

Bi-Cognitive Awareness of L2 Female Learners' Honorifics in Inter-Cultural Interaction: A Socio- (*) Cognitive Linguistic Analysis

Sara Samir El-Daly

*Lecturer, Department of English,
Faculty of Arts, Menofia University.*

Abstract

This study attempts to shed light on the Second Language Users/L2ers' intercultural pragma-Syntactic Conceptualized Content/SCC in realizing the social deictic, namely, honorifics across L1 and L2 requests so as to reach the dual language system fluency (Kecskes and Cuenca, 2005). Requests are realized across L1 and L2 situational scenarios. The Second Language Users/L2ers' communicative competence is displayed across the experienced syntactic forms. In this study, the pragmatic awareness of the SCC is investigated across requesting behaviors in discursive scenarios to reach register cognitive socio-lect behavior. The discursive scenarios are the role-play situations conducted between Females' same- and cross- gender interactions. To analyze the results of the study, Byram's Inter-cultural Communication/IC conceptual approach (1997) is followed to approach the Conceptualized Content/CC across the linguistic performance that processes upon three levels of interaction; pragmatics, Interactional Sociolinguistics/IS, and discourse analysis. The study results in; a) the female L2ers possess a highly significant pragmatic CC; b) the L1 and L2 CC is practiced in a standardized manner rather than the vernacular counterpart; and c) the high extent L1 and L2 dual fluency is reached.

Keywords

Intercultural Communication/IC, Conceptualized Content/CC, Dual Fluency, Communicative Competence, Requests, Social Deictic (Honorifics)

(*)Bi-Cognitive Awareness of L2 Female Learners' Honorifics in Inter-Cultural Interaction: A Socio-Cognitive Linguistic Analysis, Vol. 9, 2020 Issue No.(31,32,33,34).

الملخص

تحاول الدراسة تسليط الضوء علي المحتوى النحوي المفاهيمي لمستخدمي اللغة الثانية في التواصل عبر الثقافات في استخدام التعبيرات الاجتماعية التي تسمى الألفاظ الشرفية في إدراك أسلوب الطلب في اللغة العربية والإنجليزية؛ وذلك لتحقيق سلاسة النظام اللغوي الثنائي (Kecskes and Cuenca, 2005, p. 49). ويتم عرض الكفاءة التفاعلية من خلال التركيبات النحوية التي تمثل المعرفة التقليدية والبنية التنظيمية بالمجتمع والنمطية اللغوية لطبقات المجتمع. فالمعرفة التقليدية والنمطية اللغوية الاجتماعية تنشئ المخطط التقليدي الذي يمكن مستخدمي اللغة الثانية من تجنب أي اشتباكات تفاعلية. وتتكون الكفاءة التواصلية الناتجة عن المحتوى المفاهيمي من المكون النحوي، الكفاءة اللغوية الاجتماعية، والكفاءة الاستراتيجية. وقد أكدت الدراسة على أهمية الانتباه المسبق والمستجد في تكوين منطوق أو مجموعة متسلسلة من المنهج الاجتماعي المعرفي للوصول إلى تحقيق التعاون التحادثي. فتحدد النية (القوة الضمنية)، الانتباه للمحتوى والتحكم اللغوي بالإشارة الواضحة للكلمة، وقد تم البحث في هذه الدراسة عن الوعي التداولي للمحتوي المفاهيمي النحوي خلال أسلوب الطلب في المواقف التفاعلية لمعرفة السلوك اللغوي لمنطقة معينة، وقد تم تحليل النتائج وفقاً لمنهج (Byram, 1997). وقد أظهرت نتائج الدراسة أن: (١) لدى مستخدمي اللغة الثانية من الإناث مستوى عال من المحتوى المفاهيمي التداولي، (٢) المحتوى المفاهيمي للغتين الأولى والثانية يمارس بشكل معياري موحد، (٣) تحقيق الطلاقة المزدوجة بدرجة عالية للغتين الأولى والثانية.

الكلمات المفتاحية

التواصل عبر الثقافات، المحتوى المفاهيمي، الطلاقة المزدوجة، الكفاءة التفاعلية، أسلوب الطلب، معتقد اجتماعي (الألفاظ الشرفية).

Introduction

1.1. Statement of the Problem

This study attempts to reach the extent the conceptualized input is perceived, realized, and experienced in daily situations represented as socio-cultural conventional role-plays performed by the academic female Second Language Users/L2ers who have pragmatically realized the valuable significance of honorifics; a) as an opening move in conversational turns; b) as an alerter in the requesting behavior and c) a generic conventional knowledge discursual feature. Thus, it examines the use of honorifics across socio-linguistic designed questionnaire that displays the social factors such as gender and social distance depending on the occupational position pre-

determined across the scenarios' daily encounters. The performance of the L2ers displays the conceptualized content of the pragmatic interest that is derived from the actual socio-cultural discursive dyads. Moreover, the extent the female L2ers prefer or not employing such linguistic discursal feature shows their clusivity to the socio-dialect varieties (i.e., high/low variety). Thus, their use of honorifics does not only point to the sociolinguistic variables nor dialectical varieties but also it elucidates the apparent performance resulted from the inner mental processing cognition.

1.2. Theoretical Background: Intercultural Communication/IC

Intercultural Communication/IC is defined as the extent the interlocutors manage, manifest, affect or affected by host/cultural values that are experienced in their home/host societies (Spitzberg and Changnon, 2009, p. 7). Pragmatically, IC refers to the in/appropriateness of communicating a message across cultures. This study addresses pragma Conceptualized Content/CC to point out the socio-cultural inherited linguistic features resulted from interacting with L1 and/or in L2. Therefore, the L1- and L2- based mutual interchangeable communicative processes set the schemata content to frame all the interrelated language networks (Kecskes, 2014, p. 1). For the bi-linguals, the CC refers to the L2-based conceptualized meaning depending on the available contextual Package of Information/POI. The bilinguals when interacting in L1 and L2 reflect a growing pragmatic competence in L1 where the interactants are living in and in L2 given the socio-employed tools to facilitate L2 process of communication inside/outside classrooms. The experience performed across the L1- and L2-based situations reflect the acquired pragmatic nurture of different language levels that are inherited when conventionally and prototypically rest in the minds of the participants leading to the construction of the cultural script of discourse community.

Generally speaking, the cultural script, in multilingual societies, refers to the socio-linguistic/semiotic conventionalized performances of the High-variety/H or the Low-variety/L. Concerning L2 acquisitional features, the

patternized L2 cultural script may expose to; some non/linguistic behavioral miss; limited use of language features; and/or emphasis shift on various dialectical varieties (Kecskes, 2014, p. 2); due to; a) limited indexicals of core common ground; b) lack of L2 skills knowledge; c) L2 unawareness of medium of communication; and d) the audience design that requires; a) a particular generic features (Holmes, 2013, p. 243); and b) speech accommodation (Yule, 2010, p. 258). Moreover, the cultural script depicts the interrelations of conversational features; e.g. relative status, educational level, topic knowledge, played roles, gender, and age (Smith, Scholnick, Crutcher, Simeone, and Smith, 1991, p. 175). Cultural script uncovers the practiced CC in daily interactions as they show the linguistic performance (Gumperz and Roberts, 1991, p. 52).

The Intercultural Communication Competence/ICC is described through three main features that display culture as 'primitive'; a) assimilation; b) adjustment; and c) adaptation (Spitzberg and Changnon, 2009, pp. 6-7). The three features go through the individual, topoi, and contextual varieties that depend on world POI and linguistic presupposition (Gumperz and Roberts, 1991, p. 52); creating the IC frameworks that indirectly point to the IC components; attitudes, personality traits; cognitive skills; and actual behaviors of the self/other from different cultures (Van de vijverand and Leung, 2009, pp. 406-407). Thus, IC integrates language and culture in the shape of patternized habits and experienced thoughts in society (Fantini, 2012, p. 264).

Since the present study addresses L2ers' Syntactic Conceptualized-Content/SCC, the produced Inter-language Pragmatics/ILP deals with bilinguals' acquisitional features (Kecskes, 2010, p. 2889). The SCC shows the extent the ambient extra/linguistic information of events is perceived and experienced establishing 'amodal symbol system'; that converts the selected perceived POI into experienced language production, cognitive realization, and/or represented thoughts (Barsalou, 1999, p. 577). Language production, cognitive realization, and the represented thoughts create the linguistic prototypical propositional features that are embodied in terms of daily

discursive usage of mental schemata, semantic representative networks, and syntactic constructions that are widely employed in an appropriate pragmatic intercultural performance (pp. 577-578). The pragmatic convenient performance, for L2ers, is regarded as the apparent blend of language levels; lexico-syntactic, lexico-semantic, and socio-semiotic levels. Thus, the dyadic-employed language structure reflects the extent the perceived POI and allotted attention can serve the goal-oriented situations (Lindsay, 2009, p. 278); creating a mutual interchange of allotted language attention to the specified features and perception attention of the conceptualized content (pp. 275-276). This kind of mutual conceptualized attention/attainability is conducted as a pragmatic context-dependent serving a social function (Byram, 1997, p. 77). Thus, it can be concluded that syntax as conceptualized content is represented in terms of pragmatic as well as semantic represented networks (Finegan, 2000, p. 289).

Cognitively, attention belongs to mindfulness that is the manner our physical as well as our mental abilities reside in our real performances leading to openness and receptivity (Shapiro, Rechtschaffen and de Sousa, 2016, pp. 83-84 and Barsalou, 1999). Furthermore, from conceptualized-dialectical perspective, attention refers to the illocutionary force realized by the L2ers while activating pragma-related episodes; deixis, conversational implicature, presupposition, speech acts, and conversational structure (Bardovi-Harlig, 2010, pp. 219-220). In this sense, pragmatics serves the social interactive function of language use (Mey, 1993, p. 315). Kasper (1992) and Crystal (1997) agree upon the function of pragmatics as determined by the participants, their choices, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction creating a behavior repertoire (Chomsky, 2006, p. 82) and identifying true/false perceptions of identities and relationships (Dufon, 2010, p. 309). The righteous the perception of the contextual POI, the righteous the pragmatic experience practiced in society.

Believing that the linguistic CC shapes the apparent frame of the dual world knowledge (Thomas, 1983, p. 99); raising the L2ers' ICC (Spitzberg and Changnon, 2009, pp. 3-4). The duality of two systems goes back to the

interlingual identification claim stated by Weinrich (cited in Selinker, 1972, p. 211). The interlingual identification is to be processed across the levels of the two systems; that is to say, the L2ers conceptualize the similarities between the two systems to reach the attempted meaningful linguistic performance which is not actually experienced across the courses' exercises (p. 110). The linguistic performance reflects the lemma (i.e., semantic/syntactic) relations and the pragmatic competence that indicate; a) the appropriateness aspects of the phoneme, sign system, propositional content, and semantic relations; b) the interactional stages that are embodied as pre/post contextual factors and/or the earlier realized structures and its maturational developed stages (p. 212); c) accessibility degree (un/consciousness), automaticity, and im/explicitness of the communicative message; and d) the surface functioning of the linguistic choice. All these language aspects are retained for mnemonic-processing actual use (Kecskes, 2014, p. 23 and Blommaert and Verschueren, 1991, p. 191). As a result, ICC presents an open set of the linguistic analysis (Blommaert and Verschueren, 1991, p. 13). ICC openness depends mainly on its function and the interactants' realization of that function. Function realization that may vary from one participant to another, attempts to produce appropriate and effective outcomes (Spitzberg and Changnon, 2009, p. 6). As for the present study, the linguistic outcome is the social deictic called honorifics.

Honorifics display morpho-syntactic relations in Language Related Episodes/LREs as a dual representation in the context of meaningful communication (Mackey, 2007, p. 19). The transfer of language related-knowledge reflects; a) the learners' un/awareness of the socio-pragmatic function of honorifics; b) the working-memory to realize the situational context and the learners' performance/s that suit the duality of situational contexts; c) the cognitive power over the social behavior; and d) register homogeneous female-ideology across social groups or in a particular group. Thus, this study approaches honorifics, as a morpho-syntactic component, in the academic domain reflecting socio H- and L- variety. Functionally, honorifics points to the social hierarchies' value as integrating semantics and

pragmatics creating saturation and Free Pragmatic Enrichment/FPE (Depraetere and Salkie, 2017, pp. 11-14). Saturation, unlike FPE, reflects the necessity for communicating sufficiently rather than insufficiently such as naming to determine the intended person in an event (p.13). However, FPE is the ability to employ suitable morpho-syntactic selected formulae for participants according to the contextual factors. So, linguistic performance is achieved as inferences of the ambient context and relative world POI.

Realizing honorifics reflects the conscious awareness of determining the dual speech event roles in L1 and L2 seen through communicative goal determination (Marzano and Kendall, 2007, p. 12). IC performance and competence extent vary due to Chomsky's mental model (i.e., conceptualized POI) (2006, p. 102). The mental model relies on the Perceptual Model/PM and the Production Model/PM designing the daily routines; a) in producing the verbal repertoire (p. 105); b) establishing formulated pattern to represent realities (Chomsky, 2006, p. 105 and Talmy, 2008, p. 27). Both the verbal repertoire and the formulated patterns are experienced in terms of the discursive selected speech acts (e.g., requests for information, apologies, opening/closing moves in conversational turns among other discursual features) or they may be experienced in terms of sign language serving the function of the socio-semiotics documented communicative facilities. The appropriate performance as well as the efficient competence shows a high cognitive sense of communicative strategies awareness, namely, Intercultural Communication Competence/ICC.

1.2.1. Intercultural Communication Competence/ICC: Defined

Generally speaking, Communicative Competence/CC is achieved when the linguistic and the socio-cultural factors are processed together (Byram, 1997 and Spencer-Oatey, 2010). CC is partially constituted when being able to utter the conceptualized content and interpret sentences framed by the grammatical structure (Finegan, 2000, p. 304). Believing that Classroom Interactional Competence/CIC serves the function of enhancing learning-based interaction (Walsh, 2011, p. 1), the L2ers linguistic

competence evokes multiple questions concerning intercultural language acquisition and language learning (p. 7). Moreover, Byram (1997) goes hand in hand with Haugh (2010) in integrating both the levels of language as; a) micro representations of the cognitive processing represented across the linguistic behavior in discursive situations; and b) macro level of language inherited in the socio-cultural performances that appear obviously across inter-or intra-cultural communicative processes (p. 141). This blend is assumed to approach the CIC between teachers and learners to enhance the learning process.

CIC, for Walsh (2011), is the ability of building an interactional-mediating tool to enhance language acquisition and to reach a pedagogical aim which in turn constructs a real challenge for the two parties; that is because the L2ers are hypothesized to behave spontaneously inside class as well as outside class, wherein classes, the skills and strategic communicative tools play a certain role. In other words, the L2ers are responded to actions in daily situations in a way that might be different from CIC exercises (p. 21). Given that, in CIC the L2ers are guided to practice across written scenarios that cause a sense of imposition over the L2ers. The patternized behavior in classrooms creates the jagged classroom interaction profile that contains pragma semi-daily interactional routines. In this manner, the CIC reflects a mixture of in- and out- classrooms' discursive activities. The in-classrooms' behavior is determined by pedagogical aims, while the out-classrooms' behavior is overwhelmed by the convenient socio-cultural factors such as employing code-switching in various modes of communication as in Computer-mediated Communication/CMC modes, Short-texting Messaging Service/SMS, or social networks applications such as Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram. Given the fact that the bi-acquisition features are found in classrooms reflecting the linguistic CC. L2 CIC designs the learners' input (Krashen, 1982), while the inability to manage CIC depicts; a) a degree of insufficient L2 POI or CC conditions (Walsh, 2011, p. 53); and b) a problematic sense of L2ers communicative skills. L2ers competence is reflected through the progressed CIC to reach a high

level of Classroom Intercultural Interaction Communication Competence/CIICC that is experienced across classrooms' activities and tasks.

As for Intercultural Communication Competence/ICC, it has been the interest of some disciplines; applied linguistics and foreign language teaching among others to address knowledge skills, personal qualities, mindfulness, sociolinguistic competence, linguistic competence, and discourse competence (Spencer-Oatey, 2010; Spencer-Oatey and Stadler, 2010; Prechtl and Davidson Lund, 2007; Ting Toomey, 1999; and Byram, 1997). This study is interested in linguistic, socio-linguistic and discourse competence as produced by L2ers in classrooms practices. Linguistic competence is displayed across the automaticity of the output; socio-linguistic competence is presented through the socio-linguistic prototypical features across social classes; and discourse-competence is reflected in the form of honorifics' morpho-syntactic relations. Accordingly, the L2ers attempt to merge the grammatical rules across the learning classes with the pragmatic language use that is conventionally common, understandable, and sounds natural (Kecskes, 2014, p. 62).

1.2.2. Nurture-Pragmatic as a linguistic Competence: Explicature

The linguistic competence reflects nurturing pragmatics across L2ers' interactions (Gass, 2007, p. 175). The pragmatic development depends on providing the input (i.e., innate nature) with the suitable POI of the communication process that turns into a produced morpho-syntactic output. The produced output shows the schematic mental mappings that formulate the negotiated meaning uncovering the pragmatic extent the L2ers employ with others in L1 and L2 in daily routines (pp. 176-184).

Negotiation of meaning (i.e., explicature) links intention, attention, and control, reaching the privatized and common pragmatic knowledge (Kecskes, 2014, pp. 53-55). The linguistic output displays the privatized knowledge, the prior experience in terms of frequency, familiarity, and motivation. The employed linguistic features reflect the automaticity given by the mental model (Van Dijk, 2006, p. 2). The salient morpho-syntactic

features depict; a) the dominant language and culture idiolect; b) the resistant communicative strategies adopted by L2ers to keep their identity; and c) weak access to L2 knowledge (Kecskes, 2014, pp. 56-63). Thus, L1 socio-cultural imposition may hinder L2 pragmatic competence (p.64).

Moreover, the pragmatic competence indicates the L2ers' awareness of the holistic interactional process (Gass, 2007, pp. 224-225). The interactional process may produce an inter-systemic interference (Richards, 1973, p. 4). The pragmatic competence shows; a) the preference/s of some terms rather than others and b) the perception and the production of these terms as well. Therefore, the lack of L2 knowledge makes the L2ers resort to their Interlanguage/IL system to carry the conversational mode that promotes L2 morpho- syntactic/semantic relations and pragmatic use (Mackey, 2007, pp. 1-2); in light of gender, age, social distance, and occupational positions (Muho and Kuroni, 2014, p. 48).

The conversational mode is known as pushed output (Mackey, 1999, p. 557); that describes the performed function (Fang, 2010, pp. 11-12). The performed function realization requires an above level to the current input level, namely, (i+1) (Krashen, 1982, pp. 20-21). The sufficient POI provides the L2ers with the ability to produce more (p. 22). The convenient L1 and L2 output reflects the L2ers' ability to fluently set the integration continuum (Cook, 2003, pp. 6-7). Furthermore, Cook claims that the integration continuum depends mainly on the level of knowledge of individual- and world- POI as well (Laufer, 2003, p. 20). In general, this shows a degree of common CC in the single mind expressing different linguistic levels constructing the Common Underlying Conceptual Base (CUCB) (Laufer, 2003, p.11).

Cognitively, the CUCB refers to the mental representations of the concepts and the knowledge of language and culture neutral/specific in the mind map (Cenoz, 2003, p. 64). L1-based CUCB helps facilitating L2 linguistic representations (Kecskes and Papp, 2003, p. 250). L2ers' conceptual change is reflected across L2 fluency. The highest the L2 fluency, the less the learner resorts to L-1 based CUCB (p. 250) and vice

versa. Thus, the L2ers reach a dual mediating channel to help managing the CUCB (pp. 252-253).

The focus on the CC shows the L2ers inferences resulted from conventional routines. Given language teaching purpose, the insufficient L2 sociolinguistic experience produces a pragmatic failure that results in blurts, flouts and pragma-lects (Thomas, 1983, pp. 92-96). Accordingly, L2ers are in need to a meta-pragmatic refinement that moves beyond the abstract word to its social true value as a thought. Here, the morpho-syntactic/semantic relations express these values in society.

1.2.3 Discourse Competence

1.2.3.1. Honorifics

Drawing on its pragma-discoursal origin, honorifics belong to social deixis. According to Levinson (1983), deixis refers to the contextual grammaticalization value of a linguistic term (p. 53). The interactants' ill use of deictic terms represents a failure on the level of semantic and socio-pragmatic factors (p. 54); that renders deixis structure, context, and socio-cultural value, signified referential function in any event (Levinson, 1983, p. 54 and Hanks, 2011, pp. 315-316).

Honorifics are codified in the form of pronouns, summon forms, vocatives, and/or titles of address regarding the morphological base (Levinson, 1983, p. 63). Levinson's claim of honorifics' morphological state goes hand in hand with Hanks' claim that deictic terms bear a morpho-syntactic category and function as syntactic heads (Hanks, 2011, pp. 317-319). Linguistically, the inclusion and exclusion schematization of the lexical ground renders deixis its significance (Wieczorek, 2013, p. 31). Moreover, the inclusion shifts the indexicalities from zero ground to a relation ground where there is a kind of social categorization to reach the social harmony (Hanks, 2011, p. 320).

Pragmatically, 'honorifics' belongs to requests alerters in the form of address terms, titles, roles, surnames, first/nick names, endearment terms, offensive terms, pronouns, and attention getters (Jarvis, 2003, p. 66). The function of honorifics, according to Thomas (1983, p. 98), is experienced in

discursive dyads regarding; a) positions assessment); b) relations (dominance, authority); and c) function (i.e., contextual roles) to reach a communicative purpose and to convey a particular message of respect, politeness, prestige, and solidarity/power reference (Habwe, 2010, p. 129). So, honorifics point to register differences and/or similarities between social groups (Hudson, 1982, p. 50); as they design their fixed conventional 'socio-location' (pp. 51-53). Out of this regard, the social value is inherited to these particular discursal expressions (i.e., honorifics) (p. 53). Accordingly, honorifics situate both S and H in the world of thought, value, and practice where the core of cultural values stem from; age category; familial category; occupational category; and homily category (Habwe, 2010, pp. 128-132).

Due to the ICC significance, the L2ers depend on illocutionary force to deal with the L2 equivalent alternatives in L1 to avoid communication breaks by setting a strategic plan that is acquired in discursive learning environment (Hatch, 1992, pp. 213-222). The apparent linguistic behavior shows the L2ers' competent performance. The high competence the users reflects, the efficient their interpretation of honorifics serves in terms of being interperspectival. In a more elaborated manner, the Spr, who produces the deictic, is a self-contained in the event who tries to get the attention of the Adr. Furthermore, he is the source indexical anchor point creating the relevance sphere around him/her for mutual communication as well as the ground for contiguity and sensory access (Hanks, 2011, pp. 311-322).

The L2ers who interact in L2 manage pragmatic development overtime. Consequently, the more well-employed honorifics are, the more socio-pragmatic conceptualized features are built. In general, the produced output reflects the L2ers' attainability to the situational requirements (Talmy, 2008); e.g., the requesting behavior and/or its components (e.g. alerters and adjuncts/head act). Syntactically, these components present the morpho-syntactic devices that belong to either the open/closed grammatical classes. The employed morpho-syntactic variations points to; a) the morpho-syntactic features in L1 and L2; b) the conventional value and common use

of socio-hierarchies; and c) H- or L- variety preferences. The interactional process of codifying an event starts with Memory Organizing Packets (MOPs); where the situation memory of prior actions is common to many recent events (p. 104); where a mutual process of L1 and L2 conceptualizations are processed upon.

Analytically, honorifics -in the syntactic mood- are expressed in terms of morphological affixes added to the base form of the lexeme and/or verb stem to index a social value that is socio-experienced with reference to the Egyptian Arabic/EA, namely, declension regarding the variables of person, gender, and number (Ditters, 2007, p. 373). The use of the Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) is reflected through the females' L2ers realization of honorifics when adding a particular socio-conventional morphological affixes. It is assumed that morphology in Arabic language, in its literal sense, comprises feature names and values such as aspect, case, definiteness, derivation, gender, number, person, tense, and voice among other syntactic features (Ditters, 2007, pp. 370-371). In L1, the inflectional affix added to the root bears a value and a function as well. The Arabic lexeme structure is a combination of patterns (vowel and auxiliary consonants) and core root (semantic meaning) relationship (Al-Hawary, 2009, p. 1). The Arabic lexeme is derived by multiple affixations; prefixes, suffixes, infixes, or circumfixes (p. 2). The root of the Arabic word is given gender grammatical affixations (p. 5); so there are inflectional agreement features in the Arabic language between the head noun and the attributive pronoun or adjectives (p. 9). The feminine ending that is realized is {-at/at-lib-at/ت/ت/female students/الطالبات} with [t] surfacing in formal MSA serves the function of determining the addressee. Moreover, the Arabic language has the equation or verbless sentence that consists of *mubtada?* "starter" and *xabar* "predicate" (p. 10). In this case, al mubtada? "starter" which is the first constituent part contains personal pronoun, possessive pronoun, and demonstrative pronoun that point to a particular social category (p. 11). The Egyptian Arabic dialect may depict other regional variations that differ from MSA's (tense, aspect, and modality) (Holes, 2018, p. 23).

Similar to the syntactic base, the intension and extension word processes are distinguished by semantic theories (Brinton, 2000, p.130). The processes depend on the social agreement denoted to that word, given its dictionary and conventional societal meaning (p. 130). Honorifics, as a social deictic feature, have a commonly agreed upon cultural value that depends on the inherited socio-references. The Egyptian Arabic/EA community as well as the English speaking communities possesses an honorific system that is driven from the patternized deictic system. The deictic system bears its semantic properties across the word intension and extension sense. In other words, the honorific term gives particular external shared facets referring to cultural value, social categorized class, patternized behavior, and linguistic performance in the world (i.e., extension) and the intension that renders all the literal defining characteristics of that term (pp. 130-131). This calls upon their; a) working memory; b) language awareness; c) degree of academic efficacy; and d) linguistic intercultural differences.

1.2.3.2. Socio-Linguistic Competence

Socio-linguistic competence depicts; a) the traditional linguistic stereotypes of gender variations; b) the assessment of the power relations (i.e. social distance) and solidarity; c) age; d) social status dialects (i.e., H-variety vs. L- variety); and e) language change (Holmes, 2013, pp. 131-143). In this sense, the caste dialect seems to reflect the groupings' linguistic use of local-standardized/vernacular dialects that show only a degree of high or low prestigious pattern of social deictic expressions (Hymes, 1975, pp. 221-222). The h- and L- variety creates the caste-dialect (Trudgill, 2000, pp. 16-24). The caste dialect uncovers the lexicalized social kinship system designing the participants' identity as a result of the apparent syntactic as well as the lexical choice pattern that shows the participants' identity and group ideology (Byram, 1997, p. 34 and Holmes, 2013, pp. 396-398).

The experienced CC, as a linguistic behavior across intercultural interactions among different groups, shows the primary socialized POI (i.e., acquisition); and the secondary POI (i.e., formal education) is open to attitudinal perspectives rather than psychological stress (p. 35). So, the

L2ers depict not only identity but also the CC of L1/L2 culture. The L1/L2 socio-linguistic and discursal skills gained from the ICC process can be interpreted in light of the cultural shared meanings regarding the prime-simplicity nature of language (El Daly, 2017, p. 269) and the sensitivity towards different culture's heritage (Byram, 1997, pp. 26-27).

1.3. Aim of the Study

This study aims at examining the linguistic cultural mosaic (i.e., morpho-syntactic features) that represents the CC while realizing L1/L2 requests' honorifics practiced by a group of academic female L2ers. Functionally, the conventional patternized honorifics are attainably experienced across L1/L2 written scenarios (Dufon, 2010, p. 309). Thus, the study claims to uncover the L1/L2 pragma-syntactic fluent duality.

1.4. Research Questions

This study attempts to answer the following questions;

- 1) From a socio-linguistic perspective, how does gender affect realizing requests honorifics?;
- 2) From a discursal perspective, what are the most salient employed morpho-syntactic CCs among the female L2ers?; and
- 3) How do honorifics serve the function of clusivity of personal attributes?

1.5. Framework of Analysis

1.5.1. Intercultural-Communication Competence Model/ICC

The framework of analysis based on Byram's IC conceptual approach (1997, p. 23). L2ers represent the CC across the linguistic performance that processes upon three levels of interaction; pragmatics, Interactional Sociolinguistics/IS, and discourse analysis (Spencer-Oatey and Franklin, 2009, pp. 65-66). In general, the linguistic competence approaches the POI; sociolinguistic competence reaches negotiation of meanings; and discourse competence refers to the discourse generic features.

1.5.2. Tools/Instrument

The instrument in this study is Kim's (1994) designed questionnaire to

estimate the Socio-pragmatic Interactional Principles/SIPs (cited in Spencer-Oatey and Jiang, 2003, p. 1). The questionnaire is regarded, for Schunk and Greene (2018, p. 12), as a self-reported instrument that elucidates the intercultural significance. The questionnaire displays the pragmatic parameters in the situational scenarios; gender (Male/M & Female/F); type of speech act (directive speech act, e.g. requests); occupational position to determine the assumed social distance (in/formal; im/polite; and social distance) (Cappelle, 2017, p. 127). The questionnaire is distributed in L1 and L2. The English copy of the questionnaire is translated into Arabic by an English professor in the English language and Literature department, Faculty of Arts.

1.5.3. Subjects/participants

The subjects in this study are 99 female English learners, fourth grade, the Faculty of Education, Menofia Univ. class/2016-2017. The subjects belong to the same academic register representing one group as they represent the same gender, age-like, regional nature, and accordingly the same socio-cultural background of their governorate. Moreover, it is assumed to be exposed to the same L2 educational input.

1.5.4 Procedures

The designed role-playing questionnaire practice took place in the Faculty of Arts where the students are asked to attend a class performing an activity with marks. The activity, as they have been told, is to interact across the written scenarios in same- and cross- gender situations. The Arabic and English questionnaire scenarios are distributed and collected for the analytical steps; a) creating a profile for each female participant that includes dual practices as role play of female-female/F-F and female-male/F-M. The profile presents the employed honorifics in L1- and L2-based interactions; b) classifying the scenarios according to the displayed social distance (S=H, S>H, S<H); and c) counting the frequencies of the repeated dual morpho-syntactic features marking the differences between the H- and L- variety.

1.6. Results of the Study

1.6.1. Intercultural Speakers' Honorifics Realization in L1

Drawing on the L2ers' ability to manage intercultural communication, the use of honorifics across the requesting behavior reflects a degree of pragmatic competence along with linguistic/discoursal awareness, while the inability to realize requests reflects a pragmatic failure (Thomas, 1983, p. 104). The results of both L1 realizations of honorifics are presented in Table 1.

Table (1)

Arabic Frequency of Honorifics' Occurrences across the Six Scenarios

Situational Scenarios	Arabic F-M	Arabic F-F	T
S=H	24	14	38
H>S	54	46	100
H<S	18	19	37
	96	79	
Total of use	175		-----

F=Female; M= Male

The frequencies of occurrences indicate a preferable sense of using honorifics in cross-gender scenarios rather than same-gender scenarios. Drawing on the L2ers' illocutionary force -that is employed in the morpho-syntactic devices- to behave in a polite manner, L2ers render an over-elaboration, over-formality or increased elegance that could be interpreted in light of politeness theory (Kasper and Blum-Kulka, 1993, p. 6). Over formality or increased elegance refer to; a) the status position as high vs. low; b) prestigious vs. non-prestigious; and c) non/standard to depict the 'warm vs. cold' social relations (Berthele, 2010, p. 276). Standard, unlike vernacular has been employed among the academic female L2ers referring to a convenient cultural prestigious pattern (Holmes, 2013, p. 141).

Consequently, honorifics' use depicts a socio-linguistic awareness of gender and social distance.

Believing that the linguistic behavior frames the social behavior, the discursal-honorifics reflect the conventional socio-prototypical way of valuing others (self/other image). Table 2 shows how the L2ers employ the L1 honorifics' categories; address terms, naming, or pronominal use.

Table (2)
Arabic Discursal Prominent Honorifics' Constructions

Participants Roles	S=H		H>S		H<S	
Arab. Honorifics Terms	F-F	F-M	F-F	F-M	F-F	F-M
Address Terms	14	23	46	53	18	17
Naming	0	1	0	1	1	1

The experienced minimum share between the interlocutors designs the linguistic 'cultural script'. Analytically, the employed morpho-syntactic features represent the L2ers same SCC. It is obvious that females employ honorifics in H>S scenarios more than other scenarios; highlighting the power relations' significance. It is worth noting that address terms, kinship terms, and pronominal features have been mostly preferred to naming (Kecsks, 2014, p. 57). The personal pronouns assert the interaction function (Brinton, 1996, p. 13). Honorifics, as socio-valued deictic indicators, represent the females' stereotypes' beliefs in the Egyptian context. The female linguistic behavior is presented in Table 3.

Table 3

L2ers Request with MSA Honorific Terms

Gender	Request with honorific	Morpho-syntactic Syntagm
F-F	S=H يا صديقتي , عزيزتي الزميلة	-Oh! يا صديق! يا صديقتي friend عزيزات! يا الازميل
	'zizaty azmilah, - Dear comrade!	يا صديق! يا صديقتي friend عزيزات! يا الازميل
	ya Sdiqaty	يا صديق! يا صديقتي friend عزيزات! يا الازميل
	H>S أستاذتي الكريمة, عذرا مدرستي	عذر! اامدرس! ااي! --اأستاذات! ااي! الال ااكرامة! Excuse me! My teacher...- -Dear Professor
-'dhr modrsty, -ostadhaty alkarimah		
S>H أيتها الطالبة , سيدتي	-Madam! - Hey, student...	سيدات! اي—
-Saidaty, -?yatoha aTalibah		
F-M	S=H العزيز صديقي ، حضرتك	حضرة!ك -Majesty .. -Dear friend...
	Sadiqy al'aziz, haDritak	حضرة!ك -Majesty .. -Dear friend...
	H>S أستاذنا الفاضل , سيدي الفاضل , مديري	My boss - اسيداي! الال افاضل!- -Dear Sir
	modiiry, saiidy alfaDil, ostadhna alfaDil	My boss - اسيداي! الال افاضل!- -Dear Sir
S>H تلميذي العزيز: أيها الطالب، عزيزي...	ااستاذنا! الال افاضل -Our dear professor! Dear تلميذي! الال عزيزا friend - أيها! الال اطالب!، student -Hey -Dear	
Tilmidhy al'aziz, ?yoha aTalib	ااستاذنا! الال افاضل -Our dear professor! Dear تلميذي! الال عزيزا friend - أيها! الال اطالب!، student -Hey -Dear	

Transliteration from Kamel, Gindi, and El-Kholi (2008)

To reach the morpho-syntactic analysis, requests' adjuncts to head act serve the function of external modification to soften the force of the request. The adjuncts may be found in the form of honorifics as subject, descriptive, possessive or genitive of origin (Brinton, 2000, p. 131). The morpho-syntactic choices realized by L2ers reflect the universal nature of language that is cognitively conceptualized then socially-experienced to prove the

based-primitive mentality (Chomsky, 2006, pp. 82-84). The primitive mentality is reflected across the content level that splits into semantic and morpho-syntactic features, namely natural pattern (Halliday, 2014, pp. 24-27). The MSA use of honorifics' morpho-syntactic features establishes the syntagm (i.e., sequence of open/closed classes) can be unfolded into various levels leading to logo-genesis (p. 63). Syntactically, L1 honorifics realized by L2ers are represented in both open and closed class. Analytically, a text, in general; and a clause, in particular, is made tighter because of the wordings internal structure but also within the word itself, for example,

||أرجواك|| منكيا || أيتها الزميلة || أن تقرضني....

-?rjuk minky ?yatuha azamylah ?n tuqraDny....

-Please! You, Oh my friend, lend me...

In Arabic, unlike English morpho-syntactic paradigm, the seldom lexical component may contain more than one category that classifies the contextual surroundings (Halliday, 2014, p. 44). Therefore, one lexicogrammatical component such as (أرجواك/ *rjuk/Please*) may bear in its structure two semantic domains that differ in size as in the verb (أرجو) which is an open semantic category and a pronominal article [*'kaf'/ك*] which is a closed semantic category. In this sense, the MSA morpho-syntactic interrelations serve the function of pointing to or selecting a specific person rather than others. This would be interpreted as performing a deictic function, drawing on the extensive classified pragmatic reference integrated with the socio-cultural surroundings. So, the L1 affix [*'kaf'/ك*] as well as the pronominal [*ها/haa*] accompanies the vocative particle [*أي/!*] and the [*t*] to index the female addressees (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004, p. 39). The same is applied to the whole headact adjunct; when dividing [*الزميلة*] into its simplest syntactic components; [*ال/the/Al*] plays the role of the determiner; [*zamyl/friend*] is considered the post deictic term; and [*ah/ة*] that renders the feminine pronoun (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004, p. 39). In this way, the use of determiner articles, pronominal feminine articles, and morpho-syntactic relations serve the function of the deictic term that; a) has an indexicality social value; and b) a significant mental CC conveying the

socialized meaning. So, the L1 competence in realizing honorifics is believed to be cognitively-conceptualized in local standard. Moreover, the repeated use of the same affix [*'kaf'*/ك] or the pronominal [*ha?/ها?*] refers to their common consensus with almost all honorifics establishing an attribute syntactic significance base. Accordingly, the local standard L1 honorific consists of;

- a) Vocative article+definite article+Noun+Number+gender;
- b) Definite article+Noun+Number+gender; and
- c) Pronoun+Number+gender

Nouns in Arabic are represented in many sub-classes; Individuality Nouns/IN, Multitude Nouns/MN, Vessel Nouns/VN, Relation Nouns/RN, Abstract Quality Nouns/AQN and Diminutives/D (Ditters, 2007, p. 373). Functionally, the nouns' subclasses represent the mutual discursive conventional knowledge when appropriately employed as in Table 4.

Table 4
L2ers' L1 Request Honorifics with Noun Sub-Classes

Gender	Request honorific	with	Transliteration	Syntagm syntactic Features	morpho-
F-F	S=H	حبي/AQN	Hoby	احباي -My love	
	H>S	----	----		-----
	S>H	يا بنتي/RN	Ya binty	ايا بنتاي -Hey girl	
F-M	S=H	يا أخ + يا جون /IN +RN	Ya ?xy, ya Ghon		ايا أخاي -Hey pal! ايا جون - Oh John
	H>S	----	----		
	S>H	يا ابني, يا ولد, العزيز RN, RN, AQN	Ya walad, ibny al'ziz, ya ibny		ايا اولد, - Oh boy! البناي ال اعزiza, - Dear son ايا ابناي - Oh son

Given the L1 nouns' sub-classes, it is worth noting that L2ers employ almost all conventional semantically morpho-syntactic constructions across S=H and S>H in both same/cross-gender. The L2ers render sequences of linguistic levels in the single term to acting the syntagm structure (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004, p. 39). Drawing on Lakoff (1975), females use diminutives in interactions; that shapes the female local standard variety across written scenarios. Moreover, it seems that the L2ers use diminutives and/or nicknames to soften the force of requests acting for politeness. The use of (يا بنتي) [ya] [bint][y] and (يا ابني) [ya] [ibn][y]) is used in the Egyptian register by females reflecting affectionate behavior (Wierzbicka, 2010, pp. 52-53). The experienced mentally-conceptualized value indexes the personal autonomy and interpersonal solidarity (p. 53). In this sense, the simple deictics act primitively towards discursive learning and acquisition access. Moreover, they play a relative functioning role towards morpho-syntactic primes of speech acts in IC. This is a unique local standard morpho-syntactic feature in Arabic that represents its actual accessibility among the learners; asserting the role of the CC to manage interaction in in/formal situations. Additionally, the L2ers manipulate innovative re/building the Arabic syntactic constructions in local standard/vernacular (Owens, 2007, pp. 639-640).

1.6.2. Intercultural Speakers' Honorifics' Realization in L2

Believing that the prior and recent meaning experience render the linguistic term its socio-cultural value, the L2ers should employ their illocutionary force to manage new speech events; establishing the Dynamic Model of Meaning (DMM) (Kecskes, 2008, p. 385). Drawing on this claim, the L2ers' act upon language-mediated concepts where the word learnt in formal organizations and category acquired in society has a mutual influence upon each other (Jarvis and Pavlenko, 2008, p. 114). The honorific CC is developed due to participants' socio-cultural factors; so, the honorific, in its acquired/learnt sense, should reflect the socio-developmental/dialectical use which in turn affects the CC in a maturity level (p. 114). Accordingly, the accumulative sense of conceptual change

enriches the CUCB mediated channel of language use.

L2ers employ honorifics in requests in a skillful manner; however, their unawareness of the local standard/local vernacular L2 varieties is described by Thomas (1983) as a pragmatic failure (p. 92). The adopted social deictic terms show their intercultural competence behavior-like (Spitzberg and Changnon, 2009, p. 4). The intercultural competence acts upon these three behavioral processes; adjustment, assimilation, or adaptation (p. 6). Adjustment refers to adjusted behavior avoiding cultural clashes; assimilation refers to L2 attitudinal/cognitive power assimilation; and adaptation reflects the non/linguistic behavior. Both the three processes and DMM build the cultural base. The overall frequencies of use are in Table 3.

Table 3
English Frequency of Honorifics' Occurrences across the Six Scenarios

Situational Scenarios	English F-M	English F-F	T
S=H	29	16	
H>S	49	39	
H<S	15	14	
	93	69	
Total of use	162		-

It is obvious that L2ers make significant L2 contributions across the scenarios that show the female L2ers' awareness of honorifics in cross-gender conversations indicating traditional gender stereotypes. As for the prominent honorifics' discursal features, the three competent factors that control L2ers' efficiency are; a) emotional motivational attitudes; b) prior and recent linguistic world POI; and c) the regulated L2ers communication skills (p.7). The discursal features are expanded across the scenarios reflecting L2ers' cultural adaptation, acquired/learnt linguistic patternized behavior, and the linguistic CC.

Table 4
Arabic Discoursal Prominent Honorifics Features

English Honorifics Features						
Participants	S=H		H>S		H<S	
Roles						
Eng.	F-F	F-M	F-F	F-M	F-F	F-M
Honorifics						
Terms						
Address Terms	14	27	38	47	13	13
Name	2	2	1	2	2	2

Due to the DMM, L1 and L2 contextual fluency is evidenced across the preferred honorifics in the form of address terms in H>S same- and cross-gender scenarios. Their use reflects: a) the realization of the importance of honorifics; b) the social distance between the speakers; and c) cultural adjustment's trial. The cultural adjustment is approached as the L2ers resort to the prior L2 generic knowledge to reach cultural appropriate behavior as indicated by Al-Hawary's Functional Feature Hypothesis/FFH that serves the same of IL transfer (2009, p. 145). Table 5 presents some exemplified L2 honorifics' use.

Table (5)
L2ers Request with Opening Moves with Honorifics

Gender	Request with Honorific	
F-F	S=H	My friend, Dear friend, lover, Mona
	H>S	Doctor, sir, Mr. A, Dear professor, my head, my boss, Miss
	S>H	My students, Noha, my dear
F-M	S=H	My friend, my best friend, old friend, Dear, Hello, hi man
	H>S	Hello boss, dear professor, my head, my sir, my teacher
	S>H	My son, professor, my students; Hey boy, hey you, Jhon, my son, Ahmed, you are a little student

Concerning the discursual features frequencies, it is obvious that females have employed a variety of honorifics reflecting the socio-acquired cultural value. It seems that L2ers have realized honorifics as an opening move. The morpho-syntactic features play the significant role between the two systems; given that L1 possesses affix grammar-system varieties. Most of the L2 employed terms belong to the closed set of POS that do not accept change or derivations affixes; the employed terms follow the singular term, pronoun, and article (i.e., zero rule) (Brinton, 2000, p. 77-78). Even when using the occupational title, the L2 system does not permit adding a plural morphological addition to the stem rather than the L1 system that uses plural affixations to show respect. Thus, the structure of modern English is limited to certain inflectional system (p. 78). In other words, the use of genitive case (pronominal possessive) restricts the additional affixes to the pronouns; and nominative case (subject use) is restricted to the singular use and the neutral gender pronoun or common address terms that require no affixes.

Moreover, L2 address terms represent the common gender (Brinton, 2000, p. 105). So, there is no definite inflectional affixes added to the stem verb; just pronouns. Using 'my' in different scenarios goes back to the importance given to the genitive case (i.e., *the possessor*) of the speaker as stated '*my son, my doctor, and my head*'. In other words, case in modern English is represented by both the genitive and the nominative case (i.e., the subject) as indicated in (dear professor, sir, and doctor). All these lexemes serve the function of the subject role that is responsible for realizing requests (p. 107). Given that the inflections in L2 are impoverished, the L2ers manipulate the discursive function across the scenarios by naming and greetings pointing to the space between the participants (Scheider, 2008, p. 105); e.g. the informal greeting and the occupational position title, for example;

||hey|you||, ||hey|boy||, ||Hi| man||; ||Dear| professor||

The impoverished socio-contextual varieties are in line with the UG markedness value that accompanies language system to allow a kind of

extended relational grammatical features matching the peripheral subjects (Zobl, 1993, pp. 176-177). As the L2 grammatical marked values may not be available to L2ers, the result is employing the IL marked value that constitutes the superset subset of L2 grammatical features (p. 177).

Believing in Lakoff's (1975) traditional gender stereotypes, the opening move as greeting is employed mostly in female mixed-gender requests in H>S and in S>H to show a sense of informality and familiarity to continue the social harmony. The exceptional use of the derivational morpheme added to the stem [*love*] is in the example *||love+er|*, which might be expressed as *||my|love|* according to the L2 speaking community. However, there is a little use of 'you' that functions as common informality addressing pronoun (Brinton, 2000, p. 107). Informality, as an H- or L- variety, is a remarkable style that is coded between families and friends (Holmes, 2013, p. 32). The use of this style is restricted to the learners' context and may not be used across classrooms' activities (p. 78).

Generally speaking, the use of local standardized/vernacularized L1/L2 reflects the L2ers' dual conceptualized context to fluently represent these varieties (Kecskes and Cuenca, 2005, p. 49). The L2ers' use of vernacularism shows the conceptual links that process upon the conceptual mediation to find an L1-equivalent for L2-situational scenarios. Given the conceptualized social space base, the sociolect H-/L- may be extended to show a sense of solidarity between groups (Holmes, 2013, p. 77). The L2ers approach L2 representations due to the easiness of mediating the conceptualized channel (Kecskes and Cuenca, 2005, p. 52). The more fluency of L2 acquisition/learning is, the more the CC is developed and employed to reach the bi-conceptualized performance. The L2ers' role is believed to be in developing the linguistic as well as the socio-cultural related POI which in turn develops the CUCB mediating channel to reach an idiomatic L2ers' proficiency.

Generally speaking, the L2 H- variety is used in formal situations, written discourse, and dictionary use. So, the codification here is related to the grammar or the dictionary inclusion (Holmes, 2013, p. 78). Given the L2

morphological base, the L2ers' standard variety is regarded as a prestigious code regarding the lemmas set. The L2ers employ *lingua franca* in terms of address term, naming, and occupational titles within the opening moves to; a) show respect; b) code a prestigious dignity; c) promote the users' position; d) indicate the inner sensitivity; and e) depict the projected inner self-world as a manner in reflecting the prior socio-cultural POI (Haugh, 2010, p. 143). Furthermore, the local standardized use of honorifics as a direct polite strategy is similar to a high degree to L1-based requesting behavior. The L2-based requesting behavior approaches the socialized competence the L2ers have reached as they; 1) have perceived both L1 and L2 concept of politeness; 2) do not restricted to actual performances inside the regular formal classrooms; 3) do not expose directly to target/L2 cultural performances (i.e., residence in L2 societies); and 4) have managed the assessment of the pragma-linguistic/socio-cultural factors to activate the perceived latent politeness concept in their cognition (Kasper and Blum-Kulka, 1993, p. 6).

Conversely, some few L2ers do not discursively interact, namely, exclusion with the situational scenarios in L1/L2. Furthermore, clusivity sense is achieved depending on the linguistic behavior reflecting a sense of lexical and/or morpho-syntactic constructions' consensus between the academic females register which goes against Jarvis and Pavlenko's claim on the same socio-cultural groups who belong to the same background are not obliged to act upon the same conceptual representations that will be produced as identical lexical and morpho-syntactic constructions (2008, p. 117).

Due to the previous results, the female L2ers' behavior- as an idiomatic performance- shows their self-awareness and status-consciousness to the contextual roles (Holmes, 2013, p. 172). The female L2ers do not employ the Standard English varieties in requests indicating; a) the perceived POI, served by the context to evoke the old POI; b) the L1- and L2- based conceptualized dialectical varieties; c) attention is given to the social status, gender, and occupational position; d) consistent use of deictic

terms among females reflecting the same CC; e) the impoverished inherited CC of the English varieties; f) the learner has only one norm of only one dialect in the learning process (Selinker, 1972, p. 213); and g) language change, across the deictic system, cannot be processed upon easily due to its socio-valuable significance; ill-supported training courses; and the nature of system lexicalization. In fin, the conceptualized social deictic network in L1 and L2 as well, across the female L2ers, is grounded on the codified rather than non-codified sequences of speech.

1.7. Findings of the Study

Generally speaking, the results of the study point to the SCC in terms of the deictic system. The social deictic system, as a deictic category, needs to be developed to manage the pragmatic nurture of language varieties in social classes. However, the L2ers' L1 and L2 performances indicate; a) the extent the speaker is aware about the socio-cultural conventions; b) the speakers' intent to focus on particular information (i.e., designed illocutionary force); and c) manipulating the integration of prior and recent POI to show a socio-idiolect competence (Langacker, 1987, p. 65).

The results of the study show the conceptualized mediating manner that helps the L2ers to reach the appropriate conceptual link as a way of en/coding in L2 (Langacker, 1987, p. 65). So, the learners assembled particular expressions in L1 and L2 representing a constructive effort to put the linguistic convention in use as a result of memory, planning, and organizing working (p. 65). That is to say, the L2 local -/standard and vernacular reflect a degree of dialect fluency that renders limited inherent affix grammar variability in society where L2ers females attempted to act as conservative, affected by the L1 culture; and sensitive to the stigmatized nature of grammar (Trudgill, 2000, p. 71). This inherent variability is a dialect fluency of; Middle Middle Class/MMC and Lower Middle Class/LMC; and Upper Working Class/UWC and Middle Working Class/MWC (p. 34). The L2 notable local standardized use reflects an over-polite behavior; rendering the traditional gender prestigious stereotype; and a direct movement towards the status varieties (pp.73-74). The inability to

act in local-standard/vernacular is due to the indirect exposure to L2 socio-cultural detailed intercultural interactions.

On L1-based SCC, it seems that the produced morpho-syntactic level processed upon by the L2ers reaches, to a high extent, the single perception of actions to reflect the conventional CC (Krisner, 2004, p. 11). This similarity integrates; lexical choice, syntactic-domain, and common socio-cultural knowledge to the prior categorized societal value of interlocutors. In a compatible manner, the other social deictic features reflect a degree of CC dual fluency of value perceptions for 'actions', 'events', and 'states' (p. 11). The participants reach both the linguistic and the contextualized constructions due to the single- and the multiple CC (Langacker, 2004, pp. 21-22). In this sense, the L1-based context, unlike L2-based context, in the acquisitional or learning sense renders the content requirements; a) semantic, phonological, and full-/partial- symbolic structure; b) conventional schematized structure; and c) hierarchical social categories (p. 22). The L1, unlike L2 CC is achieved due to intention, perception, and attention given in formal organizations and social dyads as well (p. 22).

Furthermore, it seems that the Arabic system, unlike the English system, copes up with the Deixis Classifying Markers/DCL syntactic features (Kirtchuk, 2000, p. 32). So, the produced syntagm with affixes shows the socio-categorized value to which the deictic is directed. In L1-based practices, most of the produced syntagms bear the DCL features. That is to say, the deictic expressions are prior to human language acquisition as no linguistic system will point to objects in context with no deictics' classifications (p. 44). Given that one of the deictics' syntactic functions is to mark nouns that enter the pragmatic zone when serving space perception and structure on the speaker's side (p. 44). In a more elaborated way, this conceptualized space is represented as a noun rendering an intensive amount of information. Similarly, pronouns, demonstratives and affix grammar features, as function POS category, convey a particular portion of information referring to context (Berk, 1999, p. 61). The frequent use of nouns as the most deictic reference is given to contextual features. The more

contextual deictic reference is, the more CC is realized. The more CC realization is, the more prevailed awareness of the deictics' significance is. The more deictics' significance is rendered, the more pragma-awareness is given to the event. The more pragma-awareness is displayed, the more competent performance is processed upon. Consequently, the more L1- and L2- idiomatic competent performance is experienced, the more pragma-cognitive dual fluency is achieved.

On the level of the local standard deictic preferences, it is proved that the academic female L2ers' display social clusivity in L1- and L2-based context as Smakman (2012, p. 25) has claimed that the existence of two parallel standard languages that appear across the speech event; a) the socially external standard language; and b) the socially cohesive standard language render the 'standardized dialect language' that is the acceptable, easily recognized, and widely used form of language (pp. 25- 27). Moreover, the conventional social deictics serves the phatic communication function to keep the social harmony between the participants due to discussing inner topics (Scheider, 2008, p. 104).

Additionally, comparing the employed morpho-syntactic features along the three situational scripts, it is found that there is a relation between syntax, semantics and pragmatics that is represented in the shared deictic system. Syntactically, the deictic system displays the 'theme' of the system (Halliday, 2014, p.114). The theme of sentences is rendered in the form of 'the nominative' case. In both L1 and L2, the theme of almost all the requesting realizations is experienced in the formula of vocatives; that play the role of pointing to the theme of the request. The theme in the 'discourse flow' introduces the 'information unit' that attempts to act upon the prior and recent POI. Pragmatically, the theme of requests is the addressee who is responsible for doing the action. Thus, pragmatic social deictic system serves the 'centrality' notion that is to ground the focus on the addressee (Langacker, 2017, p. 22). The conceptualized deictic center is directed to the event physical entities that evoke similar function of prior contextual roles. In other words, the physical world represents a portion of the mental schema, which in turn is responsible for the mental conceptualization (p.

17). Furthermore, the use of the deictic transfers the use of honorifics from its syntactic category into the experiential function. Thus, the deictic system reaches the cognitive as well as experiential evidentiality as it designs the space between the speech participants; prior experience is considered 'non-real' and the recent experience is 'real'; thus, the speaker evaluates the degree of that relation and space by the integration between the non/real epistemic POI (pp. 201-202). In a more elaborated sense, the conceptual substrate evokes the following; a) the previously discourse conceptions; b) socially interacted zone with the speech event; and c) intensive social, contextual, cultural, and generic apprehension (Langacker, 2008, p. 42).

The impoverished L2 contextual background renders L2ers the inability to use the CUCB mediating channel to employ other L2 H-/L-variety; that is known as the negative transfer of the pragmatic competence which is interpreted in terms of Karmiloff-Smith's Representational Redescription (RR) (1992). The RR's notion refers to the way POI is translated from its implicit unconscious to the explicit conscious linguistic representation (Murphy and Pine, 2003, p. 142-143) to reach a behavioral mastery over the cognitive abilities (p.144). In other words, the behavioral mastery reflects the linguistic manipulation (i.e., temporal cycles in speech production) (Kormos, 2006, p. 16); where there is a change in the spontaneous production estimated as high or low fluent ability to manage language change across societies and cultures rather than the Language Of Thought (LOT) which is the ability to act upon the same socio-cultural background, system overall architecture, and conscious accessibility (Carassa and Tirassa, 1994, p. 2). So, L2ers who do not retain prior POI will not be able to process upon the recent event POI.

Functionally, the use of honorifics in requests performs a significant socio-pragmatic function that requires communicative training to enhance the IC awareness. To reach the function of honorifics, the L1- based CC should be decomposed to reach the smallest structural components to find the L2-based CC equivalent. Given the contextual background, the mutual representation of L1 and L2 CC stresses the fluent systems duality. The L1 effect appears in L2 linguistic representations since the L2ers activate the latent translational equivalence knowledge that suits, according to the mediated CUCB channel, L2 linguistic representations (Murphy and Pine,

2003, p. 250). The dual fluency high extent shows the multi-modality of mental representations that processed over language socialization giving L2ers the chance to cognitively carry out various tasks; naming, identification, comprehension, and inferences (p. 114). It is worth noting that these procedural categories are applied while trying socially to classify a person, e.g. honorifically addressing him/her. The dual fluency results in the ability to manage the communicative function in the context-dependent situations where the sub/cultural boundaries are existed (p. 116).

Furthermore, this study shows that the female L2ers' social deictic input and the produced honorifics output display the way negotiating meaning in interactional dyads across the processes of language transfer and transfer of training (Selinker, 1972, p. 215). In this sense, it presents the extent the duals are conceptually working together to reach a goal in interactional dyads. Thus, the awareness should be devoted to the content of academic courses; the Language Learners/LLs should be immersed in a near-native interactional environment where the syntactic and the semantic are structurally required; in addition to the pragmatic function of language where skills are acquired and learnt across in/formal situations.

1.8. Conclusion

Given the aim of the study, it would be mistaken to over/generalize the results of this study to the whole Egyptian society; because it reflects only the ritual use of LREs among one group of academic L2ers. Additionally, the immediate response of the written scripts does not depict a pragmatic failure that is because L2ers' working memory would be activated with a given space of time. Additionally, the course's content should contain IC communicative tasks to expose L2ers to various L2 sociolects so as to provide the CUCB with more L2 socio-POI (Kecskes and Papp, 2003, p. 248). As a result, L2ers' L2 culture representation is conceptualized when well-received. The L2 CC is created presenting the dual's socio-pragmatic skills to build an integrated-cultural heritage that is accumulated over time.

Consequently, the L1cultural heritage, unlike L2, affects the L1 message's en/coding providing the message with the required contextual POI; which may be in/sufficient to L2ers in L2 scenarios. This contextual POI renders the L2ers the sense of pragmatic management of the whole

situation. The apparent social harmony reflects intended cultural adaptation without any violations; the L2ers' illocutionary force to continue the social harmony in a prestigious manner. This intention goes hand in hand with Kormos' (2006) general requirements for any situational conceptualization, that are; 1) knowledge of the situation; 2) power relations; 3) norms of interaction in the given language; 4) rules of politeness; and 5) general knowledge/POI of the world (p. 15). Therefore, the communicative process is not distorted by L2ers over-formality and/or prestigious language use. So, coherence is rendered across the idiomatic requesting behavior pattern due to; the ability to conduct a right commitment with the addressees (same/cross- gender); the participants' occupational position; and the estimated age.

Concerning the L2ers' status that does not show honorifics in their behavior; it would be remarkable to interpret it as a lack of speech regulation and planning where intention, attention and consciousness are used to enrich the message processing. This loss may be expected to be the result of the teachers'; a) inability to executively manage the classrooms' activities either across the syllabus content or the instructional activities; and b) inability to systematize the POI about how, when, and why they can be introduced to the learners across the teaching class. This meta-cognitive management would help the teachers to plan, monitor, and evaluate the learners' skills and performance (Hartman, 2001, p. 150). Therefore, it is suggested that the teachers should consider; a) the results of classroom's prior content activities behaviors to the recent introduced-instructional activities' behavior; b) the conceptualized internal beliefs that control the L2ers' behaviors and the recent required POI to conceptually apprehend the new speech event; and c) the motivational anxiety beyond participating or initiating a new task representing the self-regulatory sense of the learner. This would progressively create a self-regulated learner who possesses the ability to think, manage, control, and move towards the new given tasks sufficiently (Hartman, 2001, p. 167). Sufficient aids given to the learners show the support presented to the CUCB channel to interact with others inter/intra-culturally.

A Worth noting point that is related to the poor aids in the L2 learning POI context is found across some factors; confusing teachers, abstruse

content, and unclear objectives that deviates the L2ers from the correct learning objective (i.e., to interact). So, the self-regulated learner takes the charge of promoting the shortage appears across the learning process either it is intended or not; starting from self-initiating then creating an environment concentrating on required resources (Ellis and Zimmerman, 2001, pp. 205-206). This is also resulted from the disability of conducting a particular learning goal. The learners who consider the learning outcomes rather than performance goals learn more (pp.: 210-211).

These findings will help in course design that is supposed to be; a) updated and introduced in an approved manner to manage a communicative goal; b) provided with activities that deal with the 'intellectual' skill to address the learners' thinking abilities for experiential behavior. In this sense, there must be a focus on the 'discovery' skill (Byram, 1997) that tends to enlarge the knowledge zone (Spencer-Oatey and Stadler, 2010, p. 199). In other words, to plan for curriculum that is justifiable in educational terms (Kelly, 2004, p. 3). The justification of any educational syllabus is built on knowledge-content and vocational interest. The vocational interest stems from the idea that the learners should learn how to be bi-dialectal learners to enable the diversity of L2 dialect (H - and L- variety) entering the classes and be used as well as the L1 dialect that is used spontaneously with no restrictions between professors and learners and vice versa (Ellis and Zimmerman, 2001, p. 214). The L2ers should behave in an obligatory sense, as active decision self-regulated makers for domain dialect shift in daily interactive dyads. Learning/acquiring vernacular L2 dialects in the L1 context doesn't reflect the non-codification of any of the language levels (i.e., L2 levels); however, it shows how natural the interactions are in L2 societies to get a macro-vision about the linguistic and the cultural perspectives for dual contextual fluency (p. 216). Out of these results, the educational ideology of the learners and to some of the professors is practiced, displayed, and prevailed as well.

Finally, the integration of the H - and L- variety in the process of language learning goes hand in hand with the sociolinguistic hypothesis of the cluster model; where prestigious language can be expressed in both the standard and its varieties. Here the prestige sociolect/dialect depends on the

overtness or covertness activated factors; linguistic forms; addressees' occupational positions; social status; gender; age; religious origin (Berthele, 2010, pp. 276-277). Given that any linguistic evaluation concerning the use of a particular form/s in addressing people is related to the inherent ideological constructions that might be changed basically once the intellectual skills become under-processing in formal organization by inserting a suitable content of L1 dialect varieties as well as L2 dialect varieties or suggesting pre-requisites for the communication skills courses registration. Moreover, the study of dialect varieties would help in drawing a line map separating two regional dialects that would be known as dialect boundary to represent the isogloss of even one linguistic item (Yule, 2010, pp. 242-243 and Holmes, 2013, p. 136), where the sharp stratification between different discourse communities will be patternized and inherited for ages pointing to the social layers (high, low, middle, and/or educated, uneducated and ill-literate) given the extent of education each person obtained. The regional dialect performance will show the dialect continuum where one language variety merges in/over another language (p. 244). In fin, the findings of the study points out the significance of investigating the male CC same- and cross-gender interactions.

1.9. Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

Although this study is designed to approach the SCC across the female L2ers, it is recommended to examine the SCC, taking into consideration; a) enlarging the number of academics as well as uneducated L2ers; b) investigating other speech acts; c) going beyond other regional accent variations within the duals; d) activating role-plays in the classrooms activities to evaluate the conceptualized content in spoken discourse; and e) investigating the CC of discorsal features on CMC modes.

1.10. Research Implications

This study doesn't present clear-cut distinctions about ICC among different groups; however, it tries to shed the light on one of the experienced linguistic behavior that may be developed in future for more practice. Gradually and developmentally, it would act as a help to develop the Cultural Behavioral Linguistic Awareness/CBLA modules, regarding the theoretical language levels in different contexts; education, tourism,

commercial business, and media. Furthermore, inserting the notion of 12 cultural awareness of varieties in course syllabi design as a prerequisite for academic degrees either in under/post graduate studies is an obligatory need with the increasing number of foreign scholarships, academic grants, and entrepreneurships for professional developments. Additionally, it would help moving forward developing the critical and reflection skills in pragmatics and communication courses. In fin, there is a requirement to move from the individual behavior to the societal planning; that is to conceptualize the 'language national need' assumed by Hymes (1975, p. 225).

Bibliography

- AlHawary, M. (2009). *Arabic Second Language Acquisition of Morphosyntax*. Yale University Press: New Haven and London.
- Bahatia, V. (2004). *Worlds of Written Discourse*. Continuum. London, New York.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2010). Pragmatics and Second Language Acquisition. In R. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Barsalou, L. (1999). Perceptual Symbol Systems. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, Vol. 22. Retrieved from <https://ase.tufts.edu/cogstud/dennett/papers/sortofsymbols.pdf>
- Berk, L. (1999). *English Syntax: From Word to Discourse*. New York: Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Berthele, R. (2010). Investigations into the folk's mental models of linguistic varieties. In D. Geeraerts, G. Kristiansen, & Y. Peirsman (Eds.), *Advances in cognitive Sociolinguistics* (pp. 265–290). Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- Blommaert, J. and Verschueren, J. (1991). *The Pragmatics of Intercultural and International Communication*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin.
- Brinton, L. (1996). *Pragmatic Markers in English. Grammaticalization and Discourse Functions*. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin. New York.
- Brinton, L. (2000). *The Structure of Modern English: A linguistic introduction*. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam/Philadelphia
- Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Multilingual Matters LTD: Clevedon. Philadelphia. Toronto. Sydney. Johannesburg.
- Cappelle, B. (2017). What's Pragmatic Doing Outside Constructions? In I. Depraetere and R. Salkie (Eds.), *Semantics and Pragmatics: Drawing a Line*. Springer International Publishing Switzerland.

- Carassa, A. and Tirassa, M. (1994). Representational Redescription and Cognitive Architectures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, Vol. 17.
- Cenoz, J. (2003). The Intercultural Style Hypothesis: L1 and L2 Interaction in Requesting Behavior. In V. Cook (Ed.), *Effects of the Second Language on The First*. Multilingual Matters LTD.
- Chomsky, N. (2006). *Language and Mind*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, V. (2003). *Effects of the Second Language on The First*. Multilingual Matters LTD.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge
- Depraetere, I. and Salkie, R. (2017). Free Pragmatic Enrichment, Expansion, Saturation, Completion: A View from Linguistics. In I. Depraetere and R. Salkie (Eds.), *Semantics and Pragmatics: Drawing a Line*. Springer International Publishing Switzerland.
- Ditters, E. (2007). Featuring as a Disambiguation tool in Arabic NLP. In E. Ditters and H. Motzki (Eds.), *Approaches to Arabic Linguistics*. Brill: Leiden Boston.
- Dufon, M. (2010). The acquisition of terms of address in a second language. In A. Trosborg (Ed.). *Pragmatics across languages and Cultures*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- El Daly, S. (2017). Semantic Primes in Political Communication: Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump Final Presidential Debate. *Occasional Papers, Vol, 63*. Vol, II.
- Ellis, D. and Zimmerman, B. (2001). Enhancing Self-monitoring during Self-Regulated Learning of Speech. In H. Hartman (Ed.). *Metacognition in Teaching and Learning*. NewYork: Kluwer Academic.
- Fang, X. (2010). The Role of Input and Interaction in Second Language Acquisition. *Cross-Cultural Communication. Vol. 6*, No. 1.
- Fantini, A. (2012). Language: an essential component of intercultural communicative competence. In J. Jackson (Ed.). *The Routledge Handbook of Intercultural Communication*. Routledge: New York and London.

- Finegan, E. (2000). *Language: Its Structure and Use*. Cengage Learning
- Gass, S. (2007). Input and interaction. In C. Doughty and M. Long (Eds.), *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Blackwell Publishing LTD.
- Gumperz, J. and Roberts, C. (1991). Understanding in Intercultural Encounters. In J. Blommaert and J. Verschoren (Eds.), *The pragmatics of Intercultural and International Communication*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Habwe, J. (2010). Politeness Phenomena: A Case of Kiswahili Honorifics. *SWAHILI FORUM, Vol. (17)*
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Routledge: New York and London.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (2014). *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group, New York and London.
- Hanks, W. (2011). Deixis and Indexicality. In W. Bublitz and N. Norrick (Eds.), *Foundations of Pragmatics*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Hartman, H. (2001). *MetaCognition in learning and Instruction: Theory, Research, and Practice*. Springer-Science Business Media, B.V.
- Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and Language Education*. Cambridge University Press.
- Haugh, M. (2010). Intercultural (im)politeness and the micro-macro issue. In A. Trosborg (Ed). *Pragmatics across languages and Cultures*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Holes, C. (2018). *Arabic Historical Dialectology. Linguistic and Sociolinguistic Approaches*. Oxford University Press.
- Holmes, J. (2013). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Routledge: New York and London.
- Hudson, T. (1982). The Effects of Induced Schemata on the 'short Circuit' in L2 Reading: Non-DeCoding Factors in L2 Reading Performance. *Language Learning. A Journal of Research in Language Studies*.

- Hymes, D. (1975). Towards Linguistic Competence. Retrieved from <https://ugp.rug.nl/sogi/article/download/20927/18399/>
- Jarvis, S. (2003). Probing The Effects of the L2 on the L1: A Case Study. In Cook, V. (Ed.), *Effects of the Second Language on The First*. Multilingual Matters LTD.
- Jarvis, S. and Pavlenko, A. (2008). *Cross-Linguistic Influence in Language and Cognition*. Routledge: New York and London.
- Karmilof, S. (1992). *Beyond modularity: A developmental perspective on cognitive science*. Cambridge, MA, US: The MIT Press.
- Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic Transfer. *Second Language Research*. Vol. 8, 3.
- Kasper, S. and Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Kecskes, I. (2008). Dueling Contexts: A Dynamic Model of Meaning. *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 40, pp. 385-406.
- Kecskes, I. (2010). The Paradox of Communication: Socio-Cognitive Approach to Pragmatics. *Pragmatics and Society*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kecskes, I. (2014). *Intercultural Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
- Kecskes, I. and Cuenca, I. (2005). Lexical Choice as a Reflection of Conceptual Fluency. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, Vol. 9, N. 1, pp. 49-67.
- Kecskes, I., and Papp T. (2003). How to demonstrate the conceptual effect of the L2 on L1? In V. Cook (Ed.), *The effect of L2 on L1*. Multilingual Matters. Clevedon. Philadelphia. Toronto. Sydney. Johannesburg.
- Kelly, A. (2004). *The Curriculum: Theory and Practice*. Sage Publications.
- Kirtchuk, P. (2000). Deixis and Noun-Classification in Pilaga and Beyond. In E. Contini-Morava and Y. Tobin (Eds.), *Between Grammar and Lexicon*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Kormos, J. (2006). *Speech Production and Second Language Acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associations: Mahwah, New Jersey.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Pergamon Press Inc.
- Krisner, R. (2004). On Paradigm, Analyses, and Dialogue. In E. Contini-Morava, R. Krisner and B. Rodriguez-Bachiller (Eds.), *Cognitive and Communicative Approaches to Linguistic Analysis*. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and Women's Place*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Langacker, R. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, R. (2004). Form, Meaning, and Behavior: The Cognitive Grammar Analysis of Double Subject Constructions. In E. Contini-Morava, R. Krisner and B. Rodriguez-Bachiller (Eds.), *Cognitive and Communicative Approaches to Linguistic Analysis*. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Langacker, R. (2008). *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Langacker, R. (2017). Evidentiality in Cognitive Grammar. In J. Arrese, G. Habler and M. Carretero (Eds.), *Evidentiality Revisited, Cognitive Grammar, Functional and Discourse, Pragmatic Perspectives*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Laufer, B. (2003). Vocabulary Acquisition in a Second Language: Do Learners Really Acquire Most Vocabulary by Reading? Some Empirical Evidence. Retrieved from: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/250196400>.
- Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lindsay, R. (2009). Perception and Language. In D. Sandra, J. Ostman and J. Verschueen (Eds.). *Pragmatics and Cognition*. John Benjamin.
- Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction, and second language development:

- An empirical study of question formation in ESL. *SSLA*, 21, 557-587.
- Mackey, A. (2007). *Conversational interaction in second language acquisition: A collection of empirical studies*. Oxford University Press.
- Marzano, R. and Kendall, J. (2007). *The New Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. Crowin Press.
- Mey, J. (1993). *Pragmatics: an introduction*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Muho, A. and Kurani, A. (2014). The role of interaction in second language acquisition. *European Scientific Journal*. Retrieved from: <https://eujournal.org/index.php/esj/article/download/4696/4488>.
- Murphy, V. and Pine, K. (2003). L2 Influence on L1 Linguistics Representations. In Cook, V. (Ed.), *Effects of the Second Language on The First*. Multilingual Matters LTD.
- Owens, J. (2007). Paradigmatic Stability and Final Laryngeals in Nigerian Arabic, or Why History Repeats Itself, Without Actuality Doing So. In E. Ditters and H. Motzki (Eds.), *Approaches to Arabic Linguistics*. The Netherlands.
- Prechtel, E. and Davidson Lund, A. (2007). "Intercultural Competence and Assessment: Perspectives from the INCA Project." In H. Kotthoff, and H. Spencer-Oatey (Eds.): *Handbook of Intercultural Communication*. Verlag: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Richards, J. (1973). *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. Longman.
- Scheider, K. (2008). Smalltalk in England, Ireland, and U.S.A. in K. Schneider and A. Barron (Eds.), *Variational Pragmatics. A Focus Regional Variety in Pluricentric Language*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Schunk, D. and Greene, J. (2018). *Handbook of Self-Regulation of Learning and Performance*. Routledge: New York and London.
- Shapiro, S., Rechtschaffen, D., and De Sousa, S. (2016). Mindfulness

- Training for Teachers. In Schonert-Reichl, K. and R. Robert (Eds.), *Mindfulness in Behavioral Health. Handbook of Mindfulness in Education: Integrating Theory and Research into Practice*. New York, NY, US: Springer-Verlag Publishing.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. In J. Richards (Ed.), *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. Longman.
- Smakman, D. (2012). *The Definition of The Standard Language: A Survey in Seven Countries*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Smith, S., Sholinck, N., Crutcher, A., Simeone, M. and Smith, W. (1991). Foreigner Talk Revisited: Limits on accommodation to non-fluent Speakers. In J. Blommaert and J. Verschueren (Eds.), *The Pragmatics of Intercultural and International Communication* (pp. 175-185). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2010). Intercultural competence and pragmatics Research: Examining the interface through studies of intercultural business discourse. In A. Trosborg (Eds.). *Pragmatics across languages and Cultures*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. and Franklin, P. (2009). *Intercultural Interaction: A Multidisciplinary Approach to Intercultural Communication*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Spencer-Oatey, H. and Jiang, W. (2003). Explaining Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Findings. Moving From Politeness Maxims to Socio-Pragmatic International Principles (SIPs). *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 35. Retrieved from Wrap.Warwick.ac.uk/2685/
- Spencer-Oatey, H. and Stadler, S. (2010). The Global People Competency Framework Competencies for Effective Intercultural Interaction. *Warwick Occasional Papers in Applied Linguistics*, 3.
- Spitzberg, B. and Changnon, G. (2009). Conceptualizing Intercultural Competence. In D. Deardorff (Ed.). *The SAGE Handbook of Intercultural Competence*. SAGE Publications, Inc.

- Talmy, L. (2008). Aspects of Attention in Language. In P. Robinson and N. Ellis (Eds.). *Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition*. Routledge: New York and London.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-Cultural Pragmatic Failure. *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 4, pp. 91-112. Retrieved from https://rodas5.us.es/file/a26cd06f.../thomas_failure.../thomas_pragmatic_failure.pdf.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1999). *Communicating across Cultures*. The Guilford Press, New York.
- Trudgill, P. (2000). *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society*. Peter Trudgill, The Benuin Group.
- Van de Vijver, F. and Leung, K. (2009). Methodological Issues in Researching Intercultural Competence, In D. Deardorff (Eds). *The SAGE Handbook of Intercultural Competence*. SAGE Publications.
- Van Dijk, T. (2006). Discourse, Context, and Cognition. *Discourse Studies*, Vol. 8(1): 159–177. SAGE Publications.
- Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring classroom discourse: Language in action*. Routledge: London and New York
- Wieczorek, A. (2013). *Clusivity: A New Approach to Association and Dissociation in political Discourse*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Wierzbicka, A. (2010). Cultural scripts and intercultural communication: In A. Trosborg (Ed.). *Pragmatics across languages and Cultures*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Zobl, H. (1993). Prior Linguistic Knowledge and The Conservatism of The Learning Procedure: Grammatical Judgments of Unilingual and Multilingual Learners. In S. Gass and L. Selinker (Eds.), *Language Transfer in Language Learning*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Appendix 1

Kim's (1994) Scenarios used in this Study

Demographic info	
Name	
Class	
Course	
Date	

Scenario 1: Repay Loan Situation (Social Status: Hearer = Speaker)

Imagine that one of your female friends, whom you have known for several years, has the habit of borrowing money and then not repaying it for long periods of time. In fact, it seems that she has been late not only in repaying money borrowed from you but also from other people. Two weeks ago, she borrowed 20 pounds from you and again did not repay it as promised. You waited a few days more, but found that you really need some money. Now you want to ask her to pay it back.

Scenario 2: Borrow Money Situation (Hearer = Speaker)

Imagine that you missed breakfast and are about to have lunch at a university cafeteria. When you search for money, you notice that you forgot to bring your wallet. Given your class schedule, you have just enough time to eat but not enough time to go back home and get money before your next class. Just then, you happen to notice one of your classmates (male), whom you have known for several years, sitting nearby. You decide to ask him to lend you some money.

Scenario 3: Take-a-Day-Off Situation (Hearer > Speaker)

Imagine that you are a graduating senior working on a research project

for a male professor with whom you have taken several classes before. You are supposed to work in the professor's office every Tuesday and Thursday. Next Tuesday, however, you have an important interview with a prospective employer. The interview coincides with your working hours, so you need to take time off to attend it. You want to ask the male professor for permission to take the time off.

Scenario 4: Homework Extension Situation (Hearer > Speaker)

Imagine that you had a cold last week. It was severe enough to make you stay home and rest, but not severe enough for you to go and see a doctor. Although your cold is almost gone now, you will not be able to finish the assignment due tomorrow in one of your classes. Your professor (female) made it clear that no points would be given for late homework without a legitimate reason. Although you do not have an official medical excuse, you cannot afford to get a zero point on the homework. Suppose you do not know the professor very well except for the class. You want to ask the professor (female) to let you hand in the homework late.

Scenario 5: Being-on-Time Situation (Hearer < Speaker)

Imagine that you are a professor in a university. In your class, group activities and

Participation is [*sic*] weighted heavily. From the start of the semester, one particular student (male) is continually late. He seldom makes it to class on time. Other students in the class appear to be disturbed by the student coming in late. After the class, you want to ask him to come on time for future sessions.

Scenario 6: Delay-a-Presentation Situation (Hearer < Speaker)

Imagine that you are a professor in a university. For your class, you require individual presentations on class material. The presentation counts for 40% of the final grade and it involves demonstrating some experiments.

Today is the first day of presentations, but due to a backlog of material, you find it necessary to lecture for part of the time to cover material for the upcoming exam. Therefore, the final presenter (female), who had to bring various devices and electronic equipment, will not be able to give her presentation today. As the professor, you want to ask her to postpone her presentation to the next class.

Appendix 2: Arabic version

Kim's (1994) Scenarios used in this Study

السيناريو الأول: في حالة سداد القرض (الحالة الاجتماعية: المستمع = المتكلم)

تخيل أن واحدة من أصدقائك الإناث، والتي تعرفها لعدة سنوات، لديها عادة اقتراض المال و لا تقوم بتسديد المال لفترات طويلة . في الواقع، يبدو أنها تأخرت ليس فقط في سداد الأموال المقترضة منك ولكن أيضا من أشخاص آخرين. فمن أسبوعين، استعارت ٢٠ جنيتها منك ولم تسدها كما وعدت. انتظرت بضعة أيام أكثر، ولكن وجدت أنك حقا بحاجة الى بعض المال. وتريد الان أن تطلب منها أن تعيد اليك أموالك

السيناريو الثاني: في حالة اقتراض المال (المستمع = المتكلم)

تخيل أن فانتك وجبة الإفطار، وأنك على وشك تناول الغداء في كافتيريا الجامعة. وعند البحث عن المال، لاحظت أنك نسيت إحضار محفظتك. ووفقا لجدول الحصص الدراسية، فيوجد لديك ما يكفي من الوقت لتناول الطعام ولكن ليس وقتا كافيا للعودة إلى المنزل واحضار بعض المال قبل الحصة المقبلة. فقط بعد ذلك، و حدث أنك لاحظت واحد من زملائك (الذكور)، والذي كنت قد عرفته لعدة سنوات، يجلس في مكان قريب. وترغب أن تطلب منه أن يقدم لك بعض المال.

السيناريو الثالث: في حالة الأجازة (المستمع < المتكلم)

تخيل أنك خريج يقوم بمشروع التخرج لأستاذ جامعي حضرت له بعض المحاضرات قبل ذلك. ومن المفترض أن تعمل في مكتب الأستاذ كل ثلاثاء وخميس. في يوم الثلاثاء المقبل، ومع ذلك، لديك مقابلة هامة مع صاحب العمل المنتظر. تتعارض المقابلة مع ساعات العمل الخاصة بك، لذلك عليك أن تأخذ وقتا للخروج لحضور ذلك. كنت تريد أن تطلب من أستاذك (الذكر) الحصول على إذن للخروج.

السيناريو الرابع: تمديد الواجبات المنزلية (المستمع < المتكلم)

تخيل أن لديك نزلة برد في الأسبوع الماضي. كانت شديدة بما فيه الكفاية لجعلك تبقي في المنزل للراحة، ولكنها ليست شديدة بما فيه الكفاية بالنسبة لك للذهاب ورؤية الطبيب. وبالرغم من أنتهاء نزلة البرد، الا انك غير قادر على إنهاء الواجب الدراسي في واحد من فصولك الدراسية المستحقة غدا. وأوضحت استاذة الدرس (أنثى) أنه لن يتم إعطاء أي نقاط لتأخر الواجبات المنزلية دون سبب مشروع. وعلى الرغم من أنك لم يكن لديك عذر طبي رسمي، لا يمكنك تحمل الحصول

على نقطة الصفر على الواجبات المنزلية. لنفترض أنك لا تعرف الأستاذ بشكل جيد خارج نطاق المحاضرات الدراسية. كنت تريد أن تطلب من أستاذتك (أنثى) أن تمكنك من تسليم في الواجبات المنزلية في وقت متأخر.

السيناريو الخامس: في حالة الحضور في الوقت المحدد (المتكلم < المستمع)

تخيل أنك أستاذ في الجامعة. ويوجد في فصلك، مجموعات وأنشطته. و منذ بداية الفصل الدراسي، يوجد طالب واحد معين (ذكر) يتأخر باستمرار. نادرا ما يجعل الصف يبدأ في الوقت المحدد. ويبدو أن الطلاب الآخرين في الصف يشعرون بالانزعاج من قبل الطالب القادم في وقت متأخر. بعد الصف، كنت تريد أن تطلب منه أن يأتي في الوقت المحدد للحصص في المستقبل.

السيناريو السادس: حالة التأخير في العرض (المتكلم < المستمع)

تخيل أنك أستاذ في الجامعة. لصفك، وكلفت الطلاب القيام بتقديم بعض العروض البحثية الخاصة بمقرررك الدراسي. ويخصص لهذا العرض البحثي حوالي ٤٠٪ من من مجمل درجات هذا المقرر الدراسي، ويتضمن هذا العرض اجراء بعض التجارب.و اليوم هو اليوم الأول من العروض، ولكن بسبب تراكم المواد، وجدت أنه من الضروري أن تعطي محاضرة لجزء من الوقت لتغطية المواد للامتحان القادم. ولذلك، فإن مقدمة العرض النهائي (أنثى)، التي كان عليها أن تجلب مختلف الأجهزة والمعدات الإلكترونية، لن تكون قادرة على تقديم عرضها اليوم. كما أستاذ تريد أن تطلب منها تأجيل عرضها إلى المحاضرة المقبلة.