Research Article

Section: Literature, Linguistics & Criticism

Check for updates

To read the paper online, please scan this QR code

Applying Brown and Levinson's model to investigate the differences in the use of politeness strategies between spoken Saudi and British English

Hanaa Alqahtani
Taif University, Taif, Saudi Arabia
Corresspondce: qahtani_ha@yahoo.com
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2479-9262

Abstract
The aim of the study was to apply Brown and Levinson's model of politeness to investigate the differences in the female use of politeness strategies between spoken Saudi and British English. The study applied an observation approach and consisted of 103 female participants which were divided into 2 groups. The 1st group comprised of 53 native speakers of Saudi Arabia and the other one consisted of 50 British English females. The researcher met the participants to explain that they would be given 15 real-life situations and they had to carefully listen to each one of them and respond. These situations were designed by the researcher according to Brown and Levinson's (1987) contextual determinants. The researcher noted their response to every situation on a pre-designed evaluation sheet. The data collected was quantitatively analyzed using SPSS program to test the significant differences between Saudi and British groups in the types of politeness strategies and the realization of the contextual determinants based on the frequencies. The findings of the study reflected significant inter-group differences in the realization of some of the contextual determinants but power did not have an influence on the speakers' performance of polite offers in both the cultures, and for social distance the result showed significant influence on the British use of politeness strategies. In conclusion, the study findings supported Brown and Levinson (1987) politeness theory in terms of cross-cultural similarities and differences.

Keywords: Brown and Levinson model of politeness, Saudi and British females

1. Introduction

Politeness is a cultural phenomenon which shows variations between one country and another or one region with another (Susanti, et al 2020). A number of studies have been conducted on politeness such as Matsumoto (1988); Gunarwan (1994); Ide et al (1989) and Aziz (2003). The finding of their study is briefly described as follow; the study of Matsumoto (1988) carries out a qualitative study to investigate the phenomenon of politeness. In the study, he observed the concept of face in Japanese society and language. The finding was an in-depth description of recognition of politeness in Japanese society pertaining to the concept of face. Another study by Ide et al (1989), compared the politeness of Japanese people to the politeness of American people. The findings of the study states that for Japanese people politeness was related to respect and for Americans it was related to the strategy as described in the theory of Brown and Levinson (1978).

Aziz (2003), conducted a study in which he examined the role of age in recognizing Indonesian politeness in West Java. A striking difference was noted by him in the recognition of politeness in different age groups. The findings of the above studies point that politeness is a cultural phenomenon. Another study by Kiyama, et al (2012) was conducted to examine the applicability of Brown and Levinson's politeness theory to facework in non-western society. The study carried out a survey questionnaire of native Japanese speakers. The researchers investigated a rank order of influences on facework behavior along with other five factors such as, intrinsic factor, contextual factor, power factor, distance factor and gender factor.

The findings of their study revealed that the factors related to intrinsic content and the interlocutor's attitudes had strong influence a compared to the inter and intra-personal factors. Their study concluded that Brown and Levinson's model of politeness was applicable to a non-western culture, Japan. Another study conducted by Dowlatabadi, et al (2014) focused on the socio-cultural aspects of conversation. The focus of their study was on politeness strategies in conversation exchanges in the Council for Dispute Settlement in Iran. They wanted to find out which strategies were more frequently applied Iranian interlocutors in terms of dispute settlement. In order to find this out the study tape recorded and transcribed 3 council meetings. The primary focus was on the talk but it also involved non-verbal aspects of exchange. To analyze the data, the model of politeness strategies which was proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) was used. The findings of their study states that the strategies of 'Notice', 'attend to H', 'Seek agreement' and 'Avoid disagreement' were more frequently used. Several studies have been found using Brown and Levinson's model of politeness (1987) in non-western context but little or no research has been conducted to investigate the tendencies among women in using politeness strategies as well as to draw similarities and differences between cultures in female performance of offers.

Therefore, this study aims to apply Brown and Levinson's model of politeness to investigate the differences in the female use of politeness strategies between Spoken Saudi and British English. The significance of this study lies in filling the literature gap that exist in this area as well as the findings of this study will help in contributing towards the development of second-language pedagogy. These results will also help to improve English language teaching in Saudi Arabia by focusing on areas that may cause pragmatic failure due to the differences between Arabic and English language. It may help the curriculum designers to add activities in which students practice making offers in English to help them improve their pragmatic competence based on the kinds of offers produced by the native British speakers in this study.

1.1 Research Questions

RQ1: Is there any significant inter-group difference between Saudi Arabic and British English speakers in using politeness strategies in realizing offers?

RQ2: Is there intra-group differences between Saudi Arabic and British English groups? That is, are there variations in the use of politeness strategies in realizing offers within the same female group in each culture?

RQ3: Is there any significant difference in the way Saudi Arabic and British English female speakers realize the contextual determinants of politeness such as, social distance, power and rank of imposition in the speech act of offering?

RQ4: Is Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness applicable to the Saudi context?

RQ5: Are there any other factors that might affect the female speaker's use of politeness strategies in realizing offers?

RQ6: Is there any significant relationship between the contextual determinants and the type of politeness strategies used?

2. Material Studied

As part of socializing, competent adults in every society learnt how to be polite linguistically and otherwise. That's why politeness has not been an instinctive part of mankind but it is a phenomenon which developed through sociocultural and historical processes. Historically tracing the term polite, it dates back in the 15th century. Etymologically, the term derived from late medieval politus which means smooth and accomplished. The word polite shared the same meaning as refined and polished when it was referred to people. Example, in the 17th century, a polite person was defined as refined and courteous in behavior, according to Oxford dictionary of etymology (Shahrokhi & Bidabadi, 2013).

2.1 Different Models of Politeness

2.1.1 Social Norm View

The social norm view of politeness in every society has its own set of social norms which consist of more or less clear rules that suggest or advice a certain behavior, state of affairs or way of thinking (Fraser, 1990). According to Nwoye (1992), in context to social norm view politeness is viewed as arising from awareness of one's social responsibilities to other members of the group to which one is indebted to loyalty or commitment. According to Eelen (2014), a final point on Fraser's theory is that he pretends the principles of Conversational Analysis rules like, repair system and turn-taking. Also, there are some conditions and prospects that are workable in any field of communication which conversationalists adhere to. Moreover, the social norm view theory of politeness is ignored because it is does not support modern linguistics and pragmatics.

2.1.2 The Conversational Maxim View

Yaqubi, et al (2016), in his study states that Grice, (1975) introduced co-operative principles and implicature as a way to investigate the hidden meaning of indirect utterances. Grice (1975), assumed that the speaker can predictably signal the implicature directly or indirectly to the hearer. He formulated a set of rules called co-operative principles also known as Grice maxims such as quality, quantity, relevance and manner which helps the interlocutors to work upon the conversational implicatures. According to Leech (2016), the framework presented by Grice in his conversational maxim theory does not directly explains as why people are indirect in conveying what they mean. Another study by Keenan (1976) also questions the universality of Grice conversational maxim view theory because according to Keenan achieving politeness through cooperative principles has not been observed in cultures.

2.1.3 Lakoff's Rules of Politeness

Co-operative principle failed to directly account for politeness but it gave rise to other theoretical and empirical work such as that of Lakoff rules of politeness. Lakoff, (1973), combined Grice conversational maxims with her own classification which consisted of 2 rules such as 'be clear and polite'. The criticism faced by this model of politeness was that it lacked sufficient empirical evidence for cross cultural strategies of politeness. This model does not even differentiate cleat polite behavior from appropriate behavior. According to Félix-Brasdefer, (2008) what is considered as appropriate behavior during social interaction like greeting, taking leaves and other routine acts may not be always be understood as polite behavior.

2.1.4 Leech's Politeness Principle and Maxims of Interaction

Leech, (2016) proposed politeness principles based on Grician framework and explained politeness as a regulative element in communication through a set of maxims. According to him, politeness is a helping factor that impacts the relationship between 'self,' which according to Leech means the speaker and the addressee. According to his model, politeness is described as reducing the expression of impolite beliefs as they are unpleasant or at a cost to it. The author of this model explains politeness as the key of pragmatic phenomenon not just for indirect conveying of what people mean to communicate but also the reason as to why people move away from co-operative principles. According to Locher, (2004), Leech's model is too theoretical to be applied to real languages. O'driscoll, (1996) in his study points that Leech's maxims do not contribute to the universality of politeness but they can be utilized for many cultural-specific realizations of politeness. Moreover, this model is not supported by enough empirical evidence cross-culturally and needs to be tested in various other cultures for further corroboration.

2.1.5 Brown and Levinson's Model of Politeness

Brown and Levinson's model of politeness is the most influential model to-date (Olshtain, et al 1993; Watts, et al 2005). Brown and Levinson (1978), constructed a Model Person who is a fluent speaker of natural language and is equipped with 2 special characteristics such as rationality and face. Rationality allows the Model Person to get involved in means-ends analysis. Also, it may play a role in the politeness theory and is related to cross-cultural features of linguistic politeness. This element has also been pointed out by Lyson (1977) who states that there are some socialization strategies that might be universal to humans. Brown and Levinson (1987) say that their model of politeness reflects strategies which are applicable to cross-linguistics and in context to cross-cultural too. This claim has been verified by Eelen, (2001) and Pikor-Niedzialek, (2005) by stating that the Model Person is seen as the personification of universally valid human social characteristics and principles of logicality and social reasoning. According to a study by Eelen (2014), Brown and Levinson's model (1987) has to some extent achieved the purpose of what it was designed for. It does not only account for what happens in polite behavior but it also explains as to why this certain behavior takes place with the notion of face. A number of researchers have been conducted to discuss the impact and influence of this model on socio-linguistics (Alkhateeb, 2015; Redmond, 2015; Adel et al 2016 and Agbaglo, 2017). In line with this, the current study finds Brown and Levinson's model (1987) as the most appropriate one to apply for investigating the difference in the female use of politeness strategies between spoken Saudi and British English.

3. Method

3.1 Study Participants

The study consisted of 103 female participants which were divided into 2 groups. The first group comprised of 53 native speakers of Saudi Arabia and the other group consisted of 50 British English females. As the British women only come for work in KSA which means their education would be at a considerable level therefore, the researcher was compelled to include only educated females as a part of the study sample. The participants aged between 18-50 and were mostly teachers, students and employees at educational institutes. The British students made up a small study size as compared to Saudis. The Saudi-students belonged to different majors such as Mathematics, Accountant, Arabic, English and History. Students who were aged between 20-23 held BA degrees and those aged between 25-35 were Masters (many of them were teachers too). On the other hand, the age of employees in these educational institutes ranged from 38-47. The other group which comprised of British participants were mainly teachers and employees from private colleges and British schools in Riyadh, and Jeddah and aged between 26-50. Only four British student participants aged 18 years participated in the study. The study compared the age range of the two groups by running a t-test. The results are shown in table 1 and 2.

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations of Age for the Saudi & the British Participants

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Saudi	53	28.5472	7.37868
British	50	35.8000	7.51597

Table 2. T-test for the Significance of Age Difference between the Saudi & the British Group

T	Df	Sig
-5.622	101	.000

Both table 1 and 2 shows a significant difference in the age mean between both the groups, t = -5.622 with a p value p< .000. Age mean in the British group is high as compared to the Saudi group (M=28.54 For Saudi females and M=35.800 for the British females). This difference is justified since the context of the study takes place in Saudi Arabia where people from the west mostly come for work and therefore the age of these people is normally high. Level of education and age both these variables were discarded from the study because of the restricted availability of British female subjects in Saudi Arabia. To decrease the effect of age on the speaker's use of politeness strategies, the sample participants included adult speakers who were either students or working women.

3.2 Problem with Sampling

A major hurdle that the researcher faced during the process of data collection resided at the stage of sampling. To get an access to British female speakers was quite a challenge as permission from the Ministry of Education was required in order to meet with the participants at different schools. Another challenge that the researcher faced was that the British population working at educational institutes were not comfortable interacting with strangers therefore only few agreed to participate in the study. This compelled the researcher to look for other participants through the internet. In this context an announcement on the websites (refer to Appendix A) were made which helped the researcher get an access to British female volunteers. The researcher observed the participants in person. One more hurdle

in data collection was the recording of participants voice that discouraged many people from both the cultures to participate in the study. In this case, the researcher assured the participants that it would be kept confidential and will be destroyed right after the completion of the study which was stated in the consent form.

3.3 Study Instrument

Before conducting the study, the researcher met the participants to get the consent form signed as well as to establish an acquaintance with them in order to make the in-depth face-to-face meeting more comfortable. In the same meeting, the researcher also handed over a form in which they had to fill their demographic details which helped the researcher to modify some situations slightly to suit the status of the participants. The researcher explained the participants what they needed to do. There were 15 real-life situations which would be described to them. They had to carefully listen to each one of them before responding (Appendix B). These situations were designed according to Brown and Levinson's (1987) contextual determinants that people are expected to come across in their daily lives. In every situation, they were asked to imagine a situation in which they had to offer something to someone. It was important for them to understand the situation completely before responding to it, the researcher helped if any of the participants encountered any problem in understanding the situation. A very important thing that was required of them before they responded was, they had to respond to every situation as naturally as possible. They were further notified that no marks would be given and there was no right or wrong answer to any of the situations. The researcher had an evaluation sheet to record their responses (Appendix C).

3.4 Study Procedure

The researcher gave instructions about the 15 situations and urged the participants to act out the offer naturally. For the Saudi group of participants, they were asked to respond in Saudi dialect not in standard Arabic. The session started by giving a description of each situation then turning on the recorder. The task was given by the researcher to one participant at a time, separately from the others to ensure individuality and confidentiality of responses. These responses were tape-recorded for transcription and analysis later on. The time for each session was between 20-30 minutes.

3.5 Validity and Reliability

To check the effectiveness of observational task consisting of 15 situations in measuring what it has been designed for, 2 types of validity were employed in this study: face validity and content validity. Items for the study were chosen so that they would comply with the test specification. Two doctors specialized in the field reviewed the test specifications and the selected items. Their comments helped in improving the task. The reliability of the instrument had been ensured by 2 types, test reliability and inter-rater reliability.

3.5.1 Test Reliability

The test reliability was attained in the pilot study by a brief checklist in which the participants were asked to evaluate every situation according to the linguistic clarity and cultural plausibility. In this case, alpha is computed in table 3.

Table 3. Reliability-Scale (Alpha) for the 15 situations

Axis		No. of items	*Alpha*
First	Socially close addressees	6	*0.8223*
Second	Socially distant addressees	4	*0.7578*
Third	Highly socially distant addressees	5	*0.8825*
Study tool as a whole		15	*0.9295*

It is clear from table 3 that the transactions of the previous stability of the main values ranged between 0.7578 and 0.8825 which are statistically acceptable. Alpha was then to be for the total=0.9295. This is also considered significantly high and indicates the possibility and stability of the results that can be obtained through a study during its final application.

3.5.2 Inter-rater reliability

In this study, the researcher along with another professor, an expert in the field analyzed a number of utterances individually. Two sets of 50 utterances (English and Arabic) were randomly chosen to test how far the researcher's coding of the test abides Brown and Levison's (1987) classification of politeness strategies. Table 4 shows the degree of agreement between the two coders.

Table 4. Degree of agreement between the two coders

	Value		Sig.	
Kappa	Saudi Arabic	British English	Saudi Arabic	*British English*
	.634	.723	.000	*.000*
Number of Valid Cases	*50*	*50*		

**The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

3.6 Data Analysis of the study

The data collected was quantitatively analyzed to answer the research questions. Therefore, the researcher looked at the frequencies of the strategies used by the participants in offers. An SPSS program was run to test the significant differences between Saudi and British groups in the types of politeness strategies and the realization of the contextual determinants based on the frequencies. For frequencies, mean and standard deviation of items of the observational instrument the computations are made. To test the comparison of the two sets of mean a t-test was carried out. As the two group cases are covered by a t-test so one-way ANOVA is used to test the differences among at least 3 groups. Lastly, Pearson Correlation test is used to verify the results of the 2 tests and illustrate the relationship between politeness strategies and the different variables.

4. Results

To answer research question 1, chi-square and ANOVA test was run and paired sample test was run for intragroup differences to answer research question 2. Moreover, to answer research question 3, a T-test and ANOVA test were used and for answering research questions 4,5 and 6, Pearson Correlation test was used.

4.1 Using a Chi-square for Inter-group Differences

The inter-group differences were examined in 2 ways such as, regarding the use of politeness strategies in 15 situations on one hand, and on the other hand the preference of the type of strategy in general. A chi-square was run to examine the inter-group differences in the realization of politeness strategies in all the 15 situations. The test results show a significant difference in frequencies of politeness strategies in most of the situations as reflected in table 5. It shows significant differences in most of the situations except in Sit#1, 9, and 10. To begin with, when making an offer to the mother (i.e., very close social distance), when the rank of imposition was low and the addressee's power was high, the differences in the politeness strategies were significant (χ^2 (4, 50) = 34.202, p < .000).

Table 5. Chi-square Test for the Significance of the Inter-group Differences between the Saudi and the British Female Speakers according to the Situations

Sit	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
χ^2	9.357	34.202	26.202	60.133	40.104	10.589	21.302	*31.117*
Sig.	.096	.000**	.000**	.000**	.000**	0.032*	.000**	*.000**
Sit	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
χ^2	6.600	9.075	44.690	21.111	47.404	42.100	10.350	
Sig.	*.252*	*.059*	*.000**	*.001**	*.000**	*.000**	*.035*	

Sit= Situation χ^2 = Chi-square   Sig. = Significance *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

4.2 ANOVA Tests for Inter-group Differences

Other way to investigate the inter-group differences was to compare the means of the used politeness strategies in general, regardless of the situations in which these strategies were used. Table 5.1 and 5.2 reflect these differences. Tables 6 and 7 show significant differences in the politeness strategies between the two cultural groups that are centered around the BOR, PSP, NGP, and Don't-do-the FTA. The first two strategies plus the fourth were more significantly frequent among Saudi female speakers, F (1, 28) = 4.183, p < .050 and F (1, 28) = 7.197, p < .012, F (1, 28) = 11.151, p <.002, respectively. NGP, on the other hand, was more significantly frequent among the British female speakers, F (1, 28) =31.145, p < .000.

Table 6. Mean Difference in the Overall Use of Politeness Strategies between the Saudi and British Group

Strat.	Gr	N	Mean	Std. Dev
BOR	S	15	9.2000	10.32473
	B	15	3.3333	4.09994
PSP	S	15	9.8667	9.22626

		N	Mean	Std.Dev
	B	15	3.0000	*3.62531*
NGP	S	15	17.8667	*11.12826*
	B	15	36.5333	*6.63181*
OFR	S	15	.8667	*1.64172*
	B	15	.1333	*.35187*
Mix	S	15	4.2000	*4.10922*
	B	15	3.1333	*3.56304*
NOTDO	S	15	11.0000	9.22729
	B	*15*	*2.7333*	*2.60403*

Strat=strategy Gr= group N= number of situations Std.Dev=Standard deviation BOR=bald on record PSP= positive politeness NGP= negative politeness OFR= off-record NOTDO= Don't-do-FT

Table 7. ANOVA Test for the Significance of Differences between the Saudi & British Groups in the Type of Strategy

Strat.		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
BOR	Between Groups	258.133	1	258.133	*4.183*	*.050**
	Within Groups	1727.733	28	61.705		
	Total	1985.867	29			
PSP	Between Groups	353.633	1	353.633	*7.197*	*.012**
	Within Groups	1375.733	28	49.133		
	Total	1729.367	29			
NGP	Between Groups	2613.333	1	2613.333	31.145	*.000***
	Within Groups	2349.467	28	83.910		
	Total	4962.800	29			
Strat.		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
OFR	Between Groups	4.033	1	4.033	2.861	*.102*
	Within Groups	39.467	28	1.410		
	Total	43.500	29			
Mix	Between Groups	8.533	1	8.533	.577	.454
	Within Groups	414.133	28	14.790		
	Total	422.667	29			
NOTDO	Between Groups	512.533	1	512.533	11.151	*.002***
	Within Groups	1286.933	28	45.962		
	Total	*1799.467*	29			

Strat. = Strategy Gr. = group df= degree of freedom BOR=bald on record PSP= positive politeness NGP= negative politeness OFR= off-record NOTDO= Don't-do-FTA **The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level * The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

4.3 Paired-Sample Test for Intra-group Differences

To answer the second research question, a pair-sample test was used to investigate the intra-group differences to examine how the speakers within each group changed their strategies from one situation to another. Table 8 shows significant differences within each group. Such differences were, in most cases, more frequent and at a high level of significance in the Saudi group across the situations, which supports the previous results of the standard deviations of the two groups.

Table 8. Paired-Sample Test for the Intra-group Differences of the Two Groups

Sit. Pair	Saudi				British	
	T-value	D.F	Sig.	T-value	D.F	*Sig.*
sit1 - sit2	-3.124	52	.003**	-.798	49	.429
sit3 - sit4	2.209	52	.032*	-3.163	46	*.003***
sit5 - sit6	-6.596	52	.000**	1.229	49	.225
sit7 - sit8	5.312	52	.000**	1.915	49	.061
sit9 - sit10	3.332	52	.002**	.659	46	.513
sit11-sit13	-9.909	52	.000**	-.785	49	.436
sit12 - sit13	-10.744	52	.000**	-2.401	49	*.020**
sit14 - sit15	3.879	52	.000**	-2.406	46	*.020**

*The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level ** The mean difference is significant at the 0.01

4.4 ANOVA & T-tests for Contextual Determinants

Brown and Levison's model claim that the cultural differences in the use of politeness strategies are derived from different realizations of contextual determinants across cultures. The tests were run to find out the realization of contextual determinants in Saudi and British culture. The results below reflect similarities and differences between the two groups in the realization of the contextual determinants. The ANOVA test did not show significant impact of power on the use of polite offers for both the groups. Whereas, on the other hand, social distance for the Saudi group showed semi-significant impact on PSP ($F= 3.307$, $p= .056$). For the British group, the social distance impact was very obvious and there was a significant impact of it on PSP ($F= 4.336$, $p < .030$) and the mixed super strategies ($F= 7.096$, $p< .006$). Moreover, the t-test results showed a significant influence of the rank of imposition on the use of NGP in the Saudi group ($F= -2.174$, $p< .049$). For the other group, the rank of imposition showed no significant impact on the type of strategy. These results showed significant effect of some of the contextual determinants but they could not explain how these determinants affected the politeness strategies. Therefore, it was necessary to conduct Pearson Correlation test to verify the previous results.

Table 9. One-way ANOVA Test for the Effect of Power on the Use of Politeness Strategies in Saudi Arabic Offers

Strategy		Sum of	d.f.	Mean Square	F	*Sig.*
	Between Group	102.700	2	51.350	.443	
BOR	Within Groups	1389.700	12	115.808		.652
	Total	1492.700	14			
	Between Group	46.533	2	23.267	.244	.787
PSP	Within Groups	1145.200	12	95.433		
	Total	1191.733	14			
	Between Group	109.200	2	54.600		
NGP	Within Groups	1587.200	12	132.267	.413	.671
	Total	1696.400	14			

OFR	Between Group	2.533	2	1.267		
	Within Groups	35.200	12	2.933	.432	.659
	Total	1.733	14			
MIX	Between Group	2.033	2	20.863	1.286	.312
	Within Groups	175.700	12	16.223		
	Total	236.400	14			
NOTDO	Between Group	25.200	2	12.600		
	Within Groups	1166.800	12	97.233	.130	.880
	Total	*1192.000*	*14*			

BOR=bald on record PSP= positive politeness NGP= negative politeness OFR= off-record NOTDO= Don't-do-FTA

Table 10. One-way ANOVA for the Effect of Power on the Use of Politeness Strategies in British English Offers

Strategy		Sum of squares	*df Mean square F Sig.*			
BOR	Between Groups	12.133	2	6.067	.326	.728
	Within Groups	223.200	12	18.600		
	Total	235.333	14			
PSP	Between Groups	52.300	2	26.150	2.383	.134
	Within Groups	131.700	12	10.975		
	Total	184.000	14			
NGP	Between Groups	109.433	2	54.717	1.297	.309
	Within Groups	506.300	12	42.192		
	Total	615.733	14			
OFR	Between Groups	.058	2	.029	.209	.814
	Within Groups	1.675	12	.140		
	Total	1.733	14			
MIX	Between Groups	2.033	2	1.017	.069	.933
	Within Groups	175.700	12	14.642		
	Total	177.733	14			
NOTDO	Between Groups	7.258	2	3.629	.497	.621
	Within Groups	87.675	12	7.306		
	Total	*94.933*	*14*			

Table 11. One-way ANOVA for the Effect of Social Distance on the Use of Politeness Strategies in Saudi Arabic Offers

Strategy		Sum of Square	df	Mean of Square	*F Sig.*	
BOR	Between Groups	239.450	3	79.817	.701	.571
	Within Groups	1252.950	11	113.905		

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F	Sig.
	Total	1492.400	14			
	Between Groups	550.933	3	183.644		
PSP	Within Groups	610.800	11	55.527	3.307	0.056
	Total	1161.733	14			
	Between Groups	393.450	3	131.150		
NGP	Within Groups	1302.950	11	118.450	1.107	0.387
	Total	1696.400	14			
	Between Groups	9.983	3	3.328		
OFR	Within Groups	27.750	11	2.523	1.319	0.318
	Total	37.733	14			
	Between Groups	39.600	3	13.200	.738	.551
MIX	Within Groups	196.800	11	17.891		
	Total	236.400	14			
	Between Groups	495.300	3	165.100		
NOTDO	Within Groups	696.700	11	63.336	2.607	0.104
	Total	*1192.000*	*14*			

BOR=bald on record PSP= positive politeness NGP= negative politeness OFR= off-record NOTDO= Don't-do-FTA

Table 12. One-way ANOVA for the Effect of Social Distance on the Use of Politeness Strategies in British English Offers

	Strategy	Sum of Squares	df	Mean of Squares	F	Sig.
	Between Groups	33.283	3	11.094	.604	.626
BOR	Within Groups	202.050	11	18.368		
	Total	235.333	14			
	Between Groups	99.700	3	33.233	4.336	.030*
PSP	Within Groups	84.300	11	7.664		
	Total	184.000	14			
	Between Groups	168.483	3	56.161	1.381	.300
NGP	Within Groups	447.250	11	40.659		
	Total	615.733	14			
	Between Groups	.183	3	.061	.434	.733
OFR	Within Groups	1.550	11	.141		
	Total	1.733	14			
	Between Groups	117.183	3	39.061	7.096	.006**
MIX	Within Groups	60.550	11	5.505		
	Total	177.733	14			
	Between Groups	4.633	3	1.544	.188	.902
NOTDO	Within Groups	90.300	11	8.209		
	Total	*94.933*	*14*			

BOR=bald on record PSP= positive politeness NGP= negative politeness OFR= off-record NOTDO= Don't-do-FTA

**The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level * The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

Table 13. T-test for the Effect of the Rank of Imposition on the Use of Politeness Strategies in Saudi Arabic Offer

Strategy	Rank	N	Mean	Standard deviation	T- Value	Sig.
BOR	low	9	13.1111	11.54821	1.974	.070
	high	6	3.3333	4.03320		
PSP	low	6	3.3333	4.03320	-.154	.880
	high	9	9.5556	8.95979		
NGP	low	6	13.3333	7.59934	-2.174	.049*
	high	9	24.6667	12.72268		
OFR	low	6	.6667	1.00000	-.564	.583
	high	9	24.6667	2.40139		
MIX	low	6	3.7778	4.38115	-.474	.644
	high	9	1.1667	3.97073		
NOTDO	low	6	12.5556	11.33701	0.789	.444
	high	9	8.6667	4.67618		

BOR=bald on record PSP= positive politeness NGP= negative politeness OFR= off-record NOTDO= Don't-do-FTA

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

Table 14. T-test for the Effect of Rank of Imposition on the Use of Politeness Strategies in British English Offers

Strategy	Rank	N	Mean	Standard deviation	T- Value	Sig.
BOR	low	9	4.7778	4.76387	1.800	.095
	high	6	1.1667	1.16905		
PSP	low	9	3.2222	2.99073	.281	.783
	high	6	2.6667	4.71876		
NGP	low	9	35.1111	7.89691	-1.019	.327
	high	6	38.6667	3.77712		
OFR	low	9	.1111	.33333	-.290	.777
	high	6	.1667	.40825		
MIX	low	9	3.7778	4.32371	.849	.411
	high	6	2.1667	1.94079		
NOTDO	low	9	2.6667	2.34521	-.117	.909
	high	6	2.8333	3.18852		

BOR=bald on record PSP= positive politeness NGP= negative politeness OFR= off-record NOTDO= Don't-do-FTA

The Pearson Correlation test supported most the previous results related to the realization of the contextual determinants in the both the cultures. Unlike, the ANOVA test, the correlation test of Saudi group indicated a strong negative relationship between social distance and PSP ($r = -.644$, $p < .010$) and a positive relationship between rank of imposition and NGP ($r = .516$, $p < .049$). For the British group, the test showed the effect of only social distance on the strategies used. There was a significantly negative correlation seen between social distance and PSP ($r = -.575$, $p < .025$) and mixed super strategies ($r = .577$, $p < .024$). On the other hand, a positive relationship with NGP is seen ($r = .521$ $p < .047$).

Table 15. Pearson Correlation Test between the Type of Strategy & B&L's (1987) Contextual Determinants in Saudi Arabic Offers

Strategy		P	SD	R
BOR	Pearson Correlation	-.119	-.039	-.480
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.674	.890	.070
PSP	Pearson Correlation	.027	-.644**	.043
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.948	.010	.880
NGP	Pearson Correlation	.203	.215	.516*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.468	.442	.049
OFR	Pearson Correlation	-.103	.435	.154
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.715	.105	.583
Mix	Pearson Correlation	.036	.000	.130
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.899	1.000	.644
NOTDO	Pearson Correlation	-.137	.351	-.214
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.625	.199	.444

BOR=bald on record PSP= positive politeness NGP= negative politeness OFR= off-record NOTDO= Don't-do-FTA

**The correlation is significant at the 0.01 level * The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

Table 16. Pearson Correlation Test between the Types of the Strategy & B&L's (1987) Contextual Determinants in British English Offers

Strategy	Correlation	P	SD	R
BOR	Pearson Correlation	-.103	.136	-.447
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.715	.628	.095
PSP	Pearson Correlation	.408	-.575*	-.078
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.131	.025	.783
NGP	Pearson Correlation	-.312	.521*	.272

OFR	Sig. (2-tailed)	.257	.047	.327
	Pearson Correlation	.180	-.374	-.218
Mix	Sig. (2-tailed)	.521	.170	.435
	Pearson Correlation	.102	-.577*	-.209
NOTDO	Sig. (2-tailed)	.717	.024	.455
	Pearson Correlation	.042	-.092	.169
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.881	.743	.548

BOR=bald on record PSP= positive politeness NGP= negative politeness OFR= off-record NOTDO= Don't-do-FTA

* The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The aim of the study was to apply Brown and Levinson's model of politeness to investigate the differences in the female use of politeness strategies between spoken Saudi and British English. Based on this aim, the study formulated 6 research questions. In Saudi context, the findings of this study showed high applicability with Brown and Levinson's model of politeness. It was observed that the Saudi females realized all the super-strategies using most of the sub-strategies.

This study contributes towards the previous studies that applied the model of Brown and Levinson to other Arabic dialects such as Khouja (2015), Lebanese Arabic; Atawneh & Sridhar (1993) Palestinian Arabic; Eshreteh (2014), Tunisian Arabic. The high applicability of Brown and Levinson model in this study supports the claim of universality as stated by Eelen, (2001) and Pikor-Niedzialek, (2005) and cited in the literature of this study. Moreover, the results of the study are in line with Brown and Levinson's claim that the realization of specific strategies are cultural-specific. This means that what makes it different from one culture to another is the stress that people put on the situational or contextual variables such as power, social distance and rank of imposition.

Although as shown in the result that inter-group differences were observed related to the realization of some contextual variables but there were instances where similarities were also observed between Saudi Arabic and British English females. Like there were similarities and differences in the way the two groups realized the social distance variable but power did not show any significant impact on the choices made by the two groups in their politeness strategies.

Overall, all the test results showed a significant impact of social distance on the use of politeness strategies in making offers among British female speakers. On the other hand, only one test reflected a significant impact of social distance on Saudi female's use of PSP, they used it more frequently with people they were familiar with rather than the unfamiliar ones. The rank of imposition showed significant impact on the Saudi female speakers while using NGP. The higher the imposition the more negatively polite the Saudi female speakers become towards the addressee. The study findings supported the cross-cultural similarities and differences that Brown and Levinson's (1978) model of politeness claims.

The study aim was to apply Brown and Levinson's model of politeness to investigate the differences in the female use of politeness strategies between Spoken Saudi and British English. The findings of the study indicated significant cultural differences in the use of politeness strategies between the two groups. The elements which caused these differences were social distance between the speaker and the addressee and the rank of imposition whereas power seems to have no significant impact on realization offers in both the groups. Another factor was the degree of involvement in the event of

offering which was found to be influential on the type of politeness strategies used.

Future studies can include male participants and compare their linguistic behavior with female mono as well as cross-culturally. Moreover, foreign language learning can be examined by involving Saudi EFL students to test the effect of cultural differences on language learning as well as the areas of transferability in realizing offers. Other methods of data collection can be adopted to obtain better results. The findings of the study show the cultural differences that are seen in Saudi Arabic and British English females in realizing polite offers, this finding may help to bridge the gaps that exist in intercultural communication. Moreover, syllabus and textbook designers may use the findings of this to include activities that may help Saudi EFL students to be engaged in real-life situations and practice realizing offers under different contextual determinants.

6. Study Limitation

The study was limited in the following ways:

- It was restricted to examining only spoken form of language in Saudi Arabic and British English.
- The data was derived from observational approach.
- The participants of this study were only females
- The dialect used in Riyadh was only examined in this study.
- For British population, working females employed at educational institutes of Riyadh and Jeddah were considered for this study.

Acknowledgments

References

Adel, S. M. R., Davoudi, M., & Ramezanzadeh, A. (2016). A qualitative study of politeness strategies used by Iranian EFL learners in a class blog. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *4*(1), 47-62.

Agbaglo, E.2017. *Sections of English Research Articles*.

Alkhateeb, I. 2015. Examining the universality of Brown and Levinsons' Politeness model In the Arabic Gulf Context. *Journal: Journal of Advances in Linguistics*, *5*(3).

Atawneh, A., & Sridhar, S. N. (1993). Arabic-English bilinguals and the directive speech act. *World Englishes*, *12*(3), 279-297.

Aziz, E. A. (2003). Theorizing linguistic politeness in Indonesian society. *Linguistik Indonesia*, *21*(2), 167-187.

Dowlatabadi, H., Mehri, E., & Tajabadi, A. (2014). Politeness Strategies in Conversation Exchange: The Case of Council for Dispute Settlement in Iran. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *98*, 411-419.

Eelen, G. (2014). *A Critique of Politeness Theory: Volume 1* (Vol. 1). Routledge.

Eshreteh, M. K. (2014). *A cross-cultural socio-pragmatic study of invitations in Palestinian Arabic and American English*.

Félix-Brasdefer, J. C. (2008). *Politeness in Mexico and the United States: A contrastive study of the realization and perception of refusals* (Vol. 171). John Benjamins Publishing.

Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of pragmatics*, *14*(2), 219-236.

Grice, P. (1975). *Logic and conversation in Syntax and semantics* 3: Speech acts, a cura di P. Cole.

Gunarwan, A. (1994). Kesantunan negatif di kalangan dwibahasawan Indonesia-Jawa di Jakarta: Kajian sosiopragmatik. *Di dalam Bambang Kaswanti Purwo (Editor). PELLBA*, 7.

Ide, S. (1989). *Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness.*

Kasper, G, (1998). *Interlanguage pragmatics.* Pp. 183-208 in learning second and foreign languages, edited by H. Byrnes. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.

Keenan, E O. (1976). The universality of conversational postulates. *Language in Society* 5:67-80

Khouja, D. A. (2015). *The pragmatics of requests in Lebanese Arabic and English in the discourse of Lebanese students* (Doctoral dissertation).

Kiyama, S., Tamaoka, K., & Takiura, M. (2012). Applicability of Brown and Levinson's politeness theory to a non-western culture: Evidence from Japanese facework behaviors. *SAGE Open*, 2(4), 2158244012470116.

Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness; or, minding your p's and q's. In *ninth regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 8: 292-305. 292J305. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Leech, G. (2016). *Principles of pragmatics*. Routledge.

Locher, M. A. (2004). *Power and Politeness in Action: Disagreements in Oral Communication.* Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of pragmatics*, *12*(4), 403-426.

Nwoye, O. G. (1992). Linguistic politeness and socio-cultural variations of the notion of face. *Journal of pragmatics*, *18*(4), 309-328.

O'driscoll, J. (1996). About face: A defence and elaboration of universal dualism. *Journal of pragmatics*, *25*(1), 1-32.

Olshtain, E., Weinbach, L., Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics*.

Redmond, M. V. (2015). *Face and politeness theories*.

Shahrokhi, M., & Bidabadi, F. S. (2013). An overview of politeness theories: Current status, future orientations. *American Journal of Linguistics*, 2(2), 17-27.

Susanti, R., Sumarlam, S., Djatmika, D., & Rohmadi, M. (2020). Study of Politeness Strategy of Speech Act Caring Utterances: Discourse Completion Test (DCT) Approach. *Latin American Utopia and Praxis: International Journal of Ibero-American Philosophy and Social Theory*, 25 (1), 282-290.

Watts, R. J., Ide, S., & Ehlich, K. (2005). *Politeness in language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Yaqubi, M., Saeed, K. M., & Khaksari, M. (2016). Conversational maxim view of politeness: focus on politeness implicatures raised in performing Persian offers and invitations. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(1), 52-58.