A Cultural Study of The Effect of Language Transfer on Politeness Strategies employed by Iranian and Turkish Students

Sohrab Rezaei

Assistand Professor Allameh Tabatabaei University,Tehran,Iran
Sohrab_rezaei@yahoo.com

Abstract: This study has been an attempt to investigate the effect of learning English as a foreign language on employing politeness strategies by Iranian and Turkish students. Two groups of Iranian grade four university students majoring English and Farsi languages and two groups of Turkish grade four students majoring English and Turkish languages have been selected as subject for the study. The results have revealed that for Iranian participants, there is evident differences between EFL and NL learners in their choice of politeness strategies in different interactions. These differences can be interpreted as coming from English into EFL learners' linguistic performance. A general comparison has revealed that language transfer effect on Turkish EFL learners is not so great but comparing this group to Iranian EFL learners, clearly shows that language transfer effect on Iranian EFL learners is more than Turkish EFL learners. These differences can be interpreted as a result of cultural differences between Iranian and Turkish EFL learners on one side and the Transfer effect coming from English language into Persian language and culture more than Turkish culture and language or it can be claimed that due to closeness of Turkey to western culture and languages, the possible language transfer effect has already come into Turkish participants linguistic and cultural behavior.

Introduction

There have been different approaches to the study of language. Some have focused on the structure of the language while others have looked at language in the light of its culture and its context of occurrence. Speakers of different languages exhibit different verbal and non verbal behavior in their interactions. The possibilities of misunderstanding can be seen when two totally different cultures come into contact with each other. There are many examples of cross–cultural misunderstanding in the literature on sociolinguistics, pragmatics, and intercultural communication.

Recently it has become widely accepted that verbal communication is not simply a means of conveying information, but also an equally important means of establishing, maintaining, and even terminating social relationships with other people. Various scholars have repeatedly emphasized the interrelationship of a culture of a society and its language. Consequently, linguistic theory cannot restrict its attention to the study of the linguistic code and ignore the general social communicative conduct, since they are closely interrelated.

Researchers have proposed several theoretical frameworks in pragmatics and sociolinguistics. One of the most outstanding frame works which has attracted the attention of most scholar all around the world is that of Brown and Levinson (1978) presented in their extensive essay "Some universals in language usage: Politeness Phenomena." Brown and Levinson present a cohesive and comprehensive theory of politeness in which linguistic devices are realizations of specific politeness strategies.

Review of literature

The communicative approach to language was one of the main reasons of pragmatic studies. There have been several definitions of pragmatics most of which share the general notion of 'studying language in use". Jame (1980) defined pragmatics as "human, broad, macro linguistics which aims to achieve a scientific understanding of how people communicate and to incorporate the functional aspect of language in to the study of languages and, to search the ways in which people put language to use". (Ibid. P.100).

Politeness Principle

Leech (1983) in his *Principles of Pragmatics* attempts to develop his previous work (*Language and Tact* in 1980) and expands and elaborates on Grice's (1975) views. He presents an extensive analysis of politeness in terms of maxims with respect to a more general pragmatic framework in which politeness features count as a very important pragmatic factor regulating interaction.

He characterizes his approach to pragmatics as 'rhetorical' in the sense that the focus is placed on a goal-oriented speech situation, in which speaker's [**s's**] use of language is to produce a particular effect in the mind of hearer [**h**].

Politeness Theory

Brown and Levinson (1987), henceforth (B&L) propose a theory of politeness which draws its basic concepts from Grice's CP. They believe that the CP defines an unmarked or asocial presumptive framework for communication with the essential assumption of "no deviation from rational efficiencies without a reason" (p. 5). But they do not seed the modifications of the Gricean program as wholly successful. (See 2.3 for discussion).

B&L also draw on speech act theory though less heavily than the CP. At first, they took this theory as a basis for a mode of discourse analysis, but then they found it not so promising as speech act theory forces a sentence-based, speaker-oriented mode of analysis where their own thesis requires that utterances are often equivocal in force.

The alternative they took is that they avoided taking such categories as the basis of discourse analysis and chose other more demonstrable categories. In what follows, these categories and notions, as depicted in their lengthy description of their theory (1987) are reviewed.

The notion of face and face threatening acts

Basic to Brown and Levinson's model, is a Model Person who is a willful fluent speaker of a natural language. All Model Persons are endowed with two qualities: 'rationality and face' as means to satisfy communication and face-oriented ends. They have borrowed the term 'face' from Goffman [1967] and from the English folk term that is related to the notions of being embarrassed or humiliated or losing face.

In B & L's view, face consists of two related aspects: (1) negative face: the basic claim of territories, personal preserves, right to non-distraction, i.e., to freedom of action and freedom from imposition, and (2) positive face: the positive self-image or 'personality' (crucially the desire of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others.

The other notion that B&L's theory rests on is the notion of face threatening acts (FTAs). They assert that either or both of an individual's face, i.e., the negative face and the positive face can be threatened by certain face threatening acts, which are defined in terms of whose face, Speaker's (S's) or Hearer's (H's) is at stake and which face want is threatened.

Strategies for doing FTAs

The next notion that B&L's theory rests on is the strategies for doing FTAs. They believe that in the context of the mutual vulnerability of face, any rational agent will seek to avoid these FTAs or will use certain strategies to minimize the threat. In deciding to do the FTA, they can go *on record* or *off record.*

In going on record, an actor makes it clear to participants what communicative intention led the actor to do an act (A).On the other hand, if an actor goes off record in doing A, then there is more than one ambiguously attributable intention so that the actor cannot be held to have committed him/herself to one particular intent.

Positive politeness

The linguistic realizations of this strategy are very much like normal linguistic behavior between intimate individuals where expressions of solidarity, informality and familiarity are routinely exchanged. But the only feature that distinguishes positive politeness redress from normal everyday intimate language behavior is an element of exaggeration, which, in turn, introduces an element of insincerity. Nevertheless, this insincerity in exaggerated expressions of approval or interest, such as, "How absolutely marvelous! I can't imagine how you manage to keep your roses so exquisite, Mrs. B "(ibid. p. 103) implies that the S really sincerely wants H's positive face to be enhanced. (See ibid. p. 102 for illustration).

Negative politeness

In negative politeness, strategies are addressed to H's negative face, i.e., his desire to have his freedom of action unhindered. This is the heart of respect behavior and its function is to minimize the particular imposition that the FTA effects. In the western cultures, negative politeness is the most elaborate and the most conventionalized set of linguistic strategies and fills the etiquette books. The forms of politeness are characterized as expressions of restraint, formality and distancing, and its linguistic realizations can be exemplified as: be conventionally indirect, give deference, and apologize. The output strategies given for negative politeness (see ibid. p.131 for illustration) are all useful forms for social distancing and in so doing S wants to put a social brake on his course of intentions; unlike positive politeness

Off-Record

There are two major strategies within this super strategy making up fifteen minor strategies.The first type involves 'invite conversational implicature via hints triggered by violation of Gricean maxims'.The second major strategy, namely, 'be vague or ambiguous' involves violation of Manner maxim.

The circumstances or the sociological variables

B & L argue that these following sociological variables, i.e., social distance (D), relative power (P), and absolute ranking of impositions in the particular culture are intended as actor's assumptions of such ratings which are mutually assumed between S and H within certain limits.

D is a symmetrical social dimension of similarity/difference in which S and H stand for the purposes of this act. More often, it is based on an assessment of the frequency of interaction and the kind of material or non-material goods, including face, exchanged between S and H.

P is an asymmetrical social dimension of relative power. This is the degree to which H can impose his/her plans and self-evaluation. They mention that there are mainly two sources of power that can be authorized or unauthorized: material control (over economic distribution and physical force) and metaphysical control (over the actions of others). Usually, both of these sources of power are at play.

R is a culturally and situationally defined ranking of impositions, which is based on two scales, or ranks that are empirically identifiable for negative-face FTAs. The first ranking is in proportion to the expenditure of *services* including the provision of time, and the second of *goods* including non-material goods, such as information, as well as the expression of regard and other face payments.

There have been numerous studies on B&L's theory and have found this concept apparently successful. But the claim for universality of this theory has been called into question from both an empirical and theoretical viewpoint by a number of authors. O'Driscoll (1996) who strongly argues in favor of the universality of this theory summarizes the oppositions as follows. Within the mainland Chinese culture, this concept has been used for an exposition of the communicative norms and has been claimed to be irrelevant to this culture. Similarly, although one study has found the concept fruitful for illuminating the Japanese system of honorifics, several other studies have shown that there are some very common situations and linguistic enactments in Japanese culture to which it does not seem to be applicable. Siffianou (1992) finds this concept very useful for comparing British and Greek norms of politeness, but Pavlidou [1994] finds it hard to apply it to a comparison of Greek and German habits on the telephone. It has also been claimed that this concept has no place in an exposition of Igbo society. Finally, Wierzbicka (1985) shows that face does not seem to entail values in Polish culture. In sum, three aspects of this criticism can be perceived: (1) objections to the universality of B&L's face and its constituents, (2)

B&L's exposition of its role in politeness, and (3) data found to be inapplicable.

Koutlaki (2002) mentions that B&L's theory has received criticism mainly because of their (1987, p. 24) assertion that "some acts are intrinsically threatening to face and thus require softening". For a review of B&L's theory with respect to non-western languages see Koutlaki (1997, 2002).

Aims and objectives of the study

The main aim of this study has been to investigate the effect of language transfer on employing politeness strategies by students from two different cultural/ linguistic situations in order to discuss the extent to which it is universal. It has attempted to investigate how it is visualized in Farsi and Turkish language and cultures. The major speech acts to be studied here in this research are favor asking, complaining and griping.

The participants in this study have represented eight cultural/ linguistic communities:
a) Iranian male and female native speakers of Farsi studying Farsi language and literature at grade four undergraduate level in different universities in Tehran.
b) Iranian male and female native speakers of Farsi studying English language or English literature at grade four undergraduate level in different universities of Tehran.
c) Turkish male and female native speakers of Turkish majoring Turkish language and literature at grade four undergraduate level in university of Istanbul.
d) Turkish male and female native speakers of Turkish studying English language or literature at grade four undergraduate level in university of Istanbul.

It is worth mentioning that the participants mentioned in groups "b" and "d" above have been studied to see the instances of deviation from the norms of Turkish or Farsi languages in the speech acts of these students as a result of studying English and getting familiarity with it. It can be considered as transfer effect not from L1 to L2 but vice-versa, as Weinreich (1983) defined it as a two – way process.

The inclusion of two groups of undergraduate EFL students in the study can reveal the influence of any possible transfer effect from English to their use of their native language and will show whether being familiar with English language and studying it can cause any difference in selecting and using communication strategies between these groups and those who do not have more knowledge of English.

Research question:

This study has aimed to find an answer to the question, "Does studying EFL at undergraduate level have any influence on the selection and realization of

politeness strategies of native speakers of Farsi and Turkish languages?"

Instrumentation

A written discourse completion task (WDCT) including 24 situations, has been used to collect data as the instrument for this research.

Data collection

The procedures for gathering the data have been as follows: As for the NST and Turkish EFL groups, the researcher asked the Istanbul University to help him in doing the task. Since the subjects were senior students in two fields namely EFL and teaching Turkish literature and language ,which is called NL henceforth , needed measure were taken to ask for permission from the officials. Then a copy of questionnaire was give to those students who were interested to take part in the study. They were told that no time limitation was set to do the task and were given enough time to return the questionnaires.

As for the Persian EFL and NSP groups, the researchers as well as several colleagues attended different classes at several universities and explained to the classes the type of informants were needed with respect to their parents' and their own mother-tongue. To those who volunteered, a copy of the WDCT was given and they were asked to take it home and return it to their professor within a month.

All the groups under study have been asked to fill out a background questionnaire which required them to provide information about their age, degree(s) held or being sought, their first language, their parents' first language, language(s) spoken at home, place of birth and residence in the past and proceed along the instructions provided for completing the WDCT.

Language transfer and politeness strategies.

One of the most important aims of the present study has been to investigate the possible differences between EFL and native language (NL) learners and to find out whether the study of native language or EFL makes any change in the employment of politeness strategies by the subjects from Iranian and Turkish societies.

The effect of language transfer on Iranian EFL and NL learners' choice of politeness strategy.

This section has intended to find out the probable impact of studying EFL in the choice of politeness strategies by Iranian males and females in general .From another point of view it can survey the probable impact of native language in EFL learners' choice of politeness strategies. Table 1. shows the frequency and type of strategies employed by Iranian interlocutors.

*Table -1. Language transfer and politeness strategies used by **Iranian** interactors.*

Crosstab

			DEGREEOFPOLITNESS					Total
			BOR	PPS	NPS	OFFR	DON'T	
LANGUAGE	**NATIVE**	**Count**	287	447	639	685	305	2363
		% within LANGUAGE	12.1%	18.9%	27.0%	29.0%	12.9%	100.0%
	EFL	**Count**	433	484	719	600	141	2377
		% within LANGUAGE	18.2%	20.4%	30.2%	25.2%	5.9%	100.0%
Total		**Count**	720	931	1358	1285	446	4740
		% within LANGUAGE	15.2%	19.6%	28.6%	27.1%	9.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	101.676(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	103.327	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	79.976	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	4740		
A 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 222.34.			

As it has been revealed in table 1, a Chi Square has been applied to the data obtained from Iranian subjects under study. The observed value of Chi-Square is101 which is greater than the critical value of Chi-Square at 4 degree of freedom.i.e.9.49.This means that there is a significant difference between Iranian male and female interlocutors in their interaction .This can lead to the fact that there is language transfer effect in Iranian EFL learners' choice of strategy. The order of strategies employed by Iranian EFL learners is NP, OFF-R, PP, BO-R, and NTA, but this order for Iranian learners of native language is OFF-R, NP, PP, BO-R and NA. While the most preferred strategy by EFL learners is NP, the native speakers of Persian prefer to use OFF-R strategy most of the time. This can be regarded as the effect transferred from English to EFL learners' performance. These results obtained here can also be interesting if we consider the two groups use of BO-R and NA strategies. 12% of Iranian native speakers have employed the BO-R strategy while this is 18% for FEL group. At the same time while 12.9% of native speakers have used NA strategy, this percentage is 5.9 %for EFL group. Both of these choices explicitly reveal the language transfer effect on Iranian learners.

1-1. Language transfer and rank of imposition for Iranian interlocutors.
The effect of language transfer has been once more studied concerning the relative rank of imposition by Iranian EFL and NL learners. The results obtained from applying Chi-Square to the data have been presented in table 1-1.

*Table 1-1.The effect of **language transfer** on rank of imposition for **Iranian** interlocutors.*

Crosstab

			LEVELOFDIFFICULTY			Total
			EASY	DIFFICULT	VERY DIFFICULT	
LANGUAGE	NATIVE	Count	1034	892	437	2363
		% within LANGUAGE	43.8%	37.7%	18.5%	100.0%
	EFL	Count	1451	725	201	2377
		% within LANGUAGE	61.0%	30.5%	8.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	2485	1617	638	4740
		% within LANGUAGE	52.4%	34.1%	13.5%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	174.481(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	176.951	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	174.440	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	4740		
a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 318.06.			

The Chi-Square observed is 174.48 which is greater than the critical value of Chi-Square at 2 degree of freedom which is 5.99.This is a sign of differences between two groups of Iranian EFL and NL learners. While 61% of EFL learners feel easy in their interaction, this percentage for NL learners is 43.8%.The root of this difference lies in the transfer effect from English into their native language. The same fact is attributable for the high level of imposition. While only 8.5% of EFL learners have chosen the very difficult level or high rank of imposition, this percentage for NL learners is 18.5% which in its turn shows significant difference between two groups of Iranian.
2-The effect of language transfer on Turkish EFL and NL learners' choice of politeness strategies.
The same procedure has been taken for the two groups namely EFL and NL learners of Turkish language in order to see the possible differences between these two groups on one side and to survey the possible differences

between Turkish and Iranian groups and to find out the rate of language transfer effect on Turkish and Persian native speakers .The results have been revealed in table 2 as follows:

*Table 2.The effect of **language transfer** on **Turkish NL and EFL** learners' choice of politeness strategies.*

Crosstab

			DEGREEOFPOLITNESS					Total
			BOR	PPS	NPS	OFFR	DON'T	
LANGUAGE	NATIVE	Count	365	590	506	619	148	2228
		% within LANGUAGE	16.4%	26.5%	22.7%	27.8%	6.6%	100.0%
	EFL	Count	397	560	597	600	124	2278
		% within LANGUAGE	17.4%	24.6%	26.2%	26.3%	5.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	762	1150	1103	1219	272	4506
		% within LANGUAGE	16.9%	25.5%	24.5%	27.1%	6.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.495(a)	4	.022
Likelihood Ratio	11.505	4	.021
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.307	1	.253
N of Valid Cases	4506		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 134.49.

Crosstab

			LEVELOFDIFFICULTY			Total
			EASY	DIFFICULT	VERY DIFFICULT	
LANGUAGE	NATIVE	Count	1313	654	302	2269
		% within LANGUAGE	57.9%	28.8%	13.3%	100.0%
	EFL	Count	1383	760	227	2370
		% within LANGUAGE	58.4%	32.1%	9.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	2696	1414	529	4639
		% within LANGUAGE	58.1%	30.5%	11.4%	100.0%

As it has been revealed in table 2, a Chi Square is applied to the data obtained from Turkish subjects under study. The observed value of Chi-Square is11.425 which is greater than the critical value of Chi-Square at 4 degree of freedom.i.e.9.49.This means that there is difference between Turkish male and female interlocutors in their interaction though it is not so great. The order of strategies employed by Turkish EFL learners is OFF-R, PP, NP, BO-R, and NA, but this order for Turkish learners of native language is OFF-R, NP, PP, BO-R and NA. This is in line with the results obtained from other parts of the study. The results obtained here can also be interesting if we consider the two groups' use of BO-R and NA strategies. While 16.4% of Turkish native speakers have employed the BO-R strategy, this is 17, 4% for FEL group. At the same time while 6.6% of native speakers have used NA strategy, this percentage is 5.4 %for EFL group .Both of these choices reveal the language transfer effect on Turkish learners but this effect is not the same as on Iranian participants.

2-1. Language transfer and rank of imposition for Turkish EFL and NL learners.

The effect of language transfer has once more been studied concerning the relative rank of imposition for Turkish EFL and NL learners to see whether there is any difference between Turkish EFL and NL learners in their feeling of imposition in interaction. The results obtained from applying Chi-Square to the data obtained from this group have been presented in table 2-1as follows:

*Table 2-1.***Language transfer** and **rank of imposition** *for* **Turkish EFL and NL learners.**

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	18.207(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	18.241	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.326	1	.038
N of Valid Cases	4639		
a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 258.74.			

The Chi-Square observed is 18.207 which is greater than the critical value of Chi-Square at 2 degree of freedom which is 5.99.This is a sign of differences between two groups of Turkish EFL and NL learners. But this difference is not as great as observed in case of Iranians. While 58.4% of EFL learners feel easy in their interaction, this percentage for NL learners is57.9%. The root of this difference lies in the transfer effect from English into their native language. The same fact is attributable for the high level of imposition. While only 9.6% of EFL learners have chosen the very difficult level or high rank of imposition, this percentage for NL learners is 13, 3% which in its turn shows significant difference between two groups.

3. The effect of language transfer on Iranian female EFL and NL learners.
Here once more the data has been processed in order to find out the effect of language transfer on Iranian female learners of NL and EFL. The results have been delineated in table 3 as follows.

Table 3.Language transfer and politeness strategies employed by **Iranian female EFL and NL learners***.*

Crosstab								
			DEGREEOFPOLITNESS					Total
			BOR	PPS	NPS	OFFR	DON'T	
LANGUAGE	**NATIVE**	Count	166	241	296	326	134	1163
		% within LANGUAGE	14.3%	20.7%	25.5%	28.0%	11.5%	100.0%
	EFL	Count	170	209	356	366	76	1177
		% within LANGUAGE	14.4%	17.8%	30.2%	31.1%	6.5%	100.0%
Total		Count	336	450	652	692	210	2340
		% within LANGUAGE	14.4%	19.2%	27.9%	29.6%	9.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.093(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	26.313	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.811	1	.368
N of Valid Cases	2340		
a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 104.37.			

As it has been revealed in table 3, a Chi-Square is applied to the data obtained from Iranian female subjects under study. The observed value of Chi-Square is 26.093 which is greater than the critical value of Chi-Square at 4 degree of freedom.i.e.9.49.This means that there is a great difference between Iranian female EFL and NL learners in their interaction .This can lead to the fact that there is language transfer effect in Iranian female EFL learners' choice of politeness strategy. The order of strategies employed by both Iranian EFL and NL learners is OFF-R, NP, PP, BO-R, and NA. But the number of those who have chosen different strategies only for BO-R strategy is similar to each other .This is in line with the results obtained from other parts of the study. The main differing point is employing NA strategy which is 11.5% for NL but only 6.5 for EFL learners. This can be regarded as the effect transferred from English to EFL learners' performance.

3-1. Language transfer and rank of imposition for Iranian female EFL and NL learners.
The effect of language transfer has been once more studied concerning the relative rank of imposition for Iranian EFL and NL female learners. The results obtained from applying Chi-Square to the data have been presented in table 3-1.

*Table 3-1.**Language transfer** and rank of imposition for **Iranian female EFL and NL learners.***

Crosstab

			LEVELOFDIFFICULTY			Total
			EASY	DIFFICULT	VERY DIFFICULT	
LANGUAGE	NATIVE	Count	573	403	187	1163
		% within LANGUAGE	49.3%	34.7%	16.1%	100.0%
	EFL	Count	730	349	98	1177
		% within LANGUAGE	62.0%	29.7%	8.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	1303	752	285	2340
		% within LANGUAGE	55.7%	32.1%	12.2%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	50.506(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	51.024	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	50.242	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	2340		
a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 141.65.			

The Chi-Square observed is 50.506 which is much greater than the critical value of Chi-Square at 2 degree of freedom which is 5.99.This is a sign of a lot of differences between two groups of Iranian female EFL and NL learners. While 62.0% of EFL learners feel easy in their interaction, this percentage for NL learners is 49.3%. The root of this difference lies in the transfer effect from English into their native language. The same fact is attributable for the high level of imposition. While only 8.3% of EFL learners have chosen the very difficult level or high rank of imposition, this percentage for NL learners is 16.1% which in its turn shows significant difference between two groups of Iranian females.

4-The effect of language transfer on Iranian male EFL and NL learners
Here once more the data has been processed in order to find out the effect of language transfer on Iranian male NL and EFL learners. The results have been delineated in table 4 as follows.

*Table 4. The effect of **language transfer** on **Iranian male** EFL and NL learners' choice of politeness strategies.*

Crosstab

			DEGREEOFPOLITNESS					Total
			BOR	PPS	NPS	OFFR	DON'T	
LANGUAGE	NATIVE	Count	121	206	343	359	171	1200
		% within LANGUAGE	10.1%	17.2%	28.6%	29.9%	14.3%	100.0%
	EFL	Count	263	275	363	234	65	1200
		% within LANGUAGE	21.9%	22.9%	30.3%	19.5%	5.4%	100.0%
Total		Count	384	481	706	593	236	2400
		% within LANGUAGE	16.0%	20.0%	29.4%	24.7%	9.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	136.934(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	140.181	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	134.440	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	2400		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 118.00.

As it has been revealed in table 4, a Chi Square is applied to the data obtained from Iranian male subjects under study. The observed value of Chi-Square is 136.934 which is greater than the critical value of Chi-Square at 4 degree of freedom.i.e.9.49. This means that there is a great difference between Iranian male EFL and NL learners in their choice of politeness strategies for their interaction .This can lead to the fact that there is language transfer effect in Iranian male EFL learners' choice of strategy. The order of strategies employed by 2 groups are very interesting. Iranian male NL learners have preferred the order of their strategies as, OFF-R, NP, PP, NA and BO-R at the end but this order is completely different for male EFL learners. Here the order is NP, PP, BO-R, OFF-R and NA.

The main differing point is employing NA strategy which is 14.3% for NL but only 5.4% for EFL learners. This can be regarded as the effect transferred from English into male EFL learners' performance. Another important point is the two groups' choice of BO-R strategy. While 21.9% of EFL group have used this strategy only 10.1% of NL group have employed this strategy. Here is one of the most supporting points for the effect of language transfer on EFL learners' performance in their native language.

4-1. Language transfer and rank of imposition for Iranian male EFL and NL learners.

The effect of language transfer has been once more studied concerning the relative rank of imposition for Iranian male EFL and NL learners. The results obtained from applying Chi-Square to the data have been presented in table 4-1.

*Table 4-1. **Language transfer** and rank of imposition for **Iranian male** EFL and NL learners.*

Crosstab

			LEVELOFDIFFICULTY			Total
			EASY	DIFFICULT	VERY DIFFICULT	
LANGUAGE	NATIVE	Count	461	489	250	1200
		% within LANGUAGE	38.4%	40.8%	20.8%	100.0%
	EFL	Count	721	376	103	1200
		% within LANGUAGE	60.1%	31.3%	8.6%	100.0%
Total		Count	1182	865	353	2400

	% within LANGUAGE	49.3%	36.0%	14.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	133.168(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	135.586	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	132.607	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	2400		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 176.50.

The Chi-Square observed here, is 133.1, which is greater than the critical value of Chi-Square at 2 degree of freedom which is 5.99.This is a sign of a lot of differences between two groups of Iranian male EFL and NL learners. While 62.1% of EFL learners feel easy in their interaction, this percentage for NL learners is 38.4%. The root of this difference lies in the transfer effect from English into their native language. The same fact is attributable for the high level of imposition. While only 8.6% of EFL learners have chosen the very difficult level or high rank of imposition, this percentage for NL learners is 20.8% which in its turn shows significant difference between two groups of Iranian males.

5. The effect of language transfer on Turkish female EFL and NL learners.

Here once more the data has been processed in order to find out the effect of language transfer on Turkish female NL and EFL learners. The results have been delineated in table 5 as follows:

*Table 5. The effect of **language transfer** on **Turkish female** EFL and NL learners' choice of politeness strategies.*

Crosstab

			DEGREEOFPOLITNESS					Total
			BOR	PPS	NPS	OFFR	DON'T	
LANGUAGE	**NATIVE**	Count	182	374	282	309	43	1190
		% within LANGUAGE	15.3%	31.4%	23.7%	26.0%	3.6%	100.0%
	EFL	Count	213	263	280	282	66	1104
		% within LANGUAGE	19.3%	23.8%	25.4%	25.5%	6.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	395	637	562	591	109	2294
		% within LANGUAGE	17.2%	27.8%	24.5%	25.8%	4.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	24.680(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	24.783	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	.654	1	.419
N of Valid Cases	2294		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 52.46.

As it has been revealed in table 5, a Chi Square is applied to the data obtained from Turkish female subjects under study. The observed value of Chi-Square is 24.680 which is greater than the critical value of Chi-Square at 4 degree of freedom.i.e.9.49.This means that there is difference between Turkish female EFL and NL learners in their interaction .This can lead to the fact that there is language transfer effect on Turkish female EFL learners' choice of strategy.

The order of strategies employed by Turkish EFL group is OFF-R, NP, PP,BO-R and NA, but for NL learners is PP, OFF-R, NP, BO-R, and NA. The number of those who have chosen different strategies is

interestingly different for two groups .The EFL group have marked PP as the most frequently used strategy while NL group have used OFF-R as their mostly preferred strategy. .This is different from the results obtained from Iranian female groups. The main differing point is employing the NA strategy which is 3.6% for NL but 6.0 for EFL learners. This can be regarded as the effect transferred from English to EFL learners' performance.

5-1. Language transfer and rank of imposition for Turkish female EFL and NL learners.

The effect of language transfer has been once more studied concerning the relative rank of imposition felt by Turkish female EFL and NL learners. In order to do this a Chi-square was applied to the data. The results obtained from applying Chi-Square to the data have been presented in table 5-1.

*Table 5-1.**Language transfer** and rank of imposition for **Turkish female** EFL and NL learners.*

Crosstab

			LEVELOFDIFFICULTY			Total
			EASY	DIFFICULT	VERY DIFFICULT	
LANGUAGE	NATIVE	Count	614	411	165	1190
		% within LANGUAGE	51.6%	34.5%	13.9%	100.0%
	EFL	Count	696	383	117	1196
		% within LANGUAGE	58.2%	32.0%	9.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	1310	794	282	2386
		% within LANGUAGE	54.9%	33.3%	11.8%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.275(a)	2	.001
Likelihood Ratio	14.319	2	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	14.122	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	2386		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 140.65.

As the data in this figure has shown, the observed Chi-Square is 14.275 which is meaningful at 2 degree of freedom. It is clearly seen from the results that NL learners of Turkish feel more imposition than EFL learners. Although both groups have chosen the same order for rank of imposition but 58.2% in the EFL group have ranked the easy level while this percentage for NL group is 51, 6%.At the same time the choice of third level of imposition is completely meaningful for two groups.13.9 % in NL group have reported very difficult or high level of imposition while only 9.8% in FEL group have reported high level of imposition.

6. The effect of language transfer on Turkish male EFL and NL learners' choice of politeness strategies.

In order to find out the effect of language transfer on Turkish male NL and EFL learners' choice of politeness strategies, the data has been analyzed once more. A Chi-Square was applied and the results have been delineated in table 6 as follows.

*Table 6.**Language transfer** and choice of politeness strategies by **Turkish male** EFL and NL male learners.*

Crosstab

			DEGREEOFPOLITNESS					Total
			BOR	PPS	NPS	OFFR	DON'T	
LANGUAGE	NATIVE	Count	183	216	224	310	105	1038
		% within LANGUAGE	17.6%	20.8%	21.6%	29.9%	10.1%	100.0%
	EFL	Count	184	297	317	318	58	1174

	% within LANGUAGE	15.7%	25.3%	27.0%	27.1%	4.9%	100.0%
Total	**Count**	367	513	541	628	163	2212
	% within LANGUAGE	16.6%	23.2%	24.5%	28.4%	7.4%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	**df**	**Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	34.201(a)	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	34.394	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.099	1	.008
N of Valid Cases	2212		
a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 76.49.			

As it has been revealed in table 6, a Chi-Square is applied to the data obtained from Turkish male subjects under study. The observed value of Chi-Square is 34.201 which is greater than the critical value of Chi-Square at 4 degree of freedom.i.e. 9.49. This means that, there is a significant difference between Turkish male EFL and NL learners in their choice of politeness strategies in their interaction .This can lead to the fact that there is language transfer effect on Turkish male EFL learners' choice of strategy. The order of strategies employed by two groups are the same i.e. OFF-R, NP, PP, BO-R and NA. The number of those who have chosen different strategies is interestingly different for two groups .The main differing point is employing the NA strategy which is 10.1% for NL but 4.9% for EFL learners. This can be regarded as the effect transferred from English to Turkish male EFL learners' performance.

6-1. Language transfer and level of difficulty for Turkish male EFL and NL learners.

The effect of language transfer has been once more studied concerning the relative rank of imposition for Turkish male EFL and NL learners. The results obtained from applying Chi-Square to the data are presented in table 6-1.

*Table 6-1.**Language transfer** and rank of imposition for **Turkish male** EFL and NL learners.*

Crosstab						
			LEVELOFDIFFICULTY			**Total**
			EASY	**DIFFICULT**	**VERY DIFFICULT**	
LANGUAGE	**NATIVE**	**Count**	699	243	137	1079
		% within LANGUAGE	64.8%	22.5%	12.7%	100.0%
	EFL	**Count**	687	377	110	1174
		% within LANGUAGE	58.5%	32.1%	9.4%	100.0%
Total		**Count**	1386	620	247	2253
		% within LANGUAGE	61.5%	27.5%	11.0%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	**df**	**Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)**
Pearson Chi-Square	28.061(a)	2	.000
Likelihood Ratio	28.245	2	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.033	1	.309
N of Valid Cases	2253		

a 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 118.29.

As the data in this figure has shown the observed Chi-Square is 28.061 which is meaningful at 2 degree of freedom. It is clearly seen from the results that NL learners of Turkish feel less imposition than EFL learners for levels 1and 2, but for third level EFL learners have reported better than NL learners... Although both groups have chosen the same order for rank of imposition but 58.5% in the EFL group have ranked the easy level while this percentage for NL group is 64.8%.At the same time the choice of third level of imposition is completely meaningful for two groups.12.7% in NL group have reported very difficult or high level of imposition while only 9.4% in FEL group have reported high level of imposition.

Conclusion

Regarding language transfer effect, the results have revealed that for Iranian participants, there have been evident differences between EFL and NL learners in their choice of politeness strategies in different interactions. These differences can be interpreted as coming from English into EFL learners' linguistic performance. More EFL learners use NP strategy while more NL learners use OFF-R strategy. It means that NL learners try to be more conservative than EFL learners. Again EFL learners use NA strategy less than NA learners; instead, they use BO-R strategy more than NL learners. Concerning the rank of imposition Iranian EFL learners have felt less imposed in their interactions than Iranian NL learners. All these differences can be interpreted as a result of language transfer effect coming from English into Iranian EFL learners linguistic performance.

A general comparison has revealed that language transfer effect on Turkish EFL learners hasn't been so great but comparing this group to Iranian EFL learners, has clearly shown that language transfer effect on Iranian EFL learners has been more than Turkish EFL learners. These differences can be interpreted as a result of cultural differences between Iranian and Turkish EFL learners on one side and the Transfer effect coming from English language into Persian language and culture more than Turkish culture and language or it can be claimed that due to closeness of Turkey to western culture and languages, the possible language transfer effect has already come into Turkish participants linguistic and cultural behavior.

Comparing rank of imposition for Iranian female EFL and NL learners, the analysis has shown that Iranian female NL learners have been more imposed than Iranian female EFL learners in their interactions. A proof of this claim is employing NP and OFF-R strategies by most Iranian female EFL learners while Iranian female NL learners try to use NA strategy more than female EFL learners. So EFL learners have tended to be more active in their interaction than NL learners. These differences can be signed as language transfer effect.

Comparing Iranian male EFL and NL learners, it is clear that Iranian male EFL learners have tended to be more frank and direct in their interactions than Iranian male NL learners .A proof of this claim is the use of BO-R strategy by male EFL learners two times more than male NL learners in their choice of politeness strategies. At the same time EFL learners use NA strategy two times less than NL learners. These differences can be interpreted as a sign of language transfer into Iranian male EFL learners' linguistic performance. Iranian male EFL learners feel less imposed in their interaction than Iranian NL learners .The rank of imposition felt by Iranian male NL learners is two times more than the rank of imposition felt by Iranian male EFL learners for less imposing rank level and two times less for more imposing rank level.

Comparing Turkish female EFL and NL learners reveals the fact that these two groups have done differently in their interactions. Turkish female EFL learners have used PP strategy most of the time but Turkish female NL learners have used OFF-R strategy. BO-R strategy is also used by female EFL learner's more than female NL learners. Turkish female EFL learners feel less imposed than female NL learners.

Comparing Turkish male EFL and NL learners, shows that the results have been again different for two groups. This difference may be interpreted as a sign of language transfer effect on Turkish male EFL learners' linguistic performance. The main difference has been the use of NA strategy by male NL learners more than male EFL learners. Male EFL learners have also reported less imposition than male NL learners in their interactions.

Corresponding Author:
Sohrab Rezaei
Assistand Professor Allameh Tabatabaei University
Tel:+982122195144
Mobile:+989363224553
E-mail:Sohrab_rezaei@yahoo.com

REFERENCES
2- Austin, J. L. (1998). How to do things with words. In A. Kasher (Ed.), *Pragmatics: Critical concepts: Vol. 2. Speech act theory and particular speech acts* (pp. 7-28). London: Routledge.
3- Billmyer, K. & Varghese, M. (2000). Investigating instrument-based pragmatic

Variability: Effects of enhancing discourse completion tests. *Applied Linguistics, 21*, (4), 517-552.

4- Boxer, D. (2002). *Applying sociolinguistics: Domains and face-to-face interaction* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

5- Brown, J. D. (2001). Pragmatic tests: Different purposes, different tests. In K. R. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 301-327). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

6- Brown, P & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

7- Cohen, A. D. (1996). Speech acts. In S. L. MacKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 383-420). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

8- Council of Europe. (2000), A common European Framework of Reference for Languages.

9- Goddard, C. & Wierzbicka, A. (1994). Discourse and culture. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction, Vol 2: Discourse: A multidisciplinary introduction* (pp. 231-257), London: Sage Publications.

10- Goddard, C. (1997). Cultural values and 'cultural scripts' of Malay. *Journal of Pragmatics, 27,*183-201.

11- Goddard, A. & Patterson, L. M. (2000). *Language and gender.* London: Routledge.

12- Goddard, C. (2001). Sabar, ikhlas, setia – patient, sincere, loyal? Contrastive semantics of some 'virtues' in Malay and English. *Journal of Pragmatics, 33,* 653-681.

13- Halliday, M. A. k. (1999). The Notion of "Context" in Language Education", In M. Ghadessy (Ed), *Text and context in functional linguistics*. (pp. 1-24).

14- Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. Jorgensen, J. (1996). The functions of sarcastic irony in speech. *Journal of Pragmatics, 26,* 613-634.

15- Kasper, G. & Blum-Kulka, S. (Eds.) (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics.* New York: Oxford University Press.

16- Koutlaki, S. A. (1997). *Persian system of politeness and the Persian concept of face with some reference to EFL teaching to Iranian native speakers*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wales, Cardiff.

17- Koutlaki, S. A. (2002). Offers and expressions of thanks as face enhancing acts: tae'arof in Persian. *Journal of Pragmatics, 34,* 1733-1756.

18- Labov, W. (1998). The intersection of sex and social class in the course of Linguistic change. In J. Cheshire & P. Trudgill (Eds.) *The sociolinguistics Reader: Vol.2, Gender and discourse* (pp. 7-52). London: Arnold.

19- Laforest, M. (2002). Scenes of family life: Complaining in everyday conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics, 24*, 1595-1620.

20- Marandi, S. S. (1997). *The construct validity of Searle's speech act classification*. Unpublished master's thesis, Tehran University, Faculty of Foreign Languages, Tehran.

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

22- Rose, K. R. (1994). On the validity of discourse completion tests in non-western Contexts. *Applied Linguistics, 15* (1), 1-14.

23- Searle, J. R. (1998). The structure of illocutionary acts. In A. Kasher (Ed.) *Pragmatics: Critical concepts Vol. 2: Speech act theory and particular Speech acts*. (pp. 48-64), London: Routledge.

24- Sifianou, M. (1992). *Politeness phenomena in Greece and England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

25- Wierzbicka, A. (1994). 'Cultural scripts': A new approach to the study of cross-Cultural communication. In M. Putz (Ed.) *Language contact, language Conflict*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Company.

Electronic References

1- www.logos.uoregon.edu/explore/socioling/politeness.html
2-www.bowland-files.lancs.ac.uk/staff/greg/204/linguistic politeness
3-www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail
4-www.wpel.net/v14/v14n1 bell.
5-www.asian-efl-journal.com
6-www.linguistlist.org
7-www.stanford.edu.coppock/face
8-www.carla.acad.umn,edu/speech acts/requests
9-www.shu.ac.uk/wpw/politeness/bargiela.html
10-www.wikipedia.org/wiki/politeness
11-www.changing minds.org/explanations/theories/politeness.
12-www.hull.ac.uk/php/sbsjrc/politeness and research project writing doc.

8/12/2012