apologizer words (I am sorry)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Using apology by stating the favor .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Expressing embarrassment .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Criticizing oneself	0	0.0%	1	3.1%	1	1.4%
5	Recognition of imposition	Acknowledging the imposition	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Stating or diminishing the need for the favor .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
6	Repayment	Offering services, (next time is my turn)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Feeling indebted (I owe you one)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Promising future self-improvement.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
7	Other	Here statements (here you are)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Small talk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Leave taking (good bye, have a nice day)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Joking	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8	Alerter	Attention getter (e.g. Hey, Hi, Well)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Title (e.g. Dr., Professor! Sir!)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Name (e.g. John, Mary)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
9	No expression		0	0.0%	0	0.0%	17	24.3%
10	Combination		3	10.0%	5	15.6%	0	0.0%
	Total		30	100%	32	100%	70	100%

Table (4.12) shows that the highest frequency of using the sub-strategy of ‘simple thanking by only using the word thank you’ occurred in situation twelve. Although YEFLLs were closer to AENSs in using this sub-strategy (65.7% and 70.0% respectively), they were more adherent to YANSs in using the sub-strategy of 'thanking and mentioning

the imposition caused by the favor', which was not used by AENSs at all. Similarly, the sub-strategy of 'apology by criticizing oneself' was used with low percentages by YANSs (3.1%) and YEFLLs (1.4%), whereas no one of the AENSs used it. In addition, the sub-strategy of 'positive feeling by expressing positive reaction to a person' was employed by AENSs (13.3%) and YANSs (9.4%) while YEFLLs did not use any one of them. Besides, YEFLLs were distinct from the other two groups by using the strategies of "recognition of imposition", "*alterer*" and "on expression", which were used only by them with different percentage (2.9%), (1.4%) and (24.3%), respectively. In contrast, YEFLLs didn't use the strategy of "combination" in this situation whereas AENSs and YANSs used it by (10.0%) and (15.6%), respectively.

Example for YANSs responses in situation twelve:

- اشكرك لأنك صديق صدوق

Thank you for being an honest friend. (Thanking)

- هذا لطف كبير منك

It is a great kindness out you. (Positive feeling)

- شكراً جزيلاً

Thank you so much. (Thanking)

- أشكرك يا صديقي على لطفك وكرم أخلاقك

Thank you my dear friend for your kindness and proper conduct. (Thanking)

- شكراً وسوف اخدمك في الافراح

Thank you, I will help you next time. (Combination)

**Situation 13:**

*"You enter a parking garage. As the parking attendant gives you the parking voucher, you hand him the money and ask him about the empty space".*

Table 4.13 Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Thirteen (parking)

No.	Gratitude strategies	Gratitude Sub - strategies	AENSs (30)		YANSs (32)		YEFLLs (70)	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Thanking	Simple thanking by only using the word "thank you".	6	20.0%	18	56.3%	32	45.7%
		Thanking by stating the favor.	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
		Thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor	9	30.0%	9	28.0%	3	4.3%
2	Appreciation	Using the word "appreciate"	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
		Using the word "appreciate" and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor .	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
3	Positive feeling	Expressing positive reaction to a person	5	16.8%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Expressing positive feeling to action.	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
4	Apology	Using the apologizer words (I am sorry)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Using apology by stating the favor.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Expressing embarrassment.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Criticizing oneself	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5	Recognition of imposition	Acknowledging the imposition	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Stating or diminishing the need for the favor.	0	0.0%	2	6.3%	3	4.3%
6	Repayment	Offering services, (next time is my turn)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Feeling indebted (I owe you one)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Promising future self-improvement.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
7	Other	Here statements (here you are)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Small talk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	1.4%
		Leave taking (good bye, have a nice day)	1	3.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Joking	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8	Alerter	Attention getter (e.g. Hey, Hi, Well)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Title (e.g. Dr., Professor! Sir!)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Name (e.g. John, Mary)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
9	No expression	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	25	35.7%	
10	Combination	6	20.0%	3	9.4%	1	1.4%	
		Total	30	100%	32	100%	70	100%

According to the results provided in Table (4.13), YEFLLs exhibited further sorts of violation to the target language norms of gratitude. For instance, in the selection of thanking sub-strategies. they were closer to YANSs in using 'simple thanking by only using

the word 'thank you' than to AENSs (45.7%, 56.3% and 20.0%), respectively. While in using 'thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor' they were less frequent (4.3%) than AENSs (30.0%) and YANSs (28.1%). The sub-strategy of 'thanking by stating the favor', on the other hand, was used less frequently by AENSs (3.3%) and YEFLLs (2.9%), whereas YANSs did not use it. In addition, the strategy of 'recognition of imposition by Stating or diminishing the need for the favor' was used by YANSs (6.3%) and YEFLLs (4.3%) while no one of AENSs used it. Moreover, AENSs employed the strategy of "combination" (20.0%) more than YANSs (9.4%) and YEFLLs (1.4%). AENSs also employed the strategy of 'positive feeling by expressing positive reaction to a person' (16.8%) more frequently than YEFLLs (1.4%). Furthermore, AENSs used the sub-strategies of 'appreciation by using the word 'appreciate', 'mentioning the imposition caused by the favor', 'positive feeling by expressing positive feeling to action', and 'Leave taking' with the same percentage (1.3%), whereas no one of YEFLLs and YANSs used them.

Example for YANSs responses in situation thirteen:

- شكراً لتعاونك. أنت مجتهد في عملك ورائع في أداءك

Thank you for help, you are such a diligent and a great person. (combination)

- أشكرك لأنك دليتي على الموقف المناسب لسيارتي

Thank you for guiding me to the suitable place for parking my car. (Thanking)

- شكراً لك وجزاك الله خيراً

Thank you, may Allah reward you. (Combination)

- اشكرك على تعاونك ومساعدتك لي

Thank you for your cooperation and help with me . (Thanking)

- شكراً على العمل الرائع الذي قمت به

Thank you for the great job you have done. (Thanking)

**Situation 14:**

*"You have been invited to the home of a rather new friend. You have dinner with him and his family and a few other friends of theirs. The food was great, and you really enjoyed the evening. As you leave, your hosts accompany you to the door"*

Table 4.14 Frequency of Using Gratitude Strategies in Situation Fourteen (dinner party)

N o.	Gratitude strategies	Gratitude Sub – strategies	AENSs (30)		YANSs (32)		YEFLLs (70)	
			N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)
1	Thanking	Simple thanking by only using the word "thank you"	0	0.0%	3	9.4%	8	11.4%
		Thanking by stating the favor	0	0.0%	2	6.3%	4	5.7%
		Thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor	6	20.0%	6	18.8%	12	17.1%
2	Appreciation	Using the word "appreciate"	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Using the word "appreciate" and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
3	Positive feeling	Expressing positive reaction to a person	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	4.3%
		Expressing positive feeling to action.	1	3.3%	3	9.4%	12	17.1%
4	Apology	Using the apologizer words (I am sorry)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Using apology by stating the favor	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Expressing embarrassment .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Criticizing oneself	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
5	Recognition of imposition	Acknowledging the imposition	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Stating or diminishing the need for the favor .	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
6	Repayment	Offering services, (next time is my turn)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Feeling indebted (I owe you one)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Promising future self-improvement.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
7	Other	Here statements (here you are)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Small talk	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Leave taking (good bye, have a nice day)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%
		Joking	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
8	Alerter	Attention getter (e.g. Hey, Hi, Well)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Title (e.g. Dr., Professor! Sir!)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
		Name (e.g. John, Mary)	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
9	No expression	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	2.9%	
10	Combination	23	76.7%	18	56.1%	27	38.6%	
		Total	30	100%	32	100%	70	100%

In situation fourteen (dinner party), YEFLLs were, again, different from AENSs in their use of gratitude strategies. According to the results demonstrated in Table (4.14), YEFLLs was used the strategy of "combination" (38.6%) less frequently than YANSs (56.1%) and AENSs (76.7%). In addition, the sub-strategies of "thanking" i.e., 'simple thanking by only using the word thank you' and 'thanking by stating the favor' were employed by YEFLLs (11.4%), (5.7%) and YANSs (9.4%), (6.3%), but never used by AENSs. However, the similar frequency of the sub-strategy 'thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor', which was used by AENSs (20.0%), YANSs (18.8%) and YEFLLs (17.1%) does not provide any indication of pragmatic competence by YEFLLs as it was used quite similarly by the three groups. Besides, YEFLLs were different from AENSs in using the sub-strategy of 'expressing positive feeling to action' which was used by the two groups for (17.1%) and (3.3%) respectively, whereas YANSs used it for (9.4%). In addition, YEFLLs were distinct from the other two groups in using some other sub-strategies, such as 'leave taking', 'expressing positive reaction to a person' and the strategy of "no expression".

Example for YANSs responses in situation fourteen:

- شكراً جزيلاً لقد أمضيت وقتاً ممتعاً معكم -

Thank you very much, I spent very interesting time with you. (Thanking)

- أكرمكم الله وأدامكم -

May God bless you and protect you. (Prayers)

- شكراً على اهتمامكم بي ولكم جزيل الشكر -

Thank you so much for help and for taking care of me. (Thanking)

- اشكرك على لطفك وكرمك. انا محظوظ لأنني صديق عائلة طيبة كعائلتكم -

Thank you for your kindness and generosity. I am lucky because I am a friend to your kindness family. (Combination)

سلمت لقد سررت كثيراً لقضاء هذا المساء معكم -

Thank you, I feel happy to spend this evening with you. (Combination)

#### **4.2.1.1 Summary of the Types of Gratitude Strategies Used by AENSs and YEFLLs and YANSs**

Based on data analysis above, this sub-section is meant to provide an insightful image of YEFLLs' pragmatic competence in English through eliciting their main aspects of adherence and/or violation of gratitude strategies followed by AENSs. It is observed that AENSs, YEFLLs and YANSs utilized all the main strategies of gratitude, though they differed in the frequencies and percentages of using such strategies. The differences exhibited by the three groups in using gratitude strategies varied between big and minor.

Whereas some strategies were very common in use by the three groups, some other strategies were more preferred by one group rather than the others. The most frequent main gratitude strategy of Chang's taxonomy among the three groups was 'thanking' with its three sub-strategies. The three groups showed high frequency in using the strategy of "thanking" in most of the situations, (54.0%) by YANSs, (36.6%) by AENSs and (44.1%) by YEFLLs. They also showed variation in the use of "thanking" sub-strategies according to the context of the situation. For example, 'simple thanking by only using the word "thank you"' was the most common sub-strategy employed by YEFLLs and YANSs while the sub-strategy of 'thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor' was more common sub-strategy used by AENSs. The least frequent sub-strategy used by the three groups was 'thanking by stating the favor' (Appendix III).

The second common main strategy employed by AENSs and YANSs was 'positive feeling' and its two sub-strategies. They employed 'expressing positive reaction to a person' more than 'expressing positive feeling to the action' according to the situation itself. The sub-strategy 'positive feeling' was employed (14.5%) by AENSs, whereas YANSs employed it at (5.7%), and (6.1%) by YEFLLs. However, the second common strategy for YEFLLs was 'no expression' at (10.3%), whereas 'positive feeling' was the third common for them at (6.1%). It is noted that YEFLLs and YANSs used the strategy of "positive feeling" approximately at same percentage (Appendix III).

The strategy of "appreciation" by using the word 'appreciate' was commonly used by AENSs at (4.2%) more than by YEFLLs at (3.1%) and YANSs at (1.5%) of overall strategies. However, it was rarely employed by YANSs who preferred to use it in combination with some other strategies rather than using it alone as a main strategy. Similarly, 'recognition of imposition by stating or diminishing the need for the favor' was commonly employed by YANSs and YEFLLs more than by AENSs. Moreover, YEFLLs employed the strategy of 'repayment' more than the YANSs and AENSs. It could be noticed that YEFLLs and YANSs employed the strategy of 'repayment' in the case of (big and small loan) situations, such as "*I will pay it back as soon as I can*" while AENSs used it more in the case of (dinner party and lunch) situations, AENSs used 'positive feeling' and 'appreciation' to express their gratitude in the case of (big and small loan). On the other hand, the strategies "other", "repayment", "apology" and "alerter" were hardly used alone as main strategies by YANSs and AENSs while it employed more by YEFLLs. However, the participants of the three groups employed these strategies in combination with other strategies more than using them alone, such as in '*Oh, wow. That's very nice. Thank you*'

in which "alerter", "attention getter", "expressing positive reaction to action" and "thanking" were combined together for expressing gratitude.

On the other hand, the participants of three groups utilized the strategy of "combination" which isn't not included in Chang's taxonomy with different frequent and percentage. AENSs preferred using a complex and indirect way to express their gratitude, that's why they preferred using "combination" in most of the situations more than the other two groups; (30.3% by YANSs and 21.3% by YEFLLs vs. 42.1% by AENSs) (Appendix III). The "combination" will be explained in details in section two of data analysis.

To conclude, it could be inferred from the results obtained in this study that, in accordance with many previous studies (Jung 1994, Díaz Pérez 2005, Chang 2005, Farina and Suleiman 2009, Ozdemir & Revani 2010), gratitude speech act strategies are universal as they are used by people of different cultures with different frequencies according to the situation. For example, '*thank you for your help*' occurs more when there is an actual service done for the person while "repayment" occurs more when someone invites a person to lunch or a party, such as '*Thank you for lunch. Next time it's my treat*'. Similarly, "positive feeling" such as '*You're a lifesaver*' is followed to express cases of gratitude when a someone is offered a big or unexpected help, lending money (big loan), for instance. However, YEFLLs were found closer to YANSs in their using of gratitude strategies rather than to AENSs, for example, YEFLLs and YANSs employed the strategies of "thanking", "positive feeling", "recognition of the imposition" and "no expression" with approximately the same percentage.

It is also worth-mentioning that some strategies, not included in Cheng's (2005) taxonomy, were detected in this study. In fact, these strategies are culture-specific

expressions of gratitude utilized by YANSs at low frequencies, such as "سلمت يداك، بارك الله" (salemt yiadak, bark allah feik) meaning 'May God Bless you'. These prayer-expressions were used instead of saying 'thank you', and coded as 'simple thanking'.

#### **4.2.2 YEFLL's Pragmatic Competence in Producing the Speech Act of Gratitude**

This sub-section is devoted to investigate YEFLLs' pragmatic competence through analyzing the extent to which they approximated AENSs' norms of gratitude in terms of strategies combinations utilized for expressing gratitude in English. To achieve this objective, all strategies combinations made by AENSs, YANSs and YEFLLs in the fourteen situations are listed in Table (4.15), presenting their frequencies and percentages of occurrence. To test whether the frequency of gratitude strategy combinations made by YEFLLs are significantly different from the frequency of the same combinations made by AENSs, chi-square test has been manipulated. In this test, if the computed significance value (P value) is either equal to or greater than 0.05, the critical value, then the differences between the frequencies is said to be not significant. This procedure helps in figuring out the extent of approximation demonstrated by the YEFLLs to the norms of gratitude in English and, hence, epitomizing their pragmatic competence on the basis of chi-square values given in Table (4.15) below. YEFLLs' lack of pragmatic competence was reflected in their used of more direct and simpler gratitude strategy than AENSs, and it appears in the significant differences of many gratitude strategies combination between AENSs and YEFLLs.

Table 4.15 Gratitude Strategy Combinations Used by AENSs, YEFLLs and YANSs.

No.	Strategies combination	AENSs (30)		YANSs (32)		YEFLLS (70)		YEFLLS & YANSs		YEFLLS & AENSs	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	Chi-Square	Asym. Sig.	Chi-Square	Asymp . Sig.
1.	TH + EPFA	45	11.8	27	6.0	43	4.4	70.000	.000	18.167	.000
2.	TH +EPRP	39	9.3	45	10.0	41	4.2	86.000	.000	80.000	.000
3.	TH+APP	17	4.0	4	0.9	7	0.7	11.000	.001	24.000	.000
4.	TH+DNF	1	0.2	3	0.7	2	0.2	5.000	.025	4.000	1.000
5.	TH +AP	7	1.7	3	0.7	5	0.5	8.000	.005	12.000	.001
6.	TH+REP	15	3.6	41	9.2	50	5.1	91.000	.000	65.000	.000
7.	TH +EPRP+REP	1	0.2	2	0.4	3	0.3	5.000	.025	4.000	.046
8.	AG +REP	0	0.0	2	0.4	1	0.1	3.000	.083	-	-
9.	AG +TH+AP	2	0.5	0	0.0	2	0.2	-	-	0.000	1
10.	AG +TH	19	4.5	5	1.1	11	1.1	0.000	1.000	30.000	.000
11.	AG +EPFA	4	1.0	0	0.0	6	0.6	-	-	10.000	.002
12.	AG+ EPRP	2	0.5	0	0.0	1	0.1	-	-	3.000	.083
13.	AG +TH +REP	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.2	-	-	-	-
14.	AG +APP	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.1	-	-	-	-
15.	TH+REP+APP	0	0.0	1	0.2	1	0.1	0.000	1	-	-
16.	TH +EPRP+APP	2	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	-	-	-	-
17.	TH +LT	5	1.2	1	0.2	0	0.0	-	-	-	-
18.	TH+EPFA+APP	2	0.5	3	0.7	0	0.0	-	-	-	-
19.	REP+APP	7	1.7	0	0.0	1	0.1	-	-	8.000	.005
20.	AP+REP	0	0.0	2	0.4	0	0.0	-	-	-	-
21.	AG +DNF	1	0.2	1	0.2	0	0.0	-	-	-	-
22.	AG+EPFA+TH	3	0.7	0	0.0	6	0.6	-	-	11.000	.841
23.	AG+EPFA+ EPRP	3	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	-	-	-	-
24.	EPFA+DNF	1	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	-	-	-	-
25.	EPRP+APP	2	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	-	-	-	-
26.	TH+EPFA+APP	1	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	-	-	-	-
27.	AG+AP+TH+ REP	2	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	-	-	-	-
28.	AG+TH+DNF	1	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	-	-	-	-
29.	TH+REP+AP	2	0.5	1	0.2	0	0.0	-	-	-	-
30.	TH+REP+EPFA	3	0.7	1	0.2	1	0.1	0.000	1	4.000	.046
31.	TH+ST	2	0.5	1	0.2	3	0.3	4.000	.046	5.000	.025
32.	EPFA+APP+REP	1	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	-	-	-	-

The total number of the combinations employed by the three groups of participants in this study was thirty-two ranging between (18) binary, (13) triple and (1) quad. A considerable diversity of strategies combination as made by the three groups was detected. To illustrate, the total number of gratitude strategies combination made by AENSs was twenty-seven, whereas the combinations made by YEFLLs were nineteen and the combinations made by YANSs were twelve. YEFLLs and AENSS shared fifteen

combinations while YEFLLs and YANSs shared twelve combinations. Table (4.15) presents all gratitude strategies combinations as employed by the three groups of participants.

According to the results demonstrated in Table (4.15) above, "Thanking + expressing positive feeling to action" (TH+EPFA) was the most varied combination of gratitude strategies in terms of its use by AENSs, YANSs and YEFLLs. To illustrate, the difference in using this combination was exhibited more occasionally between AENSs and YEFLLs. This combination was used for (11.8%) of the responses made by AENSs compared to (4.4%) by YEFLLs. The p-value here was 0.00 lower than 0.05 ( $p < 0.05$ ) which indicates a significant difference between AENSs and YEFLLs. On the other hand, YANSs were less different from YEFLLs as they employed this combination twenty-seven times (6.0%). However, according to chi-square reading, they also showed a significant difference with YEFLLs as the p-value was 0.000 lower than 0.05 ( $p < 0.05$ ). Furthermore, it is noticed that there are three situations in which this combination was not used at all by the three groups in situations two, six and seven. The three highest percentages of occurrence for this combination by AENSs were (0.50%), (0.46%) and (0.23%) in situations fourteen, three and nine respectively, whereas for YEFLLs they were (0.20%), (0.14%) and (0.13%); situations fourteen, three and ten respectively, and for YANSs they were (0.25%), (0.16%) and (0.13%); situations three, four and twelve respectively, (cf. Appendix IV). It was also noted that there was a kind of accordancy between AENSs and YEFLLs in terms of the highest percentages of using (TH+EPFA) and the situation of where it was used. The most frequent occurrences of this combination by these two groups were exhibited in situations fourteen and three. However, (TH+EPFA) was commonly

employed by the YEFLLs and AENSs groups in situation fourteen (dinner party) and in situation three (birthday gift) by YANSs as in the following examples extracted from the participant's responses:

AENSs.

- "Thank you for inviting me. The dinner was delicious."
- "Thank you for the wonderful dinner. The entire meal was delicious and healthy."

YEFLLs

- "Thank you so much, it's a wonderful day in my life to be with you and your family "
- "It was wonderful day, many thanks"

YANSs

" شكراً لك ، على هذه الهدية الرائعة ، انها القميص المفضل لدي "

*(Thank you so much for giving me such a lovely and meaningful gift, it was my blue sweater that I wish to have)*

The second gratitude strategy combination at variance was "thanking + expressing positive reaction to a person" (TH+EPRP), which was used thirty-nine times by AENSs (9.3%) compared to YEFLLs who used it forty-one times (4.2%). The p-value here was 0.00 lower than 0.05 ( $p < 0.05$ ) which indicates a significant difference between AENSs and YEFLLs. On the other hand, YEFLLs were more different from YANSs who used this combination forty-five times (10.0%). Depending on chi-square reading, YEFLLs also showed a significant difference with YANSs as the p-value was 0.00 lower than 0.05 ( $p < 0.05$ ). The three highest percentages of occurrence of this combination by AENSs were

(0.23%), (0.20%) and (0.13%); situations ten, one and six respectively, whereas by YANSs they were (0.25%), (0.22%) and (0.16%); situations seven, eleven and four respectively and by YEFLLs they were (0.11%), (0.09%) and (0.07%); situations fourteen, nine and three respectively, (cf. Appendix IV). It is also observed that the three groups did not use this combination in three situations (five, twelve and thirteen). Moreover, there was no noticeable accordance between the three groups in terms of the highest percentages of using (TH+EPRP) and the situation in which it was used most frequently. To witness, AENSs employed this combination in situation ten (farewell party) more than in the other situations, for example:

- "Our journey together in this college was so good. You were my best friend from the first day. Thank you very much for the farewell party."
- "I'm a lucky person to have a friend like you who is thinking of me. Thank you so much"

YANSs used (TH+EPFP) more in situation four (raise in company), for example:

- "شكراً لك، أنت مدير رائع وتستحق ما نبذل من جهد في شركتك"

*(Thank you, you are really a great manager and you deserved what we did and achieved in this company)*

*(Thank you, you are a great manger.)*

- "اشكرك، نعم المدير انت"

For YEFLLs, (TH+EPFP) was used in situation fourteen (dinner party):

- "Thank you, that is kind of you"
- "Thank you, that is so kind and generous of you"

"Thanking + appreciation" (TH+APP) strategy combination came third in variation among the three groups of participants. According to the results presented in Table (4.15) above, AENSs used this combination seventeen times (4.0%). YEFLLs recorded a low frequency of this combination, seven times (0.7%), and were closer to YANSs who used it for four times only (0.9%). In the use of this combination, both YANSs and AENSs showed a significant difference with YEFLLs where the p-values were .001 ( $p < 0.05$ ) and .000 ( $p < 0.05$ ) respectively. It is observed that this combination was never used by the three groups in many situations (two, five, six, nine, twelve and thirteen). The three highest percentages of occurrence for this combination by AENSs were (0.23%), (0.13%) and (0.07%); situations one, seven and ten respectively. YANSs employed it only in two situations (eight and ten) with the same percentage (0.06%). For YEFLLs, it was employed for (0.04%) in situation one and for (0.01%) in situations four, eight, ten and eleven, equally, (cf. Appendix IV). In general, AENSs showed higher frequency of employing (TH+APP) rather than YEFLLs and YANSs. These examples are extracted from AENSs in situation one (\$500 Loan):

- "Thanks a lot. I truly appreciate you."
- "Thanks. I really appreciate it."

The following example is taken from situation eight (house work) by a YEFLL:

- "Thank you for spending time to do that, I appreciate it "

The example below is extracted from situation eight (house work) by a YANS.

- "شكراً جزيلاً واقدر جهدك الذي تبذله من اجلي"

*(Thank you so much. I appreciate what are you doing for me)*

The fourth instance of variation among the participants was in the combination of "thanking + stating or diminishing the need to the imposition" (TH+DNF) gratitude strategies. This combination showed fewer degrees of differences between the three groups of participants. It was used only one time by AENSs (0.2%), two times by YEFLLs (0.2%) and three times by YANSs (0.7%). The p-value reflected no significant difference between the performance of YEFLLs compared to AENSs – 1.000 ( $p > 0.05$ ), whereas there was a significant difference between YEFLLs and YANSs as the p-value read 0.025 ( $p < 0.05$ ). In addition, it is noticed that this combination was employed by the three groups in situations eight, nine, ten and four, only; more commonly in situation eight. In situations nine and ten, it was used only by YANSs with the same percentage (0.03%) while in situation four it was used only by YEFLLs (0.03%), (cf. Appendix IV). This example is taken from situation eight by an AENS:

- "You didn't have to do that... I was going to do it sooner or later, I just haven't had the time to do it yet. But thanks a lot."

This example is quoted from situation four by a YEFLL:

- "Thank you, but I don't want the raise I just want some days off."

This example is from situation ten by a YANS:

- "اشكرك على ذلك، ولكنني لا أحب حفلات الوداع"

*(Thank you for the party, but you know I don't like the farewell party)*

The fifth combination "thanking + apology" (TH+AP) of gratitude strategies showed fewer degrees of difference between the three groups of participants. This combination was used seven times (1.7%) by AENSs, five times (0.5%) by YEFLLs and three times (0.7%) by YANSs. Although YEFLLs and YANSs were found more similar in

the use of (TH+AP) combination, the p-values reveal a significant difference between the performance of YEFLLs compared to AENSs- .001 ( $p < 0.05$ ), and between YEFLLs compared to YANSs- .005 ( $p < 0.05$ ). In addition, the data collected from the three groups of participants showed that (TH+AP) combination was never used in eight situations (one, three, four, five, nine, eleven, twelve and thirteen). Its two highest percentages of occurrence by AENSs were (0.10%) in situation eight and (0.07) in situation six. Similarly, for YEFLLs the two highest percentages of occurrence were (0.03%) in situation eight and (0.01) in situation six while for YANSs they were (0.06%) and (0.03%) in situations two and seven (cf. Appendix IV). Accordingly, YEFLLs appeared closer to AENSs in the situations where this combination scored the two highest percentages of use. For these two groups, (TH+AP) was more frequent in situation eight (house work) rather than in the other situations. Example of AENSs' responses:

- "You embarrassed me, thank you".

Example responses made by YEFLLs:

- "Sorry if I bother you and Thank you for your favor".

Example responses made by YANSs:

- "المعذرة منك وشكراً لك يا صديقي على القيام بعملتي"

*(I am sorry and thank you for doing my work)*

- "اشعر بالحرج لما قمت به تجاهي مع ذلك شكراً لك"

*(What you do for me, made me felt embarrassed. Thank you.)*

In the case of the sixth combination "thanking + repayment" (TH+REP), where YANSs recorded higher frequency of use compared to the other two groups, it was used forty-one times (9.2%) by YANSs against fifteen times (3.6%) by AENSs and fifty times

(5.1%) by YEFLLs. Occurrence frequency of this combination reveals a significant difference between YEFLLs and the other two groups as the p-value was .000 ( $p < 0.05$ ) in both cases, (Table 4.15). This combination was not utilized by any participant of the three groups in six situations (two, five, six, ten, eleven, and thirteen). The three highest percentages of (TH+REP) frequency by AENSs were in situations nine (0.20%), eight (0.13%) and seven (0.07%). In relation to YEFLLs, they were (0.20%), (0.17%) and (0.14%); situations seven, nine and one while for YANSs they were (0.31%), (0.22%) and (0.19%); situations nine, seven and one, respectively, (cf. Appendix IV). Accordingly, a clear accordance, in relation to combination high frequency and situation nature appeared between the three groups, more particularly between YEFLLs and YANSs. In general, this combination was employed more frequently by all groups in situation nine (lunch), as in the following examples:

YEFLL:

- "Thank you, next time I will pay you "

YANS:

- " شكراً لك وسوف اعيدها لك قريباً "

(Thank you, I will pay you back as soon as I can)

AENS:

- "Thank you for lunch. I'll be in touch soon and would like you to come to my place sometime."

The seventh combination is the triple grouping of "thanking + expressing positive reaction to person + repayment" (TH+EPRP+REP) which was used only three times (0.3%) by YEFLLs, more than YANSs who used it two times (0.4%) and AENSs who used it one time only (0.2%). Occurrence p-values of this combination, as made by YEFLLs against

YANSs and AENSs, were .025 ( $p < 0.05$ ) and .046 ( $p < 0.05$ ) respectively, indicating significant differences in both directions (Table 4.15). In general, this combination was hardly utilized in six situations; (situations eight and four) by YANSs with the same low percentage (0.03%); (situations seven, fourteen and one) by YEFLLs with the same low percentage (0.01%); (situation three) by AENSs for one time only (0.03%), (cf. Appendix IV).

YEFLLs:

- "I feel very grateful to have a boss who appreciates and values her employees. You are a very great boss. Thank you. I look forward to continuing to do great work with you"

YANS:

- " اشكرك هذا لطف منك واعدك انى سوف اكون عند حسن ظنك بي "

(Thank you, this is kind of you. I promise I will be in the best position you expected.)

AENS:

- "Thank you. You are a great friend I will buy you what you wish in your birthday."

The eighth combination "attention getter + repayment" (AG+REP) was employed by YEFLLs only one time (0.1%) and two times by YANSs (0.4%), while none of AENSs used it at all. The underused frequency of this combination made p-value reading between YEFLLs and YANSs was higher than 0.05 indicating no significant difference between the two groups (Table 4.15) above. It was used by YANSs in situations four and nine with the same low percentage (0.03) and by YEFLLs in situation nine (0.01%) (cf. Appendix IV).

YEFLLs:

- "Oh! Next time I will do it for you"

YANSs:

- "يا رجل الناس لبعضها سوف عيدها لك في أقرب وقت ممكن"

(Oh! Man, I will pay you back as soon as I can)

In relation to "attention getter + thanking + apology" (AG+TH+AP) combination, AENSs and YEFLLs groups recorded low frequency of usage by (0.5%) and (0.2%), respectively while it was never used by YANSs. There was no significant difference between AENSs and YEFLLs as the p-value read 1 ( $p>0.05$ ), (Table 4.15). In general, this combination was employed only in three situations; in situations six and eight by AENSs with same low frequency (0.03%) and in situations six and nine by YEFLLs for (0.03%) and (0.01%), respectively (cf. Appendix IV). as in the following examples:

YEFLLs:

- "OMG, you embarrassed me, thank you "

AENSs:

- " Oh, I am so sorry that I didn't keep my promise. Thank you for your help."

The combination "attention getter + thanking" (AG +TH) was used nineteen times (4.5%) by AENSs against eleven times (1.1%) by YEFLLs and five times (1.1%) by YANSs. The p-values reflected a significant difference between the performance of YEFLLs and AENSs- .000 ( $p<0.05$ ), but no significant difference between YEFLLs and YANSs- 1.000 ( $p>0.05$ ). As such, the occurrence frequency of this combination showed

more correspondence between YEFLLs and YANSs than between YEFLLs and AENSs. (AG+TH) was never utilized in five situations (one, two, five, twelve and fourteen). The two highest percentages of occurrence for AENSs were (0.33%) and (0.13%) in situations eleven and four respectively, whereas for YEFLLs they were (0.09%) and (0.03%) in situations eight and three respectively, and for YANSs they were in situations three and four (0.06%) and (0.03%) (cf. Appendix IV). Such variation in occurrence frequency, in terms of situation, reflects another sort of deviation from the side of YEFLLs in following the norms of gratitude made by AENSs. as in the following examples:

YEFLLs:

- " Wow! It is the sweater which I wish to have, Thank you"

AENSs:

- " Wow! Thanks "
- " Oh, many thanks"

YANSs:

- "يا للروعة! شكرا لك على الهدية الجميلة"

*(It is wonderful! Thank you for the beautiful gift)*

In the cases of "attention getter + expressing positive feeling to action" (AG+ EPFA) and " attention getter + expressing positive reaction to person" (AG+ EPRP) combinations, AENSs and YEFLLs groups recorded similar low frequency of usage for (1.0%) against (0.6%), and (0.5%) against (0.1%), respectively. These two combinations were never used by YANSs. However, the p-value of implementing (AG+EPFA) read - .002 ( $p < 0.05$ ), indicating a significant difference between AENSs and YEFLLs whereas

for (AG +EPRP) the p-value -.083 ( $p>0.05$ ) indicated no significant difference between the two groups (Table 4.15).

YEFLLs:

- " Oh, my God. It is very beautiful sweater"
- " Oh, my dear! You are a great friend"

AENSs:

- " Phew! That was the kind of lunch I desperately needed. Really hearty meal! My stomach is processing the amazing meal that we had."
- "Wow!! What a delightful lunch it was! Seriously, I enjoyed it to the fullest!"

YANSs:

- "ما عملت من أجلى يدل على أنك شخص رائع يا أخي العزيز"

*(My dear brother what you do for me indicated that you are a great person)*

The combinations of gratitude strategies "attention getter + thanking+ repayment" (AG+TH+REP) and "attention getter + appreciation" (AG+APP) recorded similar low frequency of use by YEFLLs (0.2%) and (0.1%) in situation eight and ten, respectively, Table 4.15. These two combinations were never used by YANSs and AENSs. This indicated that these two combinations of gratitude strategy were not so common in use.

Regarding the combination of "thanking + repayment + appreciation" (TH+REP+APP), YANSs and YEFLLs groups recorded similar low frequency of usage by (0.2%) and (0.1%), respectively whereas none of AENSs employed it. Though, there

was no significant difference between YANSs and YEFLLs as the p-value read – 1 ( $p>0.05$ ) Table 4.15. On the other hand, the combination of "thanking + expressing positive reaction to person + appreciation" (TH+EPRP+APP) was only employed by AENSs with low frequency (0.5%). In addition, the combinations of "thanking + leave talking" (TH+LT) and "thanking + expressing positive feeling to action + appreciation" (TH+EPFA+APP) recorded low frequency of usage by AENSs and YANSs. None of these combinations were used by YEFLLs.

"Repayment + appreciation" (REP+APP) combination of gratitude strategies were employed by YEFLLs for one time only (0.1%) and by AENSs for seven times (1.7%). No one of YANSs used this combination at all. The p-value .005( $p<0.05$ ) of occurrence frequency indicates a significant difference between YEFLLs and AENSs in this case. This combination was used by AENSs in situation three for (0.20%) and in situation seven for (0.03). YEFLLs used it in situation eight only for (0.01%), (cf. Appendix IV). The combination "apology + repayment" (AP+REP), on the other hand, was used by YANSs only for two times in situation seven with a very low percentage (0.4%). No one of the participants of the other two groups used this combination at all. Furthermore, the combination "attention getter + diminishing the need for the favor" (AG +DNF) of gratitude strategies was used for one time only by both YANSs in situation four and AENSs in situation eight, with the same percentage (0.2%) while no one of YEFLLs used it at all. Accordingly, these two combinations had no p-values for the low frequency of occurrence exhibited by all groups.

Although the combination of gratitude strategies "attention getter + expressing positive feeling to action + thanking" (AG+EPFA+TH) was implemented by AENSs for

(0.7%) and by YEFLLs for (0.6%), the p-value read .841 ( $p > 0.05$ ) showing no significant difference between the two groups (Table 4.15). This combination was used only in five situations; by YEFLLs in situations three (0.07%) and four (0.01%), whereas in situations three, nine and ten it was used by AENSs with the same percentage (0.03%) (cf. Appendix IV).

The combination "Thanking + repayment + expressing positive feeling to action" (TH+REP+EPFA)" was used three times (0.7%) by AENSs against one time (0.1%) by YEFLLs and one time (0.2%) by YANSs. The p-value .046 ( $p < 0.05$ ) reflected a significant difference between the performance of YEFLLs and AENSs, while the p-value .1 ( $p > 0.05$ ) showed no significant difference between YEFLLs and YANSs. It is also observed that this combination was used one time by YANSs in situation fourteen and one time by YEFLLs in situation nine, whereas it was used in both situations (nine and fourteen) by AENSs for (0.03%) and (0.07%), respectively. On the other hand, the combination "thanking + small talk" (TH+ST) came the last combination in variation among the three groups of participants. It was used two times (0.5%) by AENSs compared to YEFLLs who used it three times (0.3%) and YANSs who used it one time only (0.3%). According to the p-values readings (Table 4.15), YEFLLs showed a significant difference against both of YANSs and AENSs where the p values were .046 ( $p < 0.05$ ) and .025 ( $p < 0.05$ ), respectively.

Finally, the remaining eight combinations of gratitude strategies: "(AG+EPFA+EPRP), (EPFA+DNF), (EPRP+APP), (TH+EPFA+APP), (AG+AP+TH+REP) (AG+TH+DNF), (TH+REP+AP) and (EPFA+APP+REP) were used with low frequency by AENSs only. YANSs and YEFLLs never used these combinations. Therefore, their occurrence frequency had no p-values of significant difference.

### **4.2.3 The Influence of YEFLLs' Mother Tongue on Producing Gratitude Strategies in English**

This section is devoted to examining YEFLLs' performance of gratitude speech act and comparing it to AENSs and YANSs in order to find the correlation between the three groups. In relation to the third objective of the current study, this procedure helps in finding out the extent of pragmatic transfer operated by YEFLLs while expressing gratitude in English. The results pertaining to this section revealed some similarities as well as some differences between YEFLLs, on one hand, and the other two groups, AENSs and YANSs, on the other hand. However, YEFLLs were found closer to YANSs in their combinations of gratitude strategies rather than to AENSs. Negative transfer of L1 pragmatic norms of expressing gratitude into L2, was exhibited by YEFLLs in using 'TH+ REP+ APP', 'AG+TH +REP', 'AG+ REP' and 'AG+APP' which never used by AENSs but by YANSs. In addition, twelve gratitude strategy combinations were used only by AENSs participants but not by YEFLLs.

According to the results demonstrated in Table (4.15) above, the total number of gratitude strategies combinations made by all the three groups of participants was thirty-two. Out of the thirty-two combinations, the three groups employed only ten combinations in common. Fifteen combinations were commonly used by YEFLLs and AENSs, while twelve combinations were commonly used by YEFLLs and YANSs. The remaining fifteen combinations were not used by YEFLLs, having no p-value of significant difference between them and the other two groups, reflecting no significant results in relation to the third objective.

The combinations that revealed frequency significant difference, in which ( $p \leq 0.05$ ), between AENSs and YEFLLs were eleven, including 'TH+EPFA', 'TH+EPRP', 'TH+APP', 'TH+AP', 'TH+REP', 'TH+EPRP+REP', 'AG+TH', 'AG+EPFA', 'REP+APP', 'TH+REP+EPFA' and 'TH+ST'. Only four combinations were found of no significant difference ( $p > 0.05$ ) between the two groups: 'TH+DNF', 'AG+TH+AP', 'AG+EPRP' and 'AG+EPFA+TH'. Quite the contrary, by comparing YEFLLs to YANSs, eight combinations were found of significant differences ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) between the two groups. These combinations were 'TH+EPFA', 'TH+EPRP', 'TH+APP', 'TH+AP', 'TH+DNF', 'TH+REP', 'TH+EPRP+REP' and 'TH+ST'. Four combinations showed no significant difference ( $p > 0.05$ ) between the two groups: 'AG+R+EP', 'AG+TH', 'TH+REP+APP' and 'TH+REP+EPFA'. These results provide evidence of pragmatic transfer happened in YEFLLs performance while expressing their gratitude in English as they were similar to YANSs more than to AENSs.

Moreover, the most preferred gratitude strategy combination for YEFLLs was "TH+REP". They used it for fifty times (5.1%) out of overall combination occurrence. The second preferred combination for YEFLLs group was "TH+EPFA", which was used for forty-three times with a frequency of use (4.4%). The third and fourth combinations in preference for YEFLLs were "TH+EPRP" and "AG+TH". They were employed for forty-one times (4.2%) and eleven times (1.1%), respectively. The remaining combinations were less common in use by YEFLLs. As for AENSs, "TH+EPFA" was the most frequent combination as they used it forty-five times (11.8%). As such, AENSs shared YEFLLs in the preference of this combination. The second combination in preference for AENSs was "TH+EPRP" which was used thirty-nine times at (9.3%). The third combination was

"AG+TH" which used nineteen times (4.5%) while fourth one was "TH+APP" which was used seventeen times (4.0%). The remaining combinations were used at lower frequencies. On the other side, the most preferred gratitude strategies combination for YANSs was "TH+EPRP", who used it for forty-five times at the percentage of use (10.0%). The second preferred combination for this group was "TH+REP" which was used forty-one times (9.2%). The third and fourth preferred combinations were "TH+EPFA" and "AG+TH", which were used twenty-seven (6.0%) and five times (1.1%), respectively.

Based on what has been mentioned above, it appears that out of the four most frequent combinations by the three groups, YEFLLs were similar to YANSs in the preference of "AG+TH" and "TH+ EPFA". These two groups were also similar in using "TH+REP" as the third preference, but different from AENSs which preferred "TH+ APP" as the third preference. In other words, YEFLLs and YANSs showed apparent similarity in the preference of specific combinations rather than AENSs, this proves the negative pragmatic transfer of YEFLLs when they produce the speech act of gratitude.

It is also worth-mentioning that YANSs used some other combinations of strategies not included in Cheng's (2005) taxonomy. However, these combinations were used at low frequencies such as "thanking + idioms or hadeeth", "thanking + expressing hope" and "thanking + praising God". For example, "شكراً لك والمسلم مرآة اخيه المسلم" was used two times in situation six, "شكراً لك و الصديق وقت الضيق" was used three times in different situations, "شكراً لك واتمنى لك التوفيق" was used twice in situation one and "شكراً لك واحمد الله ان لي صديق مثلك" was occurred one time. These combinations were coded as "TH+ EPRP". According to what has been mentioned above, it can be concluded that YANSs reflected the norms of their culture and the strong ties with religion in expressing gratitude. Arabs and Muslims

have their faith in God (Allah) deeply embedded within their performance of speech acts. That is why some semantic formulas implemented in gratitude responses are religious in content.

### **4.3 Conclusion**

The current study aimed to examine the usage of gratitude strategies by YEFLLs, AENSs and YANSs. In addition, to examine the pragmatic competence of YEFLLs in English and the influence of their first language in performing the speech act of gratitude. Considering the objectives of the study, it could be concluding that YEFLLs employed the gratitude strategy as single strategy more than using them in combination, whereas AENSs used them more in combination. In relation to combination preference, AENSs produced twenty-seven combinations while YEFLLs and YANSs produced only (nineteen and seventeen) respectively, YEFLLs were close to YANSs more than to AENSs in their productions. On the other hand, only fifteen combinations were commonly used by AENSs and YEFLLs, and twelve combinations were used by YANSs and YEFLLs. However, YEFLLs' responses reflected no significant difference in four combinations with the other two groups equally while the rest of these combinations reflected significant difference. Therefore, YEFLLs' lack of pragmatic competence in the target language can be inferred. This might be attributed to their negative transfer of L1 socio-pragmatic norms into L2, such as in their correlation with YANSs in using the combinations "TH+ REP+ APP", "AG+TH +REP", "AG+ REP" and "AG+APP", which were never used by AENSs. YEFLLs' lack of sufficient pragmatic competence in using gratitude strategies might happen as a result of cultural variances and their strong ties with native community.

Therefore, YEFLLs need to be exposed to the English culture to gain a reasonable level of pragmatic competence.

## **Chapter Five**

### **Main Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

This chapter provides a summary of the study and presents the major findings of the study followed by conclusions, pedagogic recommendations and suggestions for further research.

#### **5.2 Summary of the Study**

The current study aimed to investigate the use of gratitude strategies by YEFLLs, AENSs and AENSs. In addition, it examined the pragmatic competence of YEFLLs in English and the influence of their mother tongue in performing the speech act of gratitude. In order to achieve these objectives, a quantitative approach was followed. The data were collected through a DCT consisting of fourteen gratitude scenarios. The participants of the study were thirty AENSs, seventy of YEFLLs and thirty-two of YANSs. Cheng's (2005) coding system of gratitude strategies was adopted to identify the strategies used by the three groups of participants. In order to analyze the collected data, a descriptive analysis as well as some statistical processes (SPSS and Chi-square) were employed. Data analysis revealed some main findings and conclusions regarding the pragmatic competence of YEFLLs and the impact of pragmatic transfer in relation to the use of gratitude speech act. The following two sections summarize the main findings and conclusions reached in the current study.

### 5.3 Main Findings of the Study

The main findings attained in this study are presented in the following three sub-sections in terms of its three objectives as follows.

#### 5.3.1 Finding Pertaining to the Types of Gratitude Strategies Used by AENSs and YEFLLs and YANSs

1. In most situations, all the three groups showed similar preferences in adopting certain gratitude strategies, such as using the strategy of " simple thanking by only using the word *thank you*" in certain situations like (newspaper, parking) and simple thanking by stating the favor and mention the imposition" in such situations like (house work).
2. The differences between AENSs and YEFLLs were mainly in the frequencies and percentages of using such strategies. for example, they used the strategy of "thanking" as the first preferred single strategy for the three groups as main strategy, but they differ in the frequencies. It occurred (36.6%) by AENSs, (54.0%) by YANSs and (44.1%) YEFLLs.
3. YEFLLs and YANSs tended to use more direct and simpler gratitude strategy. While AENSs preferred using a complex and indirect way to express their gratitude, that's why they preferred using "combination" in most of the situations more than using single gratitude strategy (44.1% by AENSs, 30.3% by YANSs and 21.3% by YEFLLs).
4. In consistency with Hymes, (1971), Coulmas, (1981), Cheng, (2005), the strategy of "thanking" with its sub-strategies was the most common single strategy in use among all the groups of participants.

5. The gratitude sub-strategy '*Thanking and mentioning the imposition caused by the favor*' was more frequent in use by AENSs rather than YEFLLs, whereas it is a common tendency of YEFLLs and YANSs to use, '*Simple thanking by only using the word "thank you"*' in formal situations.
6. The strategy of "no expression" was not used by AENSs in all situations of this study while it employed (10.3%) by YEFLLs and (2.4%) by YANSs.
7. The gratitude strategy "appreciation" was used only seven times by YANSs at (1.5%) single strategy, but more frequently in combinations, while it used (4.2%) by AENSs and (3.1%) by YEFLLs.
8. The strategies "others", "repayment", "apology" and "alserter" were hardly used alone as single strategies by AENSs and YANSs, they employed them more in combination.
9. Some extra gratitude strategies, which are not included in Cheng's (2005) classification of gratitude strategies, were used by YANSs such as, "*God gratitude*" and "*saying prayers*".

### **5.3.2 Finding Pertaining to YEFLL's Pragmatic Competence in Producing the Speech Act of Gratitude**

1. Thirty-two gratitude strategy combinations were formulated and used by the three groups, ranging between (18) binary, (13) triple and (1) quad combinations.
2. The explicit gratitude expression "*thanking*" was a basic component of almost all gratitude strategy combinations used by the three groups.

3. P-value readings revealed significant differences between AENSs and YEFLLs in using most of gratitude strategy combinations. Only four gratitude strategy combinations indicated no significant differences between them.
4. The most preferred gratitude strategy combination for AENSs was 'TH+ EPFA' and the combination 'TH+ EPRP' for YANSs while the combination mostly preferred for YEFLLs was 'TH+ REP'.
5. AENSs formulated long structured gratitude even within binary-strategy combinations, while YEFLLs used short structures even within triple-strategy combinations.
6. The only quad combination of gratitude strategies was 'AG+ AP+ TH+ REP' used only by AENSs in situation eight.
7. Gratitude strategy combinations with "*attention getter*" were more used by AENSs rather than YEFLLs, whereas the gratitude strategy combinations with "*repayment*" were more used by YEFLLs and YANSs.
8. Differences between AENSs and YEFLLs in employing strategies might be attributed to cultural variances, such as YEFLLs and YANSs employed the strategy of 'repayment' in the case of (big and small loan) situations, such as "*I will pay it back as soon as I can*" while AENSs used it more in the case of (dinner party and lunch) situations, AENSs used 'positive feeling' and 'appreciation' to express their gratitude in the case of (big and small loan).
9. Out of the thirty – two gratitude strategy combinations used by the participants in this study, only twenty-seven gratitude strategy combinations used by AENSs.

10. Out of the thirty-two gratitude strategy combinations used by all the three groups, only fifteen combinations were commonly used by AENSs and YEFLLs.
11. Twelve gratitude strategy combinations were used by AENSs but not by YEFLLs.
12. AENSs and YEFLLs showed higher tendency of using binary combinations, such as "TH+ EPFA", "TH+ EPRP" and "AG +TH" in their gratitude.

### **5.3.3 Finding Pertaining to the Influence of YEFLLs' Mother Tongue on Producing Gratitude Strategies in English**

1. The findings reached in this study elicited some extra combinations, which were employed only by YANSs such as '*thanking+ expressing hope*', '*thanking + God gratitude*' and '*thanking + idioms or hadeeth*'.
2. Out of the thirty-two gratitude strategy combinations used by all the participants in this study, seventeen combinations were made by YANSs.
3. Out of the seventeen gratitude strategy combinations made by YANSs, twelve combinations were also used by YEFLLs.
4. Out of the twelve combinations made by both YEFLLs and YANSs, only four gratitude strategy combinations exhibited no significant difference between them.
5. Five gratitude strategy combinations were used only by YANSs participants but not by YEFLLs, such as " TH+ LT", "TH+ EPFA+ APP", "AP+ REP" "AG+ DNF" and "TH+ REP+ AP".
6. YEFLLs and YANSs participants, showed high tendency in using the combination of "TH+ REP" in their gratitude.

7. Negative transfer of L1 socio-pragmatic norms was demonstrated by YEFLLs via using ‘TH+ REP+ APP’, ‘AG+TH +REP’, ‘AG+ REP’ and ‘AG+APP’ such strategies were never used by AENSs.

#### **5.4 Conclusions**

1. The findings of the present study are in line with the previous studies into speech acts (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999; Kasper & Schmidt, 1996, cited in Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003) which demonstrated that non-native speakers’ production was different from native speakers’ production of certain speech acts.
2. The findings showed that there are some similarities and differences between YANSs, YEFLLs and AENSs. Some strategies seemed to be universal across the two cultures like "thanking ", "positive feeling", whereas strategies of " *Gratitude to God*", "*prayers*" and "*expressing hope*" are culturally specific to Arabic.
3. YEFLLs' lack of pragmatic competence was reflected in their used of more direct and simpler gratitude strategy than AENSs, and the negative transfer of L1 pragmatic norms of expressing gratitude into L2, was exhibited by YEFLLs in using ‘TH+ REP+ APP’, ‘AG+TH +REP’, ‘AG+ REP’ and ‘AG+APP’ which never used by AENSs but by YANSs. In addition, twelve gratitude strategy combinations were used only by AENSs participants but not by YEFLLs.
4. In relation to gratitude strategy combinations, it appears that the explicit gratitude expression "thanking" is an essential component of most of the combination used by the three groups.

5. The lack of pragmatic competence in using gratitude strategies in relation to context might be interpreted to the fact that many aspects of pragmatics are context-dependent and culture-specific. Therefore, YEFLLs need to be exposed to native culture to gain a reasonable level of pragmatic competence.
6. Regardless of YEFLLs' pragmatic competence, the socio-cultural variation between L1 and L2 might have been the reason behind using inappropriate gratitude strategies.
7. Lack of the necessary linguistic competence seemed to have a negative effect on YEFLLs pragmatic competence when constructing gratitude strategies.
8. The extra combination of gratitude strategies, which were employed only by YANSs such as '*thanking+ expressing hope*' and '*thanking + God gratitude*' reflected the YANSs culture and their strong ties with religion, Arabs have their faith in God (Allah) deeply embedded within their speech acts.
9. The results yielded that AENSs produced more gratitude combinations than YEFLLs and YANSs.
10. In consistency with Cheng (2010), in the American culture, the expression of gratitude is regarded commonly more mechanical than sincere as it is done for big as well as for small favors while YEFLLs and YANSs were more sincere in their gratitude.
11. The findings reached in this study inferred that YEFLLs were closer to YANSs rather than AENSs, this indicated that YEFLLs were not able to produce speech act of gratitude like native responses due to negative pragmatic transfer.

## 5.5 Pedagogic Recommendations

This section introduces some pedagogic recommendations for English language instructors and syllabus designers to help in develop the pragmatic competence of YEFLLs.

1. It is not enough to master the pronunciation, grammar, words and idioms in learning second language, but it is also necessary to focus on the ways in which the language reflects the ideas, customs, and behavior of native speaker's society in order to develop learners' pragmatic competence, so English language teachers should teach the learners both linguistic and pragmatic conventions of using speech acts by enriching the classroom input with real-world materials, such as recordings of native speakers' conversations and television programs
2. Syllabus developers should pay attention to speech acts in general, and gratitude speech act in particular, by providing authentic concrete lessons, activities and by focusing on learner-centered activities such as role-plays and real discussions.
3. To improve EFL learners' pragmatic competence, speech acts must be taught in both formal and informal contexts focusing on the appropriate pragma-linguistic forms used in different contexts.
4. Classifying all possible strategies of speech acts with their different semantic formula and listing them in English textbooks might be helpful for improving English language learners' pragmatic knowledge.
5. English foreign language teachers should be aware that pragmatic competence is as important as linguistic competence when teaching English language, so EFL Teachers

have to take pragmatic training courses or educational training visits to native countries' schools and colleges in order to raise their students' awareness of pragmatics in English.

6. Direct and formal instructions on how to use speech act would enhance learners' pragmatic competence.
7. EFL learners need to be aware of ENSs' norms of making speech act preferences in relation to strategies either by exposing them to L2 culture or by direct instructions in English language classrooms.

### **5.6 Suggestions for Further Research**

1. This study examined the similarities and differences between AENSs and YEFLLs' in their use of gratitude speech act with ignoring social variables. Therefore, it is suggested for forthcoming studies to focus on the effect of social variables such as gender, severity of offence, social distance and social power on the production of gratitude speech act.
2. In relation to the participants, further studies can be recommended to involve larger samples and more situations to yield more valid results.
3. In relation to data instruments, it might be suggested to incorporate other data collection tools together with DCT such as role -play situation and observation.
4. Learners' pragmatic performance could be studied longitudinally in forthcoming research so that their pragmatic development can be investigated more accurately.

## References

- Aijmer, K. (1996). *Conversational routines in English: Convention and creativity*. London, United Kingdom: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Al-Khateeb, S. M. I. (2009). *The speech act of thanking as a compliment response as used by the Arab speakers of English a comparative intercultural study* (Doctoral dissertation). Nablus, Palestine: An-Najah National University.
- Al-Khawaldeh, N. N. & Zegarac, V. (2013). Gender and the communication of gratitude in Jordan. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 3(3), 268-287.
- Al-Momani, H. & Jaradat, A., Al-Khawaldeh, N. & Bani-Khair, B. (2017). Expressing gratitude in an EFL context: The case of Jordanian learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 6(4), 190-198.
- females (Master's Thesis)*. USA: Ball State University.
- Altalhi, H. K. (2014). *Speech acts of thanking and thanking responses by Hijazi females (Master's Thesis)*. USA: Ball State University.
- Al-Zubaidi, N. A. (2013). Expressions of gratitude in American English and Iraqi Arabic. *LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing*, 1(1), 376-396
- Anderson, E. S. (1990). *Developing communicative competence in a second language*. New York: Newberry House Publishers.
- Apte, M. L. (1974). 'Thank you' and South Asian languages: A comparative sociolinguistic study. *Journal of Linguistics*, 136 (3), 67-89.
- Austin, J. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University press.
- Bach, K. and Harnish, R. M. (1979). *Linguistic Communication and Speech Acts*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L.F. & Palmer, A.S. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Bardovi- Harlig, K., Hartford, B. A., Mahan-Taylor, R., Morgan, M. J., & Reynolds, D. W. (1991). Developing pragmatic awareness: Closing the conversation. *ELT Journal*, 45(1), 4-15.
- Bardovi- Harlig, K. (2001). *Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatic*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). *Teaching pragmatics*. Washington, DC: United States Department of State.
- Bakırcı, D. & Özbay, A. Ş. (2020). Investigating EFL speakers' gratitude strategies: Interlanguage pragmatics. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(4), 1698-1721.
- Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). *Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals*. New York, NY, USA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning how to say what you mean in a second language: A study of the speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Journal of Applied Linguistics* 3(1), 29-59.
- Bodman, J., & Eisenstein, M. (1988). May god increase your bounty: The expression of gratitude in English by native and non-native speakers. *Cross currents*, 15(1), 1- 21.
- Bouton, L. (1994). Conversational implicature in the second language: Learned slowly when not deliberately taught. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 22(2), 157-167.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (2008). *Language as mind tools: Learning how to think through speaking*. Abingdon on-Thames, UK: Psychology Press.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*.1(1), 1-47.
- Canale, M. (1983). *From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy*. London: Longman.
- Canale, M. (1988). The Measurement of Communicative Competence. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*.8(3), 67-84.

- Cheng, S. W. (2005). *An exploratory cross-sectional study of interlanguage pragmatic development of expressions of gratitude by Chinese learners of English (Dissertation)*. United States of America: University of Iowa. Retrieved from <http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/104>.
- Cheng, S. W. (2010). A corpus-based approach to the study of speech act of thanking. *Concentric: Studies on Linguistics*. 36(2), 257-274.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Coulmas, F. (1981). *Poison to your soul: Thanks and apologies contrastively viewed*. The Hague, the Netherlands: Mouton.
- Coulmas, F. (1998). *The handbook of sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell publishers.
- Crystal, D. (1985). *A dictionary of linguistics and phonetics* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Crystal, D. (2010). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*, (3rd Edition). Cambridge :Cambridge University Press .
- Cui, X. (2012). A cross-linguistic study on expressions of gratitude by native and non-native English Speakers. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. 3(4), 753-760. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/jltr.3.4.753-760>
- De Pablos-Ortega, C. (2010). Attitudes of English speakers towards thanking in Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 20(2), 201– 222. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.20.2.02pab>
- Díaz Pérez, F. J. (2005). The speech act of thanking in English: Differences between native and non-native speakers' behavior. *Revista de Filología inglesa*. 26(2), 91- 102.
- Eisenstein, M. & Bodman, J. W. (1986). "I very appreciate": Expressions of gratitude by native and non-native speakers of American English. *Applied Linguistics*. 7(2), 167-185.

- Eisenstein, M., & Bodman J. (1993). *Expressing gratitude in American English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- El Samaty, M. (2005). Helping foreign language learners become pragmatically competent. *Paper presented at the 10th TESOL Arabia Conference*, 9, 341-351.
- Eslami-Rasekh Z., Eslami-Rasekh A. and Fatahi A. (2004). The effect of explicit metapragmatic instruction on the speech act awareness of advanced EFL students. *TESL-EJ*, 2 (8), 199-208. Retrieved from <http://www.writing.berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/ej30/a2.html>
- Farashaiyan, A. & Hua, T. (2012). On the relationship between pragmatic knowledge and language proficiency among Iranian male and female undergraduate EFL learners. *The southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 18 (1), 33- 46.
- Farina, M. & Suleiman, R. (2009). An Interlanguage pragmatic study of expressions of gratitude by Iranian EFL learners- A pilot study. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*. 5(1), 108- 121. Retrieved from: <http://usm.academia.edu>
- Fauzia, (2016). The Difficulties of English Foreign Language (EFL) Learner in Understanding Pragmatics. *Ethical Lingua*. 3(1), 1-12.
- Faqe, C. K, Jbrae, S. J. and Muhammad, K. R. (2019). The use of thanking speech act strategies in English realized by Kurdish learners. *Education Quarterly Reviews*. 2(3), 640-650.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2004). *Indirectness and politeness in Mexican requests*. Somerville, MA. Mexican: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Félix-Brasdefer, C. (2008). *Politeness in Mexico and the United States*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gass. M. & Neu, J. (Eds.). (1996). *Speech acts across cultures: Challenges to communication in a second language (Studies on Language Acquisition 11)* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Grice, P. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. New York: Academic Press.

- Grief, E. B., & Gleason, J. B. (1980). Hi, thanks, and goodbye: More routine information. *Language in Society*, 9(2), 156-166.
- Hinkel, E. (1994). Pragmatics of interaction: Expressing thanks in a second language. *Applied Language Learning*, 5(1), 73-91.
- House, J. & Kasper, G. (1987). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Requesting in a foreign language*. Tuebingen: Narr. Retrieved from <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2006/entries/pragmatics>
- House, J. (1988). "Oh excuse me please..." : *Apologizing in a foreign language*. Englisch als Zweitsprache. Tubingen: Narr.
- Hulleberg, S. (2008). *A comparative study of gratitude expressions in Norwegian and English from an interlanguage pragmatic and second language acquisition research perspective (Master thesis)*. Oslo: University of Oslo.
- Hymes, D. (1971). *On linguistic theory, communicative competence, and the education of disadvantaged children: Anthropological perspectives on education*. New York: Georgetown University Press.
- Jaszczolt, K. (2002). *Semantics and pragmatics: Meaning in language and discourse*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson/Longman.
- Jautz, S. (2013). *Thanking formulae in English: Explorations across varieties and genres*. Amsterdam, The Netherland: John Benjamins.
- Johansen, S.H. (2008). *A comparative study of gratitude expressions in Norwegian and English from an interlanguage pragmatic and second language acquisition research perspective (A doctoral dissertation)*. Oslo: University of Oslo.
- Jung, W.H. (1994). Speech acts of thank you and responses to it in American English. *Paper Presented at The Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics*. Baltimore: U.S.S
- Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research*, 8(3), 203-231.
- Kasper, G. & Blum-Kulka, S. (Eds.). (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press

- Kasper, G. & Schmidt, R. (1996). Introduction: Interlanguage pragmatics in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 18(2), 145-148.
- Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics: Current research issues*. New York :Oxford University Press.
- Kasper, G. & Rose, K. R. (2001). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Korta, K. Y. and Perry, J. (2006). Pragmatics. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2006 Edition)*. Retrieved from <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2006/entries/pragmatics>
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London and New York: Longman.
- Leech, G. (1989). *An a-z of English grammar and usage 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liu, S. (2003). Studies on negative pragmatic transfer in international pragmatics. *Guangxi Normal University Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.gxnu.edu.cn/Personal/szliu/negative%20pragmatic%20transfer.doc>
- Macaro, E. (1997). *Target language collaborative learning and autonomy*. Clevedon: Multilingual Masters LTD.
- Moore, L.C. (2009). On communicative competence... In the field *Lang. language & Communicative journal*. 29 (3), 244-253. Retrieved from <http://people.ehe.osu.edu/lmoore/files/2009/03/moore-correctedproof.pdf>
- Morris, C. (1938). *Foundations of the theory of signs*. Chicago, IL, USA: University of Chicago Press.
- Morris, C.W. (1946). *Signs, Language and Behavior*. Prentice- Hall: Englewood Cliff, NJ.
- Morsi, R. (2010). *The speech act of thanking in Egyptian Arabic* (masters' thesis). Indiana: Ball State University. Retrieved from <http://cardinalscholar.bsu.edu/handle/123456789/193733>.

- Murray, N. (2010). Pragmatics, awareness raising, and the cooperative principle. *ELT Journal*. 64(3), 293-301.
- Norrick, N.R. (1978). Expressive illocutionary acts. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 26(2), 277- 291.
- Okamoto, S. & Robinson, W. P. (1997). Determinants of gratitude expressions in England. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*. 16(4), 411-433.
- Olshtain, E., & Cohen, A. (1983). E. The production of speech acts by EFL learners. *TESOL Quarterly*. 27(1), 33- 65.
- Ozdemir, C. & Revani, S. A. (2010). Interlanguage pragmatics in action: Use of expressions of gratitude. *Science Direct Journal. Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*. 18 (3), 194 -202
- Rizk, S. (2003). "Why say NO! when you refuse?". Paper presented at the TESOL Arabia.
- Schmidt, R. & Richards, J. C. (1980). Speech acts and second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*. 1(2), 129-157
- Schmidt, R. (1993). Consciousness, learning and interlanguage pragmatics. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1975). *Indirect speech acts*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1976). *A classification of illocutionary acts Language in society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Siregar, R. (2011). Students' experience of translation tool use in language learning. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*. 11(10), 75- 81.

- Takahashi, T. & Beebe, L. (1987). Development of pragmatic competence by Japanese Learners of English. *Journal of the Japan Association of Language Learners*, 8(2), 131-155.
- Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic transferability. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 18(2), 189-223
- Takashi, N., Janjira, W., & Motoko, T. (2005). Gratitude in university's students in Japan and Thailand. *Journal of Cross - Cultural Psychology*. Thousand Oaks. Vol.36.(2), 200-247.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*.4(2), 91-112.
- Trosborg, A. (1987). Apology strategies in native/non-natives. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 11(2), 147-167. University Press: Newbury House Publishers.
- Van Ek, J. A. (1977). *The threshold level of modern language learning in schools*. London: Longman.
- Verschueren, J.& Ostman J. O. (2009). *Handbook of pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wijana, I. P. (1996). *Pragmatics Basics*. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.
- Wolfson, N. (1981). Compliments in cross-cultural perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*. 15(2),117-24.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. UK: Oxford University press.

**Appendix ( I )**

**DCT (English Version)**

---

Dear participant,

Thank you for participating in this survey. This study is intended to explore cross cultural and Interlanguage speech behavior. The information you provide below will be used for this study only and will remain confidential. In the following section, please mark an 'X' between the boxes corresponding to your response.

Background information:

Name -----

university: -----

Intended/completed Degree:

BA ( )      MA ( )      PHD ( )

Year :-Freshman ( ) Sophomore ( ) Junior ( ) Senior ( )

Age: -----

Gender:      Male ( )      Female ( )

**Instruction:**

You will find the following scenarios involve being placed in a situation where you may feel, to different degrees, obliged or grateful to someone who has done something for or requested of/from you. Please imagine yourself in each situation and respond accordingly based on your immediate reaction. If you feel that a specified situation does not warrant a response, please provide an explanation.

1. It is Friday. You look into your wallet and notice that you only have \$2.00. your good friend at work notices this and hears you say, ' I'll have to go to the bank.' Your friend asks if you need money, and you say that you forgot to go to the bank. Your friend says, 'I have plenty. How much do you need?' You say, 'Could you lend me \$5.00? I'll pay you back on Monday.' Your friend says, 'Sure. Are you sure you don't need more than that?' You say you don't. Your friend gives you the \$5.00.

You would say:-----

You would say nothing because:-----

2. You board the bus, pay your money and take a seat near the front of the bus. Just before your stop, you guess that the driver is not going to stop. You move to the front, and ask the driver to stop and he stops.

You would say: -----

You would say nothing because:-----

3. It is your birthday, and you're having a few people over for dinner. A friend brings you a present. You unwrap it and find a blue sweater that you wish to have.

You would say: -----

You would say nothing because:-----

4. You work for a large company, which is usually very busy. You send your manager a request for some days off. The vice-president of personnel calls you into his office. He tells you to sit down. You feel a little nervous, because you have only been working there for

six months. The vice-president says, 'You're doing a good job. In fact, we are so pleased with you that I am going to give you a raise'.

You would say: -----

You would say nothing because: -----

5. In the supermarket, you ask the cashier to bag your groceries. He does this, and then turns to begin serving the next customer. You pay and pick up your bags to leave.

You would say: -----

You would say nothing because:-----

6. At the table in a restaurant a friend says, 'you have something on your face.' You ask where. Your friend tells you. You rub your face and ask, 'Is it off?' your friend says that it is.

You would say:-----

You would say nothing because:-----

7. You find yourself in sudden need of money--\$500. You mention this to a friend. Your friend immediately offers to lend it you. At first you say, 'Oh no, I didn't mean it as a request. I couldn't take it.' Your friend says, 'Really, it's all right. What are friends for?' Your friend insists again, and you take the check.

You would say: -----

You would say nothing because:-----

8. You are studying in another city. Both you and your roommate work. You come home late from work and find that your roommate has done some work around the house that you had promised to do, but had not had a chance to do.

You would say: -----

You would say nothing because:-----

9. Your friend suggests going out to lunch. You say that you'd like to go, but you only have \$2. Your friend says. 'Ah, don't worry. I'll treat you today.' Your friend takes you to a very nice restaurant –a much more expensive one than you usually go to. You have a wonderful meal. Your friend pays, and you get up to leave.

You would say: -----

You would say nothing because:-----

10. You have just gotten an admission from a foreign university. A close friend in the university tells you she has organized a farewell party for you.

You would say: -----

You would say nothing because:-----

11. You have just gotten your hair cut in a new style, and you like it better than the old one. Your friend sees it and you ask him what he thinks. He says, 'Hey, you've got a new haircut. It looks nice.'

You would say: -----

You would say nothing because:-----

8. You share an apartment with a friend. You're both sitting and relaxing in the living room. You ask your friend to hand you the newspaper which is nearby. Your friend gives you the newspaper.

You would say: -----

You would say nothing because:-----

13. You enter a parking garage. As the parking attendant gives you the parking voucher, You hand him the money and ask him about the empty space.

You would say: -----

You would say nothing because:-----

14. You have been invited to the home of a rather new friend. You have dinner with him and his family and a few other friends of theirs. The food was great, and you really enjoyed the evening. As you leave, your hosts accompany you to the door.

You would say: -----

You would say nothing because:-----

## Appendix II

### DCT (Arabic version)

#### استبيان

بيانات القارئ:

الاسم: ----- العمر: -----

مؤهلك العلمي: ----- جهة اصدار المؤهل: -----

الجنس: -----

عزيري القارئ:

هذه دراسة في علم اللغة تهدف الى معرفة مدى تأثير اللغة العربية على اللغة الانجليزية من قبل المتعلمين للغات الأجنبية، فأرجو منك شاكرا تعاونك أن تتخيل نفسك في هذه المواقف، والرد بطرق الشكر والثناء المناسبة لكل حدث من الاحداث التالية حيث سيتم مقارنتها بطرق الشكر والثناء في اللغة الإنجليزية وتوضيحه الفروق في البحث.

١\_ في أحد أيام الجمعة تفقدت محفظتك فوجدت أنك لا تمتلك سوى ألف ريال، فلاحظ ذلك أحد أصدقائك حين سمعك تقول: كان يجب عليان أن اذهب الى البنك لأخذ نقود، فسألك صديقك أن كنت تحتاج المال، واخبرك أن لديه المال الوفير وأن باستطاعته أن يقرضك، فأخبرته أنك تحتاج خمسة ألف ريال فقط، وأنك سوف تعيدها له في أسرع وقت ممكن، فسالك إن كنت تحتاج أكثر من ذلك ليعطيك، فأخبرته أنك لم تكن تحتاج سوى خمسة ألف ريال فقط.

-ماذا تقول لتعبر عن شكرك:-----

-إذا لم يكن لديك ما تقوله، اذكر السبب:-----

٢- صعدت على باص، ثم دفعت الأجرة، وجلست على المقعد، ولكن قبل محطتك التي تتجه اليها اعتقدت أن سائق الباص لن يتوقف فيها، فتحركت متجه الى السائق لتطلب منه أن يتوقف عند محطتك فنظر إليك مبتسما وفعل ما طلبت منه.

-----ماذا تقول لتعبر عن شكرك:-----

-----إذا لم يكن لديك ما تقوله، اذكر السبب:-----

٣- في عيد ميلادك دعوت اصدقائك على وجبة العشاء والسهر في حفلة عيد الميلاد، وأثناء الحفلة قام أحد أصدقائك بإعطائك هدية، وعند فتحها تفاجأت لأنك وجدته قميصا ازرق كنت قد تمنيت شرائه.

-----ماذا تقول لتعبر عن شكرك:-----

-----إذا لم يكن لديك ما تقوله، اذكر السبب:-----

٤\_ أنت تعمل في شركة عملاقة حيث أن أعمالها كثيرة دائما لذلك قمت بتقديم طلب إجازة الى مديرك في الشركة لتأخذ قسط من الراحة، وفي ذلك اليوم اتصل بك مديرك، وطلب منك الحضور الى مكتبه، فتوجهت الى مكتبه، فطلب منك الجلوس على المقعد، وفي تلك اللحظة شعرت بتوتر لكنك تفاجأت حين اخبرك المدير بأنه يريد ترقية لك لأنك عملت لمدة ستة أشهر بإخلاص.

-----ماذا تقول لتعبر عن شكرك:-----

-----إذا لم يكن لديك ما تقوله، اذكر السبب:-----

٥\_ انت في مركز تسوق، وطلبت من المحاسب في المركز أن يضع لك مشترياتك في كيس بلاستيكي، فبتسمم ونفذ ما طلب منه، ثم عاد ليأخذ النقود من العميل الاخر.

-----ماذا تقول لتعبر عن شكرك:-----

-----إذا لم يكن لديك ما تقوله، اذكر السبب:-----

٦\_ في أحد المطاعم، وعلى طاولة الطعام قام أحد اصدقائك بالإشارة اليك بأن هناك شيء ما في وجهك فسألته عن مكان ذلك الشيء، فأخبرك وقيمت بازالته.

-----ماذا تقول لتعبر عن شكرك:-----

-----إذا لم يكن لديك ما تقوله، اذكر السبب:-----

٧\_ وجدت نفسك في حاجة ماسة للمال، فأخبرت أحد أصدقائك ذلك فعرض عليك أن يقرضك بعض النقود، فرفضت ذلك في بداية الأمر، وأخبرته أنك عندما أخبرته بحاجتك للمال لم تكن تقصد بذلك أن يقرضك، فأصر عليك وقبلت القرض منه فقبلت منه بعد أن قال لك أنك صديقه، والاصدقاء عون لبعضهم البعض.

-----ماذا تقول لتعبر عن شكرك:-----

-----إذا لم يكن لديك ما تقوله، اذكر السبب:-----

٨\_ أنت تدرس في المدينة أحر غير مدنك، وتسكن مع أحد اصدقائك في تلك المدينة وتنتشركون في أداء الأعمال المنزلية، وفي أحد الايام قام صديقك بأداء اعمالك التي من المفترض أن تقوم انت به ولكن بسبب انشغالك بأعمال أخرى لم تستطع أداءها.

-----ماذا تقول لتعبر عن شكرك:-----

-----إذا لم يكن لديك ما تقوله، اذكر السبب:-----

٩\_ أقترح عليك أحد اصدقائك أن تناولوا وجبة الغداء في أحد المطاعم، فأعجبت بالفكرة، ولكن لم يكن لديك النقود الكافية لذلك فقال لك صديقك: لا تقلق سأدفع بالنياية عنك، ثم دعاك الى مطعم فاخر وأسعار وجباته جدا -ماذا تقول لتعبر عن شكرك:-----

-----إذا لم يكن لديك ما تقوله، اذكر السبب:-----

١٠\_ تلقيت رسالة بقبولك في جامعة أجنبية كنت قد قدمت اليها طلب لدراسة فيها، فقام أحد اصدقائك بمفاجأتك حيث أنه قام بتجهيز حفلة توديع لك.

-----ماذا تقول لتعبر عن شكرك:-----

-----إذا لم يكن لديك ما تقوله، اذكر السبب:-----

١١\_ قمت بتغيير شكل قصة شعرك بشكل جديد أفضل من القصة السابقة وسألت أحد اصدقائك عن رائيه، فأخبرك أنها قصة جميلة جعلتك وسيما.

-----ماذا تقول لتعبر عن شكرك:-----

-----إذا لم يكن لديك ما تقوله، اذكر السبب:-----

١٢- تتشارك انت وأحد اصدقائك في شقة سكان قرب مقر دراستك. وفي أحد الأيام جلست مع صديقك في غرفة الجلوس فطلبت ن يمنه أحضر لك الجريدة، فذهب وأحضرها بصدر رحب.

-----ماذا تقول لتعبر عن شكرك:-----

-----إذا لم يكن لديك ما تقوله، اذكر السبب:-----

١٣\_ أدخلت سيارتك الى موقف سيارات فتجه إليك حارس الموقف وأعطاك قسيمة اشتراك في موقف السيارات وأخذ منك ثمن القسيمة ثم ذلك على المكان المناسب للتوقف.

-----ماذا تقول لتعبر عن شكرك:-----

-----إذا لم يكن لديك ما تقوله، اذكر السبب:-----

١٤\_ قام أحد اصدقائك الجدد بدعوتك لتناول طعام العشاء مع عائلته، فكان طعام العشاء لذيذا وقضيت وقتنا رائعاً مع صديقك وعائلته وعند مغادرتك قام بمرافقتك الى الباب.

-----ماذا تقول لتعبر عن شكرك:-----

-----إذا لم يكن لديك ما تقوله، اذكر السبب:-----

### Appendix III

The Overall Distribution of the Frequency of Using the Main Gratitude Strategy  
(YEFLLS vs AENSs and YANSs)

No.	Gratitude strategies	AENSs (30)		YANSs (32)		YEFLLS (70)		YEFLLS& AENSs		YEFLLS& YANSs	
		N	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	Chi-Square	Asymp. Sig.	Chi-Square	Asymp. Sig.
		1	Thanking	154	36.6%	242	54.0%	433	44.1%	6.832	.009
2	Appreciation	18	4.2%	7	1.5%	31	3.1%	1.714	.190	10.387	.001
3	Positive feeling	61	14.5%	34	7.5%	60	6.1%	7.698	.006	.101	.750
4	Apology	1	0.2%	4	0.8%	33	3.3%	12.026	.001	7.148	.008
5	Recognition of imposition	1	0.2%	12	2.6%	48	4.8%	18.493	.000	3.489	.062
6	Repayment	3	0.7%	1	0.2%	29	2.9%	6.616	.010	10.835	.001
7	Other	5	1.1%	1	0.2%	29	2.9%	3.899	.048	10.835	.001
8	Alerter	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	0.7%	-	-	-	-
9	No expression	0	0.0%	11	2.4%	101	10.3%	-	-	23.790	.000
10	Combination	177	42.1%	136	30.3%	209	21.3%				
	Total	420	100	448	100	980	100				



No.	Combination used by the participants	Situation eight			Situation nine			Situation ten			Situation eleven			Situation twelve			Situation thirteen			Situation fourteen																			
		AENSS (30)		YENSS (32)	AENSS (30)		YENSS (32)	AENSS (30)		YENSS (32)	AENSS (30)		YENSS (32)	AENSS (30)		YENSS (32)	AENSS (30)		YENSS (32)	AENSS (30)		YENSS (32)																	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%																
1.	(TH + EFPA)	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	0.09	5	0.07	4	0.13	3	0.09	9	0.13	0	0.00	2	0.03	1	0.03	4	0.13	0	0.00	5	0.17	3	0.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	15	0.50	8	0.25	14	0.20
2.	(TH + EPRP)	2	0.07	3	0.09	2	0.06	6	0.09	7	0.23	1	0.03	0	0.00	2	0.07	7	0.22	3	0.04	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	0.09	8	0.11
3.	(TH+APP)	0	0.00	2	0.06	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	0.07	2	0.06	1	0.01	1	0.03	0	0.00	1	0.01	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.03	0	0.00	0	0.00
4.	(TH+DNA)	1	0.03	1	0.03	1	0.03	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.03	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
5.	(TH+AP)	3	0.10	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.03	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
6.	(TH+REP)	4	0.13	7	0.22	7	0.10	6	0.20	12	0.17	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.03	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	0.07	4	0.13	2	0.03		
7.	(TH+EPRP+REP)	0	0.00	1	0.03	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00		
8.	(AG+REP)	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.03	1	0.03	1	0.01	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
9.	(AG+TH+AP)	1	0.03	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.01	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
10.	(AG+TH)	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	0.09	1	0.03	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	0.07	1	0.03	1	0.01	10	0.33	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.03	0	0.00	0	0.00
11.	(AG+EFPA)	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	0.07	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.03	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
12.	(AG+ EPRP)	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.01	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
13.	(AG+TH+REP)	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	0.03	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
14.	(AG+APP)	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
15.	(TH+REP+APP)	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	0.10	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
16.	(TH+EPRP+APP)	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
17.	(TH+LT)	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
18.	(TH+EFPA+APP)	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
19.	(REP+APP)	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.01	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
20.	(AP+REP)	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
21.	(AG+DNF)	1	0.03	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
22.	(AG+EFPA)	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.03	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
23.	(AG+EFPA+ EPRP)	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	0.07	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
24.	(EFPA+DNF)	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
25.	(EPRP+APP)	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
26.	(TH+EFPA+APP)	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.03	0	0.00
27.	(AG+AP+TH+REP)	1	0.03	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
28.	(-AG+TH+DNF)	1	0.03	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
29.	(TH+REP+AP)	2	0.07	2	0.06	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
30.	(TH+REP+EFPA)	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.03	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	0.07	1	0.03
31.	(TH+ST)	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
32.	EFPA+APP+REP)	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.03	0	0.00

## ملخص الدراسة

أقيمت هذه الدراسة بهدف البحث في ظاهرة الكفاءة التداولية عند الطلاب اليمنيين الذين يدرسون اللغة الإنجليزية. وذلك بما يتعلق في ممارستهم لأساليب الثناء في اللغة الإنجليزية. كما سعت هذه الدراسة إلى اكتشاف أساليب وأنماط الثناء المستخدمة من قبل كلاً من: الأمريكيين المتحدثين للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أم، واليمنيين المتحدثين للغة العربية كلغة أم، وأيضاً اليمنيين المتعلمين للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية. وأيضاً هدفت إلى معرفة مدى تأثير اللغة العربية كلغة أم على أداء المتعلمين للغة الإنجليزية بما يخص أساليب الثناء في أفعال الكلام، وقد احتوت هذه الدراسة على ثلاث مجموعات من المشاركين الذين أُقيمت عليهم الدراسة، وهي سبعون طالب يمني متعلم للغة الإنجليزية، واثنتان وثلاثون يمني متحدث للغة العربية كلغة أم، وأيضاً ثلاثون أمريكي متحدث باللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أم، وقد تم جمع البيانات بواسطة اختبار إكمال الخطاب المستخدم لاستنباط أساليب الثناء، والذي تم تصميمه بواسطة (بودمان) و(ايزنستين) في عام (١٩٩٣)، كما أنه تم تحليل البيانات وفقاً لتصنيف تشنج (٢٠٠٥)، والذي احتوى على (ثمان) استراتيجيات أساسية، وأيضاً تم استخدام منهج الكمي لتحليل البيانات بطريقة كمية والنوعية عن طريق استخدام اختبار كاي التربيعي والإحصاءات الوصفية لكي يتم تحديد أوجه التشابه والاختلاف في أداء المشاركين، وكشفت النتائج عن وجود أوجه للتشابه والاختلاف بين المشاركين في الدراسة، وذلك كالتالي: بعض استراتيجيات الثناء شائعة الاستخدام لدى المجموعات (الثلاث) المشاركة، والبعض الآخر يخص مجموعة واحدة مثل: اليمنيين المتحدثين لغة عربية كلغة أم، وعلى سبيل المثال استخدام استراتيجية الثناء على الله، والدعاء للشخص الآخر، والجمع بين الثناء وقول حديث أو حكمة. كما أوضحت النتائج وجود ضعف في الكفاءة التداولية لدى متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية بما يخص أساليب الثناء من أفعال الكلام، وظهر هذا الضعف جلياً في التركيب اللغوي لأساليب الثناء وطريقة الجمع بين الاستراتيجيات عند متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية وأيضاً في استخدامهم لأسلوب مباشر ومبسط على خلاف المشاركين الأمريكيين، وأيضاً أوضحت النتائج اختلاف هام بين اليمنيين متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية والأمريكيين متحدثي اللغة الإنجليزية في معظم التراكيب اللغوية المستخدمة في الثناء. كما كشفت هذه الدراسة عن وجود تأثير جلي للغة العربية الأم على أداء اليمنيين المتعلمين للغة الإنجليزية.