

**FEDERAL STATE AUTONOMOUS EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION
OF HIGHER EDUCATION PATRICE LUMUMBA PEOPLES’
FRIENDSHIP UNIVERSITY OF RUSSIA**

As a manuscript

KAMEH KHOSH Neda

**POLITENESS AND COMMUNICATIVE STYLES IN BRITISH AND
PERSIAN FAMILY DISCOURSE**

5.9.8- Theoretical, applied and comparative-linguistics

THESIS

for a PhD Degree
candidate of philology

Research supervisor:

Doctor of Philology
Professor Tatiana V. Larina

Moscow - 2023

**ФЕДЕРАЛЬНОЕ ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЕ АВТОНОМНОЕ
ОБРАЗОВАТЕЛЬНОЕ УЧРЕЖДЕНИЕ ВЫСШЕГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ
РОССИЙСКИЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ ДРУЖБЫ НАРОДОВ ИМЕНИ
ПАТРИСА ЛУМУМБЫ**

На правах рукописи

КАМЕХ ХОШ НЕДА

**ВЕЖЛИВОСТЬ И СТИЛЬ КОММУНИКАЦИИ В БРИТАНСКОМ И
ПЕРСИДСКОМ СЕМЕЙНОМ ДИСКУРСЕ**

5.9.8- Теоретическая, прикладная и сравнительно-сопоставительная
лингвистика

ДИССЕРТАЦИЯ

на соискание учёной степени
кандидата филологических наук

Научный руководитель:
доктор филологических наук
профессор Татьяна В. Ларина

Москва - 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	3
CHAPTER 1. POLITENESS AS A UNIVERSAL AND A CULTURE-SPECIFIC PHENOMENON.....	17
1.1. Linguistic etiquette and politeness	17
1.2. Politeness in interpersonal interaction	22
1.2.1. Conversational maxim view of politeness	25
1.2.2. Face-saving view of politeness	32
1.2.3. Discursive approach to politeness	40
1.3. Politeness from a cross-cultural perspective.....	42
1.4. Politeness and communicative ethno-styles.....	50
Summary	54
CHAPTER 2. BRITISH AND PERSIAN UNDERSTANDING OF POLITENESS.....	56
2.1. Data and methodology	56
2.2. Politeness in British culture	58
2.3. Polite vs. impolite behavior in British culture	60
2.4. Politeness in Persian culture.....	64
2.5. Polite vs. impolite behavior in Persian culture	71
Summary	77
CHAPTER 3. SPEECH ACTS, POLITENESS STRATEGIES AND COMMUNICATIVE STYLES.....	79
3.1. Data and methodology	80
3.2. Addressing.....	82
3.2.1. Addressing in top-down context: parents to children	84
3.2.2. Addressing in bottom-up context: children to parents	86
3.2.3. Addressing in linear context: spouses	91
3.3. Request	99
3.3.1. Request in top-down context: parents to children.....	102

3.3.2. Request in bottom-up context: children to parents	106
3.3.3. Request in linear context: spouses	109
3.4. Response to request.....	114
3.4.1. Response to request in top-down context: parents to children	116
3.4.2. Response to request in bottom-up context: children to parents	118
3.4.3. Response to request in linear context: spouses	127
3.5. Thanking.....	134
3.5.1. Thanking in top-down context: parents to children	136
3.5.2. Thanking in bottom-up context: children to parents	142
3.5.3. Thanking in linear context: spouses	149
3.6. Response to thanking	157
3.6.1. Response to thanking in top-down context: parents to children	158
3.6.2. Response to thanking in bottom-up context: children to parents.....	160
3.6.3. Response to thanking in linear context: spouses.....	169
3.7. Dominant features in British and Persian communicative styles	179
3.7.1. Negative Politeness Strategies and communicative styles features	180
3.7.1.1. Directness vs. indirectness	180
3.7.1.2. Formality vs. informality.....	182
3.7.1.3. Verbosity vs. laconism	183
3.7.2. Positive Politeness Strategies and communicative styles features	187
3.7.2.1. Formality vs. informality.....	187
3.7.2.2. Expressivity vs. non/less expressivity.....	190
3.7.2.3. Verbosity vs. laconism	194
3.7.3 Socio-cultural features and communicative styles features	200
Summary	208
CONCLUSION.....	211
REFERENCES	217
APPENDIX	240

INTRODUCTION

Politeness is one of the most important features of communication among people, which nowadays attracts a great interest of scholars from various fields, such as sociolinguistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, and others. This interest is due to the fact that politeness is a social and pragmatic category, and its study discloses a lot about how people interact and how their relations are organized in a specific society. The study of politeness is of particular importance for intercultural communication as numerous difficulties in communication emerge from the fact that people do not only speak different languages, but they use their languages differently [Goddard & Wierzbicka 1997]. These differences are “profound and systematic” and “reflect different cultural values, or at least, different hierarchies of values” [Wierzbicka 2003: 69].

People, who come from distinctive cultures, do not constantly share opinions on what is polite behavior and what is impolite behavior [Mugford 2020; Pizziconi 2003; Sifianou 1992; Watts 2003; among many others]. As a result, an identical verbal or a non-verbal act can be viewed as polite in one culture and comprehended as non-appropriate, disrespectful, impolite or even rude in another culture [Larina 2015: 196]. As Wierzbicka [1985: 145] states, linguistic differences are shaped due to specificities of culture, which act more effectively than mere norms of politeness. These differences are predetermined by the type of culture and values. Consequently, achieving success in intercultural communication pertains strongly to understanding of communicative objectives of interlocutors, as well as the pragmatic meanings of their acts. In other words, behaving politely in another culture requires knowledge of cultural values manifested in applying culture-specific strategies.

Politeness guides communicative behavior and shapes communicative ethno-styles [Larina 2009, 2015, 2020]. Knowledge of dominant features of culture-specific communicative styles and factors associated with them, is an essential component of intercultural communicative competence required to function successfully in intercultural contexts.

One of the most influential theories of politeness has been introduced by Brown and Levinson [1978, 1987], who address both Positive and Negative Face wants of interlocutors and suggest a framework for research on linguistic politeness. They develop the face theory of Goffman [1955] and focus on the main notions of face, Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) and politeness strategies. In spite of its great contribution to the study of linguistic pragmatics, Brown and Levinson's model of politeness, defined as a universal phenomenon, was encountered with radical criticisms by many scholars, who found their model Anglo-based, directed towards individualistic and egalitarian cultures of Western communities, rather than groups-based and hierarchical Eastern cultures [Watts et al., 1992, 2005; Wierzbicka 2003].

From many perspectives, politeness is a phenomenon with universal nature, as it can be observed in all cultures. However, despite universal entity of politeness, actual manifesting of politeness, approaches, through which politeness is recognized as well as standards, with which our judgement on (im)polite behavior is structured differ across cultures. These differences derive from the original notion of politeness in distinctive cultural contexts. Watts [2003: 14] claims that even the lexems "polite" and "politeness" in different cultures may vary from their perspectives on meaning and the connotations that are connected with them. He strongly emphasizes that people's understanding and perception of politeness and polite behavior differs from one culture to another culture [Larina 2009, 2015; Mugford 2020; Sifianou 1992; among many others].

Culture-specific differences in politeness have been explored in various languages and cultures [e.g., Asdjodi 2001; Blum-Kulka 1992; Culpeper et al., 2017; Gu 1992; Hickey & Stewart 2005; Huang 2008; Leech 2005, 2014; Leech & Larina 2014; Larina 2008, 2015, 2020; Locher & Larina 2019; Lakoff & Ide 2005; Mugford 2020; Pizziconi 2003; Reiter 1999, 2000; Sifianou 1992; Watts 2003; Watts et al., 1992, 2005; Wierzbicka 1991/2003; among many others]. However, Muslim culture, in general, and Persian culture, in particular, have not been devoted much attention [Izadi 2015, 2022; Koutelaki 2002; Tajeddin & Rassaei Moqadam 2023]. This study

explores politeness in Persian culture and compares it with British culture, focusing on family discourse.

The subject of the study is the categorization of politeness in the cognition of the representatives of British and Persian communicative cultures, the strategies for its implementation in various situations of family discourse, and their influence on the communication styles.

Based on *the main hypothesis of the study*, cultural differences impact the way British English and Iranian Persian speakers understand politeness, which dictates their choice of politeness strategies and shapes their communicative styles.

The aim of the study is to identify the differences in understanding of politeness by the British and the Persian speakers, and to trace their impact on politeness strategies and communicative styles in British and Persian family discourse. We have limited ourselves to family discourse, and explored politeness strategies in a few speech acts, which are regularly performed in everyday interactions, namely, the speech acts of addressing, request and thanking. Responses to request and thanking have also been considered. The contrastive study has been conducted with heeding attention to similarities and distinctions in British and Persian family discourse, and oriented towards explaining recognized differences through understanding of politeness, cultural values, lingua-cultural identity and specificities of British and Persian family relations.

To achieve this goal, we accomplished the following *objectives*:

- 1) to consider the existing approaches to the study of politeness and determine the most effective one for this research,
- 2) to conduct a comparative socio-cognitive study in order to clarify the understanding of politeness by the representatives of British and Persian communicative cultures,
- 3) to design and distribute a descriptive socio-cognitive written interview as well as a Discourse Completion Task (DCT) to acquire reliable empirical data,
- 4) to conduct a contrastive analysis of the obtained data and identify similarities and differences in the performance of speech acts of addressing, request

and thanking, as well as responses to request and thanking in British and Persian family discourse, with an emphasis on politeness strategies and linguistics' means used to their realization,

5) to identify discursive differences and highlight the dominant features of the British and Persian styles of communication observed in family discourse in symmetrical and asymmetrical contexts,

6) to interpret the revealed differences through cultural values, understanding of politeness and socio-cultural characteristics of family relations in British and Persian cultures.

The data of the study were gathered via a descriptive written interview as well as a questionnaire designed in the form of a Discourse Completion Task (DCT). They were developed on the basis of a preliminary review of the literature. The target of the written interview was to define and particularize British and Persian understanding of politeness and a polite person, as well as to manifest the main cultural values, on which politeness is established. The British and Persian interviewees were asked to present their own definition of politeness, to describe a (im)polite person, and to bring forward their examples of polite and impolite behavior. The written interview was sent by email to overall 100 native British English and Iranian Persian speakers. 32 replies from the British and 30 replies from the Persian speakers came back.

The questionnaire was aimed at collecting discursive practices from British and Persian family settings and designed in the form of a Discourse Completion Task (DCT). In the questionnaire, the British and Persian respondents were provided with a short description of eight situations with a clear indication of the settings and the family relationship among members of the family and requested to complete the dialogues in a way they perform them in the natural situations. The questionnaire was designed to extract the speech acts of request, response to request, thanking and response to thanking. As the data obtained from the respondents in both lingua-cultures contained a lot of usages of address forms and compliments, we also paid attention to these speech acts in our analysis.

The questionnaire was sent by email to overall 200 native British English and Iranian Persian speakers. 55 replies from the British and 57 replies from the Persian speakers came back. Both, in the written interview and in the questionnaire, the age of the respondents varied from 20 to 70 years old. They were the British citizen, whose native language is English, and Iranian citizens, whose native language is Iranian Persian, which hereafter will be referred to as English and Persian [Gazsi 2020: 442]. All the representatives came from the middle social class with university degree or were university students.

The methodology of the study. The data obtained from the descriptive written interview have been subjected to a contrastive socio-cognitive and socio-cultural analysis, aimed at revealing how British English and Iranian Persian speakers understand politeness and, which cultural values predetermine their understanding of what is polite and what is impolite. The reason of choosing the descriptive written interview, as the method of data collection in our study, can be justified as below:

- It is flexible and adaptive approach to collecting data.
- It provides with useful data because it enables participants to describe their personal information in detail.
- As the researcher can pose a list of specific questions in a descriptive written interview, therefore he/she has a more comprehensive supervision on the obtained data.
- The impressions and experiences of people are comprehended in depth.

The data gathered from the questionnaire, including 896 mini-dialogues, have been subjected to contrastive, pragmatic, discursive, stylistic and lingua-cultural analyses, aimed at exploring similarities and differences in using politeness strategies and defining the main dominant features of British and Persian communicative styles in a family setting. The focus was put on addressing, request, response to request, thanking and response to thanking.

The questionnaire, designed in the form of a Discourse Completion Task (DCT), as the method of data collection in our study, has the advantage of enabling us to collect a large amount of data by distributing questionnaires to numerous

subjects, and also to record the updated communicative data rather than relying on retrospection or secondhand material. It provides with a higher volume of data to be collected in a short period of time as well. The use of a Discourse Completion Task (DCT) for this study was, particularly, advantageous because it encourages people to complete the task, similar as they perform them in the natural situations.

As another advantage, this method views the distinctive variables and takes them under control. The collected data have been categorized both qualitatively, using qualitative methods of contents' analysis and, quantitatively, using quantitative methods to determine the frequency of mentioning certain aspects of politeness.

Social factors such as age, gender, power distance (P) and social distance (D) were considered throughout the whole analysis. The present study is of a limited nature, as we mostly focused on the obtained data from politeness strategies and communicative styles used by members in a family setting. Regarding the settings beyond the family circle, the present study is limited to acquaintances, for instance friends, relatives, casual acquaintances such as neighbors and strangers of different age and gender categories. It is necessary to mention that other settings such as workplace, university, and medical facilities were not taken into consideration.

Furthermore, the empirical results, represented herein, should be viewed in the light of some limitations, such as ignoring the written interview or questionnaire by the subjects, which in this case, addressing a bigger quantity of the respondents to collect the reliable data is necessitates, deliberate lying because some of the respondents evade presenting a socially undesirable answers, as well as unconscious mistakes, which mostly occur when the respondents have socially undesirable traits that they do not intend to accept. Another limitation can be defined in the situation, in which the respondents accidentally misunderstand the questions and respond incorrectly to the questions subsequently.

It is important to indicate that the consent of all the participants was obtained, and the study was conducted in accordance with the ethical principles. In the study, we present the final results of the analyses of our empirical data collection, which

are consistent with our ethnographic observations. It is worth mentioning that the study of natural communication, in order to verify the results, and deeper conclusions, is required.

The theoretical background of the study. Implicating an interdisciplinary methodology, the study draws on:

- *Speech Acts Theory* [Austin 1962; Mey 1993; Searle 1969, 1975],
- *Politeness Theory* [Brown & Levinson 1987; Eelen 2001; Kádár & Haugh 2013; Larina 2009, 2015; Larina & Ponton 2022; Leech 1983, 2014; Locher 2012; Mugford 2020; Mills 2003; Sifianou 1992; Watts 2003; among many others],
- *Discourse Analysis* [Alba-Juez 2016; Esalami et al., 2023; Fairclough 1992, 2003; Goddard 2006; Bilá & Ivanova 2020; van Dijk 1997, 2009; among many others],
- *Intercultural and Cross-Cultural Pragmatics* [Kecskes 2014, 2017; McConachy & Spencer-Oatey 2021; Wierzbicka 1991/2003],
- *Communicative Styles Theory* [Gudykunst 1991; Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey 1990; House 2006; Larina 2009, 2015, 2020],
- *Cultural Studies and Studies on Identity* [Besemeres & Wierzbicka 2007; Ellis 2007; Hofstede 1991; Jenkins 2004; Larina et al., 2017; Scollon & Scollon 2001; Triandis 1994].

This methodology enabled us to disclose differences in understanding of politeness in British and Persian cultures, as well as to illuminate culture-specific characteristics of speech acts discussed in British and Persian family settings, and to highlight some dominant features of British and Persian discourse and communication styles.

The novelty of the study. The dissertation is the first contrastive study of British and Persian politeness, considered in socio-cognitive, pragmatic, discursive, and socio-cultural aspects. The novelty of the study lies in (1) specifying the understanding of politeness by the representatives of British and Persian cultures, (2) highlighting some similarities and differences in politeness strategies and

linguistic means of their implementation in British and Persian family discourse, (3) identifying some dominant features of the Persian style of communication against the background of the British style, as well as (4) in the use of a comprehensive methodology, which lets us systematize and interpret the discursive-pragmatic and stylistic differences observed in British and Persian family discourse, through socio-cultural relations, cultural values, and an understanding of politeness that regulates the interaction of people.

The theoretical implication of the study lies in identifying differences in understanding of politeness by the representatives of British and Persian linguacultures and tracing these differences in their communicative behavior. Using family discourse, as an example, the study has demonstrated the impact of socio-cultural and axiological parameters of society on discursive practices and the possibility of systematizing ethno-cultural features of communication through the dominant features of communicative ethno-styles. It provides with numerous linguistic manifestations of different types of relationships and the styles of communication in British and Persian family settings, which are based on differences in the socio-cultural organization of society and cultural values. The obtained results could contribute to the further development of cross-cultural pragmatics, discourse analysis, politeness theory, and communicative ethno-stylistics. The data, clarifying the impact of socio-cultural context on language use and communicative styles, may be of interest to related disciplines. The results of the study, once again, confirm the existence of an obvious interdependence between culture, cognition, language and communication, and emphasize the importance of interdisciplinary methodology that allows us to look at language and its usage from different angles and find an explanation for the identified differences.

The applied implication of the study shows the prospect of using the presented results in further contrastive studies of culture-specific discursive differences. The main results and conclusions of the study could be applied in theoretical courses on sociolinguistics, cross-cultural pragmatics, discourse analysis and cultural linguistics. They could also find an application in the second language

acquisitions and intercultural communication. Moreover, the collected material could serve as a practical source for recommendations for English and Persian communication, as well as textbooks, aimed at developing the pragmatic, discursive and intercultural communicative competencies of students.

The propositions to be defended are as below:

1. The discursive approach to the study of politeness enables us to trace the influence of the situational and socio-cultural context, namely, the social organization of society and cultural values on the understanding of politeness, which being as a universal category, has culture-specific characteristics.

2. In British and Persian cultures, politeness is understood as respect for others, but it is manifested and implemented in different ways. In individualistic British culture, politeness is understood as respect for privacy of people, maintaining distance, demonstrating equality and emotional self-control. In collectivistic Persian culture, politeness is viewed as respect for those, who are older in age and/or higher in status, showing closeness and maintaining contact, as well as being emotionally open.

3. Differences in conceptualization of politeness require different strategies. While in British family, Negative Politeness Strategies are regularly used in both symmetrical and asymmetrical contexts, in Persian family, an asymmetrical role position dictates the use of Negative Politeness Strategies in linear and bottom-up contexts, while in top-down context, straightforwardness is permitted. Positive Politeness Strategies are also used with more intensity and more elaborateness in bottom-up context in Persian family.

4. The regular usage of culture-specific politeness strategies shapes the main features of the British and Persian communicative styles. In British family, the style of communication could be defined as person-oriented, indirect, informal and egalitarian in all the contexts, while the Persian style shows a marked sensitivity to the context and could be defined as status-oriented, that is indirect and formal in bottom-up context, and direct and informal, more complex, more verbose and more expressive, compared to the British style in top-down context.

5. The revealed differences are based on socio-cultural characteristics and values and could be interpreted through them. The fact that the British style appears to be egalitarian and person-oriented is determined by a slight vertical distance and a pronounced horizontal distance and, as a consequence, the values of equality and independence that characterize British politeness. On the contrary, the Persian style, as a status-oriented style, is predetermined by a significant power distance and the values of age and status that underlie Persian politeness.

The reliability and validity of the study results can be supported by the critical analysis of a considerable volume of relevant literature on the topic of the study as well as a comprehensive analysis of solid empirical material, conducted with the implementation of a complex of modern research methods, both qualitatively and quantitatively.

The approbation of the dissertation. The main findings of the study were discussed in 16 publications including 2 VAK publications, 1 publication indexed in WoS, and presented at 13 conferences:

(1) 14th All-Russian Research and Methodological Conference with International Participation: Current Issues in Modern Linguistics and Humanities (Moscow, RUDN 2022), (2) 9th International Conference on Education & Education of Social Sciences (Istanbul, Turkey 2022), (3) International Academic Research Conference: Current Problems of Linguistics and Cross-Cultural Communication (Moscow, A.N. Kosygin State University of Russia & Istanbul Medipol University 2021), (4) 5th Firsova Readings: Modern Languages, Communication and Migration in the Context of Globalization (Moscow, RUDN 2021), (5) International Academic Research Conference: Current Problems of Linguistics and Cross-Cultural Communication (Moscow, A.N. Kosygin State University of Russia 2020), (6) 6th International Conference on Advances in Education (Dubai, UAE 2020), (7) 7th International Conference on Education and Social Sciences (Dubai, UAE 2020), (8) 1st All-Russian Scientific and Practical Conference: Oriental Kaleidoscope (Moscow, RUDN 2020), (9) 4th All-Russian Students' Scientific and Practical Conference: Current Problems of Intercultural Communication (Moscow, RUDN

2020), (10) 4th Firsova Readings: Language in Modern Discourse Practices (Moscow, RUDN 2019), (11) 19th International Symposium on Psycholinguistics and Communication Theory: Speech Activity Theory: Current Challenges (Moscow, RUDN 2019), (12) Students' Annual Conference: Language. Culture. Translation (Moscow, RUDN 2019), (13) Interuniversity Students' Scientific and Practical Conference: Current Problems in Intercultural Communication (Moscow, RUDN 2019).

I. The publication indexed in Web of Science:

1. Larina, Tatiana V, and Neda Kameh Khosh. 2020. Cultural values and politeness strategies in British and Persian family discourse. *Proceedings of INTCESS. –7th International Conference on Education and Social Sciences*. (Dubai, UAE). Pp. 603-610. ISBN: 978-605-82433-8-5.

II. The publications in VAK indexed journals:

2. Larina, Tatiana V, and Neda Kameh Khosh. 2021. Cultural values and understanding of politeness in British, Russian and Persian lingua-cultures. *Russian Language Abroad* (2). Pp. 10-18. Doi:10.37632/PL.2021.285.2.002. ИФ= 0,271.

3. Kameh Khosh, Neda. 2021. Politeness strategies in British and Persian family discourse: Forms of addressing. *Gramota: Philology. Theory & Practice* 14 (7). Pp. 2265-2271. ISSN 1997-2911. Doi: 10.30853/phil210360.

III. Related publications:

4. Kameh Khosh, Neda. 2022. Person-oriented vs. status-oriented communicative styles: British and Persian family settings. *14th All-Russian Research and Methodological Conference with International Participation: Current Issues in Modern Linguistics and Humanities*. Moscow: People's Friendship University of Russia. Pp. 16-23. ISBN 978-5-209-11685-1. Doi: 10.22363/11685-2022-1-515.

5. Kameh Khosh, Neda, Ekaterina Rossinskaya, and Alexander G Rossinsky. 2022. Politeness in second language teaching. *Proceedings of SOCIOINT. –9th International Conference on Education & Education of Social Sciences*. (Istanbul, Turkey). Pp. 121-128. ISBN: 978-605-06286-6-1. Doi:10.46529/socioint.202216.

6. Kameh Khosh, Neda. 2021. Politeness in table etiquette: British and Persian intercultural context. *International Academic Research Conference: Current Problems of Linguistics and Cross-Cultural Communication 6(10)*. Moscow: A.N. Kosygin State University of Russia & Istanbul Medipol University. Pp. 11-15. ISBN 978-5-00181-269-2.

7. Kameh Khosh, Neda. 2021. Communicative styles and politeness strategies of response to thanking in British and Persian family setting. *5th Firsova Readings: Modern Languages, Communication and Migration in the Context of Globalization*. Moscow: People's Friendship University of Russia. Pp. 241-245. ISBN 978-5-209-10982-2.

8. Kameh Khosh, Neda. 2020. Politeness strategies in response to request in British and Persian family discourse. *Proceedings of ADVED –6th International Conference on Advances in Education*. (Dubai, UAE). Pp. 405-413. ISBN: 978-605-06286-0-9. Doi: 10.47696/adved.202097.

9. Kameh Khosh, Neda, Amr A. A. Khalil, and Hashem Hani Shehadeh Alhaded. 2020. Cultural values and norms of communication: A view from the Middle East. *Proceedings of ADVED. –6th International Conference on Advances in Education*. (Dubai, UAE). Pp. 396-404. ISBN: 978-605-06286-0-9. Doi:10.47696/adved.202096.

10. Kameh Khosh, Neda. 2020. Politeness strategies in thanking in British and Persian family discourse. *International Scientific Conference: Current Problems of Linguistics and Cross-Cultural Communication 5(9)*. Moscow: A.N. Kosygin State University of Russia. Pp. 86-91. ISBN 978-5-00181-065-0.

11. Kameh Khosh, Neda. 2020. Politeness strategies in complimenting in British and Persian family discourse. *1st All-Russian Scientific and Practical Conference: Oriental Kaleidoscope*. Moscow: People's Friendship University of Russia. Pp. 65-70. ISBN 978-5-209-10385-1.

12. Kameh Khosh, Neda. 2020. Politeness strategies in making request in British and Persian family discourse. *4th All-Russian Students' Scientific and*

Practical Conference: Current Problems of Intercultural Communication. Moscow: People's Friendship University of Russia. Pp. 109-114. ISBN 978-5-209-10323-3.

13. Kameh Khosh, Neda. 2019. British and Persian understanding of politeness: The British value manner and equality, the Persians value age and status: A case study of interpersonal communication in an intercultural context. *4th Firsova Readings: Language in Modern Discourse Practices*. Moscow: People's Friendship University of Russia. Pp. 30-37. ISBN 978-5-209-09615-3.

14. Kameh Khosh, Neda. 2019. Persian understanding of politeness: The Persians value age and status. *19th International Symposium on Psycholinguistics and Communication Theory: Speech Activity Theory: Current Challenges*. Moscow: People's Friendship University of Russia. Pp. 213-214. ISBN 978-5-91730-870-8.

15. Kameh Khosh, Neda. 2019. Politeness, culture & understanding. *Students' Annual Conference: Language. Culture. Translation*. Moscow: People's Friendship University of Russia. Pp. 95-100. ISBN 978-5-209-09488-3.

16. Kameh Khosh, Neda. 2019. The English keep stiff upper lip, the Persians dwell on their emotions and feelings: A case study of emotional/emotive communication in an international context. *Interuniversity Students' Scientific and Practical Conference: Current Problems in Intercultural Communication*. Moscow: People's Friendship University of Russia. Pp. 31-34. ISBN 978-5-209-09322-0.

The structure of the dissertation consists of an Introduction, 3 Chapters, a Conclusion, a list of References involving (256) sources, and 2 Appendices including the forms of a descriptive written interview and a Discourse Completion Task (DCT) questionnaire in English and Persian languages. The text of the dissertation contains (254) pages.

The ***Introduction*** highlights the relevance of the study and offers a brief background on politeness as a universal and a culture-specific phenomenon, which is viewed as one of the most important characteristics of interpersonal interaction. It specifies the aim, hypotheses as well as data and methodology, substantiates the scientific novelty, theoretical and practical implications of the dissertation, and presents information about its structure and approbation of the results.

Chapter I, Politeness as a universal and a culture-specific phenomenon, provides with a comprehensive review of literature on Politeness Theory, and discusses different approaches to the study of this communicative category. It outlines the types of culture and values, and the role of cultural values in the choice of politeness strategies from a cross-cultural perspective. The chapter is concluded with a brief discussion of the impact of politeness strategies on communicative ethno-styles and theorizes about the possible parameters of their description.

Chapter II, British and Persian understanding of politeness, focuses attention on our findings of empirical analysis of British and Persian communicative values and understanding of politeness. The chapter starts analyzing the provided definitions of politeness in our British and Persian material in order to explore how the British and Persian native speakers understand politeness, and what cultural values base British and Persian politeness. Analyzing the examples of polite and impolite behavior, mentioned by the representatives of both lingua-cultures, reveals some similarities and differences in cultural values in both the British and Persian contexts, which have been also discussed in detail in the chapter.

Chapter III, Speech acts, politeness strategies and communicative styles, presents our findings of contrastive analysis of politeness strategies in a few speech acts, which are routinely performed in everyday interactions, namely, the speech acts of addressing, request, response to request, thanking, response to thanking and compliments by native speakers of British English and Iranian Persian. It discusses some dominant features of communicative styles in British and Persian family settings. To illustrate the main findings, the chapter provides with the tables including the results of contrastive quantitative analysis for all the speech acts, as well as the most typical examples, extracted from per situation in British and Persian family settings together with the tables demonstrating the main stylistic features of family discourse in both lingua-cultures.

Conclusion summarizes the key supporting ideas discussed throughout the study. Furthermore, it offers the core findings of the study and suggests the prospects for further research.

CHAPTER I. POLITENESS AS A UNIVERSAL AND A CULTURE-SPECIFIC PHENOMENON

1.1. Linguistic etiquette and politeness

The proposed definition of linguistic etiquette originally signified that there are numerous objections on the sphere and theoretical place of this term [Kasper 1998: 1]. Most scholars characterize politeness as a specificity of language use (cited from the subtitle of Brown and Levinson's *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*). Brown and Levinson [1978, 1987] and Leech [1983], who present the action-theoretical perspective of politeness, strongly admit that linguistic etiquette is positioned within the scope of language use, although they define decontextualized speech acts in two different polite and impolite categories.

Politeness of linguistic actions is not specified by their innate characteristics, but by their happening in communicative contexts [Fraser 1990: 233]. Fraser,

proposing this statement, steps further and emphasizes that behaving politely is attributed to utterers of a language, but not to the language itself. From a cross-linguistic point of view, Coulmas [1992: 321] debates on language systems that may be demonstrated as distinctively polite based on means, determined to mark politeness, as well as the delicacy level agreed upon in polite forms. A language is explained as polite if it is correct from a social perspective, and if it shows understanding of and concern for the feelings of members, who belong to a linguistic society. Such a principle is accomplished by applying a number of specialized means for marking politeness, and the level of delicacy codified in polite forms [Jdetawy & Hamzah 2020: 704].

As suggested by Watts et al., [1992], language systems, usage, and use are all three levels of analysis, based on which politeness operates. They [1992: 3] draw a distinction between “first-order politeness” and “second-order politeness”. The “first-order politeness” is connected with politeness as a folk concept. It is how people understand and categorize actions based on politeness. This type of categorization is appertained to manuals of etiquette, a collection of *do*’s and *dont*’s through social interactions, as well as metapragmatic interpretations about what is polite and what is impolite behavior, as Fraser [1990] indicates to as a social norm view of politeness [Kasper 1998: 1-2].

The “first-order politeness” involves many approaches, in which polite behavior is observed and enforced by ordinary people conducting in a society [Bowe et al., 2014: 61; Watts 2003: 9]. Meanwhile, “second-order politeness” has a theoretical structure and is placed in a social behavior theory and language use. It is related to the theorization of politeness by scholars, who were researching the first wave of politeness theories.

The “second-order politeness” is concerned with the theoretical observations about social anticipation and power balance dominating among participants in a social interaction [Bowe et al., 2014: 62]. Watts et al., [1992] address “second-order politeness” as “politic” to distinguish it from “first-order” polite behavior. Therefore, there is a methodological distinction between “first-order politeness” and

“second-order politeness” that reveals the relationship between the statements about linguistic etiquette at distinctive levels of analysis [Kasper 1998: 3; Salmani Nodoushan 2019: 113; Watts 1989].

The term linguistic etiquette is attributed to the practice of systematizing linguistic action in any speech society, so that it is viewed as appropriate to the current communicative act [Kasper 1998: 1]. It is additionally characterized as a framework of norms and rules of polite speech behavior, within which a sustained observance guarantees the presence of polite communication among interlocutors [Duskaeva 2020]. Although the term etiquette in the Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English [Bauer 1978: 373] is defined as “the formal rules of proper behavior”, the scope of linguistic etiquette is not merely restricted to this definition [Kasper 1998: 1].

The preliminary study on linguistic etiquette was conducted by Geertz [1960], in which he defines linguistic etiquette like a wall, constructed around every person, in order to keep his/her inner feelings secure. While discussing linguistic etiquette, it is practically impossible for any utterer of any linguistic background to communicate with other people without signifying the social relationships from status and formality perspectives [Rababah & Malkawi 2012]. That is, there are unique words, involving connotative as well as denotative meanings, that are used to enhance the level of speech or to indicate the status and the formality among interlocutors. Furthermore, due to displaying mutual politeness and deference, interlocutors should take the specific socio-cultural norms of linguistic etiquette into consideration.

The fundamental function of linguistic etiquette is the proper development of communicative relations among interlocutors in terms of its specified and accepted rules and norms. Moreover, at a genetic level, people fully acknowledge that a speaker, who acts properly in accordance with general norms and standards of linguistic etiquette, is able to pay respect and admiration for other people and sustains the mutually communicative atmosphere as favorably as possible. As a consequence, he/she could leave a positive impression on his/her interlocutor during

a conversation. The importance of the status of a person in linguistic etiquette cannot be overstated [Jdetawy & Hamzah 2020: 700-701].

In relation to the fact that linguistic etiquette has a cultural specificity, each nation generates its own particular system including principles of speech behavior [Fomina et al., 2020: 5]. It presents an approved set of required forms, contents, orders, characters and situations that are relevant to a speaker or an expression [Tewerefou 2010]. Besides, linguistic etiquette connects with words and phrases that are used to greet someone, ask something from somebody, address someone or apply appropriate intonation to show politeness to interlocutors.

Linguistic etiquette is a segment of linguistic routines that manifests a consecutive system beyond one sentence, either as actions of one person or as interpersonal interactions among two or more people [Agyekum 2005: 1]. Numerous examples of these routines are performed during our daily interactions. In order to demonstrate the relevance of linguistic etiquette and the notion of politeness, Green [1992] explains that these two concepts are used interchangeably with an equal connotation by revolving around the principles that are specified by “refined” behavior.

Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory [1978: 61] is interpreted as attempts at redressing affronts to a person’s self-esteem by efficiently claiming positive social values through social interactions. In this regard, the concept of self-esteem is construed as the concept of face, which was introduced by Goffman [1955]. Goffman proposes the theory of face [1955, 1967: 5] as the positive public image that is expected by any person in social interactions.

The notion of face represents one of the parts of politeness theory. This notion is completed by the other parts, involving Positive Face and Negative Face, Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) and their relevant strategies, as well as the factors that play influential roles in choosing these strategies [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987]. According to Kádár & Haugh [2013], politeness is a principal part of all our relationships, and operates as a fundamental element when we make communication with each other and express ourselves. It is not only restricted to conventional

features of linguistic etiquette, but it encompasses all types of interpersonal behavior, by which we manifest and sustain our relationships.

Brown and Levinson used Goffman's face theory as a basis to demonstrate polite people's interactions and expanded this theory by discussing that interlocutors have two faces. They [1987: 61] introduce Positive Face as "the positive consistent self-image or personality, crucially including the desire that this self-image be appreciated and approved of, claimed by interactants" and Negative Face as "the basic claim to territories, personal preserves, rights to non-distraction i.e. to freedom of action and freedom from imposition".

They propose politeness as an answer to saving face or losing face, and principally, to alleviating or refraining from Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs) when receiving requests or in cases of being insulted. Therefore, politeness strategies are applied to construct messages to save the hearer's Positive Face when Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs) are unavoidable or anticipated. Kasper [1998: 4] highlights that these two sides of face have been discussed by other scholars under the titles of distance vs. involvement [Tannen 1986], deference vs. solidarity [Scollon & Scollon 1983], autonomy vs. connection [Green 1992], self-determination vs. acceptance, and personal vs. interpersonal face [Janney & Arndt 1992].

Scholars, who identify a role for face in linguistic etiquette, speculate that face is properly comprehended only in the context of "self" notions. They stress the fact that such notions are inevitably impressed by perceptions of personhood and relationships between a person and a society, which occur differently in different cultures. Thus, in order to research linguistic etiquette, it is important to recognize social marking routines and politeness strategies in different communities and speech occurrences in larger cultural societies to base orientations of "self" and face, which differ among cultures. Such research is not only required for expressively proportionate explanations of politeness in and across cultures, but it is also an essential protective shield against purposeless stereotyping along the obtained lines of Eastern and Western approaches to understanding of personhood and social relations [Kasper 1998: 5].

1.2. Politeness in interpersonal interaction

Politeness is one of the most important study fields in pragmatics [Culpeper 2011]. Meanwhile, linguistic politeness is a pragmatic phenomenon, by which language users either indicate that they pay attention to people's feelings and/or express that they have adequate awareness of their own as well as others' rights and commitments in a specific context [Kádár 2017: 2, 2019: 152].

Politeness, as stated by the Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary & Thesaurus, is "behaving in a way that is socially correct and shows understanding of and care for other people's feelings". In the Dehkhoda Encyclopedia [1966, 1980], as the largest comprehensive Persian Encyclopedia, politeness (ادب/ adab) is delineated as the knowledge, by which an individual is able to refrain from having any fault in utterances. Meanwhile, the boundaries of definition of politeness have exceeded beyond to the knowledge of any affair, through which an individual is able to avoid from having any sort of fault, which would lead to a tranquil, cordial and affectionate relationship between people [Shahrokhi & Shirani Bidabadi 2013: 17].

Politeness, as a field of research, can be characterized as the study of interactional approaches accepted by individuals in order to base and sustain their relationships. It comprises behavioral strategies, applied by interlocutors, to exhibit that they take the feelings of other individuals into consideration with the purpose of maintaining their interpersonal relationships. These behaviors are converted to action through evaluative moments [Kádár 2017: 1]. Politeness, as an arbitrary meta representation of an interpersonal attitude, is related to the sphere of intentionality [Ruhi 2008].

While productive intention is influential in politeness behavior and producing, besides evaluating of politeness, lean to pursuing patterns that are conventionalized patterns by default [Kádár 2017], it cannot be possible to hypothesize that the producer and receiver of a speech conceive its value of politeness on common bases [Enfield 2006]. Therefore, the notion of politeness is a section of explaining that how interlocutors evaluate a specific utterance [Eelen 2001].

As politeness specifies the behavior of people, it is studied within interdisciplinary research that indicates why people debate it in connection with pragmatics. Pragmatics is the study of actual language use in the field of linguistics [Jakubawska 1999: 13]. Language use relies not merely on a grammatical and lexical knowledge of linguistics, but also strongly depends on cultural and interpersonal context and convention [Mayes 2003: 46]. To approve this statement, pragmatics is studying of function of language in relation to its context [Lycan 2018: 138].

The critical purpose of pragmatics is answering to this question that how context and convention, in their most extensive sense, result in meaning and understanding [Senft 2014]. Pragmatics is a subcategory of linguistics and semiotics that pays attention to the approaches, in which context helps to cause meaning. It is a relatively young discipline in linguistics that is presently under research by numerous scholars around the world and involves the study of relations that are shaped among such situational parameters to speakers' aims and their actual form of utterances [Richards et al., 1985].

Politeness is an important element to make communication and, as a main substance in culture, has cumbersome entity to define [Yuni Rahastri 2017]. According to Green [1989: 141], when people discuss politeness in pragmatics, they exactly note the strategies that are required to maintain or impose changes on interpersonal relationships. Hence, politeness, as taking the hearer's feelings, concerns and wishes into account, when people make communication with each other through speaking and performing acts, can be illustrated verbally and non-verbally [Leech 1983: 140]. Verbal politeness is outlined by using honorific and prestigious language presented within particular linguistic forms of a specific language [Fukada & Asato 2004; Yoshimura & Macwhinney 2011] and non-verbal politeness is defined through actions, for instance, an appropriate style of dressing and adhering to appropriate facial expressions and gestures [Hutheifa et al., 2016: 263].

This kind of emphasis on the importance of politeness through people's interactions affirms that this phenomenon is a substantial feature of communication,

specifically, when we consider it across cultures, where appearing misunderstandings can lead to very negative and destructive results in interpersonal interactions among people [Haugh & Chang 2015: 389].

Viewing politeness, as a strategic conflict avoidance, which may act as an approach to controlling threats that potentially occur between speakers and hearers [Leech 1980: 19] seems similar to what has been proposed by Brown and Levinson of politeness [1987] as a rational behavior with the aim of mitigating of Face Threatening Acts (FTAs). Due to the potential of politeness in controlling cooperative behavior in conversation, it possesses an important role through interactions [Thomas 1995: 158]. Consequently, using politeness strategies among speakers is aimed at creating harmony between people through their personal interactions.

The fact that the strategies of politeness are used by speakers of a language in order to sustain harmony in relationships and to have a more formality in the context of relations reveals more power between interlocutors and explains that when interlocutors' relations are conducted unequally, or in a disharmonious way, a higher degree of distance between interlocutors is yielded [Holmes 1995: 19].

In the study field of politeness, people have to avoid friction through face-to-face interactions, which in turn, is resulted in a successful communication [Ermida 2006: 844]. From a linguistic point of view, in order to be polite or impolite, a person requires speaking in terms of relationships that connect him/her to the listener. Judging polite or impolite behavior in any society relies firstly on evaluating social relationship between interlocutors in accordance with two indexes of power and solidarity and secondly, on being aware of social values, and norms of that society [Holmes 2001: 268]. In other words, politeness is established on identifying differences in power distance and degrees of social distance among interlocutors in a society [Fairclough 1989: 66].

Politeness is tightly connected with the most fundamental principles that have been characterized in a socio-cultural system and interpersonal relations through social communities and should be examined in the contexts of social distance (D) as

well as power distance (P). These two factors are viewed as the main aspects in per culture [Hofstede 1991, 2001]. In most cases, social distance (D) and power distance (P) are together. To be more explicit, cultures with a more individualistic nature is specified by an index of a lower power distance, while cultures with a more collectivistic nature is characterized by an index of a higher power distance [Larina 2006, 2008; Yoo et al., 2011].

The same could be mentioned in British and Persian cultures. British culture is an individualistic culture with a lower power distance, while on the contrary, Persian culture has a collectivistic nature with a higher power distance. In other expressions, due to a horizontal communicative system in British culture, the scale of social distance (D) in this culture is longer. On the other hand, due to a vertical hierarchical system of communication in Persian culture, the scale of power distance (P) in this culture is longer than in British culture.

1.2.1. Conversational maxim view of politeness

Grice's illustration of linguistic politeness is provided with his general Cooperative Principle (CP) and maxims, which have been followed by Lakoff [1973] and Leech [1983]. The conversational-maxim view is fundamentally established on Grice's work, based on which our speech exchanges do not normally include a sequence of detached remarks, but the remarks are substantially cooperative attempts, and each interlocutor identifies a direction in cooperative attempts that is mutually adopted.

From Grice's viewpoint, talk exchangers should act cooperatively and in accordance with the maxims. Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP) consists of "make your contribution such as is required at the stage, at which it occurs by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange, in which you are engaged" [Grice 1975: 45]. In fact, Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP) and maxims of conversation, in which the main purpose of conversation is suggested as exchanging information effectively, is considered as one of the most influential contributions to the pragmatics study [Grice 1989: 28; Hamza 2007: 27].

Grice suggests four maxims of conversation, namely, the maxims of “quality”, “relation”, “manner”, and “quantity”. Accordingly, Gricean maxims demonstrate what interlocutors have to do in order to conduct a maximally efficient, rational and cooperative communication through a conversation. Participants conduct their conversation in a sincere, relevant, and unambiguous manner while they endeavor to submit sufficient information and avoid submitting extra, non-essential information to the hearer.

Grice emphasizes that Cooperative Principle (CP) is always remarked, so that any actual or obvious breaches of the maxims result in signaling conversational implicatures in a form of non-clear and ambiguous messages that the speaker intended to send to the hearer and should have been understood by the hearer. In Grice’s perspective, Cooperative Principle (CP) and its maxims are logical and rational behavior, thus, they are universal [Grice 1975: 45-46]. However, the concept of rationality of cooperation among people, proposed by Grice, is not accepted by all scholars.

While Gricean Cooperative Principle (CP) and its maxims do consider the speaker’s and the hearer’s meaning, this theory is known approximately as a fixed theory as it is not able to take the very actual effects of socio-cultural restrictions on any given linguistic contribution into account. In other expressions, this theory is judged too prescriptive as real-world situations, in which the Gricean maxims are scorned as they cannot be demonstrated merely within Grice’s framework [McCarthy 2014]. Leech [1983: 80] criticizes that Cooperative Principle (CP) is too broad [Leech & Thomas 1989] and cannot clarify why people often convey what they mean so indirectly.

In his opinion, this principle cannot also provide with a sufficient description of politeness phenomena. In fact, in order to analyze the real application of a language, Cooperative Principle (CP) should involve the maxims of a language application, which have been oriented not only socially, but also psychologically. Leech suggests complementing Cooperative Principle (CP) by adding Politeness Principle (PP). He believes that Politeness Principle (PP) describes why people

occasionally may be less than relevant or less than informative [McCarthy 2014]. Consequently, in the case of re-interpreting Gricean maxims as the aspects of behavior, they could be viewed as the universal maxims [Hymes 1986].

The other criticism, posed by Green [1990: 419], clarifies that Cooperative Principle (CP) cannot be described as a realistic behavior in communication. People often waive Cooperative Principle (CP) in specific situations, in which violating this principle shows more politeness. According to Keenan [1976: 67], Cooperative Principle (CP) does not conduct communications universally, because some maxims may not be applicable in some societies. He explains that heeding the maxim of “quality” is strongly restricted by social specificities in relation to interaction, which makes this maxim dependent on culture that is in contradiction with the universality of maxims.

Furthermore, Schmidt [1980: 139] asserts that although the Gricean maxims can be discussed as universal, considering deviations that take place from the norms, scholars are forced to disclose extra maxims, motivations as well as strategies in order to provide with a rationale for deviations from an ideal system of communication [Avramides 1989; Green 1995; Kauffeld 2001]. However, Cooperative Principle (CP) shapes the foundation of more complicated and advanced politeness theories involving Politeness Principle (PP), proposed by Leech [1983], as well as Brown and Levinson’s Politeness Theory [1978, 1987], which consider the influence of social restrictions on a speech.

Among other scholars, Loveday [1983] claims that Cooperative maxims have relatively cultural attributes. He demonstrates, in some cultures, such as Japanese, since being clear and explicit can be perceived as offensive in most contexts, the maxim of “manner” is not very commonly noticed. Meanwhile, objections and arrogance are interpreted as cooperative approaches to behavior in some other cultures, such as Black Americans, whereas in others, such as Chinese, cooperative behavior is conceived as speaking in a manner, and little enough to avoid any sort of conflict [Clyne 1994]. Wierzbicka [1985] goes beyond these statements and explains that the universality of the logic of conversation is ethnocentric, because it

is grounded on the English language. In spite of disagreements on the opinion of the universality and rationality of Cooperative Principle (CP), scholars such as Lakoff [1973], Brown and Levinson [1978] and Leech [1983] not only approve the influence of Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP) on the theory of conversation, but also improve it further.

Lakoff [1973] is a pioneer in adopting Gricean maxims in her work in order to deal with politeness. She applies the Gricean framework in describing a model of politeness from a pragmatic perspective and proposes [1975: 64] that politeness is outstretched by societies with the aim of diminishing friction through personal interactions among interlocutors. In most of the research, politeness is taken into consideration as a strategic conflict avoidance or as a strategic structure of cooperative social interactions [Eelen 2001: 21; Watts 2003: 47]. However, Lakoff believes that Gricean maxims are not only too general, but also have no obvious explanation to elucidate the terms of relevance and the amount of information. Due to these reasons, Lakoff proposes two universal principles of pragmatic competence, including 1) “be clear” and 2) “be polite”. The latter principle contains three strategies of 1) “do not impose”, 2) “give options”, and 3) “be friendly”.

According to Lakoff [1973: 296], if a person intends to have a successful communication, the message must be transmitted clearly, so that no mistakes in his/her intention are revealed. She [1990: 34] also explains that a system of interpersonal relations is constructed to assist and to ease the progress of interaction smoothly by drawing potential conflict to its minimum level. Her emphasis is put on the potential confrontation, which, in her opinion, is intrinsic in all human beings' interchange. This explanation shows that Lakoff focuses on the addressee.

Proposing pragmatic principles, Lakoff claims that these principles are broadly impressed by three pragmatic elements, consisting of “relations with addressee”, “situation of the actual world”, and “imposition degree”, which the speaker may have on the addressee. Therefore, the forming process of politeness manners is strengthened by the addressee's wants and concerns that should be considered by the speaker. To be more clear, the pragmatic principles, proposed by

Lakoff, have been aimed at dragging the possibility of conflict between the speaker and the hearer to its minimum [Johnstone 2008].

Meanwhile, the positive influence of Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP) has drawn Lakoff's linguistic concerns towards Gricean pragmatics. Her enthusiastic activities in an American feminist campaign in the late 1960s and 1970s directed her interests to publishing of the work [Lakoff 1975], which played an important role in achieving a prominent position for politeness [Fauziati 2017; Watts 2003: 58]. Lakoff's experiences in Generative Semantics has a great influence on her work in conceptualizing politeness theory. Through her new analysis of politeness, based on sociopragmatic investigation, an innovative perspective is introduced. In terms of Cooperative Principle (CP), Lakoff [1973: 296, 1975: 87] proposes politeness in a framework of pragmatic rules to reveal whether an utterance is pragmatically well-structured or not.

Although Cooperative Principle (CP) has the nature of communicative rationality through a communication, it seems that it does not follow the pragmatic rules or even completely ignores them [Al-Hindawi & Raheem Alkhazaali 2016; Chendeb 2019]. In order to understand this type of failure in Cooperative Principle (CP), Lakoff [1973: 296] outlines the pragmatic principles of politeness. Therefore, according to the pragmatic rules of politeness, when dealing with politeness, this phenomenon must be conducted based on the preliminary rules of a language system. On the other hand, viewing politeness, in terms of strategies, discloses that politeness has an individual nature, depending on the user's strategy, which is selected in advance and specified pursuant to the situation.

Therefore, Lakoff, as a formalist linguist, endeavors to form a language as a system by accepting the pragmatic principles [Locher 2012; Locher & Watts 2005]. Referring to Lakoff [1972, 1973, 1975, 1990], politeness phenomenon is a collection of strategies that are preferred by users. This definition explicates that the term of strategies is an implication of variability and a process of choosing in the context. As a consequence, a polite speech act is an utterance that is performed based on the

pragmatic principles of politeness. On the contrary, an utterance, performed out of the politeness norms, is viewed as a non-polite speech act.

The politeness notion, proposed in Lakoff's model, is concerned with paying respect to personal territory of interlocutors, suggesting alternatives and granting a pleasant feeling to interlocutors. However, while Lakoff's model of politeness contributes to avoid forming friction in an interpersonal communication, she does not present an adequate empirical evidence for her suggested politeness strategies in the contexts of cross-cultural communication. As a consequence, her purposes for the universality of this perspective are still doubted [Félix- Brasdefer 2008: 15].

Furthermore, Lakoff's analysis is not able to provide with an integrating theory, which puts her principles of politeness in a structure, in which their form is based on social relationships and anticipations about people as interactants could be explained [Brown 1976: 246]. Franck [1980] draws Lakoff's principles under critical criticism as well, and states that her pragmatic principles have been placed on a level with other linguistic principles. As a consequence, she has lost the difference between sentence meaning and communicative function. Despite the criticisms, Lakoff has made a significant contribution to the study of politeness, and dramatically broadened the scope of its research [Pan 1995].

Leech [1983] also follows the Gricean structure of conversational principles and explains a politeness analysis based on principles and maxims through a pragmatic framework. In this framework, politeness is viewed as a regulative element in interaction. He endeavors to elaborate on *why* people often transfer meaning in an indirect way. Moreover, Leech considers politeness as a main pragmatic phenomenon for indirectness and justifies *why* people have deviations from Cooperative Principle (CP). He represents an approach, in which there are differences from Lakoff's approach, and introduces the notion of indirectness. Leech argues that politeness in the form of maxims has more flexibility than principles, because these maxims explicate how politeness acts as a social manner. From his point of view, maxims of politeness can be adhered to the process of communication unless one motivation acts as an obstacle.

Leech proposes a difference between a speaker's illocutionary aim and a speaker's social aim. The difference relates to the speech act(s), which the utterer means to perform through his/her speech and the position that the utterer selects for behaving politely, truthfully, ironically, etc. He explains a pragmatic structure that involves two main sectors of textual rhetoric and interpersonal rhetoric. Each sector consists of a set of principles. Politeness is viewed in the area of interpersonal rhetoric, which includes three sets of principles: Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP) with its four maxims, Leech's Politeness Principle (PP) and Leech's Irony Principle (IP).

Politeness is explained by Leech [1983] as a set of social performances that create respect and appreciation. Meanwhile, from his point of view, politeness refers to a tendency of the speaker to be involved in a relatively harmonious, respectful, and coordinated social interactions. Leech discusses how some illocutionary performances, such as making an offer or apology, are innately polite, while there are some acts that are not polite by nature. This means that, due to the different degrees of politeness, individuals do not fully speak politely or impolitely.

Leech not only places Politeness Principle (PP) in a similar position to Cooperative Principle (CP), but also regards it as a motivation for deviating from Gricean maxims. In fact, his Politeness Principle (PP) is framed in a very identical construction to Grice's Cooperative Principle (CP), and analyzed based on the maxims of "tact", "generosity", "approbation", "modesty", "agreement", and "sympathy" [Leech 1983: 138-139]. Due to the subjective nature of these maxims, measuring them is impossible [Reiter 1999: 14]. According to Leech, the fundamental function of politeness maxims is minimizing the degree of rudeness and maximizing the degree of politeness simultaneously.

The meanings and the connotations of politeness maxims, represented by Leech, vary among the maxims. Furthermore, these maxims include other minor maxims categorized by invalidating of disharmony as Negative Politeness, which implies more importance than looking for harmony as Positive Politeness. Leech states that the maxim of "tact" impresses on individuals' utterances more than the

maxim of “generosity”, whereas the maxim of “modesty” is less critical than the maxim of “approbation”. He emphasizes that the speaker can employ more than one maxim of politeness when making conversation.

One ambiguous point in politeness theory of Leech is revealed when he highlights particular types of illocutions as polite or impolite [Fraser 1990: 227]. From Fraser’s viewpoint, while the efficiency of an illocutionary act can be so assessed, the same cannot be stated for the act itself. The problem here is trying to categorize an act as polite and/or impolite intrinsically without considering its cultural and situational context. Another critique in relevance to Politeness Principle (PP), proposed by Leech, is that all the maxims of politeness are rooted in distinctive types of speech acts. In fact, Leech connects his politeness with particular illocutionary acts and explains that there is a direct connection between different politeness maxims and speech acts.

In such an approach, maxims of politeness seem essential in specifying speech acts’ nature, and maybe this necessity for the maxims is felt only in a situation, in which people intend to perform a specific type of speech act. However, this analysis is not completely acceptable, because during conversational communication, all politeness styles are not needed, and all people also do not apply the same styles of politeness. In fact, this is a situational context, based on which performing a polite speech act or an accomplished speech act with politeness styles are shaped differently.

1.2.2. Face-saving view of politeness

Face-saving view is one of the most known approaches to politeness, and its tenets are presented by Brown and Levinson [1978, 1987]. It is established on a particular explanation, proposed by Goffman [1967, 1971], concerned with the role of face through a social interaction. Goffman [1967: 5-8] illustrates face as “the positive social value, a person effectively claims for himself, by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact”.

Face is also defined as an image of self-delineated in compliance with the accepted social perspectives. Good face is formed when the social behavior of a situation is in conforming with face, whereas when information about the social value is developed in a way that could not be integrated, bad face is shaped. In fact, an interlocutor, who moves towards out of the line, during his/her social interaction, is construed as out of face.

In such a situation, the interlocutor is not able to follow the accepted social behaviors that are expected of him/her in a particular situation. During a conversation, through an active verbal and non-verbal interaction with other individuals, we conceptualize our “self”. Face is also revealed through evaluations, which we create of ourselves in the flow of our social interactions [Félix-Brasdefer 2008: 13].

According to Goffman [1967: 6], changes of face take place across interactions, and it relies on the social context of culture. He asserts that there are principles of community, a group of people, and an illustration of a situation, which specify how many emotions individuals are to have for a face and how these emotions are to be spread among the faces that are involved. In Goffman’s opinion [1967: 12], facework is “the actions taken by a person to make whatever he is doing consistent with face”.

Brown and Levinson point to Goffman’s definition of face as the image and the positive social value that an individual expects of him/herself and obtains from the community during a particular interaction [Holtgraves 2002: 38]. From their perspectives, face can be ruined, sustained or improved through social interactions. They highlight specific illocutionary acts that may be considered as a threatening to a person’s face and name these threats as Face Threatening Acts (FTAs).

Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) are actions, through which the speaker may hinder the action’s freedom of the hearer, for instance, in making a request or bringing a suggestion. Other Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) consist of imposing pressure on the hearer in order to accept or reject an action. Examples in this regard could be making offers and compliments to a person or acting as if to indicate that

the speaker would like to achieve something through the addressee [Hamza 2007: 37].

Brown and Levinson use the concept of face as a universal groundwork in politeness studies. They [1987: 61] corroborate that face is the concept of “public self-image that a person would like to claim for him/herself”. All interlocutors participate in a common cooperation in order to sustain face through an interaction [Yuka 2009: 59]. Due to the fact that each individual in a society potentially possesses a face, then, face as a concept, needs to be taken into account through interactional communication. Both the utterer and the listener must have awareness of the notion of face while socially interacting with each other [Wardhaugh 2010: 292].

All adult individuals in a community have concerns about their face, the self-image that they reveal to other people in a society, and that they identify other people, who have the same face wants. Brown and Levinson recognize two characteristics of face as Negative Face and Positive Face (refer to 1.1), which in their opinions, are universal and discuss two fundamental desires of any member of society during any interaction. As a consequence, the notion of Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs) is debated by Brown and Levinson [1987: 67], as a social behavior, that is a threatening to face desires and wants of the speaker and/or the addressee, either positively or negatively.

In order to maintain the interlocutor’s face, he/she has to cooperate with other members of community through any type of social communication as a necessity of sustaining the individual’s face depending on other members of society [Wijayanto et al., 2013]. In the notion of face, proposed by Goffman, the public is viewed as an intrinsic constituent, whereas in Brown and Levinson’s perspectives of face, the public is an external modifier. This distinction has been led to many critiques of Brown and Levinson’s theory, which claim that this theory has Anglocentric bias or, in its interactional dynamics, has a Western individualistic nature [Mao 1994; Wierzbicka 1985].

Brown and Levinson [1978, 1987] define politeness as “a complex system for softening face threats”. Their theory of politeness plays an influential role in the field of pragmatics and has motivated consecutive international debates about the universality of politeness and the viewpoints of a broad sphere of specific cultures. Some scholars, as contributors to these debates, have advocated the theory [e.g., Fukada & Asato 2004; Pizziconi 2003], while others have either submitted their rejection to it [e.g., Matsumoto 1988, 1989] or approved some parts and adapted some other parts of it [e.g., Spencer-Oatey 2000].

Brown and Levinson claim that their proposed theory is applicable to all languages. Thus, the focus of the debates was put on two principal questions: 1) how much universal their theory could virtually be, and 2) whether this theory is an absence of paying attention to the certain types of culture or not [Brown 2007: 31]. Expanding the concept of face into politeness, Brown and Levinson [1978, 1987] propose Positive Politeness and Negative Politeness.

They explain that Positive Politeness is employed to show what can be performed during communication in order to satisfy requirements of Positive Face, while Negative Politeness has two distinctive functions. The first function is that Negative Politeness can be expressed to save face of the speaker, and the second function can be expressed by accomplishing requirements of Negative Face, showing respect and deference to the addressee and remembering that the rights of the addressee must be highly regarded, and nothing should be imposed on the addressee in any way.

According to Brown and Levinson [1978, 1987: 16-17], politeness and face are universal, and people are rational. Therefore, people choose the means that help them obtain their targets. They assert that there are particular types of actions that are perceived as Face Threatening Acts (FTAs). In order to prevent Face Threatening Acts (FTAs), all rational representatives employ strategies. The employment of any such strategy is strongly dependent on (relative) power, social distance, and degree of imposition, as defined by Brown and Levinson, as three social factors. These factors should be considered by interlocutors during any interaction. They propose

their definition of power in connection with the social status of the speaker and the hearer.

Social distance and degree of imposition have also been characterized respectively as a degree, at which interlocutors are acquainted with each other, a rank that interlocutors have, and their ability in order to impose their ideas, intentions, and wants on the others. Kida [2011: 183] states that social distance is explainable by employing different linguistic forms to show respect and politeness.

On the same line, Martinze-Flor [2007: 6] debates that the degree of imposition indicates the way, through which an interlocutor is able to impose his intentions and desires on the hearer. As a consequence, it is essential to pay attention to these social factors in an appropriate performance of any speech act in terms of the social context. These social factors control the linguistic forms that interlocutors prefer to employ. Behaving extremely politely relies on the potential threat of a communicative act, and the factors involved in evaluating face threats suggested by Brown and Levinson could influence politeness strategies that are applied to perform specific speech acts [Hutheifa et al., 2016: 264; Wang et al., 2010: 2].

Brown and Levinson [1987: 94-227] introduce four classifications of politeness strategies in their proposed model of politeness, which are placed in different ranges starting from the least and ending in the most redressible actions. These strategies are Bald On-Record Directness Politeness Strategies, Positive Politeness Strategies, Negative Politeness Strategies and Off-Record Indirectness Politeness Strategies [Assadi Aidinlou et al., 2012: 11323; Keikhaie & Mozaffari 2013: 56; Mansoor 2018].

In Bald On-Record Directness Politeness Strategies [Brown & Levinson 1987: 94-101], the speaker applies a direct approach of expressing utterances in an unambiguous, direct as well as a concise way without any attempts to minimize imposition on the hearer. The speaker does not endeavor to save or minimize the hearer's face. In fact, Bald On-Record Politeness Strategies are mostly employed between individuals, who are in a very intimate relationship with each other, such as members of a family or close friends. By these politeness strategies, the only

concern of the speaker is transferring efficient and clear messages, while Face Threatening Acts (FTAs), taking place potentially through conveying messages, is out of the speaker's core of attention. For instance, if someone recognizes that the other person is faced with a dangerous situation might cry out loudly "watch out" or a father reminds his child "do your assignments". In case of applying these types of strategies, out of their appropriate context, they could be threatening.

Brown and Levinson [1987: 101-129] state that in Positive Politeness Strategies, the speaker's granting approval to the addressee shows that the addressee's wishes and wants are taken into consideration by the speaker. On the one hand, Positive Politeness Strategies are redressive actions conducted towards Positive Face of the hearer and his/her wants and wishes, which should be placed at the center of attention of the speaker. On the other hand, the speaker makes efforts in order to establish a friendly relationship with the addressee and pay respect and attention to him/her through performing or, at least, speaking about the addressee's wishes and wants. Such a situation, in which the speaker attempts to prepare a level of comfort and safety for the addressee through a relationship, takes place in a social community, for instance, in a circle of friends with no distance between its members.

Negative Politeness Strategies [Brown & Levinson 1987: 129-211] intensify Negative Face by not imposing on the addressee's freedom of choice. The strategies are at the heart of respective behaviors, which relate to the stereotypes of avoidance. In contrast to Positive Politeness Strategies that are flexible in their ranges, Negative Politeness Strategies are particular and specific-focused. The strategies are redressive actions, directed towards Negative Face of the addressee, by which the addressee has a desire to sustain his/her freedom without a tendency to be imposed by the utterer while being in a mutual interaction with the utterer. To be more explicit, when applying Negative Politeness Strategies, the addressee needs to be respected by the utterer in the same way and at the same frequency, which the speaker pays respect and attention to other individuals in a society. The strategies take place on occasions when there is social distance between interactants.

In Off-Record Politeness Strategies [Brown & Levinson 1987: 211-227], the utterer follows an implicit manner by giving mere hints, and grants this opportunity to the addressee to make a decision on how to interpret the action of the utterer. In this classification of politeness strategies, the utterer mentions something indirectly or impliedly about his/her wants or needs, and the addressee may meet the speaker's wishes without feeling imposed on by the utterer. For instance, when a woman needs to borrow a handkerchief from her colleague, she just searches in her pocket or her bag instead of asking for it directly. In such a situation, with applying Off-Record Politeness Strategies, the speaker might simply say *I can't find my handkerchief*.

In spite of the fact that Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness is a great contribution to politeness studies [Chen 2010; Gu 1990; Haugh 2005; Ide 1989; Kitamura 2000; Matsumoto 1989; Mao 1994], their theory was subjected to many radical criticisms. The critiques were mainly concerned with the universality of politeness and face. Although Brown and Levinson [1987: 161-62] believe that their two proposed types of face are encountered with differences among different cultures and societies, but they still stand by their perspectives, in which they imply an essential social validity that may be applied in distinctive cultures and can overwhelm the cultural barriers among different societies. They claim that differences among cultures do not have any influence on face to be positive or negative. In their opinions, cultural differences can only specify whether a specific speech act is positive or negative [Mao 1994: 471].

In order to generalize this theory, they should also take non-Western cultures into consideration, while their theory has been concentrated merely on illustrating politeness in Western societies with Anglo-Saxon cultures [Matsumoto 1989]. Brown and Levinson focus on how people perform speech acts in a polite manner, while they ignore the group identity within a society. Moreover, they should pay attention to how politeness works among non-Western cultures. As a consequence, their politeness theory might not be adequate and appropriate for Persian culture with a collectivistic nature, in which people use politeness strategies in a way that is different from Western cultures with their individualistic nature.

The concept of face [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987], as a universal framework, is also criticized. Mao [1994] discusses that this notion has not been used appropriately because Brown and Levinson could not basically identify the source of face. Meanwhile, he argues that they have not examined the occasions of politeness when Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) occur. In Mao's opinion, interactants from different cultures have different understanding of the notion of face. In a more egalitarian society, people tend to apply Positive Politeness Strategies as an approach to encoding and accordingly to approve a less territorial perspective of face, and face is mentioned to be attributed to the merit of people rather than achieved by birth [Grundy 2000: 162].

Other critics argue that Brown and Levinson's politeness model is established on a philosophical point of view, mainly focused on Speech Act Theory and Cooperative Principle (CP). Thus, it is essential to make an analysis of speeches, based on their broader linguistic context, in order to have a more authentic understanding and an explanation of politeness [Hayashi 1996].

Some other critiques, concerning the implied message as a concept, are structured in accordance with Cooperative Principle (CP). Brown and Levinson's politeness theory is expected to be prepared according to the social influences of a specific community on speech act behavior [Jary 1998]. Moreover, Sperber and Wilson [1995] as well as Fraser [1990] assert that the norms of politeness can be ordinarily overlooked by interlocutors. Therefore, it seems natural if people unintentionally comply with such norms of polite behavior.

While many empirical researchers [e.g., Leung 1988; Ting-Toomey 2009; Ting-Toomey & Kurogi 1998] pursued the assumption of universality, some others [Ide 1989; Mao 1994; Matsumoto 1989] commenced with putting fundamental criticisms on their assumption. The critics claim that the politeness model is not only originally Western-biased, but also does not bring any advantages, particularly, when interlocutors intend to retain the degree of a Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs) to a minimum, towards the addressee, by applying power, distance, and imposition as politeness factors.

The main arguments of the theory are either based on the opinion that the purpose of comparative research is to reveal the fundamental universals of politeness by empirically evaluating the validity of universal classification among various cultures, or to gather more empirical data about politeness phenomena between different cultures by creating new universal classifications. From the critics' viewpoints, the validity of the universality hypothesis itself as a basic research assumption is not considered. On the whole, criticisms are mainly focused on the principle of rationality, the universality of face proposed by Brown and Levinson, the universality of their suggested politeness strategies, the rigidity of the politeness scale in relation to their three sociological variables, the ignorance of discourse, and the negligence of the context [Janney & Arndt 1993: 15].

1.2.3. Discursive approach to politeness

In order to understand the different standpoints of politeness theories, Terkourafi [2005] proposes two principal categorizations that are traditional theories of politeness, introduced by Brown and Levinson [1987], Lakoff [1973] and Leech [1983], as well as discursive theories of politeness, invented by Eelen [2001], Mills [2003] and Watts [2003].

Since the first category of politeness theories views it as a social phenomenon, it is founded on Grice's theory of Cooperative Principle (CP) and Speech Act Theory, which have been focused on the intention of the speaker as an abstracted embodiment from a real performance. This group of politeness theories adhere to the orientation of the speaker's face. The scholars, who support traditional theories of politeness, assume that since they believe in politeness as a general social phenomenon, notwithstanding differences among cultures, cultures act homogeneous internally. Consequently, they claim that face and the principles of politeness are universal phenomena [Brown 2015].

In response to these claims, the second category of scholars concentrated on the nature and form of politeness norms among cultures. This group of researchers believe that politeness is heterogeneous within and across cultures. Due to this

heterogeneity, it could be concluded that the feature of the universality of politeness principles does not match with all cultures [Hutheifa et al., 2016]. In contrast to the theories, suggested by scholars, who were strong advocates of traditional theories of politeness, in the second category of politeness theories, the addressee plays an impressive and a main role in judging politeness. Moreover, based on scholars, who were strong advocates of the second category of politeness theories, politeness is not only associated with strategies, applied between the speaker and the hearer, but also is improved in order to involve exchanges that occur in the specific situations [Terkourafi 2005].

The trend of the research on politeness has significantly developed by the scholars' contributions [Eelen 2001; Watts 2003; Mills 2003], who proposed new perspectives in dealing with politeness, relying on social concepts, in particular, "habitus" concept. This concept is a collection of dispositions to treat in a manner that is harmonious with social constructions internalized by people in their experiences through social interactions [Watts 2003: 274]. Politeness theory within this approach is observed as a social practice. The theoretical basis, upon which discursive approach is established, is the idea that politeness is specified by the intentions of the speaker and achieving a complete success or a specific level of success in the recognition of the speaker's intentions by the addressee [Hammood 2016].

Discursive theorists argue that (im)politeness is not situated at the level of speech, as it has been mentioned by Brown and Levinson. The general focus of discursive approach is interpreted as interactants' located and dynamic evaluations of politeness, not shared forms or strategies of politeness [Culpeper 2010: 3235]. Therefore, theorists suggest considering an interaction as a part of a whole context rather than as a separate speech in order to lead to a reliable evaluation of (im)politeness. Interpretation of speech can be different in different contexts [Bikhtiyar 2014: 36].

Discursive approach is related to viewing all the factors that influence the structure of language and the interpretation of speech. Its researchers attempt to

bring contextual elements into the analysis of politeness [Pan 2011: 71], and its advocates argue that since the structure and the interpretation of interactions are not rule-governed, it is incredible to evaluate the entity of interactions only by considering their generalized frameworks. Therefore, in discursive approach, researchers need to pay attention to all the elements including personal, cultural, situational and contextual elements, so that they can influence the interactional structure and interpretation [Culpeper 2011; Mills 2003; Watts 2003].

It is worth noting that the difference between emic (lay) and etic (theoretical, scholarly) understandings of (im)politeness has stimulated a discursive approach to (im)politeness [Eelen 2001]. The discursive turn to politeness has revealed the evaluative and situated nature of the concepts of politeness and impoliteness and the role of identity and the context in their assessment [Haugh et al., 2013; Langlotz & Locher 2013, 2017; Locher & Watts 2005, 2008].

1.3. Politeness from a cross-cultural perspective

At the outset, the principal theories of politeness put mere concentration on explaining this phenomenon within a specific culture, and then initiated making comparisons between politeness forms and disciplines across different cultures. Politeness is strongly coupled with the most basic principles of the socio-cultural structure and interpersonal relationships within social categories and should be taken in terms of social distance (D) and power distance (P) into account. Social distance (D) and power distance (P) are viewed as the most fundamental features in every culture [Hofstede 1991, 2001; Larina 2008: 33].

In most cases, social distance (D) and power distance (P) exist together. Therefore, cultures with a more individualistic nature are specified by an index of a lower power distance, while cultures with a more collectivistic nature are explained by an index of a higher power distance [Larina 2006, 2008; Yoo et al., 2011]. The same could be elucidated about British and Persian cultures. British culture, as an individualistic culture, has a lower power distance, while on the contrary, Persian culture, with a collectivistic nature, has a higher power distance. In other expressions, due to a horizontal system of relation in British culture, the scale of

social distance in this culture is longer, while, due to a vertical hierarchical system of communication in Persian culture, the scale of power distance in this culture is longer than in British culture.

Politeness is defined as a universal phenomenon, but many scholars [e.g., Blum-Kulka 1992; Blum-Kulka & House 1989; Culpeper et al., 2017; Gu 1992; Haugh & Chang 2015; Hickey & Stewart 2005; Leech 2005, 2014; Leech & Larina 2014; Larina 2006, 2008, 2009, 2015; Locher & Larina 2019; Mugford 2020; Pizziconi 2003; Rhee 2019; Reiter 1999, 2000; Sifianou 1992; Triandis 1994; Tzanne & Sifianou 2019; Watts 2003; Watts et al., 1992, 2005; Wierzbicka 1985, 1987, 1991/2003; among many others] believe that politeness is also a culture-specific phenomenon.

Differences in the politeness system mirror differences, which take place in values. Blum-Kulka [1992: 270] states that politeness systems reflect an interaction's interpretation that is culturally refined. Thus, the abundant problems arise from the fact that people's behavior is conducted according to their particular social and linguistic norms and values, as well as their understanding of politeness and impoliteness, which differ among cultures [Culpeper 2011; Hickey & Stewart 2005; Leech 1983, 2007, 2014; Larina 2008, 2009, 2013; Matsumoto 1989; Pizziconi 2003; Reiter 2000; Sifianou 1992; Scollon & Scollon 2001; Visson 2013; Wierzbicka 1991/2003; Watts 2003; among many others].

Nowadays, it is mainly acknowledged that people from different cultural backgrounds do not have a common opinion about polite and impolite acts [Larina 2003, 2006, 2009; Pizziconi 2003; Sifianou 1992; Watts 2003; among many others]. To be more explicit, an identical verbal or a non-verbal act, which is conceived as politeness in one culture, may be understood as impoliteness or inappropriateness in another culture. Hence, behaving politely in another language and in a different culture consists of understanding values of that society and that culture, which conduct the way, through which social dimensions such as status, solidarity, and formality are illustrated [Kadar & Mills 2011; Marish 2010: 3].

Linguistic differences, due to their cultural attributes, have much deeper roots than the bare norms of politeness in a society and are connected with cultural differences. The understanding of differences among cultures leads to influence communicative behavior and is viewed as an essential section of intercultural communicative competence. Therefore, the comparative study of communicative behavior among cultures should scrutinize the communicative values and the understanding of (im)politeness in a particular culture as well [Wierzbicka 1985: 145].

Culture, as a social expression prevailed meaningfully among members of a community [Griswold 2012], can be described as the means, by which people behave in compliance with practices that are prototypical in a society as well as the values, which are accepted by that society. Meanwhile, culture is viewed as a context of communication established based on previous experiences in a society. Through intercultural interactions, culture plays the most important and influential extra-linguistic role, which influences the communicative behavior of a society and structures the behavioral styles of members of that society. From a metaphorical viewpoint, culture is a process of collective programming of the mind that differentiates members of one group of people from another group [Hofstede 2001: 9; Hofstede et al., 2010: 6].

Among the definitions of culture, language is an important aspect [Triyuni et al., 2018: 151]. People use language as a means of building communication. Communication is always associated with interpretations involving meaning. From a discursive perspective, meaning is not absolute and is permanently specified by different contexts, while communication refers to the signs of people's lives, in which culture is settled. Therefore, language is not certainly detached from cultural context, while the presence of language and its specific nature are determinedly under the influence of the culture of a society [Dharma et al., 2018].

In order to understand differences in a cultural logic encoded in each language, it is critical to consider the words that signify a social classification and the types of social relationships, as we can identify how people, employing them,

interact with another [Gladkova 2013; Larina 2020: 422; Ye 2004, 2013]. The classifications of culture are performed in terms of specific elements. Hofstede [1983] proposes one of the best-known categorizations of culture. From his point of view, cultures have different features, therefore, he establishes his classification based on the initial cultural differences, within which cultures can be situated and identified. According to Hofstede's classification, there are four dimensions of culture: "power distance", "uncertainty avoidance", "individualism vs. collectivism" and "masculinity vs. femininity".

Individualism is an aspect of a society where people are principally responsible for themselves and immediate members of their family. By contrast, in collectivistic cultures, people are born and raised in a network society, in which they find themselves a strong, supportive large group of family and relatives, who protect each other seriously throughout their lifetime. In these conceptualizations, two main universals as "I-orientation" cultures, emerged from an individualistic theoretical framework [Hofstede 1991; Triandis 1995], and "We-orientation" cultures emerged from a collectivistic theoretical framework are identified.

While people in "I-orientation" cultures value the elements of individuality, independence, individual freedom, and non-imposition, people in "We-orientation" cultures give value to the elements such as interdependence and involvement by feelings of more responsibility towards events that are taking place around them. Based on people's cultural backgrounds, everyone can observe him/herself, either as an independent and autonomous person, which is defined as a typical specificity of an individualistic culture, or as a participant of a group that is identified as the main feature of a collectivistic culture [Kalyango & Kopytowska 2014; Kurteš & Kopytowska 2015; Larina et al., 2017; Ozyumenko & Larina 2018: 594; Wierzbicka 1997, 2006].

Ting-Toomey [1998] puts cultures into a classification of "direct vs. indirect". In such a category, cultures could act more explicitly or implicitly, and the purpose of the explanations posed by communicators vary too much. In a direct culture, communicators explore much more detailed information with a precise method of

verbal communication. On the contrary, in an indirect culture, the main part of information is disclosed implicitly through a non-verbal communication, which is left to the interlocutor to understand.

Hall [1976] proposes his classification of cultures as “high-context vs. low-context”, in which people are more implicit or explicit in structuring the main differences within the patterns of communication. A high-context culture is a more implicit culture, in which less detailed and less precise information is required, and people usually perceive things in a form of bodily communication as well as facial gestures. By contrast, in a low-context culture, it is necessary to present more detailed information to make a purposeful communication fully interpreted. Low-context culture, as a more explicit culture, is usually a combination of bodily communication and facial gestures. Intercultural communicators, who keep these principal differences in mind, gain a better understanding of distinctive cultures and their popular patterns of thinking and behavior [Behbahani 2009; Dang 2016].

The important parameters of horizontal distance, vertical distance, and cultural values, all have an effect on communication. A culture with a long vertical distance has a short horizontal distance, and correspondingly, a culture with a short vertical distance has a long horizontal distance. Culture and its relevant values influence broadly social categorization and can be described as a relationship system in a society and how they relate in order to base the sense of that society [Smith 2015]. British culture, as an individualistic, an egalitarian and a symmetrical culture has a long horizontal and a short vertical distance, while on the contrary, Persian culture as a collectivistic, a non-egalitarian and an asymmetrical culture, in some contexts, has a long vertical and a short horizontal distance. As far as the long vertical distance cultures are concerned, status and hierarchy are important cultural values. In these cultures, for example in Persian culture, age, power and social status play an influential role, while in cultures with a long horizontal distance like British culture, equality is valued more than status.

Social organization of a community, involving horizontal distance and vertical distance, is the most influential variable that specifies values and

understanding of politeness and regulates the choice of politeness strategies [Larina 2015]. Wierzbicka [1985: 156] brings an example of distance as a positive cultural value, interconnected with personal autonomy and independence among English speakers, while on the contrary, distance is more connected with being indifferent among people of a collectivistic culture such as native Iranian Persian speakers [Dastmalchian & Kabasakal 2001: 480-488; Larina 2015; Leech & Larina 2014: 24; Larina & Khalil 2018]. These values can be viewed on distinctive language levels, including phraseology, lexis and grammar.

On the phraseological level, there is an example of a Persian proverb that puts emphasis on the values of closeness and solidarity in this culture, *one hand has no sound* (یک دست صدا نداره/ yek dast seda nadare), indicating the importance of maintaining closeness and solidarity and displaying a great tendency of Persian speakers to cooperate and do common activities. By contrast, the value of distance can be revealed in British proverbs, for instance, *he travels the fastest, who travels alone*, which indicates the significance of keeping distance, privacy and independence in this culture [Larina 2015: 201].

At the level of lexis, for instance, in Persian culture as well as in Russian [Larina 2020], there is not an exact semantic equivalent for the word of *privacy*, and the word of *individualist* shows a negative connotation. In Persian culture, people constantly are encouraged to support each other by behaving openly, keeping contact, and being close to each other. In such a collectivistic culture, it is placed an emphasis on doing things in company with each other instead of doing it by oneself. While a person, who comes from an Anglo-Saxon culture, like British English culture, regards such types of behavior impolite and violating borders' of people's privacy. The tendency towards "We-orientation" is observed in Persian culture, while on the contrary, in British culture, "I-orientation" is valued.

Viewing the level of communicative behavior highlights that people in a collectivistic culture, like Persian culture, by a short horizontal distance, desire to show the value of solidarity more than privacy and being independent. Thus, the speech acts of request (response to request), thanking (response to thanking),

addressing and compliments are less imposing and less face threatening. Besides, due to the lack of directness in bottom-up context between children and parents in Persian culture, it is not characterized offensive as in British culture, which is identified as an Anglo-Saxon culture with an egalitarian social order and a longer horizontal distance.

Cultural common ground is cultural values, beliefs, and norms of a society [Clark 1996] and has influences greatly on the communicative ethno-styles and the choice of speech acts in that society. Cultural values and norms are set by a language system, which has an effect on the communicative behavior of a speech society [Bromhead & Ye 2020; Lewis 2019; Sharifian 2017] and are associated with choosing polite or impolite speech acts. Speakers of British English, who come from an individualistic and “I-orientation” culture, due to an egalitarian social order, a symmetrical role position, and a short vertical distance among members of society, have a lower level of formality in family relations. Meanwhile, they show a greater tendency towards respecting equality and manner, emphasizing keeping distance and privacy to show politeness to each other. By contrast, in Persian culture, as a collectivistic and “We-orientation” culture, due to a non-egalitarian social order and an asymmetrical role position, in some contexts, there is a long vertical distance as well as a high power distance among members of society, which leads to a higher level of formality in family relations to show respect to people, older in age or/and higher in status that are prescribed by etiquette and are intrinsic traits of politeness in this culture.

Per culture is counted as an appropriate instance, in which culture is described by other communicative features and shapes a distinctive style of communicative behavior. All these features are strongly interrelated and interdependent with each other, while they differ from culture to culture. Paying close attention to the concept of distance, which varies among cultures, leads us to an understanding of the concepts of vertical distance and horizontal distance that in most cases proceed together. Cultures with a long horizontal distance are identified with a short vertical distance, and with the order reversed, cultures with a short horizontal distance are

signified by a long vertical distance. Vertical and horizontal distances, as social systems of a society, are the most important elements that specify cultural values, understanding of politeness, and politeness strategies in that society.

As stated by Wierzbicka [1985: 150], Anglo-Saxon is a cultural tradition, in which particular emphasis is placed on personal rights, as well as individual autonomy with abhorrence of any kind of interference in other people's affairs. This cultural tradition is tolerant of personal differences, paying respect to individual privacy and supporting conciliation and objections to any form of dogmatism. She [1985: 156] believes that in Anglo-Saxon cultures, distance is dealt with a positive cultural value connected to respecting an individual's autonomy. On the other hand, what she has mentioned as distance in Anglo-Saxon cultures is comprehended as hostility and estrangement in Persian culture, where distance is understood as an absence of feelings or apathy related to disrespect and alienation.

The value of closeness can be observed at all levels of Persian language. Due to the fact that in Persian culture, *individualism* (فردگرایی/ fard-garayi) has a negative connotation, it inspires people to act openly to each other and maintain relations closely. In Persian culture, there is a strong emphasis on accompanying each other in order to do things commonly rather than individually. It seems that Persian speakers pursue the concept of the communal performance much more than British speakers. Therefore, in cultures with a short horizontal distance, like Persian culture, people are more accessible to each other and more ready to get involved in common activities and to share feelings and experiences with each other. In such cultures, solidarity is viewed as a more valuable style of communicative behavior than independence and privacy.

The importance of culture and its values derive from the effectiveness of culture when it dictates an appropriate communicative behavior in a society. In order to obtain proper recognition and a description of cultural differences encoded in a language's usage, it is practically essential to analyze the linguistic patterns and expressions that elucidate both the social categorization and the nature of interpersonal relationships among members of a society. This significance is

remarkable in understanding how members of a social group or society make communication with each other [Gladkova 2013; Ye 2013]. As Larina [2015] mentions, people, who belong to different linguistic backgrounds do not only use different languages to speak, but the ways of applying their languages are also different. Thus, different linguistic strategies, which are guided by cultural values of a society, are employed by people, who live in that society. Different cultures shape different values, which influence strategies of politeness and result in differences in communicative styles.

Every single culture possesses different specificities defining how interlocutors of that culture manifest their thoughts in an ambiguous or a clear manner, concisely or in an explanatory manner, express their emotions openly or in a restrained way and sustain distance or focus attention on closeness, etc. [Larina 2015: 200; Larina & Leontovich 2015: 10]. As a consequence, what is typically accepted in one culture is not certainly admitted or even tolerated from interlocutors' perspectives of another culture. Thus, the Gricean maxims, adjusted for a low-context culture with an individualistic entity, for instance, British culture, [Hall & Hall 1990] as well as the politeness maxims of Leech [1983] may not be completely applicable for the cultures formulated as high-context cultures with a collectivistic nature, such as Persian culture, in which different communicative characteristics and behavior have been demonstrated.

1.4. Politeness and communicative ethno-styles

Politeness is a communication strategy system that is not completely shared among distinctive cultures [Larina 2006]. People in different countries speak in different ways. The reason is not only that people employ various linguistic codes, consisting of various lexicons and various grammars, but also it is due to the fact that they employ various ways in order to use those linguistic codes. Since some of these differences are systematized and stable, one is not permanently able to make an obvious border between various codes and various ways of employing these codes, or between various grammars and various speech ethnographies [Goddard &

Wierzbicka 1997; Larina 2015: 196, 2020: 421; Wierzbicka 2003]. As Wierzbicka [2003] mentions, these systematized and fixed differences are appointed by cultural values and verified by the cultural logic. Language is saturated by cultural values that direct communicative behavior of utterers and frame their communicative styles. These cultural values are appeared at all the levels of language [Larina 2020: 435].

Attaining success in intercultural communication relies broadly on the comprehension of intentions, which are followed by interlocutors through communication and the pragmatic meanings of interlocutors' utterances as well [Larina 2008: 33]. Due to the fact that people employ different languages in different approaches, based on their particular norms and values categorized in social and linguistic spheres as well as their socio-cultural conventions agreed upon among people in a society, numerous difficulties in communication arise. Such problems are highlighted when the notions of politeness and imposition differ among cultures. As a consequence, these are the culture-specific communicative strategies that conduct a process of choosing and preferring the language's means applied by people in the same situations [Larina 2006: 1].

Culture-specific differences in communication are not accidental, but they appear systematically. Regular use of strategies results in shaping communicative characteristics, the entirety of which leads to constituting of culture-specific communicative styles, named by Larina [2015: 197]. Though there is no one single approach to demarcate the various communicative styles, and there are still open questions about its senses, the basics of its descriptions, and its constituents, but the classification put forward by Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey [1990] is worthy to mention in this regard:

- direct vs. indirect style
- succinct vs. elaborate style
- personal vs. contextual style
- instrumental vs. affective style

Direct vs. indirect style is associated with how predominantly speakers demonstrate their intentions through utterances. In a direct style, the speaker discloses his/her intentions based on his/her needs and wishes in an explicit form. On the contrary, in an indirect style, the intentions of the speaker are shrouded and revealed in an implicit way.

The second feature is connected to the quantity of speech that is remarked in distinctive cultures and the expressiveness/expressivity of speech consisting of three stylistic variables known as elaborate style, exacting style, and succinct style. The elaborate style is related to the use of language in an expressive form through daily conversational interactions. Meanwhile, the succinct style encompasses using understatements and the noticeable silent pauses that are semantically loaded.

Personal vs. contextual style of communication is referred to a role that is played by a context through communication and, broadly, the relationships of that role among speakers. The personal style is an individual-centered and a person-oriented style, which focuses on a person, demonstrating an egalitarian social order and a symmetrical role position of interlocutors. On the other hand, the contextual style is a role-centered and a status-oriented style with the focus on the role of interlocutors, illustrating a non-egalitarian social order and an asymmetrical role position among speakers.

Instrumental vs. affective style is related to what is finally meant to be transmitted. In an instrumental style, the content is the main center of focus and is explained as achieving success in communicating. In an affective style, the communication process, itself, is more important in comparison with achieving the actual target of communication. Information is conveyed implicitly by gestures, or facial expressions, and non-verbal communication plays an influential role in this style.

These styles, to some extent, interrelate with the ideas of Grice [1975], since they relate to such characteristics of communication as “quantity”, “quality”, “relevance” and “manner” (clarity of speech). They exist in all cultures, and the question is which of the styles of communication are dominant in a culture. Larina

[2009, 2015: 204] further elaborates the notion of culture-specific communicative styles or communicative ethno-styles, which she defines as “a historically, culturally and traditionally predetermined type of communicative behavior, choice and preference of certain strategies and means of communication (verbal and non-verbal)”. She considers it as “a framework for interpreting linguistic and cultural idiosyncrasies” [Larina 2015: 195].

Drawing on the classification of communicative styles, proposed by Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey [1990] and viewed as a general scheme of possible stylistic differences, Larina notices that it suggests some basic parameters for the description of styles that can be composed of the volume of the text, the manner of expressing the communicative intentions directly or indirectly, the subject orientation or the object orientation, the degree of expressiveness/expressivity and the aim of the communication, involving to convey a message or merely to maintain a relationship, etc. [Larina 2015: 198].

Larina suggests an interdisciplinary approach to the study of communicative ethno-styles and expands the scope of parameters that can be used for their description. She argues that they can relate to socio-cultural, axiological, sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, linguistic, and other domains, for instance:

- socio-cultural parameters (distance vs. close contact, focus on status vs. focus on person, symmetry vs. asymmetry in relations, etc.),
- axiological parameters (cultural values that affect the process of communication, including personal autonomy or intimacy, respect for equality or status, truth, and sincerity or tact and face-saving, etc.),
- sociolinguistic parameters (subject-oriented or object-oriented communication, degree of acceptability of direct imposition, directness vs. indirectness, formality vs. informality, etc.),
- psycholinguistic parameters (emotional restraint vs. emotional openness, role and function of emotions, expressivity of speech, etc.),
- linguistic parameters (availability, choice, and preference of certain language features, syntactic organization of sentences, ritualization of speech, etc.),

including quantitative characteristics (laconicism vs. verbosity, the length of utterances, the number of replicas used in various communicative situations, etc.) [Larina 2015: 207-208].

It is important to underline that while describing communicative ethno-styles, some generalizations are unavoidable, as without generalization, any comparative study of languages and cultures would not be possible. As Larina [2015: 199] states, “in recognition of the fact that variability in language is detected in every subsystem of the national language and that the modern standard language does not represent a completely homogeneous linguistic structure, we believe that it is legitimate to generalize and speak of certain communicative dominants, which distinguish the communicative behavior of a community and form the communicative ethno-styles”. In this case, we explore a typical user of a standard language and his/her communicative behavior in interpersonal interactions in everyday situations.

Summary

Politeness is a fundamental feature of communication, which nowadays attracts a great interest of scholars from various fields, such as sociolinguistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, intercultural communication, and others. It is as a field of research, which can be characterized as the study of interactional approaches accepted by individuals in order to base and sustain their relationships.

Linguistic politeness is greatly connected with etiquette, and sometimes these terms are used interchangeably. However, the scope of phenomena, assembled under the term of linguistic politeness, is much broader. Etiquette is mostly focused on the norms and rules of proper behavior, while politeness is not restricted to them. Politeness is a sociolinguistic phenomenon, and it varies according to the contextual factors. The level of politeness or impoliteness is evaluated by the hearer.

The scholars distinguish between “first-order politeness” and “second-order politeness” [Watts 2003]. The “first-order politeness” is a folk concept of politeness, which shows how people understand politeness and categorize actions based on it. Meanwhile, “second-order politeness” refers to the theorization of politeness by

scholars. Another important distinction draws a line between “absolute politeness” and “relevant politeness” [Leech 1983, 2014] or “semantic politeness”, which can be evaluated by its form, and “pragmatic politeness”, which is context-dependent [Leech & Larina 2014].

Politeness is one of the most important study fields in pragmatics. Different theories have been suggested to explain the role of politeness in communication. In chapter 1, the particular attention has been paid to conversational maxim view of politeness, face-saving view and discursive approach to politeness, which we consider most relevant to our study. One of the most influential theories of politeness has been introduced by Brown and Levinson [1978, 1987], who put an emphasis on the universality of politeness, address both Positive Face and Negative Face wants of interlocutors and suggest a framework for research on linguistic politeness. They propose Negative Politeness and Positive Politeness and a set of strategies used to perform them.

Discursive approach to politeness observes politeness as a social practice rather than a set of strategies. It brings the contextual elements into the analysis of politeness and views all the factors that influence usage of language and interpretation of speech, including personal, contextual, situational and cultural viewpoints. It proposes the new perspectives in dealing with politeness, relying on social and cultural concepts.

As numerous studies have demonstrated, despite the universality of politeness in its nature, it is a culture-specific phenomenon. People, who come from different cultures, have different understanding of politeness, which is predetermined by the types of culture and the values regulating the usage of different strategies for the performance of politeness.

Politeness is tightly connected with a social organization of a society and should be examined in the contexts of social distance (D) as well as power distance (P). As it has been illustrated, in British culture, as an individualistic culture, characterized by a long horizontal distance and a short vertical distance, equality and privacy are the most significant communicative values. In contrast, in a collectivistic

Persian culture, with a short horizontal distance and a salient vertical distance, people value closeness and demonstrate respect to age and status.

The socio-cultural and axiological differences are manifested in the categorization and the politeness performance. They guide the choice of the conventional strategies of politeness, which their regular usage shapes culture-specific communicative styles. Varieties of social relations and cultural values form an understanding of politeness that is specific to that culture, as Blum-Kulka [1991: 270, 1992: 195] states, “systems of politeness manifest a culturally filtered interpretation of interaction”.

CHAPTER 2. BRITISH AND PERSIAN UNDERSTANDING OF POLITENESS

2.1. Data and methodology

The data analyzed in this chapter were gathered via a descriptive written interview. The target of the interview was to define British and Persian speakers' understanding of politeness and identify the main cultural values, on which politeness is based. In this interview, the British and Persian interviewees were requested to present their own definition of politeness, to characterize a polite person and to provide with the examples of polite and impolite behavior.

The written interview was sent by email to overall 100 native British English and Iranian Persian speakers. 32 replies from the British, and 30 replies from the Persian respondents, came back. The age of the objects varied from 20 to 70 years old. They were the British citizens, whose native language is English, and the Iranian citizens, whose native language is Iranian Persian, which hereafter will be referred to as English and Persian [Gazsi 2020: 442]. All the representatives came from the middle social class with university degree or were university students. In both cultural categories of the British and Persian interviewees, we had an equal gender proportion of 50% males and 50% females. In the interview, we aimed to answer two main questions:

- 1) How do British and Persian people understand politeness?
- 2) What cultural values are at the core of British and Persian politeness?

In the research, three principal objectives were pursued: (a) to explore how British and Persian people understand politeness, (b) to conduct a contrastive social and cultural analysis of British and Persian values, which structure the styles of interpersonal communication, and (c) to examine how British and Persian values are revealed through interpersonal interactions in a family setting.

Our contrastive analysis of British and Persian cultures revealed some similarities and differences.

2.2. Politeness in British culture

The analysis of the responses, collected from the British objects, illustrated that 53% of the interviewees defined politeness as *respecting people in words and manners*. They believe that a polite person behaves respectfully and shows good manners towards other people. In our collected material, the definition of politeness and a polite person, stated by the interviewees from British culture, came together:

(1) *Politeness is respectful behavior or manners towards people. A polite person talks to people with respect. (male/24)*

(2) *Politeness is friendly and respectful behavior towards others. A polite person shows kindness and courtesy to people. (female/30)*

(3) *Politeness is fundamentally about respecting people. It includes speaking to people with respect, showing good manners to people, and taking care of their sentiments. A polite person shows respect, kindness, and modesty towards other people. (male/46)*

(4) *Politeness is respecting people and showing them that they are important and deserve to be treated respectfully. A polite person, by his/her respectful behavior or manners, gives a feeling of worth to other people. (female/62)*

Our British material revealed that 42% of the interviewees characterized politeness as *respecting people's privacy and personal autonomy*. In their opinions, a polite person lets people keep their personal space, avoids getting too close to people, respects independence of people and preserves people's personal autonomy:

(5) *Politeness is giving right to privacy of people. A polite person keeps his/her distance from another person physically and emotionally. (male/ 40)*

(6) *Politeness is not breaking invisible boundaries of people's personal space. A polite person respects the right of privacy for everyone and avoids getting too close to other people's personal life. (female/25)*

(7) *Politeness is respecting the non-observable bubble space of people that they have around them. A polite person respects others' personal space. (male/37)*

(8) *Politeness is respecting the privacy of people. A polite person entitles people to have their privacy and personal space and let them in a state of “be free” from intrusion or disturbance in their private life or personal affairs. (female/69)*

Our data disclosed that 24% of the British interviewees defined politeness as *respecting people’s feelings and concerns*, and a polite person pays respect to what people feel and think:

(9) *Politeness is respecting others’ feelings. A polite person attaches importance to people’s feelings. (male/38)*

(10) *Politeness is respecting people’s feelings, thoughts, and worries. A polite person is not indifferent to people’s feelings and concerns. (female/43)*

(11) *Politeness means heeding people’s feelings and concerns, trying not to hurt their feelings, and not ignoring their concerns through interactions. A polite person is a well-behaved person, who respects what people feel and think. (male/50)*

(12) *Politeness is simply showing our sensitivity and enthusiasm towards others’ feelings, thoughts and values. A polite person is aware of others’ feelings and worries and has a certain empathy for them. (female/ 21)*

According to our findings, 21% of the interviewees in British context speculated that politeness is *respecting people’s equality of rights*. They state that a polite person grants equal rights to all walks of life without considering their age, gender, race, or religion:

(13) *Politeness is the practice of giving equal rights to all people. A polite person, regardless of differences between people, maintains equal rights for all people in society. (male/29)*

(14) *Politeness is respecting people’s equality of rights. A polite person protects people from direct and indirect discrimination in society. (female/54)*

(15) *Politeness is refusing any discrimination among people. A polite person respects human dignity and equality in order to give a positive impression to people around him/herself. (male/40)*

(16) *Politeness is having an egalitarian belief. Everyone, regardless of differences in age, gender, race or religion, must have an equal opportunity to*

improve his/her circumstances. A polite person prefers to play fair in games of life and gives equal chances to all people to win and enjoy. (female/37)

Our analysis showed that 20% of the British interviewees defined politeness as *being reserved* and believe that a polite person is a repressed person, who keeps a stiff upper lip:

(17) Politeness is tending to be more reserved when expressing feelings. A polite person is proud of his/her capacity to grin and bear it. (male/49)

(18) Politeness is the absence of an outgoing personality. A polite person keeps a stiff upper lip and avoids chatting about personal life. (female/34)

(19) Politeness is being reserved and self-controlled. A polite person is reserved about expressing feelings in public. (male/22)

(20) Politeness is about camouflaging emotions. A polite person has a great tendency to hide feelings and veil his/her thoughts in words. (female/60)

Our analysis demonstrated that the British interviewees mostly defined politeness as (Table 2.1.):

- a) respecting people in manners and words
- b) respecting people's feelings and concerns
- c) respecting people's equality of rights
- d) respecting people's privacy and personal autonomy
- e) being reserved

Table 2.1. Cultural values: British understanding of politeness

Understanding of politeness	British (%)
Respecting people in words and manners	53
Respecting people's privacy and personal autonomy	42
Respecting people's feelings and concerns	24
Respecting people's equality of rights	21
Being reserved	20

Summing up the results demonstrated that *respecting people in words and manners* (53%) and *respecting peoples' privacy and personal autonomy* (42%) are

the most frequent definitions of politeness in British culture. While 24% of the British defined politeness as *respecting people's feelings and concerns*, 21% characterized politeness in *respecting people's equality of rights* and 20% believed that politeness is *being reserved*.

2.3. Polite vs. impolite behavior in British culture

In our written interview, the interviewees were requested to bring examples of polite and impolite behavior. The answers highlighted verbal etiquette as a characteristic of polite behavior, especially the importance of *saying sorry, please* and *thank you* regularly.

In our British data, 64% of the interviewees believed that their great tendency *to apologize* is an example of polite behavior. They emphasized that *I am sorry* is the sentence that is most commonly applied among British people. Here are some examples:

(21) *The British frequently use "I am sorry" in their daily conversations. We say sorry to show respect when we have to interrupt people, or when we are late for an appointment. (male/30)*

(22) *The British have a well-documented tendency to apologize excessively. One of the most famous instances in this regard is when we have booked a seat on a train or flight, and somebody has occupied the place mistakenly. In such a situation, we say, "I am sorry you sat in my seat". (female/ 21)*

Our data disclosed that 58% of the British believed in *saying please* and *thank you* as a polite behavior in this culture:

(23) *In British culture, saying "please" and "thank you" is very important to behave politely. If you forget to say them, you may be reminded of your p's and q's. (male/41)*

(24) *One example of polite behavior is frequent saying "thank you" and "please" to show respect to people during daily activities. (female/24)*

Based on our British material, 40% of the interviewees mentioned that *being punctual* is a polite manner. Here are some examples:

(25) *In my opinion, good timekeeping and being punctual are very good examples of being polite in our culture. We are to arrive to our official meeting early enough or punctually for our friendly party. (male/29)*

(26) *Being punctual is one of the most important polite manners in British culture. We should arrive, at least, five minutes before our meeting. (female/65)*

Our findings illustrated that 42% of the interviewees in British context set their examples by referring to *social etiquette* as polite manners. Handshaking while greeting when we are introduced to somebody, keeping a friendly smile on the face, opening the door for a lady or assisting her in carrying a large heavy bag, waiting our turn in queues, looking into our interlocutor's eyes to show interest are some relevant instances in this regard. Here are some more examples:

(27) *As a businessman, I believe that shaking hands with everyone, who is present at business or social meetings is a common way to greet someone politely. (male/62)*

(28) *One example of being polite is paying attention to social etiquette. For example, when greeting each other, we shake hands two or three times with a friendly smile on the face. (female/ 28)*

(29) *We wait our turn in queues in a polite manner. (male/ 36)*

(30) *An example of polite manner in British social etiquette is covering the mouth with a hand when yawning or coughing in public places. (female/50)*

(31) *In my opinion, one specific example of polite manner in British culture is standing on the right side of the elevator, so that people could cross from the left side. (male/44)*

Accordingly, a violation of social etiquette is a striking feature of impolite behavior. Based on our British material, 58% of the interviewees believed that *ignoring social etiquette* is viewed as impolite. Jumping queues and talking loudly in public places are some relevant instances in this regard. Here are some examples:

(32) *People, who throw any kind of rubbish or cigarette puffs on the floor in the street or anywhere, are impolite. (female/36)*

(33) In my opinion, ignoring social etiquette such as talking loudly on mobile phone in public places, specifically, on public transportation means, is impolite. (male/49)

(34) One impolite behavior is pushing ahead in a line. (female/20)

(35) Answering the phone or being busy with messaging on the phone when meeting and chatting with someone is an example of impolite behavior. (male/60)

According to our analysis, 61% of the British interviewees stated that the most common behaviors, considered impolite, are connected both verbally and nonverbally with *invading people's privacy and autonomy*. Asking private questions, interrupting people, making an offer to keep company and standing too close to somebody are some relevant examples in this regard. Here, more examples have been put forth:

(36) It is impolite if someone tries to eavesdrop on others' private conversations or reads their private letters or messages. (female/66)

(37) It is impolite when someone tries to dig into issues that are of no business to him/her. For example, asking about how much somebody earns or how much something of somebody's stuff costs. (male/28)

(38) When people ask some questions such as why you are still single or how much is your weight, I feel so embarrassed, and I think that they are impolite persons by asking such non-appropriate questions. I'm irritated by having to deal with such inconvenient questions that invade my personal space. (female/ 38)

(39) It's very impolite and uncomfortable to me when someone stands too close to me or puts his/her arm around my shoulders or pats on my shoulder. This type of manner seems appropriate only in the circle of my family or close friends. (male/52)

(40) Sitting next to people on a bus or train while there are other free places is an example of violating people's privacy. (female/40)

It is worth mentioning that privacy and autonomy relate to independence, which, as an important value, is a salient feature of Anglo-Saxon mentality.

(41) *When someone makes an offer to keep company, to help, or to give a hand to do things together, it seems impolite to me that he/she has doubts about my abilities, talents, and initiatives. This type of behavior calls my independence and autonomy into question. (male/ 31)*

(42) *Independence is highly valued in our culture. I am able to solve problems or accomplish goals on my own without having to rely on assistance from others. When someone wants to break my feeling of self-reliance, it is impolite to me. (female/46)*

(43) *Dependence on others is shameful or embarrassing to me. People are often expected to pull themselves up by their bootstraps when they face difficulties and drawbacks. Thus, it seems impolite to me if people try to invade my autonomy and self-sufficiency when they find out that I am suffering from a setback. (male/27)*

Our findings corroborated the results of the studies on British cultural values, communicative behavior and understanding of politeness [e.g., Fox 2005; Larina 2008, 2015; Wierzbicka 2003; Watts 2003] and revealed that showing respectful behavior towards people in words and manners, respecting people's feelings and concerns, respecting their equality of rights, their privacy, and their personal autonomy, besides being reserved are the cultural values characterized at the core of British understanding of politeness. Accordingly, examples of polite and impolite behaviors, including verbal and nonverbal etiquette, are consistent with British cultural values involving equality, independence, privacy, and distance.

2.4. Politeness in Persian culture

The analysis of the responses, collected from the Persian objects, showed that 75% of the interviewees believed in politeness as *respecting the elderly*, in general, while 79% of the Persian interviewees characterized politeness as *respecting parents and grandparents*, in particular. The Persian interviewees state that a polite person pays high respect to the elderly, specifically, parents and grandparents. In our collected material, the definition of politeness and a polite person, mentioned by the interviewees from Persian culture, came together:

(44) *Without a doubt, in Persian culture, politeness is respecting the elderly, particularly, parents and grandparents. This type of respectful behavior means honoring our roots, our history and our generation. A polite person respects the elderly, specifically, parents and grandparents. (male/41)*

(45) *First and foremost, politeness in Persian culture is respecting the elderly, particularly, parents and grandparents, who are the origins of our existence and education. A polite person is attentive to paying respect to the elderly and cares about showing pleasant and kind attitudes towards them. (female/ 25)*

(46) *Politeness means sustaining the dignity and honor of parents and grandparents. A polite person understands the value and worth of the elderly and maintains their honor and dignity. (male/64)*

Based on our Persian material, the interviewees defined politeness not only as respecting people, who are older in age, but also as showing respectful behavior to people, who are higher in status, such as teachers. Our analysis illustrated that 68% of the Persian interviewees characterized politeness as *respecting teachers*. From their points of view, a polite person respects teachers as people, who, due to their greater knowledge, are able to lighten the way of life in order to build a brilliant future for human beings:

(47) *One of the main definitions of politeness in Persian society is based on respecting teachers, who bring knowledge and awareness into our lives. A polite person behaves respectfully to teachers due to the fact that people in such a status possess something valuable to contribute that increases people's knowledge and improves the level of their personal and social life. (female/35)*

(48) *In Muslim religion and Persian culture, politeness is greatly associated with behaving respectfully towards teachers. A polite person honors teachers, due to their knowledge and their efforts, in order to convey awareness, and educate children through their career. That's why, in Islam, teachers are called "prophets on the earth", who act like a light in the darkness, and respecting them, has been strongly recommended. (male/29)*

(49) Due to the high status of teachers in Persian culture and Muslim religion, the principal of respecting teachers is one of the most important aspects of politeness in this culture. The main concept is that we have become educated people with the help of teachers' knowledge and efforts, and we owe them a lot. A polite person pays respect to teachers, as they bear the burden of instructing and educating people on their shoulders, and they have the responsibility of building generations one after another in a society. (female/60)

Our Persian data illustrated that 42% of the interviewees defined politeness as *following social etiquette*, while 38% of the Persian interviewees mentioned that politeness is *adhering to "taarof"*, as a collection of social etiquette specific to Persian society and culture, and 24% of the interviewees stated that politeness is *showing good behavior or manners to people*, which we have also characterized as falling into the category of social etiquette.

Persian culture has its own specific politeness system, named "taarof" [Izadi 2015: 84; Pourmohammadi 2018; Sharifian & Tayebi 2017: 240; Shafiee Nahrkhalaji et al., 2013: 123]. There are numerous studies concerning with "taarof" from different points of view [Dahmardeh et al., 2016; Haghighat 2016]. "Taarof" is a cultural pattern that shapes a particular part of daily social interactions among Iranian people and acts as Common Ground (CG) through communication with numerous speech acts, involving making request for favors or services, refusing requests or welcoming offers and invitations [Sharifian 2011: 226].

Whilst "taarof" is defined as "compliment(s), ceremony, offer, gift, flummery, courtesy, flattery, formality, good manners, soft tongue, honeyed phrases, and respect" [Aryanpour & Aryanpour 1976: 306-307], many researchers [e.g., Asdjodi 2001; Assadi 1980; Beeman 1976/1986; Eslami 2005; Hillmann 1981; Koutelaki 2002; Rafiee 1992; among many others] believe that the significance of "taarof" notion in Persian culture is a communicative strategy. "Taarof" is the backbone of Persian politeness system, which plays a dominant and influential role in the majority of interpersonal interactions among Iranians in various settings [Izadi et al., 2012: 77; Yaqubi 2018: 32]. Consequently, without referring to "taarof", any

explanation or analytical description of Persian politeness system seems incomprehensible and non-efficient [Koutelaki 2002].

From Beeman's point of view [1976/1986], Iranians act like magicians, who have mastery over transforming reality. He believes that the understanding of sophisticated conversations among Persians, through their ordinary daily interactions, is linked to a noticeable discrepancy between what Iranian speakers mention, and the true intention of what they intend to mention. This discrepancy among other linguistic patterns in Persian language is recognized and approved by Persian politeness system of "taarof" [Yaqubi 2018: 32]. Beeman debates that the art of conducting personal relations among Iranian Persian speakers requires numerous complex verbal skills [Sharifian 2014: 228].

Iranian people, who live in a collectivistic community, build intimate bonds among members of society by using "taarof" in order to sustain their relationships [Izadi 2015; Sharifian 2011]. The understanding of members, participating in such unspoken norms, is a vital element in achieving the successful performance of "taarof" in any given situation in the Persian community [Maghbouleh 2013: 823].

Due to the fact that "taarof", compared to other politeness systems, has more particular features with many figurative meanings in its formulaic ways of expressing, non-native Persian speakers prefer to ignore its usage in Persian language and not to delve into the complicated process of interpreting its meanings in different situations [Miller et al., 2014].

"Taarof" is a highly developed collection of complimentary behavior or manners including the social and hospitable parts performed by Iranian Persian speakers and supposed to be returned [Polite 1978: 14]. Here are the examples of *following social etiquette*, including *sticking to "taarof"* and *showing good behavior or manners to people*:

(50) Politeness is paying attention to social etiquette. It means that politeness is a kind of commitment, by which people feel responsibility towards all members of the community. A polite person cares about following the norms and standards enacted by society. (male/32)

(51) *Politeness is the best way of moderating and easing mutual communication with people in society. In order to achieve this target, one of the most practical ways is following social etiquette. A polite person follows social rules and norms, which would make communicating with people in a respectful and peaceful way possible. (female/21)*

(52) *Politeness is showing good behavior or manners through daily interactions with members of family, friends, relatives, and people in a society. A polite person is humble and generous and shows well-accepted and appropriate behavior or manners towards people in order to maintain tranquil and respectful relationships with them. (male/51)*

(53) *Politeness is showing valued qualities such as kindness, integrity, empathy, modesty, patience, and trustworthiness towards people. A polite person pays a great deal of attention to exhibiting good behavior or manners and making respectful relationships, not only with family members and friends, but also with all people in society. (female/46)*

(54) *Politeness is taking care of “taarof” as the most comprehensive politeness manifestation in Iran. I speculate that understanding and following “taarof” principles for non-native people is very complicated or even impossible, but among Iranians, “taarof” is a non-separable part of their life. A polite person sticks to “taarof” in order to show his/her polite behavior or manners towards others. (male/35)*

(55) *Politeness is adhering to the principles of “taarof”. In “taarof”, people insist on a higher status of others and self-deprecation. For a polite person, who is faithful to “taarof” principles, respecting people in an exaggerated way, saying ultra-polite sentences and giving priority to them in everything, is of great importance. (female/65)*

Our data showed that 31% of the Persian interviewees defined politeness as *maintaining solidarity and keeping contact*. They believe that a polite person has a close and consistent relationship with his/her family, friends and relatives:

(56) *Politeness is being sociable, friendly, and outgoing. A polite person has a wide circle of social connections, gains a lot of energy and positive impressions from social interactions, and is inspired by different aspects of creating communication with other people. (male/29)*

(57) *Politeness is keeping permanent contact with members of the family, close relatives, and reliable friends. A polite person keeps him/herself in active connection with family and relatives, enjoys their practical experiences, and uses their help and recommendations in moments of trouble. This type of intimacy among members of the family and close relatives come from the Persian culture and the Muslim religion, in which maintaining relationships among family members and trusted friends by doing things together and sharing happiness, sorrow, and problems, are strongly encouraged. A polite person knows the magic of making coherent communications between people, specifically, different generations, and tries to maintain contact and solidarity among family members to obtain a more accurate pattern for a better life. (female/55)*

(58) *Politeness is being very social, friendly and expressive. A polite person seeks to form friendships, expresses his/her feelings and thoughts freely and openly, engages in social activities and enjoys creating active communications with other people. (male/35)*

(59) *Politeness in Persian society, as a predominantly Muslim community, is grounded in keeping constant contact among members of the family, relatives, and friends. This type of communication is recommended by our holy book, the Quran, in which having a coherent connection between people is strongly recommended as a sign of faith among believers. People show politeness and courtesy to others by building coherent relationships, talking about different issues, mentioning problems, asking about others' problems, trying to solve problems and remove barriers in a circle of family, relatives and close friends. A polite person cares about family and friendly connections and looks for ways to be helpful to other people. (female/42)*

Based on our findings, 28% of the Persian interviewees stated that politeness is being extroverted and a polite person has a great willingness and tendency to share

his/her emotions, feelings and experiences with the family, relatives and close friends in order to show that they are important to him/her and keep polite behavior or manners towards them:

(60) Politeness is expressing feelings and disclosing thoughts. A polite person would like to discuss decisions with other people to understand if they help or influence decisions positively. It also involves discussing hopeful and happy experiences with others to convey a positive impression on them. It goes without saying that sharing experiences are not limited to happy ones. A polite person has an open and expressive heart and a clear mind towards people in order to show sincere feelings and honesty to them, to attract their positive impressions and to receive their experiences in the form of practical lessons. (male/34)

(61) Politeness is a desire to make connections with other people by expressing inner feelings and emotions. It involves maintaining contact by bringing pleasant and unpleasant experiences forward, as well as giving and receiving consultation from others in different situations in life, so that it creates support and safety through relationships. It happens definitely between members of the family and mostly among close friends and acquaintances. A polite person is interested in communicating, building trust, mutual understanding and common interests with family members, relatives, and friends. (female/26)

(62) Politeness is making your feelings, thoughts, and concerns known to family, relatives, and friends. A polite person does not hide feelings and concerns from close people around him/herself, consisting of family members and friends. (male/48)

(63) Politeness is creating a sense of unity and sympathy among family members, relatives, and close friends. It precisely means granting a broad awareness of inner feelings to others and receiving emotions and feelings from them in response, so that we could keep harmony and respect through our relationships with people including strangers or familiars. A polite person always endeavors to strengthen relationships and keep his/her contacts with other people by expressing

emotions and sharing bright and dark moments of life, specifically, with family members and close friends. (female/68)

Our analysis revealed that the Persian interviewees mostly define politeness as (Table 2.2.):

- a) respecting the elderly
- b) respecting parents and grandparents
- c) respecting people in a higher status such as teachers
- d) following social etiquette
- e) sticking to “taarof”
- f) showing good behavior or manners to people
- g) maintaining solidarity and keeping contact
- h) being extroverted

Table 2.2. Cultural values: Persian understanding of politeness

Understanding of politeness	Persian (%)
Respecting parents and grandparents	79
Respecting the elderly	75
Respecting people in a higher status, such as teachers	68
Following social etiquette	42
Sticking to “taarof”	38
Maintaining solidarity and keeping contact	31
Being extroverted	28
Showing good behavior or manners to people	24

Summing up the results demonstrated that *respecting the elderly* (75%), particularly, *respecting parents and grandparents* (79%), and *respecting teachers* as people in a higher status (68%) are the most frequent definitions of politeness and demonstrated the dominant cultural values of politeness in Persian culture. While 42% of the Persian interviewees elucidated politeness in *following social etiquette*, 38% focused on *sticking to “taarof”*, as a culture-specific system of politeness in Iran, and 31% stated that *maintaining solidarity and keeping contact* is the definition

of politeness in Persian culture. Based on our results, 24% of the interviewees in Persian context described politeness as *showing good behavior or manners to people*, and 28% believed that politeness means *being extroverted*.

2.5. Polite vs. impolite behavior in Persian culture

In our written interview, the interviewees were requested to bring examples of polite and impolite behavior or manners. The answers highlighted verbal and non-verbal etiquette as the characteristics of polite behavior, specifically, the importance of addressing, prioritizing, and keeping voice down while talking with people, who are older in age, namely, the elderly, particularly, parents and grandparents, and people, who are higher in status, such as teachers.

In our Persian material, 71% of the interviewees provided with the examples of *respecting the elderly*, specifically, parents and grandparents as the main feature of polite behavior or manners in this culture. Some examples, observed among the Persian responses, are giving seat priority to the elderly on a bus or train, opening a door for the elderly and keeping it open to let them go through first, giving head of table to the elderly to sit and visiting the elderly regularly. Some other examples are:

(64) *In Persian culture, due to the worth and importance of age and the status of the elderly, particularly, parents and grandparents, we must treat them gently with a smile on the face and use polite words in conversing with them. (male/55)*

(65) *Not interrupting the elderly and addressing them by their family name or title (if they are not family members) or kinship terms, like Dad/ Mom/ Grandpa/ Grandmom (if they are family members) is polite behavior. In Persian culture, through informal relationships, even in the case of being strangers, we address the elderly by kinship terms of Father/ Mother/ Grandfather/ Grandmother to show our respect and regard for them. (female/38)*

(66) *In Persian culture, speaking smoothly with low intonation to the elderly is a polite manner. (male/42)*

(67) *When greeting the elderly, it is considered polite to say hello (سلام/ salaam) immediately first. (female/28)*

(68) Showing willingness and enthusiasm to initiate conversation with parents and grandparents and being patient with them, even when they have different or opposing opinions, are examples of polite behavior in Persian culture. (male/63)

(69) In Islam, it has been strongly recommended to behave politely with the elderly, particularly, parents and grandparents. It means that we must be mindful of how we voice our disagreements. If we disagree with them, we should not be rude about disclosing it. Besides, we must watch our language and avoid mentioning some words or jokes that we usually use in our routine conversations with friends or people of the same age. (female/32)

Accordingly, a violation of respecting the elderly is a striking feature of behaving impolitely. Our Persian material showed that 78% of the interviewees stated some examples of *disrespecting the elderly* as impolite behavior or manners. Walking in front of the elderly while stepping with them, having a sharp tongue to answer to the elderly, raising voice at the elderly or talking aggressively in case of having a disagreement or debate with them and sitting with back to the elderly are some examples mentioned by the Persian interviewees in this context. Here are some more examples:

(70) Never lie down or extend your legs while sitting next to the elderly. It is impolite. (male/42)

(71) I think it is impolite when children, while speaking with their parents or grandparents, scroll down the posts on different social media, such as Instagram or WhatsApp, chat with friends or play games on their cellphone. They must stay away from their cellphones in the presence of the elderly. (female/55)

(72) When talking to the elderly, everyone must be careful about his/her body language. For example, crossing arms while talking with the elderly is impolite. (male/34)

(73) In Persian culture, when the elderly, particularly, parents or grandparents, reproach us for our misbehavior or mistakes, we must absolutely avoid keeping a straight eye contact and bringing impetuous answers and reasons forward immediately. Even if we have one or more convincing reasons, the polite

manner is to wait patiently, and after a while, try to pose the answers and reasons that we have kept hidden. (female/26)

(74) In Persian language, there are two different pronouns to address people, namely, the second-person plural pronoun you (شما/ shoma) to address someone older or in a higher status, and the second-person singular pronoun you (تو/to) to address someone at the same age or a close friend. Addressing the elderly by the second-person singular pronoun you (تو/to) is impolite. (male/31)

(75) When being interlocutor for the elderly, whether strangers or parents and grandparents, interrupting them because we are answering a cellphone, greeting others, or starting another conversation with people, who suddenly bump into us, is impolite. Of course, there are emergency cases that are excluded. (female/60)

Our Persian material revealed that 58% of the interviewees provided with the examples of *respecting teachers* as polite behavior or manners. Some examples, stated by the interviewees in Persian context, are raising hand before speaking at lesson, getting permission of the teacher to entering classroom or leaving it, avoiding being distracted or making other students distracted while the lesson is being conducted by the teacher, greeting politely to the teacher, being on time at lesson and following classroom principles and guidelines that matter to the teacher. Here are more examples:

(76) In Islam, teaching is a divine profession, as our beloved Prophet Muhammad has called himself “a teacher from God”, who guides human beings. That’s why we are obliged to hold teachers with high respect and dignity, for example, by paying full attention quietly to the teacher when he/she is talking or teaching. (male/42)

(77) Teachers are the origins of social development and perfection and are thought to be the driving forces behind the community's guidance and evolution. We easily understand the highest rank and the importance of teachers from the quote of Imam Ali, in which he states, “If someone teaches me one single word, he has made me his servant for a lifetime”. Therefore, respecting teachers, for example, not interrupting them and nodding politely with a smile on the face as confirming their

words and showing full attention to what teachers are talking about, are polite manners in Persian culture and religion. (female/53)

(78) Since teachers bear responsibility of forming students' personalities and making them equipped with knowledge for their future life, they have a higher status in Persian society. Thus, as a sign of respect, we stand up when the teacher enters the classroom, and we wait stood until the teacher takes a seat. (male/30)

Our findings showed that 51% of the Persian interviewees pointed to examples of *following social etiquette* as polite behavior or manners, for example, being punctual at an appointment or meeting, waiting at the door and asking somebody, who is with us to go first through the door, taking turns and not jumping queue, greeting the elderly, who are present at a gathering or meeting first before greeting others, opening a door for women and keeping it open to go through it first, bringing a bunch of flowers or a box of chocolate when we have been invited to a friend's or relative's house and taking care of paying bill when we go to eat meal or drink something in a restaurant or café with our friends. Meanwhile, 61% of the Persian interviewees provided with the examples of *sticking to "taarof"*, which we have also addressed as a category of social etiquette. Some more examples are:

(79) In Persian culture, following social etiquette is a very important indication that shows you are a polite person. For example, when you are a guest at a friend's or at a relative's house, you should check to see if your host is wearing shoes or not. If not, you should remove your shoes at the door. (female/31)

(80) Sticking to "taarof", as a social etiquette, is being polite in Persian culture. In Persian hospitality, the guest is the dearest and should be highly honored. For instance, the best chair in the sitting room is offered to the guest. At the dinner table, the host starts eating after the guest starts, and avoids leaving the table before the guest finishes eating. Besides, when leaving, the host insists politely on staying with the guest for some more hours, although they both know very well that it is only "taarof", and the party has already been finished. (male/27)

(81) Adhering to "taarof" means behaving politely in our culture. The system of "taarof" is not understandable for foreigners and makes people, who are not

familiar with its real meaning, confused. As an example, imagine a situation, in which you are in a shop and choose something to buy. Then, you are expected to pay the bill at the cashier's desk. When you take out money from your wallet or ask the price, the cashier would make "taarof" and say no need to pay, be our guest this time (قابلی نداره، اینبار مهمون ما باشید /ghabeli nadare, inbar mehmoone ma bashid). In such a situation, you both know that it is only "taarof" and you must pay money for what you have taken. (female/53)

(82) In Iran, following "taarof" principles shows that you are a polite person. Refusing an offer of someone for taking food, piece of cake, or beverages, even if the person really likes to take them, is an example of polite manner in Persian culture. In such a situation, both the offeror and the receiver, know that not accepting the food or beverages for the first time is only "taarof" and the second time of offering or serving is absolutely needed. (male/48)

Subsequently, a violation of social etiquette is a striking feature of impolite behavior or manners. Our data demonstrated that 53% of the interviewees in Persian context, providing with some examples, stated that *ignoring social etiquette* is impolite manners or behavior in Persian society, for example, going to someone's place, even close friends or relatives, without prior announcement or arrangement, slurping while eating and drinking or blowing nose in public. Some more examples are put forth here:

(83) It is impolite manner, when eating at the dinner table, the guest leaves even a small amount of food on the plate. (female/32)

(84) People, who ignore the rights of others in society and are careless about social etiquette, exhibit the most non-appropriate behavior or manners in society. For example, those, who jump queues or those, who do not cross the pedestrian lane to cross the street. (male/44)

(85) Talking on the cellphone or chatting with friends loudly in public, whispering with someone in the presence of others, or staring at people on public transportation means is considered a breach of social etiquette. (female/68)

(86) Smoking or parking the car in a place, in which it is forbidden, ignoring the rules of coexistence in an apartment, and disturbing the neighbors of any kind are relevant examples. (male/ 25)

Our findings illustrated that Persian understanding of politeness is mainly focused on respecting the elderly, with particular attention to respecting parents and grandparents, as the most dominant understanding of politeness in Persian culture. Based on our data, the Persian interviewees defined politeness not only as respecting people, who are older in age, but also as paying respect to people in a higher status, such as teachers. Meanwhile, following social etiquette and sticking to “taarof”, which is known as culture-specific social etiquette among Iranian Persian speakers, showing good behavior or manners to people, maintaining solidarity, keeping contact, and being extroverted are also characterized as an understating of politeness in Persian culture. These features of politeness, including verbal and nonverbal etiquette, are consistent with Persian cultural values of respect for age and status, solidarity and contact, and interdependence.

Summary

In this chapter, drawing on our results collected from a descriptive written interview, we aimed to highlight how British and Persian native speakers understand politeness. Our findings, with the main focus on politeness, revealed some similarities and differences. Both the British and Persian interviewees understand politeness as showing respect to people and having good behavior or manners towards them. However, the way they show respect and its meaning differ significantly.

Our analysis demonstrated that British understanding of politeness prescribes respecting people’s privacy and personal autonomy, equality of rights, respecting people’s feelings and concerns, and being reserved. In fact, British understanding of politeness correlates with the cultural values of privacy, distance, independence, equality and emotional self-control, and fits in the logic of culture.

The British interviewees, as the representatives of an individualistic culture, view distance as a positive cultural value [Wierzbicka 1985] and highly respect to privacy, independence and personal autonomy of each person. In other expressions, the British speakers, keeping their physical and verbal distance, show politeness to each other. According to our results, British politeness prescribes following a number of the strict norms to specify and to protect the right of personal autonomy, and to demonstrate respect that should be paid to independence and personal space of every individual. These findings confirm that British communicative culture tends to be avoidance-based and person-oriented. The value of individuality in British culture contributes to forming “I-identity”.

In Persian culture, on the contrary, distance is perceived negatively. Based on our results, the Persian interviewees considerably tend to be a member of a group in order to proceed common activities and are generous in sharing their personal opinions and perspectives, including successful or even unsuccessful life experiences with other people in the circle of family, close friends and relatives. The value of collectivity in Persian culture supports forming “We-identity”.

In contrast to an individualistic egalitarian British culture, in collectivistic Muslim cultures, inclusive of Persian culture, age plays a very important social role, and respecting the elderly, specifically, parents and grandparents is the most significant manifestation of showing politeness in this culture. Muslims are encouraged to behave respectfully to other people, particularly, the elderly with the main emphasis on respecting parents and grandparents, as it has been strongly recommended in the numerous hadith from Muslim Prophet Muhammad and the Holy Quran. In Islam, there is also the deep religious belief that respecting parents and behaving them with honor is one of the most significant aspects of politeness, which results in mercifulness and blessings in the lives of young people. According to Prophet Muhammad, “who has no mercy on our young people and does not respect the elderly, does not belong to our society” [cited from Khalil and Larina 2018].

Meanwhile, in Persian society, status is a very significant social and communicative value. There are numerous hadith from saint people, elected from God, based on which respecting people, who are in a higher status, like teachers, are valued. Furthermore, our findings illustrated that “tarooof”, as a culture-specific Persian etiquette, emphasizes both deference and social rank. Our research may confirm that the principles of identity, mainly derived from the Holy Quran, are the foundations of politeness norms and principles in Persian communicative culture and indicate that linguistic politeness in Persian culture is strongly established on showing respect to the elderly, as the persons, who are older in age, and teachers, as the persons, who are higher in status.

Consequently, Persian understanding of politeness presupposes solidarity and contact, paying respect to the elderly, in particular, parents and grandparents, and people in a higher status, such as teachers, sticking to “taarof” and being extroverted. Thus, Persian politeness is based on such social and communicative values as solidarity and contact, interdependence, emotional openness, respect to age and status, veneration of the Holy Quran and adherence to “taarof”.

These results confirm that Persian communicative culture tends to be solidarity-based and status-oriented, which correlates with a short horizontal distance and a salient vertical distance in this culture. Therefore, the differences in cultures predetermine cultural values and an understanding of politeness, which guides the communicative behavior that is to be elaborated on Chapter 3.

CHAPTER 3. SPEECH ACTS, POLITENESS STRATEGIES AND COMMUNICATIVE STYLES

3.1. Data and methodology

The data, analyzed in this chapter, were obtained from a questionnaire, aimed at collecting discursive practices from British and Persian family settings. The questionnaire was designed in the form of a Discourse Completion Task (DCT), in which the British and Persian objects were provided with a short description of eight situations with a clear illustration of the settings and the relationship among members of the family and requested to complete the dialogues in a way that they perform them in the natural situations.

The questionnaire was planned to extract the speech acts of addressing, request and thanking. In our analysis, response to request and response to thanking have been scrutinized as well. However, as our respondents have often used a compliment in thanking, we also included this speech act in our analysis, focusing

on politeness strategies and linguistic forms of their realization. In our analysis, both symmetrical and asymmetrical contexts have been taken into consideration.

The questionnaire was sent by email to overall 200 native British English and Iranian Persian speakers. We received 55 replies from the British and 57 replies from the Persian respondents. The age of the respondents varied from 20 to 70 years old. They were the British citizens, whose native language is English, and the Iranian citizens, whose native language is Iranian Persian, which hereafter will be referred to as English and Persian [Gazsi 2020: 442]. All the representatives came from the middle social class with university degree or were university students. We had 31 males (56%) and 24 females (44%) among the British respondents, and 17 males (30%) and 40 females (70%) among the Persian respondents.

In the chapter, we present our quantitative and qualitative analysis, focusing on pragmatic moves, politeness strategies and linguistic means of their realization applied in British and Persian family settings and trace their impact on stylistic features drawing on *Speech Acts Theory* [Austin 1962; Mey 1993; Searle 1969, 1975], *Politeness Theory* [Brown & Levinson 1987; Eelen 2001; Kádár & Haugh 2013; Larina 2009, 2015; Larina & Ponton 2022; Leech 1983, 2014; Locher 2012; Mugford 2020; Mills 2003; Sifianou 1992; Watts 2003; among many others], *Discourse Analysis* [Alba-Juez 2016; Esalami et al., 2023; Fairclough 1992, 2003; Goddard 2006; Bilá & Ivanova 2020; van Dijk 1997, 2009; among many others], *Intercultural and Cross-Cultural Pragmatics* [Kecskes 2014, 2017; McConachy & Spencer-Oatey 2021; Wierzbicka 1991/2003], *Communicative Styles Theory* [Gudykunst 1991; Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey 1990; House 2006; Larina 2009, 2015, 2020], *Cultural Studies and Studies on Identity* [Besemeres & Wierzbicka 2007; Ellis 2007; Hofstede 1991; Jenkins 2004; Larina et al., 2017; Scollon & Scollon 2001; Triandis 1994].

Bringing the examples, extracted from the responses, we demonstrate the detailed similarities and differences of politeness strategies in British and Persian cultural contexts and their influence on communicative styles.

3.2. Addressing

Our contrastive analysis of addressing family members, in British and Persian contexts, revealed some similarities and differences. The similarities concerned with the categories of terms of address, and the differences concerned with their use. The respondents from both lingua-cultures used almost the same categories of terms of address:

- first names
- nicknames
- endearment terms
- comradely terms
- kinship terms
- zero address terms

The observed terms of address have been classified into the categories of personal names, divided in two subcategories of first names, and nicknames as a shortened form of first names, endearment terms and comradely terms as the address terms to show affection, intimacy and closeness, kinship terms as well as zero address terms [Aliakbari & Tohi 2008: 6]. The categories of address terms and examples are presented in Table (3.3.).

Table 3.3. Categories of terms of address in British and Persian family discourse

British			Persian	
Categories of terms of address	%	Examples	%	Examples
First names/ nicknames	55	Emma, Hanna, Rita (female) Henry, Peter, John (male)/ Kate, Liz, Deb (female) Bob, Andy, Ben (male)	24	مريم/ Maryam, سبا/ Saba, شکوفه/ Shokoofeh (female) پارسا/ Parsa, ایمان/ Iman, علی/ Ali (male)/ آتی/ Ati, مری/ Mary, پانی/ Pani (female) کامی/ Kami, سیا/ Siya, ابی/ Ebi (male)

Endearment terms	25	Sweet pie, honey bunny, sweetheart, kitty, baby, sugar, dear, hun, cutie (parents to children) - Sweet honey pie, bunny, sweetheart, my love, babe, darling, hun, nutter butter, angel, beloved, dearest, sweet pea, sugar, honeybunches (husband to wife) Good-looking, handsome, sweetheart, dearest, honey, darling, sugar pie (wife to husband) Buddy, fellow, champion, dude, pal (father to son)	35	قند عسل (azizam), my honey sugar (ghande asalam), my breath (nafasam), sweetheart (azize delam) (parents to children) The best Dad in the universe (behtarin babayi jahan/ babaye jahan), my beloved Dad (babaye mahboobe man), the most beautiful Dad (ghashang-tarin baba) (children to father) My beautiful angel (fereshteye zibaye man), the most beautiful Mom in the universe (ghashang-tarin mamane jahan), the most delicate flower in the world (latif-tarin gole donya) (children to mother) Darling (azizam), honey (asalam), jewel, gold, brilliant (javaher, tala, berelian), my sweetheart (azize delam), doll (aroosak), my love canary (ghanariye eshghe man) (husband to wife) Darling (azizam), handsome husband (shohare khoshtip), my love (eshgham), sweetheart (azize delam), my soul (jane man) (wife to husband) -
Comradely terms				
Kinship terms	17	Mom/Dad (children to parents) Son (father to son)	40	Mom (maman/ babayi baba) (children to parents) My daughter (dokhtaram)/ my son (pesaram) (parents to children)
Zero address terms	3	-	1	-

While the respondents in both lingua-cultures used the terms of address of the categories mentioned in Table (3.3.), however, the analysis of the usage of these terms revealed some differences. The differences mostly concerned with the preferences of certain categories and their dependence on the context. As Table (3.3) shows, personal names including first names and nicknames are the most dominant category in our British material (55%), while the Persian respondents (75%) give preference to endearment terms (35%) and kinship terms (40%).

3.2.1. Addressing in top-down context: Parents to children

Our findings, summarized in Table (3.4.), revealed that in top-down context, when the parents address their children, in all the situations, the British parents preferred to address the children by name or nickname: 74% (in situation 1), 69% (in situation 4), 83% (in situation 5) and 82% (in situation 6), while the Persian parents gave preference to kinship terms of *son* (پسر/ pesar) or *daughter* (دختر/ dokhtar): 72%, 75%, 79% and 67% consequently.

It is important to state, in Persian family, kinship terms were used with the possessive pronoun *my* (مال من/ male man) as *my son* (پسر من/ pesaram) and *my daughter* (دختر من/ dokhtaram), which demonstrates closeness and intimacy in parents-children communication in this context. In our British material, the parents hardly used kinship terms to address the children: 4% (in situation 5). Among the British parents, kinship terms were used only to address the son.

The British parents showed a clear tendency towards a frequent use of endearment terms (e.g., *sweet pie*, *honey bunny*, *sweetheart*, *kitty*, *baby*, *sugar*, *dear*, *hun*, *cutie*) while addressing the daughter: 22% (in situation 1) and 26% (in situation 4), and terms of comradely (e.g., *buddy*, *champion*, *dude*, *pal*, *fellow*) while addressing the son: 13% (in situation 5), and 15% (in situation 6). In our Persian material, terms of endearment were used less frequently (e.g., *honey* (عزیزم/ azizam), *my honey sugar* (قند عسلم/ ghande asalam), *my breath* (نفسم/ nafasam), *my eyes* (چشمای من/ cheshmaye man), *sweetheart* (عزیز دلم/ azize delam) while addressing the daughter: 9% (in situation 1), and 9% (in situation 4).

Comradely terms were not observed in our Persian material. Based on our data, to show affection and solidarity to the son and the daughter, the Persian parents preferred to use kinship terms of *son* (پسر/ pesar) and *daughter* (دختر/ dokhtar) with the possessive pronoun *my* (مال من/ male man) as *my son* (پسر من/ pesaram) and *my daughter* (دختر من/ dokhtaram). Zero address terms were hardly revealed in both contexts: 4% (in situation 1), 5% (in situation 4) and 3% (in situation 6) among the respondents in British context, and 2% (in situation 1) among the Persian respondents.

Table 3.4. Addressing in top-down context: Parents to children

Terms of address	Situation (1) Father-daughter		Situation (4) Mother-daughter		Situation (5) Father-son		Situation (6) Father-son		Total	
	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %
Personal names	74	17	69	16	83	21	82	33	77	22
Name	38	10	51	16	45	21	53	33	47	20
Nickname	36	7	18	0	38	0	29	0	30	2
Endearment terms	22	9	26	9	0	0	0	0	12	4
Comradely terms	0	0	0	0	13	0	15	0	7	0
Kinship terms	0	72	0	75	4	79	0	67	1	73
(my) daughter	0	72	0	75	-	-	-	-	0	37
(my) son	-	-	-	-	4	79	0	67	1	36
Zero address terms	4	2	5	0	0	0	3	0	3	1

The findings showed that in both British and Persian family settings, the parents used Positive Politeness Strategy “use given names and nicknames” [Brown & Levinson 1978/1987: 107-109] to address the children, however, they used different terms of address. In British family, addressing the children by personal names (first names or nicknames) is the most frequent way of addressing, while in Persian family, the most frequent terms of address, used by the parents, are kinship terms with the possessive pronoun *my* (my son and my daughter) that emphasize intimacy and closeness in parents-children communication in Persian context. In British family, addressing the son by kinship terms was rarely observed, while addressing the daughter by kinship terms was not revealed.

Furthermore, the British parents used terms of endearment to address the daughter and comradely terms to address the son, while in Persian context, addressing the daughter by endearment terms is a less frequent way of addressing and comradely terms for addressing the son were not revealed. Zero address terms in British and Persian family settings were rarely observed. As a result, the most frequent terms of address differ in British and Persian family discourse (Table 3.5.).

Table 3.5. The most typical ways of addressing: Parents to children

British Personal names	Persian Kinship terms
(87) Katrin , would you please give me the salt? (father to daughter)	(91) My daughter , please pass me the salt. (father to daughter) دخترم، لطفا نمکو به من بده. <i>dokhtaram, lotfan namako be man bede.</i>
(88) Suzi , would you please babysit your brother? (mother to daughter)	(92) My daughter , please stay at home and babysit your sister. (mother to daughter) دخترم، لطفا خونه بمون و از خواهرت مراقبت کن. <i>dokhtaram, lotfan khoone bemoon va az khaharet moraghebat kon.</i>
(89) The bike is fixed now, Joshua . (father to son)	(93) Your bike is like its first day, my son . (father to son) نوجرخه ات مثل روز اولش شده، پسرم. <i>docharkhat mesle rooze avalesh shode, pesaram.</i>
(90) Chris , could you please clean the garage? (father to son)	(94) My son , please clean the garage. (father to son) پسرم، لطفا گاراژو تمییز کن. <i>pesaram, lotfan garazho tamiz kon.</i>

3.2.2. Addressing in bottom-up context: Children to parents

Based on our data, the most conventional forms of addressing the parents in both British and Persian family settings are *Mom* (مامان/ maman) and *Dad* (بابا/ baba). They were used by 55%, 71%, 73% and 76% of the British, and 84%, 74%, 91% and 95% of the Persian respondents (in situations 2, 4, 5 and 6) consequently (Table 3.6.). However, considerable differences in addressing the parents in British and Persian contexts were also revealed. Our material disclosed that a significant number of the British respondents used personal names (first names or nicknames) to address the parents: 45% (in situation 2) when the son addresses his mother, 25% (in situation 4) when the daughter addresses her mother, 27% (in situation 5) and 24% (in situation 6) when the son addresses his father. In Persian context, where paying respect to parents is one of the most important cultural values, such address terms are not acceptable and appropriate:

(95) **Mary**, could you please give me a glass of water? (son to mother)

(96) Sorry, **Vandi**. I can't help you. I have an exam next week and over the weekends, I must study. (daughter to mother)

(97) Can you please help me repair my bike, **Paul**? (son to father)

In contrast to the informality of addressing the parents in British family setting, the Persian respondents used superlative metaphorical endearment terms for mothers (e.g., *my beautiful angel* (فرشته زیبای من/ fereshteye zibaye man), *the most beautiful Mom in the universe* (قشنگترین مامان جهان/ ghashang-tarin mamane jahan), *the flower of our house* (گل خانه ما/ gole khooneye ma) and *my wealth* (هستی من/ hastiye man): 16% (in situation 2) and 26% (in situation 4), and for fathers (e.g., *the best Dad in the universe* (بهترین بابای جهان/ behtarin babaye jahan), *the most specialist Dad in the world* (متخصص ترین بابای دنیا/ motakhas-es-tarin babaye donya), *my heart* (قلب من/ ghalbe man) and *my champion Dad* (بابای قهرمان من/ bababye ghahramane man): 9% (in situation 5).

The results confirmed that in Persian family, superlative metaphorical endearment terms were used towards the mothers more frequently than the fathers: 42% (in situations 2 and 4), in which the son and the daughter address the mother by endearment terms, and 9% (in situation 5), in which the son addresses his father by endearment terms:

(98) **My beautiful angel**, could you please kindly do a favor and give me a glass of water? (son to mother)

فرشته زیبای من، میتونید لطفاً بی زحمت به من یک لیوان آب بدید؟
fereshyete zibaye man, mitoonid lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat konid va be man yek livan ab bedid?

(99) **The best Dad in the universe**, may I ask you please kindly to do a favor to me and repair my bike? (son to father)

بهترین بابای جهان، ممکنه ازتون خواهش کنم لطفاً بی زحمت به من به محبت کنید و دوچرخه ام رو تعمیر کنید؟

behtarin babaye jahan, momkene azatoon khahesh konam lotfan bi-zahmat be man ye mohabat konid va docharkham ro ta-mir konid?

(100) *My wealth, I am sorry. I can't. But as I really want to help you, maybe we could find the other way to handle it? (daughter to mother)*

هستی من، متاسفم. نمی توانم. اما از اونجایی که واقعا میخوام بهتون کمک کنم، ممکنه بتونیم یه راه حل دیگه برای انجام این کار پیدا کنیم؟

hastiye man, mota-asefam. nemitoonam. ama az oonjayi ke vaghean mikham behetoon komak konam, momkene betoonim ye rahe dige baraye anjame in kar peyda konim?

In both British and Persian family settings, zero address terms were rarely revealed: 4% (in situation 4) among the British respondents, and 5% (in situation 6) among the respondents in Persian context.

Another significant difference concerned with the pronominal terms of address in Persian family. It is important to note that in Persian language, in contrast to English, there are two different pronouns for the second-person: an informal *you* (تو/ to) for addressing a person, who is at the same age and/or at the same status, and a formal *you* (شما/ shoma) for addressing a person, who is older in age and/or higher in status. The similar pronominal terms of address are observed in Russian language as *ты* and *Вы* or in French as *tu* and *vous*. In our Persian material, in all the situations, the Persian respondents used the second-person plural pronoun *you* (شما/ shoma), similar to *Вы* in Russian and *vous* in French, to address the parents:

(101) *The garage is well-cleaned, as **you** wanted. (son to father)*

همونطور که شما خواستید، گاراژ خیلی خوب تمییز شده.

hamoontor ke shoma khastid, garazh kheyli khoob tamiz shode.

(102) *It's OK. On eye. If it helps **you**, I will do it. (daughter to mother)*

باشه. چشم. اگه اینکار کمکی به شما میکنه، انجامش میدم.

bashe. chasham. age in kar komaki be shoma mikone, anjamesh midam.

Table 3.6. Addressing in bottom-up context: Children to parents

Terms of address	Situation (2) Son-mother		Situation (4) Daughter-mother		Situation (5) Son-father		Situation (6) Son-father		Total	
	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %

Kinship terms	55	84	71	74	73	91	76	95	69	86
Dad	-	-	-	-	73	91	76	95	37	47
Mom	55	84	71	74	-	-	-	-	32	39
Personal names	45	0	25	0	27	0	24	0	30	0
Name	36	0	16	0	20	0	15	0	22	0
Nickname	9	0	9	0	7	0	9	0	8	0
Endearment terms	0	16	0	26	0	9	0	0	0	13
Comradely terms	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zero address terms	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	1	1

According to our data, in British and Persian family settings, the children used Positive Politeness Strategy in addressing the parents, but they do it differently. The British respondents used Positive Politeness Strategy “use given names and nicknames” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 107-109], which results in an informality, while the Persian respondents used Positive Politeness Strategy of exaggeration “exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with hearer” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 104-106], which leads to a formality in children-parents communication in this context. Meanwhile, the Persian respondents used superlative metaphorical endearment terms to address the parents, emerged from an obligation to paying high respect to parents in Persian culture, that were not viewed among the British respondents. Table (3.7.) illustrates the most typical ways of addressing the parents in the cultures under the study.

Table 3.7. The most typical ways of addressing: Children to parents

British	Persian
Kinship terms	Kinship terms
Personal names	Endearment terms
(103) Mom , could you please give me a glass of water? (son to mother)	(107) Mom , would you please kindly do a favor and give me a glass of water? (son to mother) مامان میشه لطفا بی زحمت یه محبت کنید و یک لیوان آب به من بدید؟ maman mishe lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat konid va yek livan ab be man bedid?

<p>(104) <i>I am sorry, Katy. I cannot take care of her. My friends and I are going to camp this weekend. (daughter to mother)</i></p>	<p>(108) <i>Of course, I can, My universe. I do surely sit with her. (daughter to mother)</i> البته که میتونم، هستی من. از ش حتما مراقبت کنم. albate ke mitoonam, hastiye man. azash hatman moraghebat mikonam.</p>
<p>(105) <i>Dad, would you please give me a helping hand to repair my bike? (son to father)</i></p>	<p>(109) <i>The best Dad in the world, could you please kindly do a favor and help me repair my bike? (son to father)</i> بهترین بابای دنیا، میتونید لطفا بی زحمت یه محبت کنید و کمک کنید دوچرخه ام رو تعمیر کنم؟ behtarin babaye donya, mitoonid lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat konid va komak konid docharkham ro ta-mir konam?</p>
<p>(106) <i>I am sorry, Mike. I am not really able to clean the garage. It's too much for me. (son to father)</i></p>	<p>(110) <i>Dad, I am sorry. I cannot clean the garage at least this weekend. Because I have a pre-scheduled plan with my cousins. (son to father)</i> بابا خیلی متاسفم. حداقل این آخر هفته نمی تونم گاراژو تمییز کنم. چون یه برنامه از قبل چیده شده با پسر عموهام دارم. baba kheyli mota-asefam. hade-aghal in akhare hafte nemitoonam garazho tamiz konam. chon ye barnameye az ghabl chide shode ba pesar amooham daram.</p>

Our contrastive analysis indicates four interesting differences:

1) Although in both British and Persian lingua-cultures, the respondents used kinship terms of *Mom* (مامان/ maman) and *Dad* (بابا/ baba) to address the parents, in Persian family, kinship terms of address were used more frequently than in British context: 86% to 69%.

2) In British family, the respondents addressed the parents by personal names including first names or nicknames: 30%, while in Persian family, addressing the parents by personal names is non-appropriate, and was not observed in our data: 0%.

3) The Persian respondents used endearment terms to address the parents: 13%, while in British family, endearment terms were not observed: 0%.

4) In Persian family, in all the situations, the respondents used the second-person plural pronoun *you* (شما/ shoma), similar to *Вы* in Russian and *vous* in French, to address the parents with the aim of paying respect to the parents.

Therefore, our findings revealed that, contrary to British family setting, in which an informal style of communication, an egalitarian social order and a symmetrical role position are observed in bottom-up context, the Persian children use emotive politeness more frequently than their British counterparts, in addition to using the marker of formality of *you* (شما/ shoma), which suggests a non-egalitarian social order, an asymmetrical role position and a higher degree of formality in children-parents communication in Persian culture.

3.2.3. Addressing in linear context: Spouses

Analyzing the terms of address, in linear context, we distinguished between the terms of address used by the husbands and the wives in British and Persian family settings. In British family, in all the situations, the husbands addressed the wives by personal names involving first names or nicknames: 44% (in situation 3), 60% (in situation 7) and 47% (in situation 8). In our Persian material, almost the same results were revealed: 46% (in situation 3), 32% (in situation 7) and 51% (in situation 8).

Based on our findings, there is a significant tendency to address the wife by endearment terms in both British and Persian family settings. In our British material, endearment terms (e.g., *honey*, *sweetheart*, *sweet peach*, *sweet pie*, *darling*, *beloved*, *sugar*, *angel*, *honeybunches*, *peach*, *love*, *babe*) with the possessive pronoun *my* were used by 53% of the respondents (in situation 3), 40% (in situation 7) and 49% (in situation 8). In our Persian data, using endearment terms (e.g., *darling* (عزیزم/ azizam), *honey* (عسل/ asal), *my beauty* (خوشگلم/ khoshgelam), *my peach* (هلولی من/ hoolooeye man), *my angel* (فرشته من/ fereshteye man), *my lady* (خانمم/ khaanoomam), *sweetheart* (عزیز دلم/ azize delam), *my love* (عشقم/ eshgham) with the possessive pronoun *my* (مال من/ male man), almost the similar results were observed: 54% (in situation 3), 68% (in situation 7) and 44% (in situation 8).

It is worth mentioning that in Persian family, the husbands used endearment terms with the possessive pronoun *my* (مال من/ male man) more frequently than their British counterparts: 26% to 14% (in situation 3), 32% to 10% (in situation 7) and 21% to 19% (in situation 8). Zero address terms were hardly observed in linear context of both British and Persian family settings: 3% (in situation 3) and 4% (in situation 8) among the British respondents and 5% (in situation 8) among the respondents in Persian family (Table 3.8.).

Table 3.8. Addressing in linear context: Husband to wife

Terms of address	Situation (3)		Situation (7)		Situation (8)		Total	
	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %
Personal names	44	46	60	32	47	51	50	43
Name	33	21	51	18	36	39	40	26
Nickname	11	25	9	14	11	12	10	17
Endearment terms	39	28	30	36	30	23	33	29
(my) endearment terms	14	26	10	32	19	21	14	26
Comradely terms	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zero address terms	3	0	0	0	4	5	3	2

Our findings in linear context, in direction from husband to wife, showed that in both lingua-cultures, the British and Persian respondents used Positive Politeness Strategy “use given names and nicknames” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 107-109] in addressing the wife. According to our data, using personal names including first names or nicknames, as well as endearment terms, were revealed as the most frequent terms of address in this context in both British and Persian family settings, while zero address terms were rarely used among the British and Persian husbands to address the wives (Table 3.9.).

Table 3.9. The most typical ways of addressing: Husband to wife

British	Persian
Personal names	Personal names
Endearment terms	Endearment terms

(111) Mandy , would you please make some tea for me? (husband to wife)	(116) Pani , could you please make me some tea? (husband to wife) پانی، می تونی لطفا برام یکم چای دم کنی؟ Pani, mitooni lotfan baram yekam chay dam koni?
(112) Princess , could you please make me some tea? (husband to wife)	(117) Honey , make me some tea, please. (husband to wife) عزیزم، لطفا برام یکم چای درست کن. azizam, lotfan baram yekam chay dorost kon.
(113) Sweet peach , do you like your new car? (husband to wife)	(118) Sweetheart , do you like your new car? (husband to wife) عشقم، ماشین جدیدتو دوست داری؟ eshgham, machine jadideto doost dari?
(114) Love , would you please bring me the documents to the office? (husband to wife)	(119) My lady , would you please bring me the documents to the office? (husband to wife) خانمم، میشه لطفا مدارکو برام بیاری دفتر؟ khanoomam, mishe lotfan madareko baram biyari daftar?
(115) My angel , you are more helpful than you realize. (husband to wife)	(120) My beloved , you always warm my heart with your support. (husband to wife) عزیز دلم، تو همیشه با حمایتت قلب منو گرم میکنی. azize delam, to hamishe ba hemayatet ghalbe mano garm mikoni.

Our data, illustrated in Table (3.10.), explain that in linear context, when the wives address the husbands, in all the situations, the British respondents used personal names, namely, first names or nicknames: 49% (in situation 3), 71% (in situation 7) and 58% (in situation 8), while in our Persian material, addressing the husbands by first names or nicknames was revealed less frequently than in British context: 33% (in situation 3), 28% (in situation 7) and 32% (in situation 8).

Based on our material, the Persian respondents gave more preference to use endearment terms (e.g., *honey* (عزیزم/ azizam), *a man of attraction* (مرد جذاب/ marde jazab), *my love* (عشقم/ eshgham), *a man of dreams* (مرد رویاها/ marde royaha), *sweetheart* (عزیز دلم/ azize delam), *a prince on a white horse* (شاهزاده سوار بر اسب سفید/ shah-zadeye savar bar asbe sefid) with the possessive pronoun *my* (مال من/ male man)

to address the husbands than their British counterparts (e.g., *honey*, *charming*, *sweetheart*, *handsome*, *babe*, *darling*): 45% (in situation 3), 29% (in situation 7) and 36% (in situation 8) among the British, and 67% (in situation 3), 72% (in situation 7) and 65% (in situation 8) among the Persian respondents.

In Persian family, the wives used endearment terms with the possessive pronoun *my* (مال من/ male man) more frequently than their counterparts in British family: 16% to 10% (in situation 3), 18% to 12% (in situation 7) and 19% to 12% (in situation 8). Zero terms of addressing in linear context between the wives and the husbands were hardly observed: 6% (in situation 3) and 6% (in situation 8) in British family, and 3% (in situation 8) among the respondents in Persian context.

Table 3.10. Addressing in linear context: Wife to husband

Terms of address	Situation (3)		Situation (7)		Situation (8)		Total	
	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %
Personal names	49	33	71	28	58	32	60	31
Name	34	33	42	18	42	21	40	24
Nickname	15	0	29	10	16	11	20	7
Endearment terms	35	51	17	54	24	46	25	50
(my) endearment terms	10	16	12	18	12	19	11	18
Comradely terms	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zero address terms	6	0	0	0	6	3	4	1

Our results in linear context, in direction from wife to husband, disclosed that in both lingua-cultures, the British and Persian respondents used Positive Politeness Strategy “use given names and nicknames” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 107-109] in addressing the husband. According to our results, using personal names including first names or nicknames, and endearment terms were remarked as the most frequent terms of address in this context in both British and Persian family settings, while zero address terms were rarely used among the British and Persian wives to address the husbands (Table 3.11.).

Table 3.11. The most typical ways of addressing: Wife to husband

British	Persian
Personal names	Personal names

Endearment terms	Endearment terms
(121) Andy , tea is coming. (wife to husband)	(124) Siya , tea is ready. (wife to husband) سیا، چای حاضره. Siya, chay hazere.
(122) Handsome , would you please buy me a new car? (wife to husband)	(125) Sweetheart , may I ask you please to buy me a new car? (wife to husband) عزیز دلم، میشه ازت خواهش کنم برای من یه ماشین نو بخری؟ azize delam, mishe azat khahesh konam baraye man ye machine no bekhari?
(123) My darling , I am sorry. I can't. I will be busy with managing household chores today all day long. (wife to husband)	(126) My beloved , I am sorry. I can't. My plan is more than full today, and I don't have time at all. (wife to husband) عشقم، متاسفم. نمیتونم. برنامه امروز خیلی پره و اصلا وقت ندارم eshgham, mota-asefam. nemitoonam. barnamam emrooz kheyli pore va aslan vaght nadaram.

Therefore, our contrastive analysis in linear context revealed that in both British and Persian family settings, the respondents used personal names and endearment terms quite frequently in both directions, from husbands to wives and wives to husbands. However, our findings indicate four interesting differences:

1) Personal names, consisting of first names or nicknames, were used among the British spouses more frequently than the spouses in Persian family: 50% to address the wife and 60% to address the husband in British family, and 43% to address the wife and 31% to address the husband among the Persian spouses.

2) Endearment terms of address, on the contrary, appeared to be used among the Persian spouses more frequently than their counterparts in British context: 55% to address the wife and 68% to address the husband in Persian family, and 47% to address the wife and 36% to address the husband among the British spouses.

3) Though endearment terms were used in both directions, from husbands to wives and wives to husbands, in our British material, the wives (47%) were

addressed by endearment terms more often than the husbands (36%), while our Persian material indicate the opposite results, based on which, 68% of the husbands and 55% of the wives were addressed by endearment terms. According to our contrastive analysis, the Persian husbands were addressed by endearment terms almost two times more often than the British husbands and the Persian wives used emotive politeness more frequently than their British counterparts, which, in turn, might suggest an asymmetrical role position between the spouses in Persian family setting.

4) Though in our Persian material, the possessive pronoun *my* (مال من/ male man) with endearment terms (e.g., *my love* (عشقم/ eshgham), *my lady* (خانمم/ khaanoomam), *my gentleman* (جنتلمن من/ gentlemane man), *my handsome* (خوشتیپ من/ khoshtipe man) were used in both directions, from husbands to wives and wives to husbands, the Persian wives were addressed by the possessive pronoun *my* with endearment terms more frequently than the husbands: 26% to 18%, while in British context, such address forms (e.g., *my darling*, *my peach*, *my sugar*, *my babe*, *my honey*) were used almost equally in both directions from husbands to wives and wives to husbands: 14% to 11% respectively (Tables 3.8. & 3.10.). In both British and Persian cultures, there are few examples of zero address forms.

The results of our contrastive analysis of addressing demonstrated that both the British and Persian family members use the same categories of terms of address, however, they show a clear preference for different categories. Our findings confirmed that the British respondents gave preference to personal names consisting of first names or nicknames: 77% in top-down context, 30% in bottom-up context, 50% in linear context from husbands to wives, and in the same context, 60% from wives to husbands, while the Persian respondents used personal names by 22%, 0%, 43%, and 31%, respectively.

Personal names were used as a form of addressing in all types of British contexts, including bottom-up context, when the children address the parents by their first names or nicknames, which makes the style of children-parents communication informal and egalitarian, while using personal names in bottom-up context in Persian

family is non-appropriate and was not revealed in our Persian data. Furthermore, the Persian parents (73%) preferred to use kinship terms of *my daughter* and *my son*, while in our British material, only 1% of the respondents used kinship terms to address the children. Addressing the parents by kinship terms of *Mom* and *Dad* was observed more frequently among the Persian respondents than their British counterparts: 86% to 69%.

Another salient difference concerned with endearment terms, which were used in Persian family more often than in British context. Though in British family, in top-down context, the respondents (19%) used endearment terms, including comradely terms towards the children more frequently than the Persian respondents (4%), in Persian family, to show affection, intimacy, and solidarity to the son and the daughter, the Persian parents (73%) preferred to use kinship terms of *son* and *daughter* with the possessive pronoun *my* (مال من/ male man). The situation in bottom-up context is different and the Persian children (13%) used endearment terms to address the parents, while no examples in British context were observed.

In linear context, our analysis presented interesting results. The Persian husbands (55%) gave preference to endearment terms to address the wives more frequently than the British husbands (47%), while the Persian wives (68%) used endearment terms to address the husbands almost two times more often than their British counterparts (36%). The findings disclosed an asymmetry in relations between the spouses in Persian family. In zero address terms, significant differences between the representatives of two cultures were not observed.

Overall, our results indicated that in British and Persian family settings, the respondents used personal names, involving first names or nicknames (55% to 24%), endearment terms, including comradely terms (25% to 35%), kinship terms (17% to 40%), and zero address terms (3% to 1%) in all the contexts. The fact that in Persian family, the children use endearment terms addressing their parents, and the wives conventionally use endearment terms addressing their husbands may suggest that these terms are the markers of emotive politeness and are used to show respect rather than emotions and feelings. Moreover, in Persian family, addressing the parents by

the children using the second-person plural pronoun *you* (شما/ shoma) corroborates this hypothesis as well.

Meanwhile, the fact that in British family, both the parents and children use personal names, involving first names or nicknames, to address each other, and these terms of address were not observed in bottom-up context in our Persian data may suggest an egalitarian social order and a symmetrical role position in parents-children communication in British context, in which the parents and children use personal communicative styles that are individual-oriented. On the contrary, in Persian family, due to a hierarchical system of communication, non-egalitarian social order and an asymmetrical role position between parents-children, contextual communicative styles that are status-oriented are used. Besides, a great tendency of the Persian children to address their parents by kinship terms of *Mom* and *Dad* may advocate the importance of cultural value of status in children-parents communication in Persian culture.

Our observations expressed that in both British and Persian family settings, the parents used Positive Politeness Strategy “use given names and nicknames” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 107-109] to address the children, which indicates an informality in parents-children communication in both lingua-cultures. Though in bottom-up context, the British and Persian children used Positive Politeness Strategy in addressing the parents, but they do it differently. The British children used Positive Politeness Strategy “use given names and nicknames” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 107-109], identical to the strategy used in top-down context in British family, which leads to an informality and an egalitarian social order in children-parents communication in British context, while the children in Persian family, used Positive Politeness Strategy of exaggeration “exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with hearer” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 104-106], which intensifies the statement of status cultural value, and highlights a formality, a non-egalitarian social order, and an asymmetrical role position in children-parents communication in Persian culture. In linear context, both the British and Persian

spouses used Positive Politeness Strategy “use given names and nicknames” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 107-109] in addressing the couple.

Due to the fact that in British family, in all the contexts, the same Positive Politeness Strategy was used to address the parents, children, and couples may suggest an informality, an egalitarian social order and a symmetrical role position among the family members in British context, while in Persian family, different Positive Politeness Strategies, used in top-down and bottom-up contexts, indicate a formality, a non-egalitarian social order and an asymmetrical role position in parents-children and children-parents communication in Persian context. It is worth mentioning that in Persian culture, with a long vertical distance, a hierarchical communication system, and status as one of the most dominant cultural values, children are obliged to use honorifics when addressing the parents.

3.3. Request

Our contrastive analysis of requesting in both British and Persian family settings also revealed some similarities and differences. The similarities mostly concerned with the types of requests and politeness strategies, and the differences concerned with their use in different contexts. While in Persian family, both types of direct and indirect requests were used, in British context, the only type of indirect request was observed:

- direct request
- indirect request

The direct requests were performed by imperative forms of verbs with/without “please” (لطفاً/ lotfan), and the model of explanation + imperative requests with/without “please” (لطفاً/ lotfan). The indirect requests were performed by questions with modal verbs *can*, *could*, *would*, *may*, and their Persian equivalents *can*, *could* (میتوانید/ mitoonid), *would* (میشه/ mishe), *may* (ممکنه/ momkene). The types of requests, main linguistic patterns, and examples are presented in Tables (3.12. & 3.13. & 3.14.). The tables illustrate that in Persian family, in all the situations, between parents to children, children to parents and spouses, both the direct and

indirect requests were used, while the British respondents only used the indirect type of request in all the situations, involving both symmetrical and asymmetrical contexts of top-down, bottom-up and linear.

Table 3.12. Types of requests in British family

British			
Types of requests	Linguistic patterns	%	Examples
Direct request	-	-	-
Indirect request	Can you do X? Could you do X? Would you do X? Would you mind doing X? May I ask you to do X?	100	Can you please give me the salt? (father to daughter) Would you please babysit your sister? (mother to daughter) Could you please clean the garage? (father to son) Can you please bring me a glass of water? (son to mother) Would you mind please repairing my bike? (son to father) Would you please make me some tea? (husband to wife) May I ask you please to buy me a new car? (wife to husband) Would you mind please bringing me the documents to the office? (husband to wife)

Table 3.13. Direct requests in Persian family

Persian			
Types of requests	Linguistic patterns	%	Examples
Direct request	Imperative form of verb with/without "please" (شکل امری فعل با/بدون "لطفا")	33	Give me the salt, please. (father to daughter) لطفا نمک رو به من بده. lotfan namak ro be man bede. Please babysit your sister this weekend. (mother to daughter) لطفا این آخر هفته از خواهرت مراقبت کن. lotfan in akhare hafte az khaharet moraghebat kon. Clean the garage at the weekend. (father to son) این آخر هفته گاراژو تمیز کن. in akhare hafte garazho tamiz kon

		<p>Make me some tea, please. (husband to wife)</p> <p>لطفاً برام یکم چای دم کن.</p> <p>lotfan baram yekam chay dam kon.</p> <p>Please bring me the documents to the office. (husband to wife)</p> <p>لطفاً مدارکو برام بیار دفتر.</p> <p>lotfan madareko baram biyar daftar.</p>
	<p>Explanation + imperative request with/without “please”</p> <p>(توضیح + درخواست امری با/بدون "لطفاً")</p>	<p>I need some salt. Pass it to me. (father to daughter)</p> <p>کمی نمک میخوام. اونو به من بده.</p> <p>kami namak mikham. oo-no be man bede.</p> <p>Your sister is still quite baby, and I can't leave her alone at home. Please, take care of her this weekend. (mother to daughter)</p> <p>خواهرت هنوز خیلی کوچیکه و من نمیتونم خونه تنهات بذارم. لطفاً این آخر هفته ازش مراقبت کن.</p> <p>khaharet hanooz kheyli koochike va man nemitoonam khoone tanhash bezaram. lotfan in akhare hafte azash moraghebat kon.</p> <p>There is a lot of mess in the garage. Please clean it this weekend. (father to son)</p> <p>گاراژ خیلی کثیفه. لطفاً این آخر هفته تمیزش کن.</p> <p>garazh kheyli kasife. lotfan in akhare hafte tamizesh kon.</p>

Table 3.14. Indirect requests in Persian family

Persian			
Types of requests	Linguistic patterns	%	Examples
Indirect request	<p>Can you do X?</p> <p>Could you do X?</p> <p>Would you do X?</p> <p>Would you mind doing X?</p> <p>May I ask you to do X?</p>	67	<p>Could you please pass me the salt? (father to daughter)</p> <p>میتونی لطفاً نمکو به من بدی؟</p> <p>mitooni lotfan namako be man bedi?</p> <p>Would you mind please babysitting your sister this weekend? (mother to daughter)</p> <p>میشه لطفاً اگه زحمتی نیست این آخر هفته از خواهرت مراقبت کنی؟</p> <p>mishe lotfan age zahmati nist in akhare hafte az khaharet moraghebat koni?</p> <p>Can you please clean the garage? (father to son)</p> <p>میتونی لطفاً گاراژو تمیز کنی؟</p>

		<p>mitooni lotfan garazho tamiz koni?</p> <p>Would you please kindly do a favor and bring me a glass of water? (son to mother)</p> <p>میشه لطفا بی زحمت یه محبت کنید و برام یک لیوان آب بیارید؟</p> <p>mishe lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat konid va baram yek livan ab biyarid?</p> <p>Would you mind please kindly doing a favor to me and repairing my bike? (son to father)</p> <p>میشه لطفا بی زحمت یه محبت به من کنید و دوچرخه ام رو تعمیر کنید؟</p> <p>mishe lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat be man konid va docharkham ro ta-mir konid?</p> <p>Can you please make me some tea? (husband to wife)</p> <p>میتونی لطفا برام یکم چای دم کنی؟</p> <p>mitooni lotfan baram yekam chay dam koni?</p> <p>Would you mind please buying me a new car? (wife to husband)</p> <p>میشه لطفا اگه زحمتی نیست برام یه ماشین جدید بخری؟</p> <p>mishe lotfan age zahmati nist baram ye mashine jadid bekhari?</p> <p>May I ask you please to bring me the documents to the office? (husband to wife)</p> <p>ممکنه ازت بخوام لطفا مدارکو به دفتر کارم بیاری؟</p> <p>momkene azat bekham lotfan madareko be daftare karam biyari?</p>
--	--	--

3.3.1. Request in top-down context: Parents to children

Our findings, summarized in Table (3.15.), described that in top-down context, when the parents request the children, the representatives of British and Persian lingua-cultures behave differently and manifest a clear preference for different linguistic patterns. In all the situations, the British respondents (100%) requested the children indirectly through questions with modal verbs *can*, *could*, *would*, *may* (in situations 1, 4 and 6):

(127) ***Could*** you please pass me the salt? (father to daughter)

(128) ***Would** you please babysit your brother this weekend? (mother to daughter)*

(129) ***Can** you please clean the garage at the weekend? (father to son)*

Our data revealed that in British family, 100% of the parents used Negative Politeness Strategies “be conventionally indirect” and “ask questions” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 132], aimed at avoiding imposition, while the direct type of requests was not observed in our British material (Table 3.15.). In this context, Politeness Strategy “dissociate the hearer from discourse” [Spencer-Oatey & Franklin 2009: 120; Scollon & Scollon 1995: 40-41] was also observed:

(130) ***May** I ask you the salt, please? (father to daughter)*

(131) ***May** I ask you please to babysit your brother this weekend? (mother to daughter)*

(132) ***May** I ask you please to clean the garage? (father to son)*

In Persian context, the indirect type of requests with modal verbs was rarely observed: 3% (in situation 1), 5% (in situation 4) and 4% (in situation 6). In contrary to the parents in British family, 96% of the Persian parents used Bald-On Record Directness Politeness Strategy, which is task-oriented [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 94-95]. They gave preference to the direct type of requests and used imperative forms of verbs with/without “please” (لطفاً/ lotfan): 44% (in situation 1), 44% (in situation 4) and 56% (in situation 6):

(133) ***Stay** at home this weekend and **babysit** your little sister. (mother to daughter)*

این آخر هفته خونه بمون و از خواهر کوچیکت مراقبت کن.

in akhare hafte khoone bemoon va az khahare koochiket moraghebat kon.

(134) *The garage needs to be cleaned. **Please clean** it. (father to son)*

گاراژ باید تمییز شه. لطفا تمییزش کن.

garazh bayad tamiz she. lotfan tamizesh kon.

It seems interesting to mention that the imperative requests without “please” (لطفاً/ lotfan) happened to be a dominant pattern in Persian context: 90% (in situation

1), 18% (in situation 4) and 49% (in situation 6). This fact discloses that the Persian parents hardly mitigate their imposition when they request the children:

(135) *The salad has no taste at all. Give the salt to me. (father to daughter)*

سالاد اصلا مزه نداره. نمک رو به من بده.

salad aslan maze nadare. namak ro be man bede.

(136) *The garage is terribly dirty. Manage your time to clean it this weekend.*

(father to son)

گاراژ وحشتناک کثیفه. برنامتو تنظیم کن، تو این آخر هفته تمیزش کنی.

garazh vahshatnak kasife. barnamato tanzim kon in akhare hafte tamizesh koni.

Nevertheless, 48% of the Persian respondents proceeded with their request by an explanation in the beginning, which softens the imposition, indicating its necessity: 53% (in situation 1), 51% (situation 4) and 40% (in situation 6):

(137) *Though the salad is very delicious, but it needs some salt. Pass the salt*

to me, please. (father to daughter)

با اینکه سالاد خیلی خوشمزه‌س، اما نمک می‌خواد. لطفا نمکو به من بده.

ba inke salad kheyli khoshmazas, ama namak mikhad. lotfan namak ro be man bede.

(138) *Your brother is not old enough yet to stay lonely at home. Take care*

of him this weekend. (mother to daughter)

برادرت هنوز اونقدر بزرگ نیست که تنها خونه بمونه. لطفا این آخر هفته ازش مراقبت کن.

baradaret hanoz oonghadr bozorg nist ke tanha khoone bemoone. lotfan in akhare hafte azash moraghebat kon.

(139) *You see I am very busy these days. Please you clean the garage at the*

weekend. (father to son)

میبینی من این روزا سرم خیلی شلوغه. تو لطفا آخر هفته گاراژو تمیز کن.

mibini man in rooza saram kheyli shoologhe. to lotfan akhare hafte garazho tamiz kon.

Based on our material, in Persian family, 4% of the respondents requested the children indirectly through questions with modal verbs *can*, *could*, *would*, *may* with their Persian equivalents *can*, *could* (میتونید/ mitoonid), *would* (میشه/ mishe), *may* (ممکنه/ momkene) in situations 1, 4 and 6, using Negative Politeness Strategies “be

conventionally indirect” and “ask questions” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 132], aimed at avoiding imposition:

(140) *Would* you please babysit your little brother this weekend? (mother to daughter)

میشه این آخر هفته از برادر کوچیکت مراقبت کنی؟

mishe in akhare hafte az baradare koochiket moraghebat koni?

(141) *Could* you please clean the garage at the earliest time? (father to son)

میتونی لطفا در نزدیک ترین زمان ممکن گاراژو تمیز کنی؟

mitooni lotfan dar nazdik-tarin zamane momken garazho tamiz koni?

Table 3.15. Request in top-down context: Parents to children

Types of requests	Situation (1) Father-daughter		Situation (4) Mother-daughter		Situation (6) Father-son		Total	
	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %
Indirect request with modal verb	100	3	100	5	100	4	100	4
Can you do X?	44	0	15	0	49	0	36	0
Could you do X?	20	3	33	0	38	4	30	2
Would you do X?	22	0	47	5	13	0	28	2
May I ask you to do X?	14	0	5	0	0	0	6	0
Direct request	0	97	0	95	0	96	0	96
Imperative with “please”	0	7	0	44	0	21	0	24
Imperative without “please”	0	37	0	0	0	35	0	24
Explanation + imperative with “please”	0	0	0	33	0	26	0	20
Explanation + imperative without “please”	0	53	0	18	0	14	0	28

Considering the strategies used in top-down context in both British and Persian family settings results in the fact that the style of British request in top-down context is indirect, while the style of Persian request is direct. Similar to Asian East cultures, in Middle East cultures like Persian culture with a short horizontal distance, there is a type of politeness strategy, with which parents use direct imperative forms in order to make request their children through conversation. In fact, in these cultures, it is perfectly viewed as an effective aspect that parents express their wants

freely to the children, and appeal to children in an imperative form of communication [Kyung-Joo 2007: 125; Larina 2015, 2020]. Table (3.16.) presents the most frequent types of requests used by the British and Persian parents towards the children, which illustrate this statement.

Table 3.16. The most typical types of requests: Parents to children

British Indirect form	Persian Direct form
(142) <i>Can</i> you please give me the salt? (father to daughter)	(145) Give me the salt. (father to daughter) (imperative request without “please”) نمک رو به من بده. namak ro be man bede.
	(146) Salad is not really eatable without salt. Pass the salt to me. (father to daughter) (explanation + imperative request without “please”) سالاد واقعا بدون نمک خوردنی نیست. نمک رو به من بده. salad vaghean bedoone namak khordani nist. namak ro be man bede.
(143) Would you please babysit your sister? (mother to daughter)	(147) You know that I am still really afraid of letting your brother alone at home. Please babysit him this weekend. (mother to daughter) (explanation + imperative request with “please”) می‌دونم که من هنوز واقعا می‌ترسم برادرت رو خونه تنها بذارم. لطفا این آخر هفته ازش مراقب کن. midooni ke man hanooz vaghean mitarsam baradareto khoone tanha bezaram. lotfan in akhare hafte azash moraghebat kon.
(144) Could you please clean the garage? (father to son)	(148) The garage is dirtier than I thought. Clean it at the weekend. (father to son) (explanation + imperative request without “please”) گاراژ کثیف‌تر از اون‌می‌فکر می‌کردم. آخر هفته تمیزش کن. garazh kasif-tar az ooni ke fekr mikardam. akhare hafte tamizezh kon.
	(149) Please clean the garage. (father to son) (imperative request with “please”) لطفا گاراژو تمیز کن. lotfan garazho tamiz kon.

3.3.2. Request in bottom-up context: Children to parents

In bottom-up context, when the children request the parents, in all the situations, both the British and Persian respondents used the indirect type of request through questions with modal verbs *can*, *could*, *would*, *may* with their Persian equivalents *can*, *could* (میتونید/ mitoonid), *would* (میشه/ mishe), *may* (ممکنه/ momkene). Our findings revealed that 60% of the British respondents used *can* (24%

+ 36%), 53% used *could* (36% + 17%), 61% used *would* (25% + 36%) and 26% used *may* (15% + 11%) in situations 2 and 5 respectively. Meanwhile, in Persian family, 53% of the respondents used *can* (میتونید/ mitoonid): 32% + 21%, 41% used *could* (میتونید / mitoonid): 9% + 32%, 57% used *would* (میشه/ mishe): 40% + 17% and 49% used *may* (ممکنه/ momkene): 19% + 30% in situations 2 and 5 respectively (Table 3.17.). However, the usage of indirect requests revealed two outstanding differences in British and Persian family settings:

1) The Persian respondents (90%) requested the parents through the long utterances using the model of *please kindly do a favor (to me)* (لطفا بی زحمت به محبت / lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat (be man) konid), which emphasizes respect and politeness towards the parents, while such utterances were not revealed in bottom-up context of our British material:

(150) *Could you please kindly do a favor and give me a glass of water? (son to mother)*

میتونید لطفا بی زحمت به محبت کنید و یک لیوان آب به من بدید؟

mitoonid lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat konid va yek livan ab be man bedid?

(151) *Would you please kindly do a favor to me and repair my bike? (son to father)*

میشه لطفا بی زحمت به محبت به من کنید و دوچرخه ام رو تعمیر کنید؟

mishe lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat be man konid va docharkham ro ta-mir konid?

2) In Persian family, in all the situations, besides using the second-person plural pronoun *you* (شما/ shoma), namely, *vous*-form of address to address the parents, the plural form of verbs was used by the Persian respondents in order to request the parents and pay respect to the parents simultaneously.

Though the respondents from both lingua-cultures requested the parents indirectly through questions with modal verbs, we observed a significant difference in politeness strategies in British and Persian family settings.

Table 3.17. Request in bottom-up context: Children to parents

Types of requests	Situation (2)	Situation (5)	Total
	Son-mother	Son-father	

	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %
Indirect request with modal verb	100	100	100	100	100	100
Can you do X?	24	32	36	21	30	26
Could you do X?	36	9	17	32	27	20
Would you do X?	25	40	36	17	30	29
May I ask you to do X?	15	19	11	30	13	25
Modal verb + <i>please kindly do a favor</i>						
Modal verb + <i>please kindly do a favor</i>	0	91	0	89	0	90

The findings disclosed that in British family, in order to request the parents, the children used Negative Politeness Strategies “be conventionally indirect” and “ask questions” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 132], aimed at avoiding imposition. Meanwhile, the Persian respondents demonstrated a clear tendency to use *can/ could/ would/ may I ask you please kindly (to) do a favor (to me)?* (میتونید/ میشه/ ممکنه لطفا بی زحمت یه محبت (به من) کنید؟) *mitoonid/ mishe/ momkene lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat (be man) konid?*): 91% (in situation 2) and 89% (in situation 5). Thus, besides Negative Politeness Strategies “be conventionally indirect” and “ask questions”, the Persian children used Negative Politeness Strategy “give deference” as well [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 178-187], aimed to intensify respect to the parents while requesting them.

Pragmatically, it also indicates a role difference between the parents and children, and a higher status of the parents in Persian culture. In Persian family, the parents are not supposed to comply with the requests of the children and if they do, their act is perceived as a favor. Additionally, our data revealed that the Persian children used speaker-oriented question *may I ask you to do X?* two times more often than their British counterparts: 25% to 13%, which suggests that asking for permission is an important discourse practice for the Persian children.

Table 3.18. The most typical types of request: Children to parents

British	Persian
Indirect form	Indirect form

(152) <i>Could</i> you please bring me a glass of water? (son to mother)	(156) <i>Could you please kindly do a favor to me and bring me a glass of water?</i> (son to mother) میتونید لطفا بی زحمت یه محبت به من کنید و برام یک لیوان آب بیارید؟ mitonid lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat be man konid va baram yek livan ab biyarid?
(153) <i>Would</i> you please bring me a glass of water? (son to mother)	(157) <i>Would you please kindly do a favor and bring me a glass of water?</i> (son to mother) میشه لطفا بی زحمت یه محبت کنید و برام یک لیوان آب بیارید؟ mishe lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat konid va baram yek livan ab biyarid?
(154) <i>Can</i> you please repair my bike? (son to father)	(158) <i>Can you please kindly do a favor to me and repair my bike?</i> (son to father) میتونید لطفا بی زحمت یه محبت به من کنید و دوچرخه ام رو تعمیر کنید؟ mitoonid lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat be man konid va docharkham ro ta-mir konid?
(155) <i>May</i> I ask you please to repair my bike? (son to father)	(159) <i>May I ask you please kindly to do a favor to me and repair my bike?</i> (son to father) ممکنه ازتون بخوام لطفا بی زحمت یه محبت به من کنید و دوچرخه ام رو تعمیر کنید؟ momkene azatoon bekham lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat be man konid va docharkham ro ta-mir konid?

Table (3.18.), including the most frequent types of request in bottom-up context, illustrates that the Persian respondents do more face-saving work besides the mitigator “please”. They conventionally use *please kindly do a favor (to me)* (لطفا) (lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat (be man) konid), which makes their request more elaborate. Moreover, they use the second-person plural pronoun *you* and the plural form of verbs to intensify their tendency for showing an emphasized respect to the parents. All these results testify that there is an index of a

higher power distance, a non-egalitarian social order, and an asymmetrical role position in children-parents communication in Persian culture, which makes the style of Persian requests more indirect and formal.

3.3.3. Request in linear context: Spouses

The analysis of our data, illustrated in (Table 3.19.), revealed some interesting, though less salient, differences in linear context, when the British and Persian spouses request each other. The findings demonstrated that 100% of the British spouses, in all the situations, used the indirect type of request through questions with modal verbs *can*, *could*, *would*, *may* with their Persian equivalents *can*, *could* (میتونید/ mitoonid), *would* (میشه/ mishe), *may* (ممکنه/ momkene):

(160) **Can** you please make me some tea? (husband to wife)

(161) **Would** you mind please buying me a new car? (wife to husband)

(162) **May** I ask you please to bring the documents to my office? (husband to wife)

In Persian context, the indirect request has also appeared to be preferable: 96%.

(163) **Would** you please make me some tea? (husband to wife)

میشه لطفا برام یکم چای دم کنی؟

mishe lotfan baram yekam chay dam koni?

(164) **May** I ask you please to buy me a new car? (wife to husband)

ممکنه ازت بخوام برام یه ماشین نو بخری؟

momkene azat bekham baram ye machine no bekhari?

(165) **Can** you please bring me the documents to the office? (husband to wife)

می تونی لطفا مدارکو برام بیاری دفتر؟

mitooni lotfan madareko baram biyari daftar?

However, some cases of the direct request in the form of imperative have also been observed in Persian context: 9% (in situation 3) and 3% (in situation 8). It is important to state that imperative requests were only used by the husbands

addressing their wives, while this type of request was not revealed among the British spouses:

(166) *Please make me some tea. (husband to wife)*

لطفاً برام کمی چای دم کن.

loftan baram kami chay dam kon.

(167) *Please bring me the documents to the office. (husband to wife)*

لطفاً مدارکو برام بیار دفتر.

lotfan madareko baram biyar daftar.

Table 3.19. Request in linear context: Spouses

Types of requests	Situation (3) Husband-wife		Situation (7) Wife-husband		Situation (8) Husband-wife		Total	
	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %
Indirect request with modal verb	100	91	100	100	100	100	100	96
Can you do X?	40	31	42	0	33	23	38	18
Could you do X?	22	23	0	33	24	30	15	28
Would you do X?	31	37	36	49	25	18	31	35
May I ask you to do X?	7	0	22	18	18	26	16	15
Direct request	0	9	0	0	0	3	0	4
Imperative with “please”	0	9	0	0	0	3	0	4

Our contrastive analysis of requesting in linear context between the British and Persian spouses revealed that 100% of the British and 96% of the Persian respondents used Negative Politeness Strategies “be conventionally indirect” and “ask questions” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 132], aimed at avoiding imposition on the hearer. Moreover, the results confirmed the similarities concerned with using the indirect type of request through questions with modal verbs among both the British and Persian spouses, while the differences concerned with the usage of the direct type of request in Persian family.

Established on our Persian material, 4% of the respondents used Bald-On Record Directness Politeness Strategy [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 94-95], which is task-oriented and was only observed in the husband’s request to the wife,

while this strategy was not revealed between the spouses in our British material. The result suggests some role differences and an index of a higher power distance in husbands-wives communication in Persian context. It also indicates that the Persian wives show more formality and distance to their husbands, while the husbands may let themselves be direct and request the wives through the imperative form of request.

Our findings explained that in linear and bottom-up contexts, the indirect type of request is the conventional form in both British and Persian cultures. However, in top-down context, the Persian parents demonstrated a clear tendency to use the direct style when requesting their children. While in total, 96% of the Persian parents used the bare imperative form, addressing the children, to make the direct request, our data specified in detail that 24% of the respondents preferred to use the imperative form of verb with “please”, 24% used the imperative form of verb without “please”, 20% of the respondents showed their tendency to use the model of explanation + imperative request with “please”, and 28% preferred to use explanation + imperative request without “please”. In our material, in top-down context, 100% of the British respondents used the indirect type of request towards the children, while in Persian family, only 4% of the respondents preferred to request the children indirectly through questions with modal verbs.

It is worth mentioning that 6% of the British parents used the speaker-oriented question *may I ask you to do X?* to request their children, while in our Persian material, it was not observed. The fact signifies that there is no power distance between parents and children in British context, or at least, it is not manifested in communication, which makes the British style in an egalitarian social order and a symmetrical role position among parents-children and children-parents communication. Though in both lingua-cultures, 100% of the British and Persian children used the indirect type of request, the request by the Persian children appeared to be more elaborate as 90% of the Persian respondents used *please kindly do a favor (to me)* (لطفاً بی زحمت به من کنید) / lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat (be man) konid) as the superlative polite phrase to emphasize their respect to the parents.

In requesting, the obvious tendency of the Persian children to use *vous*-form of address, namely, the second-person plural pronoun *you* (شما/ shoma), besides using the plural form of verbs, are in the line with this observation.

Due to the fact that in British family, both the parents and children used Negative Politeness Strategies “be conventionally indirect” and “ask questions” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 132], aimed at avoiding imposition, may reveal that there is the same level of informality, an egalitarian social order and a symmetrical role position in parents-children and children-parents communication in British context. It is important to mention that in British top-down context, Politeness Strategy “dissociate the hearer from discourse” [Spencer-Oatey & Franklin 2009: 120; Scollon & Scollon 1995: 40-41] was also observed.

Although in Persian context, both the parents and children used Negative Politeness Strategies “be conventionally indirect” and “ask questions” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 132], similar to what we observed in British context, the significant differences are highlighted. Our findings disclosed that the Persian parents used mostly Bald-On Record Directness Politeness Strategy [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 94-95], which is task-oriented, when they request the children directly in the imperative form of request, and the Persian children also used Negative Politeness Strategy “give deference” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 178-187], aimed at paying respect to the parents and emphasizing their dignity.

This analysis expresses a formality, a non-egalitarian social order and an asymmetrical role position in parents-children and children-parents communication in Persian context, in which the children, due to an index of a higher power distance in this culture, are obliged to request their parents through long utterances, using more emotive politeness, to maintain respect of their parents. However, the Persian parents request the children directly through the imperative requests, even without “please”.

Overall, in British and Persian family settings, in all the situations, between parents to children, children to parents and spouses, both the indirect and direct types of requests were used. While the British respondents (100%) used only the indirect

type of request in all the contexts of top-down, bottom-up and linear, in Persian family, 33% of the respondents preferred to use the direct request, which was not revealed in our British material. The results affirm that the avoidance of direct imposition on the hearer is a conventional discursive practice in British conversation, which is not concerned with the context, while Persian family discourse appears to be more context-dependent that is status-oriented. It is understood as principally avoidance-based negatively-oriented [Stewart 2005: 117] with the most conventionalized set of linguistic strategies in order to redress Face Threatening Acts (FTAs), aimed at minimizing imposition on the hearer [Larina 2008: 34].

3.4. Response to request

Our contrastive analysis of response to request among family members in British and Persian contexts showed some similarities and differences. The similarities mostly concerned with the form of response to request and politeness strategies, and the differences concerned with their use in different contexts. The analysis of the speech act of response to request follows a similar line drawing on G rcia [1993: 142]:

- accepting request
- rejecting request

In both British and Persian family settings, in top-down context, accepting the request was performed by either immediate acceptance using *OK* (باشه/ *bashe*), *sure* (حتما/ *hatman*), *solved* (حله/ *hale*), *alright* (بسیار خوب/ *besyar khoob*), *why not* (چرا که نه/ *chera ke na*) and *yes, of course* (بله، حتما/ *bale, hatman*) in 1 pragmatic move, or explanative acceptance using the model of immediate acceptance + explanation in 2 pragmatic moves.

In British family, in bottom-up context, accepting the request of the parents was performed by immediate acceptance in 1 pragmatic move, while in Persian family, the respondents, with a great tendency to accept the request of the parents, used either immediate acceptance in 1 pragmatic move, in response to the small

request of passing the salt to the father, or explanative acceptance using two models of immediate acceptance + explanation in 2 pragmatic moves, and immediate acceptance + *on eye* + explanation in 3 pragmatic moves in response to the big requests of babysitting the sibling by the daughter, and cleaning the garage by the son.

Our data indicates that the Persian children prefer to accept the request of the parents through long utterances in 3 pragmatic moves more frequently than 1 or 2 pragmatic moves. Meanwhile, using *on eye* (چشم/ chashm) as the marker of emotive politeness in accepting the request of the parents expresses the importance of respecting parents with immediate performance of their request.

Although in our material, in top-down context, no rejection of the request was observed in both British and Persian family settings, in bottom-up context, in British family, the respondents rejected the request of the parents using the model of apology + rejection + explanation in 3 pragmatic moves, while in Persian family, the respondents rejected the request of the parents not only in 3 pragmatic moves using the model of apology + rejection + explanation, but also used the model of apology + rejection + explanation + emotional question in 4 pragmatic moves. In bottom-up context, when rejecting the request of the parents by the children, two differences are noticed:

- 1) The children in British family rejected the request of the parents more frequently than their Persian counterparts.

- 2) The children in Persian family used longer utterances to reject the request of the parents than the children in British family.

In linear context, in both British and Persian family settings, the spouses accepted the request of the couple using the model of immediate acceptance in 1 pragmatic move, or explanative acceptance containing immediate acceptance + explanation in 2 pragmatic moves. Our data expressed that in both lingua-cultures, immediate rejection was not observed among the spouses, and the British and Persian respondents rejected the request of the couple using the model of explanative rejection including apology + rejection + explanation in 3 pragmatic moves.

Due to the fact that the speech acts of acceptance and rejection of request have not addressed in our present study, we limited ourselves to highlighting some significant similarities and differences, focusing on the models and the pragmatic moves of responding to the request by the British and Persian respondents in a family setting. The speakers of both lingua-cultures used the same forms of response to request, however, the analysis of the use of the forms revealed some differences. The differences mostly concerned with the preferences of certain forms and their dependence on the context and the status of the addressee.

3.4.1. Response to request in top-down context: Parents to children

Our findings, summarized in Table (3.20.), illustrated that in top-down context, when the parents respond to the request of their children, both the British and Persian respondents used two models of 1 and 2 pragmatic moves:

- 1 pragmatic move, including immediate acceptance:

(168) **OK.** (*mother to son*)

(169) **Sure.** (*father to son*)

(170) **Alright.** (*mother to son*)

بسیار خوب.

besyar khoob.

(171) **Why not.** (*father to son*)

چرا که نه.

chera ke na.

- 2 pragmatic moves, including immediate acceptance + explanation:

(172) **OK. This week, I am up to my neck in work, but in a week, I have free time to repair it.** (*father to son*)

(173) **OK. Of course, I cannot promise to help you repair it today or tomorrow, but I put it as my priority this weekend.** (*father to son*)

باشه. البته نمیتونم قول بدم که امروز یا فردا در تعمیر دوچرخه ات کمکت کنم، اما جزو اولویتهام این آخر هفته میذارمش.

bashe. albate nemitoonam ghol bedam ke emrooz ya farda dar ta-mire docharkhat komaket konam, ama jozve olaviyat-ham in akhare hafte mizaramesh.

Besides accepting the request of the children by all the British and Persian respondents: 100% (in situation 2), our data illustrated that the British respondents accepted the request of the children in 1 pragmatic move more frequently than the respondents in Persian family: 33% to 23% (in situation 5). It is necessary to state that in our material, no rejection of the request in both cultures was revealed.

Though in both British and Persian family settings, the respondents used explanative acceptance involving immediate acceptance + explanation in 2 pragmatic moves to respond to the request of the children, based on our findings, the Persian respondents used this model of accepting in 2 pragmatic moves more frequently than their British counterparts: 77% to 67% (in situation 5).

Table 3.20. Response to request: Parents to children

Forms of response to request	Situation (2) Mother-son		Situation (5) Father-son		Total	
	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %
Accepted request	100	100	100	100	100	100
Immediate acceptance	100	100	33	23	67	61
Explanative acceptance (immediate acceptance + explanation)	0	0	67	77	33	39
Rejected request	0	0	0	0	0	0

According to our findings, in both lingua-cultures, when the parents respond to the request of the children, they gave preference to immediate acceptance to the request of the children: 67% of the British respondents, and 61% of the respondents in Persian family, while 33% of the British respondents and 39% of the respondents in Persian context showed their acceptance to the children's request through explanation (Table 3.20.).

Table 3.21. The most typical models of response to request: Parents to children

British 1 pragmatic move Immediate acceptance	Persian 1 pragmatic move Immediate acceptance
(174) <i>Sure. (mother to son)</i>	(179) <i>Alright. (mother to son)</i> بسیار خوب. <i>besyar khoob.</i>
(175) <i>Of course. (father to son)</i>	(180) <i>Solved. (father to son)</i> حله. <i>hale.</i>
2 pragmatic moves Immediate acceptance + explanation	2 pragmatic moves Immediate acceptance + explanation
(176) <i>Why not. Next two weeks, I have a mountain of work to do but after that I will be free enough to take care about your bike. (father to son)</i>	(181) <i>Sure. I absolutely help you, but next weekend. (father to son)</i> حتما. قطعا کمکت میکنم، اما آخر هفته آینده. <i>hatman. ghat-an komaket mokonam, ama akhare hafteye ayande.</i>
(177) <i>Alright. Speaking of repairing cars and bikes, I have nothing to say, but I have a friend to help us. (father to son)</i>	(182) <i>OK. I think tomorrow after work, I have free time to help you repair it. (father to son)</i> باشه. فکر میکنم فردا بعد از کار وقت آزاد دارم تو تعمیر دوچرخه ات بهت کمک کنم. <i>bashe. fekr mikonam farda baad az kar vaghte azad daram too ta-mire docharkhat behet komak konam.</i>
(178) <i>OK. Cause I am not good at repairing bikes at all, I promise to take it to the repair center tomorrow evening. (father to son)</i>	(183) <i>Yes, of course. I am busy these days, but I try to look at it at the earliest time. (father to son)</i> بله، حتما. من این روزها سرم شلوغه، اما سعی میکنم در نزدیکترین زمان ممکن نگاهی بهش بندازم. <i>bale, hatman. man in rooza saram sholooghe, ama say mikonam dar nazdik-tarin zamane momken negahi behesh bendazam.</i>

Our contrastive analysis revealed that in both lingua-cultures, the parents used Positive Politeness Strategies “claim common ground: show agreement” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 113-115] and “notice/ attend to hearer: his interests, wants, needs and goods” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 103-104] to respond to the request of the children.

3.4.2. Response to request in bottom-up context: Children to parents

Our contrastive analysis, shown in Table (3.22.), illustrated that in both lingua-cultures, in bottom-up context, 100% of the respondents accepted the request

of the parents in situation 1, while the Persian respondents accepted the request of the parents more frequently than the respondents in British family: 95% to 82% (in situation 4) and 84% to 64% (in situation 6), and rejected the request of the parents less frequently than their British counterparts: 5% to 18% (in situation 4) and 16% to 36% (in situation 6).

Established on our findings, in bottom-up context, the British respondents used the model of 1 pragmatic move, while the respondents in Persian family used the models of 1, 2 and 3 pragmatic moves in order to show acceptance of the request of the parents. In British family, the respondents used immediate acceptance in 1 pragmatic move to respond to the request of the parents more frequently than the respondents in Persian family: 100% to 79% (in situation 1), 82% to 0% (in situation 4) and 64% to 19% (in situation 6):

(184) **Alright.** (*daughter to father*)

(185) **Why not.** (*daughter to mother*)

(186) **Sure.** (*son to father*)

(187) **OK.** (*daughter to father*)

باشه.

bashe.

(188) **Yes, of course.** (*son to father*)

بله، البته.

bale, albate.

While accepting the request of the parents, using the models of 2 and 3 pragmatic moves, were not observed in our British material, our findings revealed that the respondents in Persian family used explanative acceptance, including immediate acceptance + explanation in 2 pragmatic moves, to show acceptance of the request of their parents: 8% (in situation 4) and 14% (in situation 6):

(189) **Alright. I always like to give you a helping hand.** (*daughter to mother*)

بسیار خوب. من همیشه مایلیم به شما کمک کنم.

besyar khoob. man hamishe mayelam be shoma komak konam.

(190) **Sure. Suppose it “done”.** (*son to father*)

حتما. "انجام شده" فرضش کنید.

hatman. "anjam shode" farzesh konid.

Moreover, our Persian material highlighted that the children in this culture have a great tendency to use immediate acceptance + *on eye* + explanation in 3 pragmatic moves in order to accept the request of the parents: 21% (in situation 1), 87% (in situation 4) and 51% (in situation 6). It is important to mention that *on eye* (چشم/ chashm), as the marker of emotive politeness, is used to exhibit respect to parents in Persian family and demonstrates a willingness to comply with the request of parents without any excuse and hesitation (Table 3.22.):

(191) OK. **On eye.** Here you are. (daughter to father)

باشه. چشم. بفرمایید خدمت شما.

bashe. chashm. befarmayid khedmate shoma.

(192) Sure. **On eye.** I give my all senses to him¹. (daughter to mother)

حتما. چشم. شش دنگ حواسم بهش هست.

hatman. chashm. shesh donge havasam behesh hast.

(193) Alright. **On eye.** I make it like a bunch of flowers². (son to father)

بسیار خوب. چشم. عین دست گلش میکنم.

besyar khoob. chashm. eyne daste golesh mikonam.

Based on our analysis, in British family setting, the respondents rejected the request of the parents more frequently than the respondents in Persian family: 18% to 5% (in situation 4) and 36% to 16% (in situation 6). While any immediate rejection in 1 pragmatic move was not observed in both lingua-cultures, the respondents in British family rejected the request of the parents by explanative rejection, using the model of apology + rejection + explanation in 3 pragmatic moves, more frequently than their Persian counterparts: 18% to 5% (in situation 4) and 36% to 8% (in situation 6):

(194) Sorry. **I can't.** This weekend, I am extremely busy. (daughter to mother)

¹ In Persian language, it means "I keep a close eye on him".

² In Persian language, it means "I make it spotless".

(195) Sorry. I am not able to do that. This weekend, I have a gathering with my friends from school. (son to father)

(196) Sorry. I can't. Though I understand how much it could be important to give a helping hand to you this weekend, and I know that it is my duty, but I have a midterm exam next week and this weekend is the only opportunity to get prepared for it. (daughter to mother)

بیخشید. نمی تونم این کارو بکنم. با اینکه متوجهم کمک کردن به شما این آخر هفته چقدر می تونه مهم باشه و میدونم که کمک کردن بهتون وظیفه، اما من هفته آینده امتحان میان ترم دارم و این آخر هفته تنها زمانیه که می تونم براش آماده بشم.

bebakhshid. nemitoonam in karo bokonam. ba inke motavajeham komak kardan be shoma in akhare hafte cheghadr mitoone mohem bashe va midoonam ke in kar vazifamame, ama man hafteye ayande emtehan miyan term daram va in akhare hafte tanha zamaniye ke mitoonam barash amade besham.

(197) I am sorry. I can't. The reason is that I will be supposed to participate in school's football match that is our extracurricular. (son to father)

بیخشید. نمیتونم. دلیلشم اینه که قراره تو مسابقه فوتبال مدرسه که کار فوق - برناممونه شرکت کنم.

babakhshid. nemitoonam. dalilesham inke gharare to mosabegheye footbale madrese ke kare foghe-barnamamoone sherkat konam.

Moreover, 8% of the Persian respondents, using explanative rejection in the model of apology + rejection + explanation + emotional question in 4 pragmatic moves, rejected the request of the parents (in situation 6), while this model of rejection of the request was not revealed in our British material (Table 3.22.):

(198) I am so sorry. I can't do it. The reason is that this weekend, I am going to participate in a friends' re-union from high school after a long time. Do you remember how long I was waiting for this event? (son to father)

خیلی متاسفم. نمیتونم این کارو انجام بدم. دلیلشم اینکه قراره این آخر هفته بعد از مدتها تو یک دورهمی دوستان دبیرستانم شرکت کنم. یادتونه چقدر منتظر این اتفاق بودم؟

kheyli mota-asefam. nemitoonam in karo anjam bedam. dalilesham ineke gharare in akhare hafte baad az modat-ha too yek dore hamiye doostane dabirestanam sherkat konam. yadetoone cheghadr montazere in etefagh boodam?

(199) *I am sorry. I can't clean the garage this weekend. I've been looking forward to camping in the woods with my friends for quite some time. Could you please kindly do a favor to me and wait one more week for my sake?* (son to father)

ببخشید. این آخر هفته نمی‌تونم گاراژو تمییز کنم. خیلی وقته منتظرم با دوستانم تو جنگل چادر بزنیم. میتونید لطفاً بی زحمت یه محبت به من کنید و یک هفته دیگه به خاطر من صبر کنید؟

bebakhshid. in akhare hafte nemitoonam garazho tamiz konam. kheyli vaghte montazeram ba doostam too jangal chador bezanim. mitoonid lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat be man konid va yek hafteye dige bekhatere man sabr konid?

Table 3.22. Response to request: Children to parents

Forms of response to request	Situation (1) Daughter-father		Situation (4) Daughter-mother		Situation (6) Son-father		Total	
	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %
Accepted request	100	100	82	95	64	84	82	93
Immediate acceptance	100	79	82	0	64	19	82	33
Explanative acceptance (immediate acceptance + explanation)	0	0	0	8	0	14	0	7
Explanative acceptance (immediate acceptance + <i>on eye</i> + explanation)	0	21	0	87	0	51	0	53
Rejected request	0	0	18	5	36	16	18	7
Immediate rejection	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Explanative rejection (apology + rejection + explanation)	0	0	18	5	36	8	18	2
Explanative rejection (apology + rejection + explanation + emotional question)	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	5

Our results caused us to understand that in both lingua-cultures, in bottom-up context, the children used Positive Politeness Strategies “claim common ground: show agreement” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 113-115] and “notice/ attend to hearer: his interests, wants, needs and goods” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 103-104] in addition to Negative Politeness Strategy “communicate S’s wants to not impinge on H: apologize” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 187-188] to respond positively or negatively to the request of the parents. Besides, the Persian children also used Negative Politeness Strategy “give deference” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 178-187], aimed at intensifying their respect and dignity to the parents. Tables (3.23.) to (3.27.) illustrate the models of response to request in 1, 2, 3 and 4 pragmatic moves in bottom-up context of British and Persian family settings.

**Table 3.23. The model of 1 pragmatic move of response to request:
Children to parents**

British 1 pragmatic move Immediate acceptance	Persian 1 pragmatic move Immediate acceptance
(200) <i>OK. (daughter to father)</i>	(203) <i>Alright. (daughter to father)</i> بسیار خوب. <i>besyar khoob.</i>
(201) <i>Alright. (daughter to mother)</i>	-
(202) <i>Alright. (son to father)</i>	(204) <i>OK. (son to father)</i> باشه. <i>bashe.</i>

Table 3.24. The model of 2 pragmatic moves of response to request:
Children to parents

British 2 pragmatic moves Explanative acceptance (immediate acceptance + explanation)	Persian 2 pragmatic moves Explanative acceptance (immediate acceptance + explanation)
-	(205) <i>Why not. I won't let her be away from my sight even a second.</i> (daughter to mother) چرا که نه. چشم. نمیذارم حتی یه ثانیه هم از جلوی چشمم دور شه. <i>chera ke na. chashm. nemizaram hata ye saniye ham az jeloye cheshmam door she.</i>
-	(206) <i>Solved. This weekend is exactly the right time to do it.</i> (son to father) حله. این آخر هفته دقیقا وقتیه انجام همین کاره. <i>hale. in akhare hafte daghighan vaghte anjame hamin kare.</i>

Table 3.25. The model of 3 pragmatic moves of response to request:
Children to parents

3 pragmatic moves Explanative acceptance (immediate acceptance + <i>on eye</i> + explanation)	3 pragmatic moves Explanative acceptance (immediate acceptance + <i>on eye</i> + explanation)
-	(207) <i>Of course. On eye. You could keep it on your side.</i> (daughter to father) البته. چشم. میتونید همون جا بذاریدش. <i>albate. chashm. mitoonid hamoon ja bezaridesh.</i>
-	(208) <i>Sure. On eye. I do my best to take care of him.</i> (daughter to mother) حتما. چشم. تمام تلاشمو میکنم که ازش خوب مراقبت کنم. <i>hatman. chashm. tamame talashamo mikonam ke azash khoob moraghebat konam.</i>

-	<p>(209) Alright. On eye. Just leave it to me and deliver an extremely clean garage. (son to father)</p> <p>بسیار خوب. چشم. فقط این کارو به من بسپارید و به گاراژ فوق تمیز تحویل بگیرید.</p> <p>besyar khoob. chashm. faghat in karo be man besparid va ye garazhe foghe tamiz tahvil begirid.</p>
---	---

Table 3.26. The model of 3 pragmatic moves of response to request:

Children to parents

3 pragmatics Explanative rejection (apology + rejection + explanation)	3 pragmatics Explanative rejection (apology + rejection + explanation)
(210) <i>I am sorry. I can't take such a big responsibility. I never get along with children, even if that child is my sister.</i> (daughter to mother)	<p>(212) <i>Excuse me. I can't do it. You know better than anyone that I am not good at babysitting at all.</i> (daughter to mother)</p> <p>ببخشید. من نمیتونم این کارو انجام بدم. شما بهتر از هرکسی میدونید که من اصلا بچه داریم خوب نیست.</p> <p>bebakhshid. man nemitoonam in karo anjam bedam. shoma behtar az har kasi midoonid ke man aslan bache darim khoob nist.</p>
(211) <i>I am sorry. I can't do it this weekend. I need to rest and do nothing after a very hard week.</i> (son to father)	<p>(213) <i>Excuse me. I can't do it for you. The reason is my course work, which definitely must be finished during this weekend.</i> (son to father)</p> <p>ببخشید. نمی تونم این کارو براتون انجام بدم. دلایلش هم پروژه مه که باید حتما همین آخر هفته تموم شه.</p> <p>bebakhshid. nemitoonam in karo baratoon anjam bedam. dalilesh ham prozham ke bayad hatman hamin akhare hafte tamoom she.</p>

Table 3.27. The model of 4 pragmatic moves of response to request:

Children to parents

4 pragmatic moves Explanative rejection (apology + rejection + explanation + emotional question)	4 pragmatic moves Explanative rejection (apology + rejection + explanation + emotional question)
-	<p>(214) <i>I am sorry. I cannot take such a responsibility this weekend. The reason is my pre-scheduled plan with my friends that, as a matter of fact, has been managed by myself. Now, how could I explain to them that it is canceled?</i> (son to father)</p> <p>ببخشید. نمی تونم همچین مسئولیتی رو این آخر هفته به عهده بگیرم. دلایلم برنامه از پیش چیده شده ایه که اتفاقا خودم هم هماهنگش کردم. حالا الان چطور میتونم به دوستام توضیح بدم که کنسل شده؟</p> <p>mota-asefam. nemitoonam hamchin mas-ooliyati ro in hafte be oh-de begiram. dalilesham barnameye az pish chide shodeyi ke etefaghan</p>

Our contrastive analysis of response to request in British and Persian family settings indicates four interesting differences in bottom-up context:

1) Though in both lingua-cultures, acceptance of the request of the parents was observed, the respondents in Persian family accepted the request of their parents more frequently than their British counterparts: 93% to 82%.

2) In our British material, the respondents showed their acceptance using immediate accept in 1 pragmatic move more frequently than the respondents in Persian context: 82% to 33%. The result expresses an informality, an egalitarian social order and a symmetrical role position in children-parents communication in British family.

3) While in Persian context, 60% of the respondents used explanative accept in 2 or 3 pragmatic moves in order to respond to the request of the parents, explanative accept was not observed among the British respondents. The fact that the Persian respondents preferred to use long utterances as well as *on eye* (چشم/chashm), as a marker of emotive politeness in Persian culture, in order to respond positively to the request of the parents suggests a formality, a non-egalitarian social order and an asymmetrical role position in children-parents communication in Persian context.

(4) In British family, the respondents rejected the request of the parents more frequently than the respondents in Persian family: 18% to 7%. Meanwhile, though in both lingua-cultures, the respondents used explanative reject including apology + rejection + explanation in 3 pragmatic moves, the Persian respondents, using longer explanative utterances, described the reason of rejecting the parents' request more elaborately. Moreover, the respondents in Persian family used the model of explanative reject involving apology + rejection + explanation + emotional question in 4 pragmatic moves, which was not viewed in our British material. The results may suggest that there is an index of a higher power distance in children-parents

communication in Persian culture, in which the children are obliged to convince their parents for not performing their request and paying respect to them simultaneously.

3.4.3. Response to request in linear context: Spouses

Analyzing the forms of response to request in linear context (Table 3.28.), we distinguished between the forms of response to request used by the husbands and wives in British and Persian family settings. Though the respondents in British and Persian linear contexts accepted equally the request of the husband: 100% (in situation 3), the British respondents accepted the request of the couple more frequently than their Persian counterparts: 62% to 47% (in situation 7) and 73% to 59% (in situation 8).

Based on our findings, 100% of the British and Persian respondents (in situation 3), 42% of the British respondents and 17% of the respondents in Persian family (in situation 8), using immediate acceptance in 1 pragmatic move, responded positively to the husband's request:

(215) ***It's OK.*** (*wife to husband*)

(216) ***Sure.*** (*wife to husband*)

(217) ***Yes, of course.*** (*wife to husband*)

بله، حتما.

bale, hatman.

(218) ***Alright.*** (*wife to husband*)

بسیار خوب.

besyar khob.

Comparing the forms of response to request in British and Persian linear contexts disclosed that the respondents in both lingua-cultures used explanative acceptance, namely, immediate acceptance + explanation in 2 pragmatic moves in order to respond to the couple's request: 62% of the British respondents and 47% of the respondents in Persian family to respond to the request of the wife (in situation 7), and 31% of the British respondents and 42% of the respondents in Persian family in showing response to the request of the husband (in situation 8):

(219) ***It's OK. Let's find some relevant information about the appropriate models on the site.*** (husband to wife)

(220) ***It's OK. Let's see how much we could invest on replacing your new car.*** (husband to wife)

(221) ***Why not. I bring them to your office after shopping.*** (wife to husband)

(222) ***Alright. I have to ask about a new model with the best price and good options.*** (husband to wife)

بسیار خوب. من باید در مورد به مدل جدید با بهترین قیمت و آپشن های خوب تحقیق کنم.
besyar khoob. man bayad dar morede ye modele jadid ba behtarin gheymat va option-haye khoob tahghigh konam.

(223) ***Yes, of course. Your offer is welcome to me cause, as a matter of fact, it's a great idea in my mind too.*** (husband to wife)

بله، البته. از پیشنهادات استقبال میکنم، چون اتفاقا به نظر من هم خیلی فکر خوبییه.
bale, albate. az pishnahadet esteghbal mikonam, chon etefaghan be nazare manam kheyli fekre khoobiye.

(224) ***Sure. Before noon, you will have whatever you need on your desk.*** (wife to husband)

حتما. هر چی لازم داری قبل از ظهر روی میزت خواهد بود.
hatman. har chi lazem dari ghabl az zohr rooye mizet khahad bood.

Though in both British and Persian linear contexts, no rejection of the husband's request was observed (in situation 1), the respondents in British family rejected the request of the couples using explanative rejection, including apology + rejection + explanation in 3 pragmatic moves less frequently than their Persian counterparts: 38% to 53% in showing response to the request of the wife (in situation 7), and 27% to 41% in responding to the request of the husband (in situation 8):

(225) ***I am sorry. We are not able to do that. I think it's not a perfect idea to go to the expense of buying a new car, while we are in a big debt to the bank.*** (husband to wife)

(226) ***I am sorry. We can't replace your car, at least now. You know, this year, we have some other priorities on our required list.*** (husband to wife)

ببخشید. ما، حداقل الان، نمی تونیم ماشین تورو عوض کنیم. خودت میدونی امسال اولویتهای دیگه ای تو لیست مایحتاجمون داریم.

bebakhshid. ma, hade-aghal alan, nemitoonim mashine toro avaz konim. khodet midooni emsal olaviyat-haye digeyi too liste mayahtajemoon darim.

(227) *I am sorry. I can't leave the house. I have a very bad headache from the morning.* (wife to husband)

(228) *I am sorry. I can't manage it at all. You can't imagine how many places I should go and how many things I have to do today.* (wife to husband)

ببخشید. اصلا نمی تونم این کارو بکنم. نمیتونی تصور کنی امروز باید چند جا برم و چند تا کار انجام بدم.
bebakhshid. aslan nemitoonam in karo bokonam. nemitooni tasavor koni emrooz chand ja bayad beram va chand ta kar bayad anjam bedam.

Table 3.28. Response to request: Spouses

Forms of response to request	Situation (3) Wife-husband		Situation (7) Husband-wife		Situation (8) Wife-husband		Total	
	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %
Linguistic variable								
Accepted request	100	100	62	47	73	59	78	69
Immediate acceptance	100	100	0	0	42	17	47	39
Explanative acceptance (immediate acceptance + explanation)	0	0	62	47	31	42	31	30
Rejected request	0	0	38	53	27	41	22	31
Explanative rejection (apology + rejection + explanation)	0	0	38	53	27	41	22	31

Our findings demonstrated that in linear context of both British and Persian family settings, the spouses used Positive Politeness Strategies “claim common ground: show agreement” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 113-115] and “notice/

attend to hearer: his interests, wants, needs and goods” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 103-104] to respond to the request of the couple. Meanwhile, both the British and Persian respondents used Negative Politeness Strategy “communicate S’s wants to not impinge on H: apologize” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 129] when they intend to reject the request of the couple as well.

Based on our contrastive analysis, in British family, the respondents accepted the request of the couples more frequently than their Persian counterparts: 78% to 69%. Furthermore, in British family, the respondents used immediate acceptance more frequently than the respondents in Persian family: 47% to 39%, while in both lingua-cultures, the respondents used explanative acceptance, including immediate acceptance + explanation almost equally: 31% of the British respondents, and 30% of the respondents in Persian context. Our data manifested that in British family, the spouses rejected the request of each other, using explanative rejection, involving apology + rejection + explanation in 3 pragmatic moves less frequently than the respondents in Persian family: 22% to 31% (Table 3.29.).

Table 3.29. The most typical models of response to request: Spouses

<p>British</p> <p>1 pragmatic move</p> <p>Immediate acceptance</p>	<p>Persian</p> <p>1 pragmatic move</p> <p>Immediate acceptance</p>
<p>(229) <i>OK. (wife to husband)</i></p>	<p>(234) <i>Alright. (wife to husband)</i></p> <p>بسیار خوب. <i>besyar khoob.</i></p>
<p>British</p> <p>2 pragmatic moves</p> <p>Explanative acceptance</p> <p>immediate acceptance +explanation</p>	<p>Persian</p> <p>2 pragmatic moves</p> <p>Explanative acceptance</p> <p>immediate acceptance +explanation</p>
<p>(230) <i>It's OK. Let's see what options we have to choose from. (husband to wife)</i></p>	<p>(235) <i>Sure. We take a look at advertisements tonight to find out what's going on in the car market these days. (husband to wife)</i></p> <p>حتما. امشب به نگاه به آگهی ها میندازیم ببینم تو بازار ماشین این روزا چه خبره. <i>hatman. emshab ye negah be agahi-ha mindazim bebinim too bazare mashin in rooza che khabare?</i></p>

(231) <i>Yes, of course. I will be there in an hour. (wife to husband)</i>	(236) <i>It's OK. Of course, I need some time to get dressed, call a taxi and be stocked in our usual traffic jam. (wife to husband)</i> باشه. البته من کمی زمان لازم دارم تا لباس بپوشم، یه تاکسی خبر کنم و تو ترا فیک معمولمون هم بمونم. bashe. albate man kami zaman lazem ta lebas bepoosham, ye taxi khabar konam va too trafike ma-moolemoon ham bemoonam.
3 pragmatic moves Explanative rejection apology + rejection + explanation	3 pragmatic moves Explanative rejection apology + rejection + explanation
(232) <i>I am sorry. We surely could not afford it this year. I guess that next year, we will have more financial opportunities to replace your car with the new one. (husband to wife)</i>	(237) <i>I am sorry. It is not possible at the present situation. Besides, I strongly believe that you don't need a new car, at least, not this year. (husband to wife)</i> ببخشید. این در شرایط کنونی ممکن نیست. علاوه بر این، من قویا فکر میکنم تو حداقل امسال به یه ماشین جدید نیاز نداری. mota-asefam. in dar sharayete konooni momken nist. alave bar in, man ghaviyan fekr mikonam to hade-aghal emsal be ye mashine jadid niyaz nadari.
(233) <i>Sorry. I can't. Today I have an important meeting with my new customer, and I need to be focused on my presentation beforehand. (wife to husband)</i>	(238) <i>I am sorry. I can't. Today I am very busy. (wife to husband)</i> ببخشید. نمی تونم. امروز خیلی سرم شلوغه. bebakhshid. nemitoonam. emrooz saram sholloghe

The results of our contrastive analysis of responding to request in the contexts of top-down, bottom-up and linear in British and Persian family settings disclosed that both the British and Persian family members use the same forms of response to request, however, they reveal a clear preference to use different linguistic patterns.

In top-down context, in both lingua-cultures, to respond to the request of the children, the parents preferred to use immediate acceptance in 1 pragmatic move almost two times more often than explanative acceptance in 2 pragmatic moves: 67% to 33% in British family and 61% to 39% among the Persian respondents. It is worth mentioning that in this context, no rejection of the request was observed.

Moreover, the British parents used immediate acceptance more frequently than the parents in Persian family: 67% to 61%, however, the Persian parents showed

a greater tendency to use explanative acceptance than their British counterparts: 39% to 33%.

In bottom-up context, the British respondents accepted the request of the parents less frequently than the Persian respondents: 82% to 93%. However, our material displayed that the children in British family preferred to use immediate acceptance in 1 pragmatic move more frequently than their Persian counterparts: 82% to 33%. While in bottom-up context, explanative acceptance was not observed in our British material, 60% of the children in Persian family accepted the parents' request by explanative acceptance, using two models of immediate acceptance + explanation, or immediate acceptance + *eye on* + explanation in 2 or 3 pragmatic moves respectively. It is important to review that using *on eye* (چشم/ chashm), as the marker of emotive politeness in Persian culture, expresses acceptance of the parents' request by the children with no excuse and hesitation. Besides, our data revealed that the British children rejected the request of the parents two times more often than their counterparts in Persian family: 18% to 7%.

The findings may demonstrate that, due to a hierarchical system of communication with an index of a higher power distance in Persian culture, there is a non-egalitarian social order and an asymmetrical role position in children-parents communication in this context, in which the children have a great tendency to respond to the request of the parents through long utterances, emphasizing their interest to give a helping hand to the parents, in case of accepting the request, or justifying their excuse, in case of rejecting the request, in order to pay high respect to the age and the status of the parents, which are viewed as the most dominant cultural values in Persian culture. The fact that the Persian children accepted the request of the parents more frequently and rejected the request of the parents less frequently than their British counterparts may suggest that children in Persian family are more obedient and dependent on their parents and put the request of parents in top priority, even if it is against their plans or desires.

In linear context, the British spouses exhibited a greater tendency to accept the request of the couple than the spouses in Persian family: 78% to 69%. Our data

represented that the British spouses showed response to the request of the couple, using immediate acceptance in 1 pragmatic move, more frequently than the Persian respondents: 47% to 39%, however, in both lingua-cultures, the spouses responded to the request of each other by explanative acceptance in 2 pragmatic moves almost equally: 31% of the British and 30% of the Persian respondents. Furthermore, the respondents in British family rejected the request of the couple by explanative rejection, using the model of apology + rejection + explanation in 3 pragmatic moves, less frequently than the Persian respondents: 22% to 31%.

In both British and Persian lingua-cultures, Positive Politeness Strategies “claim common ground: show agreement” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 113-115] and “notice/ attend to hearer: his interests, wants, needs and goods” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 103-104] were used in all the contexts among the family members to respond to the request of the parents, children and spouses. Moreover, in both British and Persian bottom-up and linear contexts, Negative Politeness Strategy “communicate S’s wants to not impinge on H: apologize” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 129] is also observed when the children showed their negative response to the request of the parents, and when the spouses responded negatively to the request of the couple. The latter politeness strategy was not revealed in top-down context between the parents and children in British and Persian family settings.

The significant difference was observed in bottom-up context of Persian family when the children used Negative Politeness Strategy “give deference” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 178-187] with *one eye* (چشم/ chashm) in order to intensify their positive response to the parents’ request. This politeness strategy was not revealed in our British material. Though in British family, there is no considerable difference in using politeness strategies in top-down, bottom-up and linear contexts, which indicates an egalitarian social order and a symmetrical role position in all the contexts of British culture, using Negative Politeness Strategy “give deference” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 178-187] in bottom-up context of Persian family illustrates an index of a higher power distance in Persian culture, which forms a more formality, a non-egalitarian social order and an asymmetrical

role position in children-parents communication. As a consequence, the Persian children insist on performing the parents' request by stating the superlative polite utterance *on eye* (چشم/ chashm) in order to show their regards towards their parents.

3.5. Thanking

Thanking is expressing gratitude to someone for providing something, including services and favors [Hornby 1985: 1043]. The respondents in both British and Persian family settings used almost the same types of thanking, dependent on the situation. In terms of Columas [1981: 77-78], they were “thanks for a favor” in situations 1 and 2, and “thanks for a promise” in situation 4. They also thanked “for a promise” + “for material goods (services)”/ “for some action resulting from a request, wish or order” in situations 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8. In Persian family setting, in bottom-up context, the respondents used “thanks that imply indebtedness” in situation 5 as well. The types of thanking employed in our analysis have been extracted from:

- thanks ex ante (for a promise, offer, invitation)
 - thanks ex post (for a favor, invitation (afterwards))
- thanks for material goods (gifts, services)
 - thanks for immaterial goods (desires, compliments, congratulations, information)
- thanks for some action initiated by the benefactor
 - thanks for some action resulting from a request, wish or order by the beneficiary
- thanks that imply indebtedness
 - thanks that do not imply indebtedness

Our contrastive analysis of thanking in British and Persian family settings in the contexts of top-down, bottom-up and linear also revealed some similarities and differences. The similarities concerned with the types of thanking, and the differences concerned with the frequency, the expressivity, and the length of gratitude utterances, dependent on the context.

In both lingua-cultures, the respondents used the conventional expression of thanking *thank you*, which, in Persian language, equals to a wide variety of thanking expressions with the same meaning, for instance ممنونم/ mamnoonam, متشکرم/ motashakeram, دستت درد نکه / dastet dard nakone (as a gratitude utterance with the second-person singular pronoun *you* (تو/ to) and the singular form of verb in case of addressing by *tu*-form in French and *mbi*-form in Russian), دستتون درد نکه / dastetoon dard nakone (as a gratitude utterance with the second-person plural pronoun *you* (شما/ shoma) and the plural form of verb in case of addressing by *vous*-form in French and *Bbi*-form in Russian), مرسی/ mersi) in 1 pragmatic move, or a combination of *thank you*, followed by a compliment in 2 pragmatic moves.

In British family, the respondents used almost the same types of thanking with the same expressivity and the same length of gratitude utterances in all the contexts of top-down, bottom-up and linear between parents-children, children-parents and spouses in 1 or 2 pragmatic moves. In Persian family, the parents used the same types of thanking as the parents in British family:

- thank you (with the Persian equivalents of ممنونم/ mamnoonam, متشکرم/ motashakeram, دستت درد نکه / dastet dard nakone (as a gratitude utterance with the second-person singular pronoun *you* (تو/ to) and the singular form of verb in case of addressing by *tu*-form in French and *mbi*-form in Russian), دستتون درد نکه / dastetoon dard nakone (as a gratitude utterance with the second-person plural pronoun *you* (شما/ shoma) and the plural form of verb in case of addressing by *vous*-form in French and *Bbi*-form in Russian), مرسی/ mersi)
- thank you + intensifier (e.g., *very (much)*, *too*, *so* (خیلی/ kheili), *extremely* (بینهایت/ bi-nahayat), *really*, *real* (واقعا، واقعی/ vaghean, vagheyi), *amazingly* (به طرز شگفت آوری/ be tarze shegeft-avari), *definitely* (قطعاً/ ghat-an), *fully*, *totally*, *quite*, *entirely*, *perfectly* (کاملاً/ kamelan)

However, one significant difference was observed in bottom-up context in Persian family. The Persian children expressed their gratitude towards the parents in a more elaborate way, using the model of *thank you* + compliment + intensifier, more frequently than the children in British family. In Persian context, the children

thanked their parents through long complimentary utterances in 2 pragmatic moves (Table 3.31.). The models of thanking employed in our analysis in both symmetrical and asymmetrical contexts of British and Persian family settings are:

- thank you (+ intensifier)
- thank you + compliment (+ intensifier)

Furthermore, in British and Persian family settings, the respondents complimented each other based on the categories classified by Manes & Wolfson [1981: 120]:

- performances/ ability/ skills
- personality traits
- appearance/ possessions

Our contrastive analysis presents information about the frequency, the expressivity as well as the length of gratitude utterances in 1 or 2 pragmatic moves.

3.5.1. Thanking in top-down context: Parents to children

Our findings, explicated in Table (3.30.), revealed that in top-down context, when the parents thank the children, in all the situations, the British and Persian respondents used two models of 1 or 2 pragmatic moves:

- 1 pragmatic move:
 - thank you (+ intensifier)

(239) *Thank you (so much).* (mother to daughter)

(240) *Thank you (very much).* (father to son)

خیلی ممنونم.

kheyli mamnoonam.

- 2 pragmatic moves:
 - thank you + compliment (+ intensifier)

(241) *Thank you. You are such a (very) beautiful angel.* (mother to daughter)

(242) *Thank you. You are (really) a quick and responsible boy.* (father to son)

مرسی. تو واقعا یه پسر فرز و مسئولیت پذیر هستی.

mersi. to vaghean ye pesare ferz o mas-ooliyat pazir hasti.

It is worth reviewing that the British respondents, in response to the request of the parents, accepted the request less frequently than their Persian counterparts: 82% to 95% (in situation 4) and 64% to 84% (in situation 6), while all the respondents (100%) in British and Persian contexts accepted the request of a parent in situation 1 (Table 3.22.). The results of the acceptance of the parents' requests, led to the parents' gratitude, analyzed in this section.

Our findings illustrated that 100% of the British and Persian respondents thanked the children by the type of thanking "for a favor", using the model of *thank you* (+ intensifier) in 1 pragmatic move (in situation 1), while this type of thanking in the same model in 1 pragmatic move, was observed among the British respondents less frequently than their Persian counterparts: 11% to 33% (in situation 4) and 13% to 35% (in situation 6). Though the type of thanking "for a favor" using the model of *thank you* (+ intensifier) in 1 pragmatic move was revealed in both lingua-cultures, our material disclosed some differences in the usage of the model of thanking between the British and Persian respondents.

Based on our British data, the respondents not only used *thank you* less frequently than the Persian respondents: 5% to 12% (in situation 4) and 4% to 14% (in situation 6), but also used *thank you* with an intensifier less frequently than the respondents in Persian family: 6% to 21% (in situation 4) and 9% to 21% (in situation 6). The model of thanking without an intensifier was revealed among all the British and Persian respondents (100%) in situation 1 (Table 3.30.):

(243) *Thank you (so much). (mother to daughter)*

(244) *I (really) thank you. (father to son)*

(245) *Thank you (very much). (mother to daughter)*

خیلی ازت ممنونم.

kheyli azat mamnoonam.

(246) *I (truly) thank you. (father to son)*

واقعا ممنونم.

vaghean azat mamnoonam.

Moreover, in both British and Persian family settings, the respondents used the type of thanking “for a promise” + “for material goods (services)”/ “for some action resulting from a request”, using the model of *thank you* + compliment (+ intensifier), in 2 pragmatic moves: 71% and 51% among the British respondents, 62% and 58% among the respondents in Persian family (in situations 4 and 6 respectively):

(247) *Thank you. **You are (very) helpful.*** (mother to daughter)

(248) *Thank you. **No one like you could do it (perfectly) with this accuracy.***
(father to son)

(249) *Thank you. **You (really) are my helping little angel.*** (mother to daughter)

ممنونم. تو واقعا فرشته کوچولوی یاریگر منی.

mamnoom. to vaghean fereshte koochoolooye yarigare mani.

(250) *Thank you. **Such a big, (quite) perfect job.*** (father to son)

دستت درد نکنه. کارت واقعا عالییه.

dastet dard nakone. karet vaghean aliye.

Accordingly, our analysis of the responses in this type of thanking, using the model of *thank you* + compliment (+ intensifier), revealed that the respondents in British family used the model of *thank you* + compliment of performance in 2 pragmatic moves more frequently than their Persian counterparts: 33% to 27% (in situation 4) and 30% to 26% (in situation 6):

(251) *Thank you. **I (really) like the way you manage this job.*** (mother to daughter)

(252) *Thank you. **I feel proud when you take this big responsibility.*** (mother to daughter)

(253) *Thank you. **Good job.*** (father to son)

(254) *Thank you. **Your skills (extremely) impact me every day, son.*** (father to son)

(255) *Thank you. **Last time, I saw how (perfectly) you took care of your sister, even better than me.*** (mother to daughter)

مرسی. دفعه قبل دیدم چقدر عالی، حتی بهتر از من، از خواهرت مراقبت کردی.

mersi. dafe ghabl didam cheghadr ali, hata behtar az man, az khaharet moraghebat kardi.

(256) *Thank you. I feel (extremely) relieved when I assign something to you.*
(mother to daughter)

ممنونم. وقتی کاری به تو میسپرم خیالم بینهایت راحته.

mamnoonam. vaghti kari be to misparam khiyalam bi-nahayat rahate.

(257) *Thank you. Because of your good job, I think it's time to assign you another bigger responsibilities.* (father to son)

دستت درد نکنه. به خاطر کار خوبت فکر میکنم وقتشه مسئولیتهای بزرگ تر دیگه ای بهت بسپارم.
dastet dard nakone. bekhatere kare khoobet fekr mikonam vaghteshe mas-ooliyat-haye bozorgtare digeyi behet besparam.

(258) *Thank you. I can (truly) count on you to do the right thing.* (father to son)

مرسی. من واقعا میتونم رو تو برای انجام کار درست حساب کنم.

mersi. man vaghean mitoonam roo to baraye anjame kare dorost hesab konam.

Besides, the British respondents used the model of *thank you* + compliment of personality traits in 2 pragmatic moves less frequently than the respondents in Persian family: 26% to 30% (in situation 4) and 11% to 25% (in situation 6):

(259) *Thank you. You are a (very) smart cookie.* (mother to daughter)

(260) *Thank you. You are a wonderful member of our family.* (mother to daughter)

(261) *Thank you. You are strong enough to do such a big job.* (father to son)

(262) *Thank you. You are (amazingly) the best version of myself in doing things excellent.* (father to son)

(263) *Thank you. Your interest for being helpful deserves everything nice in the universe.* (mother to daughter)

دستت درد نکنه. اشتیاق برای کمک حال بودن سزاوار همه چیزهای خوب دنیاست.

dastet dard nakone. eshtiyaghet baraye komak-hal boodan sezavare hameye chiz-haye khoobe donyast.

(264) Thank you. **You are (truly) my stress reliever.** (mother to daughter)

دستت درد نكنه. تو واقعا نگرانی رو در وجود من از بین میبری.

dastet dard nakone. to vaghean negarani ro dar vojood man az beyn mibary.

(265) Thank you. **You are not only a (very) good boy, but also, from now on, I can count on you as a grown-up man.** (father to son)

ممنونم. تو نه تنها پسر خیلی خوبی هستی، بلکه میتونم از حالا به بعد به عنوان یه مرد روت حساب کنم.
motashakeram. to na tanha pesare kheyli khoobi hasti, balke az hala be baad, mitoonam be onvane ye mard root hesab konam.

(266) Thank you. **Your hard-working hasn't gone unnoticed.** (father to son)

دستت درد نكنه. سختكوشیت از چشمم پنهان نمونده.

dastet dard nakone. sakht kooshit az cheshmam penhan namoonde.

It is worth stating that the model of *thank you* + compliment of personality traits with an intensifier (e.g., *very (much)*, *too*, *so* (خیلی/ kheili), *extremely* (ببینهایت/ bi-nahayat), *really*, *real* (واقعی/ vaghean, vagheyi), *amazingly* (به طرز شگفت/ be tarze shegeft-avari), *definitely* (قطعاً/ ghat-an), *fully*, *totally*, *quite*, *entirely*, *perfectly* (کاملاً/ kamelan) was observed among the British respondents more frequently than the respondents in Persian family: 12% to 5% (in situation 4) and 10% to 7% (in situation 6):

(267) Thank you. **You are (extremely) lovely.** (mother to daughter)

(268) Thank you. **You are (definitely) my hard-working big man.** (father to son)

(269) Thank you. **You are a (very) sweet girl, specifically at the times you help me.** (mother to daughter)

تو دختر خیلی شیرینی هستی، مخصوصاً مواقعی که به من کمک میکنی.
motashakeram. to dokhtare kheyli shirini hasti, makhsoosan mavagheyi ke be man komak mikoni.

(270) Thank you. **You have become a (very) key, important person in our family.** (father to son)

ممنونم. تو آدم خیلی کلیدی مهمی در خانواده ما شدی.
mamnoonam. to adame kheyli kelidiye mohemi dar khanevadeye ma shodi.

Table 3.30. Thanking: Parents to children

Types of thanking	Models of thanking	Situation (1) Father-daughter		Situation (4) Mother-daughter		Situation (6) Father-son		Total	
		British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %
Thanks “for a favor”	Thank you (+ intensifier)	100	100	11	33	13	35	41	56
	Thank you	100	100	5	12	4	14	3	9
	Thank you + intensifier	0	0	6	21	9	21	38	47
Thanks “for a promise” + “for material goods (services)”/ “for some action resulting from a request”	Thank you + compliment (+ intensifier)	0	0	71	62	51	58	41	40
	Thank you + compliment of performance/ skills/ abilities	0	0	33	27	30	26	21	18
	Thank you + compliment of personality traits	0	0	26	30	11	25	12	18
	Thank you + compliment of personality traits + intensifier	0	0	12	5	10	7	7	4

Our material disclosed that in both British and Persian family settings, the parents used Positive Politeness Strategy “claim common ground: notice, attend to hearer: his interests, wants, needs and goods” in order to express their gratitude to the children [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 103-104].

3.5.2. Thanking in bottom-up context: Children to parents

In both lingua-cultures, in bottom-up context, when the children thank the parents (Table 3.31.), the respondents used 1 pragmatic move of *thank you* (+ intensifier), and 2 pragmatic moves including *thank you* followed by a compliment, or by a compliment, which is emphasized by an intensifier. However, some differences were revealed. Our British data demonstrated that the respondents in this context had a great tendency to thank their parents with the type of thanking “for a favor” using the model of *thank you* (+ intensifier) in 1 pragmatic move more frequently than the respondents in Persian family: 85% to 19% (in situation 2) and 65% to 16% (in situation 5).

Other differences concerned with the usage of intensifiers. The British respondents used *thank you* without an intensifier more frequently than the Persian respondents: 85% to 8% (in situation 2) and 55% to 3% (in situation 5), while, on the contrary, the respondents in Persian family preferred to intensify their gratitude towards the parents, using *thank you* with an intensifier, more frequently than their British counterparts: 11% to 0% (in situation 2) and 13% to 10% (in situation 5):

(271) *Thank you. (son to mother)*

(272) *Thank you (very much). (son to father)*

(273) *Thank you (so much). (son to mother)*

خیلی متشکرم.

kheyli motashakeram.

(274) *Thank you. (son to father)*

دستتون درد نکنه.

dastetoon dard nakone.

Besides, our findings illustrated that the respondents in British family setting thanked the parents with the type of thanking “for a promise” + “for material goods (services)”/ “for some action resulting from a request” using the model of *thank you* + compliment (+ intensifier) in 2 pragmatic moves less frequently than the respondents in Persian family: 15% to 81% (in situation 2) and 35% to 84% (in situation 5). Accordingly, our contrastive analysis of the responses in this type of thanking, clarified that 31% of the respondents in Persian family used the model of *thank you* + compliment of performance in 2 pragmatic moves (in situation 5), while this model of thanking was not observed to thank the parents among the British respondents (Table 3.31.):

(275) *Thank you. Your supports make me confident. (son to father)*

دستتون درد نكنه. حمايتهاى شما منو دلگرم ميكنه.

dastetoon dard nakone. hemayat-haye shoma mano delgarm mikone.

(276) *Thank you. I am proud of your specialty and kindness. (son to father)*

دستتون درد نكنه. من به مهربونى و تخصص شما افتخار ميكنم.

dastetoon dard nakone. man be takhasos va mehrabooni shoma eftekhar mikonam.

Moreover, based on our data, the model of *thank you* + compliment of personality traits without an intensifier in 2 pragmatic moves was used by the respondents in British context less frequently than their Persian counterparts: 10% to 37% (in situation 2) and 25% to 31% (in situation 5):

(277) *Thank you. Your heart is made of gold. (son to mother)*

(278) *Thank you. You're my guardian angel. (son to mother)*

(279) *Thank you. You are perfect in everything. (son to father)*

(280) *Thank you. You are simply the best. (son to father)*

(281) *Thank you. I have told it to you a thousand times and I tell it again that you are my own unique mother. (son to mother)*

متشكرم. هزار بار بهتون گفتم يه بار ديگه هم ميگم كه شما مامان منحصر به فرد خودمى.

motashakeram. hezar bar behetoon goftam ye bare dige ham migam ke shoma mamane monhaser be farde khodami.

(282) *Thank you. I never stop needing your love because you are my back.*

(son to mother)

دستتون درد نكنه. هيچ وقت از عشق شما بي نياز نميشوم چون شما پشت و پناه من هستيد.

dastetoon dard nakone. hich vaght az eshghe shoma bi niyaz nemisham chon shoma posht o panahe man hastid.

(283) *Thank you. I admire your intelligence when you inspire me every day.*

(son to father)

دستتون درد نكنه. من هوش شمارو تحسین میکنم وقتی که هر روز الهام بخش من هستيد.

dastetoon dard nakone. man hooshe shoma ro tahsin mikonam vaghti ke har rooz elham-bakhshe man hastid.

(284) *Thank you. Without your help, I would be (totally) lost.* (son to father)

ممنونم. بدون کمک شما، من كاملاً گيج ميبودم.

mamnoonam. bedoone komake shoma man kamelan gij miboodam.

Based on our material, the respondents in Persian family used the model of *thank you* + compliment of personality traits with an intensifier (e.g., *very (much), too, so* (خیلی/ kheili), *extremely* (ببینهایت/ bi-nahayat), *really, real* (واقعا، واقعی/ vaghean, vagheyi), *amazingly* (به طرز شگفت آوری/ be tarze shegeft-avari), *definitely* (قطعاً/ ghat-an), *fully, totally, quite, entirely, perfectly* (كاملاً/ kamelan) more frequently than the respondents in British family: 44% to 5% (in situation 2) and 16% to 10% (in situation 5):

(285) *Thank you. You are (so) nice.* (son to mother)

(286) *Thank you. It's (very) kind of you.* (son to mother)

(287) *Thank you. You are (truly) inspiring.* (son to father)

(288) *Thank you. You are a (real) champion in my life.* (son to father)

(289) *Thank you. You are (quite) a miracle in my life, coming and going.*

(son to mother)

دستتون درد نكنه. شما در زندگي من كاملاً يه معجزه هستيد كه ميريد و ميايد.

dastetoon dard nakone. shoma dar zendegiye man kamelan ye mojeze hastid ke mirid o miyayd.

(290) *Thank you. You are the (extremely) caring Mom, who Heaven is under your feet.* (son to mother)

دستتون درد نكنه. شما همون مامان بی نهایت مراقب من هستيد كه بهشت زیر پاهاتونه.
dastetoon dard nakone. shoma hamoon mamane bi-nahayat moraghebe man hastid
ke behesht zire pahatoone.

(291) *Thank you. My difficulties are (fully) eased with your magic wisdom.*
(son to father)

ممنونم. سختی های من با درایت جادویی شما تمام و کمال آسون ميشن.
mamnoonam. sakhti-haye man ba derayate jadooyie shoma tamam o kamal asoon
mishan.

(292) *Thank you. You are (definitely) my biggest hero in the life.* (son to father)

متشكرم. شما قطعاً بزرگترین قهرمان من در زندگی هستيد.
motashakeram. shoma ghat-an bozorg-tarin ghahramane man dar zendegi hastid.

Another difference revealed in British and Persian family settings concerned with the type of thanking “for a promise” + “implies indebtedness” using the model of *thank you* + compliment of performance in 2 pragmatic moves, which were only observed among the Persian respondents: 6% (in situation 5):

(293) *Thank you. I owe you a debt of gratitude for your help.* (son to father)

مرسی. من یه تشکر بابت کمکتون به شما مديونم.
mersi. man ye tashakor babate komakatoon be shoma madyoonam.

(294) *Thank you. I am indebted to you for your help.* (son to father)

دستتون درد نكنه. من مديون كمك شما هستم.
dastetoon dard nakone. man madyoone komake shoma hastam.

Table 3.31. Thanking: Children to Parents

Types of thanking	Models of thanking	Situation (2) Son-mother		Situation (5) Son-father		Total	
		British	Persian	British	Persian	British	Persian
		%	%	%	%	%	%
Thanks “for a favor”	Thank you (+ intensifier)	85	19	65	16	75	17
	Thank you	85	8	55	3	70	5

	Thank you + intensifier	0	11	10	13	5	12
Thanks “for a promise” + “for material goods (services)”/ “for some action resulting from a request”	Thank you + compliment (+ intensifier)	15	81	35	84	25	83
	Thank you + compliment of performance/ skills/ abilities	0	0	0	31	0	16
	Thank you + compliment of personality traits	10	37	25	31	17	34
	Thank you + compliment of personality traits + intensifier	5	44	10	16	8	30
Thanks “for a promise” + “implies indebtedness”	Thank you + compliment of performance/ skills/ abilities	0	0	0	6	0	3

Our contrastive analysis illustrated that in bottom-up context, the British and Persian children used Positive Politeness Strategy “claim common ground: notice, attend to hearer: his interests, wants, needs and goods” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 103-104] in order to thank the parents, however, the children in Persian family used also Positive Politeness Strategy of exaggeration “exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with hearer” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 104-106] in order to show gratitude and pay respect to their parents simultaneously.

Though in top-down and bottom-up contexts, both the models of *thank you* (+ intensifier) in 1 pragmatic move, and *thank you* + compliment (+ intensifier) in 2 pragmatic moves were observed in our British and Persian data, our findings highlighted seven differences in the frequency, the length of gratitude, and its expressivity among the British and Persian respondents:

1) In top-down context, the Persian parents used *thank you* (+ intensifier) in 1 pragmatic move more frequently than their British counterparts: 56% to 41%, while there is no significant difference in the frequency of using the modal of *thank you* + compliment (+ intensifier) in 2 pragmatic moves among the British and Persian respondents: 41% of the respondents in British context and 40% among the Persian respondents.

2) The Persian parents used *thank you* with an intensifier in 1 pragmatic move more frequently than their counterparts in British family: 47% to 38%, while on the contrary, the parents in British family used *thank you* + compliment with an intensifier in 2 pragmatic moves more frequently than their Persian counterparts: 7% to 4%.

3) Despite the facts that there is no significant difference in the frequency of the respondents using the model of *thank you* + compliment (+ intensifier) in 2 pragmatic moves between both lingua-cultures, and the respondents in British family used the model of *thank you* + compliment with an intensifier in 2 pragmatic moves more frequently than the respondents in Persian family, our findings disclosed that the Persian parents gave preference to showing their gratitude to the children through longer utterances with a higher level of expressivity than their British counterpart. This may also contribute to our results in defining the cultural value of being extroverted among the Persian respondents (refer to chapter 2).

4) In bottom-up context, though the British children used the model of *thank you* (+ intensifier) in 1 pragmatic move more frequently than their Persian counterparts: 75% to 17%, the Persian respondents preferred to use *thank you* with an intensifier in 1 pragmatic move more frequently than the British children: 12% to 5%.

5) The children in Persian family showed a great tendency to use the model of *thank you* + compliment (+ intensifier) in 2 pragmatic moves more than the children in British context: 83% to 25%.

6) The Persian children used the model of *thank you* + compliment of personality traits with an intensifier more frequently than the children in British family: 30% to 8%. It is worth mentioning that the intensifiers were only observed in complimenting of parents' personality traits in both lingua-cultures.

7) Among the Persian children, the type of thanking "for a promise" + "implies indebtedness" using the model of *thank you* + compliment of performance in 2 pragmatic moves was rarely observed: 3%, however, this type of thanking was not revealed among the British children.

One important significant characteristic, highlighted in our Persian material in bottom-up context, is using *vous*-form of addressing, and the plural form of verbs when the children address the parents in order to show their gratitude to them (e.g., *you are the most amazing father in the universe* (شما شگفت انگیزترین بابای جهان هستید) / *shoma shegeft angiz-tarin babaye jahan hastid*), *you are the unique father in the world* (شما بی نظیرترین بابای دنیا هستید) / *shoma bi nazir-tarin babaye donya hastid*), *you untie all gordian/blind knots with your magic fingers* (شما با انگشتهای جادویی تون همه / *shoma ba angosht-haye jadoo-eetoon hameye gere-haye koor ro baz mikonid*), *Mom, you are the angel of my life* (مامان شما فرشته زندگی من / *maman shoma fereshteye zendegiye man hastid*), *how could I be like you such a kind and helpful person, Mom?* (چطور میتونم مثل شما اینقدر مهربون و کمک حال باشم، / *cheton mitoonam mesle shoma inghadr mehraboon va komak-hal basham, maman?*).

Our analysis caused us to understand that in British family in top-down and bottom-up contexts, the parents and children used the same politeness strategy in the same length, the same intensity and the same expressivity to thank each other. Though in Persian family setting, the parents used the same politeness strategy as the British parents, and no significant difference was observed in the types of thanking in top-down context in both lingua-cultures, our data demonstrated that the Persian parents are more expressive and use longer utterances in showing gratitude to their children than their British counterparts.

Furthermore, in bottom-up context, the Persian children preferred to use longer complimentary utterances with an intensifier as well as the formality markers of *vous*-form of addressing, namely, the second-person plural pronoun *you* (شما/ *shoma*) as well as the plural form of verbs, to thank their parents. The results may illustrate a higher level of formality, a non-egalitarian social order and an asymmetrical role position in children-parents communication in Persian context, in which the children are obliged to thank their parents in an exaggerated way to express respect and dignity to the age and the status of the parents in family.

Meanwhile, using Positive Politeness Strategy of exaggeration “exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with hearer” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 104-106] by the Persian children may concern with the statement of power distance in this culture, and emphasize the higher status of the parents and the necessity of showing exaggerated gratitude for a favor, received from the parents. Besides, our findings may suggest that in Persian family, the children use more emotive politeness towards the parents than their counterparts in British family. The type of thanking, implying indebtedness in our Persian material, with which the children express their owing towards the parents, in a great debt of gratitude because of their help, supports this statement. This type of thanking was not observed in our British material.

3.5.3. Thanking in linear context: Spouses

Our contrastive analysis, summarized in Table (3.32.), explained that in linear context, in all the situations, when the spouses thank the couple, the British and Persian respondents used 1 pragmatic move of *thank you* (+ intensifier), and 2 pragmatic moves of *thank you* + compliment (+ intensifier).

It is important to review that the British spouses, in response to the request of the couple, accepted the request more frequently than their Persian counterparts: 62% to 47% (in situation 7) and 73% to 59% (in situation 8). All the respondents (100%) accepted the request of the couple in situation 3 (Table 3.28.). The result of the acceptance of the request among the spouses, led to the couples’ gratitude, analyzed in this section.

Based on our findings, the respondents in British family showed gratitude to the wife with the type of thanking “for a promise”, using the model of *thank you* (+ intensifier) in 1 pragmatic move, more frequently than the respondents in Persian family: 87% to 68% (in situation 3) and 15% to 10% (in situation 8):

(295) *Thank you (very much). (husband to wife)*

(296) *Thank you (so much). (husband to wife)*

خیلی متشکرم.

kheyli motashakeram.

While the British respondents used *thank you* without an intensifier more frequently than the respondents in Persian context: 63% to 37% (in situation 3) and 10% to 3% (in situation 8), our data disclosed that the Persian respondents preferred using the model of *thank you* with an intensifier (e.g., *very (much), too, so* (خیلی/ kheili), *extremely* (بینهایت/ bi-nahayat), *really, real* (واقعا، واقعی/ vaghean, vagheyi), *amazingly* (به طرز شگفت آوری/ be tarze shegeft-avari), *definitely* (قطعا/ ghat-an), *fully, totally, quite, entirely, perfectly* (کاملا/ kamelan) more frequently than their British counterparts: 31% to 24% (in situation 3) and 7% to 5% (in situation 8). The models of *thank you* with or without an intensifier were not observed in situation 7 in both lingua-cultures (Table 3.32.):

(297) *Thank you (very much). (husband to wife)*

(298) *I (truly) thank you. (husband to wife)*

واقعا سپاسگزارم.

vaghean sepasgozaram.

Though in both British and Persian linear contexts, the respondents showed their gratitude to the couple with the type of thanking “for material goods (services)”/ “for some action resulting from a request”, using the model of *thank you* + compliment (+ intensifier) in 2 pragmatic moves, our findings explored different results. The British respondents thanked the couple in 2 pragmatic moves less frequently than their counterparts in Persian family: 13% to 32% (in situation 3), while the same type and the same model of thanking were used by the respondents in British context more frequently than the respondents in Persian family: 62% to 47% and 58% to 49% in situations 7 and 8 respectively (Table 3.32.). Based on our material, the British respondents used the model of *thank you* + compliment of appearance in 2 pragmatic moves less frequently than the respondents in Persian context: 2% to 14% (in situation 3), 4% to 12% (in situation 7) and 12% to 18% (in situation 8):

(299) *Thank you. You are my beautiful girl. (husband to wife)*

(300) *Thank you. Your face is more magnificent when giving me such good news. (wife to husband)*

(301) Thank you. **The best tea is coming with my shiny queen.** (husband to wife)

بهترین چایی داره با ملکه زیبای من میاد.

behtarin chay dare ba malakeye zibaye man miyad.

(302) Thank you. **You look more handsome in my eyes today.** (wife to husband)

ممنونم. تو امروز به چشم من خوشتیپ تر میای.

mamnoonam. to emrooz be cheshme man khoshtip-tar miyay.

Our data highlighted that in both lingua-cultures, the British and Persian respondents used the model of *thank you* + compliment of performance in 2 pragmatic moves almost equally between the spouses: 25% to 26% (in situations 3 and 8) and 16% to 16% (in situation 7):

(303) Thank you. **It is a great feeling when I can count on your help at any time.** (husband to wife)

(304) Thank you. **You make me surprised with your quick, positive response.** (wife to husband)

(305) Thank you. **You (totally) make my life easy.** (husband to wife)

دستت درد نکنه. تو کاملاً زندگی منو آسون میکنی.

dastet dard nakone. to kamelan zendegiye mano asoon mikoni.

(306) Thank you. **World would be paradise if all keep their words like you.** (wife to husband)

مرسی. دنیا بهشت میشد اگه همه مثل تو به قولشون عمل میکردند.

mersi. donya behesht mishod age hame mesle to be gholeshoon amal mikardan.

In British context, the respondents manifested a greater tendency to use the model of *thank you* + compliment of personality traits in 2 pragmatic moves than the respondents in Persian context: 28% to 14% (in situation 7) and 12% to 8% (in situation 8):

(307) Thank you. **You are my angel.** (husband to wife)

(308) Thank you. **You are (amazingly) an example of love and generosity.** (wife to husband)

(309) *Thank you. You are a brilliant example of supporting angel.* (husband to wife)

دستت درد نكنه. تو نمونه بارزى از فرشته حامى هستى.

dastet dard nakone. to nemooneye barezi az fereshteye hami hasti.

(310) *Thank you. You are (very) generous.* (wife to husband)

دستت درد نكنه. تو خيلى دست و دل بازى.

dastet dard nakone. to kheyli dast o delbazi.

Based on our findings, the model of *thank you* + compliment with an intensifier in 2 pragmatic moves was used among the British respondents more frequently than their Persian counterparts: 7% to 3% (in situation 3), 14% to 5% (in situation 7) and 13% to 12% (in situation 8). Though the model of *thank you* + compliment of appearance with an intensifier in 2 pragmatic moves was observed rarely in both lingua-cultures, our data specified that the British respondents used this model of thanking more frequently than the respondents in Persian context: 7% to 3% (in situation 3), 8% to 0% (in situation 7) and 8% to 6% (in situation 8):

(311) *Thank you. Your beauty is (so) glowing.* (husband to wife)

(312) *Thank you. You are (very) handsome.* (wife to husband)

(313) *Thank you. You (amazingly) look gorgeous.* (husband to wife)

دستت درد نكنه. تو به طرز شگفت آورى زيبايى.

dastet dard nakone. to be tarze shegeft-avari zibayi.

(314) *Thank you. You are (extremely) beautiful in my eyes.* (husband to wife)

ممنونم. تو در چشمى من بينهايت زيبايى.

mamnoonam. to dar cheshmaye man bi-nahayat zibayi.

In both British and Persian family settings, the respondents used the model of *thank you* + compliment of personality traits with an intensifier in 2 pragmatic moves almost equally: 6% to 5% (in situation 7) and 5% to 6% (in situation 8), while this model of thanking was not revealed among the British and Persian respondents in situation 3:

(315) *Thank you. You are (too) helpful, even more than you realize.* (husband to wife)

(316) *Thank you. You (truly) attend to my wishes. (wife to husband)*

(317) *Thank you. You are (definitely) perfect in every role. (husband to wife)*

دستت درد نکه. تو قطعاً در هر نقشی بدون نقص عمل میکنی.

dastet dard nakone. to ghat-an dar har naghshi bedoone naghsh amal mikoni.

(318) *Thank you. You are (really) amazing in surprising me. (wife to husband)*

متشکرم. تو واقعاً در غافلگیر کردن من بی نظیری.

motashakeram. to vaghean dar ghafel-gir kardane man bi-naziri.

Table 3.32. Thanking: Spouses

Types of thanking	Models of thanking	Situation (3) Husband-wife		Situation (7) Wife-husband		Situation (8) Husband-wife		Total	
		British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British h %	Persian %	British h %	Persian %
Thanks “for a promise”	Thank you (+ intensifier)	87	68	0	0	15	10	34	26
	Thank you	63	37	0	0	10	3	24	13
	Thank you + intensifier	24	31	0	0	5	7	10	13
Thanks “for material goods (services)/ “for some action resulting from a request”	Thank you + compliment (+ intensifier)	13	32	62	47	58	49	44	43
	Thank you + compliment of appearance / possessions	2	14	4	12	12	18	6	15
	Thank you + compliment of performance/ skills/ abilities	4	15	16	16	21	11	14	14
	Thank you + compliment of personality traits	0	0	28	14	12	8	13	7
	Thank you + compliment + intensifier	7	3	14	5	13	12	11	7

Thank you + compliment of appearance / possessions + intensifier	7	3	8	0	8	6	7	3
Thank you + compliment of personality traits + intensifier	0	0	6	5	5	6	4	4

Our findings represented that in both lingua-cultures, in linear context, the spouses used Positive Politeness Strategy “claim common ground: notice, attend to hearer: his interests, wants, needs and goods” to show gratitude to the couple [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 103-104], however, there are two interesting differences:

1) The British respondents used the model of *thank you* (+ intensifier) in 1 pragmatic move more frequently than the Persian respondents: 34% to 26%, while the respondents in Persian family gave preference to thank the couple, using the same model with an intensifier in 1 pragmatic move, more frequently than their British counterparts: 13% to 10%.

2) In both lingua-cultures, the respondents used the model of *thank you* + compliment (+ intensifier) in 2 pragmatic moves almost equally: 44% of the British respondents and 43% of the respondents in Persian family, however, our findings revealed that the respondents in British context gave preference to use the models of *thank you* + compliment of appearance and *thank you* + compliment of personality traits with an intensifier in 2 pragmatic moves more frequently than their counterparts in Persian family: 11% to 7%.

The fact that the British and Persian respondents showed a greater tendency to thank the couple in 2 pragmatic moves rather than using 1 pragmatic move: 44% to 34% among the British respondents, and 43% to 26% among the respondents in Persian family may suggest that the spouses, in both lingua-cultures, prefer to use emotive politeness through long utterances to express their gratitude to the couple.

Our contrastive analysis of thanking in all the contexts of top-down, bottom-up and linear in British and Persian family settings illustrated that both the British and Persian family members used almost the same types of thanking, however they revealed a clear preference for different models of thanking in different linguistic patterns.

Although the model of thanking, *thank you* (+ intensifier) in 1 pragmatic move, was used in both lingua-cultures in top-down context, our data showed that the Persian parents used 1 pragmatic move to thank the children more frequently than the parents in British context: 56% to 41%. Furthermore, while the parents in Persian family exhibited a greater tendency to use *thank you* without an intensifier than the parents in British context: 9% to 3%, the same result was observed in Persian context when the parents expressed their gratitude towards the children adding an intensifier to the model of *thank you* in 1 pragmatic move: 47% to 38%. Besides, in top-down context, the British parents used 1 and 2 pragmatic moves equally to thank the children: 41% to 41%, while in Persian family, the parents gave preference to use 1 pragmatic move instead of bringing long utterances with a compliment in 2 pragmatic moves: 56% to 40%.

In bottom-up context, the British children preferred to thank the parents using the model of *thank you* (+ intensifier) in 1 pragmatic move more frequently than the Persian children: 75% to 17%. While the British children showed a considerable tendency to use the model of *thank you* without an intensifier than their Persian counterparts: 70% to 5%, the Persian children preferred to use the same model of thanking with an intensifier in 1 pragmatic move more frequently than the children in British family: 12% to 5%. Moreover, the more preference of the Persian children to use 2 pragmatic moves of *thank you* + compliment (+ intensifier) in comparison to the children in British family was revealed considerably: 83% to 25%. In fact, the Persian children manifested a great tendency to thank their parents in 2 pragmatic moves, using the model of *thank you* + compliment with an intensifier, than the children in British family as well: 30% to 8%.

Due to the facts that in top-down context, the British parents used 1 and 2 pragmatic moves equally (41% to 41%), while the Persian parents preferred to use 1 pragmatic move more frequently than 2 pragmatic moves (56% to 40%), and also in bottom-up context, the British children used 1 pragmatic move more frequently than 2 pragmatic moves (75% to 25%), while the Persian children gave preference to use long utterances with an intensifier in 2 pragmatic moves (83% to 17%) may indicate that there is an informality, an egalitarian social order and a symmetrical role position between children-parents and parents-children communication in British culture, while on the contrary, in Persian culture, due to a hierarchical system of communication and an index of a higher power distance between parents and children, there is a formality, a non-egalitarian social order and an asymmetrical role position in children-parents and parents-children communication, in which the children intensify their gratitude towards the parents through long utterances in more expressivity and exaggeration.

To be more explicit, the way, with which the Persian children thank the parents explains that the children in Persian culture use too many words more than necessary to thank their parents. They are more expressive, use a higher degree of verbosity and longer utterances than their British counterparts, to thank their parents, as taking the obligation of the status seriously.

Considering our data, in linear context, the British spouses used 1 pragmatic move of *thank you* (+ intensifier) more frequently than the Persian spouses: 34% to 26%, while no significant difference was observed among the respondents in British and Persian family settings when the spouses thank the couple in 2 pragmatic moves of *thank you* + compliment (+ intensifier): 44% to 43%, respectively. Meanwhile, in both lingua-cultures, the spouses showed a greater tendency to thank the couple in 2 pragmatic moves including *thank you* + compliment (+ intensifier) instead of using the model of *thank you* (+ intensifier) in 1 pragmatic move: 44% to 34% among the British spouses, and 43% to 26% among the spouses in Persian family.

In British family setting, in all the contexts, the parents, children and spouses used Positive Politeness Strategy “claim common ground: notice, attend to hearer:

his interests, wants, needs and goods” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 103-104] in order to show their gratitude to each other, which depict an informality, an egalitarian social order and a symmetrical role position in top-down, bottom-up and linear contexts in this culture. Though, in Persian family setting, in top-down, bottom-up and linear contexts, the family members used the same Positive Politeness Strategy “claim common ground: notice, attend to hearer: his interests, wants, needs and goods” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 103-104] to thank each other, a significant difference was revealed in bottom-up context. Besides, Positive Politeness Strategy, mentioned above, the Persian children also used Positive Politeness Strategy of exaggeration “exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with hearer” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 104-106] to show gratitude to their parents, which unveils a higher level of formality, a non-egalitarian social order and an asymmetrical role position between children-parent and parents-children communication in Persian context. It also contributes to the statement of power distance in this culture and emphasizes the higher status of the parents as well as the necessity of showing exaggerated gratitude for a favor, received from the parents in Persian family.

3.6. Response to thanking

The section presents the results of our contrastive analysis of response to thanking in both symmetrical and asymmetrical contexts between parent-children, children-parents and spouses in British and Persian family settings, with the main focus on the frequency of the types of response to thanking, the length, and the expressivity of utterances.

Our analysis revealed some similarities and differences. The similarities concerned with the types of response to thanking, and the differences concerned with their use in different situations, dependent on the context. The respondents from both lingua-cultures used almost the same types of response to thanking, which have been extracted from the types introduced by Jung [1994: 11]:

- acceptance (e.g., you’re (very) welcome, sure, OK, my pleasure)

- denial (e.g., no problem, not at all, don't mention it)

In British and Persian family settings, the categories of compliments, classified by Manes & Wolfson [1981: 120], have been also used by the respondents through showing response to thanking:

- performances/ ability/ skills
- personality traits
- appearance/ possessions

3.6.1. Response to thanking in top-down context: Parents to children

Our contrastive analysis, illustrated in Table (3.33.), clarified that in top-down context, when the parents respond to thanking of the children, the British respondents used the types of acceptance and denial in 1 pragmatic move, while the Persian respondents preferred to use only the type of acceptance in 1 pragmatic move to show their response to thanking of the children. It is necessary to review that in both lingua-cultures, all the children received positive response from their parents and showed their gratitude to the parents subsequently (Table 3.20.). Thus, the speech act of response to thanking was performed by all the respondents (100%) in top-down context.

It is important to mention that in both British and Persian family settings, in top-down context, the only identified model of response to thanking of the children consists of 1 pragmatic move:

- 1 pragmatic move:
 - acceptance
 - denial

The used linguistic variables in the type of acceptance in 1 pragmatic move among the British respondents are:

- you're welcome (in situation 2)
- it's OK (in situations 2 and 5)

The only used linguistic variable in the type of denial in 1 pragmatic move among the British respondents is:

- no problem (in situation 5)

In Persian family, the only used linguistic variable in the type of acceptance in 1 pragmatic move is:

- *it's OK* (خواهش میکنم/ khahesh mikonam) in situations 2 and 5

Meanwhile, it is necessary to state that the type of denial was not observed among the Persian respondents.

Based on our material, 24% of the British respondents used *you're welcome* (in situation 2), however this linguistic variable was not observed among the respondents in Persian family setting. Moreover, while 76% and 69% of the British respondents (in situations 2 and 5 respectively) used *it's OK*, all the respondents in Persian context preferred to use this linguistic variable to show response to thanking of the children: 100% (in situations 2 and 5):

(319) *You're welcome.* (mother to son)

(320) *It's OK.* (father to son)

(321) *It's OK.* (mother to son/ father to son)

خواهش میکنم.

khahesh mikonam.

Besides, though in both British and Persian family settings, the type of acceptance was observed, our data elaborated that the respondents in Persian context used *it's OK* (خواهش میکنم/ khahesh mikonam) more frequently than the respondents in British family: 100% to 76% (in situation 2) and 100% to 69% (in situation 5). Furthermore, 31% of the British respondents used the type of denial *no problem* (in situation 5), while this type of response to thanking was not revealed in Persian family.

Table 3.33. Response to thanking: Parents to children

Types of response to thanking	Situation (2)		Situation (5)		Total	
	Mother-son		Father-son			
	British	Persian	British	Persian	British	Persian
Linguistic variables	%	%	%	%	%	%
Acceptance or denial	100	100	100	100	100	100

Acceptance	100	100	69	100	84	100
You're welcome	24	0	0	0	12	0
It's OK	76	100	69	100	72	100
Denial	0	0	31	0	16	0
No problem	0	0	31	0	16	0

Based on our data, in both British and Persian family settings, the parents used Positive Politeness Strategy “fulfill H’s want for some X: give gift to H, for instance, goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 129] in order to respond to thanking of the children. Though the type of acceptance in 1 pragmatic move was used in both lingua-cultures, our data caused us to understand that the linguistic variable *you’re welcome* was only observed among the British respondents: 12%, and the respondents in Persian family used *it’s OK* (خواهش / *khaahesh mikonam*) more frequently than their British counterparts: 100% to 72%. It is worth stating that 16% of the respondents in British family used the type of denial in 1 pragmatic move, to respond to thanking of the children, while this type of showing response to thanking was not observed in our Persian data. In both lingua-cultures, in top-down context, 2 pragmatic moves of response to thanking were not revealed.

The fact that the parents, in British and Persian family settings, used almost the same types of response to thanking in 1 pragmatic move towards their children with the same length and the same expressivity of utterances reveals the same level of informality in parents-children communication in both lingua-cultures.

3.6.2. Response to thanking in bottom-up context: Children to parents

Our contrastive analysis, shown in Table (3.34.), elucidated that in both British and Persian family settings, in bottom-up context, when the children respond to thanking of the parents, the respondents used three models of 1, 2 and 3 pragmatic moves. It is substantial to mention that 2 pragmatic moves of acceptance + *it’s my duty* (وظیفه / *vazifame*), and 3 pragmatic moves of acceptance + *it’s my duty* (وظیفه / *vazifame*) + compliment were only observed among the Persian respondents:

- 1 pragmatic move:
 - acceptance
 - denial
- 2 pragmatic moves:
 - acceptance + compliment (+ intensifier)
 - denial + compliment
 - acceptance + *it's my duty* (وظیفمه/ vazifame)
- 3 pragmatic moves:
 - acceptance + *it's my duty* (وظیفمه/ vazifame) + compliment

Referring to Table (3.22.), we review that 100% of the children in both lingua-cultures (in situation 1), 82% of the British respondents and 95% of the Persian respondents (in situation 4), 64% of the respondents in British context, as well as 84% of the respondents in Persian family (in situation 6) accepted the request of the parents. Therefore, the speech acts of thanking by the parents, and response to thanking by the children were performed subsequently.

According to our findings, in bottom-up context of both British and Persian family settings, the respondents used the type of acceptance and denial in 1 pragmatic move to respond to the parents' thanking. Our material indicate that the total types of acceptance or denial in 1 pragmatic move, used by the British and Persian respondents, were equally observed: 100% to 100% (in situation 1), and almost equally: 53% to 54% (in situation 6), while the British respondents used the total types of acceptance or denial more frequently than their counterparts in Persian family: 82% to 51% (in situation 4).

Though the respondents in British context used the type of acceptance in 1 pragmatic move more frequently than the Persian respondents: 82% to 33% (in situation 4), and 40% to 31 (in situation 6), this type of response to thanking was observed among the Persian respondents more frequently than the respondents in British family: 100% to 91% (in situation 1).

The used linguistic variables in the type of acceptance in 1 pragmatic move among the British respondents are:

- you're welcome (in situation 6)
- it's OK (in situations 1, 4 and 6)
- my pleasure (in situation 4)

The used linguistic variables in the type of acceptance in 1 pragmatic move among the Persian respondents are:

- *you're welcome* (خواهش میکنم / khahesh mikonam) in situations 1, 4 and 6
- *it's OK* (خواهش میکنم / khahesh mikonam) in situations 4 and 6
- *my pleasure* (باعث افتخارمه / ba-ese etekharame) in situations 4 and 6
- *at any time* (همیشه در خدمتم / hamishe dar khedmatam) in situation 6

Besides, the British respondents used the type of denial in 1 pragmatic move more frequently than the Persian respondents: 9% to 0% (in situation 1), while this type of response to thanking, among the Persian respondents, was observed more frequently than the British respondents: 18% to 0% (in situation 4) and 23% to 13% (in situation 6).

The used linguistic variables in the type of denial in 1 pragmatic move among the British respondents are:

- no problem (in situation 1)
- don't mention it (in situation 6)

The used linguistic variables in the type of denial in 1 pragmatic move among the Persian respondents are:

- *no problem* (مشکلی نیست / moshkeli nist) in situation 6
- *don't mention it* (قابلی نداره / ghabeli nadare) in situations 4 and 6

Our contrastive analysis of response to thanking in bottom-up context displayed that the respondents in both lingua-cultures used the type of acceptance or denial + compliment (+ intensifier) in 2 pragmatic moves to respond to thanking of the parents as well. As our material illustrated, neither the British nor the Persian respondents used 2 pragmatic moves of acceptance or denial + compliment (+ intensifier) in situation 1. Moreover, while the respondents in Persian family used 2 pragmatic moves: 27% (in situation 4), this type of response to thanking was not

observed among the British respondents in the same situation. However, the respondents in British family used 2 pragmatic moves of acceptance or denial + compliment (+ intensifier) less frequently than their counterparts in Persian family: 11% to 23% (in situation 6):

(322) **It's OK.** *I realized that I am as strong as you. (son to father)*

(323) **You're welcome.** *You have taught me how to do this job (perfectly). (son to father)*

خواهش میکنم. شما به من یاد دادید این کارو چطور خیلی خوب انجام بدم.
khashesh mikonam. shoma be man yad dadid in karo chetor kheyli khoob anjam bedam.

(324) **My pleasure.** *It's nothing in comparison with all the things that you do for me every day. (daughter to mother)*

باعثه افتخارمه. این در مقایسه با کارهایی که شما هر روز برای من می کنید، چیزی نیست.
ba-ese etekhrame. in dar moghayese ba kar-hayi ke shoma har rooz baraye man mikonid, chizi nist.

Our data explained that the linguistic variables used in the type of acceptance or denial + compliment in 2 pragmatic moves among the British respondents are:

- acceptance + compliment of personality traits (in situation 6)

(325) **It's OK.** *I would like to be strong like you. (son to father)*

- denial + compliment of personality traits (in situation 6)

(326) **Don't mention it.** *I want to be an all-rounder like you. (son to father)*

Meanwhile, the linguistic variables used in the type of acceptance or denial + compliment in 2 pragmatic moves among the Persian respondents are:

- acceptance + compliment of performance (in situations 4 and 6)

(327) **You're welcome.** *You take care of me for your entire life much better than that. (daughter to mother)*

خواهش میکنم. شما یک عمر بهتر از این مراقب من بودید.
khashesh mikonam. shoma yek omr behtar az in moraghebe man boodid.

(328) **it's OK.** *Though, the result of my job is still far from yours in perfectness. (son to father)*

خواهش میکنم. اگر چه نتیجه کار من از نظر کامل بودن هنوز خیلی از کار شما فاصله داره.

khashesh mikonam. agar che natijeye kare man az nazare kamel boodan hanooz kheyli az kare shoma fasele dare.

- acceptance + compliment of appearance (in situation 4)

(329) **My pleasure.** *I do it for my beautiful Mom with all my heart. (daughter to mother)*

باعث افتخارمه. اینکارو با دل و جون برای مامان زیبای خودم انجام میدم.

ba-ese etekhrame. in karo ba del o joon baraye mamane zibaye khodam anjam midam.

- acceptance + compliment of personality traits (in situations 4 and 6)

(330) **My pleasure.** *Seeing your beautiful smile is the best thing in the universe. (daughter to mother)*

باعث افتخارمه. دیدن لبخند شما بهترین چیز عالمه.

ba-ese etekhrame. didane labkhande shoma behtarin chize alame.

(331) **You're welcome.** *You are always my adorable role model in doing a perfect job. (son to father)*

خواهش میکنم. شما همیشه الگوی تحسین برانگیز من در انجام یک کار عالی هستید.

khashesh mikonam. shoma hamishe olgooye tahsin bar-angize man dar anjame yek kare ali hastid.

- denial + compliment of personality traits (in situations 4 and 6)

(332) **Don't mention it.** *How could I say "No" to such a marvelous Mom? (daughter to mother)*

قابلی نداره. چطور میتونم به چنین مامان دوست داشتنی «نه» بگم؟

ghabeli nadare. chetor mitoonam be chenin mamane doost dashtani "na" begam?

(333) **No problem.** *What could be exciting more than helping you, my dear Dad. (son to father)*

خواهش میکنم. چی می تونه بیشتر از کمک کردن به شما بابای عزیزم هیجان انگیز باشه.

khashesh mikonam. chi mitoone bishtar az komak kardan be shoma babaye azizam hayajan-angiz bashe.

Besides, the respondents in Persian family used the type of acceptance + compliment of personality traits with an intensifier (e.g., *very (much), too, so* (خیلی/ kheili), *extremely* (بینهایت/ bi-nahayat), *really, real* (واقعی/ vaghean, vagheyi), *amazingly* (به طرز شگفت آوری/ be tarze shegeft-avari), *definitely* (قطعاً/ ghat-an), *fully, totally, quite, entirely, perfectly* (کاملاً/ kamelan) in 2 pragmatic moves: 11% (in situation 4) and 16% (in situation 6), while, in our British material, this type of response to parents' thanking was not observed among the respondents (Table 3.34.):

(334) ***It's OK. It's only a small favor to my (extremely) lovely Mom. (daughter to mother)***

خواهش میکنم. این فقط به لطف کوچولو به مامان بینهایت دوست داشتتیمه.
khahesh mikonam. in faghat ye lotfe koochooloo be mamane bi-nahayat doost-dashtanime.

(335) ***At any time. I am a full-time soldier at your service, my (very) powerful commander. (son to father)***

همیشه در خدمتم. فرمانده خیلی قوی من، من سرباز تمام وقت در خدمت شما.
hamishe dar khedmatam. farmande kheyli ghaviye man, man sarbaze tamam vaghte dar khedmate shomam.

In our material, one significant difference in showing response to thanking of the parents concerned with using *it's my duty* (وظیفه/ vazifame), which was revealed in 2 and 3 pragmatic moves only among the Persian respondents:

- acceptance + *it's my duty* (وظیفه/ vazifame) in situations 4 and 6

(336) ***You're welcome. It's my duty. (daughter to mother)***

خواهش میکنم. وظیفه.
khahesh mikonam. vazifame.

(337) ***At any time. It's my duty. (son to father)***

قابلی نداشت. وظیفه.
ghabeli nadasht. vazifame.

- acceptance + *it's my duty* (وظیفه/ vazifame) + compliment of personality traits (in situations 4 and 6)

(338) *It's OK. It's my duty. I help you whenever you need, my nice Mom.*
(daughter to mother)

خواهش میکنم. وظیفمه. مامان خوبم، من هر موقع شما نیاز داشته باشید، بهتون کمک میکنم.
khahesh mikonam. vazifame. mamane khoobam, man har moghe shoma niyaz dashte bashid, behetoon komak mikonam.

(339) *You're welcome. It's my duty. If I can keep your kind heart satisfied, all difficulties will be easy to me.* (daughter to mother)

خواهش میکنم. وظیفمه. اگر من بتونم قلب مهربون شما رو راضی نگه دارم، همه سختی ها برام آسون میشه.
khahesh mikonam. vazifame. agar man betoonam ghalbe mehraboone shomaro razi negah daram, hameye sakhti-ha baram asoon mishe.

(340) *You're welcome. It's my duty. I learn everything perfectly from you, a man of perfectness.* (son to father)

خواهش میکنم. وظیفمه. آقای همه چی تمام، من هر کاری رو از شما خیلی خوب یاد میگیرم.
khahesh mikonam. vazifame. aghaye hame chi tamam, man har kari ro az shoma kheyli khoob yad migiram.

(341) *It's OK. It's my duty. You are always my good helper and now, it's my turn to give a hand to you.* (son to father)

خواهش میکنم. وظیفمه. شما همیشه به من کمک می کنید و حالا نوبت منه که به شما کمک کنم.
khahesh mikonam. vazifame. shoma hamishe be man komak mikonid o hala nobate mane ke be shoma komak konam.

Table 3.34. Response to thanking: Children to parents

Types of response to thanking	Situation (1) Daughter-father		Situation (4) Daughter-mother		Situation (6) Son-father		Total	
	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %
Linguistic variables								
Acceptance <i>or</i> denial	100	100	82	51	53	54	78	68
Acceptance	91	100	82	33	40	31	71	54
(You're) welcome	0	100	0	10	18	11	6	40
It's OK	91	0	35	10	22	6	49	5
My pleasure	0	0	47	13	0	7	16	7
At any time	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	2
Denial	9	0	0	18	13	23	7	14
No problem	9	0	0	0	0	5	3	2
Don't mention it	0	0	0	18	13	18	4	12
Acceptance <i>or</i> denial + compliment (+ intensifier)	0	0	0	27	11	23	3	17
Acceptance + compliment of performance/ skills/ abilities	0	0	0	14	0	12	0	8
Acceptance + compliment of appearance / possessions	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	3
Acceptance + compliment of personality traits	0	0	0	4	6	7	2	3
Denial + compliment of personality traits	0	0	0	6	5	4	1	3
Acceptance + compliment of personality traits + intensifier	0	0	0	11	0	16	0	9
Acceptance + <i>it's my duty</i> (+ compliment)								
Acceptance + <i>it's my duty</i> (+ compliment)	0	0	0	78	0	72	0	51
Acceptance + <i>it's my duty</i>	0	0	0	54	0	65	0	39

Acceptance + <i>it's my duty</i> + compliment of personality traits	0	0	0	24	0	12	0	12
--	---	---	---	----	---	----	---	----

According to our contrastive analysis, both the British and Persian children used Positive Politeness Strategy “fulfill H’s want for some X: give gift to H, for instance, goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 129] to show response to thanking of the parents, however the Persian children used also Negative Politeness Strategy “give deference” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 178-187], aimed at intensifying their respect to the parents.

Though in both British and Persian family settings, the respondents used the type of response to thanking of acceptance or denial in 1 pragmatic move, as well as acceptance or denial + compliment (+ intensifier) in 2 pragmatic moves, our contrastive analysis indicates four interesting differences:

1) In British family, the respondents used the total types of acceptance or denial in 1 pragmatic move, to respond to thanking of the parents, more frequently than their Persian counterparts: 78% to 68%, however, our data displayed that in both British and Persian family settings, the respondents used the type of acceptance more frequently than the type of denial in 1 pragmatic move: 71% to 7% among the British respondents, and 54% to 14% among the respondents in Persian family.

2) In Persian family, the respondents manifested a greater tendency to use the type of acceptance or denial + compliment (+ intensifier) in 2 pragmatic moves than the respondents in British family: 17% to 3%.

3) Moreover, 9% of the Persian respondents preferred to use 2 pragmatic moves of acceptance + compliment of personality traits with an intensifier to show response to thanking of the parents, while this linguistic variable was not observed among the British respondents.

4) Based on our data, 51% of the Persian respondents used *it's my duty* (وظیفه/ vazifame) in 2 pragmatic moves of acceptance + *it's my duty* (وظیفه/ vazifame), and 3 pragmatic moves of acceptance + *it's my duty* (وظیفه/ vazifame) + compliment of

personality traits, while these linguistic variable were not revealed among the British respondents.

Due to the facts that a) in bottom-up context, response to thanking in 2 pragmatic moves was performed among the Persian respondents more frequently than the respondents in British family: 17% to 3%, and b) the respondents in Persian context preferred to show response to thanking of their parents with an intensifier: 9%, while the British respondents did not use intensifiers, besides c) using *it's my duty* (وظیفه / vazifame) as the culture-specific utterance in Persian family in 2 and 3 pragmatic moves, aimed at respecting parents may illustrate that there is a formality, a non-egalitarian social order and an asymmetrical role position in children-parents communication in Persian family setting.

The results may suggest a hierarchical system of communication in bottom-up context in Persian family, in which the children use more emotive politeness towards the parents by using complimentary utterances in more length and a higher degree of expressivity in comparison to their British counterparts with an egalitarian social order, a symmetrical role position and an informal style in children-parents communication.

3.6.3. Response to thanking in linear context: Spouses

Our contrastive analysis, represented in Table (3.35.), revealed that in British and Persian family settings, in linear context, when the spouses respond to thanking of each other, both the British and Persian respondents used two models of 1 and 2 pragmatic moves:

- 1 pragmatic move:
 - acceptance
 - denial
- 2 pragmatic moves:
 - acceptance + compliment (+ intensifier)
 - denial + compliment

Referring to Table (3.28.), we review that 100% of the respondents in both lingua-cultures (in situation 3), 62% of the British respondents and 47% of the respondents in Persian family (in situation 7), besides 73% of the respondents in British context, and 59% of the Persian respondents (in situation 8) accepted the request of the couple. Therefore, the speech acts of thanking and response to thanking were performed subsequently.

Based on our findings, in linear context, the British and Persian respondents used the type of acceptance or denial in 1 pragmatic move to respond to thanking of the couple. The total types of acceptance or denial, used by the respondents in British and Persian family settings, were equally observed: 100% to 100% (in situation 3), and almost equally: 23% to 26% (in situation 7), while the British respondents used the total types of acceptance or denial in 1 pragmatic move more frequently than their counterparts in Persian family: 65% to 42% (in situation 8).

Though the British respondents used the type of acceptance in 1 pragmatic move more frequently than their Persian counterparts: 100% to 63% (in situation 3) and 45% to 33% (in situation 8), the respondents in Persian family, using the type of acceptance in 1 pragmatic move, showed response to thanking of the couple more frequently than their British counterparts: 22% to 16% (in situation 7).

The used linguistic variables in the type of acceptance in 1 pragmatic move among the British respondents are:

- you're welcome (in situations 3, 7 and 8)
- it's OK (in situations 3 and 8)
- my pleasure (in situations 7 and 8)
- any time (in situations 3 and 8)

The used linguistic variables in the type of acceptance among the Persian respondents are:

- *you're welcome* (خواهش میکنم / khahesh mikonam) in situations 3, 7 and 8
- *my pleasure* (باعث افتخارمه / ba-ese etekharame) in situations 3, 7 and 8

Furthermore, our material disclosed that the respondents in British family used the type of denial in 1 pragmatic move, to respond to thanking of the couple, more frequently than the Persian respondents: 7% to 4% (in situation 7) and 20% to 9% (in situation 8). Besides, 37% of the respondents in Persian family used the denial type of response to thanking in 1 pragmatic move, while the type of denial was not observed among the British respondents (in situation 3).

The used linguistic variables in the type of denial in 1 pragmatic move among the British respondents are:

- no problem (in situation 8)
- don't mention it (in situations 7 and 8)

The only used linguistic variable in the type of denial in 1 pragmatic move among the respondents in Persian family is:

- *don't mention it* (قابلی نداره / ghabeli nadare) in situations 3, 7 and 8

Our contrastive analysis in linear context of British and Persian family settings demonstrated that the respondents in both lingua-cultures used the type of acceptance or denial + compliment (+ intensifier) in 2 pragmatic moves to respond to thanking of the couple as well (Table 3.35.). Based on our data, neither the British nor the Persian respondents used 2 pragmatic moves of acceptance or denial + compliment (+ intensifier) in situation 3. However, the British respondents used 2 pragmatic moves more frequently than the respondents in Persian family: 39% to 21% (in situation 7), while the Persian respondents used the type of acceptance or denial + compliment (+ intensifier) more frequently than their British counterparts: 17% to 8% (in situation 8):

(342) **My pleasure.** *Don't forget, you are my splendid girl. (husband to wife)*

(343) **No problem.** *You are always cool-headed as the secret of your success. (wife to husband)*

(344) **You're welcome.** *I like the moment that you show happiness in your beautiful eyes. (husband to wife)*

خواهش میکنم. من لحظه ای که تو خوشحالی تو تو چشمای قشنگت نشون میدی رو دوست دارم.

khashesh mikonam. man lahzeyi ke to khoshhalito tooye cheshmaye ghashanget neshoon midi ro doost daram.

(345) **You're welcome.** *I can't compete with you in being quick response.*
(wife to husband)

خواهش میکنم. من نمیتونم با تو در تر و فرز بودن رقابت کنم.

khashesh mikonam. man nemitoonam ba to dar tar o ferz boodan reghabat konam.

Our data explored that the linguistic variables, used in the type of acceptance or denial + compliment (+ intensifier) in 2 pragmatic moves among the British respondents are:

- acceptance + compliment of appearance (in situation 7)

(346) **My pleasure.** *I really like your attractive smile.* (husband to wife)

- acceptance + compliment of personality traits (in situations 7 and 8)

(347) **You're welcome.** *I did it for my unique angel.* (husband to wife)

(348) **You're welcome.** *You also have a quite protective nature.* (wife to husband)

- denial + compliment of personality traits (in situations 7 and 8)

(349) **Don't mention it.** *Your generous heart deserves more.* (husband to wife)

(350) **No problem.** *You are like a badge of honor on my chest.* (wife to husband)

Meanwhile, the linguistic variables, used in the type of acceptance or denial + compliment (+ intensifier) in 2 pragmatic moves among the Persian respondents are:

- acceptance + compliment of performance (in situation 8)

(351) **You're welcome.** *I copied whatever you do for me in the same situation.*
(wife to husband)

خواهش میکنم. من همون کاری رو کردم که تو توی چنین شرایطی برای من میکنی.

khashesh mikonam. man hamoon kari ro kardam ke to too chenin sharayeti baraye man mikoni.

- acceptance + compliment of appearance (in situation 7)

(352) **My pleasure.** *Why I shouldn't do that when your beautiful eyes fascinate me every day.* (husband to wife)

باعث افتخارمه. چرا نباید این کارو بکنم، وقتی چشمای زیبای تو هر روز منو مجذوب میکنه.

ba-ese eftekharame. chera nabayad inkaro bokonam, vaghti cheshmaye zibaye to har rooz mano majzoob mikone.

- acceptance + compliment of personality traits (in situations 7 and 8)

(353) **You're welcome.** *It's your kind spirit that made me a better man.*
(husband to wife)

خواهش میکنم. این روح مهربان تونه که از من مرد بهتری ساخته.

kharesh mikonam. in roohe mehrabane toe ke az man marde behtari sakhte.

(354) **My pleasure.** *Because of your caring character, you have also done lots of great things to me in different situations so far.* (wife to husband)

باعث افتخارمه. تو هم تا حالا به خاطر شخصیت حمایتگرت در شرایط مختلف کارای مهم زیادی برای من انجام دادی.

ba-ese eftekharame. to ham ta hala bekhatere shakhsiyate hemayat-garet dar sharayete mokhtalef kar-haye moheme ziyadi baraye man anjam dadi.

- denial + compliment of personality traits (in situations 7 and 8)

(355) **Don't mention it.** *I admire your inner kid whenever you are excited.*
(husband to wife)

خواهش میکنم. من کودک درونتو وقتی که خوشحالی تحسین میکنم.

kharesh mikonam. man koodake darooneto vaghti ke khoshhali tahsin mikonam.

(356) **No problem.** *Your delicate soul is the best encouraging to me.* (wife to husband)

خواهش میکنم. روح لطیف تو بهترین دلگرمی برای منه.

kharesh mikonam. roohe latife to behtarin del-garmi baraye mane.

Besides, in both lingua-cultures, the respondents showed response to thanking of the couple in 2 pragmatic moves, using the type of acceptance + compliment with an intensifier (e.g., *very (much), too, so* (خیلی/ kheili), *extremely* (بینهایت/ bi-nahayat), *really, real* (واقعی/ vaghean, vagheyi), *amazingly* (به طرز شگفت آوری/ be tarze shegeft-avari), *definitely* (قطعاً/ ghat-an), *fully, totally, quite, entirely, perfectly* (کاملاً/ kamelan). Our data illustrated that the British respondents used 2 pragmatic moves of acceptance + compliment with an intensifier more frequently than the Persian

respondents: 11% to 9% (in situations 7), while the respondents in Persian family used the same type of response to thanking more frequently than their British counterparts: 10% to 6% (in situation 8). Meanwhile, 2 pragmatic moves, using the type of acceptance + compliment with an intensifier, was not observed neither among the British nor among the Persian respondents in situation 3 (Table 3.35.).

The linguistic variables, used in the type of acceptance + compliment with an intensifier among the British and Persian respondents are:

- acceptance + compliment of personality traits with an intensifier (in situation 8)

(357) ***It's OK.*** *You are also (**absolutely**) caring and supportive to me. (wife to husband)*

(358) ***You're welcome.*** *I know that you're also (**truly**) a big softie. (wife to husband)*

خواهش میکنم. من میدونم که تو هم واقعا به کار راه انداز بزرگ هستی.

khahesh mikonam. man midoonam ke to ham vaghean ye kar rah-andaze bozorg hasti.

- acceptance + compliment of appearance with an intensifier (in situation 7)

(359) ***You're welcome.*** *You are such an (**extremely**) happy butterfly in my life. (husband to wife)*

(360) ***My pleasure.*** *It's your looks that (**amazingly**) caught my eye. (husband to wife)*

باعث افتخارمه. این نگاههای تونه که به طرز شگفت آوری چشم منو گرفته.

ba-ese eftekharame. in negah-haye toe ke be tarze shegeft-avari cheshme mano gerefte.

Table 3.35. Response to thanking: Spouses

Types response of thanking	Situation (3) Wife-husband		Situation (7) Husband-wife		Situation (8) Wife-husband		Total	
	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %	British %	Persian %
Acceptance <i>or</i> denial	100	100	23	26	65	42	62	56
Acceptance	100	63	16	22	45	33	53	39
You're welcome.	38	46	6	7	21	25	21	26
It's OK.	46	0	0	0	10	0	19	0
My pleasure.	0	17	10	15	6	8	5	13
Anytime.	16	0	0	0	8	0	8	0
Denial	0	37	7	4	20	9	9	17
No problem	0	0	0	0	10	0	3	0
Don't mention it.	0	37	7	4	10	9	6	17
Acceptance <i>or</i> denial + compliment (+ intensifier)	0	0	39	21	8	17	16	12
Acceptance + compliment of performance/ skills/ abilities	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	3
Acceptance + compliment of appearance / possessions	0	0	27	10	0	0	9	3
Acceptance + compliment of personality traits	0	0	7	6	4	5	4	4
Denial + compliment of personality traits	0	0	5	5	4	3	3	2
Acceptance + compliment + intensifier	0	0	11	9	6	10	6	6
Acceptance + compliment of personality traits + intensifier	0	0	0	0	6	10	2	3
Acceptance + compliment of appearance + intensifier	0	0	11	9	0	0	4	3

Our findings elucidated that in both lingua-cultures, the spouses used Positive Politeness Strategy “fulfill H’s want for some X: give gift to H for instance goods,

sympathy, understanding, cooperation” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 129] in order to respond to thanking of the couple.

Though in both British and Persian family settings, the respondents used both the types of acceptance and denial in 1 pragmatic move to show response to thanking of each other, based on our contrastive analysis, in British family, the respondents used the total types of acceptance or denial in 1 pragmatic move more frequently than the respondents in Persian context: 62% to 56%. Besides, the respondents in British family used the type of acceptance in 1 pragmatic move more frequently than their counterparts in Persian family: 53% to 39%, while on the contrary, the type of denial in 1 pragmatic move was used among the Persian respondents more frequently than among their British counterparts: 17% to 9%.

According to our material, the respondents in both lingua-cultures used the type of acceptance or denial + compliment (+ intensifier) in 2 pragmatic moves as well. The British respondents used 2 pragmatic moves more frequently than the respondents in Persian family: 16% to 12%, while no difference was observed when using the type of acceptance + compliment of personality traits or compliment of appearance with an intensifier in 2 pragmatic moves by the British and Persian respondents: 6% to 6%. Based on our results, no significant difference was also revealed between the British and Persian respondents when they showed their response to thanking of the couple using the same politeness strategy with almost the same length and the same expressivity.

In an overview, our contrastive analysis of response to thanking in British and Persian family settings disclosed that both the British and Persian family members used almost the same types of response to thanking, however, they presented a clear preference for different linguistic variables.

In top-down context, when the parents responded to thanking of the children, the British and Persian parents preferred to use the type of acceptance or denial in 1 pragmatic move: 100% to 100%. Our data demonstrated that the Persian parents used preferably the type of acceptance more frequently than the British parents: 100% to 84%. On the other hand, the British parents preferred to use the denial type

to respond to thanking of the children: 16%, while this type of response to thanking was not revealed in our Persian material. The fact that the parents in British and Persian family settings used almost the same types of response to thanking towards their children in 1 pragmatic move with the same length and the same level of expressivity of utterances reveals an informality in parents-children communication in both lingua-cultures.

In bottom-up context, though both the British and Persian children used 1 and 2 pragmatic moves to respond to thanking of the parents, however, some salient differences were observed in the frequency of the types of response to thanking, the length and the expressivity of utterances among the children in British and Persian family settings. The children in British context used the total types of acceptance or denial in 1 pragmatic move more frequently than their Persian counterparts: 78% to 68%. Besides, in both lingua-cultures, the British and Persian children gave their preference to use the type of acceptance or denial in 1 pragmatic move, to respond to thanking of their parents, more frequently than 2 pragmatic moves, consisting of acceptance or denial + compliment (+ intensifier): 78% to 3% among the British respondents and 68% to 17% among the respondents in Persian family, while the children in Persian family preferred to use 2 pragmatic moves more frequently than their British counterparts: 17% to 3%.

Based on our findings, 9% of the children in Persian family showed response to thanking of the parents in 2 pragmatic moves using the type of acceptance + compliment of personality traits with an intensifier, while any examples of using intensifiers were not observed among the British children.

It is important to mention that the children in Persian family manifested a noticeable tendency to use *it's my duty* (وظیفه/ vazifame) when they respond to thanking of the parents in 2 pragmatic moves: 51%. Considering *it's my duty* (وظیفه/ vazifame), as the superlative polite phrase in responding to the parents' thanking in Persian family, illustrates that the children in this context use more emotive politeness towards their parents than their British counterparts. It may also suggest that there is an index of a higher power distance between children-parents

communication in Persian family, based on which the children emphasize that they have an absolute duty towards their parents, which oblige them to perform their request without any hesitation and excuse.

The fact that the children in Persian context, to respond to thanking of the parents, preferred to use 2 pragmatic moves more frequently than their British counterparts may explain that there is a higher level of formality, a non-egalitarian social order and an asymmetrical role position in children-parents communication in Persian culture, in which the children respond to thanking of the parents through utterances in more length and more expressivity.

However, the greater tendency of the British children to respond to thanking of the parents in 1 pragmatic move, similar to what we observed in top-down context when the parents responded to thanking of their children in 1 pragmatic move, indicates an informality, an egalitarian social order and a symmetrical role position in top-down and bottom-up contexts in British family setting. Besides, using 2 pragmatic moves with an intensifier, and *it's my duty*, as the superlative polite phrase, which were only observed among the Persian children, could intensify the statement of cultural value of status in Persian culture.

In linear context, both the British and Persian spouses used 1 pragmatic move of the type of acceptance or denial, and 2 pragmatic moves of the type of acceptance or denial + compliment (+ intensifier) in order to respond to thanking of the couple. Our data explored that the spouses in British context used the total types of acceptance or denial in 1 pragmatic move more frequently than the Persian spouses: 62% to 56%. Meanwhile, we observed the same situation when the spouses, in British context, used 2 pragmatic moves of acceptance or denial + compliment (+ intensifier) more frequently than their Persian counterparts: 16% to 12%. It is worth mentioning that both the British and Persian spouses equally used the type of acceptance + compliment of personality traits or compliment of appearance with an intensifier in 2 pragmatic moves: 6% to 6%. According to our findings, no significant difference was highlighted between the British and Persian spouses in the

length and the expressivity of utterances used in showing response to thanking of the couple.

Though in both British and Persian family settings, in all the contexts, the parents, children and spouses used Positive Politeness Strategy “fulfill H’s want for some X: give gift to H for instance goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 129] to show response to thanking of each other, a significant difference drew our attention to the context of bottom-up in Persian family, in which the children also used Negative Politeness Strategy “give deference” [Brown & Levinson 1978, 1987: 178-187] to respond to thanking of their parents, aimed at intensifying respect to the parents that contribute to the statement of cultural value of status in this culture. The results may suggest a formality, a non-egalitarian social order and an asymmetrical role position between children-parents and parents-children communication in this culture. In Persian family, due to an index of a higher power distance and a hierarchical system of communication, the children oblige themselves to use more emotive politeness by applying Negative Politeness Strategy as well as the superlative polite phrase of *it’s my duty* (وظیفه/ vazifame) in order to show response to thanking of the parents than their British counterpart.

3.7. Dominant features in British and Persian communicative styles

Our contrastive analysis of politeness strategies in British and Persian family discourse represents some regularities in their choices. In this section, we attempted to elaborate the idea, posed by Larina [2009, 2015], which suggests that the conventional usage of politeness strategies results in shaping dominant features of ethno-styles that can be systematized. We aimed to identify the most salient stylistic features of British and Persian communicative styles in a family setting, taking quantitative and qualitative characteristics into consideration. We drew on culture-specific features in a dichotomous style of oppositions, extracted from Gudykunst & Ting-Toomey [1990] and Larina [2015: 195-215], and focused on the following domains and characteristics:

- the manner of expressing communicative intentions (direct vs. indirect)
- the level of formality and informality (formal vs. informal)
- the level of expressiveness (expressive vs. non/ less expressive)
- the degree of verbosity (verbose vs. laconic)
- the social characteristics and the impact of the social role of speakers on politeness strategies and the styles of communication (symmetrical vs. asymmetrical role position, egalitarian vs. non-egalitarian social order or person-oriented vs. status-oriented)

Considering verbosity vs. laconism, as a stylistic characteristic of discourse in British and Persian family settings, quantitative features of speech in relation to the length of utterances and the number of utterances are concerned as well.

3.7.1. Negative Politeness Strategies and communicative styles features

3.7.1.1. Directness vs. indirectness

Our findings illustrated that the British style of requesting can be characterized as predominantly indirect, by virtue of the fact that Negative Politeness Strategies “be conventionally indirect” and “ask questions” were used in both symmetrical and asymmetrical contexts of British family setting.

According to our data, 100% of indirect requests were observed through questions with modal verbs in all the contexts of top-down, bottom-up and linear in British family (refer to Tables 3.15. & 3.17. & 3.19.):

(361) **Can** you please pass me the salt? (father to daughter)

(362) **Could** you please babysit your sister this weekend? (mother to daughter)

(363) **Would** you please clean the garage? (father to son)

(364) **Can** you please bring me a glass of water? (son to mother)

(365) **Could** you please help me repair my bike? (son to father)

(366) **Can** you please make me some tea? (husband to wife)

(367) **May** I ask you please to buy me a new car? (wife to husband)

(368) ***Would** you mind please bringing me the documents to my office?*
(husband to wife)

Therefore, any impact of the context, and the role of the speakers on the choice of their politeness strategies were not disclosed in British family discourse.

On the contrary, in top-down and bottom-up contexts of Persian family, a salient asymmetry in politeness strategies was revealed. Based on our findings, while all the British parents (100%) addressed their children with a conventionally indirect request, the majority of the parents in Persian family (96%) preferred a direct request using the imperative request (+ please) or explanation + imperative request (+ please) (refer to Table 3.15.):

(369) ***Pass** the salt to me.* (father to daughter)

نمکو به من بده.

namako be man bede.

(370) ***Babysit** your sister this weekend, **please**.* (mother to daughter)

لطفا این آخر هفته مراقب خواهرت باش.

lotfan in akhare hafte moraghebe khaharet bash.

(371) ***As I saw yesterday, the garage is a disaster. Please manage** to clean it at the earliest time.* (father to son)

اینطور که من دیروز دیدم، گاراژ افتضاحه. لطفا ترتیبی بده که هر چه زودتر تمیزش کنی.

injoor ke man dirooz didam, garazh eftezahe. lotfan tartibi bede ke har che zoodtar tamizesh koni.

Besides the fact that the Persian children used Negative Politeness Strategy “give deference” in addition to Negative Politeness Strategies “be conventionally indirect” and “ask questions” to request their parents, our data revealed that 100% of the children in Persian family requested their parents conventionally indirect identical to what we observed in bottom-up context among the British children (refer to Table 3.17.):

(372) ***Would** you please kindly do a favor and give me a glass of water?* (son to mother)

میشه لطفا بی زحمت یه محبت کنید و یک لیوان آب به من بدید؟

mishe lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat konid va yek livan ab be man bedid?

(373) **Could** you please kindly do a favor to me and help me repair my bike?
(son to father)

میشه لطفا بی زحمت به من کنید و کمک کنید دوچرخه ام رو تعمیر کنم؟

mishe lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat be man konid va komak konid docharkham ro ta-mir konam?

Another observation of the impact of the context on the speakers' behavior in Persian family setting relates to the role of gender in linear context. Though 96% of the Persian spouses used Negative Politeness Strategies "be conventionally indirect" and "ask questions" in order to request the couple through questions with modal verbs, same as what was observed among their British counterparts, there are rare examples (4%), in which the husband performed the request towards his wife in the direct type of imperative with "please" (refer to Table 3.19.):

(374) **Please make** me some tea. (husband to wife)

لطفا برام کمی چای دم کن.

loftan baram kami chay dam kon.

(375) **Please bring** me the documents to the office. (husband to wife)

لطفا مدارکو برام بیار دفتر.

lotfan madareko baram biyar daftar.

3.7.1.2. Formality vs. informality

Concerning formality vs. informality, as a stylistic characteristic of discourse, the British style can be featured as informal in both symmetrical and asymmetrical contexts of top-down, bottom-up and linear, while the Persian style demonstrated some differences in different contexts.

Based on our findings, the Persian parents admitted an informality in their conversation with the children, however, the style of the Persian children in the conversation with their parents manifested a higher degree of formality in comparison with the style of their counterparts in conversation with the parents in British family. A number of facts may attest to this conclusion: 1) A noticeable

preference (90%) was observed among the Persian children in order to add the superlative polite phrase *please kindly do a favor (to me)* (لطفا بی زحمت به محبت (به من) کنید / *lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat (be man) konid*) to their request, which makes the request of the Persian children emphatically polite, and 2) The Persian children used *vous*-form of address, namely, the second-person plural pronoun *you* (شما/ *shoma*), and the plural form of verbs, which contribute to the statement of cultural value of status, and the children's obligation to paying high respect to the parents in Persian family (refer to Table 3.17.):

(376) *Could you [vous-form] please do a favor and bring me a glass of water? (son to mother)*

می تونید لطفا بی زحمت به محبت کنید و برام یک لیوان آب بیارید؟

mitoonid lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat konid va baram yek livan ab biyard?

(377) *May I ask you [vous-form] please to do a favor to me and repair my bike? (son to father)*

میشه ازتون خواهش کنم لطفا بی زحمت به من کنید و دوچرخه ام رو تعمیر کنید؟

mishe azatoon khahesh konam lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat be man konid va docharkham ro ta-mir konid?

The formality in the Persian style can also be corroborated in linear context when 4% of the husbands addressed their wives with a direct request using the imperative request with “please” that demonstrates some role differences and an index of a higher power distance in husbands-wives communication in Persian context (refer to Table 3.19.).

3.7.1.3. Verbosity vs. laconism

Another salient difference deals with the quantitative characteristics of the speech act of request, and concerns with the length of utterances used to perform it. As our analysis demonstrated, the Persian children, in order to request their parents, used longer utterances than their British counterparts. Consequently, the Persian style of requesting the parents seems to be more verbose, while the style of the British children to request their parents can be characterized as more laconic:

(378) *Could you please give me a glass of water?* (son to mother)

(379) *Can you please help me repair my bike?* (son to father)

(380) *Would you please kindly do a favor to me and bring me a glass of water?* (son to mother)

میشه لطفا بی زحمت یه محبت به من کنید و برام یک لیوان آب بیارید؟

mishe lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat be man konid va baram yek livan ab biyarid?

(381) *Would you mind please kindly doing a favor to me and helping me repair my bike?* (son to father)

میشه لطفا بی زحمت یه محبت به من کنید وکمک کنید دوچرخه ام رو تعمیر کنم؟

mishe lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat be man konid va komak konid docharkham ro ta-mir konam?

Another observation of the impact of the context on the choice of politeness strategies in Persian family discourse was revealed in the act of rejecting the request. In both British and Persian family settings, the children used Negative Politeness Strategy “communicate S’s wants to not impinge on H: apologize”, however the Persian children used also Negative Politeness Strategy “give deference” to show the negative response to the request of their parents in an emphatic polite manner.

The analysis of the stylistic characteristics of rejecting the parents’ request in British and Persian family settings demonstrated some similarities and differences. Though in both lingua-cultures in bottom-up context, the form of immediate rejection was not observed, and it was accompanied by an apology and bringing an explanation of the reason for rejection (apology + rejection + explanation), in British family, explanative rejection was used by the children more frequently (18%) than among the respondents in Persian family (7%) (refer to Table 3.22.). However, the examples illustrated that the style of the Persian children, used for rejecting the request of the parents, is in a higher degree of verbosity, while the British children rejected the request of their parents using a lower degree of verbosity.

To be more explicit, the Persian children not only used the longer utterances and demonstrated a higher degree of verbosity to describe the reason of rejection of the parents’ request, but also their style of rejecting the parents’ request is more

elaborate, while the British children limited themselves to giving the exact reason for rejecting the request of the parents:

(382) *I am sorry. I can't. I need to spend all weekends on tidying my room.*
(daughter to mother)

(383) *I am sorry. I can't. I'm not in a good mood to do such a difficult task at the weekends.* (son to father)

(384) *I am sorry. I can't. As I told you before, and also I promised to my friend, I am expected to help her learn the new English subjects all the weekends.*
(daughter to mother)

ببخشید. نمیتونم. همونطور که قبلا بهتون گفتم و به دوستم هم قول دادم، من قراره کل این آخر هفته به دوستم
تو یاد گرفتن درسهای جدید انگلیسی کمک کنم.

bebakhshid. nemitoonam. hamoontor ke ghablan behetoon goftam va be doostam
ham ghol dadam, man gharare kole akhare hafte be doostam too yad gereftane dars
haye jadide englisi komak konam.

(385) *Sorry. I can't. I have to finalize my course paper this weekend, and I am sure that it takes me much time because I have put it aside for more than 2 weeks, and now I must spend much more time to refresh its details and finish it.*
(son to father)

ببخشید. نمیتونم. من باید کار پایان ترممو این آخر هفته نهایی کنم و مطمئنم که این کار وقت زیادی ازم میگیره
چون بیشتر از دو هفته اس که کنار گذاشتمش و الان باید وقت بیشتری برای یادآوری جزئیاتش صرف کنم و
تمومش کنم.

bebakhshid. nemitoonam. man bayad kare payane termamo in akhare hafte nahayi
konam va motma-enam ke in kar vaghte ziyadi azam migire chon bishtar az 2 haftas
ke کنار gozashtamesh va alan bayad vaghte bishtari baraye yad-avariye
jozeeyatesh sarf konam va tamoomesh konam.

Moreover, using explanative rejection (apology + rejection + explanation), 5% of the Persian children added an emotional question, which was not observed among the British children, and made their rejection longer. The results demonstrated that the Persian children used a more expressive style of discourse at a higher level of emotionality in rejecting the request of their parents, while this form

of responding to the request was not revealed in children-parents discourse in British family (refer to Table 3.22.):

(386) *I am sorry. I can't. I have already promised my friends, the twins, to help them build a tree house in the countryside this weekend. Is it possible to help you in another way or even at another time?* (son to father)

بیخشید. نمیتونم. من به دوستانم. دوقلوها، قول دادم که این آخر هفته بهشون تو ساختن یه خونه درختی در بیلاق کمک کنم. امکان داره یه جور دیگه یا حتی یه زمان دیگه به شما کمک کنم؟

bebakhshid. nemitoonam. man be doostam, do ghoolooha, ghoul dadam ke in akhare hafte beheshoon too sakhtane ye khooneye derakhti dar yeylagh komak konam. momkene ye joore dige ya hata ye vaghte dige be shoma komak konam?

(387) *I am sorry. I can't. This weekend, it is my turn to invite my friends to watch movie together, and you know that it is our tradition for a long time and there is no way to escape from it. Won't you be upset at me if I clean the garage next weekend, but not this weekend?* (son to father)

بیخشید. نمیتونم. این آخر هفته، نوبت منه که دوستانمو دعوت کنم با هم فیلم تماشا کنیم و شما می دونید که این رسم قدیمی ماست و همیشه ازش فرار کرد. ازم ناراحت نمیشید اگه به جای این آخر هفته، آخر هفته آینده گاراژو تمیز کنم؟

bebakhshid. nemitoonam. in akhare hafte nobate mane ke doostamo davat konam ba ham film tamasha konim va shoma midoonid ke in rasme ghadimiye mast va nemishe azash farar kard. azam narahat nemishid age be jaye in akhare hafte, akhare hafteye ayande garazho tamiz konam?

Therefore, the Persian children, using Negative Politeness Strategy “give deference” in addition to other politeness strategies used in performing the speech act of responding to the request of the parents, make a more verbose and a more elaborate style of rejecting the parents’ request, which seems very polite.

In rejection of the spouse’s request, both the British and Persian spouses, used Negative Politeness Strategy “communicate S’s wants to not impinge on H: apologize”. Our data explained that the British spouses (22%) used explanative rejection (apology + rejection + explanation) less frequently than the spouses in Persian family (31%). As a consequence, the style of rejecting the request among

the Persian spouses is in a higher degree of verbosity and at a higher level of elaborateness, while the British spouses rejected the couple's request in a more laconic way (refer to Table 3.19.):

(388) *I am sorry. We can't afford it now. Besides, I believe that your car has not gone out of order yet.* (husband to wife)

(389) *I am sorry. I can't. Today is my off day to stay at home.* (wife to husband)

(390) *I am sorry. We can't spend our money on it now. In fact, as you are in the picture even better than me, this year is a financial disaster, and we have to try to save our money rather than spend it.* (husband to wife)

بیخشید. ما الان نمیتونیم پولمونو صرف این کار کنیم. در واقع، همونطور که تو حتی بهتر از من در جریانی، امسال از لحاظ مالی وحشتناکه و ما باید سعی کنیم به جای خرج کردن، پولمونو جمع کنیم.
bebakhshid. ma alan nemitoonim poolemoono sarfe in kar konim. dar vaghe, hamoontor ke to hata behtar az man dar jaryani, emsal az lahaze mali vahshatnake va ma bayad say konim be jaye kharj kardan, poolemoono jam konim.

(391) *I am sorry. I can't bring you the documents. Today, it's my turn to hold our friendly gathering, and it's impossible to leave home when I am preparing for my guests.* (wife to husband)

بیخشید. نمیتونم مدارکو بیارم. امروز نوبت منه تا دورهمی دوستانمونو برگزار کنم و غیر ممکنه که بتونم وقتی دارم برای پذیرایی از مهمونام آماده میشم، خونه رو ترک کنم.
bebakhshid. nemitoonam madareko biyaram. emrooz nobate mane ke dore hamiye doostanamoono bargozar konam va gheyre momkene ke vaghti daram baraye pazirayi az mehmoonam amade misham, khoonaro tark konam.

3.7.2. Positive Politeness Strategies and communicative styles features

3.7.2.1. Formality vs. informality

The usage of Positive Politeness Strategies influences communicative styles as well. Our findings revealed that in both British and Persian family settings, the parents used Positive Politeness Strategy "use given names and nicknames" to address the children. Though the British parents (77%) used personal names,

including first names and nicknames, more frequently than their Persian counterparts (22%), the most frequent terms of address used by the parents in Persian family (73%) were kinship terms of *my daughter* (دخترم/ dokhtaram) and *my son* (پسرم/ pesaram), while, using kinship terms was hardly observed among the British parents (1%). The results illustrated the informal discourse style of addressing in parents-children communication in both lingua-cultures (refer to Table 3.4.):

(392) *Liz, could you please babysit your brother this weekend? (mother to daughter)*

(393) *Peter, it would not be a bluff, if I say your bike works even better than before. (father to son)*

(394) *My daughter, I need your help this weekend. Please babysit your brother when I go to the party. (mother to daughter)*

دخترم من این آخر هفته به کمکت نیاز دارم. لطفا وقتی من میرم مهمونی از برادرت نگهداری کن.
dokhtaram man in akhare hafte be komaket نیاز دارم. lotfan vaghti man miram mehmoonni az baradaret negaheari kon.

(395) *My son, I guess you could help me in handling the situation of mess in the garage. Please clean it at this weekend. (father to son)*

پسرم فکر میکنم تو می تونی تو جمع و جور کردن اوضاع آشفته گاراژ بهم کمک کنی. لطفا این آخر هفته گاراژو تمییز کن.
pesaram fekr mikonam to mitooni too jam o joor kardane oza-e ashofteye garazh behem komak koni. lotfan in akhare hafte garazho tamiz kon.

The British parents showed a greater tendency to address their children by endearment terms, consisting of comradely terms (19%), while this informal style of addressing, in Persian family setting, was observed less frequently (4%), used only towards the girls. The fact manifested that the parents in Persian context express their affection, closeness and intimacy to the children by using kinship terms of *my daughter* (دخترم/ dokhtaram) and *my son* (پسرم/ pesaram), rather than endearment terms (refer to Table 3.4.):

(396) *Sweetie, would you please babysit your sister this weekend? (mother to daughter)*

(397) *My favorite kid, you have cleaned the garage in the good way that I expected you. (father to son)*

(398) *My love, babysit your sister this weekend. (mother to daughter)*

عشقم، این آخر هفته از خواهرت مراقبت کن.

eshgham, in akhare hafte az khaharet moraghebat kon.

(399) *My heart, please pass me the salt. (father to daughter)*

جان دلم، لطفا نمکو به من بده.

jane delam, lotfan namako be man bede.

The findings suggest that the British style of addressing is more person-oriented, while addressing in the Persian style can be characterized as context-oriented. The style of addressing, used by the British and Persian children towards their parents, also confirms the obtained conclusion. Though in both British and Persian family settings, the children used Positive Politeness Strategy in addressing the parents, but they performed it differently. The British children used Positive Politeness Strategy “use given names and nicknames” that is the same strategy applied by the British parents in addressing their children.

According to our data, the British children (69%) addressed their parent by kinship terms of *Mom* (مامان/ maman) and *Dad* (بابا/ baba) less frequently than the children in Persian family (86%). Moreover, 30% of the children in British context addressed their parents by personal names, namely, first names or nicknames, which characterizes the British style as a more informal style, while addressing the parents by personal names was not observed among the children in Persian family, which determines the Persian style as a more formal style (refer to Table 3.6.):

(400) *Sorry, Mom. I can't sit with the baby. At the weekend, I have to study and iron my clothes. (daughter to mother)*

(401) *Sorry, Sara. I can't. I am going to visit the exhibition of Emilia, who is my best friend's cousin. (daughter to mother)*

(402) *Dad, my bike does not work well. Would you please help me repair it? (son to father)*

(403) *OK. Cleaning the garage is already inserted in my weekly schedule,*
Joseph. (son to father)

(404) *OK, Mom. On eye. I do it with my soul and heart. (daughter to mother)*
باشه مامان. چشم. با جون و دلم این کارو انجام میدم.

bashe maman. chashm. ba joon o delam in karo anjam madam.

(405) *I am sorry, Dad. I can't clean the garage this weekend. I must study.*
(son to father)

ببخشید بابا. این آخر هفته نمی تونم گاراژو تمییز کنم. باید درس بخونم.
bebakhshid baba. in akhare hafte nemitoonam garazho tamiz konam. bayad dars bekhoobam.

3.7.2.2. Expressivity vs. non/ less expressivity

Our findings displayed that 13% of the Persian children, using Positive Politeness Strategy of exaggeration “exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with hearer”, addressed their parents by superlative metaphorical endearment terms, while this form of addressing was not revealed among their counterparts in British family setting. This observation demonstrated the stylistic characteristic of expressiveness with the use of emotivity in children-parents discourse in Persian family (refer to Table 3.6.):

(406) *All my life, could you please kindly do a favor and bring me a glass of water?* (son to mother)

همه زندگی من، میتونید لطفا بی زحمت یه محبت کنید و برام یک لیوان آب بیارید؟
hameye zendegiye man, mitoonid lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat konid va baram yek livan ab biyarid?

(407) *OK. On eye. No worries, as I do manage it, the dearest in my life.*
(daughter to mother)

باشه. چشم. عزیزترین زندگیم، نگران نباشید چون من ترتیبشو میدم.
bashe. chashm. aziz-tarine zendegim, negaran nabashid chon man tartibesho midam.

(408) *You did a great job, the most supportive Dad in the world.* (son to father)

afarin, hami-tarin babaye donya.

Furthermore, our data illustrated that the British spouses addressed the couple by personal names, including first names or nicknames, more frequently than the spouses in Persian family: 50% to 43% (husband to wife), and 60% to 31% (wife to husband), while the Persian spouses preferred to use endearment terms to address the couple more frequently than their counterparts in British family setting: 55% to 47% (husband to wife), and 68% to 36% (wife to husband), which makes the Persian style more expressive than the style of addressing used among the British spouses (refer to Tables 3.8. & 3.10.):

(409) *Sweet angel, it takes only in the blink of an eye to find a new car for you. (husband to wife)*

فرشته شیرین، پیدا کردن یه ماشین نو برای تو فقط به اندازه یک پلک زدن طول میکشه.

fereshteye shirin, peyda kardane ye machine no baraye to faghat be andazeye yek pelk zadan tool mikeshe.

(410) *Lovebird, I will be there at the drop of a hat. (wife to husband)*

مرغ عشقم، من فوراً اونجا خواهم بود.

morghe eshgham, man fo-ran oonja khaham bood.

A higher level of expressivity of the Persian style was also observed in the speech act of thanking. In bottom-up context, both the British and Persian children used Positive Politeness Strategy “claim common ground: notice, attend to hearer: his interests, wants, needs and goods” in order to show gratitude to their parents, however, the children in Persian family also used Positive Politeness Strategy of exaggeration “exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with hearer” to thank the parents, which makes the Persian style of thanking more elaborate and more expressive.

According to our data, the British children mostly (75%) showed a noticeable tendency to use *thank you* (+ intensifier) more frequently than their Persian counterparts (17%), while on the contrary, the majority of the children in Persian family (83%) preferred to show their gratitude towards the parents using *thank you*

+ compliment (+ intensifier) more frequently than the children (25%) in British family (refer to Table 3.31.):

(411) *Thank you. You are the most caring Mom in the world.* (son to mother)

(412) *Thank you. You are all that.* (son to father)

(413) *Thank you. Your presence is the only reason to have the feeling of tranquility and safety in my heart.* (son to mother)

ممنونم. حضور شما تنها دلیل احساس آرامش و امنیت در قلب منه.

mamnoonam. hozoore shoma tanha dalile ehsase aramesh o amniyat dar ghalbe mane.

(414) *Thank you. You are not simply all the best, but you are the most perfect Dad in the world who deserves a big hug and lots of love.* (son to father)

دستتون درد نکنه. شما نه فقط بهترینی، بلکه بی نقص ترین بابای دنیا هستی که شایسته یه بغل حسابی و یک عالمه عشقه.

dastetoon dard nakone. shoma na faghat behtarini, balke bi-naghs-tarin babaye donya hasti ke shayesteye ye baghale hesabi o ye alame eshghe.

The fact that the children in Persian family prefer to thank their parents through long complimentary utterances indicates that the style of thanking among the Persian children is more expressive with a higher level of emotionality. Moreover, the Persian children use a higher level of elaborateness to express their gratitude towards the parents, while the British children have a greater tendency to thank their parents at a lower level of expressivity and elaborateness.

The same results can be also noticed when showing response to thanking of the parents among the children in British and Persian family settings. According to our analysis, the children in both lingua-cultures used Positive Politeness Strategy “fulfill H’s want for some X: give gift to H, for instance, goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation” to respond to thanking of the parents, however the Persian children also used Negative Politeness Strategy “give deference” to respond to thanking of their parents, which corroborates using a higher level of elaborateness and emotionality among the children in Persian context in comparison with their British counterparts.

Based on our data, the type of acceptance or denial + compliment (+ intensifier) was used among the Persian children (17%) more frequently than the children in British family (3%). Furthermore, the Persian children (9%) used acceptance + compliment with intensifier to respond to thanking of their parents, while this linguistic variable was not observed among the children in British family. The significant difference, revealed among the Persian children (51%), concerned with using acceptance (+ compliment) plus *it's my duty* (وظیفه/ vazifame), as the superlative polite utterance, to intensify respect and dignity in showing response to thanking of the parents. The Persian style of showing response to thanking of the parents may indicate that the children in this context, due to the impact of the context, resulted from an asymmetrical role position of the speakers in Persian family setting, oblige themselves to use a more expressive style of discourse in order to respond to thanking of the parents (refer to Table 3.34.):

(415) *You're welcome. It's my duty. I am proud to be able to make you happy as the most amazing human in my life. (daughter to mother)*

خواهش میکنم. وظیفه. به خودم می بالم از اینکه می توانم شگفت آورترین آدم زندگیمو خوشحال کنم.
khahesh mikonam. vazifame. be khodam mibalam az inke mitoonam shegheft avar-tarin adame zendegimo khoshhal konam.

(416) *My pleasure. It's my duty. You are the first and the best master person in my life who are deserved happiness. (son to father)*

باعث افتخارمه. وظیفه. شما اولین و بهترین استاد من در زندگی هستید که سزاوار خوشحالیه.
ba-ese eftekharame. vazifame. shoma avalin va behtarin ostade man too zendegi hastid ke sezavare khoshhaliye.

Our analysis acknowledged the impact of the context, and the role of the speakers on the choice of their politeness strategies in Persian family discourse. Moreover, the noticeable preference to use *thank you* (+ intensifier) with compliment in Persian family setting shapes such characteristics of Persian family discourse as expressivity and elaborateness as we have mentioned above. The usage of Positive Politeness Strategies also contribute to the latter.

3.7.2.3. Verbosity vs. laconism

Verbosity vs. laconism, as a stylistic characteristic of discourse, was revealed in some other speech acts, including the speech act of responding to the request. Our British and Persian material in a family setting exhibited that in both lingua-cultures, the parents and the children used Positive Politeness Strategies “claim common ground: show agreement” and “notice/ attend to hearer: his interests, wants, needs and goods” in order to respond to the request of the children and the parents respectively, however the examples showed using the same politeness strategies in different approaches.

The fact that the British parents (67%) used immediate acceptance more frequently than the parents in Persian family (61%), and the Persian parents (39%) had a greater tendency to use explanative acceptance, consisting of immediate acceptance + explanation, than their British counterparts (33%) illustrated that the style of showing response to the request of the children is in a higher degree of verbosity in Persian family, while the British parents preferred to be more laconic using a lower degree of verbosity (refer to Table 3.20.):

- ***Situation: the son asks his father to help him repair his bike.***

(417) ***It's OK.*** (father to son)

(418) ***It's OK. I need some days, but you have my word.*** (father to son)

باشه. چند روز زمان لازم دارم، اما بهت قولشو میدم.

bashe. chand rooz zaman lazem daram, ama behet gholesho midam.

Furthermore, the British children mostly (82%) used immediate acceptance to show their positive response to the request of the parents, while the Persian children (33%) had a less tendency to respond to the request of the parents positively using the form of immediate acceptance. Based on our data, while 7% of the children in British family used explanative acceptance, namely, immediate acceptance + explanation to respond positively to the request of their parents, 53% of the Persian children used immediate acceptance + *on eye* + explanation, which makes their response to the parents' request much longer (refer to Table 3.22.):

- ***Situation: the mother asks his daughter to babysit the young sibling.***

(419) **OK.** (*daughter to mother*)

(420) **OK. On eye. I manage my plan at weekends to cope with this task too.**
(*daughter to mother*)

باشه. چشم. برنامه آخر هفته موهاهنگ میکنم که بتونم این کارو هم انجام بدم.
bashe. chashm. barnameye akhare haftamo hamahang mikonam ke betoonam in karo ham anjam bedam.

- **Situation: the Father asks his son to clean the garage.**

(421) **Of course.** (*son to father*)

(422) **Alright. On eye. This weekend, I have nothing especial to do, and I could handle this task.** (*son to father*)

بسیار خوب. چشم. این آخر هفته، من کار خاصی برای انجام دادن ندارم و می‌تونم ترتیب این کارو بدم.
besyar khoob. chashm. in akhare hafte, man kare khasi baraye anjam dadan nadaram va mitoonam tartibe in karo bedam.

By Positive Politeness Strategies “claim common ground: show agreement” and “notice/ attend to hearer: his interests, wants, needs and goods”, 47% of the British spouses used immediate acceptance, in order to respond to the couple’s request, more frequently than their counterparts (39%) in Persian context. However, our data displayed that in both lingua-cultures, 31% of the spouses in British family and 30% of the Persian spouses, in the form of explanative acceptance, namely, adding an explanation to their immediate acceptance, showed their response to the request of the couple almost equally (refer to Table 3.28.):

- **Situation: the wife asks her husband to buy her a new car.**

(423) **OK. I have also noticed that you need a new car.** (*husband to wife*)

(424) **OK. You are lucky because I received a leasing ad just yesterday.**
(*husband to wife*)

باشه. تو خوش شانسی چون من همین دیروز به آگهی خرید قسطی ماشین دریافت کردم.
bashe. to khosh shansi chon man hamin dirooz ye agahiye kharide ghestiye mashin daryaft kardam.

- **Situation: the husband asks his wife to bring the documents to his office.**

(425) **OK. I bring them after watching my favorite morning show.** (wife to husband)

(426) **Alright. Let me check my emails, firstly, then I am off to you.** (wife to husband)

بسیار خوب. بذار اول ایملهامو چک کنم، بعد به سمت تو حرکت میکنم.
besyar khoob. bezar aval email hamo check konam, baad be samte to harekat mikonam.

It is worth emphasizing that the stylistic characteristic of verbosity is heavily influenced by the social context in Persian family setting. According to our analysis, as the Persian children show their gratitude to the parents in an expressive manner, using a higher degree of verbosity than their British counterparts, the Persian parents thank their children in a more laconic way.

In both British and Persian family settings, the parents used Positive Politeness Strategy “claim common ground: notice, attend to hearer: his interests, wants, needs and goods” to show their gratitude to the children. Our results manifested that the Persian parents (56%) used *thank you* (+ intensifier) more frequently than their counterparts (41%) in British family setting. However, the parents in both lingua-cultures used *thank you* + compliment (+ intensifier) almost equally: 41% of the British parents and 40% of the parents in Persian context (refer to Table 3.30.):

(427) **Thank you. You are a real bright spark in our life.** (mother to daughter)

(428) **Thank you. I am glad for having your helping hand.** (father to son)

(429) **Thank you. Your help to me is like a light in darkness.** (mother to daughter)

دستت درد نكنه. كمك تو براى من مثل نورى در تاريكيه.
dastet dard nakone. komake to baraye man mesle noori dar tarikiye.

(430) **Thank you. Your caring character always makes me confident.** (father to son)

دستت درد نكنه. شخصيت حمايتگر تو هميشه منو مطمئن ميكنه.
dastet dard nakone. shakhsiyate hemayatgare to hamishe mano motma-en mikone.

In British family, due to a symmetrical role position among the speakers, the impact of the context was not observed in choosing politeness strategies by the parents and children to thank each other. Consequently, the style of thanking in both contexts of top-down and bottom-up in British family setting has an equal degree of verbosity and equal level of expressivity. On the contrary, due to an asymmetrical role position among the parents and children in Persian family, we observed the impact of the context, which results in choosing different politeness strategies by the parents and children to show their gratitude to each other. The children in Persian family not only used Positive Politeness Strategy “claim common ground: notice, attend to hearer: his interests, wants, needs and goods”, but also used Positive Politeness Strategy of exaggeration “exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with hearer” to thank their parents, which makes their style of thanking more elaborate at a higher level of expressivity.

In both lingua-cultures, the spouses used Positive Politeness Strategy “claim common ground: notice, attend to hearer: his interests, wants, needs and goods” to show their gratitude to the couple. Though in British family, the spouses (34%) thanked the couple using *thank you* (+ intensifier) more frequently than their Persian counterparts (26%), however, both the British and Persian spouses used *thank you* + compliment (+ intensifier) almost equally to thank each other: 44% among the British spouses and 43% of the spouses in Persian family (refer to Table 3.32.). The results revealed that in both British and Persian family settings, the style of thanking among the spouses possesses an equal degree of verbosity and an equal level of expressivity and elaborateness to show gratitude towards each other:

(431) *Thank you. You are always generous and thoughtful to gift me.* (wife to husband)

(432) *Thank you. Whenever I ask something from you, you pave my path without hesitation.* (husband to wife)

(433) *Thank you. I feel protected and at ease with your presence and cares.* (wife to husband)

ممنونم. من با حضور و توجهات تو احساس امنیت و آرامش می کنم.

mamnoonam. man ba hozoor va tavajohate to ehsase amniyato aramesh mikonam.

(434) *Thank you. **You continually impress me by your caring and supportive character.** (husband to wife)*

متشکرم. تو دائما منو با شخصیت حمایتگرت تحت تاثیر قرار میدی.

motashakeram. to da-eman mano ba shakhsiyate hemayatgaret tahte-tasir gharar midi.

In both British and Persian family settings, the parents used Positive Politeness Strategy “fulfill H’s want for some X: give gift to H, for instance, goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation” in order to respond to thanking of the children. Our data clarified that 100% of the parents in both lingua-cultures used the type of acceptance or denial that reveals the exacting style of responding to gratitude of the children in British and Persian family settings (refer to Table 3.33.):

(435) ***You’re welcome.** (mother to son)*

(436) ***It’s OK.** (father to son)*

خواهش میکنم.

khahesh mikonam.

According to our material, the British and Persian children used also Positive Politeness Strategy “fulfill H’s want for some X: give gift to H, for instance, goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation” in order to show response to thanking of the parents. Using the identical Positive Politeness Strategy as well as the identical style of showing response to thanking in both contexts of top-down and bottom-up in British family manifested the fact that there is a symmetrical role position and an egalitarian social order among the speakers in British context, and the context has no impact on choosing their politeness strategies and their style of communication to perform the speech act.

Though in both lingua-cultures, the British children (78%) and the children in Persian family (68%) mostly used the type of acceptance or denial with the exacting style of discourse to show their response to thanking of the parents, our data indicated that the Persian children (17%) had a greater tendency to use the type of acceptance or denial + compliment (+ intensifier) than their British counterparts

(3%). The results confirmed that the children in Persian family, more than their British counterparts, preferred to use the elaborate style of showing response to thanking of the parents, while this style of discourse among the British children is at a lower level of elaborateness (refer to Table 3.34.):

(437) *You're welcome. I am so lucky to have a caring and generous father like you. (son to father)*

(438) *Don't mention it. I have a long way to go to be like you, such a perfect lady in every scene. (daughter to mother)*

قابل نداره. من راه طولانی در پیش دارم تا مثل شما یک خانم تمام معنا در همه چیز باشم.
ghabel nadare. man rahe toolani dar pish daram ta mesle shoma yek khanoome
tamam ma-na dar hame chiz basham.

(439) *At any time. You are the first role model in my life, and your tendency to be a perfect person always inspire me. (son to father)*

همیشه در خدمتم. شما الگوی من در زندگی هستید و تمایلتون به یک انسان کامل بودن همیشه الهام بخش منه.
hamishe dar khedmatam. shoma olgooye man dar zandegi hastid va tamayoletoon
be yek ensane kamel boodan hamishe elham bakhshe mane.

Our findings demonstrated that in both British and Persian family settings, the spouses used Positive Politeness Strategy “fulfill H’s want for some X: give gift to H for instance goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation” to respond to thanking of the couple as well. According to our analysis, the majority of the British (62%) and Persian spouses (56%) preferred to use the type of acceptance or denial, to show response to thanking of the couple, rather than using the type of acceptance or denial + compliment (+ intensifier): 16% to 12% respectively. The results revealed that the style of showing response to thanking of the couple among both the British and Persian spouses is exacting, and the spouses in both lingua-cultures showed a less tendency to use the elaborate style of discourse when showing response to thanking of each other (refer to Table 3.35.):

(440) *My pleasure. I feel excited when I can make my beautiful wife feel special. (husband to wife)*

(441) *It's OK. I would love to have an active role, as you have been really supportive of me.* (wife to husband)

(442) *My pleasure. I love doing anything that results in lighting up your beautiful eyes.* (husband to wife)

باعث افتخارمه. من عاشق انجام هرکاری هستم که به درخشیدن چشمای زیبای تو منجر میشه.
ba-ese eftekharam. man asheghe anjame har kari hastam ke be derakhshidane
cheshmaye zibaye to monjar mishe.

(443) *You're welcome. Helping my hardworking man is one of the right things to do in the world.* (wife to husband)

خواهش میکنم. کمک کردن به همسر سختکوشم یکی از درست ترین کارهای دنیاست.
khahesh mikonam. komak kardan be hamsare sakht-koosham yeki az dorost tarin
karhaye donyast.

3.7.3 Socio-cultural features and communicative styles features

Our contrastive analysis caused us to understand the strong impact of the social contexts and the role of the speakers on the choice of politeness strategies in Persian family discourse and, as a consequence, their stylistic characteristics. In this section, the similarities and differences in social characteristics, the impact of the social role of the speakers on politeness strategies and the styles of communication, including symmetrical vs. asymmetrical role position, egalitarian vs. non-egalitarian social order, and person-oriented vs. context or status-oriented have been discussed and summarized providing with examples of dialogues from our British and Persian material:

▪ Top-down context: Parents to children

Situation 1: Mother asks his daughter to babysit the young sibling.

British context:

Mother: Mary, we have been invited to a party this weekend. Could you please babysit your sibling?

Daughter: Sure.

Mother: Thank you. You are my angel.

Daughter: It's OK.

The British dialogue manifests an informality in addressing the daughter by first name, the indirect type of request using Negative Politeness Strategies, as well as an expressive style of showing gratitude towards the daughter with a compliment of personality trait.

Persian context:

Mother: My daughter, we have been invited to a party this weekend. Please take care of your little brother.

Daughter: OK. On eye. Of course, I do.

Mother: Thank you. I always feel better with your help.

Daughter: Don't mention it. It's my duty. You do much more than that to me every day.

موقعیت 1: مادر از دخترش می خواهد از برادر / خواهر کوچکش مراقبت کند.

مادر: دخترم ما آخر هفته به یه مهمونی دعوت شدیم. لطفا از خواهر کوچیکت مراقبت کن.

دختر: باشه. چشم. البته که اینکارو میکنم.

مادر: ممنونم. من همیشه با کمک تو احساس بهتری دارم.

دختر: قابلی نداره. وظیفمه. شما هر روز خیلی بیشتر از این برای من انجام میدید.

In the Persian dialogue, an informality in addressing the daughter by kinship term of *my daughter* (دخترم / dokhtaram) is observed. Meanwhile, on contrary to the British dialogue, the Persian dialogue shows the direct type of imperative request using Bald-On Record Directness Politeness Strategy, which is task-oriented, as well as an expressive style of thanking towards the daughter with a compliment of performance. The significant differences are remarked in responding to the request and responding to thanking in the British and Persian dialogues. In contrast to the British dialogue, in which the laconic style of responding to the request and responding to thanking towards the mother is observed, in the Persian dialogue, due to the usage of *on eye* (چشم / chashm) to express putting the mother's request in top

priority and performing it without any hesitation and excuse, and *it's my duty* (وظیفه/ vazifame) to express respectful response to the mother's gratitude, a higher degree of verbosity and a higher level of expressivity with emotionality are revealed.

▪ **Bottom-up context: Children to parents**

Situation 2: Son asks her mother for a glass of water.

British context:

Son: Susan, I am so thirsty. Would you please bring me a glass of water?

Mother: OK.

Son: Thank you.

Mother: You're welcome.

The British dialogue shows an informality in addressing the mother by first name, the indirect type of request using Negative Politeness Strategies and the laconic style of thanking.

Persian family:

Son: I am so thirsty, Mom. May I ask you please kindly to do a favor and bring me a glass of water?

Mother: Sure.

Son: Thank you, my beautiful angel. Heaven is under your feet.

Mother: It's OK.

موقعیت 2: پسر از مادرش می خواهد برای او یک لیوان آب بیاورد.

پسر: من تشنه مامان. ممکنه ازتون خواهش کنم بی زحمت محبت کنید و برای من یه لیوان آب بیارید؟
مادر: حتما.

پسر: دستتون درد نکنه، فرشته زیبای من. بهشت زیر پای شماست.
مادر: خواهش میکنم.

Although both dialogues occur in the similar situation and contain the similar speech acts, they demonstrate some salient differences in their performance, which

concern with the level of formality and informality of the forms of addressing, the degree of directness and indirectness of the request, the level of expressivity and the degree of verbosity of showing gratitude.

While in the British dialogue, the mother is addressed by first name as an informal form of addressing, in Persian family, such informality is non-appropriate. In contrast to addressing the mother by personal name in British family, in the Persian dialogue, the son uses kinship term of *Mom* (مامان/ maman) and *my beautiful angel* (فرشته زیبای من/ fereshteye zibaye man), as the metaphorical utterance, which makes the style of addressing the mother more expressive using more emotive politeness in Persian family.

Furthermore, while in both dialogues, the type of requesting is indirect using Negative Politeness Strategies, in the Persian dialogue, due to the usage of *please kindly do a favor (to me)* (لطفاً بی زحمت یه محبت (به من) کنید/ lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat (be man) konid) in addition to using *vous*-form of address, namely, the second-person plural pronoun *you* (شما/ shoma) and the plural form of verbs, the son's request is observed in a higher degree of formality and indirectness than his counterpart in British dialogue.

In expressing gratitude to the mother, in contrast to the laconic style of thanking in British dialogue, the son, in Persian family, adds superlative metaphorical endearment term of *my beautiful angel* (فرشته زیبای من/ fereshteye zibaye man) to the conventional expression of *thank you*, followed by the utterance of *heaven is under your feet* (بهشت زیر پای شماست/ behesht zire paye shomast) with *vous*-form of address, namely, the second-person plural pronoun *you* (شما/ shoma) and the plural form of verbs, which indicate paying a high respect to the mother and emphasize a high dignity of mothers in Persian culture as the persons, who deserve to be placed in heaven. Our results gave us to understand that the communicative styles, used in Persian dialogue, are formal and more indirect in a higher degree of verbosity and at a higher level of expressiveness and elaborateness. Considering the speech acts of response to the request and response to thanking, performed by the mother in British and Persian dialogues, the laconic style of response to request and

response to thanking towards the son is revealed in both British and Persian family settings.

▪ **Linear context: Husband to wife**

Situation 3: (a) The husband asks his wife to bring the documents to his office.

British family:

Husband: Susan, I have a very busy day. Can you please bring me the documents to my office?

Wife: Yes, sure.

Husband: Thank you.

Wife: It's OK.

(b) The wife has brought the documents to her husband's office.

Wife: Here you are, your documents.

Husband: Thank you. You are always my helping angel.

Wife: You're welcome. You have also depicted the same picture towards me.

The British dialogue, from husband to wife, illustrates an informality in addressing the wife by first name, the indirect type of request using Negative Politeness Strategies, and the laconic style of thanking after receiving the acceptance of the request by the wife. It is important to state that the husband, after performing the request by the wife, uses the conventional expression of thanking *thank you*, followed by an expressive style of thanking with a compliment of personality traits in order to show gratitude to the wife. In British dialogue, when responding to the request by the wife, and showing response to thanking of the husband, the wife also uses the laconic style of communication before performing the request, and the expressive style of response to thanking by the type of acceptance with a compliment of personality traits towards the husband.

Persian family:

Husband: Saba, I have a very busy day. May I ask you please to bring the documents to my office?

Wife: Sure, why not.

Husband: Thank you.

Wife: My pleasure.

(b) The wife has brought the documents to her husband's office.

Wife: I've tried to bring it as soon as possible.

Husband: Thank you. I can count on your helping hand, whenever I need.

Wife: You're welcome. I always know that you're also around me to help.

موقعیت 3: (الف) شوهر از همسرش می خواهد مدارکی را به دفتر کارش بیاورد.

شوهر: سبا، امروز سرم خیلی شلوغه. میشه ازت خواهش کنم لطفا مدارکو بیاری دفترم؟

زن: حتما، چرا که نه.

شوهر: متشکرم.

زن: باعث افتخارمه.

(ب) زن مدارک را به دفتر کار شوهرش می آورد.

زن: سعی کردم تا حد امکان سریع مدارکو برات بیارم.

شوهر: همیشه وقتی نیاز دارم میتونم روی کمک تو حساب کنم. این برای من خیلی با ارزشه.

زن: خواهش می کنم. من همیشه می دونم که تو هم برای کمک کردن به من حاضری .

In the Persian dialogue, the same situation, as in the British dialogue, is observed. The Persian husband addresses the wife informally by first name, makes the indirect type of request using Negative Politeness Strategies, and shows his gratitude to the wife laconically. It is important to state that the husband, after performing the request by the wife, uses the conventional expression of thanking *thank you*, followed by an expressive style of thanking with a compliment of performance in order to show gratitude to the wife. In Persian dialogue, when responding to the request by the wife, and showing response to thanking of the husband, the wife also uses the laconic style of communication before performing the request, and the expressive style of response to thanking by the type of acceptance with a compliment of performance towards the husband.

▪ **Linear context: Wife to husband**

Situation 4: (a) The wife asks her husband to buy her a new car.

British family:

Wife: Sweetheart, my car is really old. Could you please buy me a new car?

Husband: It's OK. Let's see what our options are.

Wife: Thank you. You are a very generous husband.

Husband: You're welcome.

(b) They have bought a new car:

Husband: This is your new car. Do you like it?

Wife: Thank you. As you are my dear soulmate, you know what I exactly love.

Husband: You're welcome. You deserve more.

In the British dialogue, from wife to husband, an informality in addressing the husband by endearment term, the indirect type of request using Negative Politeness Strategies, and an expressive style of showing gratitude towards the husband with a compliment of personality traits is remarked. It is necessary to mention that after performing the request by the husband, the British wife also uses the conventional expression of thanking *thank you*, followed by an expressive style of thanking with a compliment of personality traits in order to show her gratitude to the husband. Furthermore, in the speech act of response to thanking, the husband, after accepting the wife's request, responds to thanking of the wife laconically, while after performing the wife's request, he uses the expressive style of response to thanking, including the type of acceptance, followed by a compliment of personality traits.

Persian family:

Wife: Darling, my car is really old. Would you please buy me a new car?

Husband: It's OK. In the first step, I need to gather some information about the best existing options in the current car market.

Wife: Thank you. I truly trust your good choice.

Husband: My pleasure.

(b) They have bought a new car:

Husband: In my opinion, following lots of research about the best current options this car is an appropriate choice. What is your idea?

Wife: Thank you. You are perfect at bringing my dreams to life.

Husband: You're welcome. All the blessings in our house are because of your existence in my life.

موقعیت 4: (الف) زن از شوهرش می خواهد برایش یک اتومبیل نو بخرد.

زن: عزیزم اتومبیل خیلی قدیمیه. میشه لطفا برام یه ماشین نو بخری؟

شوهر: حتما. در اولین قدم، من باید یک مقدار اطلاعات در مورد بهترین گزینه های موجود در بازار فعلی ماشین جمع کنم.

زن: ممنونم. من کاملا به انتخاب درست اعتماد دارم.

شوهر: خواهش میکنم.

(ب) آنها اتومبیل نو می خرند.

شوهر: از نظر من بعد از کلی تحقیق در مورد گزینه های موجود این ماشین بهترین انتخابه. تو چی فکر می کنی؟

زن: دستت درد نکنه. تو در به واقعیت نشوندن رویاهای من عالی هستی.

شوهر: قابلی نداره. همه نعمت های تو خونه مون به خاطر وجود تو در زندگی منه.

In the Persian dialogue, an informality in addressing the husband by endearment term, the indirect type of request using Negative Politeness Strategies, and expressive style of thanking with a compliment of performance after accepting the request and performing it by the husband is revealed. To be more explicit, the Persian wife, after accepting the request and performing the request by the husband, uses the conventional expression of thanking *thank you*, followed by an expressive style of thanking with a compliment of performance in order to show her gratitude to the husband. Viewing response to request and response to thanking, more expressivity and more verbosity is revealed in Persian dialogue, while in the British dialogue, the husband shows response to request and response to thanking less expressive and more laconic. Besides, in the speech act of response to thanking, the husband, after accepting the wife's request, responds to thanking of the wife laconically, while after performing the wife's request, he uses the expressive style

of response to thanking, including the type of acceptance, followed by a compliment of personality traits.

As the examples explain, the style of Persian family is extensively context-dependent. In top-down context, the stylistic features between parents-children are direct and informal, while in bottom-up context, due to a non-egalitarian social order and an asymmetrical role position among the speakers, the style used by the children are indirect, formal and expressive. On the contrary, the British style does not reveal significant sensitivity to the contexts and can be characterized as symmetrical and person-oriented.

Summary

In this chapter, we analyzed the data from a questionnaire in the form of Discourse Completion Task (DCT), aimed at extracting the speech acts of addressing, request, response to request, thanking and response to thanking, as well as identifying politeness strategies and the most salient stylistic features of British and Persian communicative styles in a family setting, focusing on qualitative and quantitative characteristics.

The contrastive analysis revealed both similarities and differences in the communicative behavior of the representatives of British and Persian culture. It showed that in both cultural contexts, the speakers used Negative Politeness Strategies and Positive Politeness strategies in the family discourse, but their frequency and the context dependency varied significantly.

Differences in the usage of politeness strategies and the way of performing of the speech acts under the study resulted in stylistic differences, which concerned with the manner of expressing communicative intentions (direct vs. indirect), the level of formality and informality (formal vs. informal), the level of expressiveness (expressive vs. non/ less expressive), and the degree of verbosity (verbose vs. laconic).

To perform requesting, the British parents, children and spouses used Negative Politeness Strategies “be conventionally indirect” and “ask questions”,

aimed at avoiding imposition on the hearer, while the direct type of request was not observed in any situation of British family setting. It is important to mention that the British parents also used Politeness Strategy “dissociate the hearer from discourse”. Therefore, the British style of requesting can be described as predominantly indirect. In contrast, the majority of the Persian parents used Bald-On Record Directness Politeness Strategy, which is task-oriented. They gave preference to the direct type of request and used the imperative request with and *even* without “please”. However, directness cannot be considered as a stylistic characteristic of Persian discourse, as the children in Persian family setting, on the contrary, used exclusively Negative Politeness Strategies to request their parents.

Besides Negative Politeness Strategies “be conventionally indirect” and “ask questions”, the Persian children also used Negative Politeness Strategy “give deference”, manifested in using *please kindly do a favor (to me)* (لطفاً بی زحمت به / lotfan bi-zahmat ye mohabat (be man) konid), in addition to using *vous*-form of address, namely, the second-person plural pronoun *you* (شما/ shoma) and the plural form of verbs.

Though the Persian spouses used Negative Politeness Strategies “be conventionally indirect” and “ask questions” to request each other, similar to what was observed among their British counterparts, there are rare cases, in which the husbands used the imperative form of request with “please” to request the wives. This fact suggests some role differences in Persian linear context, and indicates that in this culture, the wives show more formality towards their husbands, while the husbands may let themselves be direct.

While the predominance of addressing terms of personal names, including first names and nicknames, in British family setting testifies to an informality and person-orientation, the Persian style, due to the preference of kinship terms and using *vous*-form of address, namely, the second-person plural pronoun *you* (شما/ shoma), besides the plural form of verbs, by the children towards their parents appears to be formal and context-oriented. Moreover, the frequent use of kinship terms with the possessive pronoun *my* (مال من/ male man) as *my daughter* (دخترم/ dokhtaram) and

my son (پسر/ pesaram), which emphasize affection and intimacy between parents-children in Persian family setting, testifies to the value of family and “We-identity” of the representatives of Persian culture. While the preference of personal names as a category of terms of address in British context, which can be observed even in addressing the parents by the children, testifies to the value of an individual typical of “I-culture” and “I-identity” [Larina et al., 2017].

The use of metaphorical endearment terms, including comradely terms, as well as the conventional use of Positive Politeness Strategy of exaggeration “exaggerate interest, approval, sympathy with hearer” by the children in Persian family leads to a higher level of expressivity and elaborateness in the Persian style, which, pragmatically, indicates an obligation to pay high respect to the parents in this culture. Due to the fact that in Persian family, both the husbands and wives, used endearment terms of addressing, to address the couple, more frequently than their British counterparts may reveal a higher level of expressivity in the style of discourse among the Persian spouses than among the British spouses as well.

Our findings manifested that verbosity, as another characteristic of the Persian style, observed in children-parents interaction, serves the same purpose. In Persian family, requesting the parents, as well as rejecting the request of the parents are comprised of longer utterances in comparison with the same speech acts, performed by the British children. In fact, the Persian children not only used longer utterances and a higher degree of verbosity to describe the reason of the rejection, but also their style of discourse of rejecting the parents’ request is more elaborate. This verbosity in Persian context was also observed in the Persian parents’ explanative acceptance, as well as explanative rejection of the children’s request. Moreover, in Persian context, the style of discourse in linear context in explanative acceptance as well as explanative rejection of the couple’s request is more verbose than the British spouses, which may argue that verbosity is a more salient characteristic of the Persian style in comparison with the British style.

Our contrastive analysis confirms a non-egalitarian social order and an asymmetrical role position among the members of Persian family, which is revealed

in the differences in communicative behavior. It also elucidates the impact of the context on the choice of politeness strategies. As a consequence, the Persian style demonstrates a higher sensitivity to the context, and can be characterized as context-dependent, asymmetrical, and status-oriented. To be more explicit, the Persian style is indirect and formal in bottom-up context, but informal and direct in top-down context. It is worth stating that the high level of expressivity and the high degree of verbosity, observed in bottom-up context of Persian family setting, demonstrate the necessity of paying respect to the addressee. The British style, in contrast, reveals less sensitivity to the context. It can be characterized as person-oriented, due to an egalitarian social order and a symmetrical role position among the speakers in British family setting, and the values of equality and independence in British culture.

Therefore, the style of the Persian children in interaction with their parents can be illustrated as indirect, very formal, expressive, elaborate and verbose, while the style of the parents towards their children in Persian family appears to be direct, informal, less expressive, less elaborate and more laconic. Our results disclosed that the style of the British and Persian spouses revealed fewer differences. On the whole, the British styles can be characterized as symmetrical, egalitarian and person-oriented, while the Persian styles are asymmetrical, non-egalitarian and status-oriented.

CONCLUSION

Politeness, as an important aspect of communication, is a core of attention of scholars in a broad spectrum of study fields such as sociolinguistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, intercultural communication, and others. This field of research can be defined as the study of interactional approaches, adopted by people, in order to establish and maintain their relationships.

Linguistic politeness and etiquette are interconnected broadly with each other, and occasionally employed interchangeably. However, the scope of phenomena, congregated under the umbrella of linguistic politeness, is much more extensive. Etiquette is mostly concentrated on the norms and the rules of appropriate behavior,

while politeness is not restricted to the norms and the rules of proper behavior. Politeness, as a sociolinguistic and pragmatic phenomenon, varies according to contextual elements, and it is the hearer, who evaluates the level of politeness or impoliteness. Politeness is characterized as one of the most significant study fields in pragmatics. Different theories have been presented to explore the role of politeness in communication.

In chapter 1, the specific attention has been paid to the conversational maxim view of politeness, face-saving view and discursive approach to politeness, which we consider as the most relevant subjects to our study. One of the most influential theories of politeness, introduced by Brown and Levinson [1978, 1987], put an emphasis on the universality of politeness, address both Positive Face and Negative Face wants of interlocutors, and propose a framework for research on linguistic politeness. They propose Positive Politeness and Negative Politeness and a set of strategies used to perform them.

Despite the universality of politeness in nature, it is a culture-specific phenomenon. People, who come from different cultures, have different understanding of politeness, which is specified by the type of culture and the values, regulating the usage of different strategies for the performance of politeness. Politeness is strongly associated with the social organization of society, and should be taken into consideration in the contexts of social distance (D) and power distance (P). As it has been clarified, in individualistic British culture, characterized by a long horizontal distance and a short vertical distance, equality and privacy are the most significant communicative values, while on the contrary, in collectivistic Persian culture, with a short horizontal distance and a salient vertical distance, people value closeness and solidarity, and demonstrate respect to age and the status.

The identified differences, as socio-cultural and axiological differences, are revealed in the categorization and the performance of politeness. They conduct the choice of conventional strategies of politeness, which regular usage of these politeness strategies, shapes culture-specific communicative styles. Varieties of the social relations and the cultural values form an understanding of politeness that is

specific to that culture. Moreover, identification and description of the dominant features of an ethno-cultural communicative style help to systematize a collection of disparate features and provide with the communicative behavior of a society as a coherent and logical system. Knowledge of dominant features of communicative ethno-styles, as well as socio-cultural and axiological factors associated with them, is a fundamental component of communicative competence, essential for a successful intercultural communication.

In chapter 2, drawing on our results collected from a descriptive written interview, we aimed at highlighting how the British and Persian speakers understand politeness. In this chapter, putting the main focus on politeness, the findings revealed some similarities and differences. Our contrastive analysis disclosed that Both the British and Persian interviewees understand politeness as showing respect to people and having good manners towards them. However, the way they pay respect, and its meaning differ significantly.

Based on our analysis, British understanding of politeness prescribes respecting people's privacy and personal autonomy, equality of rights, respecting people's feelings and concerns, and being reserved. In other expressions, British understanding of politeness correlates with the cultural values of privacy, distance, independence, equality and emotional self-control, and fits in the logic of culture. Moreover, British interviewees, as the representatives of an individualistic culture, view distance as a positive cultural value and highly respect privacy, independence and personal autonomy of each person. The British speakers, keeping their physical and verbal distance, show politeness to each other. In fact, British politeness prescribes following a number of the strict norms to specify and to protect the right of personal autonomy, and to demonstrate respect that should be paid to independence and personal space of every individual, despite the age and the status as well. These results confirm that British communicative culture tends to be avoidance-based and person-oriented. The value of an individuality in British culture contributes to forming "I-identity" of its representatives.

In Persian culture, on the contrary, distance is perceived negatively. Based on our results, the Persian interviewees considerably tend to be a member of a group in order to proceed common activities and are generous in sharing their personal opinions and perspectives, including successful or even unsuccessful life experiences with other people in the circle of family, close friends and relatives. The value of collectivity in Persian culture supports forming “We-identity”.

In contrast to an individualistic egalitarian British culture, in collectivistic Muslim cultures, inclusive of Persian culture, age plays a very important social role, and respecting the elderly, specifically, parents and grandparents is the most significant manifestation of showing politeness in this culture. Muslims are encouraged to behave respectfully to other people, particularly, the elderly with the main emphasis on respecting parents and grandparents, as it has been strongly recommended in the numerous hadith from Muslim Prophet Muhammad and the Holy Quran. In Islam, there is also the deep religious belief that respecting parents and behaving them with honor is one of the most significant aspects of politeness, which results in mercifulness and blessings in the lives of young people.

Meanwhile, in Persian society, status is a very significant social and communicative value. There are numerous hadith from saint people, elected from God, based on which respecting people, who are in a higher status, like teachers, are valued. Furthermore, our findings illustrated that “tarooof”, as a culture-specific Persian etiquette, emphasizes both deference and social rank. Our research may acknowledge that the principles of identity, mainly derived from the Holy Quran, are the foundations of politeness norms and principles in Persian communicative culture and indicate that linguistic politeness in Persian culture is strongly established on paying respect to the elderly, as the persons, who are older in age, and teachers, as the persons, who are higher in status.

Consequently, Persian understanding of politeness presupposes solidarity and contact, paying respect to the elderly, in particular, parents and grandparents, and people in a higher status, such as teachers, sticking to “taarof” and being extroverted. Thus, Persian politeness is based on such social and communicative values as

solidarity and contact, interdependence, emotional openness, respect to age and status, veneration of the Holy Quran and adherence to “taarof”. These results testify to the fact that Persian communicative culture tends to be solidarity-based and status-oriented, which correlates with a short horizontal distance and a salient vertical distance in this culture.

In chapter 3, we explored how differences in cultures, cultural values and understanding of politeness pilot communicative behavior in a family setting. In this chapter, we provide with our qualitative and quantitative analysis and the analysis of politeness strategies, applied in the speech acts of addressing, request, response to request, thanking, response to thanking and compliments in British and Persian family settings. Moreover, we aimed at identifying the most salient stylistic features of British and Persian communicative styles in a family setting, paying attention to quantitative and qualitative characteristics. Our contrastive analysis revealed some similarities and differences, interpreted through cultural differences and values. In both cultural settings, the British and Persian respondents used Negative Politeness Strategies and Positive Politeness Strategies, but their frequency, conventionality and context dependence varied remarkably.

Based on our results, in British family, the parents, children and spouses used almost the same politeness strategies to perform the speech acts discussed. Therefore, in British family, in all the situations, both symmetrical and asymmetrical, the impact of the context on the choice of politeness strategies has not been observed. Consequently, the discourse of the parents, children and spouses, in British family setting, demonstrated almost the same stylistic characteristics, including indirectness and informality. This can be explained by a symmetrical role position and an egalitarian social order among the speakers, due to a high horizontal distance and a short vertical distance, which are considered as the social characteristics of Anglo-Saxon British culture.

On the contrary, in Persian family, due to a non-egalitarian social order and an asymmetrical role position among the speakers, the impact of the context in the choice of politeness strategies is underscored. Though the Persian parents and

spouses, as their British counterparts, mostly used the same politeness strategies, some significant differences in children-parents communication revealed a high vertical distance with placing a high value on the age and the status of the parents in this culture. As a result, the Persian style demonstrates significant context dependency. In bottom-down context, between children and parents, the stylistic characteristic of communication is indirect and formal, while in top-down context, the Persian style appears to be direct and informal. Moreover, expressiveness and verbosity are also salient characteristics of the Persian style in bottom-up context, which manifest an emphasized politeness of the speaker towards the addressee. The British style, in contrast to the Persian style, is less expressive, less elaborate and more laconic.

The revealed differences, as well as the fact that personal names, involving first names and nicknames are a predominant form of address in British context, while the Persian speakers prefer kinship terms confirm the statement that the British style of interpersonal communication is person-oriented [Larina 2009, 2015], while the Persian style can be characterized as context-dependent and status-oriented.

The present study is of a limited nature as we only focused on the data from a descriptive written interview and (DCT) questionnaire, including a few speech acts in a family setting. The topic of politeness strategies and communicative styles through performing speech acts are fertile research area that is worthy of more investigation, as it exhibits how politeness determines communicative behavior and shapes communicative styles. Therefore, we anticipate carrying out further research in the future to provide a more complete picture of using politeness strategies and communicative styles in more speech acts in British and Persian lingua-cultures in other settings and discourses. Moreover, further research can be executed to trace what changes in politeness strategies and communicative styles of performing speech acts in British and Persian cultures have experienced through history and the factors that have governed and led to such changes. Additionally, the study of natural communication is required for verification of the results and deeper conclusions.

REFERENCES

1. Agyekum, K. (2005). The pragmatics of requests in Akan communication. *Legon Journal of Humanities*, 16, 1-26.
2. Assadi Aidinlou, N., & Tina, F. & Bonab, V. (2012). An investigation of politeness strategies among Iranian EFL learners in producing written requests. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2(11), 11322-11329. ISSN 2090-4304.
3. Alba-Juez, L. (2009). *Perspectives on Discourse Analysis: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
4. Alba-Juez, L. (2016). Discourse analysis and pragmatics: Their scope and relation. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 20(4), 43-55. doi:10.22363/2312-9182-2016-20-4-43-55.
5. Al-Hindawi, F., & Raheem Alkhazaali, M. (2016). A critique of politeness theories. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(8), 1537-1545. doi:10.17507/tpls.0608.03.
6. Aliakbari, M., & Toni, A. (2008). The realization of address terms in modern Persian in Iran: A sociolinguistic study. *Linguistic online*, 35(3/08), 3-12.
7. Asdjodi, M. (2001). A comparison between taarof in Persian and limao in Chinese. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 148, 71-92.
8. Assadi, R. (1980). Deference: Persian style. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 22, 221-224.
9. Austin, J. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
10. Avramides, A. (1989). *Meaning and Mind: An Examination of a Gricean Account of Language*. MIT Press.
11. Beeman, W. (1976/1986). Status, style and strategy in Iranian interaction. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 18(7), 305-322.
12. Behbahani, M. (2009). *Intercultural communication, a key to integration*. Göthenburg University.

13. Besemeres, M., & Wierzbicka, A. (Eds.). (2007). *Translating Lives: Living with Two Languages and Cultures*. Queensland University Press.
14. Bikhtiyar, O. (2014). Approaches to politeness theories. *Journal of Koya University*, 29-50. ISSN. 2073-0713.
15. Bilá, M., & Ivanovna, S. (2020). Language, culture and ideology in discursive practices. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 24(2), 219-252. doi:10.22363/2687-0088-2020-24-2-219-252.
16. Blum-Kulka, S. (1992). The metapragmatics of politeness in Israeli society. In R. J. Watts, S. Ide, & K. Ehlich (Eds.), *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice* (pp. 255-280). Mouton de Gruyter.
17. Blum-Kulka, S., & House, J. (1989). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross-Cultural and Situational Variation in Requesting Behaviour* (pp. 123-154). NJ: Ablex.
18. Bowe, H., & Martin, K. & Manns, H. (2014). Schemas, face and politeness. In *Communication across Cultures: Mutual understanding in a global world* (2nd ed., pp. 48-70). Cambridge University Press.
19. Bromhead, H., & Ye, Z. (2020). *Meaning Life and Culture: In Conversation with Anna Wierzbicka*. Australian National University Press.
20. Brown, I. (2006). The applicability of Brown and Levinson's theory of politeness to Japanese: A review of the English literature. *Bull. Joetsu Univ. Euc.*, 26, 31-41.
21. Brown, P. (1976). Women and politeness: A new perspective on language and society. Review of "language and woman's place" by R. Lakoff. *Reviews in Anthropology*, 3, 240-249.
22. Brown, P. (2015). Politeness and language. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 18, 326-330. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.53072-4>.
23. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In E. N. Goody (Ed.), *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction* (pp. 56-310). Cambridge University Press.

24. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511813085.
25. Chen, R. (2010). Pragmatics between East and West: Similar or different? In A. Trosborg (Ed.), *Pragmatics across Languages and Cultures: Handbooks of Pragmatics 7* (pp. 167-188). Mouton de Gruyter.
26. Chendeb, H. (2019). Linguistic politeness across Arabic, French and English languages. *Journal of Arts & Humanities*, 8(12), 57-72.
27. Clark, H. (1996). *Using Language*. Cambridge University Press.
28. Clyne, M. (1994). *Inter-Cultural Communication at Work: Cultural Values in Discourse*. Cambridge University Press.
29. Coulmas, F. (1981). Poison to your soul: Thanks and apologies contrastively viewed. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Conversational Routine* (pp. 69-93). The Hague Mouton Publishers.
30. Coulmas, F. (1992). Linguistic etiquette in Japanese society. In *Politeness in Language* (pp. 300-323). Mouton de Gruyter. doi:10.1515/9783110886542-015.
31. Culpeper, J. (2010). Conventionalised impoliteness formulae. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 3232-3245.
32. Culpeper, J. (2011). Politeness and impoliteness. In W. Bublitz, A. H. Jucker, & K. P. Schneider (Eds.), *Handbooks of Pragmatics: Sociopragmatics* (Vol. 5, pp. 391-436). Mouton de Gruyter.
33. Culpeper, J., & Hardaker, C. (2017). Impoliteness. In J. Culpeper, M. Haugh, & Z. Kádár (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)Politeness* (pp. 199-220). Palgrave Macmillan. doi:10.1057/978-1-137-37508-7.
34. Dahmardeh, M., & Parsazadeh, A. & Rezaie, S. (2016). Culture matters: The question of metaphor and taarof in translation. *Cultura*, 13(1), 137-160.
35. Dang, L. (2016). *Intercultural communication: Differences between Western and Asian perspective*. Centria University of Applied Sciences.

- 36.Dastmalchian, A., & Kabasakal, H. (2001). Introduction to the special issue on leadership and culture in the Middle East. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50(4), 479-488.
- 37.Dharma, A., & Lubis, W. & Syahra, N. (2018). Teenagers cultural values towards their vernacular and Indonesian languages. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching*, 2(1), 68-77. doi:10.30743/ll.v2i1.466.
- 38.Duskaeva, L. (2020). Speech etiquette in online communities: Media linguistics analysis. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 24(1), 56-79. doi:10.22363/2687-0088-2020-24-1-56-79.
- 39.Eelen, G. (2001). *A Critique of Politeness Theories*. St. Jerome Publishing.
- 40.Ellis, D. (2007). A discursive theory of ethnic identity. In R. Mole (Ed.), *Discursive Construction of Identity in European Politics* (pp. 25-44). Palgrave Macmillan.
- 41.Enfield, N. (2006). Social consequences of common ground. In N. J. Enfield, & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Roots of Human Sociality: Culture, Cognition and Interaction* (pp. 399-430). Berg.
- 42.Ermida, I. (2006). Linguistic mechanisms of power in Nineteen Eighty - Four: Applying politeness theory to Orwell's world. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38(6), 842-862.
- 43.Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. Longman.
- 44.Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 3(2), 193-217. doi:10.1177/0957926592003002004.
- 45.Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. Routledge. ISBN 9780415258937.
- 46.Fauziati, E. (2017). Linguistic politeness theory. *Language Arts & Discipline*, 88-108.

47. Félix-Brasdefer, J. (2008). *Politeness in Mexico and the United States: A Contrastive study of the Realisation and Perception of Refusals*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
48. Fitriyah, E., & Ridwan, S. (2019). Cultural values of politeness in EFL classroom: A study of ethnography of communication. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching*, 3, 207-216. doi:10.30743/ll.v3i2.1965.
49. Fomina, O., & Potanina, O. & Shcherbakova, I. (2020). Etiquette failure of the speech as a linguoecological problem. *Innovative Technologies in Science and Education (ITSE-2020): E3S Web of Conferences*. 210, pp. 1-6. Don State Technical University. doi:10.1051/e3sconf/202021016007.
50. Fox, K. (2005). *Watching the English: The Hidden Rules of English Behavior*. Hodder.
51. Franck, D. (1980). *Grammatik and Konversation*. Scriptor.
52. Fraser, B. (1990). Perspective on Politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(2), 219-236. doi:10.1016/0378-2166(90)90081-N.
53. Fukada, A., & Asato, N. (2004). Universal politeness theory: Application to the use of Japanese honorifics. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(11), 1991-2002. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2003.11.006.
54. García, C. (1993). Making a request and responding to it: A case study of Peruvian Spanish speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 19, 127-152.
55. Gazsi, D. (2020). Iranian languages. In C. Lucas, & S. Manfredi (Eds.), *Arabic and Contact-Induced Change* (pp. 441-457). Language Science Press. doi:10.5281/zenodo.3744539.
56. Geertz, C. (1960). *The Religion of Java*. The University of Chicago Press.
57. Gladkova, A. (2013). Intimate" talk in Russian: Human relationships and folk psychotherapy. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 33(3), 322-343. doi:10.1080/07268602.2013.846453.

58. Goddard, C. (2006). Ethnopragmatics: A new paradigm. In C. Goddard (Ed.), *Ethnopragmatics: Understanding Discourse in Cultural Context* (pp. 1-30). Mouton de Gruyter.
59. Goddard, C., & Wierzbicka, A. (1997). Discourse and culture. In T. A. Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 231-257). Sage Publications Inc.
60. Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes*, 18, 213-231.
61. Goffman, E. (1967). *On Face-Work: An Analysis of Ritual Elements in Social Interaction*. Anchor Books.
62. Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in Public: Microstudies of the Public Order*. Basic Books.
63. Green, G. (1989). Pragmatics and natural language understanding. *Language*, 67(2), 345-347.
64. Green, G. (1990). The universality of Gricean interpretation. In K. Hall, J. Koenig, M. Meacham, S. Reinman, & L. A. Sutton (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 16th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (pp. 411-428). Berkeley Linguistics Society.
65. Green, G. (1992). *Implicature, Rationality and the Nature of Politeness*. University of Illinois.
66. Green, M. (1995). Quantity, volubility and some varieties of discourse. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 18(1), 83-112.
67. Grice, P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole, & H. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts* (Vol. 3, pp. 41-58). Academic Press.
68. Grice, P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words*. Harvard University Press.
69. Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics* (3 ed.). Routledge.
70. Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(2), 237-257.
71. Gu, Y. (1992). Politeness, pragmatics and culture. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 4, 10-17.

72. Gudykunst, W. (1991). *Bridging Differences: Effective Intergroup Communication*. Sage Publications Inc.
73. Gudykunst, W., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1990). *Culture and Interpersonal Communication*. Sage Publications Inc.
74. Haghighat, G. (2016). *Socio-cultural attitudes to taarof among Iranian immigrants in Canada*. University of Saskatchewan.
75. Hall, E. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. Anchor Press.
76. Hall, E., & Hall, M. (1990). *Understanding Cultural Differences: Germans, French and Americans*. Intercultural Press.
77. Hammood, A. (2016). Approaches in linguistic politeness: A critical evaluation. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Culture (Linqua- LLC)*, 3(3), 1-21.
78. Hamza, A. (2007). *Cross-cultural linguistic politeness: Misunderstanding between Arabs and British speakers of English*. Sheffield Hallam University.
79. Haugh, M. (2005). The importance of “place” in Japanese politeness: implications for cross-cultural and intercultural analysis. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2(1), 41-68.
80. Haugh, M., & Chang, W. (2015). Understanding im/politeness across cultures: An interactional approach to raising sociopragmatic awareness. *Mouton de Gruyter*, 53(4), 389-414. doi:10.1515/iral-2015-0018.
81. Haugh, M., & Kádár, Z. & Mills, S. (2013). Interpersonal pragmatics: Issues and debates. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 58, 1-11.
82. Hayashi, T. (1996). Politeness in conflict management: A conversation analysis of dispreferred message from the cognitive perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 25, 227-255.
83. Hickey, L., & Stewart, M. (2005). *Politeness in Europe*. (J. Edwards, Ed.) Multilingual Matters LTD. doi:10.21832/9781853597398.
84. Hillmann, M. (1981). Language and social distinctions. In M. Bonine, & N. R. Keddie (Eds.), *Modern Iran: The Dialectics of Continuity and Change* (pp. 327-340). State University of New York Press.

- 85.Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. The McGraw-Hills Companies.
- 86.Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations across Nations* (2 ed.). Sage Publications Inc.
- 87.Hofstede, G. (2010). The GLOBE debate: Back to relevance. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41, 1339-46.
- 88.Holmes, J. (1995). *Women, Men and Politeness*. Longman.
- 89.Holmes, J. (2001). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Pearson Education Limited.
- 90.Holtgraves, T. (2002). *Language as Social Action: Social Psychology and Language Use*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.
- 91.House, J. (2006). Communicative styles in English and German. *European Journal of English Studies*, 10(3), 249-267.
- 92.Huang, Y. (2008). Politeness principle in cross-culture communication. *CCSE: English Language Teaching*, 1(1), 96-101.
- 93.Hutheifa, Y., & Sabariah, R. & Ain Nadzimah, A. (2016). A critical review of prominent theories of politeness. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 7(6), 262-270. ISSN: 2203-4714.
- 94.Hymes, D. (1986). Discourse: Scope without depth. *International Journal of the Sociology of the Language*, 57, 49-89.
- 95.Ide, S. (1989). Formal forms and discernment: Two neglected aspects of universals of linguistic politeness. *Multilingua-Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 8, 223-248.
- 96.Izadi, A. (2015). Persian honorifics and im/politeness as social practice. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 85, 81-91.
- 97.Izadi, A. (2022). Intercultural politeness and impoliteness: A case of Iranian students with Malaysian professors. *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 33-43. doi:10.22055/RALS.2022.17801.
- 98.Izadi, A., & Atasheneh, N. & Farzaneh, Z. (2012). Refusing ostensible offers and invitations in Persian. *Advances in Asian Social Science*, 1(1), 77-78.

99. Jakubawska, E. (1999). *Cross-cultural dimensions of politeness in the case of Polish and English*. University of Śląski.
100. Janney, R., & Arndt, H. (1992). Intracultural tact versus intercultural tact. In R. Watts, S. Ide, & K. Ehlich (Eds.), *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice* (Vol. 59, pp. 21-41). Mouton de Gruyter. doi:10.1515/9783110886542-004.
101. Jary, M. (1998). Relevance theory and the communication of politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 30(1), 1-19.
102. Jdetawy, L., & Hamzah, M. (2020). Linguistic etiquette: A review from a pragmatic perspective. *Technium Social Sciences Journal*, 14, 695-717. ISSN: 2668-7798.
103. Jenkins, R. (2004). *Social Identity* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
104. Johnstone, B. (2008). Discourse analysis: Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 18(2), 149-169.
105. Jung, W. (1994). Speech act of "thank you" and responses to it in American English. *Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics*, 11.
106. Kádár, Z. (2017). Politeness in pragmatics. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, 1-27. doi:10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.218.
107. Kádár, Z. (2019). Introduction: Advancing linguistic politeness theory by using Chinese data. *Acta Linguistica Academica*, 66, 149-164. doi:10.1556/2062.2019.66.2.1.
108. Kádár, Z., & Mills, S. (Eds.). (2011). *Politeness in East Asia*. Cambridge University Press.
109. Kádár, Z., & Haugh, M. (2013). *Understanding Politeness*. Cambridge University Press. ISBN: 9781107626942.
110. Kalyango, Y., & Kopytowska, M. (Eds.). (2014). *Why discourse matters: Negotiating identity in the mediatised world*. Peter Lang.

111. Kameh Khosh, N. (2019). British and Persian understanding of politeness: The British value manner and equality, the Persians value age and status: A case study of interpersonal communication in an intercultural context. *4th Firsova Readings: Language in Modern Discourse Practices*. People's Friendship University of Russia. (pp. 30-37). ISBN 978-5-209-09615-3.
112. Kameh Khosh, N. (2019). Persian understanding of politeness: The Persians value age and status. *19th International Symposium on Psycholinguistics and Communication Theory: Speech Activity Theory: Current Challenges*. People's Friendship University of Russia. (pp. 213-214). ISBN 978-5-91730-870-8.
113. Kameh Khosh, N. (2019). The English keep stiff upper lip, the Persians dwell on their emotions and feelings: A case study of emotional/emotive communication in an international context. *Interuniversity Students' Scientific and Practical Conference: Current Problems in Intercultural Communication*. People's Friendship University of Russia. (pp. 31-34). ISBN 978-5-209-09322-0.
114. Kameh Khosh, N. (2020). Politeness strategies in response to request in British and Persian family discourse. *Proceedings of ADVED –6th International Conference on Advances in Education*. (pp. 405-413). ISBN: 978-605-06286-0-9. doi: 10.47696/adved.202097.
115. Kameh Khosh, N., & Khalil, A. & Hani Shehadeh Alhaded, H. (2020). Cultural values and norms of communication: A view from the Middle East. *Proceedings of ADVED. –6th International Conference on Advances in Education*. (pp. 396-404). ISBN: 978-605-06286-0-9. doi:10.47696/adved.202096.
116. Kameh Khosh, N. (2020). Politeness strategies in thanking in British and Persian family discourse. *International Scientific Conference: Current Problems of Linguistics and Cross-Cultural Communication 5(9)*. A.N. Kosygin State University of Russia. (pp. 86-91). ISBN 978-5-00181-065-0.

117. Kameh Khosh, N. (2020). Politeness strategies in making request in British and Persian family discourse. *4th All-Russian Students' Scientific and Practical Conference: Current Problems of Intercultural Communication*. People's Friendship University of Russia. (pp. 109-114). ISBN 978-5-209-10323-3.
118. Kameh Khosh, N. (2021). Politeness strategies in British and Persian family discourse: Forms of addressing. *Gramota: Philology. Theory & Practice* 14 (7). pp. 2265-2271. ISSN 1997-2911. doi: 10.30853/phil210360.
119. Kameh Khosh, N. (2021). Communicative styles and politeness strategies of response to thanking in British and Persian family setting. *5th Firsova Readings: Modern Languages, Communication and Migration in the Context of Globalization*. People's Friendship University of Russia. (pp. 241-245). ISBN 978-5-209-10982-2.
120. Kameh Khosh, N. (2022). Person-oriented vs. status-oriented communicative styles: British and Persian family settings. *14th All-Russian Research and Methodological Conference with International Participation: Current Issues in Modern Linguistics and Humanities*. People's Friendship University of Russia. (pp. 16-23). ISBN 978-5-209-11685-1. doi: 10.22363/11685-2022-1-515.
121. Kasper, G. (1998). Linguistic Etiquette. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Blackwell Publishers. doi:10.1111/b.9780631211938.1998.00025.x.
122. Kauffeld, F. (2001). Grice without the Cooperative Principle. *OSSA Conference Archive* (pp. 1-17). University of Windsor.
123. Kecskes, I. (2014). *Intercultural Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
124. Kecskes, I. (2017). Context-dependency and impoliteness in intercultural communication. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 13(1), 7-31.
125. Kecskes, I. (2017). Cross-cultural and intercultural pragmatics. In Y. Huang (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Pragmatics*. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199697960.013.29.

126. Keenan, E. (1976). The universality of conversational postulates. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 67-80.
127. Keikhaie, Y., & Mozaffari, Z. (2013). A socio-linguistic survey on females' politeness strategies in the same gender and in the cross-gender relationship. *Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 51-82.
128. Khalil, A., & Larina, T. (2018). Arabic forms of address: Sociolinguistic overview. *The European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences EpSBS - WUT: Word, Utterance, Text: Cognitive, Pragmatic and Cultural Aspects*, XXXIX, 299-309. doi:10.15405/epsbs.2018.04.02.44.
129. Kida, I. (2011). Language distance across cultures as a way of expressing politeness and not only. In *Aspects of Culture in Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Learning* (pp. 183-191). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-20201-8_14.
130. Kitamura, N. (2000). Adapting Brown and Levinson's politeness theory to the analysis of casual conversation. *Proceedings of ALS2k: The 2000 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society.*, (pp. 1-8).
131. Koutelaki, S. (2002). Offers and expressions of thanks as face enhancing acts: Taarof in Persian. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 34(12), 1733-1756.
132. Kurteš, S., & Kopytowska, M. (2015). Communicating identities in daily interaction: Theory, practice, pedagogy. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 10(1), 1-17.
133. Kyung-Joo, Y. (2007). My experience of living in a different culture: The life of a Korean migrant in Australia. In M. Besemers, & A. Wierzbicka (Eds.), *Translating Lives: Living with Two Languages and Cultures* (pp. 114-127). UQP.
134. Lakoff, R. (1972). Language in context. *Linguistic Society of America*, 48(4), 907-927.
135. Lakoff, R. (1973). Language and woman's place. *Language in Society*, 2(1), 45-79.

136. Lakoff, R. (1973). The logic of politeness: Minding your p's and q's. *Comparative Literature Studies*, 9, 290-305.
137. Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and Woman's Place*. Harper & Row.
138. Lakoff, R. (1990). Talking Power: The Politics of Language. *The Executive*, 5(1), 99-101.
139. Lakoff, R., & Ide, S. (Eds.). (2005). *Broadening the Horizon of Linguistic Politeness* (Vol. 139). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
140. Langlotz, A., & Locher, M. (2013). The role of emotions in relational work. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 58, 87-107.
141. Langlotz, A., & Locher, M. (2017). (Im)politeness and emotion. In J. Culpeper et al., *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness* (pp. 287-322). University of Basel. doi:10.1057/978-1-137-37508-7_12.
142. Larina, T. (2003). *Kategoriya veshlivosti v angliyskoy y russkoy kommunikativnyh kul'turakh (Politeness in English and Russian)*. Publishing house of People's Friendship University of Russia.
143. Larina, T. (2006). Directness vs. indirectness in Russian and English communicative cultures. *Series A: General & Theoretical Papers*, 647, 1-21. ISSN 1435-6473.
144. Larina, T. (2008). Directness, imposition and politeness in English and Russian. In *What Do You Mean?: The Pragmatics of Intercultural Interaction and Communicative Styles* (Vol. 33, pp. 33-38). Cambridge ESOL Research Notes.
145. Larina, T. (2009). Politeness and communicative style: Comparative analysis of English and Russian language and culture traditions. *Languages of Slavic Cultures*.
146. Larina, T. (2013). *The English and the Russians: Culture and communication*. Languages of Slavic Cultures.
147. Larina, T. (2015). Culture-specific communicative styles as a framework for interpreting linguistic and cultural idiosyncrasies. *BRILL: International Review of Pragmatics*, 7(5), 195-215.

148. Larina, T. (2020). Sense of privacy" and "sense of elbow": English vs. Russian values and communicative styles. In H. Bromhead, & Z. Ye (Eds.), *Meaning, Life and Culture* (pp. 421-440). ANU Press.
149. Larina, T., & Leontovich, O. (2015). Too many walls and not enough bridges: The importance of intercultural communication studies. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 4, 9-16.
150. Larina, T., & Ozyumenko, V. & Kúrtes, S. (2017). I-identity vs. We-identity in language and discourse: Anglo-Slavonic perspectives. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 13(1), 109-128. doi:10.1515/lpp-2017-0006.
151. Larina, T., & Kameh Khosh, N. (2020). Cultural values and politeness strategies in British and Persian family discourse. *Proceedings of INTCESS 2020- 7th International Conference on Education and Social Sciences*, 603-612. ISBN: 978-605-82433-8-5.
152. Larina, T., & Kameh Khosh, N. (2021). Cultural values and understanding of politeness in British, Russian and Persian lingua-cultures. *Russian Language Abroad*, 2, 10-18. doi:10.37632/PI.2021.285.2.002.
153. Larina, T., & Ponton, D. (2022). I wanted to honour your journal, and you spat in my face: Emotive (im)politeness and face in the English and Russian blind peer review. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 18(1). doi:10.1515/pr-2019-0035.
154. Leech, G. (1980). *Explorations in Semantics and Pragmatics*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. doi:10.1075/pb.i.5.
155. Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman. ISBN 9780582551107.
156. Leech, G. (2005). Politeness in intercultural context, politeness: Is there an East-West divide? In T. V. Larina, *What Do You Mean?: The Pragmatics of Intercultural Interaction and Communicative Styles* (Vol. 6, pp. 48-54). Journal of Foreign Languages.
157. Leech, G. (2007). Politeness: Is there an East-West divide? *Journal of Politeness Research*, 3, 167-206.

158. Leech, G. (2014). *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195341386.001.0001.
159. Leech, G., & Thomas, J. (1989). *Pragmatics: The State of the Art* (Vol. 48). Lancaster Papers in Linguistics.
160. Leech, G., & Larina, T. (2014). Politeness: West and East. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 4, 9-34.
161. Leung, K. (1988). Some determinants of collective avoidance. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 19, 125-136.
162. Lewis, R. (2019). The cultural imperative: Global trends in the 21st century. *Training, Language and Culture*, 3(3), 8-20.
163. Locher, M. (2012). Politeness research from past to future with a special focus on the discursive approach. In *New Perspectives on (Im)Politeness and Interpersonal Communication* (pp. 1-22). Cambridge Scholars Publishing. doi:978-1-4438-4171-9 (hbk.);1-4438-4171-4 (hbk.).
164. Locher, M., & Watts, R. (2005). Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1(1), 9-33. doi:10.1515/jplr.2005.1.1.9.
165. Locher, M., & Watts, R. (2008). Relational work and impoliteness: Negotiating norms of linguistic behavior. In D. Bousfield, & M. A. Locher (Eds.), *Impoliteness in Language. Studies on its Interplay with Power in Theory and Practice* (pp. 77-99). Mouton de Gruyter.
166. Locher, M., & Larina, T. (2019). Introduction to politeness and impoliteness research in global contexts. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 23(4), 873-903. doi:10.22363/2312-9182-2019-23-4-873-903.
167. Loveday, L. (1983). Rhetoric patterns in conflict: The socio-cultural relativity of discourse-organizing process. *Journl of Pragmatics*, 9, 169-190.
168. Lycan, W. (2018). *Philosophy of Language: A Contemporary Introduction* (3rd ed.). Routledge. ISBN 9781138504585.

169. Maghbouleh, N. (2013). The taarof tournament: Cultural performances of ethno-national identity at a diasporic summer camp. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(5), 818-837.
170. Manes, J., & Wolfson, N. (1981). The compliment formula. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *ConversationL Routine: Explorations in Standardized Communication Situations and Prepatterned Speech* (pp. 116-132). The Hague Mouton Publishers.
171. Mansoor, I. (2018). Politeness: Language study. *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, 8(4), 167-179. ISSN: 2249-4642, p-ISSN: 2454-4671.
172. Mao, L. (1994). Beyond politeness theory: "Face" revisited and renewed. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21(5), 451-486.
173. Marish, L. (2010). Language politeness in different cultures. *Parafrase*, 10(1), 1-7.
174. Martinez-Flor, A. (2007). Analysing request modification devices in films: Implications for pragmatic learning in instructed foreign language contexts. In *Intercultural Language Use and Language Learning* (pp. 245-280). Springer Netherlands.
175. Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexaminations of the universality of face. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 12(4), 403-426.
176. Matsumoto, Y. (1989). Politeness and conversational universals observations from Japanese. *Multilingua-Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 8(2-3), 207-222.
177. Mayes, P. (2003). *Language, Social Structure and Culture*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. doi:10.1075/pbns.109.
178. McCarthy, M. (2014). A pragmatic analysis of requests in Irish English and Russian. *TEANGA*, 25, 121–137.
179. McConachy, T., & Spencer-Oatey, H. (2021). Cross-cultural and intercultural pragmatics. In M. Haugh, Z. Kádár, & M. Terkourafi (Eds.), *The*

- Cambridge Handbook of Sociopragmatics* (pp. 733-757). Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781108954105.037.
180. Mey, J. (1993). Pragmatics: An introduction. *Journal of pragmalingüística*, 3-4(1995-1996), 523-525.
 181. Miller, C., & Strong, R. & Vinson, M. & Brugman, C. (2014). Ritualized indirectness in Persian: Taarof and related strategies of interpersonal management. *University of Maryland Center for Advanced Study of Language*.
 182. Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.
 183. Mugford, G. (2020). Mexican politeness: An empirical study on the reasons underlying/motivating practices to construct local interpersonal relationships. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 24(1), 31-55. doi:10.22363/2687-0088-2020-24-1-31-55.
 184. Ozyumenko, V., & Larina, T. (2018). Cultural semantics in second language teaching: A case study of Russian "drug" and English "friend". *INTED2018 Proceedings: 12th International Technology, Education and Development Conference*.
 185. Pan, Y. (1995). Power behind linguistic behaviour: Analysis of politeness in Chinese official settings. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 14(4), 462-484.
 186. Pan, Y. (2011). Methodological issue in East Asian politeness research. In Z. Kádár, & S. Mills (Eds.), *Politeness in East Asia* (pp. 71-91). Cambridge University Press.
 187. Pizziconi, B. (2003). Re-examining politeness, face and the Japanese language. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(10-11), 1471-1506. doi:10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00200-X.
 188. Polite, A. (1978). More "taarof" on streets, less at home, befarmid. *The Iran Times*, 7(52), 14.
 189. Pourmohammadi, E. (2018). *The use of "taarof": The generation and gender factors in Iranian politeness system*. University of Saskatchewan.

190. Eslami, Z. (2005). Invitations in Persian and English: Ostensible or genuine? *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 2(4), 453-480.
191. Eslami, Z., & Larina, T. & Pashmforoosh, R. (2023). Identity, politeness and discursive practices in a changing world. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 27(1), 7-38. doi:10.22363/2687-0088-34051.
192. Rababah, M., & Malkawi, N. (2012). The linguistic etiquette of greeting and leave-taking in Jordanian Arabic. *European Scientific Journal*, 8(18), 14-28.
193. Rafiee, A. (1992). *Variables of communicative incompetence in the performance of Iranian learners of English and English learners of Persian*. University of London.
194. Reiter, R. (1999). *"Polite" and "impolite" requests and apologies in British English and Uruguayan Spanish: A comparative study*. British Library: Imaging Services North.
195. Reiter, R. (2000). *Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A Contrastive Study of Requests and Apologies*. John Benjamins Publishing company.
196. Rhee, S. (2019). Politeness pressure on grammar: The case of first and second person pronouns and address terms in Korean. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 23(4), 950-974. doi:10.22363/2312-9182-2019-23-4-950-974.
197. Ruhi, S. (2008). Intentionality, communicative intentions and implication of politeness. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 5, 287-314.
198. Salmani Nodoushan, M. (2019). Clearing the mist: The border between linguistic politeness and social etiquette. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 13(2), 109-120.
199. Schmidt, R. (1980). Review of questions and politeness in social interaction. *RELIC*, 11(2), 100-114.
200. Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (1983). Face in interethnic communication. In J. C. Richards, & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication* (pp. 156-188). Longman.

201. Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (1995). *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach*. Basil Blackwall Publishers.
202. Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (2001). *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach* (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishers.
203. Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
204. Searle, J. (1975). Indirect speech acts. In P. Cole, & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts* (Vol. 3, pp. 59-82). Academic Press. doi:10.1163/9789004368811_004.
205. Senft, G. (2014). *Understanding Pragmatics*. Routledge.
206. Shafiee Nahrkhalaji, S., & Khorasani, M. & Rashidi Ashjerdi, M. (2013). Gendered communication in Iranian university classrooms: The relationship between politeness and silence in Persian culture. *Iranian Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 1(1), 118-130. Retrieved from ISSN 2322-4762.
207. Shahrokhi, M., & Shirani Bidabadi, F. (2013). An overview of politeness theories: Current status, future orientations. *American Journal of Linguistics*, 2(2), 17-27.
208. Sharifian, F. (2011). *Cultural Conceptualisations and Language: Theoretical Framework and Applications*. John Benjamins publishing company.
209. Sharifian, F. (2014). Cultural schemas as "Common Ground". In K. Burridge, & R. Benczes (Eds.), *Wrestling with Words and Meanings: Essays in Honour of Keith Allan* (pp. 219-235). Monash University Publishing. doi:ISBN 9781922235312.
210. Sharifian, F. (2017). *Cultural Linguistic: Cultural conceptualisations and language*. (N. Yu, & F. Sharifian , Eds.) John Benjamin Publishing Company. ISSN 1879-8047.

211. Sharifian, F., & Tayebi, T. (2017). Perception of (im)politeness and the underlying cultural conceptualisations: A study of Persian. *Pragmatics and Society*, 8(2), 231-253. doi:10.1075/ps.8.2.04sha.
212. Sifianou, M. (1992). *Politeness phenomena in England and Greece: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Oxford University Press.
213. Smith, E. (2015). Understanding culture, social organization and leadership to enhance community engagement. *Leadership & Organizational Management Journal*, 2015(3), 1-11.
214. Spencer-Oatey, H. (2000). Rapport Management: A Framework for Analysis. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally Speaking* (pp. 11-45). Continuum.
215. Spencer-Oatey, H., & Franklin, P. (2009). *Intercultural Interaction: A Multidisciplinary Approach to Intercultural Communication*. Palgrave Macmillan.
216. Stewart, M. (2005). Politeness in Britain: It's only a suggestion. In L. Hickey, & M. Stewart (Eds.), *Politeness in Europe* (pp. 116-129). Multilingual Matters LTD. doi:<https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853597398-010>.
217. Tajeddin, Z., & Rassaei Mogadam, H. (2023). Perception of impoliteness in refusal and response to it by native speakers of English and Persian. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 27(1), 88-110. doi: 10.22363/2687-0088-33391.
218. Tannen, D. (1986). *Gender and Discourse*. Oxford University Press.
219. Terkourafi, M. (2005). Beyond the micro-level in politeness research. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1, 237-262.
220. Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. Longman. ISBN 9780582291515.
221. Ting-Toomey, S. (2009). Facework collision in intercultural communication. In F. Bargiela-Chiappini, & M. Haugh (Eds.), *Face, Communication and Social Interaction* (pp. 225-249). Equinox Publishing.

222. Ting-Toomey, S., & Kurogi, A. (1998). Facework competence in intercultural conflict: An updated face-negotiation theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 22(2), 187-225.
223. Triandis, H. (1994). *Culture and Social Behavior*. McGraw-Hill.
224. Triandis, H. (1995). *Individualism and Collectivism*. Westview.
225. Triandis, H., & Gelfand, M. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(1), 118-128. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.74.1.118.
226. Triyuni, D., & Fadhillah, F. & Putri, L. (2018). Teenegers perception toward languag use in public place advertisement. *Language Literacy: Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Language Teaching*, 2(2), 151. doi:10.30743/ll.v2i2.648.
227. Twerefou, I. (2010). Language etiquette and culture in teaching of foreign language. *Practice and Theory in Systems of Education*, 5(3), 1-14.
228. Tzanne, A., & Sifianou, M. (2019). Understanding of impoliteness in Greek contexts. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 23(4), 1014-1038. doi:10.22363/2312-9182-2019-23-4-1014-1038.
229. van Dijk, T. (Ed.). (1997). *Discourse as Social Interaction: Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction* (Vol. 2). Sage Publications Inc.
230. van Dijk, T. (2009). *Society and Discourse: How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk*. Cambridge University Press. ISBN-13 978-0-521-51690-7.
231. Vission, L. (2013). *Where Russian go wrong in spoken English: Words and phrases in the context of two cultures*. R. Valent.
232. Wang, N., & Johnson, W. & Gratch, J. (2010). Facial expressions and politeness effect in foreign language training system. In *Intelligent Tutoring Systems* (pp. 165-173). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-13388-6_21.
233. Wardaugh, R. (2010). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Basil Blackwell Publishers.

234. Watts, R. (1989). Relevance and relational work: Linguistic politeness as politic behaviour. *Multilingua*, 8(2/3), 131-166.
235. Watts, R. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge University Press.
236. Watts, R., & Ide, S. & Ehlich, K. (1992, 2005). Introduction. In *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory & Practice* (p. 3). Mouton de Gruyter.
237. Wierzbicka, A. (1985). Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts: Polish vs English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 9(2-3), 145-178. doi:10.1016/0378-2166(85)90023-2.
238. Wierzbicka, A. (1987). *English Speech Act Verbs: A Semantic Dictionary*. Academic Press.
239. Wierzbicka, A. (1991/2003). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction*. Mouton de Gruyter.
240. Wierzbicka, A. (1997). *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German and Japanese*. Oxford University Press.
241. Wierzbicka, A. (2003). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantic of human interaction* (2nd ed.). Mouton de Gruyter.
242. Wierzbicka, A. (2006). *English: Meaning and Culture*. Oxford University Press.
243. Wijayanto, A., & Malikatul, L. & Prasetyarini, A. & Susiati, S. (2003). Politeness in interlanguage pragmatics of complaints by Indonesian learners of English. *English Language Teaching*, 6(10), 188.
244. Yaqubi, M. (2018). On subtitling of Taarof apologies. *Journal of Language and Translation*, 8(1), 31-42.
245. Ye, Z. (2004). Categorization of Chinese interpersonal relationships and the cultural logic of Chinese social interaction: An indigenous perspective. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 1(2), 211-230. doi:10.1515/iprg.2004.1.2.211.

246. Ye, Z. (2013). Understanding the conceptual basis of the "old friend" formula in Chinese social interaction and foreign diplomacy: A cultural script approach. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 33(3), 365-385.
247. Yoo, B., & Donthu, N. & Lenartowicz, T. (2011). Measuring Hofstede's five dimensions of cultural values at the individual level: Development and validation of CVSCALE. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 1-17.
248. Yoshimura, Y., & Macwhinney, B. (2011). Honorifics: A socio-cultural verb agreement cue in Japanese sentence processing. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 32(1), 551-569. doi:10.1017/S0142716410000366.
249. Yuka, A. (2009). Positive politeness strategies in oral communication 1 textbooks: Focusing on terms of address. *The Economic Journal of Takasaki City*, 52(1), 59-60.
250. Yuni Rahastri, C. (2017). *Politeness strategies used by Ellen Degeneres and U.S. politicians in The Ellen Show*. Sanata Dharma University.

DICTIONARIES

251. Aryanpour, A., & Aryanpour, M. (1976). *The Concise Persian-English Dictionary* (Vol. 1). Amir Kabir Publications.
252. Bauer, L. (Ed.). (1978). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. Longman.
253. Dehkhoda, A. (1966). *Dehkhoda Persian Dictionary*. Dehkhoda Foundation.
254. Dehkhoda, A. (1980). *Dehkhoda Persian Dictionary*. Dehkhoda Foundation.

255. Hornby, A. (1985). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford University Press.
256. Richards, J., & Platt, J. & Weber, H. (1985). *Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. Longman.

APPENDIX

NO 1.: WRITTEN INTERVIEW

UNDERSTANDING OF POLITENESS BY BRITISH ENGLISH AND PERSIAN SPEAKERS

I would very much appreciate your help with my research. Would you please fill in the blanks or put X in the appropriate place in the following?

I would very much appreciate your help with my research. Would please you fill in the blanks or put X in the appropriate place in the following.

Age: _____ Sex: M: ☐ F: ☐ Nationality: English ☐ Persian ☐
Other ☐

Place of birth: _____ Place of residence: _____

Education: Secondary school ☐ High school ☐ University ☐

Occupation / profession: _____

1. Could you please write in the place provided below what the word “politeness” means to you, and what you consider to be the characteristics of a polite person.
2. Please give an example of behavior which impresses you as being polite.
3. Please give an example of behavior which impresses you as being impolite.
4. How would you characterize English people in general?
 - A. Very polite:
 - B. Fairly polite:
 - C. Not polite:
5. How would you characterize Persian people in general?
 - A. Very polite:
 - B. Fairly polite:
 - C. Not polite:
6. What other traits of English and Persian communicative styles could you pick out?

English:

Persian:
7. Add any comments you consider relevant to the questionnaire.

پیوست 1: مصاحبه کتبی

تعریف ادب از نگاه انگلیسی و فارسی زبانان

از همکاری شما در پیشبرد اهداف و به سرانجام رساندن این تحقیق بسیار سپاسگزاریم. لطفا جاهای خالی را با پاسخ مناسب و یا با گذاشتن علامت ضربدر در محل مورد نظر پر نمایید.

سن:

جنسیت:

مرد

زن

ملیت:

انگلیسی

ایرانی

محل تولد:

محل اقامت:

میزان تحصیلات:

ابتدایی

متوسطه

دیپلم

دانشگاه

شغل / حرفه:

1- لطفا واژه " ادب " را از دیدگاه خود تعریف کرده و ذکر نمایید از نظر شما فرد مودب دارای چه خصوصیتی می باشد؟

2- لطفا از یک رفتار مودبانه مثالی بیاورید.

3- لطفا از یک رفتار غیر مودبانه مثالی بیاورید.

4- از نظر شما انگلیسی ها در کدام یک از گروههای زیر جای میگیرند:

- خیلی مودب

- نسبتاً مودب

- بی ادب

5- از نظر شما ایرانی ها در کدام یک از گروههای زیر جای میگیرند:

- خیلی مودب

- نسبتاً مودب

- بی ادب

6- به چه ویژگی های خاص دیگری از انگلیسی ها / ایرانی ها می توانید اشاره کنید؟

7- اگر نقطه نظر دیگری در خصوص پرسشنامه دارید، لطفا ذکر نمایید.

NO. 2.: DISCOURSE COMPLETION TASK QUESTIONNAIRE

FAMILY DISCOURSE

I would very much appreciate your help with my research. Would please you fill in the blanks or put X in the appropriate place in the following.

Age: _____ **Sex:** M: ☐ F: ☐ **Nationality:** English ☐ Persian ☐
Other ☐

Place of birth: _____

Place of residence: _____

Education: Secondary school ☐ High school ☐ University ☐

Occupation / profession: _____

Would you please now make the dialogues and complete them in the way which seems to you the most natural in these situations between the family relations? Say as much or as little as you wish.

Put a dash where you think the dialogue ends.

Situation 1. At the dinner table - Father asks his daughter to pass the salt.

Father: There is no salt in the salad. _____

Daughter: _____

Father: _____

Daughter: _____

Situation 2. Son asks her mother for a glass of water.

Son: I am so thirsty. _____

Mother: _____

Son: _____

Mother: _____

Situation 3.

(a) The husband asks his wife to make some tea for him.

Husband: _____

Wife: _____

Husband: _____

(b) Wife brings the tea.

Wife: _____

Husband: _____

Wife: _____

Situation 4. Mother asks his daughter to babysit the young sibling.

Mother: We have been invited to a party this weekend. _____

Daughter: _____

Mother: _____

Daughter: _____

Situation 5.

(a) The son asks his father to help him repair his bike.

Son: My bike does not work well. _____

Father: _____

Son: _____

(b) The father has repaired the bike.

Father: _____

Son: _____

Father: _____

Situation 6.

(a) The Father asks his son to clean the garage.

Father: _____

Son: _____

Father: _____

(b) The son has cleaned the garage.

Son: _____

Father: _____

Son: _____

Situation 7.

(a) The wife asks her husband to buy her a new car.

Wife: My car is really old. _____

Husband: _____

Wife: _____

Husband: _____

(b) They have bought a new car:

Husband: _____

Wife: _____

Husband: _____

Situation 8.

(a) The husband asks his wife to bring the documents to his office.

Husband: I have a very busy day. _____

Wife: _____

Husband: _____

Wife: _____

(b) The wife has brought the documents to her husband's office.

Wife: _____

Husband: _____

Wife: _____

پیوست 2: پرسشنامه تکمیل گفتمان

گفتمان «خانوادگی»

از همکاری شما در پیشبرد اهداف و به سرانجام رساندن این تحقیق بسیار سپاسگزاریم. لطفا جاهای خالی را با پاسخ مناسب و یا با گذاشتن علامت ضربدر در محل مورد نظر پر نمایید.

سن:

جنسیت:

مرد:

زن:

ملیت:

انگلیسی:

ایرانی:

غیره:

محل تولد:

محل اقامت:

میزان تحصیلات :

متوسطه:

دیپلم:

دانشگاه:

شغل / حرفه:

لطفا هشت موقعیت زیر را با دقت مطالعه کرده و با در نظر گرفتن خودتان در این هشت موقعیت سعی کنید متداول ترین پاسخ را بدهید. لطفا پایان جمله را با گذاشتن نقطه مشخص کنید.
موقعیت اول: سر میز شام - پدر از دخترش می خواهد نمک را به او بدهد.
پدر: سالاد بی نمک است.

دختر:

پدر:

دختر:

موقعیت دوم: پسر از مادرش می خواهد برای او یک لیوان آب بیاورد.

پسر: من تشنه هستم.

مادر:

پسر:

مادر:

موقعیت سوم:

(الف) شوهر از همسرش می خواهد برای او چای دم کند.

شوهر:

زن:

شوهر:

(ب) زن برای همسرش چای می آورد.

زن:

شوهر:

زن:

موقعیت چهارم: مادر از دخترش می خواهد از برادر / خواهر کوچکش مراقبت کند.

مادر: ما آخر هفته به یک مهمانی دعوت شده ایم.

دختر:

مادر:

دختر:

موقعیت پنجم:

(الف) پسر از پدرش می خواهد دوچرخه اش را تعمیر کند.

پسر: دوچرخه ام درست کار نمی کند.

پدر:

پسر:

(ب) پدر دوچرخه را تعمیر می کند.

پدر:

پسر:

پدر:

موقعیت ششم:

(الف) پسر از پدرش می خواهد گاراژ را تمیز کند.

پدر:

پسر:

پدر:

(ب) پسر گاراژ را تمیز می کند.

پسر:

پدر:

پسر:

موقعیت هفتم:

(الف) زن از شوهرش می خواهد برایش یک اتومبیل نو بخرد.

زن: اتومبیل خیلی قدیمی است.

شوهر:

زن:

شوهر:

(ب) آنها اتومبیل نو می خرند.

شوهر:

زن:

شوهر:

موقعیت هشتم:

(الف) شوهر از همسرش می خواهد مدارکی را به دفتر کارش بیاورد.

شوهر: امروز سرم خیلی شلوغ است.

زن:

شوهر:

زن:

(ب) زن مدارک را به دفتر کار شوهرش می آورد.

زن:

شوهر:

زن: