

Gender and Politeness in a Foreign Language Academic Context

Nahla Nola Bacha

School of Arts and Sciences, Humanities Department
Lebanese American University, P.O. Box: Byblos 36, Lebanon
Tel: 961-9-547-254/62 Ext. 2324 E-mail: nbacha@lau.edu.lb

Rima Bahous

Education Department, Lebanese American University, Beirut, Lebanon
E-mail: rbahous@lau.edu.lb

Rula L. Diab

Humanities Department, Lebanese American University, Beirut, Lebanon
E-mail: rula.diab@lau.edu.lb

Received: November 23, 2011

Accepted: December 28, 2011

Published: February 1, 2012

doi:10.5539/ijel.v2n1p79

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v2n1p79>

Abstract

Theories and strategies of politeness and impoliteness are drawn upon to investigate underlying factors that might contribute to an understanding of differences among students and teachers towards politeness strategies. Classroom politeness in the present study is operationally defined according to various strategies or behaviors that the students in question draw upon in reacting to different situations. The study explores through a survey and a discourse completion test the degree of politeness the genders in an L1 Arabic context indicate to certain situations. Results show that the possible causes for the 'misunderstandings' and any perceived differences in 'impoliteness' between the genders are more 'cultural' rather than that of 'impoliteness' on the part of the students. Recommendations are made for program coordinators and teachers to deal with this issue in EFL classrooms along with future needed research.

Keywords: Politeness, Multicultural/multilingual contexts, Academic classroom management, Polite strategies, EFL classrooms

1. Overview of linguistic politeness research

As the teacher walked into the advanced English Composition classroom on the first day of the semester, students were talking and many were on their mobiles. The teacher stood as usual at the front of the class, said good morning, wrote her name on the board, and informed the class that she would distribute the syllabus and then discuss the weekly assignments and the grading system. A young male student suddenly stood up, put his cellular in his pocket, said he had an urgent appointment and walked toward the door. The teacher called after him and said, "Please return and sit down." Before he left the door slam after him, he replied. "I told you, I have an appointment".

Who is polite? To what extent? What would you do if you were the teacher? What is your reaction if you were the students in the class?

A vast amount of research has attempted to investigate linguistic politeness in the past three or so decades; in particular, Brown and Levinson's (1987) face-saving view of politeness has stimulated a lot of discussion and controversy. This model employs Goffman's (1959) notion of "face" to argue that each person has two types of face: positive (esteemed self image) and negative (desire for autonomy); any action that threatens positive or negative face is called a "face threatening act" (FTA). According to Brown and Levinson, speakers employ positive and negative politeness strategies to maintain their face during conversations. A few examples of positive politeness strategies are attending to the needs of the other person and exaggerating interest or sympathy, while

negative politeness strategies include hedging, being indirect, or apologizing. Another influential scholar in the field of linguistic politeness is Geoffrey Leech (1983), who perceives politeness as a pragmatic strategy used by the speaker. His politeness principle consists of the following maxims: tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy.

Brown and Levinson's (1987) model has been challenged. Wilson, Aleman, & Leatham (1998) revise Brown and Levinson's (1987) model by suggesting that requesters identify potential FTAs based on rules for seeking compliance as well as specific influence goals that influence the degree of threat and potential for other FTAs. Johnson, Roloff and Riffe (2004) support Wilson et. al (1998) revision of politeness theory by examining refusals, a speech act that is not adequately addressed by Brown and Levinson, and concluding that multiple face threats are present in request and refusal situations; specifically, they maintain that there are differences in types of threat present to the requester's positive face and the refuser's face needs, depending on the obstacle underlying the refusal.

Moreover, according to Xie, He and Lin (2005), Brown and Levinson's (1987) model has been shown to be theoretically reductionistic, logically unsupportable and empirically dubious"

(p. 432). Also, Spencer-Oatey (2008) argues that Brown and Levinson's (1987) notion of face has been underspecified and proposed a modified framework conceptualizing face and rapport suggesting that rapport management includes three major components: "the management of face, the management of sociality rights and obligations, and the management of interactional goals" (p. 13). Brown and Levinson's framework has also been criticized as being an "Anglo-Western" one that emphasizes individualism and that therefore may not fit certain group-oriented cultures in the East (Mao, 1994). For instance, according to Mills (2004), in many languages, such as Arabic, indirect requests are not preferred and will be viewed as impolite, mainly because they emphasize social distance, which contradicts the close social ties that characterize Arabic communities. Mao (1994) further proposes two views of face: individual and social, and argues that one view may be more prevalent than the other, depending on the particular society. Mills (2004) goes a step further in arguing that universality in politeness cannot be assumed since class, race, and gender may influence speakers' and listeners' use and interpretation of linguistic politeness strategies and warned that scholars may be analyzing politeness from a strictly middle class perspective. The present study sets out to investigate the degree of politeness according to gender in an academic context based on Mills' (2004) theory.

2. Literature Review

Recent research on politeness has moved away from Brown and Levinson's (1987) positive/negative dichotomy to propose a relational and more dynamic paradigm to the study of politeness. It is now generally considered important to analyze discourse rather than merely the speaker and to take the particular community of practice into consideration in studying politeness (Locher, 2006; Locher and Watts, 2005; Mills, 2003; Watts, Ide, & Ehlich, 2005). Below we give a review of the main literature related to politeness in academic contexts.

2.1 Academic politeness

Despite the vast amount of research conducted on linguistic politeness, little research has examined politeness in the classroom. Other research investigating politeness in an academic context includes Sabee and Wilson's (2005) investigation of college students' primary goals, attributions, and facework during conversations with their teachers about disappointing grades. Three primary goals, namely learning, persuading, and fighting, were initially assumed, and a fourth, impressing, later emerged. Moreover, the differences in students' primary goals for talking with their instructors were related to the attributions they made for the low grade as well as to the various FTAs and politeness strategies they performed. Based on the findings, the authors conclude that primary goals are not necessarily instrumental and that instructors can benefit from learning how to diagnose and negotiate with students about primary goals.

Similarly, in a recent study, Dunleavy, Martin, Brann, Booth-Butterfield, Myers, and Weber (2008) examined American college students' nagging behavior as a potentially face threatening act. Students described a nagging exchange with a teacher by reporting on one of eight nagging strategies. Based on the findings, the authors conclude that nagging is threatening to the positive and negative face of both students and instructors. Interestingly, the "elicit sympathy" nag was found to be the most threatening to the students' positive face, and the "demonstrate frustration with the instructor" nag the most threatening to the instructors' positive face. Finally, Bell, Arnold, and Haddock (2009) also used politeness theory to analyze the developing tutorial relationship between students and writing center peer tutors at an American university. Findings revealed that tutors use politeness strategies to shift between collaborative and authoritative roles as tutors, relying more on negative politeness strategies during the first six weeks of tutorial sessions and shifting to more positive strategies later.

2.2 Politeness in the second/foreign language context/Cross-cultural studies

Meier (1997) argues that research in foreign and second language pedagogy should not rely on the Brown and Levinson theory of politeness to form the basis of teaching “politeness phenomena;” rather, there should be an attempt to raise cultural awareness. Similarly, Brown (2010) proposes a model for the study of politeness in second language learning and maintains that face and politeness should be analyzed as interactional and discursive processes. The author further argues that the way second language learners present themselves in the target community is directly influenced by pre-existing politeness ideologies. Specifically, Brown (2010) proposes that the learning of politeness in a second language is a process of “reframing”, re-analyzing existing frames regarding the linguistic behavior that generally occurs in a certain context.

One study that has attempted to investigate politeness in the second language context is Suh’s (1999) examination of the differences in the use of politeness strategies between English native speakers and ESL Korean learners. Findings revealed that though in most situations the Korean learners did not differ from the native speakers of English, in some situations such as intimate friendships, there were differences, probably as a result of cultural factors. Similarly, a number of studies have attempted to present findings from cross-cultural comparisons related to politeness and have generally concluded that cultural background is an important factor influencing choice of politeness strategies. For instance, Fukushima (1996) investigated the use of request strategies by speakers of Japanese and British English and concluded that there are differences in the types of strategies used by the two groups: the British use conventional forms and supportive acts whereas the Japanese are more direct. Similarly, Ebsworth and Kodama (2011) studied refusals by female native speakers of American English and Japanese and found several differences among the two groups; for instance, the Japanese often chose to postpone the refusal, while the Americans insisted on being honest. The Japanese participants also viewed some American refusals as impolite, while the Americans perceived the Japanese postponement as a problem.

Hong (2008) also presents findings from a cross-cultural comparison of apology strategies written in English by two groups of college students in the USA: native and non-native speakers of English. Findings revealed that the cultural background of the students and the course attendance policies were two major factors influencing choice of apology strategy. Another recent study conducted in Yemen revealed that Yemeni EFL learners use indirect refusal strategies followed by justifications for refusing a command, while American speakers tend to use direct refusal techniques preceded by feelings of regret (Al-Eryani, 2005). Finally, in a cross-cultural study of Korean and American speakers, Hahn and Hatfield (2011) examined how the face of a third party, neither the speaker nor the hearer, is managed in interactions through apology behavior. Findings revealed that even though both Koreans and Americans apologized, overall, in similar situations, there were differences regarding the specific situations in each nation.

2.3 Gender and politeness in the second/foreign language context

Lakoff (1975) argued that women identify themselves in terms of the men they are related to and that women tend to use more indirect requests, apologies, and qualifiers than men. Lakoff’s work was criticized for over-generalizing anecdotal evidence from primarily Anglo middle-class Western women to women across cultures (Mills, 2003). Nevertheless, even though gender is considered an important factor influencing speakers’ and listeners’ use and interpretation of linguistic politeness strategies (Cordella, 1991; Ide, 1992; Mills, 2003, 2004, 2005), little research has specifically addressed gender and politeness in the second or foreign language setting. As the following review will reveal, there is an obvious gap in the literature related to gender and politeness studies across different cultures.

A few studies have investigated gender and politeness in the Japanese context. For instance, Ide (1992) investigated the phenomenon of politer speech among Japanese women than among Japanese men. Based on a survey of 256 men and 271 women, middle-class parents of college students at a college in Tokyo, the author concluded that gender differences in language are the result of the duplex indexing functions of deference and demeanor, two behaviors characterizing politeness in this context. Also in Japan, Smith (1992) examined the linguistic practices of Japanese men and women giving directions and explained gender differences in terms of both a general theory of politeness as well as the culturally specific strategies for encoding politeness and authority in Japanese. In a more recent study, Saito (2010) explored seven Japanese male workplace superiors’ linguistic practices, particularly their use of directive speech acts. Findings revealed that the gender of the speaker, in addition to various contextual factors, plays a role in the choice of the directive form chosen and that actual practice is not always consistent with gender stereotypes.

In the Latin American context, Cordella (1991) and Brown (1990) investigated gender and politeness in Chile and Mexico, respectively. Cordella examined apologizing in English among Chileans and Australians and concluded

that positive politeness strategies are more frequently used in Spanish than English and that the gender of both speaker and listener should be considered. In addition, Brown examined interactional details of a court case in the Mexican community of Tenejapa and compared them with the characteristics of social interaction typical in that society. Findings revealed that the particular context of the courtroom allowed direct face-to-face confrontation that is not acceptable in other contexts in the same society and transformed gender meanings.

Even though gender differences related to linguistic and academic politeness across the various countries in the Arab world are obviously worth investigating, only a few studies, set in Jordan, have addressed gender and politeness in the Arab context: Farghal and Al-Khatib's (2001) study of compliment responses made by Jordanian college students, Bataineh and Bataineh's (2006) analysis of Jordanian EFL university students' apologies, and Manasrah and Al-Delaimi's (2008) investigation of politeness in the requests made by 30 undergraduate Jordanian students. Based on their analyses of 268 responses, Farghal and Al-Khatib concluded that gender is an important factor influencing the formulation and acceptance or rejection of a compliment. Moreover, Bataineh and Bataineh analyzed Jordanian EFL university students' apologies and found that there were differences between the male and female students in the order of the primary strategies used; females chose avoidance strategies while males tended to use strategies that blamed the victim. Manasrah and Al-Delaimi's (2008) study discussed cultural implications related to request behaviors and the impact of gender on the choice of strategy.

Due to this limited research on politeness in academic settings and between the genders especially in the Arab world, the researchers were motivated to do rigorous research at one American affiliated university in Lebanon.

3. Problem

At the university where the present study is undertaken, an increasing number of students are being viewed as exhibiting impolite behavior in the classroom, males more so, in the required general education (GE) courses. All students need to take 34 credits of GE courses (a credit is equal to one hour of instruction per week over a 15 week semester). Courses range from one to four credits. Out of these 34 credits, 13 credits are required: English language, Arabic, moral reasoning, sports, and basic health. The other 21 credits are to be selected by the students from among courses dealing with the arts, social sciences, humanities, literature and sciences. Students often report that they find the GE courses irrelevant to their major and thus do not take them seriously. Teachers report that it has been difficult to manage these classes and enforce disciplinary measures and more especially the males. Students, on the other hand, complain that they are not treated fairly and do not have opportunities to explain to teachers their complaints. Among the main teacher complaints are how students come to class late and begin to talk to the students next to them while the teacher is trying to give a lecture, call out answers to questions without raising their hands, constantly interrupt the teacher with irrelevant or trivial questions, give inappropriate remarks to both teacher and other students, address the teacher informally, walk out of the class before it is completed, and play with things such as mobile phones and the like. Although teachers often reprimand these students, issue warnings, or refer them to the office concerned, the 'impoliteness' continues and teachers become more frustrated as it is negatively affecting the teaching/learning process (personal communication with teachers and students). This situation in the GE courses at the university motivated the study.

4. Aim and Significance

The aim of the present study is to examine how students react according to gender to different GE classroom situations. This is important in order to obtain rigorous results to the continual complaints of GE teachers that students of late have become very impolite in their classroom behavior not only with their teachers but also with their peers. Specifically, the study attempts to answer the following research questions.

1. To what extent do the genders differ in their reaction (operationalized as degrees in politeness) to classroom situations in the general education courses?
2. To what extent do the genders differ according to year in their reaction (operationalized as degrees in politeness) to classroom situations in the general education courses?

5. Method

5.1 Context

The study is carried out at one English medium American affiliated university in Lebanon. Students need to pass a standardized English entrance exam to begin their selected discipline. Ninety percent of the students are L1 Arabic speakers and have completed their pre-university studies in either French (70%) and/or English (30%). Thus students are bi or multi-lingual studying in the medium of English. There are also students from many parts of the Arab world, Europe, England and USA. The discipline culture of the Lebanese schools in both private and

public (governmental) is strict in that students listen in class to the teacher and normally do not ask questions or interact in group work. However, recently with the new National curriculum that has been put in place since 1994, students in both types of schools have been exposed to group learning and student centered classrooms. Some teachers find difficulty in adapting to this new culture of learning and often face disciplinary problems. Boys, as is the case in the society, are treated as 'superior' to girls and given many advantages. Males will eventually carry the family name, continue their higher education, get good jobs to support their family and look after their parents in old age. Girls are raised to be more disciplined and obey their parents and teachers without fuss. When boys attend university, some find it difficult to adapt to a learning culture which treats boys and girls equally, and thus their concept of what is polite may conflict with that of the university's.

Most of the teachers although of Lebanese origin, have attended American universities and are familiar with the code of ethics in the classroom in turn taking, speaking out of turn, giving polite remarks and so forth. Thus, for them, they find their students exhibiting impolite behavior.

The method used in the present study is in line with recent researchers who advocate the significance of analyzing discourse and the practice in the community more than just the speaker him/herself in studying politeness (Locher, 2006; Locher and Watts, 2005; Mills, 2003; Watts et. al 2005).

5.2 Participants

The participants are students attending general education classes. All students are attending an English composition course and some students one other general education class from the elective group (e.g. history, music, cultural studies) as well as other courses in their majors. Tables 1 and 2 below indicate the sample.

<Insert Table 1 here>

It is noted in Table 2 that the gender samples were almost similar in number although the females were 10% more than males which is representative at the university in this study.

<Insert Table 2 here>

As indicated in Table 3, most of the sample are in the first years amounting to 72%. This is because some students opt to leave the university or have to leave due to their unsatisfactory performance along the path. Graduate students are fewer than undergraduates at the university as not as many opt to continue their studies at the university, some pursuing their careers or higher studies abroad. Although the graduate students are not attending GE courses, the researchers found it worthwhile to include them in the study in order to have some comparison with students who are finally not taking GE courses. It was not possible to find a sample of undergraduate students not enrolled in GE courses for this purpose as undergraduates often do not take the GE courses in one year but spread them out over their three undergraduate years.

<Insert Table 3 here>

Table 3 shows that again the females outnumber males but not significantly. Thus the sample is considered a representative one for the validity of the results.

5.3 Instruments

The 25 survey questions were on five classroom situations which were adapted on typical student and teacher behaviors as reported by the teachers (Appendix A). Students reacted to different types of behavior as described on a likert scale of 1-4 indicating least polite to most polite behavior. Alongside this was a discourse completion test (DCT) that asked a focus group of students to respond to the five situations by answering a question after each one (Appendix B). Ethical issues were considered through informed consent, anonymity, confidentiality and voluntary participation in both the survey and interview.

The T-Statistical Test for Independent samples was used to find any difference between the genders at a two-tailed significance level of $p = \text{less than } 0.5$. The non-parametric Kruskal Wallis statistical test for independent samples was used to investigate any differences among the five university years in which the students were enrolled and according to gender. Qualitative descriptive analysis of the semi-structured interviews was done on the students' comments in order to find any thematic differences between the genders and any correlation with the survey results.

5.4 Procedure

In the middle of a semester at the time of the study, we chose at random five teachers instructing general education classes at the university and two teachers instructing graduate courses to distribute the surveys (GE courses $N=750$; Graduate courses $N=50$) to their students in their respective classes. They all agreed. The

teachers assured their students that filling in the questionnaire was on a voluntary basis, no names were required and that it would require only 7 minutes of their time at the end of the class. There was a total survey return rate of 67.25% (N=538). The Discourse Completion Test (DCT) consisting of the five situations were responded to by a random sample of students from these classes. The objective behind the DCT was to document students' feedback regarding politeness/impoliteness acts in the university classroom. Seventy DCTs were distributed with a return rate of 74.28% (Total N=52; GE 48, Graduate 5) from 6 males (age 20-22) and 42 females (32: age 18-22; 10: age 24-38).

6. Results and Discussion

Main results are reported and discussed according to the five situations on the survey. Any significant results will be reported according to a comparison between the genders.

6.1 Situation 1: This focused on a student coming late to class and what ensued in the classroom as a result. Students react to seven types of behavior. Results are shown in Tables 4 and 5.

P1. You come in late and walk silently to your seat.

More than 80% of males and females and in all years found this behavior very polite with females finding it more so with a mean of 3.1280, but there was no significant differences ($p=0.699$) between the genders. All the females on the DCT mentioned that they would apologize and sit quietly. The students are aware that tardiness is looked upon unfavorably at the university which should be continuously reinforced by teachers as it institutes discipline and mutual classroom respect.

P2. You sit quietly in your seat and then talk to your friend.

In contrast, approximately 70% of both genders in all the years found this behavior impolite with females more so with a mean of 2.0966. There were no significant differences ($p=0.332$) between the genders. The student was talking out of turn, which is not tolerated at the university, but it is surprising that 75% of the graduate males found this action polite with only one male student commenting in the DCT, "good work man". Teachers need to include in their syllabi and orient students to the importance of being on time and listening respectfully to others, the teacher in this case.

P3. The teacher looks at you and you keep talking.

Approximately 80% of both genders found this behavior very impolite with females finding it significantly ($p=0.025$) more impolite. However, only a little over half of the seniors (59%) and half of the graduates (50%) male students found this behavior very impolite. Again, the older males do not find the behavior as impolite as the females do. Again, even though a small percent find no problem with this behavior, a consistent class policy should be given and implemented.

P4. Then you ask the teacher "What are we doing today?"

Females found this significantly ($p=0.032$) more impolite than the males did with a little over a two third percent of both males and females finding it so in all years. Again, the graduate males, 12.5%, did not find the behavior as impolite as the females did in all years. Again, clear classroom speaking out of turn and the type of permitted remarks made should be made specific.

P5. The teacher does not answer you.

Males found this teacher behavior more impolite than females did but the difference was not significant ($p=0.063$) with students in the early years finding it more impolite than those in higher classes. Teachers should be aware that young boys expect the teacher to give them attention which is probably a result of the attention that parents give to boys over girls in the community.

P6. Then a student calls out that you are disturbing the class.

Again, males found this behavior more impolite than females did, but the difference was not significant ($p=0.288$). This confirms the cultural practice where the demands of boys are normally attended to. All years found this behavior impolite, but nearly 90% of the male graduates found the behavior very impolite. Probably males do not accept their peers to tell them what to do which again is a reflection of the culture where parents rarely reprimand their sons.

P7. You focus on what the teacher is explaining.

Above two third percentage of the females and males found this very polite behavior and in all years, but the females more so; differences were significant ($p=0.006$). One male senior student would ignore the teacher's remarks; two older graduate female students 35 and 38 years old would confront the teacher and the others

would try to sit quietly and find out what was going on by themselves, asking a friend or checking with the teacher after class.

The DCT comments showed that all the males and females would either apologize to the teacher and/or sit quietly. Three comments are interesting to note. One 20 year old female said:

I don't let the student disturb the class. The first time I looked at him he should understand. In the second time, I will say his name and let him share with us what he's talking about and when he asks me about what we were talking about I will discuss his impoliteness with the class. I think he'll be shy or get out, simply.

Findings also indicate that older male students are shown to be more confrontational than the younger ones who find it proper and polite to apologize and remain quiet.

Calm down, I have to know what's going on

I would explain the reason that made me come late, but would say that it is not your business to say that I'm disturbing the class

<Insert Tables 4 and 5 here>

Discussion: It seems that the females in both the survey and the DCT found more impolite behaviors in situation 1 than the males did which confirms research (Manasrah and Al-Delaimi 2008) that culture impacts the gender strategies. This also reflects teachers' reports in the staff room that females are politer than males, a cultural related factor and confirms Fukuya's (2002) and White's (1989) studies in that politeness strategies are influenced by cultural practices. It also confirms research that Ide (1992) carried out on gender showing that females are politer than boys.

6.2 Situation 2: This focused on turn taking in answering questions in the classroom. Students react to four types of behavior. Results are shown in Tables 6 and 7.

P8. The teacher asks the class a question and you raise your hand.

Over 90% of the males and females find this behavior very polite with females more so (mean: 3.6621) and in all years, but the difference between the genders was not significant ($p=0.134$). It is interesting that more Freshman males found raising hands politer (91.2%) than females did (80%).

P9. A student calls out the answer.

A little over two thirds of both males and females found talking out of turn very impolite, but the difference was not significant ($p=0.430$). Interestingly again, a higher percentage of Freshman males found the behavior very impolite. As in behavior 8, Freshman males seem to be 'breaking the practice' as it is thought that females respect turn taking more than males. A possible explanation could be that the Freshman females are eager to excel and compete in order to prove to their teachers (as they do with their parents) they are good students, a familiar behavior in the community.

P10. The teacher asks the student to raise her/his hand.

Over 80% of both males and females and in all years view the teacher's request as very polite, but the females significantly more so ($p=0.002$) with a mean of 3.4530. It is not surprising that under a third of the students view the request as impolite. This practice is not reinforced in the community when youngsters want to give their opinions; in fact at meals, social discussions and so forth speakers interrupt others and often do not give cues that they would like to speak.

P11. You tell the student to stop calling out the answer.

Although females find this behavior more impolite (2.3042) than do males (2.3566), the results are not significant with both genders in all years divided whether the behavior is polite or not as indicated in Table 7. These are interesting results as it is not considered 'usual' practice in the community for peers to discipline one another; this is the parents' role or in the university context, the teacher's.

In reaction to this behavior on the DCT, most of the students said that they would ignore the behavior and do nothing. Ten female students added that it was the teacher's duty and that the teacher is in control. Eight female and three male students commented that the student should raise his/her hand to take turns and show respect to the teacher. Three female students commented that they would smile, feel tense or stare at the 'impolite' students. Two comments were interesting: the 38 year old graduate female said 'Next time you will be grounded' and a 23 male student said "Good work man".

<Insert Tables 6 and 7 here>

Discussion

It seems that both females and males in all years in situation 2 find turn taking important although they are divided on whether to consider it polite or impolite behavior as it does not reflect the practice in the community.

6.3 Situation 3: This situation focused on students not paying attention to the class lecture due to talking among themselves, a behavior that is considered at the university disruptive in many classes. Students responded to four types of behavior. Results are shown in Tables 8 and 9.

P12. A few of the students start talking among themselves.

This behavior was found to be significantly ($p=0.043$) more impolite by the females than the males although both genders found it to be very impolite and in all years. It is interesting, however, that only 50% of the male graduates found this behavior impolite.

P13. The teacher asks the students to leave the class.

Females find the teacher's reaction politer (2.6399) than the males do (2.5388), and in all years, but not significantly ($p=0.205$).

P14. The teacher lectures the students on paying attention.

Females find it significantly ($p=0.015$) very polite behavior (3.0976) to lecture the students on paying attention, while the boys not as much. The Freshman and graduate males found the behavior impolite more than the females. Again boys normally do not like to be lectured

P15. One student tells the teacher to continue the class lecture.

Both males and females do not think this is polite behavior, and any differences were not significant ($p=0.844$). The percentage of males and females in all years are almost equal. It is noted that 40% of the female graduates, higher than the male graduates and other students' in all years, found the teacher's behavior most impolite.

<Insert Tables 8 and 9 here>

Discussion

In situation 3, both genders know that talking amongst themselves in class is impolite, but when repeatedly told to stop many continue. This is common practice in the community where talking is the daily habit of socializing with friends even if there are other tasks to be attended to which, unfortunately, is carried over to the classroom. In general, females expect to be reprimanded and thus find the teacher telling the noisy students to leave the class a normal reaction, while the boys normally do not like to be reproached. In fact, the male graduates were divided in their responses.

Most of the comments on the DCT stated that the students would sit silently, listen, do nothing and pay attention. Some did, however, comment that giving assignments to the whole class was not a fair reaction, disciplining the students in class was embarrassing and should be done alone after class, and lecturing all the students is unfair.

One graduate 38 year old female commented: "Why are you lecturing us, you have to speak to those who were talking." Another 20 year old female commented: "She shouldn't tell them pay attention because she will lose their attention in this way. She must attract their attention with other instructional rules." This confirms Manasrah & Al-Delaimi's (2008) study which discussed the impact of cultural gender aspects on politeness strategies.

6.4 Situation 4: This situation focuses on how the teacher deals with the talkative students. The students responded to six types of behavior. The results are shown in Tables 10 and 11.

P16. The teacher continues the lecture.

This behavior was found to be very polite by both the females (3.3194) and males (3.0861) in all years with the females significantly more so ($p=0.003$). No female graduates viewed the behavior as impolite, while male graduates did.

P17. There is a lot of talking in the class.

Only a third percent of the males from the junior to the graduate years and a lower percent of 6-17% of the females found this behavior polite. On the whole, female students (1.5017) found this behavior to be significantly impolite ($p=0.002$) when compared to the views of the male students.

P18. The teacher continues the lecture.

The female students found this behavior significantly ($p=0.008$) politer (2.7308) than the males did (2.4938) with a higher percentages of males in each of the years finding the behavior less polite than females.

P19. The teacher asks the talkative students to meet with her alone.

Both males (3.250) and females (3.3924) find this behavior to be polite with no significant difference ($p=0.064$). A higher percentage of male graduates find the teacher's behavior impolite again probably due to their idea that they should not be reprimanded for something they believe is not a problem.

P20. The teacher dismisses the class giving them an assignment.

The female students significantly ($p=0.030$) view this behavior as politer (2.8070) than do the males (2.6214) in all years with a higher percentage of male graduates viewing this behavior as quite impolite. Again, females seem to be more sensitive than the males to interpersonal relations with their teachers than the males do confirming the research in the field.

P21. The late student in situation 1.apologizes privately for being late.

There were no significant differences ($p=0.360$) between males and females viewing this behavior as very polite. A very small percentage of students, male and female and in all years, view this behavior as impolite, but none of the senior students did. Apologizing for bad behavior in this situation seems to meet with most students' approval. This reaction is counter to the research done by Bataineh and Bataineh (2008) which found differences between the genders in L1 Arabic Jordanian university apology strategies – males being more aggressive and blaming the student.

<Insert Tables 10 and 11 here>

Discussion:

It seems that the authority of the teacher is paramount in situation 4 where the teacher disciplines the class for talking out of turn. This is acceptable due to the practice in schools where teachers are viewed as authority figures, and their management of classroom behavior is not questioned.

Most of the females commented on the DCT that they would do nothing and follow the teacher's instructions. However, some females did comment on the unfairness of the teacher with more senior males than others viewing the teacher's reprimands and assignments unfair. On the whole, both females and males were divided on the teacher's actions as typical reports show below.

Do nothing (Most of the females)

Do not interfere. It is the teacher's job and duty F 19

It is unfair F 20 years

Will not do assignment F 20

We are not responsible for students talking in class. Could we leave with no assignment F 20

Tell teacher to stop teaching and send them to detention F20

Not right to punish the whole class F20

Not fair to dismiss whole class F 20

I am not responsible M 20

No it is her call M 20

Blame teacher for blaming innocent students M21

6.5 Situation 5: This situation focuses on the reaction of the students to the teacher's treatment. Students responded to four types of behavior. The results are shown in Tables 12 and 13.

P22. A student tells the teacher that she should be stricter.

Females significantly ($p=0.041$) found this student's behavior more impolite (1.9965) than the males did (2.625). Interesting, and perhaps not surprising, the senior and graduate males found this student's behavior to be polite in contrast to their female counterparts.

P23. The teacher answers that this is not the students' business.

Although the females found the student impolite in telling the teacher to be stricter, they did not find the teacher telling the student that it was not his/her business polite (2.5088) and more so the males (2.4959). Gender differences were insignificant ($p=0.889$). Both males and females in all years also found this behavior to be more impolite than polite.

P24. A few students complain to the teacher about other students.

Again, both females (2.3217) and males (2.3058) found the students complaining about their colleagues as impolite with no significant differences (0.841) although the females found it more impolite than the males.

P25. The teacher listens attentively and says she will investigate.

More females (3.1425) approved of the teacher's follow up than the males (3.0857) though any differences were insignificant ($p=0.504$). Also, both males and females felt the same way in all the years.

<Insert Tables 12 and 13 here>

Discussion

In situation 5, both females and males do not approve of their colleagues complaining. This is part of social practice where students normally defend and support one another in times of crisis. A few of the comments of the males show their disapproval of the teacher's action.

I am not responsible M20

Semi polite M20

Two older graduate females commented

Not polite – The teacher's judgment is biased F Graduate 38

Not polite – The teacher should control the class F Graduate 29

7. Recommendations

Recommendations for EFL classroom management are made according to the main results. The first main result that there is no consensus on the politeness of the behaviors as indicated through the surveys and the DCT needs to be addressed by the teaching staff of the general university required courses through orientation program to the entering students on interpersonal interaction in the classroom in the context of the university. This could be followed by up in the classrooms through relevant readings and assignments.

A second main finding that the younger females favored strategies of turn taking, collaboration, supporting the teacher, and contributing to the class interaction, while the males, especially in the upper years, and graduates exhibited a more defiant stance as shown in their discourse which the authors contribute to social practices indicates that there are different societal attitudes towards the genders. Raising students awareness through direct means of what is expected in classroom exchanges is needed. This could be done through scenarios, simulations, debates and the like. Specifically, in the public speaking courses, required of all students, more emphasis should be placed on turn taking and listening strategies. Group work would be an excellent way of dividing work load and learning strategies of working with others.

A third result that of males and females in the upper years being consistently against what most would consider impolite in a classroom setting, needs to be addressed through simulations of interactions that being 'older' does not imply being 'right'. The university should stress the code of ethics to be followed which would clarify acceptable behavior and override any influence from the culture where older students are respected even though they might be 'wrong'. This confirms research in the field by Fukuya (2002) who claimed that politeness is context-bound and classroom settings have unique characteristics. Again, rules and regulations related to class management need to be stressed. Students who do not mind these should be talked to in private as well as take part in 'anger management' courses and the like. All in all, what is considered polite and impolite in the EFL context must not be taken for granted nor presumed that the students understand the 'proper' way to act and react in multilingual/multicultural classrooms such as those in Lebanon and in the institution in this study. It must be dealt with which is a great challenge that both program administrators and teachers should undertake for better communicative classroom dynamics. What is happening at present is that many students do not understand why they are being reprimanded for their behavior (personal communication with students and faculty) which often causes resentment, demotivation and poor work on the part of the student and anger, disappointment and negativism on the part of the teacher. The solution, that is, of raising awareness is a 'simple' matter, but do we understand the factors related to the problem? It is hoped that this research will raise this awareness, the possible causes and some solutions.

8. Conclusion

Since Brown and Levinson's (1987) dichotomy of politeness, researchers have posited that more than the speaker should be considered. Discourse and culture are a few of the dynamics at work and influence the speakers' perception of what is considered polite as well as impolite (Locher, 2006; Locher and Watts, 2005;

Mills, 2003; Watts et al., 2005). Furthermore, what is considered polite cannot be discussed without that which is considered impolite.

Motivated out of a need to rigorously study what students consider polite behavior in the classroom in order to contribute to better classroom management and taking into consideration the research in the field, this study has attempted to investigate the reactions of males and females in a university academic setting and to what degree they find certain typical classroom situations polite. Through a survey and a DCT it was found that genders react differently, based on community practice, to certain situations and discourse and the 'blame' so to speak, is quite a complex issue involving many times multiple factors.

While the results of the present study cannot be generalized as constraints at the time in obtaining teacher input these preliminary results indicate that politeness is related to discourse and culture. What might be polite in one situation and in one culture might not be so in another. This has important implications for raising teacher awareness and orientating students, and "reframing their linguistic politeness" as Brown (2010) puts it when they join a university. Rules and regulations need to be explained in the context of the country's culture as well as the university context, and also specifically as to each teacher's conception so that misunderstanding on both the part of the teacher and the student is avoided for a more effective teaching/learning environment.

Future research is needed on politeness strategies in different cultural contexts in multicultural/lingual classrooms in a variety of majors. Further, studies on the effects of orienting students to the academic politeness of the classroom in foreign language contexts would greatly help teachers in their classroom management strategies as part of their continual professional development. Discourse analysis of politeness strategies would also show how different students react to various considered "im/polite" classroom behavior. In our opening story, it might have been "politer" for the teacher to continue introducing the course and talk another time to the student who had "impolitely" left the classroom. But, then again, one might argue that this depends upon the context and culture.

References

- Al Eryani, A. (2004). Refusal strategies by Yemini EFL learners. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 9 (2), 19-34.
- Bataineh, R. & Bataineh, R. (2006). Apology strategies of Jordanian EFL university students. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 38, 1901-1927. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2005.11.004>
- Bell, D., Arnold, H. & Haddock, R. (2009). Linguistic politeness and peer tutoring. *Learning Assistance Review*, 14 (1), 37-54.
- Brown, L. (2010). Politeness and second language learning: the case of Korean speech styles. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 6, 243-169.
- Brown, P. (1990). Gender, politeness, and confrontation in Tenejapa. *Discourse Processes*, 13(1), 123-41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01638539009544749>
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chang, Y. (2011). Refusing in a foreign language: An investigation of problems encountered by Chinese learners of English. *Multilingua: Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication*, 30(1), 71-98. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/mult.2011.004>
- Cordella, M. (1991). Spanish speakers apologizing in English: A cross-cultural pragmatic study. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 14 (2), 115-38.
- Dunleavy, K. N., Martin, M., Brann, M. Booth-Butterfield, M., Myers, S. & Weber, K. (2008). Student nagging behavior in the college classroom. *Communication Education*, 57 (1), 1-19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634520701678679>
- Ebsworth, M. & Kodama, N. (2011). The pragmatics of refusals in English and Japanese: Alternative approaches to negotiation. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 208, 95-117. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/IJSL.2011.014>
- Farghal, M. & Al-Khatib, M. (2001). Jordanian college students' responses to compliments: A pilot study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33 (9), 1485-1502. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(01\)00006-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(01)00006-6)
- Fukuya, Y. (2002). *The concept of academic politeness in a multicultural university classroom*. University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday.

- Hahn, J. & Hatfield, H. (2011). Group face in Korea and the United States: Taking responsibility for the individual and the group. *Multilingua*, 30 (1), 25-70. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/mult.2011.003>
- Hong, W. (2008). Effects of cultural background of college students on apology strategies. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 189, 149–163. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/IJSL.2008.007>
- Ide, S. (1992). Gender and function of language use: Quantitative and qualitative evidence from Japanese. *Pragmatics and Language Learning*, 3, 117–129.
- Johnson, D., Roloff, M. & Riffe, M. (2004). Politeness theory and refusals of requests: face threat as a function of expressed obstacles. *Communication Studies*, 55 (2), 227–238. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10510970409388616>
- Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and women's place*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Locher, M. (2006). Polite behavior within relational work: the discursive approach to politeness. *Multilingua*, 25, 249–267. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/MULTI.2006.015>
- Locher, M. & Watts, R. (2005). Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 1 (1), 9-33.
- Manasrah, M. & Al-Delaimi, Z. (2008). Politeness in request strategies used by native speakers of Jordanian Arabic at Irbid National University. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 34(1), 169-186.
- Mao, R. (1994). Beyond politeness theory: "Face" revisited and renewed. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 21(5), 451-486. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(94\)90025-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(94)90025-6)
- Meier, A. (1997). Teaching the universals of politeness. *ELT Journal*, 51 (1), 21-28.
- Mills, S. (2003). *Gender and politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511615238>
- Mills, S. (2004). Class, gender and politeness *Multilingua*, 23, 171–190. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/mult.2004.004>
- Sabee, C. & Wilson, S. (2005). Students' primary goals, attributions, and facework during conversation about disappointing grades. *Communication Education*, 54 (3), 185–204. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634520500356154>
- Saeko, F. (1996). Request strategies in British English and Japanese. *Language Sciences*, 18 (3), 671-88. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0388-0001\(96\)00041-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0388-0001(96)00041-1)
- Saito, J. (2010). *Gender and linguistic ideology: A re-examination of directive usage by Japanese male superiors in the workplace*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Hawai'i at Manoa, USA.
- Smith, J. (1992). Women in charge: Politeness and directives in the speech of Japanese women. *Language in Society*, 21 (1), 59-82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500015037>
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (2008). Face, (im)politeness and rapport. In H. Spencer-Oatey (Ed.), *Culturally speaking: Culture, communication and politeness theory* (pp. 11 – 47). London: Continuum.
- Suh, J. (1999). Pragmatic perception of politeness in requests by Korean learners of English as a second language. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37 (3), 195-214. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/iral.1999.37.3.195>
- Watts, R., Ide, S. & Ehlich, K. (2005). *Politeness in language* (2nded.). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- White, J. (1989). The power of politeness in the classroom: cultural codes that create and constrain knowledge construction. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 4 (4), 298–321.
- Wilson, S., Aleman, C. & Leatham, G. (1998). Identity implications of influence goals: A revised analysis of face-threatening acts and application to seeking compliance with same-sex friends. *Human Communication Research*, 25, 55–62. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1998.tb00437.x>
- Xie, C., He, Z. & Lin, D. (2005). Politeness: Myth and truth. *Studies in Language*, 29 (2), 431-461. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/sl.29.2.07xie>

Appendix A. Student Survey on Politeness in the Classroom

Directions: The information is part of some research into communication in the English classroom and be will be kept confidential. Do not write your name. This is filled out on a voluntarily basis. Thank you.

Male _____ Female _____ Nationality Lebanese _____ Other _____ Specify _____
 English educated _____ French educated _____ Other _____
 Freshman _____ Sophomore _____ Junior _____ Senior _____ Graduate _____

You are taking a course in your major. Comment by circling the number of your choice with 4 being the most polite behavior in your opinion.

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|-----|
| 1. You come in late and walk silently to your seat. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. You sit quietly in your seat and then talk to your friend. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. The teacher looks at you and you keep talking. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Then you ask the teacher "What are we doing today?" | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. The teacher does not answer you. | | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 6. Then a student calls out that you are disturbing the class. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. You focus on what the teacher is explaining. | | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 8. The teacher asks the class a question and you raise your hand. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. A student calls out the answer. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10. The teacher asks the student to raise her/his hand. | | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 11. You tell the student to stop calling out the answer. | | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 12. A few of the students start talking among themselves. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 13. The teacher asks the students to leave the class. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14. The teacher lectures the students on paying attention. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 15. One student tells the teacher to continue the class lecture. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 16. The teacher continues the lecture. | | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 17. There is a lot of talking in the class. | | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 18. The teacher continues the lecture. | | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 19. The teacher asks the talkative students to meet with her alone. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 20. The teacher dismisses the class giving them an assignment. | | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 21. The late student in 1. apologizes privately for being late. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 22. A student tells the teacher that she should be stricter. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 23. The teacher answers that this is not the students' business. | | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |
| 24. A few students complain to the teacher about other students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 25. The teacher listens attentively and says she will investigate. | | 1 | 2 | 3 4 |

Appendix B. Discourse Completion Tests on Classroom Politeness Situations

Gender: M _____ F _____ Age: _____ Major: _____
 Year in university: Freshman _____ Sophomore _____ Junior _____ Senior _____

HOW POLITE ARE YOU?

According to Questions 1 to 7 on the survey

What do you do?

According to Questions 8 to 11 on the survey

What would you say to the student?

According to Questions 12 to 15 on the survey

What do you tell the teacher?

According to Questions 16 to 21 on the survey

What do you tell the teacher?

According to Questions 22 to 25 on the survey

Do you agree with the teacher's reaction and how polite is it?

Table 1. Sample by Gender

	N	Percentage
Males	248	46.1
Females	290	53.9
Total	538	100

Table 2. Sample by Year

	N	Percentage
Freshman	74	13.8
Sophomore	312	58.2
Junior	57	10.6
Senior	70	13.1
Graduates	23	4.3
Total	536	100

Table 3. Sample by Gender and Year

Gender	Class				
	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate
	N	N	N	N	N
Males	34	154	19	32	8
Females	40	158	36	38	15

Table 4. Mean Politeness by Gender

	Gender	Mean	St. Deviation	Sig. 2 tailed
P1	M	3.0976	.89365	0.699
	F	3.1280	.92094	
P2	M	2.1169	.88076	0.332
	F	2.0966	.87901	
P3	M	1.5565*	1.03621	0.025*
	F	1.3690*	.89505	
P4	M	1.9476	.97814	0.032*
	F	1.7666	.96686	
P5	M	1.9595	.99510	0.063
	F	2.1228	1.02212	
P6	M	1.9712	.93331	0.288
	F	2.0554	.88803	
P7	M	3.5837*	.71154	0.006*
	F	3.7491*	.66883	

*P = less than 0.05

Table 5. Percentage of Gender Reactions According to Year on Situation 1

		Freshman		Sophomore		Junior		Senior		Graduate	
		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
P1	MP	33.3	47.5	37.9	42.7	31.6	41.7	50.0	44.7	50.0	33.3
	P	48.5	30.0	38.6	28.7	47.4	41.7	25.0	36.8	37.5	60.0
	I	15.2	17.5	15.7	21.0	15.8	8.3	21.9	13.2	.0	6.7
	MI	3.0	5.0	7.8	7.6	5.3	8.3	3.1	5.3	12.5	.0
P2	MP	8.8	2.5	6.5	8.9	5.3	5.6	6.3	5.3	25.0	6.7
	P	20.6	32.5	19.5	22.8	21.1	11.1	40.6	26.3	50.0	20.0
	I	44.1	40.0	48.1	41.1	42.1	50.0	25.0	34.2	12.5	66.7
	MI	26.5	25.0	26.0	27.2	31.6	33.3	28.1	34.2	12.5	6.7
P3	MP	14.7	12.5	9.1	8.2	21.1	5.6	15.6	5.3	25.0	.0
	P	2.9	2.5	4.5	2.5	10.5	5.6	6.3	7.9	.0	.0
	I	2.9	2.5	9.1	5.7	5.3	5.6	18.8	5.3	25.0	6.7
	MI	79.4	82.5	77.3	83.5	63.2	83.3	59.4	81.6	50.0	93.3
P4	MP	11.8	22.5	6.5	7.7	21.1	8.3	12.5	5.4	25.0	.0
	P	20.6	15.0	14.9	9.6	10.5	5.6	18.8	13.5	25.0	6.7
	I	23.5	20.0	37.7	30.8	21.1	30.6	34.4	29.7	12.5	26.7
	MI	44.1	42.5	40.9	51.9	47.4	55.6	34.4	51.4	37.5	66.7
P5	MP	8.8	12.8	8.4	8.4	15.8	16.7	12.9	16.2	.0	13.3
	P	20.6	15.4	18.2	27.1	31.6	27.8	16.1	27.0	25.0	26.7
	I	32.4	23.1	29.9	29.0	31.6	25.0	22.6	32.4	25.0	26.7
	MI	38.2	48.7	43.5	35.5	21.1	30.6	48.4	24.3	50.0	33.3
P6	MP	3.0	2.5	9.9	7.6	15.8	8.3	3.2	7.9	.0	.0
	P	21.2	22.5	15.2	22.9	26.3	16.7	19.4	21.1	12.5	33.3
	I	48.5	25.0	36.4	43.9	42.1	52.8	41.9	36.8	.0	33.3
	MI	27.3	50.0	38.4	25.5	15.8	22.2	35.5	34.2	87.5	33.3
P7	MP	79.4	71.8	70.2	86.5	57.9	75.0	62.5	92.1	50.0	93.3
	P	11.8	15.4	22.5	9.6	31.6	19.4	28.1	5.3	37.5	.0
	I	2.9	2.6	6.0	1.3	5.3	.0	6.3	.0	12.5	6.7
	MI	5.9	10.3	1.3	2.6	5.3	5.6	3.1	2.6	.0	.0

Table 6. Mean Politeness by Gender

	Gender	Mean	St. Deviation	Sig. 2 tailed
P8	M	3.5633	.78997	0.134
	F	3.6621	.73207	
P9	M	2.0732	.90955	0.430
	F	2.1349	.89314	
P10	M	3.2204*	.89190	0.002*
	F	3.4530*	.79138	
P11	M	2.3566	.97284	0.517
	F	2.3042	.88364	

P=less than .05

Table 7. Percentage of Gender Reactions According to Year on Situation 2

		Freshman		Sophomore		Junior		Senior		Graduate	
		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
P8	MP	82.4	65.0	71.7	81.0	68.4	69.4	71.9	89.5	28.6	86.7
	P	8.8	15.0	17.1	10.8	15.8	19.4	15.6	10.5	28.6	.0
	I	5.9	12.5	7.2	5.1	10.5	8.3	12.5	.0	42.9	13.3
	MI	2.9	7.5	3.9	3.2	5.3	2.8	.0	.0	.0	.0
P9	MP	.0	10.0	7.2	10.2	15.8	5.6	6.3	5.3	12.5	6.7
	P	23.5	25.0	24.3	21.7	15.8	22.2	37.5	21.1	.0	13.3
	I	32.4	42.5	35.5	43.3	47.4	58.3	43.8	42.1	50.0	40.0
	MI	44.1	22.5	32.9	24.8	21.1	13.9	12.5	31.6	37.5	40.0
P10	MP	44.1	51.3	45.0	61.8	52.6	62.9	62.5	57.9	25.0	86.7
	P	41.2	30.8	33.1	25.5	42.1	25.7	25.0	28.9	37.5	.0
	I	5.9	10.3	16.6	10.8	5.3	8.6	6.3	10.5	12.5	13.3
	MI	8.8	7.7	5.3	1.9	.0	2.9	6.3	2.6	25.0	.0
P11	MP	18.2	17.9	13.2	8.3	5.3	.0	12.5	13.5	37.5	6.7
	P	30.3	17.9	31.1	32.1	15.8	41.7	34.4	24.3	.0	40.0
	I	30.3	41.0	35.1	39.1	36.8	38.9	37.5	51.4	37.5	46.7
	MI	21.2	23.1	20.5	20.5	42.1	19.4	15.6	10.8	25.0	6.7

Table 8. Mean Politeness by Gender

	Gender	Mean	St. Deviation	Sig. 2 tailed
P12	M	1.9087	.88504	0.043*
	F	1.7569	.83267	
P13	M	2.5388	.93844	0.205
	F	2.6399	.89424	
P14	M	2.9098	.88429	0.015*
	F	3.0976	.87958	
P15	M	2.3471	1.02022	0.844
	F	2.3646	1.01679	

P = 0.05

Table 9. Percentage of Gender Reactions According to Year on Situation 3

		Freshman		Sophomore		Junior		Senior		Graduate	
		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
P12	MP	9.4	10.0	6.7	3.2	10.5	5.6	3.1	2.6	28.6	6.7
	P	9.4	15.0	13.3	10.9	5.3	13.9	15.6	15.8	14.3	.0
	I	37.5	42.5	42.7	41.7	42.1	33.3	53.1	23.7	57.1	46.7
	MI	43.8	32.5	37.3	44.2	42.1	47.2	28.1	57.9	.0	46.7
P13	MP	11.8	17.5	15.2	16.7	10.5	20.0	21.9	21.6	37.5	20.0
	P	38.2	40.0	37.1	38.5	52.6	37.1	37.5	32.4	12.5	46.7
	I	17.6	25.0	34.4	34.6	26.3	34.3	31.3	43.2	25.0	20.0
	MI	32.4	17.5	13.2	10.3	10.5	8.6	9.4	2.7	25.0	13.3
P14	MP	12.1	33.3	30.5	39.5	26.3	36.1	40.6	35.1	25.0	40.0
	P	54.5	38.5	37.7	37.6	36.8	44.4	31.3	43.2	62.5	46.7
	I	21.2	20.5	25.8	17.2	36.8	13.9	21.9	16.2	12.5	6.7
	MI	12.1	7.7	6.0	5.7	.0	5.6	6.3	5.4	.0	6.7
P15	MP	18.2	12.5	14.0	14.7	11.1	16.7	21.9	18.4	25.0	20.0
	P	33.3	25.0	31.3	30.8	16.7	38.9	15.6	31.6	12.5	20.0
	I	15.2	30.0	28.7	32.1	55.6	22.2	46.9	26.3	37.5	20.0
	MI	33.3	32.5	26.0	22.4	16.7	22.2	15.6	23.7	25.0	40.0

Table 10. Mean Politeness by Gender

	Gender	Mean	St. Deviation	Sig. 2 tailed
P16	M	3.0861	.92339	0.003*
	F	3.3194	.86070	
P17	M	1.7406	.91651	0.002*
	F	1.5017	.80848	
P18	M	2.4938	1.04929	0.008*
	F	2.7308	.99520	
P19	M	3.2500	.90327	0.064
	F	3.3924	.85267	
P20	M	2.6214	.97313	0.030*
	F	2.8070	.98293	
P21	M	3.6420	.70374	0.360
	F	3.6972	.67765	

Table 11. Percentage of Gender Reactions According to Year on Situation 4

		Freshman		Sophomore		Junior		Senior		Graduate	
		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
P16	MP	58.8	48.7	38.7	55.4	31.6	41.7	34.4	55.3	25.0	60.0
	P	23.5	33.3	36.0	25.5	42.1	47.2	46.9	28.9	37.5	40.0
	I	14.7	10.3	16.0	12.7	26.3	11.1	12.5	13.2	25.0	.0
	MI	2.9	7.7	9.3	6.4	.0	.0	6.3	2/6	12.5	.0
P17	MP	6.3	7.5	7.4	3.2	5.3	2.8	6.3	7.9	.0	.0
	P	3.1	7.5	8.8	7.6	26.3	5.6	25.0	10.5	28.6	6.7
	I	37.5	42.5	31.1	16.6	15.8	25.0	21.9	21.1	42.9	20.0
	MI	53.1	42.5	52.7	72.6	52.6	66.7	46.9	60.5	28.6	73.3
P18	MP	18.8	30.8	21.3	29.5	22.2	20.0	15.6	18.4	.0	26.7
	P	34.4	30.8	28.7	30.8	44.4	40.0	50.0	36.8	25.0	40.0
	I	9.4	20.5	27.3	25.6	11.1	37.1	31.3	31.6	25.0	20.0
	MI	37.5	17.9	22.7	14.1	22.2	2.9	3.1	13.2	50.0	13.3
P19	MP	60.6	55.3	46.6	57.6	68.4	52.8	54.8	68.4	37.5	66.7
	P	18.2	21.1	31.1	26.6	21.1	33.3	32.3	26.3	25.0	26.7
	I	9.1	13.2	16.9	10.8	10.5	11.1	12.9	5.3	25.0	.0
	MI	12.1	10.5	5.4	5.1	.0	2.8	.0	.0	12.5	6.7
P20	MP	38.2	20.5	16.1	25.8	15.8	36.1	28.1	37.8	.0	13.3
	P	35.3	43.6	38.9	39.4	26.3	36.1	37.5	29.7	25.0	60.0
	I	14.7	15.4	28.2	20.6	42.1	22.2	25.0	21.6	50.0	13.3
	MI	11.8	20.5	16.8	14.2	15.8	5.6	9.4	10.8	25.0	13.3
P21	MP	82.4	75.0	75.2	77.1	78.9	82.9	78.1	86.8	50.0	80.0
	P	5.9	15.0	12.8	15.7	15.8	8.6	18.8	13.2	25.0	13.3
	I	11.8	5.0	10.7	4.6	5.3	2.9	.0	.0	25.0	6.7
	MI	.0	5.0	1.3	2.6	.0	5.7	3.1	.0	.0	.0

Table 12. Mean Politeness by Gender

	Gender	Mean	St. Deviation	Sig. 2 tailed
P22	M	2.1625	.98240	0.041*
	F	1.9965	.87258	
P23	M	2.4959	1.05550	0.889
	F	2.5088	1.05688	
P24	M	2.3058	.91862	0.841
	F	2.3217	.89522	
P25	M	3.0857	.98180	0.504
	F	3.1424	.96843	

Table 13. Percentage of Gender Reactions According to Year on Situation 5

		Freshman		Sophomore		Junior		Senior		Graduate	
		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
P22	MP	9.1	5.0	10.9	5.2	.0	5.6	12.5	13.5	37.5	.0
	P	21.2	20.0	20.4	17.4	47.4	27.8	34.4	21.6	25.0	13.3
	I	33.3	27.5	36.7	45.8	15.8	38.9	34.4	37.8	25.0	66.7
	MI	36.4	47.5	32.0	31.6	36.8	27.8	18.8	27.0	12.5	20.0
P23	MP	15.2	30.0	22.8	22.7	31.6	20.0	28.1	15.8	25.9	26.7
	P	15.2	15.0	25.5	28.6	21.1	25.7	18.8	31.6	37.5	20.0
	I	42.4	27.5	30.9	29.9	36.8	34.3	40.6	34.2	25.0	20.0
	MI	27.3	27.5	20.8	18.8	10.5	20.0	12.5	18.4	12.5	33.3
P24	MP	5.9	10.0	12.8	9.7	10.5	8.3	9.4	5.3	.0	.0
	P	44.1	35.0	25.5	31.2	31.6	52.8	28.1	31.6	50.0	46.7
	I	38.2	27.5	38.9	37.7	36.8	25.0	46.9	50.0	25.0	26.7
	MI	11.8	27.5	22.8	21.4	21.1	13.9	15.6	13.2	25.0	26.7
P25	MP	50.0	35.0	44.4	43.6	26.3	58.3	50.0	52.6	37.5	66.7
	P	26.5	35.0	27.2	28.8	36.8	30.6	34.4	28.9	37.5	13.3
	I	14.7	22.5	19.2	17.3	21.1	8.3	12.5	10.5	25.0	13.3
	MI	8.8	7.5	9.3	10.3	15.8	2.8	3.1	7.9	.0	6.7