The cultural Script Approach: A Praxis of an Intercultural Pragmatic Oriented Pedagogy

مقاربة البرنامج النصي الثقافي: تطبيق عملي على بيداغوجيا ثقافية براغماتية موجهة

Farida Lebbal[1]
Department of English Language and Literature, University Batna2
Email : f.lebbal@univ-batna2.dz
Pr. El Khiar ATAMNA
Department of English, Najran University, KSA.
Email: ekatamna@yahoo.co.uk

Abstract:

Intercultural pragmatics, one of the relatively new ramifications of Pragmatics, focuses mainly on the use of the language system in "social encounters between human beings who have different first languages but communicate in a common language, and, usually, represent different cultures" (Kecskes, 2010). Many foreign language researchers have recently been trying to find out ways to implementing the concept in foreign language pedagogy. Yet, in the lack of longitudinal studies, little is known about how learners can upgrade their intercultural pragmatic competence in instructional settings. Latterly, some researchers (Wierzbicka, Goddard and Ameka, to name only few) theorized that one way to attain such an objective is the instruction using the cultural scripts, an approach for "articulating cultural norms, values, and practices" (Wierzbicka and Goddard, 2007) by dint of the Natural Semantic Metalanguage technique. Through a one group pre-test post-test design, a discourse

---

[1] – Author Correspondent.

completion test, targeting specifically the speech act of requesting, is administered (prior then subsequent to introducing the Anglo-script of *personal autonomy*) to fifteen master's students, department of English, University of Khenchela. The findings demonstrate that a cultural scripts-based instruction can qualitatively promote the respondents' Intercultural requesting strategies, and so, provide a practical groundwork for Intercultural pragmatics pedagogy.

Key words: Intercultural Pragmatic Competence, Cultural Scripts, Natural Semantic Metalanguage, Discourse completion task, speech act of requesting, Master's students (University of Khenchela).

ملخص:

يرتكز مجال الدلالية بين الثقافات أساسا على دراسة النشاط اللغوي بين الأفراد الذين ينتمون إلى مرجعيات ثقافية مختلفة ويتكلمون اللغة ذاتها. وقد حاول العديد من الباحثين في مجال اللغات الأجنبية مؤخرا إيجاد بعض السبل لتطبيق هذا المفهوم في المناهج التربوية للغة الأجنبية. ومع غياب الدراسات طويلة الأمد، فإن قليلا ما يعرف عن الطرق الأنجع التي يمكن بها للمتعلمين ترقية كفاءتهم البراغماتية بين الثقافات في المنشآت التعليمية. وقد أكد بعض الباحثين أمثال ويرزبيكا وغودارد وأميكا على ضرورة و توظيف تقنية النصوص الثقافية، وهي منهاج لـ 'توضيح المعايير الثقافية والقيم والممارسات'(ويرزبيكا وغودارد، 2007) بغية تحقيق هذا الهدف.

وقد تبين من خلال نتائج اختبار إتمام الخطاب الذي أُجري على خمسة عشر طالب ماستر 1 من قسم اللغة الإنجليزية بجامعة خنشلة أنه بإمكان التعليم القائم على تقنية النصوص الثقافية تعزيز استراتيجيات الطلب بين الثقافات لمجتمع البحث نوعيا، وبالتالي توفير أسس عملية لتطوير مناهج تربوية تداولية بين الثقافات.

الكلمات المفتاحية:

الكفاءة التداولية الثقافية؛ النصوص الثقافية؛ اختبار إتمام الخطاب؛ طلبة الماستر (جامعة خنشلة).

Although main stream pragmatics has received the bulk of attention in contemporary trends of EFL research, Intercultural Pragmatics has undoubtedly begun to gain a more substantial ground. It is true that pragmatics has been able to offer a communicative, context-dependant and cooperation-based perspective to language use, it nevertheless failed to account for the "untidy, trial-and-error nature of

communication" (Kesckes, 2014). Intercultutral pragmatics thereupon emerged as an attempt to redress these and many other issues pragmatics has overlooked, focusing, not only on the intercultural trait, but also on the interplay of prior and actual situational contexts.

Intercultural Pragmatics

Despite the fact that the Intercultural Pragmatic approach (not to be mistaken with inter-language and cross-cultural approaches) grew out of main stream pragmatic theories, it created itself significantly different concerns and foci.

Intercultural pragmatics is concerned with "the way the language system is put to use in social encounters between human beings who have different first languages, communicate in a common language, and, usually, represent different cultures" (Kecskes 2004, 2010, 2013b). Research on Intercultural pragmatics offers a four-pronged insightful perspective to pragmatics that is beyond the traditional approach to the field: it investigates the way **bi/multilingual speakers** manipulate the **socio-cultural and socio-cognitive variables** imposed by **intercultural settings** in order to express situationally relevant **discourse segments**.

Two distinct concepts are of paramount importance to demarcate Intercultural Pragmatics from mainstream pragmatics:

1.   **Its Intercultural Predilection**

Interculturality has been falsely incriminated by many researchers (Hinnenkamp 1995; Thomas 1983; Ting-Toomey 1999) for being the primary reason for intercultural miscommunication. Samovar and Porter (2001) justify many intercultural communication breakdowns by interlocutors' lack of appropriate culture-related vocabulary items. Other researchers (House, 2003; Kecskes 2015) on the other hand gave evidence that interculturality is by no means a handicap, contrarily, it is thanks to the insecurity experienced during intercultural encounters that speakers force themselves to co-construct a set of rules or use a semantically transparent language which, interestingly enough, results in fewer communication breakdowns than expected.

If this first line of thought approached interculturality as a participant-concern issue, a growing body of literature (Higgins 2007;

Markee and Kasper 2004; Mori 2003) explores interculturality from an exclusively contextual perspective. Nishizaka (1995) for example, defines it as "a situationally emergent rather than a normatively fixed phenomenon". Within the same fashion, Blum-Kulka et al. (2008) depict interculturality as "a contingent interactional accomplishment".

Kecskes (2008), Kecskes and Zhang (2009) however, try to reconcile both views and offer a dialectic approach (which is adopted throughout this paper), which helps elucidating the dynamism and ever-changing nature of intercultural pragmatics. According to them, interculturality has both a relatively normative and impromptu component. Kecskes (2011) defines the concept as "a situationally emergent and co-constructed phenomenon that relies both on relatively definable cultural norms and models as well as situationally evolving features".

Thus, interculturality is not a permanent concept; it is not merely about transmitting prior knowledge, but rather a process of transformation whereby situationally emergent phenomena are co-constructed on the spot by speakers. It also vouches that, individuals not only shape the social condition but also are constrained by them.

2.   Its Socio-cognitive Rationalization

In concordance with the intercultural orientation of Intercultural pragmatics, the socio-cognitive approach also investigates the complex interplay between two purportedly incompatible elements of the communicative process: the societal/cultural element, and the private mental element.

The socio-cognitive approach posits that when language is used, a reciprocal process between language and context is activated, and the dynamic relationship between prior knowledge and actual situational contexts is set in motion. According to Gee (1999):

> When people speak or write, they craft what they need to express to fit the situation or context in which they are communicating. But, at the same time, the way people speak or write the words, expressions, and utterances they use creates that very situation, context, socio-cultural frame in which the given communication occurs. (p.182)

The socio-cognitive approach explores how private mental models are applied "categorically and/ or reflectively by individuals in response to socio-cultural environmental feedback mechanisms" (Kesckes, 2014). The approach claims that a set of cultural mental models are encapsulated in individuals' minds, but only the most (contextually) appropriate model is recalled whenever the corresponding concrete situation occurs. Kesckes qualifies this as an "appropriate verbalization of triggered thoughts and activities" (2012), and it is driven by "a synthesis of the cooperation-centered view of communication and the egocentrism-based cognitive psychological approach" (Kesckes, 2014).

Like interculturality, the socio-cognitive theory proposes an intersubjective substratum to intercultural pragmatics , upon which the "reliance on language created ad hoc by individuals in the course of interaction than on (exclusively) prefabricated language and preexisting frames" (Kesckes,2016) helps to eliminate the difference between the subjective perceptions of interlocutors.

Cultural scripts

Prior to being adopted by foreign language pedagogy, the Cultural Scripts approach has long constituted a key tool for ethnopragmatic description.

Defined by Goddard (2007) as "a technique for articulating cultural norms, values, and practices", Cultural scripts offer a framework within which ways of a society's tacit rules of conduct can be presented. It is important to recall that the concept came forth as an extension to Shweder's (1984) *cultural frames* and Kitayama and Markus's (1992) *culturally shared ideas,* but quickly was distinguished thanks to its very special format: those Cultural Scripts are generally given shape by an evaluative components ('it is good if…" or any of its variants) or peoples' perception of what they can/can't do (I can say/think/do…" or any of its variants), and also the fact that they (Cultural scripts) are formulated in the Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM henceforth), a non-natural language comprised of semantic primes and governed by a universal grammatical system, which gives them, more than anything else, their the property of being ethnocentric free.

The theory of cultural scripts asserts that qualitative differences between cultures can be determined thanks to the "information about the history of use" of words and expressions privatized by individuals' prior experiences, and recollected during the course of the intercultural encounter. Those scripts reflect the way "people think in different cultures" (Hall, 1983) and what really happens in their minds when they are interculturally communicating. Thus, the rationale of any research on cultural scripts is usually to find out more about differences in the way of thinking between interlocutors from different cultures.

Cultural scripts have been classified according to their manifestation aspect (thinking, speaking or any other kind of behavior), they also differ according to their level of generality, and the key words they are associated with. They can spell out more specific norms of interaction (the case of minor scripts), or express "a prevailing cultural attitude which has widespread ramifications across a range of cultural domains and practices" (Goddard, 2004), in the case of the master scripts/ high level scripts.

Cultural scripts and Intercultural Pragmatics

Juxtaposing research findings on Intercultural pragmatics with the cultural script approach, one cannot fail to detect the possible ways in which the latter can help carrying out the theoretical requirements of an intercultural pragmatic oriented language teaching.

Thanks to semantic primes, the culture-neutrality of cultural scripts can provide a non-ethnocentric approach to teaching intercultural pragmatics, offering thus the "insider's perspective" of the target culture Intercultural pragmatics calls for. Moreover, in addition to showing the norms of interaction of the target-culture, cultural scripts explain the reason underlying these norms. This, in its turn, helps explain common and different values embedded in the linguistic manifestations of both cultures. Differently stated, the cultural scripts approach "also attempts to make students think differently about their own culture, re-shape their identities, and re-negotiate their understandings of diversity" (Kramsch, 2008).

All in all, the cultural scripts approach offers the intercultural framework for teaching pragmatics that the putative "universal" pragmatics has overlooked.

Cultural Scripts and the Speech Act of Requesting

Having been qualified by Brown and Levinson (1987) as "one of the most face-threatening speech acts", the speech act of requesting has recurrently been investigated both in intra and intercultural settings (Martínez-Flor, 2005). And as a consequence of its face-threatening nature, speakers usually chose to resort to one (or more) of the many mitigation strategies and devices proposed by the politeness principle to lessen the impact of the speech act and favor a positive response to the request.

Like most cases of culture-bound linguistic behavior, the face-threat increases during intercultural encounters, since NNSs (Non-Native Speakers) find themselves unfamiliar with the semantic and/or syntactic elements typically preferred by NSs (Native Speakers). But if those speech patterns are rigorously described, especially in terms of the "naïve axiology" which "present a set of assumptions about what is good and what is bad to do – and what one can or cannot do – especially in speaking" (Wierzbicka, 2002), then the ethnocentric bias will reduce and lead to a successful communication.

In other words, The Cultural scripts approach is allegedly able to minimize ethnocentric bias, and enable the learner to achieve an interculturally acceptable and ethnocentric-free act of request.

The Method

The present paper explores the cultural norms of interaction reflected in request strategy (ies) adopted by advanced Algerian EFL learners, and compares them to their analogous strategies from the British culture.

In addition to being an attempt to apply the cultural scripts analytical framework on the selected Algerian cultural value underpinning the choice of request strategy (ies), this study is driven by two objectives:

1. To examine the usefulness of the cultural scripts approach in promoting FL learners' intercultural pragmatic competence (with special focus on Intercultural requests).

2. Through the pre-test post test investigation, the study not only attempts at demonstrating cultural differences between the Algerian and British culture, but also at raising learners' awareness to the importance of the third space culture, in which they are urged to find a common ground instead of converging entirely to the target culture.

Participants

Many researchers claim that all native speakers, "particularly those who already experienced the confusion of intercultural communication" (Wirzbicka , 2006) can operate as consultants to clear up differences between the norms of interaction between their own, and other cultures.

In agreement with this, 15 master's students from the department of English studies, university of Khenchela, have been randomly selected from a population of 80 students, representing thus 18.75 % of the total number.

It should be noted that Master's level has been chosen based on the traditionally- adopted- yet-debatable view that completing written DCT is a relatively difficult task and requires a certain proficiency level. Feng Xiao (2012) explains that "higher proficiency participants may have more pragma-linguistic knowledge and be more sensitive to linguistic forms and their pragmatic functions". Hence, other lower levels have been copped out.

Tool of Research

Among the most commonly used data collection tools in FL research, the Discourse Completion Task/Test is the most suitable in pragmatic and intercultural studies, for it principally aims at "comparing how members of a number of cultural communities and speakers of different languages handled the same task of speech-act production" (leech, 2014) .

The DCT used in this research (see appendix 1) is an adaptation of five discourse situations proposed in Blum-Kulka's (1986) Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP). It is originally designed to illicit linguistic realizations of requests and apologies. However, in keeping with the focus of this paper, a special attention is

paid only to the strategies of request opted for, as well as the degree of politeness applied.

Prior to asking respondents to fill in the scenarios scripts, they were asked about their age and gender. However important these two variables might be in defining the social distance between interlocutors, they are not taken into account during the analysis of data.

Description of the DCT

The five situations which comprise the present study DCT are selected based on their verisimilitude, i.e., they are likely to happen to any EFL student studying abroad. The diversity of social contexts is taken into account because they (social contexts) "determine the strength of speech act and determine the use of politeness strategies" (Brown & Levinson ,1987; Terkourafi, 2005). Accordingly, the diversity of the social contexts proposed in the five scenarios presupposes the diversity in terms of frequency, directness, formality level, distance, power and rank of imposition. (see appendix one)

The Coding scheme

The coding scheme adopted in this research (appendix two) is, once more, a variation of the request taxonomy proposed by Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper in their 1989 CCSAR Project, and which suggests three peripheral elements of request: the Alerter, Head act, and Supportive move. These three constituents determine the level of directness of the request based on the strategy adopted in formulating the request.

One important detail to remark here is that this coding scheme only assesses the request's core strategy and not the different modifying linguistic devices (upgrader and downgrader modifiers).

Needless to mention that all the previously stated variables (level of directness, strategies, and even the constituents of the speech act themselves) are culture-bound and thus, significantly impact the pragma-linguistic choices of the speech act realization.

Procedure

One fundamental trait of any cultural script analysis is its linguistically-evidenced groundwork. Wierzbicka (date) recalls that in such an endeavor, one cannot rely on dominant cultural patterns, and that all attempts to generalize need to be supported.

The present investigation is undertaken in the following three stages:

The pre-test: The first step in the in the procedure of the research consists of comparing - quantitatively and qualitatively- the request components as informed by the respondents (pre-test) with the corresponding referenced British cultural norms.

The Intervention: Since cultural scripts "can be difficult to write" (Allan, 2010), guidance is very much needed, and mentoring informants on how to interpret what they would express is an important phase of the whole procedure.

As stated earlier, the present paper hypothesizes that a cultural script informed training can upgrade foreign language learners' intercultural pragmatic knowledge and ability (eventually).

In agreement with the subject of inquiry of this research, that is, the speech act of request, one cultural script is particularly targeted: the Anglo script of "personal autonomy", and which could be formulated as follows:

 [people think like this:]

when I do something it is good if I do it because I want to do it,

not because someone else wants me to do it . (Wierzbicka 2006, p.52)

Or, from the addressee's standpoint, the script reads:

[people think:]

when I do something I want to know:

"I do it because I want to do it , not because of anything else" . (Wierzbicka 1999a, p.266)

The cultural script of *personal autonomy* is central to the Anglo-culture, it affirms that personal autonomy has a "double manifestation: on the one hand, it is present in the conceptualization of emotions themselves, while on the other it can be seen in the syntactic patterns with nouns denoting emotions" (Jelena Rakić, 2013)

The post-test: Having come up to the conclusion that some of the responses in the pre-test would be regarded as inappropriate and rude by a British interlocutor during an intercultural encounter, students have been asked to rewrite their answers , taking into consideration the cultural script of *personal autonomy that* underlies the way of

thinking, therefore of judging, of the other party. Data were collected, compared and analyzed.

The data obtained from both DCT's were organized per situation. Similar responses (or with a minimal degree of divergence) were grouped together. Table (1) below illustrates the frequency of the strategies used in performing the request prior and subsequent to the intervention phase.

Table One

Requests'componenents distributed across scenarios in leraners' responses (pre-test and post-test)

Situation / Strategy	At the Restaurant		At the Clothes Shop		At the party		To the Train Station		With the Teacher	
Alerter Used	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
Address Terms	8	10	15	15	15	15	12	15	15	15
Attention Getters	4	15	5	5	15	15	10	15	/	4
Head Act										
Direct Strategies	10	3	/	/	7	2	/	/	/	/
Conventionally Indirect	5	12	8	10	3	10	8	15	12	15
Non-Conventionally Indirect	/	/	5	5	5	3	4	/	3	/
Supportive move	2	15	12	5	6	10	5	15	15	15

Description of the Pre-test Data

The First Situation (at a restaurant): represents a "permission request", formulated in an informal and relatively frequent costumer-waiter setting.

Only eight respondents used an Alerter in their responses, with the address terms *miss, sir,* and *waiter* predominantly employed. Attention getters (hey, here! Excuse me) were occasionally used either as the only Alerter or together with an address term.

In spite of the prepotency of the direct strategies in this scenario (hedged performative particularly), the respondents had recourse to a variety of linguistic means to express the core Head act (e.g. I would like to ask for the menu, I'd like to have the menu…etc). Two respondents used a mood derivable request (e.g. bring the menu here!, The menu over here!), and five others used the query preparatory

conventionally indirect strategy (e.g. would you mind bringing the menu, can I have the menu, may I have the menu, is it possible to have the menu right here?...etc) .

As for the supportive move, the very few (only two respondents) who employed it suffixed a religious version of the promise of reward strategy (God bless you/ God protect you), which is a literal translation of a typical Islamic pragma-linguistic behavior.

All in all, the responses in general terms look more like commands than requests, and it is remarked that little to no attempts have been made to avoid the appearance of imposing the other (the waiter).

The Second Situation (at a clothes shop): is a "more formal" situation than the previous one as it is business-like and not very frequent. Another difference lies in the type of request itself, which is a negotiation request.

Regarding the taxonomy of their requests, initially most of the respondents opted for a positive politeness strategy, better illustrated in their extensive use of address terms and small talk as a redressive move to set the tone for further negotiation.

Concerning the Head act, suggestory formulas were largely used (eight cases) as a conventionally indirect strategy (e.g. how about lowering the price a bit?, what if I take it for X pounds?, is it possible to lower the price?). Five answered adopting a non-conventionally indirect strategy (strong hints predominantly, eg: It is too expensive !, don't you think that it is a bit expensive?, I could get it for half its price elsewhere, Ah! too expensive!), while one respondent chose to opt out and not to do the FTA.

The other interesting part of most of the respondent's answers is the choice of their supportive moves: expressions like: *come on, what do you say*? Or *just say yes, Come one, you can't do this t me. ..etc,* Are very typical to what Rihbany (1910) calls the attributes of "Oriental Speech" (the adjective "oriental" here is used beyond its geo-political boundaries, and it denotes the "non-occidental"), and which he particularly exposes the "unendurable habit of insisting" as an attempt to exert "undue" influence when asking a favor.

The Third Situation (at a party): scripts a casual request, where Speaker and Hearer are of equal power and lower distance. A favor of lower imposition is being asked in an informal setting.

Most of the Alerters used were combinations of attention getters and endearment terms (e.g. hey mate!, hey buddy!, hey pal!).

In terms of the Head acts core strategies, the most commonly used are direct strategies, ranging from hedged performatives (e.g. I would like to ask you for a ride home) to want statements (e.g. I need you to take me home, I am coming with you). Both strong and mild hints are used (e.g. I need a lift, it will be very late if I go on feet) as nonconventional indirect strategies, and three respondents answered using an conventionally indirect strategy (e.g. would/could/ you take me with you?)

Most of the used supportive moves are grounders (e.g. I have an exam tomorrow and I am sure I won't make it early if I go on feet) and appreciation (e.g. I owe you one, I will be grateful, I appreciate) .

The situation in general must have been viewed as informal and regular enough for the respondents not to use any politeness marker, even the commonly used *please* was left out in almost all the answers. Later discussions revealed that students, almost unanimously, judged the "affectation" of being polite (a description they have provided) as unnecessary when performing a request to a friend.

The Fourth Situation (to the train station) illustrates a relation between strangers. It is therefore a formal, yet a rather frequent situation.

The interesting remark about the type of Headers used by the respondents is that of greeting (not sure though if it is considered as an attention getter or small talk), mostly in combination with the term of Address *sir*. This could be explained by the fact that this politeness notion stems from the Islamic principle of Assalam , a behavior to be adopted at the onset of every encounter.

The train station situation also revealed another culturally bound attitude related to gender: interestingly enough, three girls chose not to perform the request at all, when asked why during the discussion, they claimed that they would rather ask a woman!

As for the core act itself, query preparatory strategy (eight answers, e.g.could you please tell me where…) and mild hints (four answers,

e.g. I am completely lost, I am heading to the station, but it seems that I lost my way, I am a stranger and I don't know where the train station is) were largely chosen by the remaining respondents.

The supportive moves were timidly used: one case of grounder use (e.g. I have been here just for a couple of days) and two promise of rewards (e.g. God bless you!).

The fifth Situation (with the teacher) is a teacher student interactional situation. The speaker is of lower power and higher distance, and the favor asking request is of higher imposition than the previous situation. However, the setting is not as formal as it might seem.

Despite the informal aspect of the request, respondents showed a very polite attitude, very long requests have been formulated and more than one strategy was opted for in each part of the request.

Attention getters (e.g. excuse me, sorry to interrupt you .. etc), were largely used along with the address term *Professor*, most of which were immediately backed with more than one supportive move, even within the same answer (grounders, preparators, getting a precommitment, promise of reward, and disarmers) either before or after the Head act of the request.

The respondents favored hedged performatives (e.g. would you please consider…, could you be kind enough and take my case into consideration…), and query preparatory (can I please have another chance).

Description of the Post-test Data

Situation One (at the restaurant): With regard to the strategies a native speaker would adopt in a similar situation, Hendricks (2002) remarks that in permission requests situations, which "imply that the addressee has control over the speaker and that the speaker's wishes are subject to the hearer's approval" (Gordon and Ervin-Tripp, 1984), English native speakers mostly use modal auxiliaries in all their forms and tenses.

Modal auxiliary requests go in line with the *personal autonomy* script as they bear the implicit message of asking about the will / ability/predisposition of the addressee to perform the requested action.

Interestingly enough, the provided explanation of the cultural script in question made respondents opt for more indirect strategies in post-test, and less for the imperative tone of mood derivables and want statements. The change at the Alerter level was rather qualitative, in the sense that respondents displayed a less directive attitude by using more polite markers (please, excuse me!) . In the supportive mood element, more appreciation expressions were used than in the post-test.

Situation Two (at the Clothes Shop) **:** Rihbany (1910) notes that, in similar situations (negotiating requests), an "oriental speaker" (which applies also to an Algerian speaker, so to speak) would resort to some strategies, like begging, insisting or bargaining, hoping to compel the addressee to comply with their request. Yet, what might be considered as a persuasive technique for an Algerian speaker may well be seen (by an English speaker) as an intolerable assault to the hearers' personal autonomy, thus, a culturally inappropriate behavior.

This same clarification, explained in terms of the *personal autonomy* cultural script, made respondents use more disarmers (e.g. I know that you only work here but…, I am aware that it the original brand but, …), imposition minimizes (e.g. could you possibly… , … if it is not too much asked), and getting a precommitment expressions (e.g. could you do me a favor ?) in their post-test. The politeness marker *please* has also been used extensively in all the requests.

Situation Three (at the party): as already stated, since speakers are of equal rank and lower distance, and even the favor itself is of low imposition, respondents judged in their Pre-test that it is unnecessary to resort to indirect request strategies. However, according to Goldschmidt (1988), "favor asking always involves reciprocity", and an English speaker, in the case the request of favor asking, is aware of its imposing nature, therefore feel obliged to return the favors to show (at least) appreciation.

The cultural script of *personal autonomy* raised the awareness of respondents that favor asking is still favor asking, even when interlocutors are of equal power. Many respondents downgraded their requests by using such modifiers as affective appeal (e.g. you are the only one who could help with this), sweeteners (e.g. you're my savior, you know?, you're a true pal!..etc), and many politeness markers (e.g.

… if its is not too much asked, if I am not bothering you, I don't want to impose anything, if you have nothing else to do…etc)

Situation Five (with the teacher): The case of Foreign language learners showing a high degree of politeness when addressing their teacher is not a strange case, Geoffrey leech (2014) remarks that, contrarily to what they expect, "students coming from countries where a high degree of vertical distance exists between senior academics and students generally are surprised by the prevailing culture of British universities where it is very common to address teachers by their (even abbreviated) first name". The case of Algerian culture is no different, and the title professor is used in a more honorific way than just an academic title "chikh" (which literally means "old man" but which stands for "wise/religious man") , that is why, our respondents attached a great significance to the polite aspect of the request.

In this situation particularly, no significant changes occurred in the post-test, because, initially, their pre-test answers were already designed, even subconsciously, according to the *personal autonomy* value.

Analysis and Interpretation of the Results

As already explained, the value of autonomy proposed in this research is by all accounts, one the most overriding cultural scripts of Anglo culture, and it is practically manifested in all request types.
Clearly, the pre-test results are mostly inconsistent with the value of *personal autonomy*: from the point of view of Algerians, the value of autonomy depends on the rank and the addresser/addressee relation. Situations like 1, 2, and 3 show no consideration to the other's autonomy, and requests took the form of a command.

An attempt to script the Algerian cultural norm of request in these situations would be:
[people think like this:]
　　　If I want person to do something for me
　　　And this person is of an equal/lower rank than me
　　　It is fine if I say to this person "do it"
Or:
[people think like this:]
　　If I want someone to do something

And this person is of an equal/lower rank than me

It is fine if I say to this person more that once to do it

Clearly, the rank of addressee is a definitional aspect of the request script, and if these two proposed scripts capture a totally acceptable behavior in the Algerian speech community (the population of the inquiry), ordering someone to do something (scenario 1, 3), putting a pressure on someone by insisting (scenario2) is unacceptable, and usually seen as culturally inappropriate in an English social interaction.

In general, it has been remarked that the negative politeness strategies reflected in the query preparatory and hedged performatives were used (in the post-test) more often than the bare imperative tone of the want statements or mood derivable requests. Syntactically speaking, those indirect conventional strategies are conventionalized expression of the speaker's uncertainty, and they serve to acknowledge, explicitly, the addressee's "autonomy": regardless of the rank or position of the addressee is. Now, whether or not the request will be complied with, is what depends on the addressee. (Wierzbicka,2006).

In the case of negociating requests(scenario 2), the Interrogative utterances such as "would you like to…?", "how about…", or "why don't you…?", which enable the speaker to acknowledge the addressee's *personal autonomy*, were effectively used as persuasive techniques instead of the strategy of insisting used in the pre-test.

Among the supportive routines which have been added in the post-test are "I'm only saying" (scenario2), "after all, it is all up to you" , "I am not trying to show you how to deal with your students…", (scenario3) , which indeed, shows that drastic change in the pragma-linguistic choice of our respondents , just after getting acquainted with the cultural value of *personal autonomy.*

Finally, since the links between the scripts of "autonomy" and "non- imposing" are not just "in the sphere of action but also in the sphere of thought" (Wierzbicka, Goddard; 1994), the pre-test post-test design of the present research validates the premise that, one way of training EFL learners to map the different pragma-linguistic items onto the appropriate socio-pragmatic settings is to present them with a pattern of thought (i.e. a selected cultural script) that would raise their

awareness to how a NS expects them to behave, and thus enable them to intercultutrally communicate more effectively.

Conclusion

Despite the dynamic expansion of intercultural pragmatics, many researchers (e.g. Giles & Franklyn-Stokes, 1989; Gudykunst & Nishida, 1989; Kesckes 2010) call for more rigorous inquiries on eventual implementation of the discipline in institutional settings. The theory of cultural scripts has recently proved that it can provide a innovative method for instructional intercultural pragmatics, not only because of its ability to spell out the diverse standards of behavior associated with different cultures, but also because it is formulated in such an unbiased and easily-transposable way that would allow the FL learner to develop a typology of communication patterns that would reduce any intercultural abstruseness.

The present research framework is built on the general premise that the cultural scripts methodology can enhance the EFL learners' intercultural pragmatic competence. Special focus is given to the cultural script or *Personal autonomy*, a value which overarches the Anglo-cultural norms of interaction in general, and prompts the choice of request strategies in particular.

One of the main findings of this research is that, if the value of *personal autonomy* is viewed by British people as a general rule of conduct regardless of the formality, distance level, power and rank of imposition, it is a mere situation-bound component to the population under investigation, and that it was only in the case of higher ranked interlocutors (teacher), or distant and formal relations (stranger at the train station /teacher) that the addresser took measures not to impose.

Furthermore, by means of the NSM, an attempt has been made to design an analogous script of request (which is not necessarily a *personal autonomy* script) based on the results obtained from the pre-test, and compared to the documented *personal autonomy* Anglo-cultural script. Examining the tacit rules expounded by the two scripts in terms of how both societies operate, and having realized how inappropriate some of their pre-test responses would be viewed by NSs, our respondents ended up reconsidering their answers in the post-test, offering more appropriate intercultural pragmatic utterances.

It is worth mentioning however, that this study is not without limitations: the limited number of participants which does not allow access to more reliable data, the tool of research (written DCT) which, according to Beebe and Cummings (1996) "bias the response towards less negotiation, less hedging, less repetition, less elaboration, less variety, and ultimately less talk", the limitation of the research to just one speech act and one cultural script. But these shortcomings could serve as a call for further topics of investigation, to widen the scope of Pragmatic research in Algeria on the one hand, and to try to sort out those interactional cultural norms of the Algerian speech community, which could serve not just as a mediator between language and culture, but as a pedagogical tool which would provide a spur to an intercultural pragmatic oriented pedagogy.

List of References

Atawneh, A., & Sridhar, S. . (1993). Arabic - English bilinguals and the directive speech act. *World Englishes*, *12*(3), 279–297.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1993.tb00030.x

Beebe, L. & Cummings, M. (1996). Natural speech act data versus written questionnaire data: How data collection method affects speech act performance. In S. Gass & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures: Challenges to communication in a second language* (65-68). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Birjandi, P., & Rezai, S. (2010). Developing a multiple-choice discourse completion test of interlanguage pragmatics for Iranian EFL learners. *ILI LanguageTeaching Journal*, *6*, 43–58.

Blum-kulka, S., & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: A cross-cultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics*, *5*(3), 196–213.

https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/5.3.196.

Blum-Kulka , Shoshana , Blondheim , Menahem , House , Juliance , Kasper , Gabriele and Johannes , Wagner. 2008 . "Intercultural pragmatics, language and society." In *Unity and Diversity of Languages* , Sterkenburg , Piet van (ed.), 155–173 . Amsterdam : John Benjamins .

Fujiwara, Y. (n.d.). An Intercultural Pragmatics Study on Japanese Resistivity and American Acceptability in Refusals, (1996), 172–190.

Gee, J.P. (1999). An Introduction to Discourse Analysis, London: Routledge.

Goddard, C. (2004). Cultural Scripts: a new medium for ethnopragmatic instruction. *Cognitive Linguistics, Second Language Acquisition, and Foreign Language Teaching*, 143–163.

Goddard, C. (2006). Ethnopragmatics: a new paradigm. *Ethnopragmatics: Understanding Discourse in Cultural Context*.

Goddard, C., & Wierzbicka, A. (2007). Semantic Primes and Cultural Scripts in Language Learning and Intercultural Communication. *Appied Cultural Linguistics: Implications for Second Language Learning and Intercultural Communication*, *1968*, 105–124.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s13398-014-0173-7.2

Goddard, C., & Wierzbicka, A. (2014). Words and meanings: lexical semantics across domains, languages, and cultures. *Oxford Linguistics*, 314. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2001.0082.

Goldschmidt, M. (1988). Do me a favor: A descriptive analysis of favor asking sequences in American English. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *29* (2), 129-153.

Gordon, David and Susan M. Ervin-Tripp, 1984. 'The structure of children's requests'. In: R.E. Schiefelbusch and A. Pickar, eds., *The acquisition of communicative competence*. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press. pp. 295-321.

Hinnenkamp, V. (1995) 'Intercultural communication', in J. Verschueren, J.-O. Östman and J. Blommaert (eds) Handbook of Pragmatics, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Hendricks, Berna. (2002). More on Dutch English…Please? A study of request performance by Dutch Native speakers, English native speakers and Dutch learners of English. Nijmegen: Nijmegen University Press.

Hsieh, S.-C. (2009). (Im)politeness in email communication: how English speakers and Chinese speakers negotiate meanings and develop intercultural (mis)understandings, (October), 365.

Hu, Z. (2014). Study on Developing Chinese College EFL Learners' Pragmatic Competence in Relation to Language Proficiency and Overseas Experience. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *5*(2), 391–398. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.2.391-398

Jackson, J. (2012). *The routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication. Routledge Handbooks*.

https://doi.org/doi:10.4324/9781315851686

Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1989). *Interlanguage Pragmatics. Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* (Vol. 53).

https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Kasper, G., & Dahl, M. (1991). Research Methods in Interlanguage Pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, *13*(2), 215. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263100009955

Kecskes, I., & Romero-Trillo, J. (2013). Research Trends in Intercultural Pragmatics. *Mouton Series in Pragmatics [MSP] 16, 8602*(July). https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2016.1204903

Kecskes, I. (2014). Intercultural Pragmatics. *Oxford University Press*, 288. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Leech, G. (2014). The Pragmatics of Politeness. *The Pragmatics of Politeness*, 1–368. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195341386.001.0001

Lyons, J. (1969). *Trends in linguistics. Lingua* (Vol. 22). https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(69)90055-2

Nishizaka, A. (1995) 'The interactive constitution of interculturality: how to be a Japanese with word?', Human Studies, 18: 301–26.

Rihbany, Abraham Mitrie. 1920. *The Syrian Christ*. London: A. Melrose.

Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E., & McDaniel, E. R. (n.d.). *Communication Between Cultures*. Retrieved from

https://wsiz.rzeszow.pl/pl/Uczelnia/kadra/asiewierska/Documents/Communication between cultures.pdf

Searle, J., Grice, P., English, A., & Ulls, B. (1988). Cross-cultural pragmatics and different cultural values ! !

Tannen, D. (1984). The pragmatics of cross-cultural communication. *Applied Linguistics*, *5*(3), 189–195.

https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/5.3.189

Wierzbicka, A. (1996). Semantics : Primes and Universals: Primes and Universals, 512. Retrieved from

https://books.google.co.nz/books/about/Semantics_Primes_and_Unive rsals.html?id=ZN029Pmbnu4C&pgis=1

Wierzbicka, A. (2006). *English : meaning and culture*. Retrieved from

http://www.loc.gov/catdir/toc/fy0612/2005047789.html%0Ahttp://ww w.loc.gov/catdir/enhancements/fy0638/2005047789- d.html%0Ahttp://www.loc.gov/catdir/enhancements/fy0724/2005 047789-b.html.

Zamanian, M. (2012). Analysis of Cultural Scripts of Suggestions and Rejection of Suggestions in Persian and English within Natural Semantic Metalanguage Framework, *1*(2), 19–39.

Appendix One: Discourse Completion Test

1. Gender of the respondent: ……
2. Age of the respondent:……..
3. What would you say in each of the following situation?

1. You are in a restaurant (in England), and before making an order, you would like to see the menu. What do you say to the waiter?

2. You are in a clothes shop (in England) and find something you like and you want to buy it. But when the shop assistant tells you the price, you think it is quite expensive. What would you say to him/her?

3. You are at a party (in England). You want to go back to the campus because you have an exam the next morning. Your English friend is driving home in the same direction. What would you say to him?

4. In England, you are walking to the train station, but you are afraid you are going to miss your train. Your decide asking someone in the street for directions. There is one man walking next to you. What would you say to him?

5. You are studying at a university (In England), and you have failed the exam of Philosophy for the second time. It is not that you don't know the answers, but you have difficulties answering them in English. You know you would do much better if the test was in Arabic. What would you say to your teacher?

Reference (Adapted version)
1. CCSARP. (1989). The CCSARP Coding Manual. In Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies, S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (eds.), New Jersey: Ablex.

Appendix Two : Coding Scheme
The data in this research were coded using the first significant coding scheme for requests, designed by Blum-Kulka et al. (1989) in their Cross Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP).

Alerters modifiers to Core Request (CCSARP)

Alerters	Address Terms	Title/ Role
		Name / Surname/nickname
		Endearment Term
		Pronoun
	Attention Getter	

Core (Head act) Strategies Used in Making Requests (Blum-Kulka, p.18)

Type	Strategy	Definition
Direct Strategies	Mood derivable	The grammatical mood of the verb indicates the illocutionary act.
	Performative	The illocutionary act is explicitly named.
	Hedged performative	The naming of the illocutionary act is modified by hedges
	Obligation statement	The obligation of the hearer to carry out the act is stated.
	Want statement	The speaker states his/her desire that the hearer carries out the act.
Conventionally Indirect Strategies	Suggestory formulae	A suggestion is made to carry out the act.
	Query preparatory	A reference to ability or willingness is made using a modal verb.
Nonconventionally Indirect Strategies	Strong hints	Partial reference to object needed for completing the act.

	Mild hints	No reference to the object of the act is made. But it is interpreted as a request by context.

Supportive Moves (Blum-Kulka, p.287)

Supportive move	Definition
Preparator	A phrase preparing the hearer for the request by checking his/her availability or asking his/her permission
Getting a precommitment	An attempt to get the hearer's commitment
Grounder	Giving reasons, explanations or justifications that either precede or follow for a request
Disarmer	Avoiding any potential refusal
Promise of reward	Announcing a reward due on fulfillment of the request
Imposition minimizer	Reducing the imposition of a request