



UNIVERSITY OF SZEGED

DOCTORAL SCHOOL IN LINGUISTICS

THEORETICAL LINGUISTICS PH.D. PROGRAM

SUMMARY OF THE DISSERTATION

**THE SPEECH ACT OF OFFER IN JORDANIAN ARABIC:
A SOCIO-PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS**

By

Sami Abdel-Karim Abdullah Haddad

Supervisor

Dr. Anett Árvay

SZEGED, 2022

1. Introduction

Language is at a nexus of interrelationships between individuals, society and culture. The interface between language and culture has been the object of considerable interdisciplinary research on methods of analysis that can be applied across pragmatics in general, and across speech acts and politeness in particular. A speaker can produce utterances and carry out some intentions as request, apology, compliment, offer, and so forth. These intentions are called *speech acts* in linguistics. Even though types of speech acts are universal in nature, their linguistic realizations are culture/language-specific (Haddad, 2022; de Zarobe & de Zarobe, 2012) and are always affected by cultural values and social norms of the target society (Bataineh & Bataineh, 2008; Kasanga & Lwanga-Lumu, 2007; Byon, 2005; Wierzbicka, 1985).

Like other human interactions, making offer and responding to the offer might be motivated by social as well as socio-cultural variables that may be determined by the culture-specific politeness rules. Compared to other speech acts like requests, apologies, and compliments, offers uncover a dearth of research, and particularly in Arabic culture as well as language. Offers in English have been tackled from various contexts using data from different sources such as corpus data (Barron, 2017a, b; 2011), naturally-occurring data (Curl, 2006; Sifianou, 1992), observations (Oraby, 2020; Alaoui, 2011) questionnaires (Al-Masri, 2015; Barron, 2003), and role-play (Bella, 2019; Edmondson & House, 1981). In addition, research carried out on offers in languages other than English has been Persian (Allami, 2012; Koutlaki, 2002), Greek (Bella, 2019, 2016; Terkorafi, 2001; Sifianou, 1992), and Chinese (Feng et al., 2011; Hua & Yuan, 2000; Zhu et al, 1998). However, much of research on offers has been conducted within the context of variational, interlanguage, and cross-cultural pragmatics. On the one hand, Barron (2017a, 2011) has carried out research on offers across the varieties of English within the context of variational pragmatics. On the other hand, moving to the much more investigated research on offers i.e. interlanguage and cross-cultural pragmatics, such research includes for English / German (Barron, 2003), English / Chinese (Tsuzuki et al, 2005; Yongbing, 1998), English / Persian (Babaie & Shahrokhi, 2015), English / Korean (Min, 2019; Chun, 2003), English/Greek (Sifianou, 1992), English / Japanese (Fukushima & Iwata, 1987).

As the analysis of Arabic offers is still very much in its infancy, much emphasis has put on how research on offers has been carried out within the context of English/Arabic cross-cultural pragmatics including (Abu-Failat, 2017; Grainger et al, 2015; Alaoui, 2011). More specifically, very few studies have focused on how offers in Jordanian Arabic function in different corpora. On the one hand, Oraby's (2020) work sounds like it is more of interactional analysis of spoken conversations by focusing on adjacency pairs of offers and invitations in JA from a socio-pragmatic perspective. On the other hand, Al-Masri's (2015) work seems it is more pragma-linguistic rather than socio-pragmatic analysis by focusing on linguistic realizations of offers. However, my research work adds to the limited scholarship on offers in Arabic, and particularly in Jordanian Arabic. By addressing the politeness of Jordanian Arabic offers, the research adds to speech act research in the field of socio-pragmatics. In addition, by addressing

the use of the speech act of offers in commercial ads, the research also adds to speech act research in advertising discourse.

The current research has been devoted to the objective of realizing how Jordanian Arabic offerors make offer and of exploring the preference of politeness strategies in Jordanian Arabic language. It has dealt only with initial offers of the following three corpora: Facebook offers for travel and tourism; real estate offers announced by the 'Open Market' website; everyday spoken offers. As a result, the research has been more of a discourse analysis by focusing only on the first pair part of offer-acceptance/refusal adjacency pair in Jordanian Arabic offers from a socio-pragmatic perspective. The offering utterance has been approached and analyzed in terms of the face-saving model of politeness as proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). Employing the face-saving model of politeness can reveal the resources available to the data under examination and tendencies to use patterns of behavior to express polite offers. Since this research is hypothesis testing, I have answered a set of research questions regarding the hypotheses. I have grouped the research questions into three parts because the research has taken a theoretical-empirical-comparative perspective on the speech act of offering:

The theoretical perspective:

1. How can the speech act of offering be distinguished from other speech acts?

The empirical perspective:

2. What types of offering can be identified in the three Jordanian Arabic corpora?
3. Which offering type is used the most frequently in each corpus?
4. Do offerors employ politeness as a persuasive device in the art of making offers? If so, which politeness strategies are employed the most frequently?

The comparative perspective:

5. Are there any correlations among corpora of offers, offer type and offer modifications?

I have formulated the principal hypothesis as follows: Linguistic realizations of politeness strategies can serve as purpose-oriented tools included by the Jordanian Arabic context of the speech act of offer in order for the offeror to achieve a purpose-successful offer. In line with the aforementioned research questions, I have conducted qualitative and quantitative analyses of offers in order to verify these five assumptions that spell out the principal hypothesis in detail:

1. The speech act of offer has mixed characteristics,
2. Jordanian Arabic offerors use different linguistic forms in different corpora of offers,
3. Jordanian Arabic offerors make an offer directly much more often than indirectly,
4. Politeness strategies in Jordanian Arabic play a crucial role in formulating Jordanian Arabic offers, and
5. There are notable correlations between offer corpus, offer strategy, and politeness modification strategy.

2. The theoretical perspective of the dissertation

I have reviewed most of the theoretical claims about the speech act of offer and the empirical tests of the theoretical claims. The speech act of offer has been categorized differently. In addition, it has turned out that it is Anne Barron who can be regarded as the pioneer of research on offers. Barron (2017) has characterized offers as directive, commissive and conditional. Then, Barron has reflected the characterization of offer on the linguistic taxonomy of offer. The in-depth review of previous research on offers would have allowed me to have an emic perspective on the discussion and present an appropriate characterization of offer from a Jordanian Arabic perspective.

Offer was first categorized as a commissive illocutionary act. However, some scholars argued for a different categorization after Aijmer (1996) had claimed that offers have fuzzy characteristics and that they are realized by a range of commissive and directive strategies. Wunderlich (1977) dealt with offers as conditional speech acts. Hancher (1979) contended that offers have directive and commissive illocutionary forces in parallel. Hernández (2001) challenged Hancher's observation and asserted that offers are closer to prototypical commissive than to prototypical directive illocutionary acts. In light of theory-based politeness, Brown and Levinson (1987) viewed offer as a face-threatening act whereas Leech (2014) considered offer to be as a face-threatening as well as face-enhancing speech event.

I have argued with the claim supported by Leech and Wunderlich which states that offers are conditional. The conditional aspect of offers serves as a turning point of the illocutionary force from directive to commissive or commissive to directive. I have argued against Hernandez's claim around offers because Hernandez neglected the basic role of the conditional aspect, which in turn, lies between commissive and directive. The conditionality of offers can be justified by Wierzbicka's (1987:191) claim that "the one who offers leaves the addressee the freedom to decide whether to accept or decline the proposed action to take place". I have matched two different illocutionary purposes of offers coined by Wierzbicka with speech acts. The first purpose of offer corresponds to the Searlean commissive and Haverkate's (1984) non-impositive directive, while the second purpose meets with the Searlean directive and Haverkate's (1984) permission-seeking impositive directives. As a result, offers as a speech act have mixed characteristics.

Despite the fact that Barron was the pioneer of research on offers, Barron did not suggest a relatively organized order of offer characteristics. I have added a new aspect to the offering act pertaining to the potential arrangement of the offer characteristics in terms of 'salience' as coined by Kecskes (2014) and performance from a Jordanian Arabic perspective. I see the three characteristics of offer are existent in the same utterance of offer but one characteristic may be more salient than the others. The two concepts 'salience' and 'performance' help give priority to the most predominant offer characteristic in light of the interactional roles of both the offeror and offeree. The conditional characteristic of offer is crucial as it lies between the two other

characteristics. The question that is raised here is when the offering utterance can be more commissive than directive or directive than commissive.

I have summarized the arrangement as follows: the offering utterance is firstly recognized by the offeree as a directive illocutionary act, then it is turned to be as a commissive illocution on condition the offeree's acceptance. In case of the offer acceptance by the offeree, the offer will be successfully fulfilled and thus the offeree will take advantage of the action. I have eventually designed the following table in order to simplify the potential arrangement of the offer characteristics.

Characteristics of the offer			
The offering utterance		<i>Conditional</i>	
	directive	<i>Accept</i>	purpose-successful commissive
	directive	<i>Reject</i>	***

As clearly shown in the table, offer is successfully achieved in case of its acceptance so that polite expressions can be a purpose-oriented tool, which in turn, help the offeror persuade the offeree to accept not reject the offer. As regards offer from the nature of face, I have supported the Leechian claim that offers can be Face-threatening and face-enhancing acts. Offers in Jordanian Arabic have the two natures because of the conditional characteristic of offers. Given to the culture of Jordanian Arabic, individuals like to offer because of its positive consequences which are in line with their cultural expectations but they do not like their offer to be refused due to potential negative consequences of the refusal. This observation makes Jordanian Arabic offers as face-enhancing acts and face-threatening acts. I see the significance of language use in realizations of Jordanian Arabic offers helps the offer to be accepted or helps mitigate the face threat in case of potential refusal.

I have viewed the Jordanian Arabic offer as an utterance produced by an offeror toward an offeree on an occasion where the hearer explicitly takes advantage of the act in case of the hearer's acceptance of performing the action. It has turned out that the conditional characteristic is the most effectively salient due to the fact that it switches the illocutionary force of the utterance over interactional roles of the offeror and offeree. The Jordanian offeror produces the offer as directive over the Jordanian offeree. Once the offeree accepts the offer to be done, the Jordanian offeror gets committed to perform the action included. Therefore, the Jordanian Arabic offer is characterized by directive, conditional and commissive, respectively. In line with the structure of the Jordanian society, I have argued on the fact that Jordanian offer works in with the social goal, so that it often serves as a face-enhancing speech act. The Jordanian Arabic offer is conditional, so the offer decline is potential. In such case, I see the Jordanian Arabic offer is somehow a face-threatening act more than to be a face-enhancing act. So, Jordanian offerors should perform linguistically in a way that makes a balance between the way to save their face and the way to consider the offeree. As a consequence, such aspects of face may affect linguistic realizations of Jordanian Arabic offers.

3. The empirical perspective of the dissertation

My second, third and fourth research questions require a research methodology. So, I should give a brief account to my data and how I had constructed them. I had constructed the three corpora of Jordanian Arabic offers along with different criteria. I had chosen two internet written corpora that belong to the discourse of advertising: Facebook offers for travel and tourism as well as Open Market offers for real estates. I had collected 100 ads from each corpus within the three selection criteria: source; length; goal of ads. I had saved the 200 ads in two separate electronic folders. I had called the third corpus '*spoken offers*' because it is concerned with the everyday offers uttered by 100 Jordanians selected within the three criteria of age, gender and level of education. I had collected the spoken offers through a reliable and validated DCT. The DCT is composed of 10 hypothetical situations expressing imitations of real-life situations. However, I had selected a second coder to analyze the actual responses obtained by the 100 distributed samples.

3.1 Written offers of investment

I had set out the utterance as the unit of analysis. I had dealt with components of the overall act of offering presented by ads in the written corpora as an utterance. As for the utterance in the spoken corpus, it had been presented by the respondent's response to any situation in the distributed DCT. I had approached and analyzed the utterance in terms of Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper's 1989 segmentation. I had segmented the utterance employed in both the written corpora and the spoken corpus into three parts: the offeree address, the offering act, and adjuncts. However, I had analyzed data of the three corpora in a qualitative-quantitative method.

In order to present more logical answers to the remaining research questions, I have combined the two internet written corpora into one group of offers titled 'written offers of investment' and the group of offers collected through the DCT titled 'spoken offers'. In order to answer the second, third and fourth questions, I have constructed two linguistic taxonomies of Jordanian Arabic offers due to the fact that I have derived the two taxonomies from the observed data in two different types of discourse. However, I have constructed the two linguistic taxonomies based on the same two basic criteria (the cooperative principle and the felicity conditions). I have adopted the Searlean conditions of requests, promises and representatives as well as the conditions of suggestions devised by Edmondson (1981) to construct the version of felicity conditions that meet Jordanian Arabic written offers of investment. I have observed from the conditions of Jordanian Arabic written offers of investment that the offeror's benefit from the offer is interpreted by the offeree's acceptance of the offer while the offeree's acceptance of the offer interprets the offeree's benefit from the offer.

I have segmented written offers into direct and indirect because direct offers are observant to maxims of speech while indirect offers generate implicatures. Indirect offers are highly motivated by felicity conditions. This observation explains why some linguistic patterns

serve as indirect offers. The subcategories of direct and indirect offers were basically derived from the data in the two corpora of written offers of investment. On the one hand, I have figured out that direct offers are conventionally expressed through only the two linguistic patterns: imperative constructions and gerund in place of the prepositional phrase. Imperative constructions have numerous pragmatic functions in Jordanian Arabic. From a pragma-linguistic politeness perspective, I have figured out the gerund preceded by the Arabic preposition less-threatening than the imperative construction. On the other hand, despite the fact that indirect offers include what the offeree should do, s/he is linguistically addressed in an indirect way. I have explored that indirect offers are realized through four linguistic patterns: stating the offeree's possibility that can be expressed by using the spoken Arabic modal 'يمكنكم' 'you can', using elliptical utterances, making an assertion that takes the first-person plural present-tense form of the verb, and using conditional sentences.

In spite of the imposition involved by linguistic patterns of direct offers of Facebook corpus, I have detected that they are far more widely used than indirect offers due to pragmatic clarity in the communication of the offeror-offeree relationship. Direct offers are clearly observant to the maxims of speech. Although indirect offers are less impositive to the offeree, they involve more politeness strategies. This observation indicates that the more the offer is indirect, the more the offer enhances politeness strategies. As for linguistic realizations in Facebook corpus, I have explored that linguistic realizations of positive politeness are used not only to reduce the imposition included by the linguistic pattern of offer but also to indicate that the offeror wants to get closer to offerees. Results from the data analysis show that all positive politeness strategies without exception are more frequently used than those of negative politeness. Analysis of three classes of positive politeness will be shown. Note that the examples taken represent additions of the offering act either offeree address or adjuncts. They were used to reduce the Imposition included by the offering act regardless of the offer strategy either direct or indirect. On the contrary to positive politeness whose strategies are all explored, strategies of negative politeness are stood out in Facebook offers except for the following three strategies: the strategy of being pessimistic, of stating the face-threatening act as a general rule, and of nominalizing.

As for direct offers in Open Market corpus, I have analyzed the imperative constructions employed by ads and found offerors have never used the directly specified verbs for the direct performance meant in the offer which can meet with the offered object through the two potential verbs 'اشتر' 'buy' and 'استأجر' 'hire'. I have analyzed the substitution and discovered the reason why they have substituted. It has been as a metaphorical euphemism rather than an associative euphemism. According to cultural expectations of the Jordanian society, this substitution is motivated by politeness due to pragmatic appropriateness. By indirectness in Open Market offers, I have meant how some offers refer to conditioned commitments over offerees in order to persuade them to get committed of. Both the direct and indirect offers convey the same communicative message in a different realization but linguistic patterns of the indirect offer hold more constraints over the offeree to get committed of. I have noted that indirect offers involve a considerable number of linguistic realizations of politeness strategies. Offerors may have used

indirect offers with a variety of politeness strategies to mitigate the imposition caused by the commitments over the offeree. However, I have observed that the high use of politeness strategies supports the assumption that politeness strategies can be used to express purposes other than politeness. I have found that strategies of negative politeness were all employed in Open Market offers whereas strategies of positive politeness were employed except both the strategy of joking and of giving gifts to offerees. However, I have demonstrated that not only the platform and goals of Facebook and Open Market offers affect the structure of the offers but the culture also has an obvious role in the preference of politeness strategies.

I have revealed in my in-depth qualitative and quantitative analysis that there seem some similarities and differences between the two corpora. First, direct offers are the most frequently used strategy in both corpora of Facebook and Open Market due to the cultural expectation that Jordanians are used to communicate directly in cases when the hearer benefits from doing an act. Second, all the linguistic patterns of both direct and indirect offers are existent in both corpora, with the imperative construction making up the largest proportion. Third, the occurrence of a limited number of indirect offers in both corpora is attributed to pragmatic clarity because linguistic patterns of indirect offers flout the maxims of speech. Fourth, written direct persuasion lacks the dynamism of oral communication, so that use of linguistic realizations of politeness strategies can be a more appropriate option in both corpora. As regards the differences between the two corpora, imperative constructions in Facebook corpus are expressed by the two directly specified verbs for the direct performance meant through the two imperatives (*سافر* *travel* and *احجز* *book*) while imperatives in Open Market are manifested by the directly specified verbs for the direct performance through the two potential imperatives (*اشتر* *buy* and *استأجر* *hire*). Second, Facebook offerors prefer positive politeness strategies so the art of making Facebook offer for travel and tourism is clearly affected by the collectivistic character of the Jordanian society taking into account its polychronic character where priority is given to relationships more than to jobs. Open Market offerors prefer to use more negative politeness strategies due to the observation that the significance of discourse outweighs the culture. In sum, I can conclude that written offers of investment in Jordanian Arabic are face-enhancing acts, so that linguistic realizations of politeness strategies serve purposes other than minimizing the imposition included by the offering act. Politeness was used stylistically as a cohesion tool and socio-pragmatically as a persuasion device.

3.2 Spoken offers

I have observed the spoken data and constructed the linguistic taxonomy of Jordanian Arabic spoken offers in light of the Gricean implicature and felicity conditions. According to the data, the taxonomy is composed of three strategies: direct, conventionally indirect, and non-conventionally indirect. I have divided the linguistic realizations of the three offer strategies according to their continuum between directives and/or commissives. On the one hand, direct spoken offers observed maxims of conversation. I have explored that conventionally indirect offers generate a generalized conversational implicature while non-conventionally indirect offers generate a particularized conversational implicature. On the other hand, Direct offers are clearly

observant to the felicity conditions. I have found that conventionally indirect offers are highly motivated by felicity conditions of spoken offers but non-conventionally indirect offers are slightly motivated by felicity conditions. That is why I have called non-conventionally indirect offers as charged situation-bound utterances.

I have uncovered that Jordanian Arabic spoken direct offers involve directive-end, commissive-end or both, whereby the offeror directly state what the offeree should do. According to my data, there existed five patterns through which direct offers are expressed: imperative constructions, *please* + ellipted imperative, obligation statement presented by the spoken Arabic preposition 'ب', oath, and lastly 'for God sake' followed by positive and/or negative imperative. Second, conventionally indirect offers involve that of directive-end, commissive-end or both which are realized through the six linguistic patterns: permission-giving, mood derivable, need question, permission-seeking, conditionals, and suggestory formulae. Third, because interactional roles of both offerors and offerees are absent in non-conventionally indirect offers, their explicit illocutionary force is getting divergent. They are thus realized only by the nature of directive-nor commissive-ends which is manifested only through the pattern of charged situation-bound utterances.

I have defined offer from a Jordanian Arabic perspective. Based on the definition, members of the Jordanian society are supposed to make offer as a generous action for two reasons. Making offers can help build harmonious relationships among members and can be an explicit way of adhering to social expectations of their society. However, I have noted that Jordanians are obliged to make offers in some cases due to the social expectation that members can be judged as sociable and generous when S/he is able to make offer and actually does so, and particularly in cases when the offeree wishes the offer to be carried out. This judgement affects the family name in a positive way because of the structure of the Jordanian society. Despite this social expectation, I have figured out Jordanian Arabic offers as face-threatening acts for two reasons. The first reason is theoretical that they are conditional so they are potentially declined. When Jordanians make offers, they are cautious at the wording because they are afraid of the potential refusal before its occurrence. So, offerors must perform linguistically in a way that makes a balance between the way to save offerors' face and the way to consider offerees. In this case, linguistic realizations of politeness strategies contribute to the balance used in Jordanian Arabic spoken offers. Regarding the second reason, it is methodologically empirical because I have explored that making offers are affected by offerees' age and gender.

I have hypothesized that there is a relation between Jordanian Arabic offers and the three variables regarding the offeree: age, gender and social distance. I have thus analyzed the data in a statistical way through SPSS. To test the impact of offeree's age, social status and gender on manifestation of Jordanian Arabic offers, I have used Chi-square test as best applied. First, I have statistically demonstrated that the older the offeree, the more the offer is direct. Jordanian offerors prefer to use direct offers while offering to older JA offerees. Pragma-linguistically speaking, direct offers are not only the most compelling but also the most generously polite, in the sense that older JA offerees are most appreciated because they have no chance to reject the

benefit triggered by the offer. On the other hand, offerors prefer conventionally indirect offers to direct offers while offering to younger offerees. Younger offerees have more tendency to reject offers than elders due to the fact that JA youngers are less aware of their society's cultural background than elders. I have supported the observation by the finding that the linguistic pattern of oath and of 'for God sake followed by a positive and/or negative imperative' are never employed by JA offerors towards younger offerees. The two patterns are very highly culture-specific.

As regards the offeree's social status, I have statistically contended that the higher-status the offeree, the more the offer is direct. Offerors prefer direct offers to the other strategies while offering to higher-status offerees. The higher use of religious expressions refers to the offeree's higher level of education. Offerors focus more to be indirect in their offers towards lower-status offerees due to the fact that offers to lower-status offerees appear to be incongruent. If higher-status speakers intend to offer towards lower-status hearers, they make a balance through a higher use of status-preserving strategies. Concerning the offeree's gender, it turns out that JA male offerors make offers indirectly towards female offerees whereas JA female offerors prefer direct offers towards male offerees. This divergence is in line with Holmes' (1998) socio-linguistic observation stating that males and females develop different language use patterns; females prefer using linguistic patterns that stress solidarity while males tend to interact in ways that stress their power through showing respect.

Based on the results of the data analysis, offers made by Jordanian males to female offerees are face-threatening acts because men are more dominant than women in the Jordanian society. On the one hand, men like to keep distant from women for some reasons regarding the tribal structure of the society. When male offerors make offers to female offerees, they prefer to be indirect and enhance their offer more by negative politeness strategies. On the other hand, when female offerors make offer to male offerees, they make the offer more directly and preferred more positive politeness strategies because they are aware of the society's cultural expectations regarding men's moral responsibility towards women in that men should respect them. Men should protect them from all respects. Men should offer help to women if they ask for help. Women expect that both sexes are equal when they make offers to men. Based on women's expectation, they make the offers directly to men and enhance their offers with positive politeness strategies to make solidarity.

Offers addressed to older people are face-enhancing acts because they are treated as parents. Offerors feel socially close to older people. So, offerors use vernacular expressions with the old people because the old people are more aware of the society's cultural expectation which states that offers are preferred not to be refused. That is the reason why offerors are found to make offers directly to older offerees and enhance their offers with more positive politeness strategies. On the contrary, offers addressed to younger offerees are face-threatening acts because offerors try to keep socially distant from the youth to the extent that they try to avoid the young in case they see the youth try to break the social distance. There are a number of Jordanian expressions warning to keep distant from the youth because they can simply intrude into the

speaker's personal territory, which in turn, threaten his/her face. This argument can be supported by the finding that offerors never enhance their offers with linguistic realizations of off-record strategies because the youth could misinterpret the expressions. Therefore, offers addressed to younger offerees were found to be more indirect.

As for offers addressed to higher status offerees, they are supposed to be face-threatening acts because of the hierarchical organization that should be given priority. However, I have detected that offerors make their offers to higher status offerees more directly in order to show their high degree of generosity. On that occasion, offerors make the balance through a higher use of linguistic realizations of negative politeness strategies. For instance, they show deference to higher status offerees by using titles of address. In the Jordanian society, the person who never uses titles of address while communicating with higher social status people is criticized. It is claimed that the person can simply threaten the higher status hearers' face. As for offers produced by higher status offerors to lower status offerees, lower status offerees do not expect higher status offerees making offers to them. So, the offer enhances lower status offerees' positive face. Therefore, higher status offerees make their offers more indirectly to preserve their status and enhanced their offers with a higher use of linguistic realizations of both positive and negative politeness strategies as a means of persuasion. When a lower status offeree receives an offer from a higher status offeror, the offer conveys a communicative message that the offeror values the society's socio-cultural background through giving a chance to make the offeree appreciate the offer and feel socially close to the offeror.

4. The comparative perspective of the dissertation

Having analyzed both the written and spoken corpora of offers, I have compared between the two types of offers in light of the Jordanian Arabic culture. First, I have identified Jordanian Arabic written offers as Jordanian Arabic written offers 'investment offers' due for their primary function while spoken offers have been identified by the three following types of offers: hospitable offers; offers of assistance; gift offers. Second, I have characterized spoken offers as directive, commissive and conditional. Unlike spoken offers, I have added the representative characteristic to written offers due to the context where they belong to. Third, I have explored two strategies through which written offers are realized: direct and indirect while spoken offers are expressed through the three strategies: direct, conventionally indirect, and non-conventionally indirect.

It turns out that written offers are face-enhancing acts due to the fact that they manifest only in ads where the offeror does not consider any socio-cultural variables regarding the offeree. This argument supports the significant impact of oral communication upon making offers in the Jordanian context. The following example taken from Facebook offers for travel and tourism illustrates how the offeror can select the words regardless of the offeree: 'حبيبتي شهرك العسل وين رح ' 'My sweetheart, where will your honeymoon be? don't accept other than Malaysia'. Despite the fact that Jordanian spoken offers are closely interlinked to values of the

Jordanian society, they are face-enhancing acts and face-threatening acts due to the conditional characteristic of offer and some socio-cultural variables.

I have observed that the propositional content condition of written offers predicates a future act on the part of the offeror whereas the one of spoken offers predicate a future act on the part of the offeror/offeree or both due to the salient position of culture represented by the frequent use of religious expressions in daily interactions. Cultural interpretations of some religious expressions involve the offeree as the primary performer or as a co-performer of the act included. Spoken offers do not necessarily involve only what the offeree should do but also involve what the offeror should take part in some cases. This observation is judged through the commissive-end as well as directive-and-commissive-end aspects of spoken offers. In addition, I have explored that the direct strategy is the most frequent strategy used in both Jordanian Arabic spoken and written offers. As for spoken offers, directness tends to be closer to values and norms of the Jordanian society manifested through generosity, yet it was avoided in some situations taking into account some socio-cultural variables regarding the offeree. This observation asserts the truth of Jordanian Arabic offers because it sounds like they are more of a straightforward way of adhering to the values and norms of that society than of establishing harmonious relationships with the others.

Politeness occupies the function of persuasion in both corpora of written and spoken Jordanian offers. As for written offers, I have indicated that direct offers are easier to interpret and thus less costly on offerees to comprehend the message. Direct and indirect written offers of investment employ linguistic realizations of politeness strategies to serve as a tool of persuasion. Since this type of offers fall within the style of ads, politeness strategies were used to get a more cohesive ad, which in turn, fits Cook's (2001) cohesive devices of ads. As for the preference of politeness strategy in each corpus of written offers, Facebook offers prefer linguistic realizations of positive politeness more than those of negative politeness. I have concluded that Facebook offers for travel and tourism are affected by the collectivistic character of the Jordanian society. On the other hand, linguistic realizations of negative politeness take priority over those of positive politeness in Open Market offers due to the fact that the significance of the discourse outweighs the significance of the prominent culture. As for politeness strategies in spoken offers, they are used by offerees not only to redress the imposition included by the action but also to persuade the offeree to achieve a purpose-successful offer. Furthermore, the preference of politeness strategies does not depend on the offer type as far as they are linked to culturally social variables regarding the offeree.

In sum, I have figured that the comparison of offer corpora, offer strategies, and offer modifications reveals some interesting correlations. For instance, the comparison shows a clear preference for Facebook offers to be realized more directly and to employ more positive politeness modifications. Likewise, Open Market offers were shown to be realized more directly with a higher use of negative politeness modifications.

Theoretically speaking, offers threaten the offeree's negative face due to the directive characteristic they hold. Since Open Market offers for real estates are predominantly expressed by direct offers and particularly the ones presented via the imperative construction, a higher use of negative-politeness modifications appeared. Offers also enhance the offeree's positive face. This insight is shown more clearly via Facebook offers for travel and tourism where a higher use of positive-politeness modifications manifested. Positive politeness modification strategies were found to intensify the force of offers. Culturally speaking, travelling and tourism are additional priorities for Jordanian individuals when compared to having real estates in the Jordanian society. Therefore, travel agencies in Jordan resort to enhancing their offers via positive politeness to intensify such offers and get more phatic offers in accordance with norms of the Jordanian culture. The preference of negative politeness in Open Market offers for real estates is attributed to the salience of the directive characteristic over other characteristics. The offered product also plays a role in determining more negative-politeness modification strategies due to the fact that having real estates as flats or houses is regarded as a necessity for individuals in the Jordanian society. Therefore, real estate agents in Jordan give an emphasis to enhance their offers through negative politeness modifications to show deference towards the individual rights and freedom of action.

The correlation between offer strategy and politeness modification strategy in spoken offers was exhibited by the microscopic examination where the most three effective socio-cultural variables were subjected to the examination. First, Jordanian offerors enhance older offerees' positive face through using positive politeness modifications. Meanwhile, they employ negative politeness modifications to mitigate the offering force addressed to offerors' and offerees' negative face. Second, offerors show the offerees status through using negative politeness modifications. In comparison with offers addressed to lower social status offerees, Jordanians prefer to show solidarity through using positive politeness modifications. Third, Jordanian male offerors employ a combination of politeness modification strategies to reduce the threat caused and intensify the offer. In contrast, Jordanian female offerors enhance their offerees' positive face through positive politeness modifications.

5. Conclusion

I have devoted the dissertation to better understand how offerors make offers and to explore the preference of politeness strategies in Jordanian Arabic. I have constructed two linguistic taxonomies of Jordanian Arabic offers due to the fact that they are derived from the observed data in two different types of discourse. I have verified the truth that when politeness is neglected by Jordanian Arabic offers, socially unacceptable forms are formulated within the offer but it is still a valid offer. To sum up, the dissertation offers a challenge to the face-saving model of politeness as the model neglected two important variables regarding age and gender through which the degree of politeness can be assessed from a Jordanian Arabic perspective. Based on the three former perspectives of the dissertation, I have arrived at the following conclusions:

- Jordanian Arabic offers are face-enhancing as well as face-threatening acts that are realized either directly and/or indirectly,
- Jordanian Arabic direct offers are more popular in use than their indirect counterparts, and
- Politeness in Jordanian Arabic offers is related to persuasion.

I have identified the implications of my dissertation. I hope that this dissertation offers a plethora of insightful contributions to pragmatics in general, Speech Act theory and Politeness theory in particular, Discourse Analysis, Corpus Linguistics, and Advertising Discourse. Finally, this dissertation fills a gap in research about speech acts and thus can be a fruitful area of language use with considerable potential for further research work. The major area for future investigation will be variational pragmatics with other Arabic varieties such as Saudi, Moroccan, Emirati, and so forth. The other major area for further investigation will be inter-language and cross-cultural pragmatics because it will help carry out contrastive research with other languages and cultures such as Hungarian, Polish, English, Japanese, and so on.

References

- Abu Al-Failat, Kholoud M. F. 2017. A comparative pragmatic study of “offers” by Palestinian EFL learners and American native speakers of English. *Unpublished MA thesis*. University of Hebron, Palestine.
- Ajimer, Karen. 1996. *Conversational routines in English: Convention and creativity*. London: Longman.
- Alaoui, Sakina M. 2011. Politeness principle: A comparative study of English and Moroccan Arabic requests, offers and thanks. *European Journal of Social Sciences* 20, no.1: 7-15.
- Allami, Hamid. 2012. A sociopragmatic study of the offer speech act in Persian. *Research in Applied Linguistics* 3, no.1: 110-129.
- Almasri, Sylvia H. 2015. A Socio-pragmatic study of the speech act of offering in Jordanian Arabic. *Unpublished MA thesis*. Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan.
- Babaie, Sherveh., and Mohsen Shahrokhi. 2015. A Cross-Cultural Study of Offering Advice Speech Acts by Iranian EFL Learners and English Native Speakers: Pragmatic Transfer in Focus. *English Language Teaching* 8, no. 6: 133-140.
- Barron, Anne. 2003. *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Barron, Anne. 2011. Variation revisited: A corpus analysis of offers in Irish English and British English. In *Anglistentag 2010 Saarbrücken: Proceedings*, J. Frenk, and L. Steveker (eds.), 407-419. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.
- Barron, Anne. 2017 b. Offers in English. In *Doing pragmatics interculturally: cognitive, philosophical, and sociopragmatic perspectives*, Rachel Giora, and Micheal Haugh (eds.), 335-352. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Barron, Anne. 2017a. The speech act of ‘offers’ in Irish English. *World Englishes* 36, no. 2: 224-238.

- Bataineh, Rula F., and Ruba F. Bataineh. 2008. A cross-cultural comparison of apologies by native speakers of American English and Jordanian Arabic. *Journal of pragmatics* 40, no.4: 792-821.
- Bella, Spyridoula. 2016. Offers by Greek FL Learners: A cross-sectional developmental study. *Pragmatics* 26, no.4: 1-32.
- Bella, Spyridoula. 2019. Offers in Greek revisited. In *from speech acts to lay understandings of politeness: multilingual and multicultural perspectives*, Eva Ogiermann, and Pilar Blitvich (eds.), 27-47, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, Juliane House, and Gabriele Kasper. 1989. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (Vol. 31). Ablex Pub.
- Brown, Penelope and Levinson Stephen C. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Byon, Andrew S. 2005. Apologizing in Korean: Cross-cultural analysis in classroom settings. *Korean Studies*, no.1: 137-166.
- Chun, Moon Y. 2003. Culture-Specific Concepts of Politeness for Offering Advice. *Proceedings of the 10th Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 287-296, Japan.
- Cook, Guy. 2001. *The discourse of advertising*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Curl, Traci S. 2006. Offers of assistance: Constraints on syntactic design. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38, no. 8: 1257-1280.
- Edmondson, J. Willis, and Juliane House. 1981. *Let's talk ,and talk about it: a pedagogic interactional grammar of English*. München: Urban & Schwarzenberg.
- Edmonson, Willis J. 1981. *Spoken discourse: A model for analysis*. London: Longman.
- Feng, Hairong, Hui-Ching Chang, and Richard Holt. 2011. Examining Chinese gift-giving behavior from the politeness theory perspective. *Asian Journal of Communication* 21, no.3: 301-317.
- Fukushima, Saeko, and Yuko Iwata. 1987. Politeness strategies in requesting and offering. *JACET Bulletin*, no.18: 31-48.
- Grainger, Karen, Zainab Kerkam, Fatiha Mansor, F., and Sara Mills. 2015. Offering and hospitality in Arabic and English. *Journal of Politeness Research* 11, no. 1: 41-70.
- Haddad, Sami A. K. A. 2022. A Theoretical review of the speech act of offering: towards a categorization of its use in Jordanian Arabic. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures* 14, no. 1: 219-236.
- Hancher, Micheal .1979. The Classification of ooperative illocutionary acts. *Language in society* 8, no.1: 1-14.
- Haverkate, Henk. 1984. *Speech acts, speakers and hearers: Reference and referential strategies in Spanish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Holmes, Janet. 2013. *Women, men and politeness*. London: Routledge.
- Hua, Zhu, Li Wei, and Qian Yuan. 1998. Gift offer and acceptance in Chinese: Contexts and functions. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 2, no. 8: 87-101.
- Hua, Zhu, Li Wei, and Qian Yuan. 2000. The sequential organisation of gift offering and acceptance in Chinese. *Journal of pragmatics* 32, no.1: 81-103.
- Kasanga, Luanga A., and Joy-Christine Lwanga-Lumu. 2007. Cross-cultural linguistic realization of politeness: A study of apologies in English and Setswana. *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture* 3, no.1: 65-92.
- Kecskés, Istvan. 2014. *Intercultural pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Koutlaki, Sofia A. 2002. Offers and expressions of thanks as face enhancing acts: tae'arof in Persian. *Journal of pragmatics* 34, no. 12: 1733-1756.
- Leech, Geoffrey. N. 2014. *The pragmatics of politeness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, USA.
- Min, Sujung. 2019. A Socio-pragmatic study of speech act of offers by Korean L2 learners of English. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, no.25: 123-139.
- Oraby, Khaled. 2020. The Sociopragmatics of invitation and offering practices in Jordanian Arabic. *Unpublished Doctoral Thesis*, Huddersfield, University of Huddersfield.
- Perez Hernández, Lorena. 2001. The directive-commissive continuum. *Miscelánea: a journal of English and American studies*23, no.1: 77-98.
- Ruiz de Zarobe, L., and Ruiz de Zarobe, Y. 2012. *Speech Acts and Politeness across Languages and Cultures*. Lausanne, Switzerland: Peter Lang Verlag. Retrieved Jan 23, 2022, from <https://www.peterlang.com/document/1052341>
- Sifianou, Maria. 1992. Cross-cultural communication: compliments and offers. *Parousia*, no.8: 49-69.
- Terkourafi, Mariana. 2001. Politeness in Cypriot Greek: A Frame-based approach. *Unpublished PhD dissertation*, University of Cambridge, Department of Linguistics.
- Wierzbicka, Anna 1987. *English Speech Acts Verbs: A Semantic Dictionary*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1985. Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts: Polish vs. English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9, no.2-3: 145-178.
- Yongbing, L. 1998. *A study of conversational formulas—From conversational perspective*. Retrieved September, 23, 2009.

List of publications

- **Already published:**

1. Haddad, Sami A. K. A. 2019. Real estate offers in Jordan: A representative-directive speech act. *International Journal of Linguistics 11*, no.6: 89-103.
2. Haddad, Sami A. K. A. 2020. Conversational implicature in Jordanian Arabic Offers. *Argumentum*, no.16: 64-75.
3. Haddad, Sami A. K. A. 2021. The speech act of offer: A theoretical framework. *Argumentum*, no.17: 94-107.
4. Haddad, Sami A. K. A. 2022. A Theoretical review of the speech act of offering: towards a categorization of its use in Jordanian Arabic. *Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures 14*, no. 1: 219-236.

- **Accepted but not published yet:**

5. Haddad, Sami A. K. A. 2023. A Socio-pragmatic Analysis of Jordanian Arabic Daily Offers. *Al-'Arabiyya*, no. 56: __ - __. Georgetown University Press.

(The final decision of the publication is available):

[A Socio-pragmatic Analysis of Jordanian Arabic Daily Offers \(scholasticahq.com\)](http://scholasticahq.com)

- **Under review:**

6. Haddad, Sami A. K. A. (202_). Towards a Linguistic Taxonomy of Written Offers of Investment in Jordan: A Socio-pragmatic Analysis.

Numbered by the Journal: **(JJMLL129-8-2022)**

Submitted on the 9th of Aug 2022.