
ASSESSING POLITENESS STRATEGIES USED FOR INTERACTION BETWEEN EFL UNIVERSITY INSTRUCTORS AND STUDENTS

D. Ridha Ghanim Dakhil

Fatima Jamal Saadullah

Abstract

Communication is the activity one uses to express his/her ideas and intents by using language, signs, or even sounds. In communication the hearer try to get what the speaker intents to convey and both of them use specific strategies as a part of communicative competence. In learning second language one needs not just to learn its linguistic competence but also its pragmatics. One may not always be lucky to convey and understand the ideas and intents through communication because of the pragmatics mistakes.

In last decades, politeness has become one of the most interested topics in pragmatics to search about. Learning second language means learning its pragmatics, because politeness can be apparent and understood in different ways through different languages. Although being polite is a universal concept, the meaning of politeness might vary across culture, gender, and power relations (Niroomanda 2012: 180). The present study is conducted on EFL Iraqi university instructor and students to assess their awareness and application of politeness strategies in interaction. Therefore it aims at:

1. Assessing the application of politeness strategies used by EFL Iraqi university instructors for interaction with their students,
2. Comparing politeness strategies used by EFL Iraqi university instructors according to their gender (male & female) with their students,
3. Comparing politeness strategies used by EFL Iraqi university instructors according to their years of experiences,

Two non-random samples have been selected at the departments of English, morning studies, at two colleges namely; College of Basic Education/ University of Diyala and College of Basic Education/ University of Al-Mustansiriayah, for the academic year 2016-2017. A sample of 14 EFL Iraqi instructors is selected for the study.

One instrument is constructed to achieve the aims of the study; 25 items of checklist used to assess the application of EFL Iraqi university instructors, the checklist is duly validated by experts to be used for



collection data. Data collected are analysed using suitable statistical methods. Results reveal the following:-

1. EFL Iraqi university instructors have sufficient application of politeness strategies used for interaction.
2. EFL Iraqi university female instructors use politeness strategies more than male instructors.
3. EFL Iraqi university instructors whose years of experience ranging (1-10), (10-20) and (20-30) have no statistical significance differences in using politeness strategies in interaction.

In the light of the results, a number of recommendations are put forward. Several suggestions are also proposed for further studies to enrich the area of investigation.

تقييم استراتيجيات التهذيب المستخدمة للتفاعل بين أساتذة وطلبة الجامعة دارسي اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية

الملخص

التواصل هو الفعالية المستخدمة لتعبير الفرد عن أفكاره ونواياه مستخدماً اللغة، الإشارات، أو حتى الأصوات في التفاعل، ويحاول المتلقي فهم ماينوي المتكلم ايصاله وكلاهما يستخدم استراتيجيات معينة كجزء من الكفاءة التواصلية لتعلم لغة ثانية، لايحتاج المتعلم الى تعلم الكفاءة اللغوية فحسب وإنما تعلم براغماتيتها أيضاً. قد لا يكون المتعلم دائماً صائباً لايصال الافكار أو فهم النوايا خلال التواصل بسبب الاخطاء البراغماتية.

في العقود الأخيرة أصبح التهذيب أحد أكثر المواضيع أهمية للبحث عنه في البراغماتية، فتعلم لغة ثانية يعني تعلم براغماتيتها، وذلك لأن التهذيب قد يُعبر عنه ويُفهم بطرق مختلفة من خلال لغات مختلفة. على الرغم من أن التهذيب مفهوم عالمي إلا أن معناه قد يتنوع بتنوع الثقافات وأختلاف الجنس وقوة العلاقات .

أُجريت هذه الدراسة على مدرسي وطلاب اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية الجامعيين العراقيين لتقييم وعيهم وتطبيقهم لاستراتيجيات التهذيب في التفاعل وعليه تهدف الدراسة الى:-

١ تقييم تطبيق استراتيجيات التهذيب المستخدمة من قبل مدرسي اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية الجامعيين العراقيين.

٢ مقارنة استراتيجيات التهذيب المستخدمة في التفاعل من قبل مدرسي اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية الجامعيين العراقيين حسب جنسهم (ذكور/ أناث)

٣ مقارنة استراتيجيات التهذيب المستخدمة في التفاعل من قبل مدرسي اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية الجامعيين العراقيين حسب سنين خبرتهم.

٤ تقييم وعي طلاب اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية الجامعيين العراقيين لاستخدام استراتيجيات التهذيب في التفاعل.

٥ تقييم تطبيق استراتيجيات التهذيب في التفاعل من قبل طلاب اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية الجامعيين العراقيين.

٦ مقارنة استخدام استراتيجيات التهذيب المستخدمة في التفاعل من قبل طلاب اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية الجامعيين العراقيين حسب جنسهم (ذكور/ أناث)

أُختيرت عينتان غير عشوائية من قسم اللغة الانكليزية ، الدراسة الصباحية من كليتين وهما: كلية التربية الاساسية/ جامعة ديالى و كلية التربية الاساسية/ الجامعة المستنصرية للسنة الدراسية ٢٠١٦-٢٠١٧. تكونت العينة من ١٤ مدرس للغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية جامعي عراقي و ١٥٦ طالب للغة الانكليزية جامعي عراقي. طُبقت ثلاث ادوات لتحقيق أهداف الرسالة:-

١ قائمة ملاحظة مكونة من ٢٥ فقرة لتقييم تطبيق مدرسين اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية الجامعيين العراقيين.

٢ استبانة مكونة من ٢٥ فقرة لتقييم وعي طلاب اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية الجامعيين العراقيين.

٣ امتحان تحريري مكون من ٢٥ فقرة باللغة الانكليزية لتقييم تطبيق استراتيجيات التهذيب من قبل طلاب اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية الجامعيين العراقيين.

تم اختبار صلاحية هذه الادوات الثلاث من قبل لجنة الخبراء والتحقق من فاعليتها بجمع البيانات، كما و أُستخدِمت أكثر من طريقة لاختبار ثبات ومصدقية هذه الادوات.

حُللت البيانات المجموعة بأستخدام طرق أحصائية مختلفة فأظهرت النتائج التالية:-

١ مُدرسي اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية الجامعيين العراقيين لديهم تطبيق كاف لاستخدام استراتيجيات اللتهذيب في التفاعل.

٢ استخدام استراتيجيات التهذيب في التفاعل لدى المدرسات الاناث للغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية الجامعيات العراقيات اكثر من استخدامها لدى المدرسين الذكور.

٣ لاتوجد اي فروق فردية ذات دلالة احصائية بين مدرسي اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية الجامعيين العراقيين التي تراوح سنين خبرتهم (٠١-١٠) (١٠-٢٠) (٢٠-٣٠) في استخدام استراتيجيات التهذيب.

٤ طلاب اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية الجامعيين العراقيين لديهم وع كاف في حول استخدام استراتيجيات التهذيب في التفاعل.

٥ طلاب اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية الجامعيين العراقيين لديهم تطبيق كاف لاستخدام استراتيجيات التهذيب في التفاعل.

٦ توجد فروق فردية ذات دلالة احصائية بين طلاب اللغة الانكليزية لغة اجنبية الجامعيين العراقيين من حيث استخدام الاناث لاستراتيجيات التهذيب في التفاعل اكثر من الذكور.

وفي ضوء النتائج السابقة وُضعت عدد من التوصيات وأدرجت بعض الاقتراحات كدليل للدراسات المعززة لمجال مواضيع البحث.

Section one

Introduction

1.1 The problem and its significance:

In every single lecture, to be observed, there is a lot of cheerful, friendly and useful interactions to take the students into academic knowledge. Instructors and students construct knowledge even when they are culturally different. These interactions would probably be described as illustration of what a nice personality the instructor has, or how an instructor can get students ready for a lecture. However, politeness is the magic stick behind all these interactions which surprises the students in every different lecture. While it enables instructors to build what they sense

as a necessary set of social relationships, it also may affect academic ways of knowing.

Nowadays, how to communicate, verbally and nonverbally in foreign language teaching and learning, becomes more important than reading and writing. So, there is a big consideration of oral communication strategies, i.e., listening and speaking have turned into a crucial topic for all foreign language learners and teachers (Zhang, 2007: 43).

In teaching and learning activities, the ways that the teachers adopt in interaction with his/ her students are very important in EFL classroom, such as teacher talks to the whole class presenting, explaining the topic, and giving instructions for an activity, many of these activities are done nonverbally. Intentionally or unintentionally, the nonverbal communication is used in the classroom. Usually, this type of interaction (e.g. facial expressions, tone and voice, hand signals ...etc.,) is used by instructors attempting to better understand and better communication with the student (Barry, 2011: 1).

Politeness is one of the basics of human interaction. For that reason, many researchers such as Leech, Brown and Levinson, and Austin and Searle focuses on politeness in their studies and proposes different theories about politeness. From this point of view, the researcher attempts to observe and check politeness strategies used for interaction between EFL Iraqi instructors and their students which is determined by the social relationships. Politeness as a means for creating, supporting, changing and realizing social relations, putting in researcher's mind the problem as noticed –through her own experience as a learner and investigating EFL instructors' opinion- that these strategies are not adequately used in Iraqi EFL Iraqi University. Identifying these strategies is supposed to answer the following questions:



1. Have EFL university instructors' any sufficient application of using politeness strategies for interaction?
2. Are there any statistically significant differences among Iraqi EFL university instructors' applications of politeness strategies according to their gender (Male & Female) and their years of experiences?

1.2 Aims

The study aims at:

1. Assessing the application of politeness strategies used by EFL Iraqi University Instructors for interaction with their students,
2. Comparing politeness strategies used by EFL Iraqi university instructors according to their gender (male & female) with their students,
3. Comparing politeness strategies used by EFL Iraqi university instructors according to their years of experiences.

1.3 Hypotheses

It is hypothesized that:

1. Iraqi EFL university instructors have no sufficient application of politeness strategies for interaction.
2. There are no statistically significant differences among Iraqi EFL university instructors in using politeness strategies according to their gender (Male & Female).
3. There are no statistically significant differences among Iraqi EFL university instructors in using politeness strategies according to their years of experiences.

Section Two

Theoretical Background and Literature Review

2.1 Politeness Strategies

Firstly, it should be mentioned that politeness strategies are considered as speech acts in sociolinguistics and conversation analysis that express and concern for others and minimize threats to self-esteem (face) in particular social contexts. Lakoff (1990 as cited in Jumanto, 2008: 44-45) claims that speech act can be categorized as polite if the speech:

- 1- Does not contain any speakers' coercion or vanity,
- 2- Gives the option to the speaker to do something, and
- 3- Provides comfort and friendly to the hearer.

Brown and Levinson (1987, according to Watts, 2003: 86) assume that everyone has two faces; positive face and negative face. The positive face is defined as the ones' desire that he wants to be appreciated and approved of in social interaction, whereas, the negative face is the desire of freedom of action from imposition. So politeness strategies aim at:

- 1- Supporting or enhancing the addressee's positive face (positive politeness) and
- 2- Avoiding transgression of the addressee's freedom of action and freedom from imposition (negative face).

Nordquist (2017: online) defines positive politeness strategies as those strategies which are intended to avoid giving offense by highlighting friendliness. These strategies include juxtaposing criticism with compliments, establishing common ground, and using jokes, nicknames, honorifics, tag questions, special discourse markers (*please*), and in-group jargon and slang, While, negative politeness strategies as those strategies which are intended to avoid giving offense by showing deference. These strategies include questioning, hedging, and presenting disagreements as opinions.

2.2.1 Positive Politeness Strategies

Brown and Levinson (1987 as cited in Kurniawan, 2015: 13) state that to show positive politeness strategies one have to deals with positive face in which the speakers contact with the hearer's positive face by giving the hearers some respect. Wardaugh (2006: 277) states that if the speaker communicate using positive politeness strategies they will help him treats the hearer as a friend and don't threat her/his face by employing and offering friendly relationship, compliment and informal language . Therefore, there are many ways one can employ to show positive politeness strategies; all these ways could be extracted from Brown and Levinson's (1992:103-129), which are relisted by Watts (2003: 89-90), fifteen strategies are addressed to positive politeness strategies as follows;

- 1- Notice, attend to H (his interests, wants, needs, goods)
- 2- Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H)
- 3- Intensify interest to H
- 4- Use in-group identity markers
- 5- Seek agreement
- 6- Avoid disagreement
- 7- Presuppose/ raise/ assert common ground
- 8- Joke
- 9- Assert or presuppose S's knowledge of and concern for H's wants
- 10- Offer, promise
- 11- Be optimistic
- 12- Include both S and H in the activity
- 13- Give (or ask for) reasons
- 14- Assume or assert reciprocity
- 15- Give gifts to H (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)

2.2.2 Negative Politeness Strategies

In linguistics, good manners or politeness, negative politeness consideration contrasts with positive politeness. It can be viewed as respect strategy (Yule, 2010: 66). Brown and Levinson, negative strategy is the methodology that situated toward listener negative face in which the speaker regards the address' negative face needs and it is accomplished without meddling with listener's opportunity or activity. In correspondence, the use of conventional politeness markers, deference markers, minimizing imposition are some examples of the strategy (Thomas, 1995: 172 as cited in Kurniawan, 2015: 21). According to Brown and Levinson (1992: 130-210) and Watts (2003: 89-90) there are ten strategies to show negative politeness in a way to be direct, do not presume, do not coerce and redress other wants of hearers. The strategy can be described as follow:

- 1- Be conventionally indirect
- 2- Using question, hedge
- 3- Be pessimistic
- 4- Minimize the imposition of R_x
- 5- Give deference
- 6- Apologize
- 7- Impersonalize speaker and hearer
- 8- State the FTA as general rule
- 9- Nominalize
- 10- Go on Record as incurring debt or not as indebting the hearer

2.3 Definitions of Interaction and Classroom Interaction

The word interaction is formed by the prefix “inter”, which implies togetherness, reciprocity, and the noun “action”, which means something done usually as opposed to something said. So interaction is a mutual

activity which requires at least the involvement of two persons and which causes mutual effect.

With some modification, The Cambridge International Dictionary of English (2000) as cited in Dagrín (2004: 128) defines the verb “to interact” as to communicate with or react to each other. So that interaction is more than action followed by reaction. It includes acting mutually, acting upon each other.

Furthermore, Brown (2001: 165) relates “interaction” to “communication”, saying, “...*interaction is, in fact, the heart of communication: it is what communication is all about*”. Likewise, Khadidja (2010: 9) who affirms that interaction is a process of communication between at least two people who share a list of signs and semiotic rules. Therefore, interaction does not occur only from one side, there must be a mutual influence through giving and receiving messages in order to achieve communication.

2.4 Types of Interaction

This study deals with three types of interactions which they are:

2.4.1 Verbal Interaction

2.4.2 Non-Verbal Interaction

In this thesis the following types of non-verbal interaction are considered in the checklist to observe the politeness strategies, which they are:

1. Facial Expressions

2. Eye Contacts

3. Hand Gestures

4. Body Language

2.4.3 Para-Verbal Interaction

In this thesis the following types of para-verbal interaction are considered in the checklist to observe the politeness strategies, which they are:

1- Intonation

2- The volume of the sound

Section Three

Procedures and Methodology

3.1 Population and Samples of Selection

The population consists of instructors at department of English Language in terms of their gender and their years of experience in the two college of Basic Education are mentioned above. It is worthy to be mentioned that the total number of instructor's population at the two colleges is 34 for both genders. The instructors' sample is purposefully selected from the teaching staff who teach the 3rd stage at the Departments of English Language, morning /studies at the two Colleges of Basic Education. To fulfil the aims of this study, the sample includes all instructors who teach at the 3rd stage representing the three field specializations and for both genders.

The instructors' sample is selected with a percentage of 41%, so the total number of instructors' sample is 14 at the Departments of English Language which is distributed in terms of their gender (males and females), and their years of experiences (0-10, 10-20, 20-30).

The total number of instructor at the College of Basic Education, University of Diyala, is 7 which is distributed as follow:

1- The number of male is 4, whereas, the number of female is 3.

In terms of College of Basic Education, University of Al-Mustansiriayah, the total number of instructors is 7 which is distributed as follow:

1- The number of male is 3, whereas, the number of female is 4.

According to the years of experience which range from 1-10, 10-20, 20-30, the sample is distributed as follow:

1- The total number of instructors at the College of Basic Education, University of Diyala is 7 distributed as follow: the instructors whose years of experience range is from 1-10 is 1, whereas, those whose year of experience range is from 10-20 is 3, and those whose year of experience range from 20-30 is 2.

2- The total number of instructors at the College of Basic Education, University of Al-Mustansiriayah is 7 distributed as follow: the instructors whose years of experience range is from 1-10 is 2, whereas, those whose year of experience range is from 10-20 is 1 and those whose year of experience range from 20-30 is 4.

3.2 Description of the Checklist

A checklist basically a list of the criteria upon which a sample's performance or behaviour to be judged (Moore, 2005: 328). Brown (2000: 268-269) mentions that checklist can be quite simple, which is better option for focusing on only a few factors within a real time. He thinks that checklist is a viable alternative for recording observation results. So the researcher determined to design a checklist observation to check the usage of politeness strategies used by EFL instructors for interaction.

The checklist covers two major aspects which are **Politeness Strategies** and **Interaction**. Each aspect consists of several subscales. The first aspect is **Politeness Strategies** which consist of two Subscales. The

first subscale is **Positive Politeness Strategies**, which includes 15 strategies. The second subscale is **Negative Politeness Strategies**, which consists of 10 strategies.

The second aspect is **Types of Interaction** which consists of three subscales. The first subscale is **Verbal Interaction** which includes the verbal interaction of each strategy that mentioned by Brown and Levinson 1987 in their book under the name of *Politeness Some Universals in Language Usage*. The second subscale is **Para-Verbal Interaction** which includes the **Intonation** and **The Volume of Voice**. The third scale is **Non-Verbal Interaction** which includes **Facial Expression, Eye Contact, Hand Gestures, and Body Language**.

The scale responses to the checklist observation consists of: **3=effective; 2=somewhat effective; 1=not effective**; (see Appendix 1)

3.3 Face Validity

The validity of this study refers to whether the test looks as if it is measured what it supposed. In other words, Gay (2001: 140) defines face validity as the degree to which a test appears to measure what is purports to measure. He states that to measure face validity is *'by experts examine the measure and agree that it does assesses what it is supposed to assess. The measure looks right, reads right, and feels right'*.

Face validity is proved by submitting the Checklist to a panel of experts (jury member) in Methodology, literature and Linguistics at different Universities include Baghdad, Al-Mustansiryha, and Diyala. The jury members are:-

1- Professor Ismail, Khalil, Ph. D in Linguistics/ College of Education for Human Sciences/ University of Diyala.

- 2- Professor Al-Ma'muri, Sami Ph. D in ELT/ College of Basic Education/ University of Diyala.
- 3- Professor Muhammed, Amthal, Ph. D in Translation / College of Basic Education/ University of Diyala.
- 4- Professor Hameed, Ayad, Mohamoud, Ph. D in Linguistics/ College of Education for Humanities/ University of Diyala.
- 5- Assistant Professor Al-Bakri, Shaima Ph. D in ELT/ College of Education/ Ibn Rushd/ College of Baghdad.
- 6- Assistant Professor Muhammed, Ghazwan Adnan, Ph. D. in ELT/ College of Education for Humanities/ University of Diyala.
- 7- Assistant Professor Mizhir, Dhyeaa, Ph. D. in ELT/ College of Education/ Ibn Rushd/ University of Baghdad.

3.4 Reliability of the Checklist

Krippendorff (2004: 223) believes that the conceivably simplest reliability data toward checklist observation are generated by two observers who assign one of two variables values to each of the common set of units of analysis.

Determining observer reliability generally requires that at least two observers independently make observations; their recorded judgements as to what occurred can then be compared to see how well they agree (Gay, 2001: 271). Thus, must at least one another person beside the researcher who needs to be familiar with the observational procedures.

Whereas Gay (ibid. 270) argues that the rating scale are used to evaluate the behaviour and give it rating form or the checklist observation, it probably consists of three categories which is ideal number, because the more categories, the more difficulty it becomes to correctly classify, for that reason, the researcher chooses three categories to be a rating scale to the

present study, which are: **3=effective; 2=somewhat effective; 1=not effective.**

Inter-observer reliability method is applied to compute the reliability of Observation Checklist. Inter-observer reliability means the degree to which two observers record the same data or draw the same conclusion in the same circumstance (ibid. 271-272). Thus this procedure is carried out by the researcher himself and her colleague. Then, inter-observer reliability coefficient has been assessed by using the Pearson Correlation Coefficient formula where it was found to be-0. 89; which indicates acceptable reliability in educational research. As Watkins and Miriam (2001: 207) point out that 88% agreement may be satisfactory in most situation.

Section Four

Results, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions

4.1 Results Related to the First Aim and Verification of the First Null Hypothesis

In order to assess the application of politeness strategies used by EFL university instructors, a checklist has been designed and administered to the sample of the study as mentioned in the earlier chapter, for that, descriptive statics are calculated to achieve the current aim and its hypothesis.

For this purpose the weighted mean and the weighted percentile for each item in the checklist are calculated to find that EFL university instructor apply politeness strategies for interaction. Yet, the theoretical mean is 2. The item is achieved if it occurs above of the theoretical mean, otherwise, the item is not fulfilled. So, the results show that all EFL university instructors are applying politeness strategies for interaction. It was founded

that the weighted mean and the weighted percentile for the total items of the checklist is (W. M. = 2.11; W. p. = 70.29).

Table 4.1 shows the weighted mean, the weighted percentile, and the rank for each strategy of the checklist. In fact, it was found that the strategies 4, 8, 12, 13 (all these strategies are positive) have gained the highest rating with (W.M. = 3; W.P. = 100), and the strategies 20, 21, 22 (all these strategies are negative) have gained the lowest rating with (W. M. = 1; W. P. = 33.33). See table 4.1 below:

Table 4.1

Weighted mean, weighted percentile, and rank for the items of the Checklist

No.	Politeness Strategies	Rank	W.M	W.P
4	Use in-group Identity Markers	2.5	3	100%
8	Jokes	2.5	3	100%
12	Include both speakers and hearer in the activity	2.5	3	100%
13	Give or ask for reasons	2.5	3	100%
14	Assume or assert the reciprocity	5	2.79	92.86%
5	Seek agreement	6	2.64	88.1%
15	Give gifts to hearer (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)	7.5	2.71	90.48%
25	Go on record as incurring a debt	7.5	2.71	90.48%
1	Notice, attend to hearer (interests, wants, needs, goods)	9.5	2.64	88.1%
6	Avoid disagreement	9.5	2.64	88.1%
2	Exaggerate (interest, approval, sympathy with H)	11.5	2.43	8.95%
16	Be conventionally indirect	11.5	2.43	80.95%
3	Intensify interest to hearer	13	2.29	76.19%
10	Offer, promise	14.76	2	66.67%
11	Be optimistic	14.76	2	66.67%
17	Question, hedge	14.76	2	66.67%
19	Minimize the imposition, R _x	17	1.86	61.9%
7	Presuppose/ raise assert common ground	18	1.5	50%
23	State the FTA as general rule	19.5	1.29	42.86%
24	Nominalize	19.5	1.29	42.86%
18	Be pessimistic	21	1.21	40.48%
9	Assert and presuppose speaker's know and concern for hearer wants	22	1.14	38.1%
20	Give differences	24	1	33.33%
21	Apology	24	1	33.33%
22	Impersonalize S and H	24	1	33.33%
Average		13	2.10	70.24%

From what the statistical results is revealed above, the reader can notice that Iraqi EFL instructors apply politeness strategies especially strategy number 4 (use in group identity markers), this strategy gained the first rank of application. Actually, this strategy can be noticed in the interaction especially when the instructors want to pay the students attention or the *Vis Versa*. Sequentially, strategy number 8 (jokes) has gained the same rank and this may return for two reasons; the first is that Iraqi society in general like joking, and the second one is that the instructor jokes to break the routine. The third strategy which gained the same rank also is strategy number 12 (include both speaker and hearer in the activity). In briefer, if this strategy has not gained this rank this will be an indication of the absence of interaction in Iraqi EFL university classroom. Finally, the explanation of the last strategy which share strategy number 12 (give or ask for reason) with the same rank confirm that when the instructor and his/her students interact their interaction have to include questions and answers for reasons.

As mentioned earlier, the checklist is designed to check the instructor's application of politeness strategies. The major results shows that all the instructors apply politeness strategies and that what makes the first null hypothesis is rejected and an alternative hypothesis is accepted which states that Iraqi EFL instructors have sufficient application of politeness strategies for interaction.

4.2 Results Related to the Second Aim and Verification of the Second Null Hypothesis

Chi-square formula is used to deduct the results of this aim. (See table 4.4)

Table 4.2

The computed and tabled X^2 , the observed and the expected of chi-square for the instructors according to their gender

Gender	Number of the sample	Observed X^2	Expected X^2	Computed	Tabled	Degree of free	Level Of Significance
Male	7	69	61.5	2.92	2	5.99	0.05
		31	32				
		75	81.5				
Female	7	54	61.5	2.92	2	5.99	0.05
		33	32				
		88	81.5				

The comparison shows that since the calculated X^2 value which is 2.92 is found to be higher than the tabulated X^2 value which is 2 when the level of significance is 0.05 and the degree of freedom is 5.99. This mean that the second null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted which states that Iraqi EFL instructors have statistical significance differences in applying politeness strategies for interaction according to their gender in favour of female.

4.3 Results Related to the Third Aim and Verification of the Third Null Hypothesis

To deduct the final result Chi-square formula is used to show whether there are any statistical significance differences among Iraqi EFL university instructors according to their year of experiences as three groups. (See table 4.8)

Table 4.3

The computed and tabled X^2 , the observed and the expected of chi-square for the instructors according to their year of experiences

Years of experiences	Observed	Expected	Computed X^2	Tabled X^2	Degree of free	Level Of significance
1-10	23	27.06	2.962	9.48	4	0.05
	12	14.08				
	42	35.86				
10-20	43	43.58				
	25	22.67				
	56	57.75				
20-30	57	52.36				
	27	27.25				
	65	69.39				

The comparison shows that since the calculated X^2 value which is 2.962 is found to be lower than the tabulated X^2 value which is 9.48 when the level of significance is 0.05 and the degree of freedom is 4. This result accepts the null hypothesis which states that there are no statistically significance differences among Iraqi EFL university instructors' application of politeness strategies according to their year of experiences.

4.4 conclusion

In the light of statistical analysis and results of the study, the following conclusions are:

1. EFL Iraqi university instructors have sufficient application of politeness strategies used for interaction.
2. EFL Iraqi university female instructors use politeness strategies more than male instructors.
3. EFL Iraqi university instructors whose years of experiences ranging from (1-10), (10-20) and (20-30) have no statistical significance differences in using politeness strategies in interaction.

4.5 Recommendations

Based on the results and conclusions the following recommendations are put forward:

1. The Ministry of Higher Education could utilize the results of the present study by setting up a course or practicum pertaining to the theme of politeness in general. Under and post graduates need to receive proper knowledge of the concept and the significance of its negative and positive impacts on the teaching and learning process.
2. The Ministry of Higher Education can be benefit from this study to overcome transmitting negative impacts of politeness by conducting workshops for the instructors and the students. Workshops have to focus on how gender, age, position, power, society and culture can be impact politeness. So that instructors and students get enough knowledge about politeness.
3. The ministry of higher education also can provide another different workshops to show the differences between English politeness and Arabic politeness and how these two cultures are share similarities and differences.
4. Curriculum designers, educators, teachers, administrators, and university faculty should put in consideration the factors which impair applying the concept of politeness. Time has changed and so have the purposes and methods underlying teaching and learning politeness.
5. Departments of English language have to provide the fresh students with some instructions about the classroom politeness under the name of classroom interaction.
6. Instructors need to be more educator about the bias of using politeness according to the variable gender and provide their students with some books, magazines or even articles about this topic.

7. Students also have a role of educating about politeness not just in classroom but also in society and how this could be differ from one culture to another.

4.6 Suggestions

In connection with this work, a number of studies can be suggested:

1. A study using the same procedures can be conducted towards EFL Iraqi high-school students' and teachers' awareness and application of politeness.
2. A study is suggested to find whether there are statistically significant differences between EFL Iraqi classroom and native English speaker's classroom.
3. A study can be conducted to analyse the prescribed curriculum and text books.
4. A comparison can be conducted to investigate the extent to which Arabic culture politeness and English culture politeness can be similar or different in the same EFL Iraqi classroom.
5. A study is proposed to find the progress achieved after applying a programme or certain procedures to enhance politeness use.

Bibliography

- Awaz, Wajidn. (2010). Nonverbal Communication. A Published Lecture. Retrieved on 5th of Jan 2017 at: <https://www.scribd.com/document/40410736/Nonverbal-Communication>
- Barry, Brock E. (2011). Student Nonverbal Communication in the Classroom. New York: United States Military Academy, West point.
- Brown, D. H. (2001). Teaching by Principles: An Introduction Approach to Language Pedagogy. New York: Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching, 4th ed. New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language: studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics, 4th ed. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, David. (1969). Prosodic Systems and Intonation in English: Cambridge Studies in Linguistics. 1. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dagrín, Mateja. (2004). Classroom Interaction and Communication Strategies in Learning English as a Foreign Language. Birografika Bori: Ljubljana.
- Dossou, Kofii and Gabriella B. Klein. (2012). Our Communication Concept. Italy: Key & Key Communications.
- Gay, L. R. and P. Airasian. (2001). Educational Research: Competencies for analysis and application, 6th ed. Columbus: Merrill.
- Jumanto. (2008). Komunikasi fatis di kalangan penutur jati bahasa Inggris. Semarang: WorldPro Publishing

- Krippendorff, K. (2004). Content Analysis: An Introduction to Methodology, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kurniawan, Nurdy. (2015). An Analysis of Positive and Negative Politeness Strategies in an Interview of Mark Rutte on Metro TV's Face 2 Face with DESI answer Program. A Thesis. Jakarta: Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University.
- Moore, K. D. (2007). Classroom Teaching Skills. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Niroomanda, Masoumeh. (2016). An Exploration of Upper-Intermediate Iranian EFL Learners' Perception of Politeness Strategies and Power Relation in Disagreement. English Language Teaching; Vol 5, No. 10. Published by Canadian Centre of Science and Education.
- Nordquist, Richard. (2017). Politeness in English Grammar. Retrieved on 16th of May 2017 at <https://www.thoughtco.com/politeness-strategies-conversation-1691516>.
- Shi, Yongming and Si Fan. (2010). An Analysis of Non-Verbal Behaviour in Intercultural Communication. University of Tasmania: The International Journal – Language Society and Culture ISSN 1327-774X.
- Wardaugh, Ronald. (2006). An Introduction to Sociolinguistics, 5th ed. United Kingdom: Basil Blackwell.
- Watts, Richard J. (2003). Politeness: Key Topics in Sociolinguistics. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Zhang Ya-ni (2007). Communication Strategies and Foreign Language Learning. University of Science and Technology; US-Chine Foreign Language. Vol.5. No.4, pp 43-48.

Appendix 1

Instructors' Checklist of Politeness Strategies Assessments

It is worthy to be mentioned that this checklist is designed by the researcher.

No.	Politeness Strategies	Verbal Interaction	Para-Verbal Interaction	Non-Verbal Interaction
1	Notice, attend to hearer (interest, sympathy with H)	-notice student's admirable qualities and show toward their interactions participations, disc opinions,...etc.	-Intonation: Stay flat -The volume of voice: medium	-Facial expression: interest. -Eye contact: looking directly to the hearer -Hand Gestures: opining shoulders and hands. -Body language: leaning gently towards the hearer
2	Exaggerate (interest, sympathy with H)	-using man emphatic words including: Wonderful, absolutely, Fantastic, beautiful,...etc.	-Intonation: going up -The volume of voice: loud	-Facial expression: excited. -Eye contact: utilizing eyes to check The hearer's ground -Hand Gestures: expressive to Illiterate the details -Body language: raising head
3	Intensify interest to hearer	-dealing with the student's wants to make a good	-Intonation: Stay flat -The volume of voice: medium	-Facial expression: smiled. -Eye contact: looking directly and raising eyebrow -Hand Gestures: expressive to illustrate the details -Body language: nodding head
4	Use in-group Identity markers	-using of address forms, Jargons, delicates, or ellipses	-Intonation: Stay flat -The volume of voice: medium	-Facial expression: friendly. -Eye contact: utilizing eyes to Contact with the students -Hand Gestures: opining shoulders and hands. -Body language: leaning gently towards the hearer
5	Seek agreement	-repeating and talking with safe topic	-Intonation: going down -The volume of voice: low	-Facial expression: light up face -Eye contact: looking upwards -Hand Gestures: thump up "ok" -Body language: nodding head
6	Avoid disagreement	-taking agreement -telling white lies -using hedging opinion	-Intonation: going down -The volume of voice: medium	-Facial expression: forced smile -Eye contact: narrowing eyebrow and shifty eyes -Hand Gestures: thump down -Body language: based head
7	Presuppose/ raise assert ground	-sharing mutual interest with the students to show common ground (using ca	-Intonation: going down -The volume of voice: medium	-Facial expression: forced smile -Eye contact: gazing eyes -Hand Gestures: strait hands -Body language: confident body
8	Jokes	-Using jokes	-Intonation: going down and going up -The volume of voice: medium	-Facial expression: funny -Eye contact: looking upward -Hand Gestures: making ccklicking noise o hand with leg -Body language: leaning gently towards the hearer
9	Assert and presuppose st knowledge and concern for wants	Understanding the hearer's wants by using: -negative question -apology -offer -request	-Intonation: going up -The volume of voice: medium	-Facial expression: interest. -Eye contact: looking directly to the hearer -Hand Gestures: opining shoulders and hands. -Body language: leaning gently towards the hearer
10	Offer, promise	-using offer and promises	-Intonation: Stay flat -The volume of voice: medium	-Facial expression: trust worthy expression -Eye contact: looking directly to the hearer with raised eyebrow -Hand Gestures: opining palm indicating some -Body language: dynamic and lively body movement
11	Be optimistic	Sharing the wants with the hearer mean coopera	-Intonation: going down -The volume of voice: medium	-Facial expression: optimistic -Eye contact: sparkled eyes -Hand Gestures: thumps up -Body language: lively body movement
12	Include both speaker and hearer in the activity	Using inclusive form (we) which is usually con (let's)	-Intonation: Stay flat -The volume of voice: medium	-Facial expression: friendly -Eye contact: looking directly to the hearer -Hand Gestures: using finger pointing to make a circle or two side lines indic Both H and S -Body language: active body movement
13	Give or ask for a reason	Asking for reasons to provide cooperative	-Intonation: going down -The volume of voice: medium	-Facial expression: smiled -Eye contact: looking directly to H -Hand Gestures: using finger pointing to the re -Body language: unmoving head

14	Assume or assert reciprocity	Using if clause	-Intonation: going down -The volume of voice: medium	-Facial expression: serious -Eye contact: looking directly to the hearer -Hand Gestures: crinkling on the table -Body language: based head
15	Give gifts to hearer (goods, sympathy, understanding, cooperation)	-sympathy -understanding H's wants -cooperation with H	-Intonation: Stay flat -The volume of voice: medium	-Facial expression: expressive -Eye contact: looking directly to the hearer -Hand Gestures: using hugged finger to indicate cooperation -Body language: enthusiastic body movement
16	Be conventionally indirect	-asking using adverbs like possibly, by any chance, etc.	-Intonation: Stay flat -The volume of voice: medium	-Facial expression: smiled -Eye contact: looking directly to the hearer eyes -Hand Gestures: pointing the thing which he a -Body language: maintain an open posture w and legs uncrossed.
17	Question, hedge	-using particles such as : Perhaps, kind of, probably... etc. -using question tags	-Intonation: going down -The volume of voice: low	-Facial expression: shyness -Eye contact: utilizing eyes and raising eyebrow -Hand Gestures: moving hand toward openness -Body language: based head
18	Be pessimistic	-indirect request -using subjunctive -using can't question form	-Intonation: going up -The volume of voice: medium	-Facial expression: confident expressions -Eye contact: looking directly to the hearer with raising eyebrow -Hand Gestures: gathered hand -Body language: nodding head
19	Minimize the imposition, Rx	-using words like exactly, merely, only, nothing etc. -using phrases with pronoun you or address form to minimize the imposition	-Intonation: going up -The volume of voice: loud	-Facial expression: intensifying expressions -Eye contact: looking directly to the hearer -Hand Gestures: shaking hand indicating ev is ok -Body language: moving head ex comfortableness with H
20	Give differences	-treating the hearer as superior -using honorifics such as Mr, Sir, Dr... etc. -S humbles and abases himself	-Intonation: Stay flat -The volume of voice: medium	-Facial expression: serious -Eye contact: utilizing eyes in contact with the H -Hand Gestures: unmoving hand -Body language: based head
21	Apology	-admitting the impingement -indicate reluctance -give overwhelming reasons -begging forgiveness	-Intonation: going down -The volume of voice: low	-Facial expression: fear expressions -Eye contact: eyes are turned downward with worried look -Hand Gestures: hugging finger means begging sorry -Body language: bowed head
22	Impersonalize S and H	-avoidance of I and You pronouns -using passive voice	-Intonation: Stay flat -The volume of voice: medium	-Facial expression: friendly -Eye contact: looking directly to the hearer -Hand Gestures: using finger or hand move make a circle or two sides lines indicating the in the same activity -Body language: dynamic and lively body movement
23	State the FTA as general rule	-pronoun avoidance -general obligation -criticize someone	-Intonation: going up -The volume of voice: medium	-Facial expression: formal -Eye contact: utilizing eyes in contact communication -Hand Gestures: unmoving hand -Body language: based head
24	Nominalize	-making a sentence or utterance in the form of n phrase	-Intonation: going up -The volume of voice: high	-Facial expression: formal -Eye contact: looking directly to the hearer -Hand Gestures: unmoving hand -Body language: based head
25	Go on record as incurring a debt	-using past tense -giving commands and instructions -making request	-Intonation: going down -The volume of voice: medium	-Facial expression: formal -Eye contact: looking directly to the hearer -Hand Gestures: making hand movement to p the means -Body language: based head