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Abstract

This study deals with linguistic feedback (see Wiener/48, Fries/52 and Allwood/93) which falls within the domain of cultural description. Feedback can informally be described like this: when a speaker performs a linguistic action which requires a linguistic response from a receiver, the given response has an important function for the speaker. In the ideal case, the listener’s response gives information to the speaker that the listener has perceived and understood the communicated content. However, the receiver can also signal that he/she has failed to hear or understand what has been said. As well as that, the receiver can ignore the speaker’s action and initiate other actions or get involved in a different conversation. It has been noted, in particular, that if a speaker performs an action that requires a response, it is less certain whether both the speaker’s performance and the receiver’s responses will succeed. When a receiver does not give a coherent or clear response, then the sender sees that the receiver is experiencing some problem(s) that deserves to be dealt with. For this reason, there might be several alternatives which the sender can initiate, e.g., to abandon the attempt to get the listener's feedback, to misinterpret the answer, or to take the listener's response into account.

By increasing awareness of the significance of feedback, we may hope to understand better problems in communication between cultures. The present study focuses on verbal feedback actions and discusses briefly non-verbal feedback actions.

The following aspects are central in the study:

I) Feedback expressions in spoken Arabic:
   - Feedback turns and non-feedback turns. This subsection will include the following items:
     feedback consisting of a one-word utterance, complex feedback consisting of an utterance of more than one word, eliciting feedback, giving and eliciting feedback, self-feedback and non-feedback turns
II) The semantic and pragmatic analysis of feedback actions:
   - Criteria for deciding the function of feedback
III) Studies of six kinds of conversation and one form of communication, which give examples of feedback in spoken Arabic.

This thesis deals also with sociolinguistic feedback and sociolinguistic variations will be described for each individual in conversation. These variations will be described with the help of tables and several selected examples from the data. These examples have to be connected with the main topic (feedback) and related to each social variant.

A number of theoretical assumptions about FB and related studies which fall under the same linguistic phenomenon i.e., human response, and possibly have universal relevance, are presented. The need for further empirical research is expressed. The present work is divided into six chapters and based on live conversations recorded in Jeddah (Kingdom of Saudi Arabia).
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Transcription, Transliteration and Translation

The recorded conversations have been transcribed, transliterated, and (partly) translated into English in order to facilitate the analysis and presentation of data. All feedback actions throughout this thesis, in the (Latin) transcription and its English translation, appear in bold face. In subsection 3.1.3, two selected examples from the data conversations are demonstrated to show how these main steps have been followed.

Transcription

The recorded conversations were first of all transcribed into written Arabic, following the main rules of transcription described by Nivre (1995), and Sofkova and Larsson (1995). Apart from a header giving background information about the recording, a transcription consists of two types of lines:

Speech lines: Speech lines begin with '$' followed by one or more capital letters identifying the speaker.

Comment lines: Comment lines start with the symbol @ and contain comments enclosed in angle brackets <>.

In speech lines, the speech of a participant is transcribed using modified standard orthography. In addition, the following symbols are used:

CAPITALS Used for emphatic or contrastive stress.
: Used to mark lengthening of continuants.

(speech) Uncertain speech is enclosed in parentheses.
(...) Unintelligible speech is transcribed as three dots in parentheses.
/ Short pause= 1 second
// Long pause= 2 seconds
/// Longer pause= 3 or more seconds
0.4 The longest pause= 4 or more seconds

[speech] Overlap; speech enclosed in indexed brackets is simultaneous with everything else enclosed in brackets with the same index.

[phonetic speech] All the Arabic examples when transliterated are represented phonetically between these brackets

+ Interruption, used to indicate a partly pronounced word, or when a speaker pauses, etc. within a word.
Additional List of the Important Symbols and Abbreviations:

A.D. = Anno Domini (according to the Christian calendar)
A.H. = After Hijra ('immigration') (according to the Islamic calendar)
C.A. = Classical Arabic
S.A. = Spoken Arabic
FB = Feedback
F (p) = Following page
P: (x) = Page (x)
[ ] = Half square parentheses enclose the phonetic reading.
' ' = Word translated into English
<> = Interrupted action during the conversation.

The codes used are: affir= affirmative, conf= confirmation, repet= repetition,
accep= acceptance, rejec= rejection, agree= agreement, corr= correction,
under= understanding, perc= perception, inter= interrogative, laugh= laughter,
domin= dominance, repro= reproaching, eval= evaluative, boul= boulemaic,
- = negative, + = positive.

Transliteration

In order to make the transcriptions readable for those not familiar with Arabic writing, they have been transliterated into Latin script. The table below shows the correspondences between the Arabic phonemes and the Latin characters used in the transliteration. For the sake of comparison, the standard transliteration symbols (International system for the transliteration of Arabic characters 1961) are given in the third column.
**Key to Symbols of Transcription and Transliteration:**

**Arabic Alphabets, the Standard Way and the Phonetical System of Writing Arabic Articulation**

Table 1.1: Symbols for Arabic in Phonetic, Latin and Standard Script

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Phonetical Rep</strong></th>
<th><strong>Latin Character</strong></th>
<th><strong>Standard Symbols</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[a]</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a-initially/ a'-a elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ay] [ee]</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>the character ay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʔ]</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>the character ‘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[aʔ]</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>the character a’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[b]</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>the character b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[t]</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>the character t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[θ]</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>the character ŧ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dʒ]</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>the character ġ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[h]</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>the character ĕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[χ]</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>the character ë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[d]</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>the character d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ð]</td>
<td>th</td>
<td>the character ð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[r]</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>the character r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[z]</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>the character z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[s]</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>the character s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃ]</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>the character š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʂ]</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>the character ş</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ɖ]</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>the character ḏ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʈ]</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>the character ŭ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʐ]</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>the character ź</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the above phonemes, there are three main types of vowels or vocalization in Arabic language:

1. which is represented in the transcription as $\text{a}$
2. which is represented in the transcription as $\text{u}$
3. which is represented in the transcription as $\text{i}$

**Translation**

For purposes of presentation, parts of the conversations have been translated into English. The translations given are idiomatic, not literal glosses.
List of Tables, Abbreviations and Symbols

1. List of Tables

Table 1.1: Symbols for Arabic in Phonetic, Latin and Standard Script in 3.1.4 13

Chapter 1:

Table 1.2: Spoken and Written Arabic (I) 1.7 93
Table 1.3: Summary of Views of Arabic in (II) 1.7 96

Chapter 2:

Table 2.1: Feedback Terminology in (II) 2.3.3 130
Table 2.2: Different Meanings of Feedback Expressions in 2.3.4 132
Table 2.3: Examples of Three Languages in (I) 2.3.5 135

Chapter 3:

Table 3.1: Setting and Participants in 3.1.2 156
Table 3.2: First Conversation in 3.1.2 157
Table 3.3: Second Conversation in 3.1.2 157
Table 3.4: Third Conversation in 3.1.2 158
Table 3.5: Fourth Conversation in 3.1.2 158
Table 3.6: Fifth Conversation in 3.1.2 159
Table 3.7: Sixth Conversation in 3.1.2 159
Table 3.8: Basic Feedback Functions in 3.2.1 166

Chapter 4:

Table 4.1: Comparison between FB Actions and Non-FB Turns in the Data in 4.2 191
Table 4.2: Comparison between FB Single Word and FB more than One Word in (I) 4.3 192
Table 4.3: Comparison between E FB Single Word and E FB more than One Word in (II) 4.3 193
Table 4.4: G & E FB Single Word and more than One Word in (III) 4.3 193
Table 4.5: Self FB Single Word and more than One Word in (IV) 4.3 194
Table 4.6: Types of Activity and FB in 4.4 198
Table 4.7: Non-FB Turns and FB Actions in 4.4.1 200
Table 4.8: FB Single Word in 4.4.1 200
Table 4.9: FB Consisting of more than One Word, type 1 (see pp: 172 to 174) 201
Table 4.10: FB Consisting of more than One Word, type 2 (see pp: 172 to 174) 201
Table 4.11: Eliciting FB Single Word and more than One Word in 4.4.1 201
Table 4.12: Giving and Eliciting FB Single Word and more than One Word in 4.4.1 201
Table 4.13: Self FB Single Word and more than One Word in 4.4.1 202
Table 4.14: Types of Conversation in 4.4.1 203
Table 4.15: FB Functions in 4.4.1 203
Table 4.16: Non-FB Turns and FB Actions in 4.4.2 204
Table 4.17: FB Single Word in 4.4.2 204
Table 4.18: FB Consisting of more than One Word, type 1 in 4.4.2
Table 4.19: FB Consisting of more than One Word, type 2 in 4.4.2
Table 4.20: Eliciting FB Single Word and more than One Word in 4.4.2
Table 4.21: Giving and Eliciting FB Single Word and more than One Word in 4.4.2
Table 4.22: Types of Conversations in 4.4.2
Table 4.23: FB Functions in 4.4.2
Table 4.24: Non-FB Turns and FB Actions in 4.4.3
Table 4.25: FB Single Word in 4.4.3
Table 4.26: FB Consisting of more than One Word, type 1 in 4.4.3
Table 4.27: FB Consisting of more than One Word, type 2 in 4.4.3
Table 4.28: Eliciting FB Single Word and more than One Word in 4.4.3
Table 4.29: Giving and Eliciting FB Single Word and more than One Word in 4.4.3
Table 4.30: Types of Conversation in 4.4.3
Table 4.31: FB Functions in 4.4.3
Table 4.32: Non-FB Turns and FB Actions in 4.4.4
Table 4.33: FB Single Word in 4.4.4
Table 4.34: FB Consisting of more than One Word, type 1 in 4.4.4
Table 4.35: FB Consisting of more than One Word, type 2 in 4.4.4
Table 4.36: Eliciting FB Single Word and more than One Word in 4.4.4
Table 4.37: Giving and Eliciting FB Single Word and more than One Word in 4.4.4
Table 4.38: Types of Conversation in 4.4.4
Table 4.39: FB Functions in 4.4.4
Table 4.40: Non-FB Turns and FB Actions in 4.4.5
Table 4.41: FB Single Word in 4.4.5
Table 4.42: FB Consisting of more than One Word, type 1 in 4.4.5
Table 4.43: FB Consisting of more than One Word, type 2 in 4.4.5
Table 4.44: Eliciting FB Single Word and more than One Word in 4.4.5
Table 4.45: Giving and Eliciting FB Single Word and more than One Word in 4.4.5
Table 4.46: Types of Conversation in 4.4.5
Table 4.47: FB Functions in 4.4.5
Table 4.48: Non-FB Turns and FB Actions in 4.4.6
Table 4.49: FB Single Word in 4.4.6
Table 4.50: FB Consisting of more than One Word, type 1 in 4.4.6
Table 4.51: FB Consisting of more than One Word, type 2 in 4.4.6
Table 4.52: Eliciting FB Single Word and more than One Word in 4.4.6
Table 4.53: Giving and Eliciting FB Single Word and more than One Word in 4.4.6
Table 4.54: Types of Conversation and FB in 4.4.6
Table 4.55: Conclusion for both FB Single Word and Complex FB Type 1 and 2 in 4.4.8
Table 4.56: Conclusion for E FB Single Word and more than One Word in 4.4.8
Table 4.57: Conclusion for G & E FB Single Word and more than One Word in 4.4.8
Table 4.58: Ranking According to Number of Turns in 4.4.8
Table 4.59: Types of Conversation and FB in 4.4.8
Table 4.67: Main FB Functions in 4.4.8
Table 4.68: Single Word FB: Functions and Frequencies in 4.4.8

Chapter 5:

Table 5.1: Age Grouping and FB, Expressions in (I) 5.2
Table 5.2: Age Variation and Number of FB Actions in Conversation 1 in (I) 5.2
Table 5.3: in Conversation 2 in (I) 5.2
Table 5.4: in Conversation 3 in (I) 5.2
Table 5.5: in Conversation 4 in (I) 5.2
Table 5.6: in Conversation 5 in (I) 5.2
Table 5.7: in Conversation 6 in (I) 5.2
Table 5.8: Social Class and Number of FB Actions in Conversation 1 in (II) 5.2
Table 5.9: in Conversation 2 in (II) 5.2
Table 5.10: in Conversation 3 in (II) 5.2
Table 5.11: in Conversation 4 in (II) 5.2
Table 5.12: in Conversation 5 in (II) 5.2
Table 5.13: in Conversation 6 in (II) 5.2
Table 5.14: Gender and FB, Examples in (III) 5.2
Table 5.15: Gender Variation and Number of FB Actions in Conversation 1 in (III) 5.2
Table 5.16: in Conversation 2 in (III) 5.2
Table 5.17: in Conversation 3 in (III) 5.2
Table 5.18: in Conversation 4 in (III) 5.2
Table 5.19: in Conversation 5 in (III) 5.2
Table 5.20: in Conversation 6 in (III) 5.2
Table 5.21: Level of Education and Examples of FB Usage in (IV) 5.2
Table 5.22: Educational Variation and Number of FB Actions in Conversation 1 in (IV) 5.2
Table 5.23: in Conversation 2 in (IV) 5.2
Table 5.24: in Conversation 3 in (IV) 5.2
Table 5.25: in Conversation 4 in (IV) 5.2
Table 5.26: in Conversation 5 in (IV) 5.2
Table 5.27: in Conversation 6 in (IV) 5.2
Table 5.28: Occupation and FB, Examples in (V) 5.2
Table 5.29: Occupation Variation and Number of FB Actions in Conversation 1 in (V) 5.2
Table 5.30: in Conversation 2 in (V) 5.2
Table 5.31: in Conversation 3 in (V) 5.2
Table 5.32: in Conversation 4 in (V) 5.2
Table 5.33: in Conversation 5 in (V) 5.2
Table 5.34: in Conversation 6 in (V) 5.2
Table 5.35: Occasion and FB, Examples in (VI) 5.2
Table 5.36: Type of Occasion and Number of FB Actions in Conversation 1 in (VI) 5.2
Table 5.37: in Conversation 2 in (VI) 5.2
Table 5.38: in Conversation 3 in (VI) 5.2
Table 5.39: in Conversation 4 in (VI) 5.2
Table 5.40: in Conversation 5 in (VI) 5.2
Table 5.41: in Conversation 6 in (VI) 5.2
Chapter 6:

Table 6.1: Main Communicative Functions and their Positive and Negative FB Examples

2. List of Figures

Chapter 1:

Figure (1.1) in 1.4.7 69
Figure (1.2) in 1.4.7 69

Chapter 2:

Figure (2.1) in 2.3.1 106
Figure (2.2) in 2.3.1 109
Figure (2.3) in (A) 2.3.2 112
Figure (2.4) in (C) 2.3.2 116
Figure (2.5) in (D) 2.3.2 117
Figure (2.6) in (E) 2.3.2 119
Figure (2.7) in (F) 2.3.2 124

Chapter 3:

Figure (3.1) in 3.2.1.1 167
Figure (3.2) in (IV) 3.2.3.1 179

Chapter 6:

Figure (6.1) in (2) 6.6 305

3. Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Arabic Dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Classical Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Egyptian Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Educated Spoken Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBG</td>
<td>Feedback Giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBE</td>
<td>Feedback Eliciting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>International Phonetic Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWA</td>
<td>Informal Written Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Modern Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Modern Standard Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA</td>
<td>Modern Literary Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLA</td>
<td>Oral Literary Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Palestinian Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMSA</td>
<td>Spoken Modern Standard Arabic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SA Spoken Arabic
St A Standard Arabic
SAL Standard way of Arabic Letters
WMSA Written Modern Standard Arabic
SMSA Spoken Modern Standard Arabic
GPTL Gothenburg Papers in Theoretical Linguistics

4. Table Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contin</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Reduplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBSWMF/FBSW</td>
<td>FB single word main functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONV</td>
<td>Conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-U</td>
<td>Non-understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hes</td>
<td>Hesitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fric</td>
<td>Fricative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glott</td>
<td>Glottal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBW</td>
<td>Feedback single word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBU</td>
<td>Feedback in an utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFBU</td>
<td>Complex feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFF</td>
<td>Main feedback functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Acceptance</td>
<td>Negative acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Acceptance</td>
<td>Positive acceptance, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affir</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf</td>
<td>Confirmation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep</td>
<td>Repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accep</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejec</td>
<td>Rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corr</td>
<td>Correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perc</td>
<td>Perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laugh</td>
<td>Laughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domin</td>
<td>Dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repro</td>
<td>Reproaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eval</td>
<td>Evaluative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boul</td>
<td>Boulemaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>is the participant’s code in conversations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>is feedback by itself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>is feedback at the beginning of a sentence, or phrase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>is feedback in the middle of a sentence, or phrase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>is feedback at the end of a sentence, or phrase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSFBU</td>
<td>Reduplication of simple feedback unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Abbreviations in the Gloss Lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBW</td>
<td>Feedback words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBC</td>
<td>Feedback copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTER</td>
<td>Interjection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
<td>Proper name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRON</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>Conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>Complementiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>Determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Verb phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conj</td>
<td>Conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/Red</td>
<td>Repetition or Reduplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det</td>
<td>Determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>Complementiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pron</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Preposition phrase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1

1.1 Introduction

Statement of the Problem

There have been several reasons for choosing to describe this particular topic. We here provide an overview of the topic. A more detailed account is discussed in section 1.2. Since the study of language communication is essential for facilitating successful contact between people, we have chosen feedback, in particular, to describe this linguistic phenomenon in spoken Arabic, and, more specifically, to apply to the Palestinian dialect.

Let us consider some of the descriptions of Arabic dialects by several writers.

Since discourse analysis is an essential element of feedback in our study, one important work that is closely related with discourse analysis in dialects of Arabic has been dealt with previously, i.e., Al-Khalil (2005), whose work is entitled *Discourse Markers in Syrian Arabic*. Al-Khalil used the term ‘discourse markers’ to describe expressions such as, ‘I mean’, ‘y’know’, ‘oh’, and ‘well’, which appear almost exclusively in spoken language. The writer focused on colloquial Syrian Arabic and selected four Syrian discourse markers: [halla?] ‘now’, [ya'ni] ‘it means’, [tayyib] ‘well’, and [lakaan] ‘so’ respectively (Al-Khalil, 2005: 1-11).

Two parts of Al-Khalil’s work are related to our study: firstly, both topics fall within the category of discourse analysis; second, discourse markers are used to play certain roles in feedback to achieve different purpose/s. This, however, will be discussed in section 5.3.

Watson (2002) seeks to provide a more comprehensive and integrated account of the phonology and morphology of Arabic. She focuses on one dialect of (Yemen) Arabic, which is from the eastern group, i.e., the old spoken Sana’ Arabic, and she tries to draw, as much as possible, comparisons with standard Arabic and other modern varieties of near-eastern Arabic, including central Sudanese, Palestinian (on which our present study is focused), the Saudi Arabian dialect of Abha and other dialects of Yemeni Arabic (Watson 2002: 9). Even though Watson’s discussion is not closely linked to our present topic, in that it has focused mainly on the phonological, morphological, and syntactical descriptions,
it nevertheless demonstrates that there are many studies nowadays that discuss the Arabic dialects.

Cowell (1963) is another writer who intended in his book to discuss three things:
 i) to provide for students who have already acquired, or are in the process of acquiring, an elementary knowledge of Syrian Arabic
 ii) to serve as a checklist of grammatical points for teachers, and
 iii) to be used as a source of information about this dialect (Damascus) for Arabists and linguists (Cowell 1963: vii-2).

We also need to explain that Cowell’s study was teaching, how to teach, and describing Syrian Arabic, which has also little to do with our main topic; however, it is still one of the useful source/s that described the use of everyday conversation by Arabic native speakers who live in Syria.

When we realised that, in descriptions of Arabic, there is no account of feedback as a linguistic phenomenon, it became vital for us to go on with this research and to expand the empirical base of general linguistic theory by providing new knowledge about spoken Palestinian Arabic. In order to tackle this topic we have based our study on a set of recordings of conversations of Palestinian Arabic speakers, all made in Jeddah (Saudi Arabia). We need to point that speech and feedback among our participants was slightly affected in the light of linguistic context. The analysis of our data conversations was based on the following:

a) Part of a coding scheme produced by Nivre, Allwood and Ahlsén (1999)
 b) Allwood’s classifications (1988) and (1993)
 c) Pragmatic analysis based on six main types of talk
 d) Semantic analysis based on six main functions of feedback
 e) Sociolinguistic variation between individuals corresponding to feedback phenomena in conversations.

**Background**

Feedback has been discussed as early as the fifth - and eighth - centuries AD. The discussion has also continued in modern times, from the mid-nineteenth century until now. This explains the importance of this linguistic phenomenon in human face-to-face interaction. Some linguists of Antiquity, e.g. Priscian in the fifth century AD and Sibawaihi in the eighth century, had made early observations which are related, to some extent, to feedback phenomena. However, we need to
stress that we have no proof that these grammarians discussed or identified the mechanism of feedback as it is discussed and known today. Moving to modern times, Wiener (1948) and Fries (1952) use the term ‘feedback’ from two different perspectives; Wiener however was the first writer who suggested and founded the term ‘feedback’ and discussed it for purely technical aims. Fries, who adopted the term feedback from Wiener, applied this term for purely linguistic aims. Allwood (1979-1999) and his followers came later on to discuss this linguistic phenomenon in more detail. However, Allwood’s discussion focused mainly on studies of feedback as pure linguistic expression. I think that it is important for the reader to know how we can study feedback as a linguistic phenomenon, because feedback can be studied from two sides: as a linguistic expression, e.g., he used the expression ‘yes’ as a feedback; and could be studied as a communicative function, i.e., ‘yes’ means to accept, and it is given in a particular situation.

In the present research, an attempt will be made to discuss and describe feedback as an expression, and as a communicative function, together. There are four basic communicative functions, according Allwood et al (1999), which are essential in human face-to-face communication, these are: contact, perception, understanding and attitudinal reactions (see also Allwood, Nivre and Ahlsén 1991). It is apparent that spoken language has a very complicated interplay between speakers who exchange information. However, the speaker needs to know if a listener is willing to continue his contact, has heard the message, understands it, and finally what his feedback will be according to what he heard and understands, whether he accepts, or rejects the message.

_Scope and Theoretical Framework_

The total number of feedback turns and non-feedback turns will be given. It accounts for the four main ways of expressing feedback: feedback as a single word form and feedback as a longer utterance; eliciting feedback as a single word; giving and eliciting feedback; and self feedback. Pragmatics and feedback which based on six main types of talk. Semantics which based on six main functions of feedback. The relation between feedback actions and all types of conversations will also be shown.

The results and contributions made by this study will be summarised. In addition, a full analysis of feedback and sociolinguistic variations will be described for each individual in conversation. Communicative acts and personal markers in connection with feedback will be discussed. A comparison between
the results of our previous study and the results of the present study will be given.

1.1.1 The Palestinian Dialect

There is a large number of Arabic dialects today, with regard to the Palestinian dialect, will be discussed, by several writers, there have been few changes of varieties. The only slight changes have been introduced by those Palestinians who were forced to live outside of Palestine, e.g., the Gulf area, etc. Two main PAs are suggested: urban spoken dialects, and Bedouin dialects.

The Palestinian dialect is a part of a large group of dialects called [Al-ʃaam], the area consisting of Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Palestine before the Second World War. These four countries have their own special dialects. After 1948 Palestinians were scattered mainly in the Middle East and then in the rest of the world. This, however, did not bring about great change or create fundamental varieties in the Palestinian dialect. Palestinians, like many other nationalities, are a people of tradition, custom and habit, which means it is very difficult to change their ways. They look upon their dialect, as other nationalities do, as an important part of their tradition in order to retain their identity. However, there have been some slight, marginal changes in the Palestinian dialect among Palestinians who live abroad in, for example, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Egypt, Tunisia, etc.

Several writers have described the many dialects of Palestine, e.g., the German writer Bergstrasser (1915). He included maps of the historical Palestine as well as parts of what are now Syria, Jordan and Lebanon. Among other things, the maps show differences in various forms of pronunciation, as well as word use.

The greatest difference between the various forms of PA seems to be between the urban dialects spoken in, for example, al-Quds, al-Khalil, Nablis, Ramallah, etc., and the rural or Bedouin dialects. The contrast can be quite distinct; for example, the dialect spoken in Ramallah is closer to the dialect of al-Quds than to the rural dialect spoken in Bir Zeit, a mere 3 km away. A recently published grammar of PA written by a syntactician from Palestine, however, shows that the Palestinian dialect has as much in common with Lebanese as it has with the dialects spoken on [iDaffaʰ iływربيyyaʰ] ‘the West Bank’.¹

¹ See M. Hoyt (2000).
There are several grammars of the dialect of al-Quds (‘Jerusalem’), the most recent and most detailed being that of Durand (1996), which is written in Italian. A detailed study of Bedouin dialects was made in al-Jalil by Rosenhouse (1984); in addition Rosenhouse has written a paper (1995) where she analyses the discourse structure of an oral narrative recorded from a speaker of one of these Bedouin dialects. There are a number of books and articles written in Hebrew but since I do not read Hebrew I am not able to comment on or refer to them. Blanc (1953) also includes a selection of texts in the Palestinian dialect. Shahin (1995) describes as rural PA the dialect of Abu Shusha, once spoken near Lydda and Ramla in historic Palestine; this dialect differs from that of Bir Zeit.

Another recent study was undertaken by Hoyt (2000) in the United States. His study focused particularly on the spoken dialect of Bir Zeit and other rural areas of the northern West Bank. He has distinguished five main characteristics in this dialect. The people in the area that Hoyt describes claim to be descended from a group of Christian Bedouins who migrated to Bir Zeit almost 300 years ago, from the area around al-Karak (in what is now Jordan).

1.1.2 What is Feedback?

The term feedback was suggested first by Wiener (1948: 114) to refer to ‘a human link in the chain of the transmission and return of information: in what we shall from now on call the chain of feed-back’. The use of the term feedback was transformed from a purely scientific concept into a purely linguistic one by Fries (1952). He focused his discussion on feedback as a linguistic expression and called it ‘listener response’. From this initial description of the term feedback as an independent linguistic phenomenon, other writers such as Allwood (1976, 1979, 1988a and b) and his adherents Nivre and Ahlsén (1991, 1999) devoted their attention to describing and analysing feedback as a purely linguistic expression and gave several classifications to describe feedback and to show the importance of this linguistic phenomenon in human language communication.

Feedback (FB from now on) can informally be described as follows: when a speaker performs a linguistic action which requires a linguistic response from a listener, the given response has a specific meaning for the speaker. In the ideal case, the listener’s response informs the speaker that the listener has perceived and understood the communicated content. However, the receiver can also signal that he/she has failed to hear or understand what has been said. The
receiver can also ignore the speaker’s action and initiate other actions or get involved in a different conversation. The following examples further illustrate the phenomenon of FB in spoken language:

‘A’ says something, and ‘B’ makes a response:

[data sample] (1)
A: [anaa ʕaayif innak ḥaamil ḥurulak ?] ‘I see you have done your work?’
B: [naʃam] ‘yes’

[data sample] (2)
A: [huwwa ʔustaað miʃ ikwayyis ?] ‘He is not a very good teacher?’
B: [laʔ] ‘no’

It seems, prima facie, that B’s responses are simple responses of acceptance, but actually B’s responses are less simple than it seems. B is making responses to indicate that he is listening, understanding and accepting what A is saying.

Daily spoken language use is a very large area to describe. Since spoken language is the main route to achieving the aims of contact successfully, it deserves to be given a high degree of attention. One important aspect of spoken communication is the need for speakers to signal that they understand, accept, confirm, reject, do not understand, or hesitate about what is being said.

Let us start by considering a simple example from Arabic:

(3)  A: [iddinyaa-btitlidʒ] ‘it is snowing’
     B: [ah] ‘yes’

When B says ‘yes’, his response, i.e. his speech production, is usually determined by his speech perception, and an understanding of what A says. In subsection 2.3.4, item ii of the present study, three functions of speech production and speech perception (according to Allwood, Nivre and Ahlsén 1990) will be discussed.
Verbal and Non-Verbal Feedback

FB can be given verbally or non-verbally. Let us explain below how it can be expressed in these two ways, also for more detailed information you may find in sec. 2.4.

I) Verbal Feedback

Nivre, Allwood and Ahlsen (1999) provided the following two definitions of transcription and FB units. Transcription is, “an utterance by a speaker $a$ is a stretch of speech produced by $a$, bounded by silence or by the speech of another speaker”. FB units is, “a maximal continuous stretch of utterance (occurring on its own or as part of a larger utterance) the primary function of which is to give and/or elicit FB” (see ‘Interaction Management’ 1999: 2, by Nivre, Allwood and Ahlsén, and also chapter 2, subsection 2.3.3).

Under verbal FB Nivre et.al., they listed and discussed three main aspects of classification are: structure, position, and function.

A) Structure, this aspect include:

i) grammatical categories, which include two subsystems are,
   - lexical categories, which is used to classify FB units consisting of single word e.g., FB word, interjection, etc, we called FB single word
   - syntactical categories, which classify FB units consisting of phrases or complete sentences (or as we called ‘complex FB utterance’) e.g., noun phrase, verbal phrase, etc.

ii) structural operations, which according Nivre et.al., (1999) distinguish three main types of operations are:
   - phonological operations, which applied to FB words consists of lengthening, recurrent reduplication, vowel addition, truncation, ingressive, and prosodic modification.
   - morphological operations, which applied to words consist of reduplication, inflection/derivation, and compounding.
   - contextual operations, which can only be defined in relation to the preceding context, like repetition. More examples in appendix 3, items: I, II, and III.
B) Position, which focuses on the position that one FB action occurs. FB can be occur in: as a single (i.e., constitutes an entire utterance by itself), initial in an utterance, medial in an utterance, or final in an utterance.

For example,
1. [aywaʰ] ‘yes’ = FB single
2. [aywaʰ widdaliil...] ‘yes and the evidence...’ = initial in an utterance
3. [haḍa kaan aywaʰ innama mij il’aan] ‘this was yes whereas not now’ = medial in an utterance
4. [fil waaqiʃ la?] ‘in fact no’ = final in an utterance
(See chapter 4, table 4.8, and also the appendix, table A.2.13 and so on., in addition, Nivre et.al., 1999).

C) Function, there are three main aspects of functions are suggested by Nivre, et.al., these are:
   i) Function type, which divided into: giving FB e.g., yes, eliciting FB e.g., right?, and giving and eliciting FB e.g., yes, right?. We have added self FB e.g., if I need to go yes!
   ii) C P U attitudes, which refer to contact, perception, and understanding. They deal mainly with the negative attitudes e.g., non/negative understanding e.g., what?, and non/negative perception e.g., I can not hear you.
   iii) Other attitudes, this third item is meant to cover any additional attitudes that are conveyed by FB unit. See Nivre et.al., (1999). This item was discussed in chapter 1, section 1.6 under ‘emotional FB ‘ which concerns of the psychological part of a speaker.

II) Non-Verbal Feedback

FB can be expressed by gestures, or sometimes gestures plus verbal expression. Of course, it is important to remind the reader that the present study is mainly concerned of verbal FB. To show the connection between gestures and FB; I have chosen some of the main expressions in communicative acts:
Examples:
- no= to reject; head shake (sideways)
- mm= to confirm; nodding head
- but= to hesitate; head shake (sideways), etc.
We need to point out that the meanings of these gestures are not universal. More discussion you will find in sec. 2.4 and subsec. 3.2.2 item ‘ii’.

Types of Feedback (primary, and secondary)

There are two types of verbal FB: primary FB, and secondary FB. Allwood (1988) suggested these two types which, according him, the difference between primary and secondary is may be a matter with degree than principle.

I) Primary Feedback

Consists of one word, not ambiguous with regards to function, represent the first type of FB word, its mainly expressed by short words, and some of which are traditionally referred to as ‘interjection’. See Priscian in subsec. 2.2.1.

Example of primary FB is: [naʃam] ‘yes’

II) Secondary Feedback

Mainly is expressed by words which also have other ‘part of speech’ functions e.g., noun, verb, adjective, adverb, etc. Allwood et.al., (1994) said that FB word, interjection, preposition, proper name, pronoun, conjunction, complementizer, determiner, and auxiliary verb; can all be used to express secondary FB.

Example of secondary FB is: [aki:d] ‘surely’.

For more information regarding primary and secondary FB, see subsec. 2.3.6. And see Allwood (1989a) and Allwood et.al., (1991-99).

Different Communicative Acts of FB

According to Allwood et.al., (1995) and Nivre et.al., (1999) there are four main functions of FB which are exist in almost every human language, these are:

a) acceptance e.g., yes/I accept
b) agreement e.g., ok/I agree
c) confirmation e.g., mm/I confirm
d) rejection e.g., no/I reject.

Moreover, two other functions were suggested by us, these are:
e) hesitation e.g., but/I hesitate
f) non-understanding e.g., what?/I don’t understand (See subsec. 3.2.4).

As we see from the above examples, there is a strong connection between specific expressions and special FB functions. See subsec. 3.2.4, and Allwood et.al., (1991).

**How Types of FB are Manifest?**

The answer of this question is related to the above list of analyses of FB. Let us specify our answer as follows, there are several ways where FB can be manifest in our talk i.e.,

a) as a single word, where it can be occur alone, or initial, medial, final of sentence/utterance e.g., ‘no’
b) as a complete sentence (or as we call it complex FB in the present study), where it can be occur as a complete sentence or a phrase for all FB units of more than one word. Under the complex FB there are two degrees of subdivisions:

i) type 1, which covers FB units consisting of six categories of phrase:
   - reduplication= ‘yes yes’
   - deictic or anaphoric linking= ‘it is’
   - repetition of simple FB units= ‘do you see?’ ‘Yes I see’
   - idiomatic phrase= ‘by all means’
   - modal phrase= ‘I do not think so’
   - other single word/phrase= ‘there is’

ii) type 2, which consists of seven categories i.e., covers different combinations of the above six categories:
   - simple FB unit + simple FB unit= ‘yes ok’
   - simple FB unit + reduplication= ‘yes, no no’
   - simple FB unit + deictic or anaphoric linking= ‘no I don’t’
   - simple FB unit + repetition of simple FB unit= ‘do you see?’ ‘yes I see yes’
   - simple FB unit + idiomatic phrase= ‘yes, thank you very much’
   - simple FB unit + modal phrase= ‘no, I don’t think so’
   - simple FB unit + other single word/phrase= ‘no, there isn’t’

Note, the simple FB unit is every FB action mentioned in the beginning of each sentence e.g., ‘yes’= simple FB unit, ‘I do’= modal phrase, ‘yes I do’= simple FB unit + modal phrase and so on. See subsec. 2.4.1 to 2.4.4, and sec. 4.4 for more detailed information. Also see Allwood (1988) and (1993: 12).
1.1.3 The Palestinian Arabic Feedback and its Main Characteristics

1.1.3.1 Feedback in Palestinian Arabic: its Characteristics and Functional Description
This subsection will deal with the ‘salient features’ of the Palestinian dialect.
Two points will be discussed in the present sub-section:

1) Some of the main characteristics and observations of FB in Palestinian Arabic

1) The characteristics of Palestinian Arabic feedback

I will support my views with some characteristics and observations which concern FB in Palestinian Arabic. It is important to point out that these characteristics and observations do not cover all FB actions in the daily use of spoken Palestinian Arabic. However, I have tried, as much as possible, to present some of the major types of FB in Palestinian Arabic. The paper ‘Arabic Feedback’ (Samarah 1994) helped me in this purpose.

1. Very often short FB (primary) e.g. [mm, aʔ] is used alone. Moreover, I have also noticed that during conversation, it is common to use one word with lexical meaning, e.g. [akiːd] ‘surely’, [tamaam] ‘perfect’.


2. Furthermore, Palestinian FB does not depend on monosyllabic expressions to the same (high) degree as Swedish, for example [jo jo] ‘yes yes’, [oʔ oʔ] ‘yes yes’, [yaw] and [nae] ‘no’, [yaHa] (a surprise expression), etc.

Here I need to point out that during my research in Sweden I found that the Swedish language includes many monosyllabic forms to express several FB actions, and deserves to be compared with Arabic because Arabic does not have such a number of expressions. This may be useful for future research into this kind of FB analysis.

Unfortunately we still do not find specific figure/s for the use of the monophonemic FB in Swedish. However, in Nordstam’s study (1994) there
seem to be number of monophonemic FB actions that occurred by her participants even though she did not give specific figures for this type of FB.

3. I have observed that Palestinian Arabic does not use as many single-phoneme expressions as FB; in other words, Palestinian FB uses very few monophonemic words. In this respect Swedish FB is simpler than Arabic FB, which uses many single-phoneme expressions as FB, e.g., [a:], [m:], [åː] [ha], etc. However, when a single sound is used as FB in Arabic, a more complete utterance usually follows:

[data sample] (4)
A: [tiidzi ma’laay] ‘would you come with me?’
C: [aa baruwh] ‘ah I will come’

This type of answer is very common in spoken Palestinian Arabic dialects.

4. In many cases Palestinian FB is used in the middle of an utterance:

[data sample] (5)
A: [huwwa raa/] ‘did he go?’
B: [mi:n-laa huwwa raayi/.] ‘who- no, he went... .’

[data sample] (6)
A: [s̟a] ‘right?’
D: [iːʃ-a: ana mit?’akkid... .] ‘what-ah, I am sure... .’

But in other cases, if FB comes at the beginning, it is commonly followed by some explanations, e.g. [naʃam liʔannu hinaa fii..] ‘yes, because here there is... .’

5. When a Palestinian speaker is sure that he/she has understood the information which he/she has received, in order to indicate agreement, acceptance, etc., he/she may use the same word twice, or two words with the same meaning, e.g. [naʃam naʃam] ‘yes yes’, [naʃam s̟a] ‘yes right’, [s̟a] ‘right sure’, etc.

6. Body signals during conversation are also very important in Palestinian FB, and very few people fail to give such signals.
7. Self FB is common and understood among the Palestinians when they communicate with each other; however, self FB often causes mis-understanding or confusion between speakers.

Several purposes would fall under this kind of FB, e.g., to confirm certain information, to show sympathy, to interrupt or take the floor, which comes in different forms:

a) It could be combined with an expression of apology, e.g., [ah ŋafwan] ‘yes pardon’

b) Interestingly, sometimes it can be used as an appendix. In other words there is no meaning or sense behind using self FB expressions, e.g. [fıl waaqif iḥnaa maa bidnāa aywaa ṭaa lamma ruḥnāa …] ‘in fact when we don’t want yes and when we went …’

c) In some cases self FB is given to attract another speaker’s attention. This could be related to eliciting FB, when a speaker tries to attract someone’s attention through eliciting FB and awaits the other person’s response. Let us consider the following example when speaker C asks one of the participants a question and gives self FB to attract one of the speakers to either get the information, or to open a new topic, then speaker B gives FB in response to this:

[data sample] (7)
C : [bass billaahii Kareem ʔinta maa iʃriftnii wallah aa] ‘but by God Kareem didn’t you know me by God yes?’
@ <mood: question>
B : [laa maa biʃrafkaʃ Kareem] ‘no he did not know you Kareem’

8. E FB in Palestinian Arabic relies mainly on rising intonation as a marker, as seems to be the case in most human languages. There could be several reasons for this, e.g. making a request like: [aruw/h?] ‘shall I go?, [a/h?] ‘ah?’, etc.

9. In Palestinian Arabic, both E FB and G & E FB are more often to be found in small talk, etc. than in narration.

10. Interestingly, the Palestinian Arabic expression [ṭab], derived from the expression [ṭayyib] which means, approximately, ‘ok’, was used several times mainly to interrupt, to take the floor from a speaker, however it was never used to
This would lead to the conclusion that Palestinian FB expressions can be used sometimes for interruption and/or floor management, rather than for FB actions only.

11. The Arab Palestinians use several religious expressions as FB, E FB, G & E FB, and self FB, e.g. [allaahu akbar] ‘God’s the greatest’ etc. to express their FB actions for several purposes like wondering, dening, showing sympathy, admiring, expressing happiness, etc., depending on the situation.

2) Functional description

It is important to discuss and exemplify some ways of signalling FB in English and Palestinian Arabic. I also would like to point out that the data conversations reported here do not cover all the FB analyses of the present section. However, these have confirmed my own observations and helped me in the collection of other data, which I recorded in Jeddah (Saudi Arabia), and Gothenburg (Sweden) some time ago.

Allwood 1987/88 (see chapter 3, section 3.2), enumerates eight main aspects of FB, as illustrated in the present section. They are:

1) Turntaking:
   a) Taker: [laakin] ‘but’, [laakin tamaam] ‘but well’, [uʃurnii laakin] ‘excuse me but’
   b) Acceptor: [aywa] ‘yes’
   c) Holder: [mm] ‘mm’
   d) Giver: [naʃam] ‘yes’

2) Perception:

3) Understanding:
   a) – Understanding: [aa bass anaa ʒaniiit...] ‘yes but I thought...’
   b) + Understanding: [maʃaak] ‘I’m with you’, [faahim] ‘I understand’

4) Acceptance:
   a) – Acceptance: [laa] ‘no’, [aa bas] ‘yes but’
5) Indication of information status:

A: [iddinyaa b-timt] ‘it is raining’
B: [aywaa iddinyaa aa] ‘yes it is yes’

A: [iddinyaa maa-btimt] ‘it is not raining’
B: [laa iddinyaa laa] ‘no it is not no’

6) Other expressive reactions:


A: [biʕsaddi/q] ‘do you believe?’
B: [baʕsaddiq] ‘I believe’

2) Boulemaic: [maʔmuwl] ‘hopefully’, ‘I hope so’

A: [bidda/k] ‘do you want?’ (an offer)
B: [biddii] ‘I want’ (confirm)


A: [iʃ raʔyak] ‘what do you think/say?’
B: [dʒayid] ‘good’

4) Basic:
a) Anger: [kayf titdʒarraʔ innak tiʃmil hay:k] ‘how dare you do this?’
b) Commiseration: [yaa li-lkusuf] ‘what a shame’
c) Disgust: [biqazziz] ‘disgusting’
d) Dominance: [naʃam] ‘yes’, [dʒayid] ‘good’ [dʒayid dʒiddan] ‘very good’
e) Fear: [Uw laa] ‘Oh no’
f) Gratitude: [ʃukran] ‘thanks’, [ʃukran ilak] ‘thank you’
h) New information: [a:ha:], [yaa all/aʔ] ‘aha’, ‘oh God’
i) Pleasure: [hubbi:] ‘lovely’, [anaa ʃaakir] ‘I am grateful, thanks’
j) Puzzlement + words: [anaa miʃ mistawʃib] ‘I don’t get it’
k) Scepticism: [kammil] ‘Go on’, [uw baʕday:n] ‘And then’
All are used in moments of sorrow also.
(‘Saatir’/‘Sattar’ is one of God’s names which means ‘coverer’, ‘protector’).
There are also many expressions in Arabic that deal with moments of shock, surprise, etc.

7) Reinforcements of functional aspects:
a) Phonemic and prosodic processes:  [ah aaah] ‘yes yes’
b) Reduplication:  [aa aa aa] ‘yes yes yes’
c) Combination of three elements with simple primary FB:  [aywa h anaa biddii aqarrir biddabt] ‘yes I will decide exactly’

8) Evocative:

A:  [il ?ustaað maa / maa kaan fii ddars] ‘the teacher was not in class’
B:  [haqiqi:/?] ‘really?’
A:  [aa] ‘yes’
B:  [hadaa variib] ‘this is strange’

1.1.4 Feedback and Communication

Cerrato (2004), in his coding scheme based on Allwood’s work (2001), considers the production of FB as one of the most important phenomena in human communication and probably an index of conversation fluency.

Communication is an essential element of FB, which is the central theme of this thesis. FB plays a central role in human language communication. The term ‘communication’ is used by Wiener (1948) to denote processes by which a
control unit gets information about the effects and consequences of its actions. Since the discussion is concentrated on linguistic (individual) FB, an explanation needs to be given of this phenomenon in spoken language communication. FB is a linguistic mechanism which enables the participants in a conversation to exchange information. This information, according to Allwood (1979, 1988), has to be related to four basic communicative functions which are essential in direct face-to-face human communication. These are: contact, perception, understanding and attitudinal reaction (for more explanation, see subsection 2.3.5 of the present study).

FB is an action that expresses individual attitudes, and it is very important to show and confirm the degree of co-operation between people during communication; therefore, terms like ‘action’ and ‘co-operation’ are quite essential to our understanding of feedback. Feedback varies also in degree, e.g., there are ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ levels, which very often are joined with non-verbal signals, and sometimes are expressed only (as ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’) non-verbally (see 2.3.6 of this study).

These fundamental assumptions should always be borne in mind as we begin to discuss linguistic FB. Indeed, it is very difficult for either interlocutor to continue talking if the speaker does not receive FB from the listener, and it is usually impossible for the listener to give adequate FB to the speaker if he/she does not listen to him/her. Therefore, the whole process is one of co-operation between interlocutors whereby FB and co-operation belong together.

FB thus seems to be a universal phenomenon in human language and is related to other concepts of linguistic communication, such as action and activity, co-operation, sender, receiver, channel, power and linguistic prestige. FB illustrates clearly how the listener must cooperate with the speaker to facilitate successful communication. When, for example, the listener signals [anaa faahim], ‘I understand’, the speaker can take this as a signal to go on talking. More specifically, it is important to study FB for a more complete understanding of human face-to-face interaction. According to Allwood et al (1990) it seems to be related to three functions of speech production and speech perception, which are:

i) **speech management functions**, i.e. the linguistic processes and mechanisms whereby a speaker manages his or her own linguistic contributions to a communicative interaction, involving phenomena that have sometimes been described as ‘planning’, ‘editing’, ‘(self) repair’, etc.
ii) interactive functions, i.e. linguistic processes and mechanisms whereby the speakers manage the flow of interaction. FB mechanisms, the topic of this work, are an example of an interactive subsystem.

iii) focused, main message functions, i.e. linguistic processes and mechanisms whereby speakers manage to communicate information which is not immediately connected with the management of their own speech or the interaction at hand. Focused or main message functions thus include most of what is commonly described in grammatical theory and can be operationally defined as that which is contained in an utterance when those parts that are devoted to speech management or interactive functions have been subtracted. Allwood et al (1990) continue: ‘speech management, interactive functions and focused/main message functions’ can further be analytically subdivided into subsystems and subsystems of subsystems, characterised by different functions. Interactive functions can, for example, be subdivided into mechanisms for:

   a) sequencing (of activities and sub-activities, communicative acts and/or topics)
   b) turn taking
   c) giving and eliciting FB

So it is clear that FB is related to many different phenomena observable in spoken communication (cf. our M.Phil thesis 2002 P. 20, and see also Allwood, Nivre and Ahlsén 1990).

1.1.5 Feedback and Intonation

Intonation is playing a central role in FB. Rising, falling, average, lengthening, or shortening, etc. all are very important to make the listener able to understand the type of FB is given, and to make the speaker willing to send his/her message with a minimum degree of misunderstanding. For example giving and eliciting FB as discussed in subsec. 2.4.3 play essential role to reveal the difference between different functions of FB. Context also one main factor that controls the intonation that should be followed for one specific FB function. Normal situation/s leads to an average level of intonation to give or elicit FB, which means, the situation directs our melody of the purpose of FB.

Let us for instance consider the following examples which use the same FB expression to give different meanings with regard to the intonation, [/m] ‘m’ with rising intonation would mean: to confirm, to warn, to surprise. [\m] ‘m’ with falling intonation would mean: to hesitate, to express sadness, to get disappointed,
etc. [m] ‘m’ with an average/normal intonation would mean: to agree, to accept, etc. and so on … . The same FB expression could be used to elicit FB, let us see the following example from our data,

[data sample] (8)

A : [qaabil /m] ‘have you agreed m’?
B : [na'am] ‘yes’

In eliciting FB a speaker uses one FB action by the end of his/her talk to encourage the listener to give his/her FB. Usually the intonation plays a central role in enabling us to distinguish the eliciting FB as we saw in the above example with rising intonation. For more information regarding the role of intonation, you may see Gussenhoven (2002), and Nivre et al (1999). Also in subsec 3.2.3.2, item G, where the relation between prosody and intonation will be discussed, and in section 6.4, item III, where the relation between FB and some of the phonological operations will be discussed, all the present thesis.

In the Palestinian Arabic, especially Yafa dialect (since most of our informants come from this city of Palestine), we observe two salient features i.e., *lengthening* and *rising intonation*. Normally these features observed among females more than males, however, both gender share the same feature during their talk. Since we are discussing FB, then the same feature apply in this linguistic phenomenon as well. Let us consider the following examples from our data,

[data sample] (9)

- [šahl:/h?] ‘right?’ = eliciting FB with long and rising intonation
- [akì:d] ‘sure’ = positive FB with long intonation
- [la:/] ‘no’ = negative FB with long and rising intonation
- [imni:: h muw hi::k?] ‘fine, isn’t it?’ = two FB actions: the first with long intonation, and the second with long and rising intonation.

### 1.2 Feedback and the Aims of the Present Study

This study deals with FB phenomena in spoken Palestinian Arabic. Since this linguistic phenomenon is essential for achieving successful contact between speakers, especially those who come from different cultures, this study falls within the domain of **CULTURAL DESCRIPTION**.
The term ‘culture’ has enormous scope. It represents human views, beliefs, thoughts and acts. Elements such as habits, customs, proverbs, etc. also belong to the study of culture. Language also falls under the cultural umbrella. I believe that culture represents, to some extent, the real identity of an individual. Since we are dealing in the present study with language as a human phenomenon to enable individuals to communicate, describing a culture (or even certain aspects of this culture, as is done shortly) which is related to this particular language is a very important factor in the reader’s background. Such a description works to remove ambiguity between speakers and will help communicators when they communicate with each other. This will be discussed in detail in 1.6 and 1.7 of the present chapter. The link between culture and FB is very strong. It can be seen, for instance, how some writers like Allwood (1976, 1985 and 1988a, b, and c), in his discussion of FB, moved from the widest area, where he discussed culture and communication, to a narrower area where he discussed FB. This is certainly one example of the connection between them, and we can say that the more knowledge we have about a certain culture, the more we succeed in our communication with those who come from this culture. FB is one essential and central issue in this matter, because if we have only a limited degree of knowledge of a certain culture, then we have to expect misunderstandings to occur all the time between us and those who come from the other culture. As a result of this, we will end up with unsuccessful contact.²

As this is a study of ‘linguistic feedback’ the term suggested by Wiener 1948:114 and then used by Allwood 1993:1, the following discussion can be added to the description of this linguistic phenomenon: if a speaker performs an action that requires a response, both the speaker’s performance and the receiver’s responses may or may not succeed. When a receiver does not give a coherent and/or clear response, then the sender sees that the receiver is experiencing some problem(s) that deserve(s) to be dealt with. For this reason, there might be several alternatives for the sender to initiate, e.g., to abandon the attempt to get the listener’s FB; to misinterpret the answer; or to take the listener’s response into account.

The importance of FB is very clear in telephone conversation – for example, when someone talks on the telephone without getting a response from the listener, or without receiving the proper answer in conversation, such an example shows a communication problem between both interlocutors (sender and receiver). If the speaker does not hear any (signal) response(s) he/she will

² See example 3 in subsection 1.4.1 of the present chapter.
probably hang up, or we may expect several interpretations, e.g., misunderstanding, mis-hearing, metaphoric answers, etc. In both cases, there is clearly a problem in the (telephone) conversation that needs to be dealt with.

The main purpose of the present thesis is to describe, analyse, and discuss verbal feedback phenomena and its operations in spoken Palestinian Arabic. The analyses will exclude non-verbal (gestural) feedback from this dialect, and to show, as possible, the importance of this linguistic phenomenon to arise successful interaction in (human) language communication.

This study is based on the Palestinian dialect and the speakers are predominantly Palestinian. Even though the interviews have taken place in Jeddah/Saudi Arabia, the recordings were made of Palestinian speakers living in Saudi Arabia. Let us see the following example of our recordings where we see the ways in which Saudi setting influenced Palestinian dialect. This is observed clearly from speaker F below, who is Palestinian, when he used the expression [māa adriī] ‘I don’t know’ which is Saudi dialect instead of [māa ba’raf] ‘I don’t know’ which is Palestinian one.

[data sample] (10)

F : [māa adriī <name> min madanii] ‘I don’t know Mahir is from.. civilian’
A : [takruwnii] ‘he is black’
G : <![<name> takruwnii]> /// wajhuw jaay min zimbaabwii willaa māa adriī min ay].
‘Mahir is black this is seen clearly on his face probably from Zimbabwe or I don’t know from which…’

From the above example we have seen how the Palestinian dialect has been affect by the Saudi setting.

The Palestinian dialect is one of a large family of dialects to be found in (what is called) the Middle East, known as [lahjat ijjam] ‘Sham dialect’, which consists of Palestinian, Syrian, Lebanese and Jordanian. This Palestinian dialect is probably one of the most widely spoken Arabic dialects today.

I have found it necessary to use the ‘international phonetic alphabet’ for Arabic (with some suggested modifications for some phonemes in the introduction of the present study). I have done this because the ISO Recommendation (International System For The Transliteration Of Arabic Characters, 1961) was partly obsolete and did not deal with the sounds used in some FB operations (utterances, words and phonemic sounds). But this applies to only a small set of sounds.
I have chosen to examine FB for the following reasons:

i) Since there is no account of FB as a linguistic phenomenon in spoken Arabic, such a study will expand the empirical base of general linguistic theory by providing new knowledge about Spoken Palestinian Arabic.

ii) To test the results that were obtained in the previous thesis (2002) and to develop them substantially in the present one.

iii) To focus on studying the FB phenomenon as a communicative function, i.e., semantically and pragmatically.

iv) To highlight, where possible, misunderstanding, misinterpretation, misjudgement, and misconception between people from the Arab world on the one hand, and other cultures, on the other hand, due to communicative differences.

v) To improve understanding between interlocutors

Regarding item iv above, it is not claimed that the present study will remove misunderstanding, etc. completely between Arabs and other cultures; however, it is possible that such a study will increase the range of understanding and decrease the scope of misunderstanding between speakers from different cultures. Regarding item i, as far as I know, still no account of FB as a linguistic phenomenon in Arabic exists. With regard to ii, some analyses have been added that were not discussed in my previous research, i.e., eliciting FB, giving and eliciting FB, self FB, pragmatic and semantic analysis. All of this is due to my intention to relate the results of the previous study, i.e., ‘Feedback in Arabic Spoken Communication’ (2002), to the main findings of the present one.

Regarding item iii, since both semantic and pragmatic considerations are combined together, i.e., the first one deals with meaning, and the second deals with situation, it seems that it will be rather difficult to isolate the semantic from the pragmatic in such studies; therefore, there will be no attempt to distinguish them. Such a distinction runs into serious practical and theoretical difficulties. In other words, it is impossible to imagine any FB expression with a loose meaning, or lack of meaning and context. For example, the (FB) expression ‘no’ is a negative FB expression semantically, and occurs in a specific situation pragmatically, e.g. refusing a request, etc. (see also Allwood 1981, and Allwood, Nivre and Ahlsén 1992).
Most of the previous studies of FB, including my previous thesis, focused on the study of FB as a linguistic expression i.e., to study FB as type of expressions/forms e.g., he used ‘yes’ as FB. For this reason, it has been decided to focus the analysis here on the studies of FB as a communicative function i.e., to study FB pragmatically e.g., ‘his FB surprised me’ and semantically e.g., his FB was positive (see item iii above).

The present thesis also deals with sociolinguistics. FB and sociolinguistic variation will be described for each individual in conversation. These variations will be described with the help of tables and several selected examples from the data. These examples have to be connected with the main topic (FB) and related to each social variant.

FB in connection with communication occurs everywhere, but it does not always occur in the same way. For instance, human beings give different types of FB in formal conversations and informal meetings. In a large part of the Middle East, FB at public performances is given through different means, i.e. loud shouts supported by hand waves, which are common even in Parliament. In some other cultures, e.g., in large parts of Europe, FB at public performances is mostly given through, for example, applause, whistles and facial expressions. (The description of the two Parliaments was based on our own observation, public readings, and further studies was held by Gothenburg University in 1990s).

In informal situations such as free conversations, etc. verbal signals are used. In the Arab world especially it is important to indicate attention and show respect. I have therefore developed a large variety of FB actions which give this type of information. Looking at some other cultures, such as Finnish (according to certain studies held by the Linguistic Department at Gothenburg University in 1990s), it has been observed that in many situations Finnish people give only a small number of FB actions during their conversation/s.

1.2.1 Outline of the Present Study

The present thesis has been organised as follows:

Chapter 2 will discuss FB (feedback) phenomena in (rather) early observations and in recent times. An attempt will be made to formulate some research questions that are relevant to this study which will be answered throughout the thesis.
In chapter 3, which covers both the data and method of this research, the collection and preparation of the data conversations will be described. The conversations, whose topics and data have been outlined briefly in 1.3 and 1.3.1, have been transcribed, transliterated, and partly translated (wherever FB actions occurred) into English in order to facilitate analysis and presentation of data. The present research is based on the same set of six recordings of conversations made in Jeddah (Saudi Arabia) used in my previous study. The data will be analysed using a coding scheme developed by several linguists. The data was collected at different times.

The present chapter will also discuss settings and informants on the one hand, and their relation to the main topic of FB actions. Four main categories will be illustrated and described in this chapter. These are:

- Eliciting FB
- Giving FB= single and complex FB utterance
- Eliciting and giving FB
- Self FB

Discussion of semantic and pragmatic analysis of FB actions will be given.

Although fresh data was not used for this thesis, fresh analyses have been employed. In some ways the lack of fresh data restricts the findings – particularly in the way that it does not allow an assessment of FB in wider social settings, for instance. But it can be said (according the results of our study) that the present data is representative of a reasonable segment of Arab people living in the Middle East. While a more diverse set of data might have produced different results, the principles of FB discussed here are universal because they cover the main FB analyses and operations suggested by several linguists e.g., Allwood, Nivre and Ahlsén (1999) who made a major contribution to this field of studies.

Chapter 4 will give the total number of FB actions and non-FB turns. It accounts for the six main ways of expressing FB.

Chapter 5 will summarise the results and the contributions made by this study. In addition, a full analysis of FB and sociolinguistic variations will be described for each individual in conversation. Communicative acts and personal markers in connection with FB will be discussed.
Chapter 6 will discuss the main findings in this thesis, and point to areas for future studies or research.

1.3 Reviewing the Previous Study and Main Points Discussed and Added to the Present Thesis

In my previous study (see my licentiate thesis June, 2002), I analysed FB in the Arabic spoken language. The study was based on a set of recordings of conversations, all made in Jeddah (in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia) between the 1st and 30th February 1994. Six recordings were made, each lasting one hour, except the fifth conversation which lasted half an hour. The recordings were all audio tape recordings. Video recordings were also planned but, for political and religious reasons, this was deemed difficult. In three of the recordings (the first, fourth and sixth), the researcher did not inform the participants beforehand that their conversation was to be recorded. Afterwards, the researcher informed the participants, offering to destroy the recording if anyone objected to being recorded. This procedure of not informing the participants in advance was motivated by the wish to have more natural and reliable data.

It is important to recognise that although not informing all participants that they were being recorded raises ethical issues, it is impossible to achieve authentic results without proceeding in this manner.

The researcher was one of the participants in three of the conversations (the first, the second, and the sixth). All the recorded conversations have been transcribed, transliterated, and (partly) translated into English in order to facilitate analysis and presentation of data. The ‘analysis of the data’ was based partly on a coding scheme developed by Nivre, Allwood and Ahlsén (1999). They offered a classification of FB units into three broad categories:

i) FB word e.g., [ناَفَام] ‘yes’
ii) FB phrase e.g., [اَتَقِيدَ حَيْكَ] ‘I think so’
iii) Complex FB e.g., [ناَفَامَ اَتَقِيدَ حَيْكَ] ‘yes I think so’

I refer to these classifications as simple and complex FB. Simple FB is exemplified in i and ii and complex in example iii.
Several main aspects regarding FB expressions were discussed and dealt with in the previous study. These were divided into five sections, as follows:

i) The total amount of correlation between FB actions and non-FB turns. This will be shown in a table capturing both aspects.

ii) The two main ways of expressing FB units: single word FB (e.g., agree) versus more than one word (e.g., I do).

iii) These two ways of expressing FB actions – FB single word and FB in an utterance (or complex FB) – were shown for individual informants in the conversations. Later in that section, non-FB turns will also be tabulated and the results shown in figures. Finally, a conclusion regarding these items will be given.

First of all, we need to explain the following:

a) the term: ‘action/s’ to refer to all FB instance/s
b) the term: ‘turn/s’ to refer to all non-FB instance/s.

These terms denote one thing, namely, when a speaker takes the floor from another speaker during conversation. We have suggested this in order to avoid repeating one expression all the time, therefore we have used the above expressions to denote the same concept: FB or non-FB expression.

The main analysis regarding this study was described as follows:

a) Simple FB, i.e., FB given as a single word utterance. This section shows whether FB occurs as single, initial, medial, or final instance in a sentence.

b) Complex FB, i.e., FB given as an utterance consisting of more than one word is divided into two parts: Type 1, which includes six categories and covers FB units consisting of more than one word; and Type 2, which includes seven categories and covers different combinations of the first six categories.

c) Conversation turns, including the sum of all turns, or non-FB actions, occurring in the course of each conversation.

iv) Four types of conversation, or types of activity, were discussed in our previous study. The reason for a high or low number of FB actions, say,
acceptance, rather than the other three types of functions, etc. will be indicated. The types occurring in the conversations will be treated and described for each conversation and tabulated. Later in this section a discussion of the correlation between FB actions and these four types of activity will be given.

v) Figures for all four main communicative acts related to FB functions are given, i.e., acceptance, agreement, confirmation and rejection. As already mentioned, Allwood, Nivre and Ahlsén (1991) have accounted for at least four main functions of primary FB: acceptance, agreement, confirmation and rejection. These attitudes cover most of the responses that can be made in any human language. A separate result for each of these four main functions is displayed and stated in figures in later subsections of this section.

The main characteristics and observations of FB in Arabic are discussed, in subsection 1.1.3, and 1.1.3.1 with the help of Allwood’s analysis (1987/88), it was discussed some ways of signalling FB in English and Arabic. The main findings based on the data used in my previous work can be summarised in the following way:

1. The total number of all FB actions in the data corpus is 1258, while non-FB actions are given 1721 times. The sum for both is 2979 FB actions and non-FB turns.

2. Single-word FB (simple FB) occurrences totalled 650 actions, while complex FB totalled of 608 actions.

3. With regard to all FB actions and non-FB turns in the conversations, the following conclusion was reached. We expect 350 to 800 turns comprising:

   - 200 to 350 FB actions, and
   - 200 to 400 non-FB turns

4. Regarding the correlation between different types of activity and types of FB, four types of talk occurred most frequently in the data conversations. These types of activities were: discussion, gossip, narratives and small talk. Two main points were discussed and the following results were found:

   i) The most frequent kinds of talk were ‘discussion’ and ‘gossip’. ‘Gossip’ occurred in all conversations except the fifth one.
ii) As for the correlation between FB function and types of conversation, acceptance forms, including ‘gossip’ and ‘telling stories’ or ‘facts’, and rejection forms, including ‘discussion’, occurred most frequently in the data.

5. Regarding FB function, the total for all main FB functions is given as 650 actions. The most frequent FB functions were acceptance and rejection, with the acceptance forms being more frequent than the rejection forms.

6. For the purpose of making an interesting and relevant comparison to the main findings, some similar (empirical) studies describing FB phenomena in Swedish can be used. In the comparison between Arabic and Swedish conversations, the third Arabic conversation was excluded, which was a formal conversation recorded in an office, in order that the conversation in settings would match the Swedish data, which all were recorded in private homes. The comparison showed some variation with regard to the length of time as well as the amount of conversation [i.e., variation, singular]. In general, this comparison focused on two phenomena: FB actions and non-FB turns. The results of this comparison show that:

   i) Swedes gave 2,333 FB actions over one and half hour, while Arabs gave 1,082 FB actions over four and half hours.
   ii) Swedes gave 7,785 non-FB turns, while Arabs gave 1,472 non-FB turns.
   iii) Total instances for Swedes 10118 FB actions and non-FB turns, and for Arabs 2554 FB actions and non-FB turns.

This enabled the assessment of the difference between FB actions given by Swedes and Arabs in normal conversations.

According to the above figures between the Swedish and Arabic FB actions, it is necessary to emphasise that, even though the result has shown that the higher number of FB actions was given in the Swedish data, it appears that informing the participants of the particular linguistic topic, which the researcher aimed to discuss, affected the outcome of result, because as soon as the participants knew about the intended topic/s, they started to use a large number of FB expressions during their conversation, which did not serve similar empirical research. In reality, having spent about a decade in this country I have observed that Swedes rarely give many FB actions during their conversation.
Under theoretical implications in my previous work, I have attempted to make three major contributions:

a) To contribute new linguistic data/information
b) To try to improve communication between Arabs and other cultures
c) To provide new knowledge about spoken Palestinian and ‘communicative’ colloquial Arabic.

The Main Points Discussed and Added to the Present Thesis

It is necessary to point out that in subsection 1.3.1 of the present study a wide comparison has been made between the previous study and the present one. Before listing the main points added and discussed in the present thesis, we would like to explain that besides expanding the discussion in a number of sections in the present thesis, several new analyses deserve to be discussed in the present study; therefore, it has been decided to involve them in the present thesis. The main analyses added are as follows:

i) A major discussion is given regarding FB expressions and their communicative functions, i.e., semantically (which based on six main functions and its relation to FB) and pragmatically (which based on six main type of talk plus one form of communication and its relation to FB).

ii) The discussion of communication has been narrowed in discourse, its process, action, activity, cooperation, and all the aspects of communication

iii) The discussion of background includes many other writers of modern times e.g., Subbs and McTear (1981), Levinson (1983) etc, more definitions of FB actions are given, and more analyses of FB operations have been added

iv) The method chapter: even though the same data conversations have been used, some modifications have been added, such as the main analyses of FB, the criteria for deciding the function of FB, semantic analyses, and pragmatic analyses

v) In the analysis chapter a list of points have been added. These are:
   - two new functions of FB, i.e., non-understanding and hesitation
   - three types of FB giving, i.e., eliciting FB, giving and eliciting FB, and self FB
As a result of this study and after adding these analyses of FB to the previous study, the number of FB actions have increased (see chapter 4 of the present study).

vi) Two new independent sections have been added in chapter 5, which are: sociolinguistic variations, and personal markers

vii) The conclusion chapter, the appendix and the references have also been expanded as well

1.3.1 A Comparison with Regard to the Previous Study

In the following section a brief review will be made of the main points that have been discussed and added to my previous study, etc. as well as the main results obtained in both studies. Although the same data that was analysed in the previous study has been used, a good number of different analyses have been added. The present study is intended to combine, as much as possible, FB as types of expressions and its communicative functions, i.e. semantically and pragmatically, while the previous study focused on describing FB phenomena as types of expressions only.

I) The previous study discussed spoken communication in general, while in the present thesis the discussion has been narrowed to the term communication in discourse, its processes, action and activity, co-operation, and the aspects of communication.

II) The second chapter of the previous study discussed the background of FB, which included some writers and their early observations and a few new contributions to the concept of FB. The discussion included many other writers of modern times. More definitions of FB actions were also given. Furthermore, more analyses of FB operations have been added.

III) The third chapter of both studies describes the method employed. Though the same data conversations have been used, some modifications were added, e.g. the main analyses of FB, the criteria for deciding the function of FB, and both semantic and pragmatic analyses. In order to support the discussion more examples have been added, mainly from the data, and where relevant examples were not found, I have relied on my own observations.
IV) Chapter four comprises the analysis of the present study. First, the main points that have been analysed will be listed, then the additional points added in the present thesis.

The previous study included two main types of FB expressions only:

- FB single word, and FB as an utterance.
- Two new functions of FB single word were added in the present study i.e., non-understanding and hesitation. By adding these two new functions; 470 FB actions was added to the previous result.

- The present thesis includes, in addition to the two types of giving FB mentioned above, the following types:

1. Eliciting FB, i.e. as a single word, occurred in 89 instances, and in an utterance, in 163 instances.
2. Giving & Eliciting FB as single word and in an utterance were found 74 times
3. Self FB, when a speaker gives FB to him/herself, was found 377 times.

Looking at these results for the different types of FB actions, we may draw the following conclusions:

a) FB single word was given the most, i.e., 1120 actions
Note, this number was reached after adding the other two functions, i.e. non-understanding, and hesitation, which seem to have played an important role as FB main functions.

b) FB in an utterance/more than one word was the second type, and it was found in 608 actions.

c) Interestingly, self FB came in third place in terms of frequency, occurring in 377 actions.

d) E FB as single word and in an utterance came in fourth place, where single word comprised 89 instances, and more than one word comprised 163 instances and the sum for both was 252 instances.

e) Meanwhile G & E FB as single word and in an utterance together came last and in fifth place according to frequency, occurring 74 times.
From the above main findings it can be argued that FB as single word in the free conversations is given the most. FB in an utterance/more than one word (both types 1, and 2 is given less, while self FB is given the least in spoken Palestinian Arabic.

**Some Advantages in Including the Above Criteria**

These analyses have been in Arabic; the results of this study are evidence;

a) To support Allwood’s theory and that of his followers by using two types of FB they have suggested and used, namely: E FB, and G & E FB.

b) The present analysis of a particular variety of FB, ‘self FB’, has shown this interesting type to exist in one major world language, namely Arabic.

c) Since these sorts of analyses can be applied to Arabic, then some of them can be applied to other languages as well.

Of course, by adding all these analyses of FB to the previous study, the number of FB actions increased. For instance, the total number of all FB actions in the previous study was 1258, while the total of all FB actions in the present thesis is 2431. Both FB actions and non-FB turns in the previous study were 2979 instances, while after adding the new analyses of FB, this figure is 4152 instances. The additional ways for expressing FB actions has doubled the number of FB actions.

For example, with regard to the analysis of self FB, sometimes a participant may give more than one response, caused by cultural, situational, or individual influences (see subsection 2.4.4 of this thesis). Pragmatic and semantic analyses have played an important part in ascertaining the variations of the frequency of FB actions. The following items have been added:

- Regarding the pragmatic part, two types of conversations have been added: provocation and intimacy. Silence as a category is also included.
- Regarding the semantic part, two functions have been added: non-understanding and hesitation. These two functions have been added into the analysis of FB main functions in this study.

The two linguistic fields of semantics and pragmatics are interconnected, and it is impossible to find any FB actions that lack either meaning or situation, unless it were nonsense talk, e.g., someone says ‘yes’ without being asked, or while talking to him/herself for a nonsensical reason.
To conclude the discussion of the pragmatic and semantic parts, I do not claim that the chosen elements for both parts cover all aspects related to these two concepts. Rather, it might be found that some other elements deserve to be considered, discussed and integrated into similar studies.

V) Two independent sections have been included in this thesis that did not feature in the previous one; these are section 5.2 and subsection 5.3. Here, the *sociolinguistic* variations have been examined with regard to FB, and an attempt has been to describe how these variations played a certain role in the formulation and production of specific FB actions by individuals.

In section 5.3, the recognition of an important phenomenon in spoken language, namely *personal markers*, has led to this linguistic phenomenon being given an independent analysis in this study. And it has been demonstrated how intimately this phenomenon is related to FB.

The next chapter will discuss the main findings and contribution in this thesis, and some points for similar studies in the future.

a) Successful communication/contact

People normally need to interact and communicate with each other, no matter where they may come from. Therefore, a description of FB will be a helpful factor for people who come from cultures other than that of Saudi Arabia, and nations other than the Arabs. This, moreover, will play a central role in establishing ways of achieving successful and fruitful contact with the culture in question.

b) Spoken Palestinian Arabic

Research into FB in spoken Palestinian Arabic, to my knowledge, has not been studied. Since this is a discussion about a very important and essential phenomenon in Arabic, and since this linguistic phenomenon involves spoken Palestinian Arabic in daily language use, the present project represents a central topic in human language communication.

It is important to point out that in the main topic of my previous research, all FB actions (verbal or non-verbal) that occurred in the conversations varied not only from one culture to another but also from one person to another, even if the participants came from the same culture. A deeper analysis of such matters will
not be made here (such analysis would require a discussion, description, and analysis of the psychological state of each participant in conversation). Neither is it claimed here that the sum of all FB actions reported entails that ‘the number of FB actions given in a similar situation should be xx actions exactly’. The results obtained, as well as those given in the present study, only represent the approximate number of FB actions that can be expected to occur in an ordinary Arabic conversation.

It needs to be pointed out that, due to adding a lot of points and discussion throughout the present thesis (see below, for instance), it has been decided not to add new data in our data base.

The present study will add the following items which were missing from the previous study:

i) Eliciting FB
ii) Giving and eliciting FB
iii) Self FB
iv) Pragmatic analyses: three types of talk were added
v) Semantic analyses: two other functions were added
vi) Sociolinguistic variations with regard to FB
vii) Personal markers.

### 1.4 The Process of Communication and Communicative Acts

Communication and communicative acts are linked to FB in the following three ways:

i) when a speaker sends a message to a receiver
ii) the transmission to a receiver, and afterwards, his interpretation of the message
iii) a receiver becomes a sender when he/she gives FB (see also subsection 1.4.7, figure 1 of the present study).

According to Allwood (1976) communicative acts are actions through which a sender intends to display or signal information to a receiver. Here, we see the strong connection between communicative acts and FB in language communication.
1.4.1 What is Communication?

*Communication* is an important feature of our lives, because each individual must continuously base his/her behaviour on available information. Communicating is a behaviour that enables the sharing of information between (interacting) individuals as they respond to each other. Communication, then, is for making information available to be shared. Human communication is not simply made up of a sentence or other expressions, but it is rather the performance of certain kinds of acts, e.g., asking questions, giving orders, making statements, apologising, thanking, explaining, making requests, congratulating, etc. A very simple example would be when a speaker performs one of these acts when he/she is uttering a sentence. The act itself must not be confused by any kind of ambiguity of expression. Individuals can benefit from making information available to each other.

The word *communication* is derived historically from the Latin *communicatio*, which means sharing. Hinde writes: ‘we can speak of communicating rooms, and the Apostle, as Mackay exemplified, (in the classical English of the Authorized Version [of the Bible?]) can admonish us not to “forget to do good and to communicate”. In this general sense, A communicates with B if anything is shared between A and B or transferred from A to B’ (Hinde, 1972: 3-4).

Lyons (1977) discussed the terms *communicate* and *communication*, and said that both are used in a fairly wide range of contexts in their everyday, pre-theoretical sense. He went on to say that we talk as readily of the communication of feelings, moods and attitudes as we do of the communication of factual information. Lyons tried to narrow down the term *communication* and said that the term is restricted to the intentional transmission of information by means of some established signalling-system. Initially, at least, for the purpose of this study, the term will be restricted still further – to the intentional transmission of factual, or propositional information (Lyons, 1977: 32).

Another writer who described communication in comparison to signals is Smith (1977), who stated that ‘when we speak of communicating, we commonly imply the use of specialized signals’. He went on to say that ‘they are not strictly necessary; we could define communication as any sharing of information from any source, as is regularly done in biology and some other sciences’.

I agree with Smith that any kind of communication must begin with signals. From this perspective, if communication is to occur, the information *must* be
shared between a speaker and a receiver. Therefore, misleading signals and/or the withholding of information which are necessary for making the process of communication possible, leads to incomplete communication (Smith, 1977: 13).

Communication is also discussed by Allwood (1995) who states that communication, normally, and at a given time, focuses more on either sending or receiving information, i.e., they (speakers) are primarily either in the sender’s role (e.g., speaker, writer, etc.) or in the receiver’s role (e.g., listener, reader, etc).

Allwood (1976) discusses communication in the following manner:

i) In its widest sense *communication* is used to designate the sharing or transference of any phenomenon whatsoever between two entities, e.g., in physics one speaks of ‘communicating vessels’ or of the ‘communication of power to a machine’.

ii) In a narrower sense the term ‘communication’ can be used to designate any such sharing or transference which takes place between human beings with some (perhaps low) degree of conscious awareness.³

To speak and/or to make gestures, etc. is to perform actions. This thesis supports Allwood’s view (1976) that linguistic communication is based on action and co-operation on the part of interlocutors. That is, both speaker and listener in spoken communication perform actions which are subject to co-operative principle.

There may be differences of convention regarding FB in communication between speakers of different languages, and according to cultural differences. For instance:

a) A speaker of Arabic and English can often explicitly ask the listener to listen.

b) A listener of Arabic and English can often explicitly say that he/she will listen to the speaker.

---

³ Several further concepts related to the concept of communication discussed by Allwood do not concern the argument of this thesis.
Before moving on to an example to support the above two characteristics, it may pointed out that these and many other characteristics to be discussed in this work might also be found in languages other than Arabic and English; however, it is a matter of how often such examples of these are found.

Regarding statement ‘a‘ here, the following example may be given from the data:

C = is the sender

[data sample] (11)
C : [isma‘ii Ali ẓallii kullu ẓalaa d‘anb ‘i‘ibaab uw lamman ẓintii ḥalaṣ fii ḥurūl uw rawwih ẓudii ma‘aakii wirmii barra] ‘you listen Ali leave it close to the door and when you finish your work you may take it with you on your way home and just throw it outside’
I : [<fii ḥurūl anaa lissa fii ḥurūl kaθiir marra>] ‘still there is a lot of work remaining’
@ <loud>

The example above shows that speaker C asks speaker I to listen to what he is saying, and speaker C knows from the response that speaker I is listening to him.

As for point ‘b’ above, there exist in Arabic several expressions which can be given to prove this case. Giving FB to a speaker for which he/she did not ask explicitly is a normal procedure among the Arabs. The motivation for this kind of FB is to give a signal to the sender that he is listening to what he is saying and to give an encouragement to keep going in his/her speech, or sometimes to give a positive signal to the other person to take initiative in speaking.

It cannot be certain that the above two characteristics are unique to Arabic, but at least they exist, are understood, and are motivated by Arab culture (for more on this subject, see self FB subsections 2.4.4, 3.2.2, and section 4.3 below)

1.4.2 Communication as a Discourse Phenomenon

Since the present study falls within the domain of ‘Discourse Analysis’, it needs to be added that discourse is an integrated part of communication. For example, people use utterances to convey information and to lead each other towards an interpretation of meanings and intentions. Discourse analysis relates to several approaches to communication, e.g., a speech act theory, as formulated in Austin (1962) and Searle (1969). The fruitfulness of the approach is attested by its influence in other disciplines like sociology (see Habermas 1984, Leech 1983),
ethnography of communication, Gricean pragmatics, and conversational analysis, etc. which are all quite explicit in relating their frameworks to communication.

Under basic units of communication, Allwood (1995) describes the unit (to be discussed below) as a ‘contribution’ and defined it as: ‘an instance of communicative behaviour bounded by lack of activity or another communicator’s activity’. Allwood suggested two contributions with regard to spoken language i.e., expression features, in which a contribution can, for instance, be expressed by oral linguistic means or gestures; and content features, in which a contribution can also be classified in several different ways, e.g., in its degree of explicitness. Several levels, according to Allwood, are relevant for the study of communication. These levels allow us to see communicators as rational agents pursuing various motives and goals, some of which are co-operative and ethical. In fact, communication in many ways seems to build on the human ability for rational co-ordinated (co-operative) interaction.

Further discussion of the role of communication in discourse will be given in subsections 1.4.2 and 1.4.7, where the main aspects of communication are discussed, as well as in subsection 2.3.2, where the discourse theories of several writers are discussed.

From the above discussion, in which an attempt has been made to show the connection between communication and discourse, let us move on to discuss the link between FB and discourse. Since FB is one linguistic phenomenon in communication, then analysing this phenomenon will require a reliance on discourse analysis. The present empirical research based on recorded materials was transcribed and partly translated, as stated in the third chapter of the present study subsections 3.1.2 and 3.1.3. These two steps represent the two main requirements for conducting any study that deals with the subject of discourse analysis. This analysis takes several forms; for instance, analysing FB as a linguistic expression, from either a semantic or pragmatic viewpoint, or even combining both. Of course, it is very important to keep in mind Allwood’s proposition of the two key aspects above when discussing these sorts of spoken linguistic phenomena.

To conclude, when we succeed in classifying and analysing our own personal FB actions, we have provided a strong link in communication theory.
1.4.3 The Process of Communication

Within the process of communicating, Smith (1977) discusses the relation of the process of communicating to semiotic theory based on C.W. Morris’ article of 1946. Morris listed three major distinctions or levels of abstractions. These are:

i) The *syntactic* level, which is concerned only with signals, the basic tools of communicating

ii) The *semantic* level, which is concerned only with what the messages *are*, not with the use made of them

iii) The *pragmatic* level, which is the most inclusive, embracing the signals and their messages studied at the previous levels and investigating their use by viewing participants (speakers) who are actually communicating (see Smith 1977: 19).

1.4.4 The Process of Communicative Acts

In the third part of his thesis, Allwood (1976) discussed ‘communicative acts’ (which he also called ‘actions and co-operation’) in two contexts:

i) the development of communicative acts in children on the basis of some recent empirical work in this area (Allwood 1976: 158)

ii) communicative acts as actions by which a sender intends to display or signal information to a receiver (Allwood 1976: 170).

Allwood prefers the term ‘communicative acts’ to the more restrictive ‘speech acts’ used by Searle (1969), who proposed that speech acts be regarded as the ‘fundamental units of human communication’. Allwood criticised Searle’s examples of speech acts, e.g., warning, begging, admitting, denying, etc. and pointed out that many of them are not necessarily connected with speech. I agree with Allwood in this matter. For instance, one can warn, admit, beg, deny, etc. *non-verbally* (see Allwood 1976: 179).

1.4.5 Action and Activity

Action is connected with human behaviour and activity is connected with establishing the relations between the speakers in any event of communication; therefore the terms are related.
We will discuss below how linguists like Allwood (1976, 1995) and Wittgenstein (1953) provide useful discussion relevant to this subject.

1.4.5.1 Action

Action and Behaviour

In connection with human behaviour, Allwood named that which is connected with intention as ‘action’. He continued by saying that both action and behaviour are related so that all action involves behaviour, but there is behaviour which is not governed by intention and thus cannot be viewed as an action.

Allwood focused his discussion on the listener’s reaction when the listener was asked certain questions, e.g., why he/she responded in a certain way. The listener’s answers are related to the following concepts. These are: reasons, grounds, motives or intentions. All these concepts are connected with the listener’s actions. Both grounds and reasons for action are circumstances which are associated with an action in the way suggested here. The extent to which desire or need gives rise to action will be referred to as motive.

Discussing actions could create another problem related to types of behaviour. A certain type of behaviour can have several types of meaning, as well as being interpreted as several (different) types of action. All are bound to different intentions (Allwood 1976: 6).

What Allwood meant here is that the term ‘basic intention’ becomes a concept which is entirely related to the degree of consciousness that the agent has of his performance of an action. Therefore, basic action is only meant to be relevant as long as action is considered as, for example, intention-governed behaviour.

To conclude the above discussion related to the four concepts mentioned above, Allwood stated that at least one of these four concepts must occur in the first place; then as a result of any of those concepts, actions will arise. For instance, if A asked B to explain a certain thing, then the first thing that would occur from B is a verbal or non-verbal action or a combination of the two.

Here a link may be built between these concepts and FB. Any FB action has to be built on a reason, ground, motive or an intention. For instance, the rejection form ‘no’ must be based on a motivation for giving it.

To sum up, no FB action is given without reason, motive, ground or intention.
1.4.5.2 Activity

There is a complexity of relations established between the speakers in any event of communication. Under ‘activity’ Allwood (1995) suggested two points in studying any ‘human activity’: i) the levels of organisation involved, and ii) the role of activity. Let us review these points.

I) Levels of Organisation

There are several levels, suggested by Allwood, that provide necessary but not sufficient conditions, and they are necessary but not sufficient enablements (resources) for human communication in both spoken and written form. These levels are:

1. Physical: The communicators are physical entities and their communicative contributions are physical processes.

2. Biological: The communicators are biological organisms whose communicative contributions from this perspective can be seen as biological activity and directed behaviour.

3. Psychological:
   a) Perception, understanding and emotion: The communicators are perceived as understanding and emotional beings whose communicative contributions are perceptually comprehensible and emotionally charged phenomena.
   b) Motivation, rationality and agency: The communicators are motivated, rational agents whose communicative contributions, consequently, are motivated, rational acts.

4. Social:
   a) Culture or social institution: The communicators are members of a culture and of one or more social institutions, and their communicative contributions can be characterised as cultural and socially institutional acts.
   b) Language: The communicators are also members of one or more linguistic communities and their contributions are normally linguistic acts.
   c) Activity: They normally play a role in a social activity, and their communicative contributions are contributions to that activity through their role; for example, a teacher lecturing to students.
d) Communication: They normally focus more on either sending or receiving information.  

II) Roles of Activity

Communicative activity means any activity related to the sending or receiving of information from one agent to another (Allwood 1976: 64-65).

Wittgenstein (1953) claimed that the meaning of linguistic expressions should be analysed in different language games. The idea of a “language game” is analysed as stereotypical language use in a particular type of social activity. Other writer/s, e.g., Kowtko, Isard and Doherty (1993), discussed language games as sequences of conversational moves – opening, closing, etc. – including the possibility of nested sub-games. The writers accounted the conversational games for that aspect of discourse coherence that is manifested in initiation – response – feedback patterns, and they do so by relating the form of dialogue to underlying non-linguistic goals.

To extend the discussion of language games, Kowtko et al said that a language game consists of the turns which are necessary to accomplish one conversational sub-goal. The writers exemplified that an instructing game begins when an instruction is given and ends when the follower indicates that the instruction is either finished or well on its way to being completed, without any other communication being necessary to do so. They went on to say that a game typically proceeds smoothly from initial move to final move; however, two types of variation may occur: nesting or a break within a game. Nesting is considered to occur when a sub-game is initiated whose purpose can clearly be seen as contributing to the goal of the current game, e.g., when a follower asks for extra information in order to carry out an instruction. A break, such as announcement of a misunderstanding, puts the status of the current game in doubt; the game might continue if the misunderstanding is cleared up, or it might be abandoned (Kowtko, Isard, and Doherty 1993: 1-3).

Before moving to Wittgenstein’s claim, it is worthy of note that the concept ‘activities’, in connection with the term ‘communicative’, was given the most reasonable interpretation by Austin (1962), i.e. the locutionary, illocutionary and prelocutionary acts, as well as those suggested by Searle (1969), i.e. the reference act, the illocutionary act, etc.

---

4 For further information regarding ‘communication’, see section 1.1 of this thesis.
For Wittgenstein the choice and meaning of linguistic expressions is seen as a product of the interaction between an inherent ‘meaning potential’ of the expression, and the use to which it is put: linguistic constructions, communicative functions and joint social activities. Wittgenstein goes on to say that the use is, thus, defined in terms of (i) collocations in different types of grammatical structure, (ii) participation in different types of communicative functions, and (iii) occurrence in a specific type of social activity.

With regard to the notion social activity discussed by Wittgenstein, Allwood suggested that social activity should be characterised by the following parameters:

1. Type, purpose and function: procedure
2. Roles: competence/obligations, rights
3. Instruments: machines/media

1. In the first parameter, Allwood meant the reason for its existence. So by finding out the purpose, we get at least a vague idea of what means could be used to pursue the activity. For example, when terms such as ‘discussion’, ‘negotiation’, ‘lecture’, etc. are considered, what is understood most precisely is the function or purpose of a specific type of activity.

2. The second parameter seems not to be related to FB that much, therefore it is not going to be discussed in detail.

3. As for the third parameter, instruments, if used, play very important roles for enabling many activities to create their own patterns of communication. For some they are necessary and for others they are more ancillary. For instance, we may consider the influence of a blackboard, chalk and overhead projectors on the act of lecturing.

4. Other physical circumstances can also be relevant, such as the level of sound or lighting. If the acoustics are bad the teacher or lecturer has to raise his/her voice. Similarly, if the light is too bright an overhead-projector cannot be used, and so on.

It is worth mentioning that in both activities and communication a certain degree of co-operation between activity and communication is essential (see Allwood 1976, and the present thesis section 1.4.3-1.4.6).
It is hoped, from the above discussion, that the picture has become clearer of the distinction between action and activity in connection with human language, and thus with communication as well.

With regard to the connection between FB and activity, it may be added that the levels of organisation suggested by Allwood provided us with many necessary items related to FB. Let us take up the third level, for instance, which includes perception, understanding and emotion. These three items represent three basic linguistic mechanisms of communicative functions which are, according Allwood et al (1991), essential for achieving any direct face-to-face communication.

The term ‘activity’, in connection with the term ‘communicative’, is related to Austin’s speech act theory (1962) of locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts. We can say that FB is related to all of these levels and especially the perlocutionary act, which focuses on the listener’s concept (perception and understanding) and is related to the overall process of FB, relying on the listener’s response.

Since the role of activity is related to both the sending and receiving of information, the relation with FB becomes clearer as an interactive process between (at least) two speakers.

1.4.6 Co-operation

General explanation of the term ‘co-operation’ was given by Allwood (1976). A brief presentation of his discussion will be made in order to show, to some extent, how cooperation is connected with communication.

The principles of cooperation are intended to capture aspects of an individual’s social competence which play an important role in communication. Allwood characterised the term ‘cooperation’ as, ‘a type of interaction involving two or more normal rational agents’ (according to Allwood, the sender and receiver) who are:

1. considering each other (what Allwood probably meant by ‘considering’ here is that speakers must give attention to each other)
2. trying to achieve one or more common purposes. These purposes can be specific and may change during the course of cooperation.
Principally, the term cooperation means ‘to be willing and able to share efforts, information, etc. with something or someone’. The writer stated: ‘it is not enough that a common purpose be achieved, however, if actions are individually performed by two agents without any interaction between them then we do not have true cooperation’ (Allwood 1976: 50).

In principle, I agree with Allwood’s argument, but would question whether cooperation can be true or false. For example, we can make efforts to cooperate but we may not succeed, so does this mean that our cooperation was false? Surely cooperation is either successful or unsuccessful, rather than true or false. It will be argued throughout this thesis that the same principle applies to FB, i.e., it is either successful or unsuccessful.

We may add that Allwood probably means ‘true’ in the sense of ‘successful’; however, we think that this should be stated explicitly and clearly, because there is still a difference in meaning between ‘true’ and ‘successful’.

To have a better understanding of communication, further consideration of the notion of cooperation is required. The connection between cooperation and communication is very important. If cooperation between speakers becomes impossible, then communication will eventually break down. Therefore, a strong need for cooperation is necessary for successful communication to be carried out.

In a section in which he sets out to define ‘ideal cooperation’, Allwood tries to connect interaction, mutual consideration, and common purpose to produce the following definition of cooperation:

‘A number of interacting normal rational agents are said to be engaged in ideal cooperation to the extent that:

1. They are voluntarily striving to achieve the same purpose
2. They are ethically and cognitively considering each other in trying to achieve these purposes
3. They trust each other to act according to 1 and 2 unless they give each other explicit notice that they are not’ (1976: 56-57).

To some extent, Allwood succeeded in his definition. The three items he connected represent the basis for establishing any kind of successful communication between interlocutors. Simply, if interaction is not pursued by at least two participants, it is impossible for any interaction to occur. And if there is no mutual understanding (which Allwood called ‘mutual consideration’) then it is very difficult to proceed towards any kind of cooperation. Additionally, if there is no aim in a speech act then it is senseless. Allwood’s items appear to cover some of the main FB requirements, therefore, such as mutual interaction
between two speakers, mutual understanding, and attitudinal reaction toward what they hear.

Furthermore, regarding the above three items that Allwood mentioned in his definition, we have found that both speakers in the first and second must have a certain purpose and a clear consideration of their contact. In addition, this is expected to be fulfilled during their interaction. Let us consider the following example from the data:

[data sample] (12)
B : [wi$Salawaat aydan ///  $uffifat ilaa $ams Salawaat] ‘and prayer times were also /// reduced to five times’
A : [na$fam] ‘yes’
B : [uw fii hadiith bimaa ma$naa $an irrasuwu $uffitiit $amasan maa lam yu$taa nabiiyan min qabilii ya$fii] ‘and there is a prophetic speech that says, I was given five (advantages) that no prophet was given before me’
A : [na$fam] ‘yes’
B : [$an d$u$ilat lii l$ard $ahuwran ay $fii ay makaan tasta$ii $an tu$sallii] waa min $iimn ila$yyaa innu kaanat fii l$ya$ $an ($..) ilqadiim innu /// ay $u$mma $abbat inhaa ittuwb ilaa $ad innu yu$tlab minnu innu yu$qul na$fu $ala$ $aan tuqbal taubatu] ‘that all the earth is made clean for me, which means you can pray anywhere, and among other things, some other matters, for any nation in the ancient period /// who sought forgiveness was asked to kill itself as a price for its repentance.
@ <mood: certain>
A : [wa innamaa $innaa la?] ‘whereas we do not have’ (= the expression [la?] means ‘no’ but in this context will be translated in this way)
B : [faa ilmuslim faa bimud$arrad maa innu iyquwl tu$btu ?ila$llaah $ala$s /// ]‘so a Muslim as soon as he says (with clean intention) God forgive me, it’s enough’
@ <unclear speech from other participants>
A : [istayfiruw allaaha fa$innahu $affaaraa] ‘seek forgiveness from God because he is a forgiver’
B : [<kayf haalkum ?>] ‘how are you?’
@ <mood: question>
A : [Alla iybaarik fiik] ‘God bless you’

Both speakers began their conversation freely at their own volition, with the following specific aims in their talk on this topic:
1. To give an initiative for starting talking
2. To show some of the fundamental differences between Islam and the other faiths, and to express some of the advantages they believe it possesses over them
3. To show how simple it is to practice some of the Islamic prescriptions and how much Muslims can gain by following and practicing these instructions. e.g., [laylat-ulqadr] ‘Al qadr night’, [attawba] ‘seeking forgiveness’, etc.

Additionally, they tried seriously to achieve these aims from the beginning. They show this by exchanging their knowledge and information in a literary way.

Their insistence and desire to continue their contact was noted, and can be described as follows:

1. Two positive FB actions were given by speaker A as well as internal confirmation from speaker B to what he heard from A.
2. The continued flow of information from B supports his serious cooperation.
3. The late greeting given by B. This greeting is supposed to come at the beginning of this conversation, but surprisingly it was delayed and came after B had already made a very valid contribution to the main topic of conversation. This gives further evidence in support of Allwood’s definition of cooperation between individuals that both speakers should trust each other to act according to Allwood’s ideal of cooperation as specified above.5

1.4.7 Aspects of Communication

Linguistic communication involves at least four main steps. These steps, which will be discussed below, are as follows:

i) The first speaker’s intention to initiate contact with the listener
ii) The speaker’s sending a message to a listener, who is the receiver
iii) The actual sending of the message (the transmission) to the listener after his/her co-activation and interpretation of what he/she receives

5 For further information, see Allwood’s dissertation, the first part of chapter 5 (1976: 43-63).
iv) The listener becoming a speaker when he/she gives FB, and the first speaker becoming a listener. This is shown, as is suggested, in the figure below, Smith (1977) shifts features:

**Figure 1.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Com Intention</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Med of Com (verb/non-verb)</td>
<td>Listener: ‘yes’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Com Intention</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Med of Com (verb/non-verb)</td>
<td>Listener</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In connection with the above figure, and under ‘features of communication event’, Smith (1977:17) suggested that these features be shifted to:

**Figure 1.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>communicator</td>
<td>to signals</td>
<td>to response</td>
<td>to other sources of information (when those sources are available)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Figure 2, it can be seen that two aspects are missing: ‘communicative intention/message’, and ‘the listener’s role’. These two aspects are extremely important for fulfilling FB in communication. Smith appears to have overlooked these aspects and wanted to show the mechanism of FB in communication. It seems that Smith wanted to open up the field of communication studies, when he named the sender as a communicator, and then when, in step 4 of figure 2, he did not specify what sort of other sources of information there would be.

Another point that caused fundamentally different viewpoints as well, regarding the last step 4 of Smith’s figure, was when he did not specify what sort of other sources of information he was talking about. It is not clear if he meant sources related to the aspects of communication, e.g., participants (speaker and hearer), etc., or the text uttered during the interlocutors’ talk.

Smith (1977: 14) refers to a communicator, a signal and a recipient. Martinich (1984: 17) refers to a sender, a message (for him much more than just a signal), a medium (e.g., the code in which signals are conveyed) and a receiver. Taylor and Cameron (1987:161) suggested a new term: ‘intersubjectivity’, as so
‘central to the study of verbal communication in modern times that it might be called its fundamental principle’ (see also Taylor 1992).

The differences and similarities of the above writers with regard to the main aspects of communication which were proposed in figure 1 may be commented upon. According to Smith (1977) and in comparison with my own interpretation, it appears that two aspects of communication are missing, as explained earlier. It seems that the aspect of ‘communicative intention’ was not known during his time as it is described and known nowadays. This may be compared, for instance, with Martinich, of the same year, who gave some observations regarding this point and observed, as stated above, that ‘message’ is more than just a signal.

Since it is the main ‘aspects of communication’ that are under discussion, which represent one main source of these aspects, that is, to give and / or elicit FB, it needs to be noted that what Smith focused on was one required and very essential aspect of which perhaps most linguists had been aware; that is, the signal, i.e., the actual communicative intention of the message.

We will now move on to Martinich (1984), who was one of the first writers to cover all the main aspects of human communication. His observation that ‘message’ is much more than just a normal signal probably opened the door to the concept of message as the main intention before the initiation of any kind of contact between speakers.

Taylor and Cameron (1987) were the first linguists who suggested a new aspect of communication: ‘intersubjectivity’. They did not employ this term directly with regard to the aspects discussed above, i.e., communicator, signal, message and recipient, but went further to consider this term as the fundamental and central aspect to any study related to verbal communication. In figure 1 above, a place for this term has not been suggested because its meaning is to share knowledge and experience between speakers, and if there is not at least a minimum level of sharing of knowledge or experience between interlocutors, then no kind of interaction and communication between individuals can occur.

Moreover, in such a case several (main) aspects of communication will be missing as well. It seems that the term ‘intersubjectivity’, according to Taylor and Cameron, and later on Schiffrin (1990) and also Taylor (1992), focuses more on the internal mechanism that feeds and supports (any) communication between interlocutors so that they can continue their contact successfully, rather
than the external mechanisms, i.e., speakers, channel of transmission (verbally/non-verbally), etc.

An attempt has been made to describe how the descriptions by several linguists of these aspects of communication have evolved gradually. It can be observed that each stage built on the previous one, starting from the three aspects suggested by Smith and ending with the term ‘intersubjectivity’.

In the following subsection the main ideas of the ‘aspects of communication’ will be described which are drawn in figure 1 above. These main aspects are: participants, communicative intentions, medium of communication, and intersubjectivity.

1.4.7.1 Participants: Sender and Receiver

When participants in a conversation are considered, it leads to the question: ‘Who is the sender (speaker), and the receiver (hearer)?’ Most scholars agree that the process of communication involves at least two participants changing roles. However, they disagree on the nature of those roles and their contribution to this process.

Communication focuses on either sending or receiving information. The sender might perform the role of speaker, writer, etc. and the receiver might perform the role of listener, reader, etc. Allwood (1976) has said that the terms ‘sender’ and ‘receiver’ are not used in their most general sense as entities emitting or receiving information, but only for denoting agents who, in this capacity, are capable of some degree of consciousness or intentionality.

To comment on Allwood’s discussion, consciousness or intentionality is essential between both speaker and listener for completing their contact successfully. In fact, Allwood gave both speaker and listener a role beyond their usual one (as two speakers engaged in mutual interaction) when he emphasised that both are capable of some degree of consciousness or intentionality.

To expand on Allwood’s discussion of consciousness or intentionality, the following example may be considered: if A says something to B, he must have the minimum degree of consciousness and intention in order to bring about a successful contact between himself as a sender and B as a receiver. The same goes for a receiver when he gives his FB to the sender, or goes on to become a sender of information.
Several terms for ‘sender and receiver’ have been given by many writers like Smith (1977), Martinich (1984), Cameron (1987), Allwood (1976), etc., e.g., ‘speakers’, ‘transmitters’, ‘agents’, ‘communicators’, ‘informants’, ‘recipients’ (receivers), etc. In the following subsections an attempt will be made to define more clearly the terms ‘sender’ and ‘receiver’.

1.4.7.1.1 Sender

The sender is the agent who sends the message. According to Allwood (1995), in the sending role they (the speakers) are performing mostly a particular communicative act which makes them the agent of actions such as stating, asking, requesting, etc. This, however, leads to characterisations of their communicative contributions with such labels as ‘sent message’, ‘speech’, ‘writing’, ‘statement’, ‘question’ and ‘request’.

Allwood (in his thesis 1976) discussed several concepts, e.g., indicators, indicative behaviour, manipulation, display, etc. to introduce and describe the sender’s function. Moreover, in chapter 7 on ‘implicative relations’ (subsection 7.7.1), he draws a figure that depicts the implicative relations between indicators, behaviour, behavioural indicators, manipulation and display. For the semiotically basic level ‘indicator’, he suggests three ways in which an individual can be an indicator, displayer, and signaller of information, viz.:

i) Through all the observable objects and features with which he/she is connected
ii) Through all his/her observable unintentional behaviour
iii) Through all his/her observable intentional actions (1976: 85-86)

Allwood appears to be describing here how a speaker becomes a sender of information. With regard to i above, during an interaction with which the individual is involved he/she becomes a sender when he/she notices (verbally and non-verbally) certain observations that excite him and encourage him/her to act as a sender. This kind of situation would make any person a sender of information.

An example may be given to illustrate this interpretation of the three ways in which Allwood (1976) suggests an individual can function as an indicator, displayer and signaller of information:
i) a man is seen to fall accidentally overboard from a boat into the sea and at first just seems to float somewhat passively. Both his fall and passive reaction function as circumstantial and behavioral indicators respectively

ii) he is then observed beating his arms voluntarily but in a useless manner, both displaying and indicating that he cannot swim

iii) finally he is heard shouting ‘Help!’ in a desperate tone. What he does now is to signal, display and indicate that he is in serious danger.

Regarding the above three ways it is apparent that any individual can be a sender of information and take the initiative in speech, either verbally, e.g., through an utterance, or non-verbally, e.g., by a facial expression, and in a direct (see ii above) or an indirect way (see i above), or sometimes in both direct and indirect ways (see iii). All these ways must be based on at least one of the following functions: to indicate, to display (to show), and to signal, which will cause a speaker to be a sender of information.

1.4.7.1.2 Receiver

The receiver is the agent who perceives the message. In this role, receivers are agents of actions such as perceiving, understanding, evaluating and responding. These roles are complementary to the actions performed in the sending role (see Allwood 1995: 11).

In section 8.6 of his thesis, Allwood (1976) draws a figure which shows the relation between influence and apprehension (it seems that Allwood meant apprehension in the sense of ‘hesitance to act, or uncertainty’ and it seems that, by influence, he meant ‘a human’s stability and / or control’). He goes on to say that a further three types of reactions – emotions, attitudes and behaviour – often arise through some form of influence, though not always. Nor do they all need to come about through apprehension. They can also arise through direct subconscious influence. Allwood suggests that emotions, attitudes and behaviour can all reciprocally affect each other. See Allwood’s PhD thesis (1976: 102).

The relationship between the activities of sender and receiver may be summarised as follows: linguists like Allwood hold that all manner of apprehension depends on the receiver. This applies to conviction and understanding too, which are both applicable to the act of apprehension from the receiver's point of view, without taking the sender into consideration. Allwood introduces the following example to support his discussion: A can be convinced
of and/or understand that B is angry irrespective of whether B has intentionally displayed his anger or not. B’s intentions are irrelevant in this respect. The following example from the data shows that speaker E was aware that speaker C was not in a good mood, therefore he made a polite statement to him:

[data sample] (13)
F : kamaal <kamal> kamal kamal
@ <laughter F>
C : [kaan dzadafi <kamal> hah kaan ?afriit <uw dzadafi>] ‘he was a good guy Kamal he was a devil and fine’
@ < loud and slow>
E : [uw maazaal / maazaal dzadafi] ‘and he is still / he is still fine’

In this example, speaker F mentions the name of one of the participants, and speaker C gives a positive comment to this participant. Speaker E was aware, but not completely certain, that speaker C might be upset, etc. Therefore speaker E tries to break the ice and create a better atmosphere with speaker C, at whom the comment is directed, by repeating the same positive expression twice.

Allwood added that in some cases it does not matter to a sender whether a receiver apprehends him to be displaying information or not. In other words, sometimes it does not matter to a sender whether or not a receiver shows his understanding of the information he received, which means that the most important thing for a sender is to send this information and therefore a receiver’s FB in this case is less important.

With regard to ‘the view of the communicating sender’ which Allwood named it ‘displayed information’; we think that Allwood (1979) wanted to focus on his second item that he suggested and discussed in (1976) (see subsection 2.3.5 of the present study) (Allwood 1976:102).

1.4.7.2 Communicative Intentions: Message

A simple interpretation of a message would be when one person makes something available to another that the other did not have before. According to most writers, e.g., Martinich (1984), Taylor and Cameron (1987), etc., oral or written non-verbal messages are the ‘communicative intentions’, namely, what an interlocutor believes or wants.
To discuss the message as an essential aspect of communication leads to the attention being focused on something that cannot be predicted because the phenomena are unseen. The only person who is willing to explain is the speaker him/herself who had the intention, while the listener’s interpretation(s) relies on prediction and probably intuition.

1.4.7.3 Medium of Communication: (sound) Signal

The medium of communication is the production and the interpretation that all messages depend upon. Despite the common tendency of linguists to focus primarily on language as a ‘medium of communication’, many scholars now focus on both verbal and non-verbal channels as media of communication (Schiffrin 1990).

The following question may thus be posed: in the case of interpretation, do we consider the interpreter as a medium of communication? In the case of interpretation, the interpreter has a double role: as sender and receiver, and as a medium of communication at the same time.

1.4.7.4 Intersubjectivity

According to some writers, e.g., Schiffrin (1990a) and Taylor (1992), intersubjectivity has to do with sharing knowledge or experience, and is central to the study of communication.

The principle of intersubjectivity was characterised by Roy Harris (1981: 9) as ‘the telementational fallacy’. According to this principle, communication is a means of bringing participants into a mutual awareness, or a common perception, of an idea, an emotion, a representation, a governing structure and so on (see also Allwood 1976). Taylor and Cameron (1987) argued that manifestations of the principle are to be found throughout the history of linguistic thought, and it is perhaps the strongest influence (and constraint) on the development of linguistic theory and linguistic methods.

When applied to the study of conversation, the principle of intersubjectivity leads to the assumption that both speaker and hearer see a conversation in the same way, i.e., they see the same stretches of behaviour as questions, repairs (when a speaker repeats and then corrects the same expression he uses during his/her talk), face-threatening acts, or promises, etc. Furthermore, they take the rules applicable to the production and combination of such conversational units
to be the same. That is, the possibility is ruled out, or at least ignored, that speaker and hearer have their own views of what is going on, what has happened, what is a next possible or probable event, and later, what it all means.

The explanation from Schiffrin (1990) and Taylor (1992) that the term ‘intersubjectivity’ has to do with sharing knowledge or experience between (two) participants seems to be more convenient and reasonable as one of the main goals of communication to be attained. Simply, it is impossible to achieve any (successful) contact between speakers, through any kind of channel(s), e.g., telephone conversation, sign language (such as is used by scuba divers), face-to-face contact, written texts, etc., without both speakers sharing a common view or knowledge and information of their conversation or communication. Conversation analysis has the task of explaining what that common view is, and how it is arrived at. Lack of experience (sometimes knowledge needs to be supported by a certain degree of experience) and/or knowledge between interlocutors will always cause plenty of misunderstanding, etc. and lead to more failure in communication.

Let us consider the following example from our data that shows how the lack of experience or knowledge regarding certain information can lead to a degree of confusion among speakers:

[data sample] (14)
The topic of the following conversation focuses mainly on a travel plan to another city. Hard discussion took place before an agreement was reached. Speaker A was the only person who objected to this plan. Speakers G, F and D decided to follow this plan, while speaker C’s role was to give information only:

A : [baʃdayn sayyaaritkum maa bitxuf f dʒadda] ‘our car is not allowed to enter Jeddah’
G : [binruwh bissarfiis] ‘we’ll take a cab’
F : [binwaddiiha ʃalaa madiinit ilhudʒdʒaadʒ marra əaanyi] ‘we will go to the pilgrims’ city once again’
A : [læw ayʃ bidnaa ib halʃalabi] ‘I swear! And what do we earn for this trouble!’ (to remove ambiguity [walla] ‘I swear’ would mean an expression of surprise, however, in some other situations as stands with speaker ‘A’; speaker/s would use it as FB action).
@ <loud, mood: refusing >
D : [laa laa ibniʃlaʃ bi sarviis ḥaʃaa innaql idʒdʒamaʃii] ‘no no we will take taxi.. a coach to’
G: [aa ibniṭla‘ binnaql id3dʒamaa‘i‘i] ‘yes we will take a coach’
D: [biinazzil ʿabaab ilharam] ‘it takes us directly to the holy mosques’
A: [innaql id3dʒamaa‘i‘i ihnaa bidnaa niṭla‘ ibsayyaaritnaa] ‘a coach! But we would like to take our car’
D: [<qadday Ś bikallif haḍaa innaql id3dʒamaa‘i‘i> <qadday Ś annafar> ʕaʃara iveryaal muw] ‘how much does it cost to take this coach? How much for each person?’
@ <mood: question>
C: [χamastaʃʃar iveryaal] ‘fifteen ryals’
D: [χamastaʃʃar iveryaal] ‘fifteen ryals’
G: [<layʃ χamastaʃʃar iveryaal> ihnaa jaayyin min Jadda]b) ‘why fifteen ryals? we are coming from Jeddah?! (the expression ‘why’ indicates surprise at and denial of information)
@ <mood: question and loud voice>
D: [ʃuwt χamastaʃʃar iveryaal <layʃ χamastaʃʃar iveryaal> kunnaa nidfa š lalll haayı χamiṣin iveryaal waahid alla] ‘what do you mean fifteen ryals why fifteen ryals? We were paying to the … fifty ryals by God!
@ <mood: question>
C: [aa aa] ‘yes yes’

The above example from our data shows us that the lack of knowledge and experience (i.e., knowing the cost of travelling to Makka) of speakers G and D led to their surprise and shock at the information about the price of a coach ticket. They are the same speakers who insisted on taking the coach after the objection from speaker A to taking their car to their target city. Another observation here is that the amount itself, which is fifteen ryals, is not that much, but probably they were shocked because they suddenly discussed it. This made them reject the unexpected information.

It is hoped that the above example gives a clearer picture of the function of (a certain level of) intersubjectivity in the case of a lack of experience and knowledge among speakers, which was caused by repeated negative FB from speakers G and D, as well as the confirmation of their rejection from speaker C.

In Primate Communication, in which Hinde (1972), reported that Ploog and Melnechuk (1969) note that some do not see any difference between social behaviour and communicative behaviour, while others perceive that a distinction
‘ought to be possible’ (Hinde, 1972: 1). In my view there is a strong connection between both concepts. However, we have to accept that facial behaviour, which represents one important feature of social behaviour, is more recognised within society than individual communicative behaviour. Of course, this does not mean one has to be controlled and governed all the time by social behaviour; otherwise this would cause a loss of our individual personality. For this reason the best is always to try, as much as possible, to keep with our own individual behaviour and to be aware at the same time of some of the social behaviour of our society or any society with which we are dealing.

To conclude the preceding discussion, the term ‘communication’ covers a very large area. It has become necessary to widen the discussion of the term ‘communication’ because the present study deals with an important phenomenon that falls under communication, namely, FB. Without verbal/non-verbal FB it would be impossible for any successful communication to arise between speakers.

In the present section an attempt has been made to bring to mind all the items relating to communication that would be relevant to the main topic, and the discussion has been supported with examples. Since the present study is based on empirical research, which is made to show the relation between communication and discourse, it has been necessary to give an overview of communication and discourse analysis. These processes have provided ample means to be able to realise the major distinctions between communication, discourse, and FB which were given, under the influence of both Morris (1964), and Allwood (1976), mentioned in subsections 1.1.2, 1.4.1, and 1.4.2 of the present study. In accordance with this discussion, both writers described related topics as follows:

- Syntax, semantics, and pragmatics (Morris, 1946)
- The communicative acts, which are the actions by which a sender intends to display or signal information to a receiver (Allwood, 1976).

Several items in communication in relation to FB have been taken into account, i.e., action and activity, cooperation, and the different aspects of communication. In these subsections the main principles on which communication is based have

6 Several works have dealt with conversation, which is just one case that falls under studies of communication. See, for example, Sacks in Atkinson and Heritage 1984: 1 and 17, as well as Schegloff and Sacks, 1973: 290, etc.
been discussed and connected to FB as one important area in human language communication.

1.5 A View of Arab Culture and Rhetoric

As has been stated above, this study falls into the domain of cultural description. For this reason, the present section begins by viewing the term *culture* according to several writers, e.g., Allwood (1985), Hymes (1974), Schiffrin (1994) and Said (1993).

Two aspects related to FB will be discussed in the following section. These are:

1) The term ‘culture’
2) Some of the main characteristics of the Arabs as portrayed in Western literature, and emotional FB as one case of analysis

The above discussion in relation to FB will be supported by several examples, mostly from the data conversations.

1) The Term ‘Culture’

The term ‘culture’ is often applied loosely to many things in human life. Allwood (1985), however, has suggested that culture should be understood as ‘all the features that a people have in common and not given by nature.’ More specifically, one may mention four characteristics of a culture:

i) Ways of thinking, e.g., belief, attitudes to different things and level of knowledge.
ii) Ways of behaving, e.g., different greetings, how to make food and how to build houses.
iii) Artifact structures, i.e., things made and used by man, e.g., boats, pens, clothes and airplanes.
iv) Traces in nature, e.g., cultivation of land, exploitation of forests and building of dams.

Regarding these four factors proposed by Allwood, the following comments can be made:
i) Lexical studies can reveal important characteristics of ways of thinking. For example, lexical richness in a certain area e.g. [assamaa?] ‘the sky’, shows that ways of thinking are related to sky by giving several names to the same aspect e.g., [alqubaa-azzarqaa?] ‘the blue doom’, and [ajjarbaa?] ‘the dappled’ (roughly). Each name reflects some of those ways of thinking which occupy a central place in the interest of the speakers. Detailed studies of communication will also reveal ways of thinking.

ii) Language constitutes an important object of study in connection with behaviour. Arabic semantics and grammar then provide the student of culture with important material like, [marhaba] ‘hey’, [kayfak] ‘how are you?’ used in Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Palestine; and [kayf ilhaal] ‘how are you?’ [hayyaak alla] ‘on God’s welcome’, [hala] ‘hey’ uttered by the people of the Arabian Gulf, e.g., Saudi Arabia, Bahrain etc., while [faslaama] ‘hey’ uttered by North Africans, e.g., Morocco and Tunisia. All these expressions refer to the same use of greeting.

iii & iv) Artifact structure and ‘traces in nature’ can be studied in language. Lexical richness of artifacts like [xiyyaam] ‘tents’, [issuduud] ‘shelters against flooding’, etc. indicate man's influence on nature. This discussion is going to focus on ‘ways of thinking’ and ‘ways of behaving’, which were mentioned by Allwood (1985). As for the study of FB, it constitutes a special kind of cultural study, also encompassing two aspects of culture mentioned above: 1) cognition, and 2) behaviour. In connection with FB phenomena, I will present some observations regarding some certain ways of thinking and behaving that a few writers have proposed as being indicative of common ways of thinking among Arabs.

The following discussion, found in Schiffrin (1994), states that there is one area in which both linguistics and anthropology share an interest, viz. ‘communication’. She argues that since language is the central means by which people communicate with one another in everyday life, understanding communication is an important goal for linguists. The understanding of communication is also important for anthropologists: the way we communicate is part of our cultural repertoire for making sense of – and interacting with – the world. As Hymes (1974) observed, however, ‘anthropologists often ignore language as cultural behaviour and/or knowledge, neglecting the fact that language is a system of use whose rules and norms are as integral a part of culture as any other system of knowledge and behaviour, such as kinship, or
political systems.’ Thus, Schiffrin continues, ‘the status of linguistic communication as a grammatical system that is used for communication and that is part of the culture – as well as a framework for analyzing it as such – was surprisingly neglected prior to Hymes’ work’.

Discussing culture, linguists like Hymes (1974) claim that behaviour and knowledge can be analytically separated and that neither of them has necessarily to be considered as a part of culture. Schiffrin, as has just been noted, thinks that anthropologists often pay too little attention to language as behaviour or knowledge, both of which she takes to be parts of culture. Culture for her comprises a general ‘world view’: a set of assumptions and beliefs that orients and organises the way people think, feel and act (Schiffrin 1994: 138-139). The word ‘culture’ according to Edward Said (1993), in his book *Culture and Imperialism*, denotes two things in particular:

a) It means all those practices, like the arts of description, communication and representation, that have relative autonomy from the economic, social and political realms and that often exist in aesthetic forms, one of whose principal aims is pleasure. Said, corresponding to this point, added that these are, of course, both popular stocks of lore about distant parts of the world and specialised knowledge available in such learned disciplines as ethnography, historiography, philology, sociology and literary history.

b) Second, and almost imperceptibly, culture is a concept that includes a refining and elevating element, each society’s reservoir of the best that has been known and thought. Said gave an example of this type to support his discussion. He said that you read Dante or Shakespeare in order to keep up with the best that was thought and known, and also to see yourself, your people, your society and tradition in their best light.

The writer expanded his discussion to say that, in time, culture comes to be associated, often aggressively, with the nation or the state; this differentiates ‘us’ from ‘them’, almost always with some degree of xenophobia. For Said, culture in this sense is a source of identity, and a rather combative one at that, as he saw in recent ‘returns’ to culture and tradition (Said 1993: xii – xiii).

We think that the writer, in his second sense, means that culture is a sort of theatre where various political and ideological causes engage one another.
Pattern of Communication

In his article ‘Are There Swedish Patterns of Communication’ (1985), Allwood discusses the concept of ‘patterns of communication’ which, according to him, is fairly general and does not imply very much more than repeated traits of, or aspects of the communication of the members of a certain social or cultural group. Allwood continued that there is a very large, perhaps infinite, number of such aspects and traits and what is a stake is, therefore, to focus on aspects and traits which have turned out to be interesting. According to the writer, this is not easy, since some form of communication is related to most sides of cultural life, i.e., to the thoughts, behaviour, and artifacts (artificially made objects), which are characteristic of the lifestyle of a certain group of people.

2) Some Main Characteristics of the Arabs as Portrayed in Western Literature

In order to further an understanding of FB phenomena, and to use the concept of FB to enhance understanding of the role of culture in communication, and since we are dealing with one, essential, linguistic phenomenon in spoken Palestinian Arabic besides one important aim behind our study (as stands previously) is to arise successful contact as possible between the Arabs and other cultures; it seems that this work is likely to be read by Western readers, some of the attitudes towards, and impressions of, Arab people as expressed in several types of Western literature need to be considered.

Mansfield (1971, 1972) has argued in a section entitled the ‘Characteristics of Arabs’, that when an Arab is silent, this means disapproval. Mansfield's observation has given us another type of FB action, viz. that which is shown when a listener ‘keeps silent’, without using any verbal or non-verbal expressions of FB.

Although I do not think the majority of Arabs would support his argument, Mansfield's observation is correct to some extent. In Saudi Arabia, for instance, this non-verbal form of communication is used to express disagreement, disapproval, etc. In addition, sometimes it is enough to use a non-verbal action, e.g., jerking one’s head, for the same purpose. This means that Arabs (and others) keep silent and do not want to give any audible FB signal, although this might simply mean they want to avoid possible arguing or disputing, for example.
Laffin (1975, 1987), has given a separate title to one of his sections: ‘The shame society’, directed at the Arabs, we will discuss as we see it from its positive perspective. It seems that the writer discussed one interesting characteristic of the Arabs when he tacked this label ‘shame society’ on them. This trait still exists among the Arabs, and is very often found, for instance, in poetry, literature and even religion. The word [al hayaa?] ‘shame’ is mentioned in Islam by the Prophet Mohammed when he says: [al hayaa?u fu’batun min fu’abli i?man]: ‘shame is a branch of faith’. Prophet Mohammed meant that [hayaa?], ‘shame’, represents one important part of a human being’s faith, and this increases the value of shame among mankind in general and Muslims in particular. This particular form of behaviour is not found only among the Arabs, of course.

In the Arab world, shame has a further dimension. It does not only mean the committing of some act against the accepted system of values, but the discovery by outsiders that the act has been committed. This can be illustrated, with the following example from the data how shame relates to FB:

[data sample] (15)
A: [inta mi fawaditnaa ?] ‘didn't you promise us?’ (female)
B: [aa sah] ‘yes right’ (male)

It is very common in Arab culture that when the guest is asking for something, e.g., a favour, service, help, etc., he/she expects to receive it. This applies to females especially. In this example, speaker B does not promise his guests anything. However, he felt ashamed to say ‘no’ to his guests or to reject their request.

For further explanation, speaker A is a female, and she knows that in the Arab culture, being a guest and female at the same time would increase her entitlement if she made a request. Therefore, she uses this advantage to get what she wants. And as we have seen, speaker B, one of the hosts, did not dare to deny her claim, but rather accepted and emphasised his acceptance in saying: ‘yes right.’

Here is a further example to illustrate this point:

[data sample] (16)
A: [anaa mi? qultillak itruwh itd?iib i?waanak bissayyaara?]? ‘didn’t I tell you to bring your brothers by car?’
B: [ma?buwt yaa waaldii] ‘exactly, my father’
Speaker A is the father of speaker B. In fact speaker A is not asking B to do anything, but speaker B would feel shame in denying his father’s statement, so he prefers to agree with him instead. We can also interpret B’s reaction as a sign of respect.

How did we know that B’s response was a false one? The answer is that the researcher was witnessing this conversation and observed an embarrassed look on B’s face when he agreed with his father’s question. Also, after recording this conversation, we asked speaker B about this, and he confirmed to us that his father never asked him such a question. Nonetheless, he felt compelled to reply to his question here.

This example suggests that if a person in Arab culture is asked something by older people, in persons in official positions, persons of high tribal standing, etc. he/she feels obliged to give positive FB. In the above example, this has nothing to do with using one’s influence as a father (even though this still exists among some of the Arabs nowadays) but mostly to do with two things in my view: showing respect to elders and especially to relatives, e.g., the father, as well as to a guest in front of the others. It is very hard to reject the father’s statement, since this would be considered as impolite and rude behaviour by the other persons. For this reason, we have noticed that B’s FB is a totally positive answer.

Of course, such behaviour, as we have seen in the above two examples, might be considered as complicated, and probably misleading. Because if, for instance, a European heard example ‘15’ above, his immediate impression would be that speaker B has made a promise to A. The European would never think that B had not make any promises.

Such examples did not occur very much in the data, but they have shown interesting aspects of Arab behaviour. Religion and habits, customs and proverbs are intersecting to play a role in producing this kind of human behaviour. We know that very often elderly people do not like to be argued with, just as many women would not like to hear the word ‘no’, especially when they ask for (necessary) favours. The situation was a very important reason in both examples given above and forced both hearers to give positive statements.

In a book entitled *Meaning Cultural Difference* (1979) by Harris and Morn, they write that ‘Arabs are very emotional people, and it’s easy to provoke them. They expect periodic displays of emotion from others, including foreigners (the writers meant the positive sides of emotion but not the negative one).’ They say that ‘Arabs love the spoken word, they do not get to the point quickly, and it is
wise to show them appreciation for that, not impatience.’ Moreover, Harris and Morn point to some rules that Arabs follow in conversations, e.g., that their response is not short and immediate but comes in a long phrase.

I would respond to Harris and Morn’s discussion as follows: when someone is sensitive, he/she is often considered an emotional person, and such a person loves to give some kind of introduction when beginning his/her speech. Similarly, it is normal for this person’s FB not to occur immediately, but to be delayed. In other words, Arabs may delay their FB in conversation, as shall be seen later. Let us now discuss this characteristic (emotions) in connection with FB phenomena.

**Emotional Feedback (sadness, happiness, mood change, etc.)**

As a branch of secondary FB, emotional FB concerns the psychological reaction on the part of an interlocutor. Allwood, Nivre and Ahlsén (1994) have considered this type of FB under ‘other attitudes’, a category that aims at covering any additional attitudes (other than contact, perception and understanding) that are conveyed by an FB unit.

Emotional FB can be negative or positive, and these are the most important marks of acceptance of a preceding act, e.g., statements, questions, requests and offers. Allwood *et al* have distinguished four different kinds of acceptance:

1) Acceptance of turn (AT)
2) Acceptance of communicative act (ACA)
3) Acceptance of handling communicated evocative functions (AHC)
4) Acceptance of evocative functions (AEF)

The above four attitudes may be coded as positive (acceptance), or be correspondingly negative (non-acceptance). I will try to exemplify the above four functions. Observe, once again, that the different functions are recoverable from the context of the preceding utterances.

(17)

i) A: may I pose a question? < > what.. ?  
   B: <yes> - Acceptance of turn (B consents to speak)

This example demonstrates the four different kinds of acceptance:
- Acceptance of communicative act (B accepts that A has asked a question)
- Acceptance of handling communicated evocative functions (B consents to answer questions)
- Acceptance of evocative functions (B gives permission, i.e. accepts the effect A wants to evoke)

In the above example it is clear that as soon as B accepts A’s request, it means that B has prepared him/herself emotionally for what is coming next, e.g., answering a question.

In his book *Cross Cultural Encounters* (1994: 152), Richard Brislin has said that ‘the intuitive-affective dimension is important in Arab countries. People express their positions through appeals and emotions. Facts seem to take second place to feeling’.

A relevant example from the data may be considered, which discusses an issue relating to Islam, in which speaker E talks about a person who intends to make the [Umrah] and to grant the reward of his visit to his father. It is a common and accepted Islamic practice to make a pilgrimage on the behalf of someone who is deceased. The divine reward then goes to the deceased.

The negative FB comes from the other speakers, A and F, to express their disagreement with his statement. Their disagreement was due to several reasons. First, they have a lack of information regarding this point: it is not known if God will accept this visit, so they doubted that such an act would be accepted, i.e., it makes more sense when a person who intends to do this visit will, himself, get its divine benefit, but not someone else:

[data sample] (18)
D : [huwwa maa ūsimil il ūumra ūan abuw] ‘he did not do the umra on his father’s behalf’
F : [anaa maa ūsimilit ūumra ūan abuwi] ‘I did not do the umra on my father’s behalf’
E : [huwwa ūawaab bass inta muʃ ūaarif iðaa qibilhaa minnak rabbak willaa maa qibilhaa aθaabak willaa maa aθaabak] ‘it is a benefit but you never know if (God) accepted it or not’
A : [ʔinta zayy ayʃ <ʕalalit> zayy ʔilli ʕalay dayn <uw biddu yitʃaddaʃ>] ‘you act like someone who is a debtor (someone who owes money to others) and would like to

---

7 when Muslims visit the holy places in Mecca.
be a creditor (someone who is owed money)’
@<low and laughter>
G: [laʔ laʔ bass huwwa illii fahhamak ifjaj? haðaa biikuwn akiid yalṭaːn fiµ] ‘no no but
I think that the person who explained this thing to you was mistaken for sure’

This example shows that in discussions between Arabs facts can take precedence over emotions. Speaker E raised a certain emotional topic related to his father who passed away some years ago. Speaker A disagreed with him because she was more experienced than him in this sort of issue. Speaker E decides to make the [ṣumraː] and to dedicate the visit to his father who died some years ago. Speaker A, according to her knowledge and background of such acts, points out that he is the only person who is entitled to earn the benefit behind this act.

Now, if the Arabs, as Brislin argues, give priority to their emotions rather than facts, the majority of participants would endorse E’s statement, especially the widow of this man, who was among them, and his two grown-up children. However, everyone accepted A’s rational argument. Although this one item of evidence is not conclusive as such, it supports the view that Brislin’s argument was, at the very least, an exaggeration of the emotional dominance in Arab culture.

It is not unusual to find cases of emotional FB in any culture, of course, although the degree and variation may be different according to the culture or situation. Take the following example from English culture:

(19)
  ii) A: a friend of mine broke his leg yesterday!
         B: sorry! + (nodding head / head shakes sideways / clicking sounds / moaning)

         - Acceptance of communicative act and emotion
         - Acceptance of turn
         - Acceptance of communicated content sharing empathy

Yassine (1997) discusses emotion in his book and gives an explanation based on his own observations of Arabs in conversation. The quotations in speech marks refer to some of Yassine’s views:
i) ‘Arabs emphasize strongly in their conversation’. This is a simple way of stating the reality. Otherwise the listener may think that the speaker is not honest enough.

One very good example of emphasis in conversation among Arabs is repetition. They use it to stress their FB. Repetition is very common among Arabs in conversation. Repetition has several functions: for repair, in response to a question, and for receiving a response (see Schegloff, 1996).

Arabic is full of examples of repetition in different forms, e.g.:

(20)
A : \[\text{lamma nimit imbaarih}\] ‘when I slept yesterday’
B : \[\text{nimit}\] ‘slept’ = repair

(21)
A : \[\text{im\\\\\\\$ayt ?}\] ‘did you go?’
B : \[\text{im\\\\\\\$ayt !}\] ‘\text{I did go}’ = response to a question

(22)
A : \[\text{huwwa mi\\\\\\\$ii ?}\] ‘did he go?’
B : \[\text{ah}\] ‘yes’
A : \[\text{ah}\] ‘yes’ = receiving a response

More examples:

[data sample] (23)
A: \[\text{inta ruhtiy a\\\$ ?}\] ‘did you go \text{yes}’?
B: \[\text{a\\\$}\] ‘\text{yes}’

[data sample] (24)
A: \[\text{sa\\\$ h ?}\] ‘\text{right/correct}’
B: \[\text{sa\\\$ h}\] ‘\text{right/correct}’

[data sample] (25)
D: \[\text{inta maax\\\$id issayyaara\\\$ ?}\] ‘will you take the car?’
E: \[\text{anaa maax\\\$id issayyaara\\\$ aa}\] ‘\text{I will take the car, yes}’
Example 25 illustrates the repetition of the whole sentence for emphasising purpose. Speaker E did not want to confirm, but to emphasise his answer. Such examples are very common and easy to find in Palestinian Arabic.

In the present data conversations, many FB actions occurred as repetitions. Schegloff (1996) distinguished between the initial, secondary, and final position of repetition. Allwood (1978, 1986), and Allwood et al (1992, 1995) have offered a general structural classification of FB, where repetitions have been treated as a type of FB exhibiting four variants: single repetitions, repetitions in initial position, in medial position, and in final position (Allwood, 1995). Presumably all functions of repetition, e.g., to show non-understanding, asking for clarification, etc. are to be found in most human languages.

ii) ‘Arabs like to make an elaborate introduction to a conversation.’ This is a very common feature of speech among Arabs. It will usually contain one FB expression or more. Let us consider the following example from the data where it can be seen how speaker D tried to get to a certain point and open a new topic through giving an elaborate introduction:

[data sample] (26)

C : [w alla yaa Khaalid ihnaa mahruwiin minnu hinaa laa itquwliii (-)] ‘oh Khalid we are really deprived of it don’t say (-)
D: [haqiqa b inhaa blaad hilway basma’, bass inta <kiif yaaayi fihnaak?> akiid maa t-hammalit ilbard ‘indaam <aa, sabbih >/// maa ahad yista’iit innu yit-hammalu sah ‘
‘indeed it is a beautiful country I hear, but how do you live there? surely you could not stand the cold ah, right? /// no one can stand this cold, right’
@ <mood: questions>
C : [?anaa laa laa bil’saks ?illii bii’iifuw ?illii bii’iifuw fii ilmamaatiq il harr < +>] ‘I no no on the contrary, those who live in the hot areas’

This example illustrates one side of spoken Palestinian Arabic communication. If speaker D’s production is examined, the following may be demonstrated:

3) A statement, when D says: ‘indeed it is a beautiful country I hear’
4) A deniable question: ‘but how do you live there?’
5) Giving FB: ‘surely you could not stand the cold ah’
6) Eliciting FB: ‘right?’
7) A statement: ‘no one can stand this cold’
8) Eliciting FB: ‘right?’
Here, it can be seen that there are two statements and one deniable question. Giving of FB occurred once, and eliciting of FB was found twice. These kinds of examples, to elaborate introduction, are not uncommon among Arabs when they are communicating with each other. One of the motivations for such an example is that the speaker is talkative or eager to encourage the listener to talk, etc. For people with little understanding of Arab culture such an example might be classified as uncommon behaviour or even hard to interact with.

Hopefully the above two points, discussed by Yassine, will help to shed light on some of the occurrences of FB in Arabic conversations. Under the category ‘Emotional normality’, Yassine claims that the Arab is a moody person, meaning that he/she might love what he/she hates, refuse what he/she accepts, and even curse what he/she seeks to praise. Such procedures are normal for him/her, however, and they reorient the kind of reaction that occurs under certain types of emotional pressure.

This description of Arab behaviour is very confusing, especially to a foreigner, e.g., a European; but, such behaviour is normal among Arabs as far as their emotions or feelings are concerned. In connection with FB, such behaviour will be confusing for the listener if he has insufficient knowledge and experience for the interpretation of these acts. Therefore, an explanation, as in the example below, is given to interpret them.

There is no doubt that emotions are an important factor for characterising Arabs. FB shows this clearly, i.e., if an Arab (emotionally) feels comfortable then his/her FB reaction will be positive most of the time (like acceptance, approval, confirmation, etc.), even toward things that are not his/her favourite, and vice versa, as the following data shows:

[data sample] (27)

A: [maa bithib ilmuntaŷab ilbaraaziilli?] ‘didn't you like the Brazilian team?’
B: [?illaa] ‘certainly’ (I do like it)

In fact, speaker B does not like the Brazilian team. However, he is in a positive frame of mind because his favourite team have achieved good results so far, which makes him give the questioner the wrong answer. Besides, speaker B would like to avoid a long and probably hard discussion, since most of the participants, including speaker A, were in favour of the Brazilian team, and he
was the only exception. The other participants wanted to start a debate with speaker B to provoke and tease him, especially when they observed that he was in a good mood.

1.6 Written Arabic and Daily Language Use

Since the present study focuses on spoken Palestinian Arabic, it would be useful to give an overview of Arabic dialects in both written and spoken forms. A more extensive description will be given in the appendix of this thesis. Two writers have been selected who have been much discussed regarding Arabic dialects: Blanc (1960), and Badawi (1973). It shall be illustrated how FB relates to all this with some examples from the data.

Writers who have described and discussed spoken communication in Arabic can be divided into three main groups:

i) Those who focus on ‘Classical Arabic’
ii) Those who are concerned with ‘Contemporary Dialects’
iii) Those who try to find common ground between these two registers.

There are generally two main points of view on the nature of Arabic. One subscribes to ‘diglossia’, the other to the notion that several registers lie on a continuum, with some, or maybe all, of those registers, overlapping at various points. Those who believe in diglossia acknowledge two distinct levels of the same language. These levels are:

i) [al fuṣḥaa] ‘classical/pure Arabic’, e.g., K(Q)ura’nic language, Prophetic speech, poetry from the pre-Islamic era, and modern standard Arabic.
ii) [illu'raḥ-iṣaammīyya] ‘colloquial language’, e.g., spoken varieties and slang, etc. Levinson (1993), Badawi, Carter and Gully (2004).

It is important to point out to the reader that there is another level of Arabic, which shows some similarities to, and differences from, the registers mentioned above. This level is [luṭu-lmuθaqqafl] ‘the language of the cultured’, e.g., that is found or used in university lectures, newspapers, formal meetings and declamation speeches, etc. This level is called MSA (Modern Standard Arabic). It falls somewhere between CA (Classical Arabic) and AD (Arabic Dialect) but is closer to CA. We might argue that most of the basic rules of CA have remained
unchanged – remarkably so in fact – although there have been a number of grammatical extensions in MSA based on CA.\(^8\)

The present thesis will be based on the ‘colloquial language’, and particularly the Palestinian dialect. Although this section is meant to discuss Arabic spoken communication in general, I will also make some comments on linguistic FB in relation to CA. To begin our discussion, we will try to compare CA/MSA with PA (spoken Palestinian Arabic) as far as FB actions are concerned.

i) The Traditional View on the Varieties of the Arabic Spoken Language

Spoken language in Arabic is divided into two main kinds:

i) \([\text{lak}na^b]\) = idiolect/accent: the speech of one individual. Or even the phonetic characteristics of a person’s speech.

ii) \([\text{lahj}a^b]\) ‘dialect’ = the speech of a regional group of people.

Since the present study is based on one Arabic dialect, not idiolect, it is worth noting the difference between the two terms with regard to Arabic. The following two examples from the data may make the picture clear. The words in bold refer to the main different expressions in the text:

(28)

i) [\text{huwwa yatakallam lak}na^b mumayyaza^b] ‘he speaks a distinctive \text{idiolect}’

A: [\text{qul-lii hal sami'ata laknatuhu ?}] ‘tell me did you hear his idiolect?’

B: [\text{na'am wallaahii kaanat laknatan}] ‘yes I swear it was a special idiolect close to al-sham dialect’

(29)

ii) [\text{huwwa bitkallam lah}d3a^b mumayyaza^b] ‘he speaks a distinct \text{dialect}’

A: [\text{ibti'raf ay's hiyya lahijditu}^b kaanat ?] ‘do you know what his dialect is?’

B: [\text{aywaa kaanat lah}d3a^b su'diyya^b qariiba^b min lahd3it ahli lihjd3az] ‘yes it was a Saudi’s dialect close to al-hijd3az dialect’

It is important to point out that in Classical Arabic CA or MSA, as in example 26 above, there is no such confusion, because there is a special expression which refers to each word i.e. \([\text{lahd}3a^b]\) ‘dialect’, \([\text{lak}na^b]\) ‘idiolect’, whereas in spoken

---

\(^8\) There has been a number of studies on this level of Arabic. See, for instance Mitchell (1966), and more recently, Badawi, Carter and Gully, \textit{Modern Written Arabic: A Comprehensive Grammar} (2004).
language, as in example 27, speakers select [lahdʒaʔ] ‘dialect’ to refer to both concepts.

The tree diagram below shows the varieties of Arabic in general. This will make it easier for the reader when he/she goes through the rest of the text. Furthermore, we will capture in table form the varieties of dialects we have suggested in the beginning of this section (cf. M.Phil thesis 2002: 40).

Table. 1.2: Spoken and Written Arabic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Spoken</th>
<th>Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Classical (CA)</td>
<td>Classical (CA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Standard (MSA)</td>
<td>Standard (MSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>Daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA dialect</td>
<td>PA dialect</td>
<td>PA dialect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(recorded in Saudi Arabia)</td>
<td>(recorded in Saudi Arabia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to point out that CA and MSA ‘almost completely overlap’. I would also like to point to what Mitchell (1986) emphasises, viz. that neither CA nor MSA is, in fact, a spoken language, nor a mother tongue yet. They probably never will be (Mitchell 1986:7-32).

In the present subsection we will give an overview of the Arabic dialects according to Blanc (1960) and Badawi (1973).

1) Blanc (1960) distinguished five varieties as follows:

1) Plain Colloquial. The homespun speech characteristic of a given region. This variety refers to any local dialect, within which the speaker may select ‘informal’ or ‘mildly formal’ features
2) Koineized Colloquial. Any plain colloquial into which levelling devices have been more or less liberally introduced
3) Semi-literary or Elevated Colloquial. Any plain or koineized colloquial that is classicised beyond the ‘mildly formal’ range
4) Modified Classical. Classical Arabic with dialectal admixtures
5) **Standard Arabic.** Essentially a range of classical Arabic styles without dialectal admixtures (Blanc 1960: 85) and (cf. M.Phil thesis 2002: 41).

2) Badawi (1973) similarly recognises five styles of contemporary Arabic in Egypt:

Badawi argues for the existence of the following levels:

1) [fuṣḥa-ṭṭuraaθ] ‘the classical or literary (Arabic) of the heritage’, otherwise classical Arabic. Traditional classical as taught, for example, at Al-Azhar.
2) [fuṣḥa-l-šaṣr] ‘the classical of the time’ or ‘modern literary Arabic’ or even modern standard Arabic. Classical as modified in response to the demands of modern civilisation, e.g., radio news bulletins, political speeches, scientific writings, etc.
3) [ʕaammiyyatu-lmuṭaqfiin] ‘the colloquial of the cultured’ or cultured colloquial. Formal speech used for serious discussion without reference to any written text.
4) [ʕaammiyyatu-lmuṭanawwirin] ‘the colloquial of the enlightened’ or educated colloquial. Influenced by contemporary life but not by CA/MSA grammar. The everyday conversational style of educated persons with family and neighbours.
5) [ʕaammiyyatu l-ʕammiyyin] ‘the colloquial of the illiterate’ or plain colloquial. ‘Mother tongue’. Uninfluenced by CA/MSA or by modern civilisation, it occurs, for example, on TV in children's shows, and in situation comedies, etc. (Badawi 1973: 67-123) and (cf. M.Phil thesis: 41 and 42).

• **A comparison between Blanc and Badawi**

A cursory look at Blanc and Badawi's classifications suggests that they have much in common. Badawi’s (1) and (2) seem to correspond to Blanc’s (3) and (5) in previous page, and his (3) approximately to Blanc’s (2). However, except for (4), there is thereafter no direct parallel or similarity. Blanc’s concern is more directly descriptive, Badawi’s sociolinguistic.

Of all these varieties mentioned above (and in the appendix of the present thesis), the most relevant one for the spoken language as observed in the recordings is the style (4) given by Badawi (1973), ‘the colloquial of the enlightened’ or educated colloquial; influenced by contemporary life, but not by CA/MSA grammar.
ii) The Varieties of Arabic – an Overview

To summarise the above, here is a table showing the varieties of Arabic dialects discussed by a number of writers, in addition to Blanc and Badawi. The codes used for each variety are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Classical Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Educated Spoken Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWA</td>
<td>Informal Written Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Modern Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Modern Standard Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLA</td>
<td>Modern Literary Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLA</td>
<td>Oral Literary Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Spoken Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St A</td>
<td>Standard Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAL</td>
<td>Standard way of Arabic Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMSA</td>
<td>Written Modern Standard Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMSA</td>
<td>Spoken Modern Standard Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWA</td>
<td>Modern Written Arabic (according to Badawi, Carter, and Gully)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.3: Summary of Views of Arabic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writers</th>
<th>Number of Varieties</th>
<th>Views (All in abbreviations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blanc (1960)</td>
<td>Distinguishes five varieties of Arabic:</td>
<td>St A, Modified Classical, Semiliterary, Koineized Colloquial and Plain Colloquial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badawi (1973)</td>
<td>Recognises five styles of contemporary Arabic in Egypt:</td>
<td>CA, MLA/MSA, Cultured Colloquial, Educated Colloquial and Plain Colloquial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meiseles (1980)</td>
<td>i) Recognises two varieties of educated and spoken Arabic:</td>
<td>OLA, and ESA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Distinguishes four styles:</td>
<td>St A, OLA, ESA and Plain Vernacular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell (1986)</td>
<td>Four varieties:</td>
<td>SA, CA, MSA and ESA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Kaye (1994)</td>
<td>i) Regarding formal and informal Arabic. He has illustrated four varieties:</td>
<td>SA, MSA, CA and ASK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two terms suggested for written and spoken modern standard Arabic:</td>
<td>WMSA and SMSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuvalay-Haak (1997)</td>
<td>Divided the Arabic language into three varieties:</td>
<td>CA, MSA and MA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since it is not possible to discuss all varieties according to each writer, just one of them will be discussed. Cuvalay-Haak’s divisions are interesting, because she did not investigate deeply all other varieties (whose existence I do not deny) and sought only the main three levels that exist in Arabic. This, however, is similar to the three groups suggested in the beginning of the present section as well. Cuvalay’s varieties represent one strong reflection of Arabic nowadays. It is necessary to clarify that not all the above-listed variables are covered; it has only been considered that it might be useful to provide brief information regarding...
Arabic, and a discussion of each variable would be beyond the scope of the main topic in the present thesis.

iii) Classical Arabic and the Palestinian Dialect with Reference to Feedback Actions

The intention of this study, as mentioned earlier, is to describe FB in spoken Palestinian Arabic. Since the Arabic language has passed through several stages, i.e. the pre-Islamic era [al-faṣri jahili] up to the present day, and since many changes have occurred in Arabic that generated many dialects, it is useful to show some of these changes by giving a brief comparison between CA and PA through some selected FB actions noted in our data, or from our own observations. One may observe in the examples below several (Arabic) forms which refer to the same FB expression:

(30) i) Change of forms/expressions, e.g., Classical [hasan] [naṣam] ‘yes’ Palestinian [aʔ/ah] [aywa] [naṣam] ‘yes’

(31) ii) Morphological change e.g. 1. Classical = [biṭṭabf] ‘sure’ Palestinian = [ṭabaʃan] ‘sure’


(32) iii) Phrase change, e.g. 1. Classical = [haaḍaa ḏayyid] ‘this is good’ Palestinian = [ḏayyid] ‘good’

2. Classical = [naṣam walaakin] ‘yes but’ Palestinian = [aʔb bass] [aʔb laakin] ‘yes but’

Our discussion will rely partly on Allwood’s classification and analysis (1987/88), which discussed ‘the functional description’ of FB. In the present chapter, subsection 1.1.3, a further description of this analysis was given. Allwood has supplied ‘eight’ different classifications for the functional description of FB. Some of these points which he has taken up was selected in order to discuss and provide examples (see M.Phil thesis 2002: 45).

1. Turn-taking. We can distinguish between expressions which are used to take, accept, hold and give away a turn. Following is a discussion on the notion of
accepting a turn, an opportunity which Arabs often seize upon to give FB in conversation:

Example (33)  
Acceptor= ‘yes’
Classical= [naʕam] ‘yes’
Palestinian dialect= A: [inta qultillu?] ‘did you tell him?’  
B: [aywaa] ‘yes’

As we have seen, the FB expression differs between the two levels. At the same time, we see that turn-management and FB are intertwined with ‘contact’.

2. Positive and negative perception. Two examples to illustrate each language level:

Example (34)  
i) Negative perception= ‘what’ (?)
Classical= [maaɁaa] ‘what’
Palestinian= A: [wiin tartiib mawqi’iissufuwdiyyah?] ‘where is the Saudi airline’s place among the rest of the airlines?’  
B: [ayʃ] / [ayb] ‘what’ (?) (see the appendix A.4, item III Structural Operations)

3. Positive and negative understanding. Negative understanding forms occurred often in the data conversations. This reflects how frequently these types of FB are used during conversations in general:

Example (35)  
i) Negative understanding= ‘yes but’
Classical= [naʕam walaakin] ‘yes but’
Palestinian= A: [inta faahimnii?] ‘do you understand me?’  
B: [aa bass anaa maa laqat-haa] ‘yes but I do not get it’

4. Positive and negative acceptance (as distinguished by Allwood). There is not much difference in expressions, morphology, etc. between the two Arabic varieties in giving the latter FB:

Example (36)  
i) Negative acceptance= ‘no’
Classical= [laa] ‘no’
The preceding section may be concluded as follows. Several writers focused on both written and spoken varieties of Arabic. Two writers have been chosen for this study, Blanc (1960) and Badawi (1973), to demonstrate and discuss their description and classification of Arabic dialects. The choice of these particular writers was built on the belief that their description of Arabic is one of the most convenient in comparison with the other writers. I have mentioned three groups of writers who described spoken Arabic: those who focus their description on CA, those who focus their description on the contemporary dialects, and those who balance between these.  

Interestingly there is only one word in spoken Arabic to refer to both dialect and idiolect, while in CA or MSA there is no such confusion. I, as a native Arab speaker, would like to say that I have been in favour of Badawi’s styles because I believe that his definition of the levels of Egyptian dialects covers a very wide area in the study of Arabic dialects. Besides, he was able to identify some interesting variations of Arabic dialects that are related to different social levels in Egyptian society.

1.7 Conclusion to Chapter One

Communication in spoken language is a very large area to describe. Many writers at different times have made great efforts to discuss this linguistic phenomenon, which is extremely important for individuals to be able to share information, knowledge, and experience with each other. I do not claim that this discussion of communication as human interaction in the present study covers this area completely. However, since the present task is to discuss and describe spoken language communication, I decided to begin the present chapter by introducing the term communication and the importance of this term according to a number of linguists, e.g., Mackay (in Hinde, 1972), Lyons (1977), Allwood (1976), and Smith (1977). After defining the term ‘communication’ historically I discussed communication in discourse, because the present study deals with

9 For further information regarding Egyptian varieties of Arabic see Badawi, E. M. (1973) Levels of contemporary Arabic in Egypt.
discourse analysis. Austin (1962), and Searle (1969) are among the main writers discussed in this connection. In conclusion, the term ‘communication’ in general focuses on either sending or receiving information, as well as communication based on action and co-operation (Allwood 1995, 1976). There has also been an attempt to summarise the previous thesis which discussed the phenomenon of FB in Arabic spoken communication, and the main results obtained in the previous work have been demonstrated.

Section 1.2 discusses the process of communication and communicative acts. Five subsections were discussed under this section; these are:

I) The process of communication, which according to Smith, consists of three major distinctions of abstractions: syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic.

II) The process of a communicative act, which is divided by Allwood (1976) into actions, co-operation and intention from a sender to display, or signal information to a receiver.

III) Action and activity: each item was discussed separately even though it was rather difficult to draw a distinction between them.

IV) Subsection 1.4.6 discusses co-operation as an important item under the study of human spoken communication.

V) Aspects of communication, which included four subsections, all of which are required to complete the circle of communication:

1) Participants= sender and receiver
2) Communicative intentions
3) Medium of communication
4) Intersubjectivity

With regard to the aims of the present thesis, the role of the notion culture has been explored. Furthermore, an example has been given to explain what is meant by ‘linguistic FB’ and the importance of this phenomenon in human communication. An overview has been presented of the method that has been followed to analyse, describe, and discuss the main topic. Finally, some background of the Arabic language was given to the reader in the form of a summary of the varieties of Arabic.

From this chapter it is hoped that all the information discussed gave the reader an initial idea of the main topic of the present study in relation to Arabic culture, and related points regarding communication in general. By giving this
introduction, it is hoped to be able to move to the next chapter where the theoretical background of the present study discusses several questions, all related to the main topic of the present study, FB.
Chapter 2

Theoretical Background

2.1 Introduction and Main Questions

The present chapter is meant to give a more extensive account of the phenomenon of linguistic FB. In particular, I intend to present current views related to the following questions:

1. How did linguists develop and use the notion of FB in early work? (see subsection 2.2)
2. How do linguists define FB as a communication process? (see subsections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2)
3. How do modern linguists define linguistic FB? (see subsection 2.3.3)
4. What specific functions does FB fulfill in communication? (see subsections 2.3.4 and 2.3.6)
5. How do we recognise an FB expression in its main functions? (see subsection 2.3.5)
6. In what specific ways is FB manifested in communication? (see subsections 2.4.1 – 2.4.4)

Spoken conversation is a very complicated interplay between a speaker and a listener. Furthermore, the speaker and listener will often change roles. The speaker wants to know whether the listener understands, accepts, confirms or rejects what he is saying. The significance of FB strikes anyone who has spoken on the telephone without getting any response from his/her interlocutor, or who has observed the importance of giving the proper responses in conversation.

The following examples give a simple illustration of the phenomenon of FB. A says something, and B makes a response:

(1) A: Lovely opportunity
    B: Yes

(2) A: It’s foggy today
    B: Yes
It would appear that B’s responses are simple responses of acceptance, but actually they are less simple than it seems. B is making responses to indicate that he/she is listening and understanding, in addition to accepting what A is saying.

What about cases such as the following, however?

(3)
A : It’s a windy day (wife)
B : Yes (a husband while reading a newspaper)

Even in cases like this, where the husband seems uninterested in what his wife is saying, we still consider his answer an instance of listening FB. Listening, therefore, does not necessarily mean to obey or give full attention to what has been said, but to be able and willing to listen to what the other person is saying, no matter whether FB action is positive or negative.

The main characteristics and observations of FB in Palestinian Arabic was discussed in subsection 1.1.3, with the help of Allwood’s analysis (1987/88).

2.2 Early Observations of Feedback

In this section I will give brief sketches of two linguists of Antiquity, Priscian and Sibawaihi, who made early observations which are at least remotely related to FB phenomena.

2.2.1 Priscian and Sibawaihi

• Priscian, a grammarian living in the fifth-century AD, recognised a class of words which he termed interjections (the traditional term interjection covers many, but not all, expressions with important FB functions), and we may assume that he had some idea about the use of these expressions in discourse. Later on in this chapter, I will discuss the relationship between interjection and FB (see our M.Phil thesis 2002:50-51).

The term ‘interjection’ which, according to Robins (1967), was first formulated around the sixth century AD, is defined as follows:

---

10 There seems to be more than one Priscian, but this is the one who lived in Aristotle’s time as mentioned by Robins (1967).
‘Interjectio (interjection): a class of words syntactically independent of verbs and indicating a feeling or a state of mind’ (Robins, 1967: 61, 66, 90,171).

• Sibawaihi, an Arab grammarian of Persian origin in the eighth-century AD, apparently had some ideas about linguistic interaction, but the question is whether he had a clear vision of FB as suggested in the following:

‘Questions and commands have an obvious reference to the hearer; indeed, it would be rather absurd to view them as “monological” speech acts, and to view the corresponding sentences as part of a “monological” or “non-functional” linguistic capacity. Sibawaihi manages to show that even statements and the corresponding sentences have a reference to the hearer, namely by conceptualising them as answers to questions which the hearer could have asked’ (Itkonen 1991: 245-246). Or, in Sibawaihi’s own words:

‘This is how we speak, even if the listener does not ask out loud, because what you say follows the extent of the questions he might pose if he were to ask you’ (Itkonen 1991: 248).

Sibawaihi pushes his ‘interactional’ view of language so far as to regard the structure of a nominal sentence in Arabic to be motivated by communicative considerations. What the first speaker has mentioned is the topic, which is known to the hearer; the latter’s expectations have been aroused, and then, as second speaker, he simply has to add the comment. To quote:

‘And that is, as far as the person spoken to expects and anticipates, one of those cases where the speaker has no choice but to mention the predicate to the listener, because if you start with a noun you have only done so for the sake of what follows, and if you make an initial term you are obliged to mention something after the initial term, otherwise what you say will be corrupt and not allowed’ (Itkonen, 1991: 249).

We may assume from Sibawaihi’s words that by the phrase ‘the person spoken to expects and anticipates’ he meant the listener’s reaction. Sibawaihi also seems to be developing a notion of multi-level, social knowledge when, discussing ellipsis, he says that ‘people only suppress (delete a word) when they know that you know what they (knowingly) mean’ (Itkonen 1991: 252).

The passage from Sibawaihi, supported by Itkonen’s views, suffice to demonstrate that writers in Antiquity were aware of factors of linguistic
interaction, but the passages also show that they had no definite idea of FB as it is understood today, and as it will be described in this chapter.

We have no evidence, therefore, that grammarians in Antiquity (as will be seen below) were acquainted with the mechanism which today is termed ‘linguistic FB’. The most we can say is that they were aware of linguistic interaction relating to ‘linguistic FB’ as a notion, (Allwood 1979, a special case of Wiener’s notion ‘feedback’ from 1948).

2.3 The Modern Conception of Feedback in Discourse

2.3.1 Wiener (1948) and Fries (1952)

I am going to present the ideas of two other linguists, Norbert Wiener (1948) and Charles Fries (1952), who took the first initiatives to discuss the term FB as an independent concept in human language communication.

In his seminal work of 1948, Wiener employed the term ‘feedback’ for purely technical and scientific aims: ‘The information fed back to the control center tends to oppose the departure of the controlled from the controlling quantity, but it may depend in widely different ways on this departure’ (my italics). He went on to say that: ‘the simplest control systems are linear: the output of the effector is a linear expression in the input, and when we add inputs, we also add outputs. The output is read by some apparatus equally linear. This reading is simply subtracted from the input’ (Wiener, 1948: 116).

Wiener talked about effective action on the outer world and maintained that although we possess good effectors, the performance of these effectors must be properly monitored back to the central nervous system, and that the readings of these monitors must be properly combined with the other information from the sense organs to produce a properly proportioned output to the effectors. Wiener continued that: ‘in this system there is a human link in the chain of the transmission and return of information: in what we shall from now on call the chain of feed-back’ (p. 114, my italics). He believed that a signalman for instance, is not altogether a free agent; that is, his switches and signals are interlocked, either mechanically or electrically, and that he is not free to choose some of the more disastrous combinations. He discussed the chain of FB in which the human element intervenes, and supported his discussion by illustrating with examples related to the mechanism of FB in the following:
- The ordinary thermostat by which we regulate the heating of a house
- The governor of a steam-engine, which serves to regulate its velocity under varying conditions of load, etc.

Wiener proposed that the feedback tends to oppose what the system is already doing, and is thus negative. In addition, he supported his discussion of negative feedback by illustrating it with several examples; for instance, the negative feedback used to stabilise the position of something, as in the case of the steering engines of a ship, which are actuated by the angular difference between the position of the wheel and the position of the rudder. Wiener suggested this example to explain that both wheel and rudder are always acting so as to bring the position of the rudder into accord with that of the wheel.

Regarding the above description of the concept of feedback, it is important to underline that the writer has applied the term ‘feedback’ to scientific contexts (e.g. the symbolism of mathematics, medicine, electricity, engines, etc) not to linguistic contexts. But Allwood, who adopted the term FB from Wiener, found a reasonable link between the FB of Wiener (with his technical contexts) and that of Fries (with his linguistic contexts), which could be applied in human language to discuss a central linguistic phenomenon in language communication.

As an early idea of the concept of feedback, Wiener suggested the following initial figure to show how the mechanism of feedback works:

Key words:

Compensator= system which serves to bring the complicated input-output relations of an effector into a form approaching a simple proportionality (pp. 111-112).
Effector= to represent both: switch and / or signal.

Regarding the term ‘effector’, Wiener provided an example of its connection with electrical and mechanical systems. He said that: ‘there is a human link in the chain of the transmission and return of information: in what we shall from now on call the chain of feedback’ (p. 96).

Figure (2.1)
According to Wiener, both compensator and effector are combined into one larger effector. This change will alter the maximum feedback admissible, and it is not easy to increase that level to a significant extent (p. 132). As we can see from the above figure, for the same feedback level, it will most definitely improve the performance of the system. Moreover, several examples were given by the writer under this figure, e.g. feedback in human and animal reflexes, feedback systems in the way in which we steer a car on an icy road, etc.

Wiener ended his chapter on feedback by reminding the reader of an important physiological application of the principle of feedback which is related, according to him, to an essential phenomenon for the continuation of life, and is found in what is known as *homeostasis* (the conditions under which life, especially healthy life, can continue in animals, are quite narrow) (Wiener, 1948: 113-136).

We may add that this view of feedback and all the examples of feedback given by Wiener with their compensators one a particular case of a complicated theory not yet fully developed.

Probably, according to Wiener, Fries, and Allwood the following links may be added; Wiener was the first writer to describe the circle that completes the chain of communication, starting from transmission until information is obtained. Wiener connected the mechanism of FB between machine and human being. Fries focused on human response only, and Allwood expanded the studies of FB to include: expression, meaning, situation, in addition to the psychological part of FB analyses.

With Fries, we have moved from a purely technical use of the term FB (see Wiener above) to a purely linguistic use, as we will see in the following discussion. Fries was the first writer to shed light on the study of FB as human communication. This can be seen in his discussion, description, and analysis of the concept of ‘listener responses’ discussed in his book *The Structure of English* (1952). In his third chapter, part III, Fries classified grammatical sentences along two dimensions:

i) The first dimension is divided into simple, compound, and complex sentences. However, Fries saw that the definitions of the first dimension provide no practical means of sorting out the *single free utterances* from other utterances presented in the recorded conversations (such as those on which the present study is based).
Therefore, he suggested further research to discover and describe the objective facts which these terms are designed to cover.

ii) The second kind of classification described English sentences as follows:

a) Declarative, i.e. statement and fact (makes a statement)
b) Interrogative, i.e. questions (asks a question)
c) Imperative, i.e. requests (gives a command)
d) Exclamatory, i.e. expresses strong emotion.

What Fries suggested as the main task here was to discover just how we know that any particular sentence ‘asks questions’, ‘gives a command’ or ‘makes a statement’ (p. 32). To explain the above discussion: what Fries meant is how, in the English language, are these particular meanings signalled? He proposed two important steps for arriving at a body of single free utterances for examination, and for separating them into their different kinds.

The basis for the procedure suggested by Fries can perhaps be made clear by the use of a general formula to represent the function of language. Fries argued here that the description of all types of animal and human behaviour often employs the terms ‘stimulus’ and ‘response’. For instance, a man stimulated by the sensation called ‘hunger’ may respond by silently seeking food and eating it, and so on. Fries went on to say that, with regard to the above example, we can describe behaviour by indicating the situation which provided the stimulus and the practical action which was the response: $S \rightarrow R$ ($S =$ stimulus, and $R =$ response).

Regarding the topic of FB, the fundamental point that Fries discussed corresponding to the above example was that man can respond not by seeking food directly and eating it, but by uttering certain speech sounds, and his wife or the cook, or even the waiter in the restaurant, will respond practically to the stimulus of these speech sounds by seeking or preparing food and bringing it to him. Man, then, has learned to use the sound waves as a means of connection between two nervous systems. This is where the initial function of the FB phenomenon was first discussed. The following figure was drawn by Fries to support his analysis of the actual communicative act consisting of stimulus (sender) and response (receiver):

$S =$ practical situation which creates the practical stimulus
$r =$ the sounds spoken by the first individual
R= practical response
s= all sounds as heard and understood by another individual

Figure (2.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual A</th>
<th>Individual B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effective field of the stimulus-situation</td>
<td>The sounds as uttered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The particular speech act which becomes effective for B through language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to this figure, any actual speech act has to consist of both r (the sounds uttered by individual A), and s (the sounds heard by individual B). Meanwhile the ‘meaning’ of any speech signal, according to Fries, must consist not only of the practical situation which stimulates the making of the particular speech sounds, but also of the practical response which these particular speech sounds (through language) produce in another individual (Fries 1952: 34).

Studying the materials of speech is another point to which the writer gave his attention. He focused on both the articulation process and acoustic qualities as very important factors in terms of the frequency and the strength of the sound variation. This has been discussed in the previous chapter, section 1.2.

There are three major groups of utterances, suggested by Fries, in which the evidence of the response was clear in the recorded materials:

i) Those that were immediately and regularly followed by ‘oral’ responses only. The following example from the data may be considered:

[data sample] (4)
A : [< ]
B : [< ]
@ <unclear overlapping from speakers A and B>
B : [χamas sitt sniin aa] ‘five to six years yes’
A : [aa] ‘yes’
C : [faayif uw ladjitnaa miθ haadʒat θaaniya] ‘you see and our particular dialect but not anything else’
ii) Those that were immediately followed by ‘action’ responses, sometimes accompanied by one of a very limited list of oral responses.

The example here would be an FB expression followed by a nodding head from a hearer to express his/her acceptance, or to combine an FB expression with a nodding of the head, but to a lesser degree than the verbal one.

iii) Those that were accompanied (not necessarily followed) by very brief oral signals of attention interjected at irregular intervals but not interrupting the flow of talk (Fries 1952: 41-42). This is shown in speaker B in the example below:

[data sample] (5)
A : [ṭinnaa masakuw ḍalaa ʿiddiinaar] ‘in our place, they could exert control over the dinar’ (the dinar is the Jordanian local currency)
B : [<ḥarb>]? (what)
@ <mood: question (mis hearing)>
A : [masaku ḍalay ʿalluw ḍaabit /// ʿiddiinaar ḍaabit ḍinnaa wīḥamdu-līlīla] ‘they exerted control over it, and made it stable /// the dinar is stable with us thank God’

In relation to this item, Fries supported his discussion with an example of a telephone conversation where a particular kind of response must be given regularly with an eliciting function in which the hearer gives continued attention to a series of utterances.

Fries used the term ‘interjection’, which has been discussed earlier in the present section, as a term that covers many, expressions with important FB functions (see subsection 2.2.1).

In fact Fries’s suggestion covers the main FB interactions that we would find in any (real-life) conversation. He did not discuss some other complicated FB actions that could occur between speakers in conversation e.g. self FB, eliciting and giving FB, etc., but there is no doubt that he is the first writer who has discussed FB phenomena in linguistics.

According to Fries, there are two kinds of sentences or free utterance units. These are:
1) Communicative utterances

These can be divided into three types:

a) Utterances eliciting ‘oral’ responses only, e.g. greetings, calls, and questions
b) Utterances eliciting ‘action’ responses, or a low degree of oral response e.g. requests or command
c) Utterances eliciting non-verbal responses, or sometimes oral signals, but taken from a limited list without interrupting the flow of the utterance unit, e.g. statements.

Fries used the expression ‘eliciting’ in all three kinds of communicative utterances. Writers such as Nivre, Allwood and Ahlsén (1999), on the other hand, consider eliciting FB (or ‘response’, according to Fries) as a means of either encouraging the hearer to give his FB to the sender, or as a signal to the sender to go on with his talk. As we have observed also, Fries used the term eliciting to refer to all kinds of responses.\(^\text{11}\)

2) Non-communicative utterances

These are all utterances characteristic of situations such as surprise, suddenness, pain, disgust, etc. (Fries, 1952: 29-54). Fries did not explain why these particular acts are the only ones to be considered as non-communicative utterances. However, it is probably because they are easily observed in human behaviour.

In his ‘functional description’ Allwood (1987/88) also discussed and offered a detailed exposition of FB expressions, where he suggested eight main aspects which are given in different situations (see also my fil lic/M.Phil thesis, June/2002, subsection 4.6.10.1).

Fries also made an important point regarding speech interaction, where he noted that every (given) response from a speaker has to fulfill at least three requirements: specific expression + meaning + situation. This is exactly what is trying to be achieved with the present investigation, i.e., to gather FB expressions and to combine them with semantic and pragmatic features. It is

\(^{11}\) See also section 2.4 for further explanation.
clear that much of Fries’ analysis was adopted and developed by Allwood, Nivre and Ahlsén later on.

From the above discussion, it can be seen how Wiener tried to explain his theory. Several examples have been given in order to demonstrate that the mechanism which Wiener followed had a technical basis, and to show how the link could be established between a machine and a human being to produce the FB. In his discussion of FB, Fries chose to focus on one part only, which is the human part of FB in language communication, and for an entirely linguistic aim. In the coming section, the term FB will be discussed according to other writers who came after Wiener and Fries with various discussions of FB interactions in human communication.

2.3.2 Feedback and Communication Process

In this section our discussion and comparison with other writers on FB will be derived, measured against and based on our discussion related to the ‘aspects of communication’ that were discussed from 1.4.7 to 1.4.7.4.


Subbs and McTear discussed the suggestion that an adequate discourse model includes constraints on the distribution of units. This raises the whole question of what conversationalists might know about producing orderly and coherent talk. Subbs and McTear have said that, when putting conversations together, participants in talk are governed by rules. The analysis they suggested is formulated as follows:

**Figure (2.3)**

\[ E(\text{xchange}) \rightarrow I(\text{initiation}) \rightarrow R(\text{response}) \rightarrow F(\text{feedeback}) \]


Looking at Subbs and McTear’s figure it can be seen that both communicative intention and medium of communication are missing. Moreover, they considered ‘response’ to be separate from ‘FB’. They also made FB the final action in the whole process. However, I consider FB as a response and a result of the interaction between interlocutors, and not simply as an action that would occur after an response.
II) Ferenc Kiefer (1969)

Kiefer discussed some types of ‘yes’ and ‘no’ utterances, which under normal circumstances cannot be answered by a plain ‘yes’ or a plain ‘no’. The writer’s account of these questions is principally based on the theory of indirect speech acts and the theory of conversation. The writer mentioned also some types of ‘yes/no’ questions which behave idiosyncratically with respect to ‘yes/no’ answers. In his analysis, Kiefer listed several classifications that were mainly focused on the use of the FB answers ‘yes’ and ‘no’ only. That is, he did not draw tables or figures, etc., to give any details of the aspects of communication between speakers (see figure 1, subsection 1.4.7). He tried to show how ‘yes/no’ can be (or not) used with different functions in different situations. However, his analysis focused on discussing many examples which are related to several situations needed to support ‘indirect speech acts theory’. For example, under Indirect Speech Acts, he listed several examples that serve to illustrate indirect requests, where the speaker wants the hearer to do something. For instance: ‘Can you pass the salt?’

An example from the data can be considered where speakers talk about dates:

[data sample] (6)
C : [tamir // ?anaa bahibbu ik0iir haðaa ittamir ðalaa ðikra] ‘dates // by the way I like these dates very much’
D : [tayyib aa] ‘delicious yes’
C : [bisammuw il ðanbarii] ‘it is called al-anbari’
D : [<haðaa il ðanbarii>] ‘is this al-anbari?’
<@<mood: question>>
C : [aa min ittub haðaa miʃ ahsan iʃii bass min ittub] ‘yes it is not the best but it is one of the top kinds of dates’
<@<English word: top>>
D : [<miin ittub> // <.>] ‘who is the top?’
<@<mood: question>>
<@<mood: approval face feature>>
F : [<ayʃ huwwa ittub>] ‘what is the top?’
<@<English word: top>>
<@<mood: question>>
C : [// <.> ittamir ittamir ?illii ?iʃyuwm akalnaa minnu ðalaa ilʃʃaar ðillii imdawwar kiða] ‘// the dates dates which we tried today at breakfast it has a sort of round shape’
<@<Event: start telephone bell>>
In the above example, speaker C described one type of date he offered to his guests, and speaker D (one of his guests) tried it without giving any ‘yes/no’ answer. Speaker C gave the name of this kind of date and D repeated the same enquiry of speaker C and probably became surprised when he knew that this kind of date is known as one of the best in the Peninsula. Speaker F, who was involved in the conversation, was very interested and curious to know about these dates as well. As a conclusion, both speakers D and F started to eat without giving any ‘yes’ or ‘no’ as an FB action.

Of course, as Kiefer says, both FB expressions ‘yes’ and ‘no’ can be given and understood, even without being uttered to express the kinds of FB that would occur in different situations. For example:

‘Yes’ shows approval without uttering it through the running talk. See, for instance, speaker D in the above example. ‘No’ shows disapproval without uttering it through the running talk. Consider the excerpt below from the data, where speakers A and G insisted that a person they are talking about comes originally from Africa, while speaker F insisted that this person was not originally from Africa, also without saying or uttering ‘no’:

[data sample] (7)
F : [madanii] ‘(he is originally from Medina, a city in Saudi Arabia)’
A : [takruwnii] ‘(he is originally from Africa)’
F : [salim madanii] ‘Salim (is originally from Medina)’
A : [takruwnii] ‘(he is originally from Africa)’
G : [salim takruwnii /// wadžhuw džaay min Zimbabwe willaa maa adrii min ay dawla fii afriiqyaa] ‘Salim (he is originally from Africa) /// even his face looks like a person who comes from Zimbabwe; otherwise I do not know from which country in Africa he comes from’

So far, it can be said that both ‘yes’ and ‘no’ represent a very flexible area for discussion in FB, since they can be given orally, non-verbally or even combined during our talk. Cultural effects play a role in this matter as well. For instance, and according our own observations and learnings,

- In the north of Sweden, Finland, etc. most people prefer not to utter ‘yes’ and ‘no’ so much.
- In England, Germany, etc. most people prefer to utter them.
- In the Arab world in general, most people would combine both verbal yes-no and non-verbal actions, or even go into more complicated forms, i.e., to repeat the same FB expression, e.g., ‘yes yes’, ‘no no no’.

Another matter discussed by Kiefer was Negative Focus Questions. Actually this leads to a very interesting and important phenomenon in spoken (Palestinian) Arabic, such that even if FB seems to be a universal phenomenon in human communication, there are language specific differences which are not easily captured in an overall theory.

Compare the following:

(8)
Example (1) In English  A: didn’t you do it?
B: no (I didn't do it)

Arabic  A: [maa ʔamalt-haa/ʃ ?] ‘didn't you do it?’
B: [illaa] ‘yes’ (yes I did it, or no I didn't not do it)

As we can see, the Arabic answer is ambiguous, and because of this it is very common in that language to supplement the FB response with a complete answer after giving a FB expression e.g., [yes] ‘I did it’ or [no] ‘I did not do it’.

(9)
Example (2) In English  A: don’t you go there sometimes?
B: no (no I don’t)

Arabic  A: [bitruwhiʃ ihnaak baʃiq ilʔhyaan ?] ‘don't you go there sometimes?’
B: [aa] ‘yes’ (yes I don't go there sometimes)

Once again, the Arabic answer is ambiguous. If this answer were given to an English interlocutor, misunderstandings would no doubt arise. Kiefer added another element which is part of the analysis in this study as well, which he called ‘meta-tag’; I call it eliciting FB. He exemplified this as follows:

---

12 The Arabic examples above are all taken from the Palestinian dialect. Classical Arabic, i.e. the language of the Qur’ _n_, [Al fusha], or standard Arabic, which is used in newspapers, is not confusing in this respect.
- You are going now, right?
- You are not going now, right?

More explanation about this part of FB analysis will be discussed in 2.4.2, 3.2, and 4.3 of the present study. See Kiefer in Searle’s *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics* (1969) (See also Kiefer 1966, ‘Some Semantic Relations in Natural Language’).

III) Allwood (1979, 1985, 1988a, b, c) and Allwood, Nivre and Ahlsén (1991)

Allwood adopted the term FB from Wiener (1948). According to Allwood (1979, 1988a, b, c and Allwood *et al* (1991), there are linguistic mechanisms which enable the participants of communication to exchange information related to four basic communicative functions, which are essential in human direct face-to-face communication. These functions are:

1. *contact*, e.g. whether the interlocutor is willing and able to continue the interaction.
2. *perception*, e.g. whether the interlocutor is willing and able to perceive the message.
3. *understanding*, e.g. whether the interlocutor is willing and able to understand the message.
4. *attitudinal reactions*, e.g. whether the interlocutor is willing and able to react and (adequately) respond to the message, specifically whether he/she accepts or rejects it.

These four functions have been shown to be relevant in the analysis of a number of human languages, and they are probably relevant in the analysis of any human language.

With regard to Allwood, and Allwood *et al*’s analysis, the following figure may be drawn:

**Figure (2.4)**

![Diagram of FB functions](https://example.com/diagram)

Allwood’s analysis of FB has covered a huge part of interpersonal communication, especially where he has devoted much effort to analysing and describing FB expressions and showing the importance of such an essential
linguistic phenomenon in verbal and non-verbal human communication. The aim in the present investigation is to support and build on his theory of FB.

Allwood (1985) observed that any conversation must be based on two control units: speaker and listener. The speaker needs to know if the information he is trying to convey to the listener really is perceived and understood. He also needs to know how the listener reacts to what is being said. The listener, in his/her turn, needs to know if he/she has really understood the speaker in the right way (see subsection 1.4.7.1).

As can be observed from Allwood’s discussion of FB, he progressed from a broad perspective where he discussed culture and communication, to a narrower one, where he discussed FB in questions. He attempted to complete the circle of this linguistic phenomenon by presenting its basic communicative functions, and the ways of expressing FB functions.

However, in our study we have added to his theory the following important points. First, Allwood’s discussion focused mainly on studying FB as a type of expression, but our task is to describe FB as a communicative function. Second, to add new knowledge and information to the empirical research of linguistics, the case of (spoken Palestinian) Arabic is presented in section 1.2, and my fil.lic thesis Feedback in Arabic Spoken Communication, June/2002).

IV) Levinson (1983)

In his work (1983), subsection 6.3.1, ‘Preferred Second Turns’, Levinson discusses FB phenomena in the course of a single turn’s construction. He supported his discussion with an example, saying that interactional FB is being systematically taken into consideration. See also Davidson (in press).

Currently, Levinson considers FB as an interaction process between (two) speakers; this interaction can be represented as follows:

Figure (2.5)

(Joint production) Speaker single turn (verbal/nonverbal) ➔ Transition ➔ (Joint production) Hearer single turn/FB (verbal/nonverbal)

Levinson’s analysis captured the three main points of speaker, transition, and hearer’s FB. Joint production was a very important item that stressed, for example, non-verbal responses, which are utilised to guide the turn’s
construction throughout the course of its production (see also Goodwin, 1979a, 1981).

To describe the expression of FB as an interactional process between speakers is a very essential point in discussing the phenomenon of FB. Furthermore, while the single turn reaction coming from the listener might be considered as the most important joint production it actually covers a large number of FB functions and processes. However, Levinson’s description of FB interaction has missed the following items:

- Communicative intention / message. Even though he discussed the term ‘pre-sequence’, his discussion was not clear enough, as has been shown earlier in subsection 1.4.7.2.
- Intersubjectivity: he never discusses how important it is to share knowledge or experience between speakers in conversation, as has been seen in 1.4.7.4 as well.

The writer’s discussion also focused only slightly on the mechanisms of speech production, and mainly on situations, and on discussing action chains which relate to several functions of FB, e.g. assessment, dis-assessment and silence to express the opposite meaning, i.e., agreement and disagreement, etc. (Levinson, 1983: 332-364).

V) Lyons (1977a)

In his second, third, and fourth chapters Lyons (1977a) discussed the process of communication and FB in different places. His discussion included the following:

1) Model of communication
2) The conversation requirement (which includes the writer’s first discussion of FB)
3) Complete FB
4) FB in child language acquisition

The following discussion will concentrate on the first and second items, which bear most directly on the main topic. An overview will be given of the third item, while the last item is not related to the topic; for this reason it will probably be left to a future project concerned with such fields of study.
1) Model of communication

Lyons suggested the following model of the communication process. His suggestion is based upon the model described in the now classic work by Shannon and Weaver (1949). Lyons’ simple model of communication is cast in the terminology of communication-engineering.

X= the source
Y= the destination

Figure (2.6)

‘X sends some information to Y, the message originated by X is encoded by the transmitter into a signal. The signal is sent over a particular communication channel to the receiver. The receiver decodes the signal into a message and passes the message on to Y’ (Lyons 1977a: 36-37).

What we have seen in Lyons’ figure is that he covers the whole chain and completes the main circle of (human) communication. According to his model, Lyons considered ‘send’ to be ambiguous because the theory of communications-engineering is generally referred to as the message, which has been discussed in 1.4.7.2 under ‘communicative intention’. Therefore, he referred to it as something ambiguous.

The other interesting observation that Lyons has drawn in his model is the ‘source of noise’, which is to say that the signal transmitted may differ from the signal that is received due to distortions introduced by noise in the channel. This, according to Lyons, may, but does not necessarily, lead to a failure in communication.

Lyons’ model, and more particularly, the last step, i.e., when the receiver decodes the signal into a message and passes the message on to Y, is confusing because we do not know exactly what Lyons meant by Y as a last destination.
Did he mean that the receiver gives his particular FB to Y? Is Y another participant? Or the person who received the message in the first place? In addition, Lyons did not specify what sort of signal is used to send to the last destination, i.e. verbal or non-verbal.

With regard to Lyons’ discussion of channel and source of noise, this is a large area in the study of FB. If one is able to succeed in achieving a ‘discussion of channel and source of noise’ during this study of interaction, then we have attained one of the main aims of studying FB phenomena. The channel is like the bridge between two speakers, and this bridge will not arise without the source of noise, i.e., the sound’s production from both speakers. Of course, in such a case we may expect the non-verbal part. This has been discussed in my fil.ic/M.Phil thesis, section 5.2. ‘Feedback and Ambiguity’.

Regarding transmitting or signalling the message in connection with FB, Lyons said that ‘there is further complication in that the sender may monitor the signal as he is transmitting it and use FB from this process, whether consciously or not, to modify the signal, and even the message during transmission itself’, however, the writer preferred to ignore all these complexities in his study (Lyons, 1977a: 37).

2) The conversation requirement, which includes his first discussion of FB

Lyons’ main discussion of FB focused on the role of the receiver and the systematic turn between speaker and hearer during conversation. He noted that, during conversation, the speaker requires continual FB from the listener, assuring him that the listener is following him; is sympathetic to what he is saying; is willing for him to continue, and so on. Lyons adds that much of this FB consists in head-nods, grunts and eye movements. He described the interaction between speaker and listener, noting that both must solve the problem of floor-apportionment, assuming or yielding the right to speak by turns (p. 66).

As we have seen from Lyons’ discussion of FB, he talks about three essential parts of FB, two connected with the receiver, and one shared between both speaker and hearer. These are:

i) Main communicative functions of FB (see subsection 2.3.5 and the definition of FB single word in subsection 2.3.3 iii).
What Lyons argued is that FB required from the listener comprises the following: to accept his contact, to understand what he (the speaker) is saying, and to some extent to exchange emotions, as well as to give him permission to go on with his talk.

We believe that Lyons’ analysis is lacking one important function of FB in the mechanism of communication however, namely, (mutual) perception. One could argue that since Lyons mentioned the items of contact, understanding, and attitudinal reaction, then presumably perception is involved in each of the above three items and there is no necessity to list it separately. However, I argue that since we are dealing with such a central linguistic phenomenon in human communication, then the analysis must be complete. Therefore, such analysis has to cover the minimum of items that are needed, but the most important items are needed in order to bring about successful contact between interlocutors. For instance, if a receiver is blind, the level of his interaction and probably his understanding of non-verbal feedback will be very low.

ii) Lyons discussed the non-verbal movements from the receiver’s side

To support Lyons’ discussion in the following point it can be said that body movements e.g. eye contact, hand waves, head shakes, etc. exist among the Arabs as one very important factor for both speaker and hearer, which cannot be ignored in face-to-face interaction. There are several motivations for the existence of these phenomena in Arabic, e.g. for the sender to support his talk, and for the receiver to show a certain degree of concern, i.e. emotional attitude, understanding, etc. toward what information he receives from a speaker. With regard to the non-verbal part of communication Lyons’ analysis focused mainly on the listener but not the speaker. However, the speaker’s movements play an important role that we cannot ignore in language communication. For instance, if a speaker talks about a serious matter and his facial expression adopts the opposite mode, e.g., smiling, etc., then what kind of impression will be given to the other communicators?

iii) Speaker turns in the conversation

Lyons assumed that both speakers must solve this problem. As can be seen, he considered this part in human contact as a problem to be solved. In principle, I agree with Lyons in this matter. As soon as one talks, the other listens. There will be no reason at all for destroying communication between speakers. Interruption, for example, may destroy the whole process of communication and
would cause much confusion between speakers e.g. misunderstanding, misinterpretation, etc. all the time. The following example from the data shows how speaker B was interrupted by both A and F:

[data sample] (10)
B : [ay ay kaan ʕumrii kaan abuwy mitwaffii lamman ruhnaa ʕalaa ʕurus ʕaali Rami] ‘yes was my age when my father died when we went to my uncle Rami’s wedding’
A : [aa <maalik intii> Rami qaddayʃ ilu // Rami <qaddayʃ ilu> Rami ilu tisʃ isni:n willaa ʕaʃara bass] ‘yes what’s up with you Rami how many has he // Rami how many has he Rami is he nine years or ten only?’
@ <mood: denying, inquiring>
F : [<{bi Rabiiʃ willaa lamman ruhnaa maʃ baʃaʃ ʕa Qazzaʃ}> ‘in Rabii’ or when we went to Qazza together?’
B : [laʃ ʕam baqwl lik yuwm ʕurs Salim] ‘no I am telling you at the wedding day of Salim’

Speakers A and F interrupted speaker B first, therefore it can be seen that her response comes in emphatic form because she was not given the chance to complete her talk before being interrupted.

3) Complete FB

Lyons accounted for several features and focused particularly on the importance of understanding how languages operate as signalling systems. Complete FB is one of the features he discussed and considered as a property which is dependent upon interchangeability, in which an organism is equipped for both transmission and reception of messages in the system. This is related to the fact that a speaker hears and is able to monitor his own performance. The hearer’s monitoring also involves the checking of one’s own utterances for comprehensibility and correctness of formation as they are produced and making adjustments when these are judged necessary (see also Allwood, 1976). Lyons considered FB as an extremely important phenomenon among human beings who can control language-utterances in the course of production.

It should be noted that ‘the design features of language’ taken from Hockett (1958, 1960), and Hockett and Altmann (1968), as well as Householder (1971: 24-42), refer to a number of general properties with respect to which languages may be compared with other semiotic systems used by man or animals.
IV) Deborah Schiffrin (1994)

Schiffrin performed analysis according to several writers who discussed the aspects of communication in discourse analysis, and models of communication.

In her discussion of aspects of communication Schiffrin listed the following items:

i) Participants, sender and receiver. This is in answer to questions such as: ‘how do we speak of those who communicate?’ and ‘what do we imagine them doing when we say that they are communicating?’

ii) A message, that is, the communicative intention, e.g. what a speaker believes or wants. For other linguists, messages are essentially thoughts that are externalised and made available to others through their representation in a shared code.

iii) Medium of communication is the production and interpretation of messages. This production and interpretation, however, includes both verbal and non-verbal contact.

iv) Intersubjectivity: Schiffrin considered this term to be central to the study of communication (see Schiffrin 1990a; Taylor 1992). It is the sharing of knowledge or experience between speakers, both senders and receivers and is seen, according to many scholars, to be relevant to communication at the two ends of the communicative activity itself: its inception, and its completion.13

The other significant and related point that Schiffrin discussed is that of models of communication. She suggested three models related to communication. These are: a code model, an inferential model (i.e. to say something about the world), and an interactional model.

   i) A code model of communication focuses only upon those thoughts that a sender intends to transmit.
   ii) The inferential model of communication depends upon a principle of intersubjectivity (see 1.4.7.4)

13 The above four aspects are discussed explicitly in subsections 1.3.7.1 – 1.3.7.4.
iii) The interactional model of communication assumes that an individual displays situated information that is interpreted by a recipient, and also places less emphasis on the principle of intersubjectivity.

The following figure may be suggested, according to Schiffrin’s analysis of these main aspects and models of communication:

**Figure (2.7)**

![Diagram showing the interactional model of communication]

Regarding features of communication in discourse analysis and models of communication, Schiffrin’s analysis appears to cover a large number of the main aspects that are needed to bring about the communication of any human being, especially when all discourse analyses (indeed all linguistic analyses) assume some underlying model of communication (Schiffrin, 1994: 286-405).

It has been observed that Schiffrin did not discuss the basic items of communicative functions in language communication. She does give an explicit and accurate analysis regarding the roles of participants during conversation until she ends her discussion on the central study of communication, intersubjectivity. However, the mechanism of this process is missing from her analysis. The missing items of communicative functions are: contact, perception, understanding, and attitudinal reactions (see section 2.3.5). The aspects of communication and the mechanisms of their communicative functions are essential, and combine to complete the circle of the communication process as a whole.

It can be seen in the preceding section that each writer has discussed different issues, but all are related to communication. I have attempted to discuss their theories as critically as possible and to combine each theory with what is missing, in order to introduce an explicit picture of the process of communication with regard to FB.

Studying language communication requires, therefore, at least two main items:

---

14 It is important to point out that intersubjectivity has to be between the first speaker and message, as well as between the medium of communication and the second speaker (the listener).
a) Specifying, as much as possible, the main aspects of communication e.g. Schiffrin (1994)
b) Integrating those aspects with the mechanisms of communication functions, e.g. Allwood (1979, 1988a, b, c), Allwood et al (1991), and J. Lyons (1977a)

After this introduction of the two main items that are required for studying communication, the next section will be an attempt to identify four definitions of FB according to several writers.

2.3.3 Definitions of Feedback

The present subsection will illustrate four different aspects of FB. These are: linguistic FB, an FB unit, and single word FB.

i) The Definition of Linguistic Feedback

Linguistic FB is the term used by Allwood (1993) to refer to ‘linguistic mechanisms which ensure that a set of basic requirements on communication, such as possibilities for continued contact, for mutual perception and for mutual understanding can be met’ (Allwood 1993: 1). Allwood adopted the term ‘feedback’ from Wiener 1948 (see subsection 2.3.2, item ‘C’).

According to Allwood (1979, 1988a, b, c) and Allwood et al (1991), there are linguistic mechanisms which enable the participants in communication to exchange information related to four basic communicative functions, which are essential in human direct face-to-face communication. These functions are:

1. Contact (whether the interlocutor is willing and able to continue the interaction)
2. Perception (whether the interlocutor is willing and able to perceive the message)
3. Understanding (whether the interlocutor is willing and able to understand the message)
4. Attitudinal Reactions (whether the interlocutor is willing and able to react and (adequately) respond to the message – specifically whether he/ she accepts or rejects it)
These four functions have been shown to be relevant in the analysis of a number of human languages, e.g. Arabic, English and Swedish, and we may assume that they are relevant to the analysis of most human languages.

ii) Feedback Unit

We have selected two definitions of FB unit: Cherry (1966: 244) and Allwood (1988a and b).

A) Cherry provided the following definition of responses in connection with meaning: ‘meaning is a difficult term and has to do with responses made to signals by their recipients – a response is an indication of the significance attached to a given signal at a given time – as well as the responses that communicators intend to elicit by providing the signal’ (Cherry in Smith, 1977: 19).

B) As to the question of what expressions are used to give – or elicit – FB, Allwood (1988a and b) proposes the following definition of an FB unit: ‘a maximal continuous stretch of utterance (occurring on its own or as part of a larger utterance) the primary function of which is to give and/or elicit FB’ (see also ‘Interaction Management’ 1999: 2, by Nivre, Allwood and Ahlsén).

In relation to Allwood’s definition of an FB unit, the following example will be discussed in order to determine whether it fulfils Allwood’s criteria above:

(11)
A: what have you been doing?
B: I bought a car

Let us consider whether B’s response is ‘a maximal continuous stretch of utterance (occurring on its own or as part of a larger utterance) the primary function of which is to give and/or elicit feedback’ (Nivre et al 1999): in other words, could B’s response be considered as FB? The answer is ‘no’, B’s answer cannot be interpreted as FB, because his answer is used to make a statement. FB is not used to express propositions directly, but may nevertheless be successful or not successful.
FB should be compared with linguistic acts that are not true or false, but rather successful or unsuccessful.
Let us consider Allwood’s classification of FB into two broad categories (1988), and his functional description based on eight main aspects in his third chapter, section 3.2 (1987/88). Neither of these analyses included this kind of response e.g., ‘I bought a car’. This is because these kinds of responses would occur through the ongoing interpersonal communication. They do not contain any sort of FB expression, either primary or secondary (see 2.3.6), but the measure would be whether a speaker succeeded or did not succeed in giving his/her response. FB is an essential part of human communication, and it is imperative that our FB be judged not as false or true; correct or not correct, etc., but rather as achieving its aim or not in communication.

Of course, metaphors can be used (see example 11 above) to express specific FB actions; for example, the answer of speaker B, in example 11, can be interpreted as: 1) negative FB, 2) lack of desire to continue with the conversation, 3) a desire to boast, etc., or even 4) to show how happy he is about having bought a car.

FB could be given ironically. However, this is not what this discussion based on, even though metaphors exist in FB as in plenty of linguistic phenomena.

iii) Feedback Single Word

A definition of FB single word have been given by Allwood in Perdue (1993), and the other by myself (1995).

Allwood in Perdue (1993: 206) has provided a definition of FB single word: ‘a feedback word is any word contained in a feedback unit (where words are identified essentially on the basis of spaces in the transcriptions)’.

iv) Feedback Single Word and as Utterance

Our definition of FB single word and as utterance relies on the four main functions of FB suggested by Allwood (1979, 1988) and Allwood et al (1991).

A linguistic act is analysed as an act of FB if the act is used to signal a reaction of one or more of these four functions:

1. continued contact
2. mutual perception
3. mutual understanding
4. reaction to main evocative intention of preceding utterance
The above four properties will be discussed further in subsection 2.3.5.

2.3.4 The Use of Feedback and its Interactive Process

The present section will discuss two main points: the use of terminology related to FB, and the ways of recognising FB. In discussing the use of FB terminology, we will illustrate several concepts, supported by tables, related to FB. Three main levels can be required to understand the term FB will be discussed below.

i) The Use of Feedback Terminology

Wiener (1948) used the term *feedback* in cybernetics to denote processes by which a control unit gets information about the effects and consequences of its actions. It is possible to reinterpret Wiener’s notion of FB to apply to spoken communication if we replace the control unit by a speaker who wants to get information about the effects of his linguistic action of saying something (see Allwood 1979). One of the first authors in modern times to notice and describe elements of this phenomenon was Fries (1952), who analysed a corpus consisting of his own telephone conversations in which he identified a set of ‘listener responses’ (see also Perdue 1993: 198, and subsection 2.2.1 B). FB can be understood on three different levels: first, the term FB is used to name an ongoing process between at least two interlocutors; for instance, this is the meaning of *FB in Arabic*. Second, the term FB is also used to name an individual act, e.g., *his FB surprised me*. Third, the term FB is also used to name a linguistic expression, e.g. he used *yes* as FB. Allwood has reserved the term *FB unit* for this third notion of FB.

Feedback and Back-Channelling

Back-channelling is defined by Allwood as ‘a title which seems to reflect the old idea behind the concept of interjection.’ Some scholars, such as Yngve have proposed a link between FB and back-channelling. Yngve discusses ‘back-channelling’ as a set of responses a person can use even when out of turn (meaning that it is not his turn). This term was also applied and made popular in psychology by Yngve's colleague at the University of Chicago, Starkey Duncan, in *Face to Face Interaction* (Duncan and Fiske, 1977).

According to Yngve (1970), speaking and listening activities go on simultaneously and it is normal for messages to flow simultaneously in both directions between the participants in a dialogue.
Allwood has explained his use of the term ‘FB’ in relation to linguistic communication by saying that the term focuses attention on the systematic organisational role of otherwise unnoticed linguistic mechanisms and constituents, like the little words ‘mm’, ‘yeah’ and ‘eh’. In spite of Priscian’s classical definition of interjection, such words are not just uttered to express emotions. Above all they are used to enable speaker and listener to control and regulate their own actions towards each other.

In the table below I have classified the use of terminology related to FB according to some of the aforementioned writers:
Table 2.1: Feedback Terminology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writers</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Individual act</th>
<th>Expression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Wiener</em> (1948)</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fries</em> (1952)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Listener responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Yngve</em> (1969)</td>
<td>Back channelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>Back channelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dittman</em> (1972)</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td>Listener responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Allwood</em> (1976-79)</td>
<td>Feedback acknowledgment</td>
<td>Feedback acknowledgment</td>
<td>Feedback unit (acknowledgers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Weydt</em> (1977)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic particles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anward</em> (1986)</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td>Response words\textsuperscript{15}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the present study I will use the following terminology: the term *FB* denotes both the interactive process and an individual act. *FB unit* refers to the expression used.

ii) Ways of Recognising Feedback

There have been attempts by Nivre, Allwood, and Ahlsén (1999), for example, to single out *FB* from all other kinds of responses made in communication. There are at least two ways of recognising *FB*: by studying communicative function (semantically, pragmatically) which is going to be given attention, and by studying the type of expression. Allwood, Nivre and Ahlsén (1999) focus on the latter when they point out that *FB* responses usually involve very short

\textsuperscript{15} Of all the terms used in the above table, we see that *FB* is the most frequently used as ‘Process’, [Wiener (1948), and Allwood (1976-79)]; ‘Individual act’, [Allwood (1976-79)]; ‘Expression’, [Allwood (1976-79)].
morphemes e.g. *yes, okay, mm, no*; and basic mechanisms such as repetition, simple body movements e.g. head nods, head shakes in combination with fairly simple phonological, morphological and syntactic operations for modifying and expanding the primary FB expressions. FB is dependent on other concepts of linguistic communication such as action and activity, co-operation, sender, receiver, channel, and power.

Let us start by considering a simple example:

(12)

A: [iddinya əalidʒ] ‘it is snowing’
B: [ah] ‘yes’

When B says ‘yes’ his response, i.e. his speech production, is determined by his speech perception, i.e. he must have understood what ‘A’ says.

FB seems to be related to three functions of speech production and speech perception, now called, ‘own communication management, interactive functions, and main message functions’. These three functions are characterised as follows (see Nivre, Allwood, and Ahlsén 1990):

a) *own communication management*, i.e. the linguistic processes and mechanisms whereby a speaker manages his or her own linguistic contributions to communicative interaction, involving phenomena that have sometimes been described as ‘planning’, ‘editing’, ‘(self) repair’ (see subsection 1.4.7.4), etc.

b) *interactive functions*, i.e. linguistic processes and mechanisms whereby interlocutors manage the flow of interaction (FB mechanisms are an example of an interactive subsystem).

c) *main message functions*, i.e. linguistic processes and mechanisms whereby interlocutors manage to communicate information which is not immediately connected with the management of their own speech, or the interaction at hand. Focused or main message functions thus include most of what is commonly described in grammatical theory and can be operationally defined as that which is contained in an utterance when those parts that are devoted to speech management or interactive functions have been subtracted.
So it is clear that FB is related to many different linguistic phenomena but especially to interaction which can be observed in spoken communication. This will be discussed later in the present chapter.

2.3.5 The General Communicative Status of Feedback and its Basic Functions

Considering the communicative status of FB, it is possible to distinguish three levels from the point of view of the communicating sender (see Allwood, 1976):

1) Indicated information is that of which the sender is not aware, or intending to either convey or conceal
2) Displayed information is that which the sender is intending to show the receiver
3) Signalled information is that which the sender is showing the receiver that he is displaying and, thus, intends the receiver to recognise as displayed.

Classifying communicative acts which precede FB actions is another way of discussing the communicative status of FB. The idea is that an act of FB gets its meaning from the overall communicative context.

To sum up the above discussion: if for instance, A says something and B answers, then his answer should be related and connected to what A says; a question, statement, request, etc. In other words, from B’s FB, e.g. acceptance, rejection, agreement, etc. we could understand, or realise what A says. Furthermore, sometimes the same FB signal like ‘yes’ might carry different meanings, e.g. because of irony. The examples in the table below further explain these points:

Table 2.2: Different Meanings of Feedback Expressions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preceding utterance</th>
<th>Listener’s reply</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: It is snowing</td>
<td>B: yes</td>
<td>acceptance of statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: It is raining</td>
<td>B: yes</td>
<td>commitment to positive fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Close the window</td>
<td>B: yes</td>
<td>acceptance of request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: Would you like some sugar?</td>
<td>B: yes</td>
<td>acceptance of offer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above illustration can be seen the connection between the communicative acts which precede the FB action, and the type of FB action given by the listener.\(^\text{16}\)

According to Allwood (1979, 1988) and Allwood et al (1991), there are linguistic mechanisms which enable the participants in communication to exchange information related to the four basic communicative functions, and which are essential in human direct face-to-face communication.

It is necessary to discuss these four functions in more detail, since they have been considered basic for an understanding of FB in general.

1. **Continued contact** is crucial in FB between speaker and listener. Without continuation of this contact there can be no further communication.

   (13) taker, e.g.  [ʕafwan bass..] ‘excuse me but…’.
   accepctor, e.g.  [aa] ‘yes’
   holder, e.g.  [mm] ‘mm’, etc.

2. The second element is **mutual perception**, without which there cannot be any contact, either verbal or non-verbal.

   [mumkin itʃiid] ‘would you repeat’, etc.

   positive perception, e.g.  [naʃam] ‘yes’, [āa] ‘aha’, [anaa basmaʃ] ‘I am
   listening’, [kulli aaδaan] ‘I am all ears’, etc.

   These expressions are used for FB.

3. **Mutual understanding** is the third element. Without willingness and ability to understand expression and message, at least to some degree, communication will be impossible.

   (15) negative understanding, e.g.  [aa ʕalaa kull  SolidColorBrush anaa ẓanniit...] ‘yeah however I
   thought…’.

\(^\text{16}\) A related discussion regarding this analysis has been given by Bloomfield in Wiener (1948: 240).
positive understanding, e.g. [anaa faahim] ‘I understand’, [anaa maʔaak] ‘I am with you’, etc.

4. The last element is the reaction to the main evocative intention of a preceding utterance. This type of reaction is related to emotional reaction. So attitudinal reaction is always an important factor in FB.

(16)

positive acceptance, e.g. [naʕam] ‘yes’, [mm] ‘mm’, [aa] ‘ah’, etc.

To Improve Understanding Between Interlocutors

Since one of the aims in the present study is to remove misunderstanding and to improve, as much as possible, the understanding between interlocutors, in relation to Taylor (1992) we may ask two big questions:
i) Do other people understand what we say and write?
ii) Do we understand them?

The above questions are not often addressed in language theory. Those professionals who work in language theory, e.g. linguists, semioticians, communication theorists, discourse analysts, theorists of rhetoric, philosophers of language, etc. are more interested in the problem of specifying what it is to understand and how we understand than in asking whether we understand. On the other hand, if we cannot in fact understand what others say or write and if they cannot understand us, it seems natural to conclude that each of us is little more than a psychological island: that is, we are isolated solipsists who hear only the echo of our own voices, all the while believing and acting under the tragicomic illusion that we are hearing and being heard by others (Taylor, 1992: 3).

However, even though understanding between interlocutors may sometimes not succeed, it still cannot be said that communication has failed. Non-understanding will be discussed below as one of FB basic functions that must lead the interlocutors to continue interacting until they arrive at a certain degree of (mutual) understanding.
2.3.6 Primary and Secondary Feedback

Following Allwood (1988), I wish to discuss two types of verbal FB that are found in the conversations under study in order to provide a framework, before developing a number of related observations and problems. The two types of FB in question are: primary FB and secondary FB.

The difference between primary and secondary FB is perhaps more a matter of degree than principle. Primary FB consists of one word, and is unambiguous with regard to function, whereas secondary FB also has another speech function (see Allwood 1991) and may be interpreted in different ways. The most typical case of FB in general (both primary and secondary) is when an interlocutor gives a direct answer [naʃam] ‘yes’ or [la] ‘no’ to a question.

i) Primary Feedback

According to Allwood (1988a), primary FB represents the first category of FB words. It is mainly expressed by short words, some of which are traditionally referred to as ‘interjections’ (see subsection 2.2.1)

Table 2.3: Examples of Three Languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Swedish</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Aspects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Nej</td>
<td>[laʔ]</td>
<td>Rejection form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ja</td>
<td>[aa]</td>
<td>Acceptance form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mm</td>
<td>Mm</td>
<td>[mm]</td>
<td>Confirmation form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>Ok</td>
<td>[imwaafiq] ‘I agree’</td>
<td>Agreement form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But</td>
<td>Mmen</td>
<td>[laakin] [bass]</td>
<td>Hesitation form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What</td>
<td>Vad</td>
<td>[ayf]</td>
<td>Non-understanding Form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are at least six functions (as discussed in this chapter) of primary FB: acceptance, agreement, confirmation, rejection, hesitation and non-understanding.
Moreover, there seems to be some correlation between a small set of expressions and special FB functions (see Allwood et al 1991):

(17)
1. Acceptance e.g. ‘yes’
2. Agreement e.g. ‘ok’
3. Confirmation e.g. ‘mm’
4. Rejection e.g. ‘no’ (Allwood, Nivre and Ahlsén 1991)
5. Hesitation e.g. ‘but’
6. Non-understanding e.g. ‘what’; ‘pardon me’

The list above represents a pairing between special expressions and primary FB functions.

It should be observed, however, that one expression can be used to signal more than one function. For example the expression [ah] ‘yes’ can be used to signal both acceptance and confirmation. The six functions above may also be expressed in a secondary way; this will be treated in part II below. However, a typical primary FB expression like [ah] ‘yes’ can also be used instead of [maají] ‘ok’, i.e. as a more indirect way of expressing agreement. In such a case we would have to say that ‘yes’ expresses another type of primary FB which is compatible with agreement.

ii) Secondary Feedback

Primary FB is expressed by short interjection-type words, whereas secondary FB is expressed by words which also have other ‘parts of speech’ functions (noun, verb, adjective, and adverb, as well as pronoun, and, as in an example from Arabic, a preposition) (see Allwood, 1989a). FB word, interjection, preposition, proper name, pronoun, conjunction, complementiser, determiner, and auxiliary verb (Allwood et al 1994) can all be used to express secondary FB.

For example, if a person uses the expressions [dʒamiːl] ‘nice’/‘lovely’ this can be interpreted as an indirect way of saying ‘I agree’.

Let us consider the following examples:

(18)
1) precisely/of course (English)      precis (Swedish)      [bittaʔkiːd] (Arabic)
It is necessary to point out that the Arabic example [bittaʔkiːd] is an adverbial expression.

ii) good (English) bra (Swedish) [dʒayyid] (Arabic)

Also here the Arabic example [jayyid] can be an adjective and adverb.

It is important to point out that the context will usually help the relevant interpretation of an FB expression. Below, there are three examples from Arabic to show how the expression [naʕam], ‘yes’, can be used automatically (or reflexively) to express ‘three’ different FB functions which are recoverable from the preceding context.

(19) i) A: [iqbilt ilʕard] ‘you accepted the offer?’
    B: [naʕam] ‘yes’ (acceptance)

    ii) A: [inwaqqif hallaʔ] ‘let’s stop now’
        B: [naʕam] ‘yes’ (agreement)

    iii) A: [idʒayt bissayyaaraʔ] ‘did you come by car?’
         B: [naʕam] ‘yes’ (confirmation)

These examples illustrate that FB expressions cannot be interpreted in isolation. In addition to the above discussion and regarding secondary FB, I would like to add the following as well: a branch of secondary FB, emotional FB (e.g. sadness, happiness, etc. concerns the psychological reaction on the part of an interlocutor. Allwood, Nivre and Ahlsén (1994) have considered this type of FB under ‘other attitudes’, and this category aims to cover any additional attitudes (other than contact, perception, and understanding attitudes) that are conveyed by the FB unit. This includes negative and positive as the most important cases of acceptance of a preceding act, such as statement, question, request, and offer. Allwood, Nivre and Ahlsén (1994) have distinguished four different kinds of acceptance:

1) Acceptance of turn
2) Acceptance of communicative act
3) Acceptance of handling communicated evocative functions
4) Acceptance of evocative functions
The above four attitudes may be coded as positive (acceptance) or negative (non-acceptance).

Secondary FB makes use of lexical expressions (nouns, adjectives, verbs, etc.) which also have a function other than FB. Agreement could be expressed, for example: ‘good’, ‘sure’, ‘fine’, etc.

Regarding some of the items which Allwood suggested to be secondary FB (listed above), it may be assumed that every expression or word can be considered as FB. It is most unlikely that any FB action would occur in any human language as ‘a preposition’, or ‘proper name’. There is no such expression that would function as FB in Palestinian Arabic, for instance.

Linguistic FB can be expressed verbally and non-verbally and as primary or secondary. The question here is whether we can use gesture only in order to give or elicit FB at both levels, primary and secondary. I think we can, because the facial expression plays a very strong, explicit part in signalling the FB of the other speaker, besides hand gestures, eye and head movements, etc, as exemplified in the following:

[data sample] (20)
A: [îsmiʕi’t ilaxbaar imbaarih?] ‘did you listen to the news yesterday?’
B: (attitude reaction plus nodding head)

Speaker B reflected his reaction corresponding to the question which related to the bad news. Then he expressed it by a sad facial expression and supported this by nodding his head also.

[data sample] (21)
A: [ayʃ raʔyak bhaʔaa?] ‘what do you think of this?’
B: (uncertain face plus hand movement)

Speaker A needs to get B’s FB concerning a certain subject. Speaker B only gives an uncertain facial expression and supports his expression with a hand gesture which in this case means roughly ‘I do not know’.

To conclude this section, this chapter has traced the early and modern conceptions of FB in discourse and all its related topics. Wiener first discussed FB as a purely technical aim, and Fries as a linguistic aim. Four definitions of FB
were given. Also discussed were how to understand and to recognise FB, as well as the main levels that should be distinguished from the point of view of sender. Finally, the two main types of FB as primary and secondary were described. After identifying and discussing FB in the present section, an attempt will be made to apply them, by illustrating examples related to verbal FB and the main structure which has been used and followed in the analyses of this study.

2.4 General Ways of Expressing Feedback

FB can be expressed verbally or non-verbally, and on different levels, as has just been demonstrated. Let me start the present section by discussing the following question:

*How do we know which FB function is being signalled in a given situation?*

For example the expression ‘mm’ might signal various functions in, for instance, Arabic, English and Swedish, such as listening, understanding, a request for continuation, or confirmation. Unfortunately, none of the writers discussed above has suggested any kind of analytical technique for solving problems of this kind. It seems, however, that analysts have various means at their disposal such as their international understanding of conversation, including different kinds of background information shared by the interlocutors. That is, the expression ‘mm’, for example, can be pronounced with different prosodic contours (level, rising, falling intonation, etc.).

This question remains a problem that needs considerable investigation, perhaps in a future work.

i) Verbal Feedback

Before illustrating the main analyses of FB that will be discussed, it is important to note a paper written by Cerrato (2004), entitled ‘A Coding Scheme for the Annotation of Feedback Phenomena in Conversational Speech’; her paper is about a coding scheme specifically developed to label FB phenomena in conversational speech. The study is based on Allwood (2001) and does not differ much from the coding manual written by Nivre, Allwood, and Ahlsen (1999). Cerrato discusses the functions of verbal FB expressions and divides them into four basic functions:
i) continuation, e.g., ‘I want to go on’ and ‘you go on’
ii) acceptance, e.g., understanding, agreement, and acceptance
iii) refusal, e.g., understanding/misunderstanding, refusal
iv) expressive, e.g., expression of an attitude, emotion, and point of view

Cerrato’s scheme presented a non-formal presentation of a coding scheme developed to analyse FB phenomena in speech communication (Cerrato, 2004: 1-3). The analysis and classification of FB in this section is based partly on that of Nivre, Allwood and Ahlsén (1999), who discuss three main aspects of classification: structure, position, and function of FB. These three main aspects represent the tag function which has FB as one of its possible values.

• Structure

The structural classification of FB includes grammatical categories and structural operations.

1) Grammatical Categories.
Two subsystems are used in this classification: lexical categories and syntactic categories. In order to exemplify the use of these categories, let us consider the classification of three different responses by B to A’s statement.

(22) A: we need to buy a new house
B: (a) yes = FB word
     (b) absolutely = adverb
     (c) we sure do = sentence

In (a) and (b), B’s responses consist of a single word and are therefore classified as lexical categories. In (c), B’s response consists of a longer phrase and is therefore classified as belonging to a syntactic category. Lexical categories are used to classify FB units consisting of single words. Lexical categories are: FB word, interjection, noun, adjective, verb, preposition, adverb, proper name, pronoun, conjunction, complementiser, determiner, and auxiliary. The exact composition of these categories, according to Nivre et al (1999), is still tentative and may have to be revised, especially when languages other than Swedish are considered.

Syntactic categories are used to classify FB units consisting of phrases, or complete sentences. Phrases can, in principle, be further analysed into lexical categories, but in most cases the phrasal categorisation will be sufficient. The
syntactic categories include sentence, noun phrase, verb phrase, adjectival phrase, adverbial phrase, and prepositional phrase.

2) Structural Operations

The second kind of structural classification concerns structural operations on FB units. Nivre et al (1999) distinguish three main types of operation: phonological operations, morphological operations, and contextual operations.

Phonological operations, which are mainly applied to FB words, consist of: lengthening, recurrent reduplication, vowel addition, truncation, and ingressive, prosodic modification. An example of vowel addition in Swedish is the modification of ja to jae.

Morphological operations, which are also applied to FB words, consist of: reduplication, inflection/derivation, and compounding. An example of reduplication in Swedish is the creation of jaja from ja.

Contextual operations are those which can only be defined in relation to the preceding context, such as repetition. For example:

(23) A: [ana mihtaadə sayyaara]  ‘I need a car’
    B: [sayyaar/ə?]  ‘a car?’

ii) Non-verbal Feedback

One important and fresh report/coding scheme for gestural studies of FB in language communication was written by Allwood, Cerrato, Dybkjaer, Jokinen, Navarretta, and Paggio (2005). This report provides vital information created to experiment with annotation of multimodal communication in short clips from movies and in video clips of interviews taken from Swedish, Finnish, and Danish television broadcasting. Their coding scheme also intends to be:

i) a general instrument for the study of gestures and facial displays in interpersonal communication, and
ii) the role played by multimodal expressions for FB turn management, and sequencing
What needs to be added regarding the above coding scheme is that it gives a lot of detailed descriptions which are supported with tables, where it shows the connections between FB (give and elicit), turn management, and sequencing on one hand, and their gestural and facial displays on the other (Allwood et al 2005).

**Gestures and Feedback Actions**

FB can be expressed by gestures, or gestures + verbal expression. However, it is important to remind the reader that the present study is essentially concerned with verbal FB. Still, I would like to give just a few examples which show the connection between gestures and FB actions. I have chosen the main expressions in communicative acts:

(24)

1) Acceptance 'yes' 'nodding head'
2) Agreement 'ok' 'nodding head'
3) Confirmation 'mm' 'nodding head'
4) Rejection 'no' 'head shake' (sideways)
5) Hesitation 'but' 'head wave' (sideways)
6) Non-understanding 'what' 'head tilted forward slightly'

The examples above are perhaps typical of the English language and Arabic. However, the meanings of these gestures are not universal. For example, in Turkey (according our observation) and the Arab world (as a native language speaker), *jerking head backwards* may signal negation, and a *click* sound of voice in the Arab world would also be a sign of negation. Another example is *inhaling sounds* in Swedish culture which is found also in Norwegian, and French, which signifies that the speaker should continue talking, or to accept, to confirm, and occasionally to express 'no'. In Arab culture this gesture means a sort of unpleasant news, or a disaster about to occur or that has already occurred. The use of gesture in FB seems to vary much from culture to culture.

To extend the above discussion, let us give the following example. If we have started to talk to someone, our words are accompanied by other gestures which may elucidate, emphasise, enhance or sometimes contradict what we say. However, at the beginning and end of our conversation we may use culturally determined signals, for instance: hand-shaking, hand-waving, particular emphasis, facial expressions, gestures, postures, and movements which accompany them, etc. These signals, however, indicate our readiness to enter into friendly acquaintanceship, or our impending departure. Besides, there is
much information that passes between us which is never put in the form of words.

Since non-verbal FB falls under non-verbal communication, the following brief discussion may be given. John Lyons has taken up in more detail the relations of non-verbal communication to verbal language, and summarised some of the basic principles involved in the study of language, as well as current views on its evolution. In addition, Lyons’ purpose was to give some account of the concepts and techniques that have been developed by linguists for the analysis and discussion of language (Hinde, 1972: 49).

There are several problems arising from the study of non-verbal communication between individuals, listed by Hinde in his book. These are:

   i) Is it so that our interpretation changes with the interpretation of the context, and depends on our own background?
   ii) Does posture really mean different things in different cultures?
   iii) If so, is the underlying motivation for i) and ii) different in kind?
   iv) Or different only in degree?

There might be some gestures that are common among people who come from different cultures; however, the motivation very often has to be different, due to cultural differences. There is the example of the common signal when a person moves his/her hand to express ‘goodbye’ and or ‘hello’. Meanwhile, an example of the second type, which has different interpretations in different cultures, is when a European raises his/her leg toward an Arab, for example by resting his/her foot on a chair; this will be taken as an insult and humiliation by the Arab. On the other hand it is not specifically directionable for a European.

There are many examples to show how gestures vary in both kind and degree and play a central role in human communication, especially with a view to different cultures.

2.4.1 Positions of Giving Feedback (Feedback Units: Single Words, and in a Longer Utterance)

The most common FB expressions in Arabic are, besides some non-verbal actions like nods and shakes of the head, small words like [a’] ‘yes’, [mm] ‘mm’, [ahha/] ‘really, well, yes’.
An interesting example in Swedish is the use of inhalation as a means to answer ‘yes’ and ‘no’ (as seen above). As a consequence of this, many non-Swedes, including me when I experienced this action for the first time, get an impression that the person was either suffocating or suffering from shock. In addition, in Arab culture, such behaviour is interpreted as an indication of a serious matter. For this reason, studying FB as a linguistic phenomenon is helpful for removing the ambiguity between speakers who come from different cultures.

The following subsection will discuss two main points related to the giving of FB. These are:

I) Single Expression, i.e. Single Word, Initial, Medial and Final
II) FB in an Utterance, i.e. Complex FB

More explanation with regard to the above two items will be provided later in the present study in chapter 4.

• Feedback Units: Single Words, and in a Longer Utterance

i) Single Expression, i.e. Single Word, Initial, Medial, and Final in sentence

Allwood (1988) presents a classification of FB units into two broad categories. The first, called ‘FB word’, or simple FB, includes units consisting of a single word. This unit may occur on its own or as part of a larger utterance. Allwood has accounted for four mutually exclusive cases that are possible here:
- FB single; in case an utterance might consist solely of one FB unit
- FB initial, medial and final; in case it might be contained in a larger utterance. See Allwood (1993: 12)

ii) Feedback in an Utterance i.e. Complex Feedback

The second category called ‘FB phrase’, or as it will from now on be called ‘complex FB’, covers all FB units of more than one word. This category is subdivided into a number of different types (see also subsection 3.2.2, and chapter 4 sections 4.3, part I, 4.4 and 4.5).

Allwood also said that each FB unit is classified as belonging to one of the following fourteen subclasses, viz. primary simple FB unit, secondary simple FB unit, reduplication of simple FB unit, deictic or anaphoric linking, repetition of simple FB unit, idiomatic phrase, modal phrase, other single word or phrase.
Allwood has gone further to build these classes into more complicated patterns when suggesting that ‘simple FB unit’ could be combined with seven different categories e.g., *simple FB unit + simple FB unit, simple FB unit + reduplication of simple FB unit, simple FB unit + deictic or anaphoric linking, simple FB unit + idiomatic phrase, simple FB unit + model phrase, simple FB unit + other single word or phrase, and more complex combinations of words and phrases* Allwood (1993).

The above classes will be illustrated with the help of tables and analysed in chapter 4.

**2.4.2 Eliciting Feedback**

Kiefer, in Searle (1969), discussed in his notes what he called ‘meta-tag’ (see Moravesik 1971:178). What Kiefer referred to as ‘meta-tag’ in his notes is what we discuss in the present subsection as ‘eliciting FB’. The example that Kiefer suggested is: ‘You are going now, right?’ The writer stated that in this type of question first a statement is made and then the speaker asks for consensus by using the meta-tag ‘right’. He went on to say that it is quite possible to disagree with the speaker in these cases as well, despite the strong bias expressed in his example above.

Nivre, Allwood and Ahlsén, in the coding manual entitled *Interaction Management* (1999: 8), classified eliciting FB under the ‘function type’ which is a broad classification of FB function. Typical expressions in Arabic which the speaker can use to elicit FB are:

Verbal, e.g. [ay/j] ‘what?’, [willa kay:f ?] ‘or how?’, [haa ∫uw ?], [∫a/h ?] ‘right?’, etc. Non-verbal, e.g. raising the hand, or a questioning facial expression, etc.

[data sample] (25)
A : [ah ∫a/h?] ‘yes right?’
B : [ya∫iι ya Sameer ∫u∫a illī qa∫a∫atu∫] ‘oh brother Sameer this is not what I meant’

The example is to show how speaker A used an eliciting FB form to ask speaker B about what he thinks of his view, etc.

In connection to this, in Arabic and English, for example, there is a system with so-called ‘tag questions’, where the FB question negates a positive expression /
affirms a negative expression, e.g. ‘you admit, don’t you?’ It may also be added that, in eliciting FB, instead of using an FB elicitor, the listener can use an expression such as ‘inta buqsud’ (‘do you mean?’), or by use of a questioning intonation, repeat a shorter or longer part of the preceding utterance, such as ‘intab tuqsud’ (‘do you mean?’), where the expressions which are repeated are the same, or more or less synonymous with expressions in the preceding utterance.

2.4.3 Giving and Eliciting Feedback

It can be argued that every language community has created a number of linguistic aids to make FB possible. Allwood (1985) suggested two types of such aids: FB givers and FB elicitors, i.e. behaviour and linguistic expressions which give and elicit FB to and from listeners or speakers. Let us consider the example from the data.

[data sample] (26)
A : [aa wall/a ?] ‘yes (do you) swear?’
@ <mood: question>
C : [walla yaa Sameer innaa mahuwmiiin minnu hinaak laa itquwliiilii (...)] ‘I swear Sameer we were deprived of it over there (in that place) don’t say (…)’

As can be seen speaker A gives and elicits FB actions at the same time. And speaker C gives his FB and continues his talk.

2.4.4 Self Feedback

When discussing self FB we have to be aware of at least two factors:

i) Cultural factors
ii) Situational factors
i) Cultural factors
To speakers from many cultures it might seem unusual to think of someone who gives his own FB. However, giving self FB is not uncommon in the dialect under review.

Culture is a crucial factor in describing FB that cannot be ignored, and since I am describing the Arabic of Arab native speakers, then it is a language that is the property of a specific culture. This culture, as discussed in sections 1.5 and 1.6, influences human behaviour, talk, etc. Arabs are a people of tradition, and their
tradition is reflected in their interactions with each other. Self FB actions are an integral element of that interaction.

None of the aforementioned works has discussed this type of FB phenomenon. This is almost certainly because they were written by Western writers describing Western languages.

ii) Situational factors
Every human action depends on and is related to different situations. In general, these situations motivate their actions. In the present data conversations there have been a lot of situations that motivated self FB.

Some Reasons Behind the Occurrence of self-FB

According to observations made of the data of the conversations in this study, a number of possible motivations have emerged for the occurrence of this kind of FB phenomenon in spoken Palestinian Arabic. (This does not mean that such a linguistic phenomenon exists only in Arabic, however.) Some of the possible motivations are as follows:

- When a person concentrates on an important matter and thinks loudly, this can be observed when he talks and gives his own FB
- When a person is involved in a controversial discussion, he/she may then try to support his/her statement by giving FB to him/herself
- Sometimes a person repeats the same phrase, sentence, etc. when asked by the other/s. This can sometimes result in giving self FB.

The examples below from the data reflect this linguistic phenomenon:
[dataset sample] (27)
A : [<laazim itywiruw ilbadlaat kullhaa ilii...> /// 01 bass law kaan iyyaamihaa fii vidiyu kaan itfarrad3uw ÿalayh (...) bass laa vidiyu walaaw ji] ‘you have to change all the uniforms that … /// but if there had been any video in those days you would have been able to watch it /// but no video or anything’
@ <laughter C and D>

As can be seen from the next example, speaker A gave self FB through her running talk. The importance of her FB in this matter, as far as we can see, is to support her narrative story:

[dataset sample] (28)
While she was talking about a certain event that happened in the past, Speaker A corrected herself by giving a rejection FB.

This is quite a complicated example, for in the beginning, speaker C confirmed the negative answer he received from speaker F, then emphasised his answer by giving a positive FB expression after his negative confirmation in the first place.\(^\text{17}\)

According to the above example, we think that situational factors, of giving self FB, (which is influenced by a cultural factor when saying [hāk hāk]) appeared through speaker A’s talking, such as [// maalhaa ifii> ah ah ?illaa bitquwl-haa ...] ‘with her ah ah, then she answered...’

Such conversational behaviour might cause confusion to the listener if he/she came from another culture, e.g. European. Such structures, i.e. to start by giving

\(^{17}\) For further information see subsection 2.3.5 concerning this point.
a negative statement, then to follow with a positive one, are not nearly so common in European cultures (see example 29 above). This, then, has the potential to create great confusion or ambiguity between speakers who come from two cultures.

2.5 Summary

To sum up the preceding chapter, which aims to present an overview of the phenomenon of linguistic FB, several questions were formulated to present current views. The FB in the early work of two linguists in Antiquity, Priscian and Sibawaihi, who made observations which are at least remotely related to the FB phenomenon were briefly reviewed. Two other writers in the early twentieth century who were the first to discuss FB phenomenon are Wiener and Fries. Wiener was the first to suggest and discuss the term FB, but in purely technical and scientific terms, while Fries was the first researcher who discussed FB as a purely linguistic notion in human communication.

The modern conception of FB in discourse according to several writers was also expounded. This exposition was derived, measured against and based on ‘aspects of communication’ that are discussed further in 1.4.7.1 to 1.4.7.4. Several writers were examined, i.e., Subbs and McTear, Kiefer, Allwood et al, Levinson, Lyons, and Schiffrin. Different issues were considered and analysed for each writer, all related to communication, and within the context of FB.

Three main definitions of FB were given:

linguistic FB according to Allwood, and Allwood et al.
FB unit: two definitions were selected, one by Sherry, and one by Allwood
FB single word: two definitions of FB single word were given, one by Allwood, and one suggested some years ago in my own work
FB single word and as an utterance suggested by me.

The use of FB terminology and FB as an interactive process were discussed and supported by a table that classified the use of terminology related to FB. FB and its main functions were outlined and supported by examples concerning the recognition of FB phenomena. Secondary and primary FB were defined as the main two types of verbal FB to be found in any conversation.

The last question in the present chapter, which was presented in a separate section, demonstrated the general ways of expressing FB. This gives an idea of
the specific ways in which FB is manifested in communication. Both verbal and non-verbal FB were reviewed. Under verbal FB, the analysis is based partly on the coding scheme written by Nivre, Allwood and Ahlsén (1999) and part of Allwood’s classification from 1988. Positions of giving FB units focused on two main units: single word and in a larger utterance/complex FB. Another three types of FB were added: eliciting FB, giving and eliciting FB, and self FB. The different types are supported by examples. It is important to point out that the following types of FB: positions, eliciting, eliciting and giving, and self FB, represent the main analyses which have been focused on.

Finally, even if we accept most of the theoretical points reviewed above, there are still some problems which need to be solved. For example:

1. How do we know which FB function is signalled in a given situation? There is as yet no explicit answer to this question (although it will be partly answered in chapter 4 of the present study).

2. There might be a problem of misunderstanding between a speaker and a hearer so that the hearer gives his/her FB response in accordance with his/her understanding, which is erroneous. The analysis of FB cannot be reduced to a study of ideal matching between expressions at a superficial level, but requires an understanding of the FB action in relation to what has been understood. The study of FB is closely related to a more general study of understanding.

3. Since FB is subject to conversational maxims in the Gricean sense (see subsection 3.2.3.1 of the present study), there is no simple correlation between FB item and FB function. For example, we can say ‘yes’ ironically instead of ‘no’ (see also chapter 2, section 2.5 of my fil.lic thesis 2002).

In the next chapter a description of data conversations and the method followed in this thesis will be discussed, as well as settings and informants and their relation to FB actions.
Chapter 3

Data and Method

The analysis will include verbal feedback but exclude non-verbal, gestural feedback operations for reasons given in chapter 1, subsection 1.2.1 and chapter 2, section 2.4, item I. It will discuss how feedback is essential to achieving successful interaction in (human) language communication.

The study is based on a set of recordings of conversations which were made in Jeddah (Saudi Arabia); all of them will be described in section 3.1. The data are presented in section 3.2 and analysis of them is based on the following:

1) Part of a coding scheme developed by Nivre, Allwood and Ahlsén (1999) (see 2.4.2, and 2.4.3)
2) A number of Allwood’s classifications (1988) and Allwood (1993:12) (see also 2.4.1: I and II)
3) Pragmatic analysis based on six main types of talk
4) Semantic analysis based on six main functions of FB, of which four at least were suggested by Allwood, Nivre and Ahlsén (1991)
5) Sociolinguistic variation between individuals corresponding to FB phenomena in conversations.

3.1 Collection and Description of Data

First of all, I would like to give a brief picture of Jeddah (Saudi Arabia), the place where the conversations in this study have been recorded. Jeddah is a city located in the western region of Saudi Arabia, Al-Hijaaz. Jeddah is the oldest and most important sea port and the prime economic centre of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. It is sometimes called the ‘Bride of the Red Sea’. It is also the main entry point for pilgrims who come to the Kingdom every year in order to visit the holy places of Islam. The population of Jeddah is approximately three millions. Arabic is the main spoken and written language, with English as the second language.
3.1.1 Recordings: Settings and Informants

The data used are where collected between the 1st and 30th February 1994, and which were used in my previous study (see 1.3). Almost all the participants are Palestinians who live in Jeddah. In the first and second conversation, the researcher took a passive role, being mainly a listener. This was due to the view that if he had tried to control or influence the conversations, they would have lost some of their value. So the most important thing was to let the speakers talk freely, while the main job of the researcher was to prepare and organise the recordings in advance.

All in all, the recordings gave very rich data. However, a few problems may be noted:

1. Some participants did not like to speak freely.
2. Some participants looked at the researcher as if asking for his permission before talking, or changing the topic.
3. Some informants reminded each other by pointing at the recorder if they started talking about, say, politics, in order to pay close attention to what they were saying.

All recordings were made in people's homes, except the third conversation, which was made in an office. A brief description of each conversation and each participant's social features follows below.

3.1.2 Summary of Recordings and Participant Characteristics

In an attempt to summarise and complement the information given above, Table 1, below, gives the main characteristics of each recording in terms of setting and participants.

Since similar research/es were done, but other than concerning FB in Arabic, required the same sorts of information; and since I discuss a topic related to Sociolinguistic; we have found that such information will help the reader to identify the social class of participants, and will also support the selected data of our research. The following information is given for each recording: place of recording, number of informants, and for each informant: sex, age, nationality, religion, education, occupation, income, family status and temporary psychological state (i.e., when the informant was either in a calm mood which
we call ‘normal’ or the opposite which we call ‘stressed’). The following abbreviations are used in the present subsection tables 2 – 7 below.

With regard to the degree to which the data can be generalised and how the results might differ if a completely different group of subjects is used, a little discussion concerning the social status of the participants will clarify this matter. Since the issue being dealt with is hypothetical, this seems to be a very difficult question to discuss. When I decided to make the recordings for this topic, I knew the difficulties I would face. The factors of social class and average income, which usually give a clearer picture of the social class of the majority of the people, are important for the success of any recorded conversation, and I have observed (without conducting any survey or statistical measure) that the majority of people in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia are from the middle class; therefore, the majority of the informants came from this particular class of people. The success of any recorded conversation also has to rely on:

- The existence of an intimate atmosphere between all/most of the participants. This is probably the most important factor to create a positive atmosphere during (any) conversation.

The New Middle-Class in (Saudi) Arabia

With regard to the discussion regarding social class above, and in accordance with several works which describe this particular social class in Saudi Arabia, it is essential here to provide a brief outline. In his book *Social Economic and Political Studies of the Middle East* (1977) Brill says that those who are taking the lead in creating a new society in the Middle East are “the salaried new middle class” (p. 22), and he defines this class by its eagerness to produce or consume goods, its values, relationships and styles, which are characteristic of middle classes the world over (Brill 1977: 22).

In (1985) Heller and Safran try to identify several groups of social classes, e.g., those in the West, the developing countries and the Middle East. Both writers emphasise that there is a new middle class which has already emerged as a pivotal element in social formation in Saudi Arabia, and to some extent they agree with Brill about the kinds of groups who represent the middle class in society; however, they add to these, for instance, doctors, lawyers, teachers and journalists, etc. The word ‘class’ for Heller and Safran is a *misnomer*, at least in the Marxist sense of relation to the means of *production* (Heller and Safran 1985:1-4). They state that the new middle class in Saudi Arabia has ‘grown
dramatically in absolute numbers, in a short period of time, and its relative significance (as represented by its percentage of labour force) has grown even more impressively.’ The calculation that both writers make with regard to the middle class in Saudi Arabia proves that the new middle class accounted for 2.1 percent of Saudi nationals in 1966 and by 1985 it was projected to reach at least 8.1 percent (ibid: 7-10). As can be observed from the above statistics, it can be left to the reader to consider the percentage growth of this middle class in 2004/05. This is also more evidence which proves that our chosen participants, in the present conversations, meet the criteria of the majority of the inhabitants in Saudi Arabia.

In *Toward a Modern Islamic Kingdom* (1986), Takabayashi uses the same terminology, i.e., ‘the new middle class’, in his fourth chapter, and describes many characteristics and ideals of the new middle class in Saudi Arabia. His studies are based mainly upon describing this group of people which contains students, intellectuals, doctors and technicians who have studied outside Saudi Arabia and played an important role in modernising the country. The writer says that this group of people is ‘growing dramatically’ in Saudi Arabia.

The final book which has been selected is by Mordechai (1988) which states that at the beginning of the twentieth century, the Saudi population could be considered, with some exceptions, a classless-society. There was no upper class to speak of in Arabia at the time. Only a small proportion of the merchants and the ‘ulama’ in the towns of Hijaaaz and Najd could be described as middle class. Mordechai says that from this study it can be seen that the only social class which has been recognised in Saudi Arabia for nearly a century is ‘the middle class’.

To conclude, it can be seen how all of the above writers have realised the importance of the middle class in Saudi Arabia, their observations being based upon statistical measures, not simply on their predictions, which supports our argument that this particular group in society represents the majority of people who live in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

If the chosen criteria had been different, i.e., an atmosphere that was not intimate, or either low- or high-class people, different results might have been obtained. One could object that most of the informants were not Saudis but Palestinians. This is partly true; however, these Palestinians were born and grew up in Saudi Arabia, which means no significant differences would be expected if we had made our recordings with those of pure Saudi origin.
It can be conceded, in principle, that if (some of) the data had been collected from manual workers, e.g., mechanics, electricians, or labourers, etc., this might have influenced the data – e.g., different types of FB might have been mentioned, louder sounds, rising intonations and it would even have been expected that different kinds of topics would be discussed.

This means that every time the variables for such empirical research are changed, then there has to be expected either a slight or a substantial difference in the results. Future studies of FB in Arabic will necessarily have to be based on a wider range of variables to show the true range of the function of FB.

There now follows a table (Table 1) illustrating the place of recording, the number of informants, gender, nationality, religion, education, occupation, income, family status and temporary psychological state.
Table 3.1: Setting and Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rec</td>
<td>Recording (1, 2, 3, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pla</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Number of informants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inf</td>
<td>Informants (A, B, C etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Palestinian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Jordanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Lebanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Saudi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rel</td>
<td>Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Secondary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Primary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occ</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inc</td>
<td>Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fam</td>
<td>Family status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPS</td>
<td>Temporary psychological state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Stressed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following tables demonstrate the main characteristics of each recording in terms of setting and participants.
Table 3.2: First conversation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec</th>
<th>Pla</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Inf</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Rel</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>Inc</th>
<th>Fam</th>
<th>TPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>UE</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first recording was a conversation involving seven adult subjects, six from Palestine and one from Jordan, four males and three females, all native Arabic speakers. The female subjects were 60, 75 and 28 years old; the males were 27, 35, 21 and 70 years old. The group was heterogeneous in terms of education and occupation, and the group included members of the middle and upper middle classes. Three of the males were professionals (one economist, one linguist and one mechanical engineer), and one was a university student. One of the females was a professional (businesswoman), two were housewives.

It is important to point out that since we are discussing the FB behaviour of adults, we have excluded around 20 turns that were contributed by several children in the conversation.

Table 3.3: Second conversation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec</th>
<th>Pla</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Inf</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Rel</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>Inc</th>
<th>Fam</th>
<th>TPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>UE</td>
<td>_</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second conversation also included seven adult subjects, five from Palestine, one from Yemen and one from Jordan. All were males, and their native
language was Arabic. Five of the subjects were between 20 and 40 years old. The other two were 66 and 70. Again, the group was diverse in terms of education and occupation, and included the middle and upper middle classes (see incomes for speakers B and F). Six of the participants were professionals (one economist, one geological engineer, one linguist, one building engineer, one mechanical engineer and one salesman), and one was a university student.

Table 3.4: Third conversation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec</th>
<th>Pla</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Inf</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Rel</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>Inc</th>
<th>Fam</th>
<th>TPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third conversation included five male adult subjects from Palestine who were native Arabic speakers. The average age was 35. The group was also diverse in terms of education and occupation, but included members of the middle class only. Two of them were specialists in computer science, and three were college students.

Table 3.5: Fourth conversation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec</th>
<th>Pla</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Inf</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Rel</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>Inc</th>
<th>Fam</th>
<th>TPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S+N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth conversation included two adult subjects, one from Palestine, and one from Lebanon, both females and both native Arabic speakers. Their ages were 38 and 33. Their social class was upper middle class. Both of them were housewives.
Table 3.6: Fifth conversation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec</th>
<th>Pla</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Inf</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Rel</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>Inc</th>
<th>Fam</th>
<th>TPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>HW</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>UE</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S+N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>UE</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fifth conversation included four female adult subjects from Palestine who were native Arabic speakers. Their ages were: 32, 20, 24 and 21. The group was diverse in terms of education and occupation, and included members of the low and middle classes. Two of them were professionals (one at a medical laboratory, one a teacher), and two were unemployed.

Table 3.7: Sixth conversation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rec</th>
<th>Pla</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Inf</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nat</th>
<th>Rel</th>
<th>Edu</th>
<th>Occ</th>
<th>Inc</th>
<th>Fam</th>
<th>TPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S+N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>UE</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sixth and final conversation included eight male adult subjects, four from Palestine, two from Yemen, one from Saudi Arabia, and one from Jordan, who were all native Arabic speakers. Their ages were: 37, 27, 38, 35, 21, 37, 25 and 70. Again, the group was diverse in terms of education and occupation, and it included members of the middle and upper middle classes. Six of them were professionals (a linguist, a geological engineer, an economist, two salesmen, one teacher), one was a university student, and the oldest one was retired. In this conversation, we have excluded about six turns that were contributed by children.
3.1.3 Texts Selected from the Data Conversations

In the following subsection two selected texts from the data conversations will be presented as examples. They will illustrate the main steps that have been followed in the present empirical research before arriving at the analyses of the main topic. These steps are: transcription, transliteration and translation.

A) Selected Text of the Fourth Conversation

1. Arabic text (transcription)
2. Latin script (transliteration)

$ Start:
A : [bismi ilaahi-irrahmaani rrahim]
@ <loud, mood: question>
@ <long laughter>
@ <mood: questions, loud, slow>

3. English version (translation)

A : in the name of God the most gracious the most merciful
B : yes 0.6 we now want to talk // about / markets and the / the high cost of living that appeared at Ramadan for instance 0.3 and dresses or anything else for the house or food, or anything could be more expensive at Ramadan, couldn't it Sameera?
A : ah / exactly ///>, 0.4 I mean, look at the prices of the things that we buy for instance, then just compare
B : I mean // when they put the prices up /// up up up I mean those big shops and centres aa // I mean they charge more for the goods // did you see, but if you compare with the other market shops the same thing is offered for sale in the same packets at qabil, bab makka and even cheaper but not when you buy it from ilbasatiin or ashsarq the same as them
A : [and they have the same contents too]
B : [ah, the same contents] and the same quality but the point is they have to cover all the expenses that are necessary // I mean for instance the rent on the shop where they work
ب: والصلاة أيضًا / / خُففْت إلى خمس صلوات

أ: نعم

ب: أو في حدث بما معناه عن الرسول ﷺ{"خُففْت إلى خمس صلوات ما لم يعطني نبأ من قبلي يعني

أ: نعم

ب: أن جعلت في الأرض طهراً أي خفيف أي مكان تستطيعان تنظيفه وإلا من ضمن الأشياء التي كانت في مصر (灯光) إنْ نَثْبِبْتُ نُفَضِّلْتِي إِلَى هَذِهِ (إنْ نَثْبِبْتُ) وإنْ أَمْهُ إِنْ تَنْتَوبْ إِلَى هَذِهِ إِنْ ثِبَتْ مِنْ أَيْنُ بُقِّيْتْ نَفسِهِ طَلَالًا (بُقْيْتِ) وَرَبِّي

أ: [(إنَّهُ) معًا لـ] مـ

ب: فما السلم فا بحب و ما إنْ بقول تبت إلى الله خصص / / بـ

أ: [إِنْ نَثْبِبْتُ] نُفَضِّلْتِي

ب: حَكْمُ حاكمك؟

أ: الله يبارك فيك

ب: حَكْمُ حاكمك؟

أ: والله المدعله
2. Latin script (transliteration)

B : [wiʃalawaat aydan ///  uyufiat ilaa ams살awaat]
A : [naʃam]
B : [uw fii hadiiθ bimaa maʃnaa ʔan irrasuwlu ʃtiitu ʃamasan maa lam yuʃtaa nabiiyan min qabilii yaʃnii]
A : [naʃam]
B : [ʔan dʒuʃilat lii l-ʔarḍ tahuwran ay <fii ay makaan tastatiiʃ ʔan tʊʃallii> waa min ḍimn ilaʃyaa innu kaanat fii l-ʔaʃr (...) ilqadiim innu // ay ʔumma habbit inhaa ittuwb ilaa had innu yuʃlab minnu innu yuqtul nafsu ʃalaʃaan [tuqbal taubatu] ww]

@ <mood: certain>
A : [wa innamaa ʃinnaa laʃ mm]
B : [faa ilmuslim faa bimudʒarrad maa innu iyquwl tubtu ʔila alla ʃalaʃ //]

@ <unclear speech from other participants>
A : [istayʃiruw allaha faʔinnahu ʃaffaaraa]
B : [<kayf haalkum>]

@ <mood: question>
A : [Alla iybaarik fiik]
B : [<kayf il ʔurdun>]

@ <mood: question>
A : [walla ilھamdulilla]

3. English version (translation)

B : the prayers also /// have been reduced to five times a day
A : yes
B : and there is a prophetic speech on their topic saying, I was given five items that no prophet was given before me
A : yes
B : that the earth became cleaned <means we can pray in any (clean) place>, and among the things from ancient times is that for instance // when a specific nation would seek God’s forgiveness, people were asked sometimes to kill themselves so that their repentance was accepted and and
A : but we don’t have the same
B : while a Muslim as soon as he says I ask God’s forgiveness, it’s done //
A : seek God’s forgiveness because he is the only forgiver
B : <how are you ?>
A : God bless you
B : how is Jordan?
A : thanks be to God

Conversations in Arabic have been transcribed, then they have been transliterated into the Latin alphabet using phonetic symbols.
3.2 Analyses of Data

In this section, the coding scheme which has been used to analyse linguistic FB in the recorded conversations will be presented. The coding scheme is based on Nivre, Allwood and Ahlsén (1999), who distinguish two main classes: FB actions that include two main units consisting of one single word per utterance, and FB actions consisting of more than one word per utterance. Eliciting FB (E FB), and giving and eliciting FB (G & E FB) have also been included in all the above analyses that were offered by Allwood et al, (1999). In addition, we have suggested a new type of FB: self FB.

One of the main focuses of our study regarding the semantic and pragmatic analysis of FB actions will be illustrated. One important discussion is related to the main criteria for deciding the general function of FB. As well as the correlation between FB functions and types of activity, conversations will also be discussed.

The above classes will be tabulated in chapter 4 and quantified for each instance in the appendix of the present study under A3, item III. In addition, Allwood’s (1988) classification will be used to analyse our data conversation containing different kinds of FB expressions. The main aspects that our study will deal with are:

1. The general recognition of FB
   - FB actions and non-FB turns. This subsection will include the following items:
     - FB consisting of one word utterance
     - Complex FB consisting of more than one word utterance
     - Eliciting FB
     - Giving and Eliciting FB
     - Self FB
     - Non-FB turns
2. Notes on the semantic and pragmatic analysis of FB actions
   - Criteria for deciding function of FB
3. Types of conversations/activity
3.2.1 The Empirical Study of Feedback and its Validity

In the present section I will investigate the empirical validity of the theory of FB by applying it to Arabic. It will become clear that the theory can account for most aspects of Arabic FB. In this study, I have tried to rely on very natural, situational contexts in order to obtain empirically valid data. It might be difficult for some researchers to obtain such recordings. However, there have not been serious difficulties in making the recordings for several reasons; for instance, all conversations were recorded in peoples’ homes (except the third one), not in a studio; all participants knew each other (they were friends and relatives); the researcher did not tell them of his main purpose in planning these recordings, and all recordings were free conversations, not specified or confined to certain subjects.

It is quite easy to demonstrate that special forms in different languages, as shown below, express the most basic FB functions:

**Table 3.8: Basic Feedback Functions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FB Functions</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Swedish</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>ja</td>
<td>[naʃam]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>ok</td>
<td>åkej</td>
<td>[maaʃli] (ok)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>.mm</td>
<td>[mm]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>nej</td>
<td>[laʔ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonunderstanding</td>
<td>what!</td>
<td>vad!</td>
<td>[ayʃ!]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitation</td>
<td>but</td>
<td>men</td>
<td>[laakin]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1.1 Technique for Realising and Classifying Feedback Actions

This subsection will introduce the technique used to track and account for all FB actions occurring in the data conversations. Five types of FB actions have been selected:
1. FB given as a single word utterance
2. FB given as a phrase or more than one word
3. eliciting FB
4. giving and eliciting FB
5. self FB.

The researcher collected all FB expressions that occurred for each participant. Each type of these FB actions was then put on a separate scale, in which each related to its particular FB type listed above. Finally, the last step was to select all actions of FB and classify them under their own relevant category.

The figure below shows the three steps followed to select and gather all FB actions. The codes used are: FBW (feedback single word), CFBU (complex feedback), E FB (eliciting FB), and G & E FB (giving and eliciting FB).

**Figure (3.1)**

(1) FB Collected → (2) Separate Scales: (FBW & CFBU, E FBW & FBU, G&E FB, Self FB) → (3) FB Classified

It was easier to trace and classify FB consisting of a single word utterance than FB consisting of more than a one-word utterance. It is more difficult to select and identify FB in a complex FB (as we will see in chapter 4, sec 4.4) than in a single word FB because the first type contains all FB expressions used to express specific meanings, while the second type comprises different combinations of the first type. This has spurred the researcher to replay the audio recordings repeatedly and listen more carefully in order to enable him to specify each FB occurrence of this type as precisely as possible.

Since ‘eliciting FB’ very often occurred at the end of a phrase, we have to point out that it relies on the speaker’s intonation and melody. Therefore, we have had to listen to each informant very carefully to be sure of this sort of FB.

‘Giving and eliciting FB’ occurred mainly from the most active participants in conversation, and in heated discussions.

‘Self FB’ was not found often in the present conversations. One possible reason for this is that when there are more than two participants in a conversation, this kind of self FB rarely arises because each speaker has to give the other/s an
opportunity to share their own opinions, responses, etc. Self FB seems to occur when an informant becomes deeply involved in a certain topic and starts to give his/her broad explanation of it.

Regarding step 3 drawn in figure 1, above, most of the classifications of each FB action given are based on the basic communicative acts of FB (see Allwood, Nivre and Ahlsén 1991). These communicative acts were discussed in 2.3.5.

The six main functions are: acceptance, agreement, confirmation, rejection, non-understanding and hesitation. Allwood (1988) presents a classification of FB units in two broad categories:

i) The first, called ‘FB word’, or ‘simple FB’, includes units consisting of a single word. This unit may in this case occur on its own or as part of a larger utterance.

ii) The second, called ‘FB phrase’, or (by us) ‘complex FB’, covers all FB units consisting of more than one word. This category is subdivided into a number of different types.

Furthermore, in the coding manual Nivre, Allwood and Ahlsén (1999) suggested as a broad classification of FB three different types according to function: G FB, E FB and G & E FB. We continue with this below, but see also chapter 4 (4.1, 4.3: I, II, III, and IV, 4.4 and the conclusion).

### 3.2.2 Feedback Turns and Non-Feedback Turns

#### i) Feedback turns

The terms ‘action’ to refer to all FB action, and the term ‘turn’ is to refer to all non FB action. This happened when a speaker takes the floor from another speaker during conversation.

Throughout the demonstration of formally defined FB units, i.e. single FB word, and FB in an utterance, eliciting FB, giving and eliciting FB, and self FB will be tabulated as well. In other words, from subsection 4.4.1 to 4.4.6 the following will be demonstrated in tables under each subsection: FBSW, CFBU, E FB, G&E FB and self FB.
ii) Non-feedback turns

This is a count of how many non-FB turns that each individual has taken the floor from the other participants. The non-FB turns will not include inaudible actions such as body language, meaning non-verbal contact, i.e. hand waves, head shakes, facial expressions, expressions of the eye, pointing fingers, etc. Things such as inhaling, exhaling, laughing, clicking, coughing, sneezing, mumbling, etc. have been excluded as well. The reason for excluding these types of actions was that they did not occur many times in the conversations. Another reason has to do with the data upon which this study is based; all were audiotaped recordings, with no video filming.

3.2.3 The Semantic and Pragmatic Analysis of Feedback Actions

The linguistic FB system cannot only be described phonologically, morphologically and syntactically, but also semantically and pragmatically. To facilitate such a description, FB mechanisms, e.g. deictic expressions and deictic mechanisms, must be regarded as highly context-dependent.

An Introductory View

The following subsection will present an overview of pragmatic and semantic accounts of linguistic ‘feedback’ mechanisms in spoken interaction. According to Morris (1946), pragmatics is the study of ‘the relation of signs to interpreters’, and semantics is the study of ‘the relation of signs to the objects to which the signs are applicable’ (see also Lyons 1977, and Levinson 1983).

As stated previously in chapter 1, section 1.2, since semantics deals with meaning, and pragmatics deals with situation, it will be rather difficult to isolate them in such studies; for this reason, we neither attempt nor claim, in the present study, to distinguish them, simply because we believe that such a distinction runs into serious practical and theoretical difficulties. For instance, it is impossible to imagine any FB expression/s that would result in a loss or lack of meaning and / or situation (see also Allwood 1981, and Nivre, Allwood and Ahlsén 1999). Probably the only difference is the matter of degree between them; however, certainly both have to be present during our interactions in general. Let us consider the following example from our data:
Both speakers are talking about the American news channel CNN. Speaker F tried to describe the difficulties of interpreting or translating into Arabic, and speaker B agreed. Both pragmatics and semantics appear here where the situation is talking about the matter of interpreting and translation, and the meaning explains some difficulties regarding this matter, namely, quick talk from the news commentator.

*Linguistic FB* from the perspective of semantics and pragmatics is a linguistic mechanism that enables the participants in spoken interaction to exchange information about *basic communicative functions*. To be able to fulfill this task to some extent, Allwood *et al* enumerate four basic communicative functions. These are: contact, perception, understanding and attitudinal reactions (e.g., sadness, happiness, etc.) to the communicated content. These four basic functions were discussed in subsection 2.3.5 of the present thesis (Allwood 1979, 1988a, b, c and Allwood *et al* 1991).

In identifying these few basic functions, it seems that Allwood *et al* have tried to capture a wide range of concepts in order to cover both semantic and pragmatic interactions in relation to FB phenomena. This opens the door for us to apply other theories in our presentation in order to support our discussion, and to cast a different light on these theories throughout the following analysis.

### 3.2.3.1 Feedback in Relation to General Pragmatic Theories

In order to try to examine FB from different angles we have discussed in the present subsection various theories according to a number of writers. These theories include: Basic Communicative Functions (Allwood 1995), ‘Conversational Implicature’ (Grice 1989), ‘Presupposition’ (Strawson 1952)
and ‘Speech Acts’ (Austin 1962). The discussion will be followed by examples from our data conversations. Hopefully, in doing this, we will provide a new approach based on Allwood et al’s main functions, but will try through our discussion to highlight the relationship between these theories and the (chosen) examples to FB.

i) Basic Communicative Functions (Allwood et al 1995)

Allwood et al (1995) held that every language appears to have conversationalised means, i.e. verbal, prosodic means and also body movement, for giving and eliciting information about the above four basic communicative functions. Furthermore, these four basic functions are essential in human direct, face-to-face communication. Below, we are going to illustrate from our data examples each of those functions.

1. Contact: Communication requires that at least two agents are willing and able to communicate:

[data sample] (2)

A : [<qadday] kaan 텀्रii lamman a lehetwnaa] <i0naʃʃar sanay uw nuʃ> ʕalaa farahhum yuwmiyit-haa maa ʃufit-haaʃ]

‘how old was I when they took us to their wedding, twelve and a half years old, I have not seen her since’
@ : <mood: question>
B : [<a: yuwmiit-haa>] ‘yes since’

From the preceding example can be seen the successful contact of speaker B with her overlapping of speaker A, who was willing and able to communicate, and even to specify the exact date of this occurrence.

2. Perception: Communication requires that the receiving agent is willing and able to perceive the message as the sending agent is signalling information:

[data sample] (3)

B : [i0naʃʃar sanay uw nuʃ baqayt latdʒawwwizit] ‘I got married when I was twelve and a half years of age’
A : [aaa anaa ʔanaa miin illi qaallii // miʃ yaʃʃii ʔaquwI ʔimmii / Ahmed alla yirhamu qaallii anaa lamman aχadt-haa maa baqatʃ imṭabqa iθaʃlaʃʃar sanay uw huuwa [kaan ʔumru sabaʃʃar sanay]]
‘yes I who told me, // not my mother / Ahmed God have mercy on him who told me, I when I got married with her (his wife), she was not above thirteen years old, and he was around seventeen years old’

This example has shown us ‘positive’ listening by speaker A to what she heard from speaker B. And she continued this story in detail, after taking the floor from speaker B.

3. Understanding: Communication requires that the receiving agent is willing and able to understand the content that the sender is displaying:

[data sample] (4)
A : [farah // salim] ‘the wedding of // Salim’
A : [aa] ‘aa’

Speaker B gave a confirmation of what she heard from speaker A, then speaker A gave her FB so as to signal her understanding of what she had heard from speaker B.

4. Attitudinal reactions: Communication requires that the receiving agent is willing and able to react attitudinally and behaviourally to various aspects of the content that the sender is signalling:

[data sample] (5)
A : [haay šuwrti mawdʒuudl anaa imbaynay qaddayj] ‘you may see my pictures, it is there and it shows how I look’
F : [laa bass huda imbaynay ikbiiray] ‘no but Huda she looks older’
C : [hattaa law / <ayʃ ayʃ il ayʃ ilbtwʃaa ilbint> fii ?ilʃumur haðaa] ‘even though what what the what did the girls understand at such an age?!’
@ <mood: question (hesitation)>
D : [hayk kaanat ?innaas] hayka ?ilʃaadaat kaanat] ‘the people used to live like this, these were the customs’

Speaker C objected to one of the participants’ comments. This comment is related to the habits and customs during the period they were talking about. This immediate involvement of speaker C in the conversation is in order to explain and to express clearly his attitudinal reaction toward what he had heard, even though speaker C did not direct his talk to F but to another participant in the conversation.
Additional examples:

Here is another example featuring all four basic communicative functions:

(A)
[data sample] (6)
E : [<bidhaa itţuţ haaḍii dʒuwwa itṣallii> ‘she would like to go inside to pray’
@ <mood: (objection) enquire>
A : [<miin haay>] ‘who is she?’
@ <mood: question>
E : [haay huda√] ‘she is Huda’
B : [χalaš halla? bitfuwt χuʃʃii bidhaa itṣallii dʒuwwa] ‘that’s it by now she will enter, come in, she would like to pray inside’

The above example reflects an important part of Arab and Islamic culture. It began when a woman wanted to pray, and the house was full of people. For this reason this participant decided to pray in a specific place where there were fewer people. Here it can be seen that speaker E denied her permission to do so (we did not know why). This was shown in the falling intonation of his talk. The question of who is coming came from speaker A. E answered the question, then speaker B used her authority as a host and decided that she could pray in the room.

Four communicative functions occurred in this example can be noted. This can be demonstrated as follows:

a) + contact for all participants
b) + perception from E and F speakers, while + - from speaker A, who found it slightly difficult to hear what E said
c) + understanding for all participants, and
d) - attitude from speaker E, and + attitudinal reactions from speaker B.

Note: the sign ‘+’ means positive (function is in evidence)
the sign ‘-’ means negative (function is not in evidence)
the signs ‘+ -’ mean something in between.

It may be added that it is always helpful when a listener can perceive (clearly) and understand (completely) various types of indicated information. In other
words, good listening and complete understanding are very important factors in obtaining successful contact between interlocutors in conversation.

The following example contains four basic communicative functions:

(B)
[data sample] (7)
B : [iθnaʃʃar sana uw nʊ buqayt latdʒawwzit] ‘I was twelve and a half years old when I got married’
C : [bass yaa salwa yaʃnii thalattaʃʃar sani! // yaʃnii waLLaahii baʃuwʃhaa innuw ilbint maa ibtifham iʃii / jɯw thalattaʃʃar sanay]
‘but Salwa I mean thirteen years old I swear I mean I see that a girl does not understand or experience anything, … what thirteen years old!’
A : [haay ṣuwtii mauwdʒuwdayʃ anaa imbayynay qaddayʃ]
‘you may see my picture, it is there and it shows how I look’
F : [laa bass salwa imbayynay ikbiiray] ‘no but Salwa she looks older’
C : [hattaa laww / <ayʃ ayʃ ilbiwʃaa ilbint> fi iʃʃumur haðaa]
‘even though what what the what did the girls understand at such an age?!’
@ <mood: question (hesitation)>

The above example may be analysed as follows:

a) + contact for all participants
b) + perception for all participants
c) - understanding from speakers A and F when they talked about something other than what C meant
d) + attitudinal reactions. This is shown clearly when C repeated and showed (his) hesitation over what he heard.

The denial of speaker C of what he heard is connected with his view of marriage, which is that to get married at this age is very difficult. He was shocked to learn that A got married when she was only thirteen years old. Of course, speaker C, who is younger than A, criticised this practice by repeating the same statement which he had made previously.

From the above examples and all other information available, we can see that FB information is related to the basic communicative functions. We agree with Allwood et al, that FB can be given at many levels of awareness and intentionality. This, moreover, can be applied in case the information is communicated through bodily or verbal means (see also Allwood et al 1995).
In his basic maxims of the co-operative principle in conversation, Grice formulates the following:

a) maxim of quality: Truth
   - Do not say what you believe to be false.
   - Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.
We may add also, which is to observe (visually) the truth on the speaker’s face. In other words, the speaker must not say what he or she believes to be false, and must not say that for which he or she lacks adequate evidence.

b) maxim of quantity: Information
   - Make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange.
   - Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.
We may add also, which is to specify the answer as briefly as possible, e.g. using colour, amount, etc. In other words, the speaker must make his or her contribution as informative as is required, and no more.

c) maxim of relation: Relevance
   - Be relevant
We may add also, which is the direct answer that carries an important sense. In other words, the speaker must be relevant.

d) maxim of manner: Clarity
   - Avoid obscurity of expression. (“Eschew obfuscation”)
   - Avoid ambiguity.
   - Be brief (“avoid unnecessary prolixity”)
   - Be orderly.
We may add also, which is where one sentence or word expression carries a completed meaning. In other words, the speaker must avoid obscurity of expression, ambiguity, be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity), and orderly (see also Taylor and Cameron 1987: 81-98):

[data sample] (8)
G : [issalaamu ʿalaykum] ‘peace be upon you’
D : [alla yiṣṭiṭik ilṣaafya³] ‘God give you health’ (+, shown as truthful and smiling face)
The above example incorporates all ‘implicature maxims’ illustrated above. In considering the maxi

of quality, we observed (during this contact) the facial expressions of speaker D plus his bodily movement, e.g. hand shake, and standing up from his place, etc. as important parts supporting his actions. Of course we have to mention that speaker G is an old man and such behaviour from speaker D is quite normal as it is required to show respect to elders.

As for the meaning of quantity, it was observed that the answer from speaker D was very short, but was focused on the following items: to wish that God blesses G, and to specify his wish toward one (single) person only, namely G.

The meaning of relation was also present here. D’s FB was relevant to the greeting from speaker G. Other traditional Arabic responses can be given to such a greeting, e.g. [wafalaykum assalaam] (‘peace be upon you too’).

The fourth and last type of Grice’s maxims found here is the meaning of manner. The sentence uttered by speaker D was well structured, brief, carried a completed meaning, avoided obscurity of expression and ambiguity and unnecessary prolixity, all of which can be applied to this kind of implicature maxim.

Probably someone would say that the above discussion might not be relevant to Grice’s theory of maxims. We say that in the above discussion we have tried, and according to our understanding, to find a relevant example of our main topic, FB, to apply to Grice’s theory.

**iii) Presupposition (Strawson 1952)**

Strawson’s theory deals with linguistic expressions that contain truth, rather than imagination. There have been several philosophical views discussing the term ‘presupposition’; for instance, the difference between entailment and presupposition, the relation between sentence and statement, etc. Presupposition, according to Levinson (1983), for example, does not deal with logical semantics, but with pragmatics. For a better understanding of his term, Strawson suggests the following example:

a) ‘the King of France is wise’, and
b) ‘there is a present king of France’
By looking at the above two examples, it may be seen that the relation between them is ‘presupposition’. Let us also consider the following example from the data as a further illustration of ‘presupposition’:

[data sample] (9)
A : [<ahmed <wayn ibn u'chant> i Salwa>] ‘Ahmed where is your nephew Salwa?’
@ <mood: question>
C : [ah talt iiddarad alallaytu] ‘yes on the stairs I left him below’
A : [lahsan bawdayn iyruwh hayk willaa hayk] ‘I am afraid he might go here or there’
C : [alllaytw iaddarad kullhum bilawbaw ma' ba'dad] ‘I left him on the stairs they all (the children) play with each other’

In the above example, speaker C used an ironic, metaphoric linguistic expression by saying [taht iaddaraj] ‘below, on the stairs’ to explain to A what she had asked him about. The answer from speaker C did not reflect all the truth, but part of this truth, simply because he did not leave the child playing on the stairs but under those stairs. To avoid explaining this in detail to speaker A, he preferred to abbreviate his answer by saying that he left the child playing on the stairs.

To sum up, implicature deals with speech acts, and not logical truth, while presupposition deals with the linguistic expression and contains truth rather than imagination. Both rely on inference (logical deduction). Both follow the meaning without dealing with formal semantics. Then we can say that there is a strong link between these theories and FB. FB is used as a linguistic expression, and related closely to the theory of ‘maxim of conversation’.

iv) Speech Act Theory (Austin 1962)

The central assertion made by ‘speech act’ theorists, is that to speak is not only to say something but also to do something. As we know, speech act theory belongs to pragmatics and has wider scope than Gricean Implicature. Austin discussed the first class of utterances and divided them into performatives (not false and / or correct), and constatives (false and / or correct). Austin suggested the term felicity conditions and distinguished between three basic senses, or three kinds of acts that are simultaneously performed. These are:

a) Locutionary acts, i.e., word acts.
In other words, the act of producing a string of words with sense, reference, and so on.
b) Illocutionary acts, i.e., the speaker’s intended action. In other words, investing utterances with some communicative force (e.g. promises, warnings, assertions, or requests).

c) Perlocutionary acts, i.e., the listener's concept. In other words, to achieve by speaking; for example, an assertion may have the perlocutionary effect of persuading the hearer that something is the case, or a warning may prevent the hearer from doing something (for more details see Levinson 1983).

The interesting observation regarding the connection between speech act theory and FB is that neither is used to express propositions too directly but may nevertheless be either successful or not successful. For this reason, in our view FB should be compared to linguistic acts, which are not true or false, but successful or unsuccessful:

[data sample] (10)
A : [<חֶלֶלֶאשׁ וּירְתַּאֵהוּ וּתַּבַּנְיִין> ‘enough they are tired and need to rest’
C : [<חֶלֶלֶאשׁ וּתַּבַּנְיִין> ‘to not let Muna say any Muna say even one single word to me, I promised them and when I do that (I mean promise) it is disagreeable and hard for me to break my promise, however, sometimes certain reasons might show up and force me to do so (meaning to break the promise), besides the Aunt didn’t complete her ‘Umra’
A : [<בּוּכָרָה> ‘tomorrow, tomorrow it will be empty, tomorrow it is going to be empty?’
@ <mood: questions>
C : [<חֶלֶלֶאשׁ וּתַּבַּנְיִין> ‘sure sure didn't you see today at al-'asr (mid-afternoon prayer) time how the holy mosque was totally empty!’

The above example, with the rough translation into English, is to show how speech act theory may be applied to such examples. The main word act, or expression, was the ‘promise’ given by speaker C to his guests (and I believe that he meant his promise), where he promised to take them to the holy mosque in Makka. Meanwhile speaker A, who had more dominance than C, refused this suggestion. Of course C tried to persuade the hearer/s, and more precisely A, that something is the case when he said that his Aunt did not complete her ‘Umra,
and what C expected, happened, i.e., that he would not be able to fulfill his promise, and this was not something that he did on purpose.

With regard to speech act theory, the preceding example confirms that a word act, the intentions of speaker, and the listener's perception all appeared and functioned as part of our data.

To conclude the above three main theories, we may observe the following:

• The Gricean Implicature does not contain logical truth, and arises from observation.
To explain the connection between FB and Gricean implicatures, we may say that Grice’s conversation principles are not unrelated to the FB phenomenon and its operations. This was shown clearly when it was said above that his implications arise from observation. Observation plays a very important role in FB situations. Let us, for instance, imagine someone’s face when he accepts an offer by displaying a sad facial expression! Or even vice versa. Of course in example 10 of the present subsection, these implications have been discussed more explicitly and an attempt has been made to draw the connection between them and the main topic FB.

• Strawson's Presupposition depends on linguistic expression and contains truth. Furthermore, both (linguistic expression and truth) deal with meaning, pragmatics and inference. In Strawson’s theory, there is also a link to FB, i.e. his theory deals with linguistic expressions and includes truth, and to a lesser degree, imagination. Here, the present study deals with FB expressions, making it relevant to Strawson’s theory, which depends on linguistic expression as it stands above.

• With Austin's Speech Acts, the circle operation may be drawn as follows:

Figure (3.2)

Speaker and Listener Utterance + Meaning + Listener's concept

Austin’s theory includes neither falsity nor truth; it contains successful and unsuccessful sentences. As far as FB is concerned, the focus is on the listener’s reaction; however, this reaction has to be related to the speaker’s utterance. In addition, this utterance has to have the minimum degree of meaning. With regard to the aforementioned theories, i.e. Implicature, Presupposition and
Speech Acts, the latter is the only theory that discusses the listener's perception, which is a central element of the subject of FB.

It may be added also that Austin’s Speech Act Theory was the most apt for characterising FB, especially when he suggested the term ‘performative’. This term has a specific interpretation with regard to the first class of utterance, i.e. neither false nor true. This is what FB seems to be about. FB should be compared to linguistic acts that are neither true nor false, but successful or unsuccessful, and this point is related very closely to Austin’s theory of the performative nature of speech acts. For example, when A asks what Smith has been doing and B answers: ‘I won a race’, B’s answer is not considered as an FB because FB is not used to express propositions too directly, but may nevertheless be either successful or not successful.

With regard to Austin’s basic notions of felicity conditions, his three kinds of acts would seem to have a strong correlation with FB. Looking, for instance, at locutionary acts, the expression ‘yes’ is an example of FB. As an illocutionary act, the example ‘yes’ functions as a positive FB expression. And finally, as a perlocutionary act, the expression ‘yes’ functions as a complete answer from the listener.

3.2.3.2 Criteria for Deciding the Function of Feedback

The overriding question that needs to be answered here is: what are the precise criteria for deciding on FB function? There are several factors that play a central role in removing misunderstandings and misinterpretations of responses on the part of the participants. These factors are common among participants and can be formalised as follows:

- Show tongue
- Show culture
- Similar background and social class (approximately)
- Knowledge of responses

All the aforementioned factors may occur together in an FB action, but at least two of them must be there. Their presence will decrease the degree of misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the exact FB expression between speakers in conversation.

Let us return to the question that was asked previously in this subsection, namely, the criteria upon which the researcher has relied for deciding which
type of FB function is precisely meant in a given situation. This subject represents a central point in this thesis. The context is paramount in deciding which FB function is relevant among the participants. Sometimes it was not easy to identify and classify FB correctly – for instance, in cases of giving an acceptance FB form and intending agreement, or in the case of a rejection form where acceptance is intended, for example:

[data sample] (11)

i) B: [inta saami’ni] ‘are you hearing/listening (to) me’
   F: [aa] ‘yes’

This example shows that speaker F used an acceptance form of FB in a confirmation context.

[data sample] (12)

ii) A: [anaa itraqqayt fi-]şuyul] ‘I got promoted at work’
    C: [laa] ‘no’

Here is where we find the role of intonation playing a part in discerning the types of some FB actions.

The rejection form with which C responds was not denying the information he received from A. On the contrary, it is surprising news and he feels happy about A’s promotion.

The criteria upon which the researcher relied are crystallised as follows:

A) Simple Context

What is meant by this item is that the recorded conversations were easy to understand because roughly the same dialect is spoken among all participants. The only contexts not included in the transcriptions of the present audio recordings are those related to the ones that are unheard. Also, the amount of overlapping among participants made it slightly difficult at times for the researcher to discern what each participant uttered exactly.

B) Verbal Context

The verbal context is that which includes conversational activity, i.e., what comes before and after the FB expression. In section 4.4, subsections 4.4.1 – 4.4.7, the conversational activity will be analysed for all conversations. The
conversations consist of several types of talk, e.g. discussion and gossip. In order to identify certain tokens of FB action accurately, the researcher listened to each tape recording several times while classifying the main topics included in conversations. With the recognition of the types of talk we were able to arrive at and identify the real function of each FB action given by the participants.

C) Spatio-temporal Context

The spatio-temporal context means that the conversation takes place in a certain place and at a certain time.

Knowing where and when the conversation was recorded is a helpful approach in identifying and analysing a given act of FB. For instance, one does not expect to hear many negative (rejection) forms on happy occasions. In such a case, no ambiguity arises that can make it hard to identify the expression of an FB function.

D) Mutual Knowledge

Mutual knowledge means ‘what people know about each other’. Where there is a large degree of shared knowledge and information among speakers the probability of unsuccessful FB actions is reduced dramatically. In such cases the function of the FB expression is given and can be explicitly identified.

E) Social and Cultural Context

The social and cultural context is the geographical location, with its own culture, where a conversation takes place. It has been explained earlier in this subsection that the participants come mainly from the same culture and represent the same society. In this case there is no doubt that the topics discussed by the speakers will be understood and that their FB function will be clear and easy to classify.

F) Psychological Context

The psychological context is the mood and openessness of participants in communication. It is very important that a certain degree of harmony exists among the participants in a conversation; otherwise we cannot imagine a successful conversation. This factor is discussed in subsection 3.1.2 under the heading ‘participant characteristics’. In fact, most participants in the present conversations are relatives and close friends. This creates a positive atmosphere among the informants. If the psychological factors were not positive enough, the
outcome of any conversation would be unreliable. We think that both lengthening and intonation in FB play a very important role in showing the average degree of positive or negative FB in a psychological context. For example:

[data sample] (13)
A: [kayf?] ‘how are you?’
B: [tama:mm] ‘fine’ (a very long lengthening)

The example shows one case of lengthening FB reflecting the level of happiness that speaker B is experiencing. Such an answer, however, may indicate the level of the psychological state (up or down) between the participants.

It needs to be added also that a personal, face-to-face interaction is an essential element in enabling us to identify what type of FB is being given i.e., whether it is positive or negative, etc.

G) Prosody

Prosody relates to the intonation and melody given in a certain FB expression.

In general, intonations given either as rising or falling, lengthening or shortening, etc., are very important for enabling the listener to identify the function of an FB expression. Several examples have occurred in the present data that reveal these differences. For instance, rising intonation denotes many FB meanings, e.g. emphasising or stressing [L/a?] ‘no’, subservience, lack of finality, request to continue question, positive FB [a?] ‘yes’, enquiring and eliciting [willa ki:/f] ‘or what?’. Meanwhile, low/falling intonation usually refers to, for instance, to represent finality, statement, authority, negative FB [la\] ‘no’, sadness [la\a?:] ‘no’, disappointment or misfortune [ya:\h] ‘uuh’. Many FB expressions were affected by prosody in the present conversations, as the following examples illustrate:

[data sample] (14)
   i) D: [walla\h juft-haa/?] ‘By God did you see it?’
      E: [laa\] ‘no’ (rising intonation: to express his positive state)

[data sample] (15)
   ii) C: [kunt ihnaa/k?] ‘were you there?’
      E: [ruh\it] ‘I went’ (low intonation: to express his state of sadness)
In the first example speaker E was not denying the information that he received from D. Quite the reverse, the rising intonation that E gave is a mixture of happiness and surprise to hear this news, even though the expression used is negative FB.

Falling intonation of the type we see from speaker E (in the second example above), mainly indicates special meanings, e.g. disappointment, sadness, misfortune, or similar states. For more information, see Gussenhoven (2004) *The Phonology of Tone and Intonation*.

To close this subsection, which represents the core of the present thesis, I am not claiming that the above items cover all the criteria that can determine FB function. Indeed, more criteria will be suggested in further studies. However, to decide which function of FB expression is operative, we need to be aware of the existence and applicability of the above items as a minimum set of working elements.

### 3.2.4 On the Semantic Analysis of Feedback Actions

First of all, the different communicative acts that researchers have discovered may be considered. According to Allwood *et al* (1995) and Nivre *et al.* (1999) there are at least four functions of primary FB: acceptance, agreement, confirmation and rejection. Two other functions are suggested by us: hesitation and non-understanding, which make a total of six functions. Moreover, there seems to be a connection between (certain) expressions and special FB functions (see Allwood *et al* 1991):

[data sample] (16)
1. Acceptance, e.g. [naʃam] ‘yes’
2. Agreement, e.g. [maafii, imwaafiq, ok] ‘ok’
3. Confirmation, e.g. [mm] ‘mm’
4. Rejection, e.g. [laa] ‘no’ (Allwood, Nivre and Ahlsén 1991)

In addition to the above four functions of primary FB, I suggest:
5. Hesitation, e.g. [laakin] ‘but’

Regarding ‘hesitation’, this means when someone is uncertain of a particular action, event, etc. Several meanings would fall under this function; for instance, when someone has not made up his mind regarding a certain point or question,
or even does not believe what he has heard. This function is usually linked to disagreement with what has been said.

6. Non-understanding, e.g. [ay] [ayh:] ‘what’

The list above represents a pairing between particular or chosen expressions and primary FB functions. It should be observed, however, that one expression can be used to signal more than one function. For example, the expression ‘yes’ can be used to signal both acceptance and confirmation. The six functions above may also be expressed in a secondary way. This has been treated in 2.3.6 under secondary FB.

To justify adding these two functions in our analyses, we say because:

a) we add semantics in our analyses (see sec. 1.2, ‘Aims of the Present Study’)

b) the high number of FB actions given/found when we added these two particular functions (see subsec. 1.3.1, item ‘IV’).

The above are main reasons justifies and probably motivate adding these two main functions in communicative acts.

A typical primary FB expression like [naʃam] ‘yes’ can also be used instead of [maajii] ‘ok’, i.e. as a more indirect way of expressing agreement. In such a case we would have to say that ‘yes’ expresses another type of primary FB compatible with agreement.

I pointed out above that FB functions can be expressed explicitly. This is the case in the following examples where the different functions are expressed directly:

(17)
1. Acceptance, e.g. [anaa qaabil] ‘I accept’
2. Agreement, e.g. [anaa imwaafiq] ‘I agree’
3. Confirmation, e.g. [anaa mutaabiq] ‘I confirm’ (that)
4. Rejection, e.g. [anaa arfud] ‘I reject’
5. Hesitation, e.g. [anaa mutraddid] ‘I hesitate’
6. Non-understanding, e.g. [anaa muw faahim] ‘I don’t understand’
The above main FB functions corresponding to the data conversations will be discussed and quantified in chapter 4, section 4.4.7.

3.2.5 Pragmatic Analysis of Main Types of Talk

Six different types of conversation have been selected, and silence as a category is also included but as a form of communication not as a form/type of talk like the remaining six types of conversations. These are discussed in section 4.4, together with their role as activities (presented in table form). The conversation types shown in the table have been captured in the course of each talk. They will be further discussed in connection with the corresponding main FB functions (see 4.4.7).

3.2.5.1 Types of Conversations

The six conversation types in question are:

A) (Aggressive) Discussion
B) Gossip, i.e. talking behind someone’s back
C) Narratives
D) Small talk
E) Provocation e.g. teasing, reproaching, etc.
F) Intimacy

3.2.5.2 Silence in Feedback

‘Silence’ is not a form of talk; however, it is a form of communication, therefore it was given an independent subsection. Silence is a very special case here, for when a speaker never says anything his attitude can be ascertained after close scrutiny. One important point observed in the data conversations is that when a speaker was talking about a certain subject, the occurrence of silence indicated some important FB functions, e.g. confirmation, or agreement, with what had been said. Reasons for the perceived lack of silence in some conversations, and more detailed information regarding the different types of silence which can be identified as positive or negative FB actions, etc. will be discussed in chapter 4, item VI.
Chapter 4

Results

This chapter contains the results of the empirical study of FB and a short presentation of each of the main analytic categories.

DEFINING CONVERSATION

In chapter 1 FB and communication were introduced, and in the present chapter conversation will be introduced and defined. The definitions of FB and communication are relevant to chapter 1 because the items already discussed are related to the introduction of this study, and since this chapter deals with the analyses of all conversations, it is relevant to explore and identify conversation.

Since this thesis deals with an empirical study based on real-life recorded conversations, a brief description of conversation as one form of human communication is in order here.

According to Leech (1983), conversation is best explained as a goal-directed activity, consisting of the implementation of interactional strategies. The participants will have various illocutionary goals (see Austin’s discussion (1962), and subsection 3.2.3), and they will design their utterances in accordance with strategies for the attainment of those goals. Leech illustrated this with the following example: I may want to warn you about your friend’s mood, so I choose a strategy which, when behaviourally realised, should convey that warning: e.g. I say ‘Watch out, she’s angry!’ Other behavioural strings could also have fulfilled that strategy and thus succeeded in attaining my (the speaker’s) goal of warning. The conversational strategy, according to Leech, is designed to achieve other goals besides illocutionary ones. Several goals were discussed, e.g. the observance of the Co-operative Principle (Austin’s speech act theory, 1962), a goal which, as has been seen in Grice’s discussion (1975: 47), is itself motivated by the common purpose of conversation; that is to say, the maximally effective exchange of information (see Taylor and Cameron, 1987).

Under the discussion of the term ‘interpersonal’ and in distinguishing between interpersonal and descriptive meaning, Goffman (1956, in Lyons 1977a) provided the following description of conversation: ‘a conversation is a piece of
social interaction, like any other; and what is actually said in words may be of relatively little importance. Its primary function is to establish and maintain social relationships; to indicate that one belongs to a particular group within the society, to assert one’s identity and personality, to present a certain image of oneself to others’ (Lyons 1977a: 66).

Looking at the definition of conversation given by Goffman in relation to FB, it can be seen that the writer characterised a conversation as an interaction, which is an essential aspect of FB. The writer talked about the primary function of this interaction, i.e. to establish and maintain the social relationship. In correlation with FB, which falls under conversation, one of its central aims is to achieve a successful contact between speakers, which in conclusion leads to the establishment of a successful relationship. When an individual achieves this aim successfully, then he/she proves that he/she belongs to a particular group within society and shows his/her personality through this interaction.

Under Overall Structures and Procedures, Allwood (1985) suggested that any conversation requires three main elements. These are:

- typical sequences, like gaze and eye contact
- turn taking, like taking the floor from a speaker
- feedback.

The above three elements were suggested by Allwood in (1985) and would cover several main steps (see ‘the conversation requirement’ in Lyons 1977a, and subsection 2.3.2) which are required for achieving any sort of contact. To the first element, which represents the beginning of face-to-face human contact, some other forms of non-verbal communication may be added; for instance, hand waves, which can give a signal to the receiver to pay attention to the sender’s initiation.

The present chapter gives the total amount of FB actions and non-FB turns. It accounts for the five main ways of expressing FB (as a single word form, in a larger utterance, eliciting FB, giving and eliciting FB, and self FB), their pragmatic properties and semantic main functions, and the relation between FB and types of conversation. Statements will be supported with some characteristics and observations which concern FB in Arabic.
4.1 Introduction of Results

This chapter contains the results of the empirical study of FB and a short presentation of each of the main analysed categories.

However, before discussing the main aspects treated in this chapter, it is necessary to present the following questions, which will be answered hereafter:

1. How much FB, roughly, is found in Arabic conversation?

2. In Arabic conversations, are there differences between the amounts of FB, and their types and classifications as:

   i) FB as single word
   ii) FB as a longer utterance
   iii) Eliciting FB with a single word, or using an utterance
   iv) Giving and eliciting (referred to henceforth as G and E respectively)
   v) Self FB

   (see also more detailed tables in the appendix A.3, item III)

3. How is FB expressed? By a single word or otherwise?

4. Are there individual differences among persons in giving FB?

5. Is it possible to establish a correlation between types of activity (types of conversations) and FB function?

6. Is it possible to distinguish, specify, and account for all FB main functions occurring in the conversations?

7. What sort of conclusion may be drawn after examining the correlation between FB function and conversation types?

8. How can FB actions be viewed and exemplified? How might some of their main characteristics in Arabic be described?

With regard to items A, B and C below, each conversation will be dealt with separately.
The main aspects of FB expressions to be discussed in this chapter will be dealt with in five sections from item ii to vi below.

A)
i) Conversation turns, including a count of the sum of all turns, for both FB actions and non-FB turns occurring in the course of each conversation

ii) FB given as a single word utterance, (or simple FB). This section shows whether FB occurs as single, initial, medial, or final in a sentence

iii) FB given as an utterance consisting of more than one word, (or complex FB). Complex FB will be subdivided into two types:
   - Type 1, which includes six categories and covers FB units consisting of a single word
   - Type 2, which includes seven categories and covers different combinations of the first six categories.
First of all, it needs to be explained that both types 1 and 2 were characterised in Allwood (1993). Briefly, the first type contains all FB expressions used to express more specific meanings, while the second type contains different combinations of the first type (see also subsections 2.4.1 and 3.2.2).

iv) E (eliciting) FB

v) G (giving) & E (eliciting) FB

vi) Self FB

These ways of expressing FB actions (ii to vi above) will be abbreviated and tabulated in the present chapter, and the results will be shown in figures. In addition, all these four ways of expressing FB actions will be shown in the appendix of the present study A.3 III for each individual in the conversations.

Finally, a conclusion regarding these items will be attempted.

B) Six types of conversations will be discussed in this section. The motivation for a high or low frequency of FB actions, e.g. acceptance rather than the other five types of functions, etc., will be indicated. The types occurring in the conversations will be treated and described for each conversation and tabulated. Furthermore, later in this section a discussion of the correlation between FB actions and these six types of activity will be given.
C) Figures for all six main communicative acts related to FB functions will be given. As already mentioned, Allwood, Nivre and Ahlsén (1991) have accounted for at least four main functions of primary FB: acceptance, agreement, confirmation, and rejection. I have added two more functions: non-understanding and hesitation. These attitudes cover most of the responses that can be made and found in any human language. A separate result for each of these four main expressions will be displayed and stated in figures in later subsections of this section.

The subsection (1.1.3) was submitted the main characteristics and observations of the Palestinian FB in Arabic. Later on, with the help of Allwood’s analysis (1978/88), I will illustrate some ways of giving FB in Arabic.

4.2 Overall Frequency of Feedback in the Recordings

The present section consists of a table showing the total number of all FB actions and non-FB turns given in the conversation data, plus a commentary.

Table 4.1: Comparison Between FB Actions and Non-FB Turns in the Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FB actions</th>
<th>Non-FB turns</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2431</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td>4152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As will be demonstrated later in the present analysis, an important reason for the high number of FB actions is that sometimes the same participant gives several FB expressions during a single turn.

As can be seen above, the sum of all FB actions was more than non-FB turns in the conversations. FB actions constituted a high percentage; this means that the participants gave, approximately, an FB response for every second turn. The highest number of FB actions was found in the first, sixth and second conversations. Usually, a high number of speakers taking part in the conversations, controversial subjects, and varied personal opinions would seem to be the main reasons for the high number of FB actions.
The number of non-FB turns in the table above, which was discussed in subsection 3.2.2 item ii, accounts for the number of times non-FB turns were given for each individual who took the floor from the other participants.

The tables in the appendix A3, part I will illustrate how many times each participant took the floor from other participants in conversation, using both FB actions and non-FB turns together.

4.3 Several Ways of Expressing Feedback

This section will present and demonstrate in tables the sum of all FB actions given in connection with the four main FB units discussed in the present study. These four main units are:

i) Feedback Single Word, and in an Utterance:

[Data sample] (1)
   a) FB single word, i.e. FB given as one word in an utterance e.g. [naʃam] ‘yes’, [lāa] ‘no’, etc.

[Data sample] (2)
   b) FB in an utterance of complex FB, i.e. FB given as a phrase or sentence. e.g. [afتاقيد هايك] ‘I think so’, [مآ بافraf] ‘I don't know’, etc.

The table below shows the total for these two units.

Table 4.2: Comparison between FB Single Word and FB More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single word</th>
<th>More than one word</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1120</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>1728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see, FB single word is more frequent than FB consisting of more than one word.
ii) Eliciting Feedback (using single word, and or an utterance):

[data sample] (3)
  a) E FB single word, i.e. eliciting FB given as a single word, e.g. [ʂah?] ‘right?’, [aːh?] ‘yes?’

[data sample] (4)
  b) E FB as an utterance, i.e. eliciting FB given as a phrase or sentence, e.g. [willə la?] ‘isn’t that right?’, [liiŋ la?] ‘why not?’

Table 4.3: Comparison between E FB Single Word and E FB More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single word</th>
<th>More than one word</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii) Giving and Eliciting Feedback

In our analysis we did not distinguish between G and E FB that occurred as single word or as more than one word.

[data sample] (5)
  When FB is given as a single word, phrase, or sentence in the same utterance, e.g. [ah // inta ruhıt ʂahiːh?] ‘yes you went, right?’

Table 4.4: G & E FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single word and more than one word</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iv) Self Feedback

[data sample] (6)
  When FB is given as a word, phrase, or sentence in the same utterance, e.g. [uw lamma ʃuftuw // la laʔ maa ʃuftuw …] ‘and when I saw him // no no I didn’t see him …’
Table 4.5: Self FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single word and more than one word</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self FB was discussed in chapter 2, subsection 2.4.4 and chapter 3, subsection 3.2.2. There are several factors resulting in the high frequency of self FB, in comparison with E FB and G & E FB above. These include the following:

i) Cultural. As stated previously in chapter 2, subsection 2.4.4., Arabs are people of tradition, and their tradition is reflected in their interactions with each other.

ii) Situational. This point is related to the sort of talk in question. For instance, if it is a serious discussion, potentially controversial, or even any topic that would excite the participants and attract them to engage in the conversation, then such a phenomenon can be expected to occur to support the interlocutor’s claim.

iii) Personal characteristics. This variable, is found less than all others, is related to personal characteristics of some participants. Some informants use this type of self FB during their talk, irrespective of whether the topic generally leads to more occurrences of FB (see situational above).

As can be observed, the FB units in table 2 above represent the most frequent ones in comparison with the other FB units, which suggests that the most frequent FB actions given in spoken Palestinian Arabic are single word and utterance.

4.4 Feedback Results for each Recording

In this section FB results for each recording will be discussed with regard to their pragmatic properties and semantic main functions, and the relationship between FB functions and types of conversations/talk

Having illustrated the total numbers of all FB actions and non FB turns in the previous sections, we will now discuss each conversation in turn. Our discussion for each conversation will include the following:
A):
Total number for all FB actions and non-FB turns
Total number for all FB occurring as single word
Total number for all FB as an utterance/complex FB type 1 and type 2
Total number for all FB occurring as E FB
Total number for all FB occurring as G & E FB
Total number for all FB occurring as self FB
(see A.3 items II and III for individual differences in FB)

B) Conversation and the sort of pragmatics in the six types of talk

C) The semantic role in terms of six main functions

A discussion of the relation between FB functions and types of conversation is given for all conversations, because it is impossible to isolate them for each one.

A) Presentation of the Main Types of Feedback: their Codes and Titles

Presentation of the Main Feedback Processes (with abbreviations explained)

1) FB Position, which includes three main tables:

My presentation of both FB single word and in an utterance, item A, is based mainly on Allwood's classifications (1988) and Allwood (1993:12) (see 2.4.1 items II and III).

a) FB consisting of a single word utterance, or simple FB.
Simple FB was classified into four types: single word alone, initial, medial, or final element in sentence. The following examples show each type:

**single:** FB by itself.
(7) e.g. A: [iddinyaa maṭar] ‘it is raining’
    B: [aa] ‘yes’

**initial:** FB at the beginning of a sentence or phrase.
(8) e.g. A: [iddinyaa maṭar] ‘it is raining’
    B: [aa uw min badrii] ‘yes and since early’

**medial:** FB in the middle of a sentence or phrase.
(9) e.g. A: [iddinyaa maṭar] ‘it is raining’
    B: [fil-haqiiqa\(^a\) aa uw maa bidhaat-waqqif] ‘in fact yes and it does not stop’
**final:** FB at the end of a sentence or phrase.

(10) e.g. A: [iddinyaa maṭar] ‘it is raining’
      B: [wallaḥ saḥ] ‘I swear right’

b) FB consisting of more than one word, or, ‘complex FB’
FB expressed in more than one word is used in more specific contexts – in other words, to express more specific meanings. FB units may consist of specialised FB morphemes such as *mm* or *no*, formulaic expressions like ‘thank you very much’, modal phrases like ‘I do not think so’, as well as different combinations of these. In addition, an FB unit may be a repetition or a reformulation of part of a preceding utterance. I have divided the results for complex FB into two main types: type 1 is FB consisting of more than one word, and type 2 is FB consisting of more than one word which covers different combinations of the previous one.

1. Type 1 covers FB units consisting of a set phrase, as follows:

   1. reduplication of simple FB unit
      [data sample] (11) e.g. [naḥam naḥam] ‘yes yes’

   2. deictic or anaphoric linking
      [data sample] (12) e.g. [muʔakkad] ‘it is’. [illa] ‘I do’

   3. repetition of simple FB unit
      [data sample] (13) e.g. A:[iṭtarayt sayyaaraḥ] ‘did you buy a car’
      B: [aa sayyaaraḥ] ‘yes a car’

   4. idiomatic phrase
      [data sample] (14) e.g. [ʃuqrən jaziilan] ‘thank you very much’

   5. modal phrase
      [data sample] (15) e.g. [aʔtaqid hayk] ‘I think so’

   6. other single word or phrase
      [data sample] (16) e.g. [mawdʒuwd] ‘there is’

The above will be represented in the following tables by this system of coding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFBU: complex feedback unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S: the participant’s code in conversations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. reduplication of simple feedback unit</td>
<td>RedFBU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. The second type consists of seven categories and covers different combinations of the above six categories (Allwood 1993), as follows:

1. simple FB unit + modal phrase
   [data sample] (17) e.g. [naʃam aʃtaqid hayk] ‘yes I think so’

2. simple FB unit + simple FB unit
   [data sample] (18) e.g. [aa mm] ‘yes mm’

3. simple FB unit + reduplication of simple FB unit
   [data sample] (19) e.g. [aa laa laa] ‘ah no no’

4. simple FB unit + deictic or anaphoric linking
   [data sample] (20) e.g. [mm illa] ‘mm I do’

5. simple FB unit + idiomatic phrase
   (21) e.g. [laa bikull imtinaan] ‘no by all means’

6. simple FB unit + single word or phrase
   [data sample] (22) e.g. [aa mawdʒuwd] ‘ah there is’

7. simple FB unit + repetition of simple FB unit
   (23) e.g. A: [iftarayt sayyaara⁵] ‘did you buy a car’
          B: [aa sayyaara⁵ aywa⁵] ‘ah a car yes’

The above will be represented in the following tables by this system of coding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CFBU: is complex feedback unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S (speaker): is the participant's code in conversations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. simple feedback unit + modal phrase  | SFB + MP |
2. simple feedback unit + simple feedback unit  | SFB + SFBU |
3. simple feedback unit + reduplication of simple feedback unit  | SFB + RedFB |
4. simple feedback unit + deictic or anaphoric linking  | SFB + DAL |
5. simple feedback unit + idiomatic phrase  | SFB + IP |
6. simple feedback unit + single word or phrase  SFB + SW or P
7. simple feedback unit + repetition of simple feedback unit  SFB + RepFB

The remaining presentation of the main FB processes in this study contains:

2) *Eliciting FB* (*E FB*), which includes both single word and more than one word

3) *Giving and Eliciting FB* (*G & E FB*)

4) *Self FB*

**B) Pragmatics and Feedback: Discussion, Gossip, Narratives, Small Talk, Provocation, and Intimacy, as well as Silence (as a form of communication)**

Here the main topics discussed by the informants during each conversation will be categorised briefly. These topics consisted of six main types of talk, namely: discussion, gossip, narrative, small talk, provocation, silence, and intimacy. These six conversation types corresponding to the main FB functions are as follows:

**Table 4.6: Types of Activity and FB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES OF CONVERSATION</th>
<th>FEEDBACK FUNCTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Discussion</td>
<td>Rejection, hesitation and non-understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Gossip</td>
<td>Acceptance, non-understanding and especially confirmation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Narratives</td>
<td>Positive perception, acceptance and non-understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Small talk</td>
<td>Agreement, confirmation and non-understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Provocation</td>
<td>Rejection, non-understanding and especially hesitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Intimacy</td>
<td>All positive FB functions in general</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As in previous chapters, subsections 3.2.5 and 3.2.5.2, I have added ‘silence’ as a category to my description. The main FB functions that could be related to silence are: agreement, hesitation + (bodily and facial expression) and especially non-understanding.

These six conversation types do not necessarily cover all identifiable types of conversation used in the data. Some other topics were also involved in the discussions, but these did not give rise to a high or even a moderate number of FB actions. I have tried to do is to generalise the types of activities with their FB functions and to discuss the link between them in connection with the main FB types.

The following codes were used:

1. Types of talk and topics in the course of conversation  
2. Length of conversation  
3. Type of talk  
4. Beginning of conversation  
5. Middle of conversation  
6. End of conversation  
7. Present in the conversation  
8. Not present in the conversation

TTCC  
LOC  
TOT  
B  
M  
E  
+  
-

The tables regarding types of activities will capture the main topics discussed by the informants during each conversation. These topics represented all the six main types of talk.

It is necessary to mention that the tables below, concerning the pragmatic analyses, i.e., table 14 and so on, were all drawn to clarify what has been discussed previously. With regard to these tables, the symbol ‘+’, for instance, does not mean that this was the only topic talked about at this particular time, but that this topic was discussed the most, either at the beginning, in the middle, or at the end of the conversation. This was not an easy task to carry out, but it has been essential to answer questions such as: ‘Why is this particular type of FB expression given the most?’.

C) Semantics and Feedback

As mentioned earlier, some writers have identified differences in communicative acts. Allwood, Nivre and Ahlsén (1991) have claimed that there are at least four
main functions of primary FB: acceptance, agreement, confirmation and rejection. Two more functions have been suggested here: non-understanding and hesitation. These six functions represent all FB actions in any human language. This was discussed in chapter 3, subsection 3.2.4, examples 16 and 17 of this thesis.

Six tables have been drawn up for the present data. These are based on the six main functions of FB, which cover the high number of responses that exist in the Arabic language. This section includes a sub-section that will examine the relationship between FB functions and types of conversations. This will give us the motivation/s for the increase or decrease a number of certain types of FB actions in the conversation. There is only one code used for the FB single word main function, which is FBSWMF.

4.4.1 In Conversation 1

A i) A table for all FB actions and non-FB turns
Let us start below with a comparison between FB actions and non-FB turns. ‘FB actions’ is the sum of all FB actions for each participant in the conversation. ‘Non-FB turns’ is the sum of all actions that do not include (any) FB actions.

Table 4.7: Non-FB Turns and FB Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>FB actions</th>
<th>Non-FB turns</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A ii) FB consisting of a single word utterance

Table 4.8: FB Single Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Medial</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A iii) 1. FB consisting of more than one word utterance, or complex FB, type 1

Table 4.9: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 1 (see pp. 172 to 174)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFBU</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>RedFBU</th>
<th>DAL</th>
<th>RepFBU</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>SW or P</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A iii) 2. FB consisting of more than one word utterance, or complex FB, type 2

Table 4.10: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 2 (see pp: 172 to 174)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFBU</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>SFB + Red</th>
<th>SFB + DAL</th>
<th>SFB + Rep</th>
<th>SFB+IP</th>
<th>SFB + MP</th>
<th>SFB + SW</th>
<th>SFB + SFB</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A iv) E FB

Table 4.11: Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E FB</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Single word</th>
<th>More than one word</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A v) G & E FB

Table 4.12: Giving and Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G &amp; E FB</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Single &amp; more than one word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
A vi) Self FB

Table 4.13: Self FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Single &amp; more than one Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversation 1 includes the most FB given in the data. Reasons such as intimate relationships between speakers account for a great deal of FB given in this conversation. Single FB and FB in an utterance were given the most. Interestingly, self FB was given more than G & E FB, which suggests that the length of time for talking played a huge part during this type of conversation for some participants, while in G & E FB it appears that the length of time for talking between participants during this type of conversation is shorter for them.

B. The relationship between conversation and pragmatics in relation to the six main types of talk in conversation 1

The first conversation contains five main types of talk: gossip, discussion, telling stories, provocation and intimacy. Gossip and story telling were moderate and occurred at the beginning and in the middle of the conversation. The topics in the gossip concerned family matters, as well as social issues. The discussion occurred in the middle and at the end, and concerned mainly family matters and different attitudes. The topics of provocation occurred in the middle and at the end of the conversation. Meanwhile, the topics of intimacy focused on recalling an old remembrance and its relation to the family and related matters. The intimate conversation occurred at the beginning of the conversation through the exchanging of greetings between speakers.
### Table 4.14: Types of Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>TOT</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gossip</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Telling stories</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aggressive discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small talk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Silence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relative, family, friends</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relative, society, politics</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>family matters</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>personal, religion</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>old remembrance, and</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>family matters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.15: FB Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FBSWMF</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-understanding</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitation</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>240 FB actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.2 In Conversation 2

A i) A table for all FB Actions and non-FB turns

Table 4.16: Non-FB Turns and FB Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-FB Turns &amp; FB Actions</th>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Non-FB turns</th>
<th>FB actions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>329</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A ii) FB consisting of a single word utterance

Table 4.17: FB Single Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FBSW</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Medial</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A iii) 1. FB consisting of more than one word utterance, or complex FB, type 1

Table 4.18: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFBU</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>RedFBU</th>
<th>DAL</th>
<th>RepFBU</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>SW or P</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A iii) 2. FB consisting of more than one word utterance, or complex FB, type 2

Table 4.19: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFBU</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>SFB + Red</th>
<th>SFB + DAL</th>
<th>SFB + Rep</th>
<th>SFB+IP</th>
<th>SFB + MP</th>
<th>SFB + SW</th>
<th>SFB + SFB</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A iv) E FB

Table 4.20: Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Single word</th>
<th>More than one word</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A v) G & E FB

Table 4.21: Giving and Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Single &amp; more than one word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A vi) Self FB

Table 4.22: Self FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Single &amp; more than one word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The middle section of the conversation contained the most turns given. FB single word was given most, then FB in an utterance. Self FB also occurred more frequently than both E FB and G & E FB. This suggests that most of the mutual discussions among the participants were focused in the middle of the conversation and contained, for instance, controversial discussion, small talk, provocation, etc. This all was reflected in the amount of FB which was given, and mainly self FB.

B. The relationship between conversation and pragmatics in relation to the six main types of talk in conversation 2

Conversation 2 contained six different types of talk: gossip, small talk (different minor subjects), discussion, provocation, silence and intimacy. The gossip concerned individual views, family matters, as well as local education. Topics of gossip occurred at the beginning and in the middle of the conversation. The
small talk occurred in the middle and towards the end of the conversation, and the topics discussed were social matters, political issues, personal attitudes, and some habitual ways of showing respect. The discussion occurred somewhere in the middle and at the end of the conversation. The topics which called forth this talk, and made it rather aggressive sometimes, were mostly concerned with correct language and politics. Provocation occurred in the middle of this conversation, and was focused mainly on personal views, which provoked several rejection FB actions. Silence, interestingly, occurred in the middle of the conversation. One motivation for silence was to have a break between the participants’ talk when food was offered, and taking some time for receiving several new guests (who became participants in the conversation later on) at the same time. Intimacy occurred at the beginning and the end of the conversation. Around three different topics were talked about during the intimacy phase.

Table 4.23: Types of Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>TCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Gossip</td>
<td>politics, relatives and level of education</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small talk</td>
<td>social, political, personal views, and respectful habits</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>language purists, politics</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling a story/facts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provocation</td>
<td>personal views</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence</td>
<td>preparing for a new meeting</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>religion, feast, and old memories</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. The semantic role in relation to the six main functions of FB

Table 4.24: FB Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FBSWMF</th>
<th>Second conversation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitation</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>189 FB actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4.3 In Conversation 3

A i) A table for all FB actions and non-FB turns

Table 4.25: Non-FB Turns and FB Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-FB Turns &amp; FB Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A ii) FB consisting of a single word utterance

Table 4.26: FB Single Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FBSW</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Medial</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A iii) 1. FB consisting of more than one word utterance, or complex FB, type 1

Table 4.27: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 1
CFBU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>RedFBU</th>
<th>DAL</th>
<th>RepFBU</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>SW or P</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A iii) 2. FB consisting of more than one word utterance, or complex FB, type 2

Table 4.28: FB Consisting of More Than One Word, type 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFBU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A iv) E FB

Table 4.29: Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E FB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A v) G & E FB

Table 4.30: Giving and Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G &amp; E FB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A vi) Self FB

Table 4.31: Self FB Single Word and More than One Word
Self FB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Single &amp; more than one word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self FB in this conversation often comes after an FB single word e.g., [uw ba‘dayn binnisba’ ilii śah amma..] ‘and then for me this is right however...’. However, this depended mainly on the sort of topics that each participant was discussing and the different individual style of each participant when discussing issues such as their problems.

B. The relationship between conversation and pragmatics in relation to the six main types of talk in conversation 3

All six main types of talk were involved in conversation 3: gossip, ‘aggressive’ discussion, small talk, story telling, provocation, silence and intimacy. The topics of the gossip concerned an individual work report and occurred at the beginning and end of the conversation. Aggressive discussion was the third type of talk. It occurred in the middle of the conversation, when the topic focused on plans for future work. Small talk occurred at the end of the conversation, and topics were: occupation and work reputation. Telling stories came at the end of the conversation, and the topics were stories for scientific purposes, statistics, and some visitors planning to come to their city or to their office in the near future. The telling of these short stories was in order to encourage the staff to make progress. Some of the participants did not feel very comfortable, but were provoked to some extent because they had not been informed that their conversation was to be recorded. For this reason they did not welcome such news.

At the end, the boss started to question specific persons in a provocative way, and some persons could not tolerate this, while in fact, owing to cultural norms, he had every right to ask such questions. Silence arose at the end of this meeting when the participants started preparing themselves to end the meeting. Intimacy occurred at the beginning when the boss started to greet everyone and list work done the previous week. Intimacy was shown again in the middle of the conversation when the boss started praising his staff’s achievements through describing several technical problems and the measures adopted to solve them.

Let us consider the following example from the data, where speakers talked in a normal and calm manner. Suddenly speaker B changed the topic when he
whispered to speaker A in a low voice, before the conversation returned to the same topic with which they began their discussion:

[Data sample] (24)
A : [<<[haiytruw]> iθalaaθ baraaamidʒ awwal fì innihaaya willaa barnaamidʒ waahid>]
‘finally will they buy all three programmes or one single programme only?’
@ <mood: question>
C : [<<[haiybruw]> aa] ‘they will buy yes’
B : [laa maa huwwa haðaa il ilmadʒnuwn θaayzu <yinhåt fii mawqif haridʒ>] ‘no I think that is why the crazy wanted him to be put in an embarrassing position’
@ <mood: whispering or low voice>
A : [<?anaa faahim ?alayk>] ‘I understand you’
@ <low voice>
B : [yaˈnii bidduw maθalan min iʃʃarikaat ibtuhlub il mɑˈruwf 0.4 miin maˈruwf il [χallii]
saeed fulaan hatta θiḥnaa ibnistaftiib // lammaa tidʒiinaa əlalaθ ʃuruwʤ ibniqraʔ θayʃ illii fii
bilʃaʔ ibniqra issiʃir ibniqra kul iʃʃi] ‘that means, for instance, he wants the other
companies to order what is offered 0.4, and leave Saeed because we need to make
a profit // when we get these three offers we will read it carefully, we read its price,
we read everything’
A : [[..]]>
C : [uw <miin kamaan fii ɣayru>] ‘and is there anyone else?’
@ <mood: question>
B : [fii salim] ‘there is Salim’
@ <<<>

FB is shown clearly from speaker C in the final position in the sentence, from
speaker B in the initial position in the sentence, from speaker A in a complete
form of understanding, and from speaker B in the initial position in the sentence.
This example is to show how the level of intimacy was affected when speaker B
changed the topic and began to whisper to A. Then the talk resumed as before.
The whispering of speaker B created an uncomfortable atmosphere for a while
(as it does very often among Arabs during their conversations) among the rest
of the participants, who were waiting to see what would be the result of his
whispering. When the boss continued his talk, the intimate atmosphere returned.
Table 4.32: Types of Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>TOT</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Gossip</td>
<td></td>
<td>personal matters, authority</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>work instructions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small talk</td>
<td></td>
<td>occupation, and work reputation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling stories/facts</td>
<td></td>
<td>scientific purposes, numbers, and visitors, etc.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>recorder issue</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence</td>
<td></td>
<td>preparing to end the conversation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>illustrating work schedule, and approving work achieved</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to explain ‘intimacy’ in terms of conversation. The term according our interpretation is based on the following measures: quiet/calm talk, low and average intonation, almost complete understanding of topic/s, no matter if it was positive or negative, FB actions were given as soon as it applies to the above measures. In addition to these measures, we asked some of the participants in certain events and during the conversation for more explanation regarding this particular point, i.e., intimacy, all in order to be sure and certain of the general atmosphere of each part of the conversation.

C. The semantic role in relation to the six main functions of FB

Table 4.33: FB Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third conversation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-understanding</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitation</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>178 FB actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above results, it may be observed that there are a similar number of FB actions from acceptance to hesitation. It seems this is typically an expected
result for such a formal meeting. When acceptance occurs, it is usually when the boss is talking, giving orders and the rest of the employees obey and accept what he is saying. With regard to hesitation, this occurred often from the boss’s side, especially when some of his staff were applying for certain commissions, promotion, new equipment or suggesting a new technique for attracting customers. Then it was rather hard for the boss to accept their suggestions and requests immediately. This was one reason for the high number of FB actions that occurred as hesitations. With regard to non-understanding FB, it often occurred from the staff when the boss was asking some questions, or making requests, etc. The other employees needed a few repetitions to be certain that they understood the boss’s message exactly.

4.4.4 In Conversation 4

A i) A table for all non-FB turns and FB actions

Table 4.34: Non-FB Turns and FB Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-FB Turns &amp; FB Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A ii) FB consisting of a single word utterance

Table 4.35: FB Single Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FBSW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A iii) 1. FB consisting of more than one word utterance, or complex FB, type 1

Table 4.36: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFBU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A iii) 2. FB consisting of more than one word utterance, or complex FB, type 2

Table 4.37: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFBU</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>SFB + Red</th>
<th>SFB + DAL</th>
<th>SFB + Rep</th>
<th>SFB+IP</th>
<th>SFB + MP</th>
<th>SFB + SW</th>
<th>SFB + SFB</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A iv) E FB

Table 4.38: Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E FB</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Single word</th>
<th>More than one word</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A v) G & E FB

Table 4.39: Giving and Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G &amp; E FB</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Single &amp; more than one word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A vi) Self FB

Table 4.40: Self FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self FB</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Single &amp; more than one word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in the previous conversation, single word FB was given the most, then self FB. With regard to single word FB, both speakers took almost an equal amount of time during the conversation, and when each informant is given enough time during his/her conversation, then it is usual to find a lot of FB actions occurring
in a single form. The narrating factor (e.g., when a speaker tell story or use the narrating style throughout his /her talk) was one important issue for self FB increasing to that extent.

B. The relationship between conversation and pragmatics in relation to the six main types of talk in conversation 4

This conversation contained five different types of talk: story telling, gossip, discussion, silence, and intimacy. Telling stories occurred throughout the whole conversation. These stories concerned families, relatives, and friends. Some of the stories were about themselves. Gossip occurred at the beginning, in the middle and near the end of the conversation and concerned social matters as well as the system of government. Aggressive talk occurred in the middle of the conversation only, on the subject of social issues and family matters. Provocation was missing in this conversation. Silence occurred in two places, once at the beginning because both speakers kept quiet for a while before choosing a specific subject to talk about, and in the middle, also in transition to a new topic. Intimacy appeared between them throughout the entire conversation, because the general atmosphere in this meeting was calm, and neither speaker broached any complicated or provocative topics.

Table 4.41: Types of Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recordings</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>T TCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling stories</td>
<td>families, relatives, friends, social behaviour</td>
<td>B + M +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossip</td>
<td>social matters, authority</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>social matters, family issues</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small talk</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence</td>
<td>preparing for new topic</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>social, relative, and family matter</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.41: Types of Conversations
C. The semantic role in relation to the six main functions of FB

Table 4.42: FB Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Fourth conversation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-understanding</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitation</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>182 FB actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some observations can be made with regard to the above table: first, the low number of non-understandings, which means that the degree of understanding between both interlocutors was reasonable. The other observation is the number of hesitations which took first place in the amount of FB. According to our observations, this was due to the high number of self FBs given during the conversation. Their self FBs were based mainly on situational factors and only slightly on individual factors, as discussed in section 2.4.4.

4.4.5 In Conversation 5

A i) A table for all FB actions and non-FB turns

Table 4.43: Non-FB Turns and FB Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Non-FB turns</th>
<th>FB actions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A ii) FB consisting of a single word utterance

Table 4.44: FB Single Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Medial</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A iii) 1. FB consisting of more than one word utterance, or complex FB, type 1

Table 4.45: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFBU</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RedFBU</td>
<td>DAL</td>
<td>RepFBU</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>SW or P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A iii) 2. FB consisting of more than one word utterance, or complex FB, type 2

Table 4.46: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFBU</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SFB</td>
<td>SFB</td>
<td>SFB</td>
<td>SFB+IP</td>
<td>SFB</td>
<td>SFB</td>
<td>SFB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Red</td>
<td>+ DAL</td>
<td>+ Rep</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ MP</td>
<td>+ SW</td>
<td>+ SFB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A iv) E FB

Table 4.47: Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E FB</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single word</td>
<td>More than one word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A v) G & E FB

Table 4.48: Giving and Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G &amp; E FB</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single &amp; more than one word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A vi) Self FB

Table 4.49: Self FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Single &amp; more than one word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was observed that, during this conversation, which lasted half an hour, FB expressions consisting of a single word were the most frequent type. Participants preferred to give short and immediate FB rather than other types e.g., a phrase. The reason for this could be that they were informed that their conversation would be recorded and they did not feel comfortable in such a situation, therefore their FB actions in general were short, direct and unambiguous.

B. The relationship between conversation and pragmatics in relation to the six main types of talk in conversation 5

Conversation 5 contained six different types of talk: small talk, telling stories, discussion, provocation, intimacy, and silence. Small talk occurred throughout the conversation, and the topics concerned society and cultural matters. Telling stories occurred at the beginning and towards the end of the conversation on the subject of individual experiences and life experiences with friends. Discussion mostly concerned social matters, and occurred at the beginning and at the end of the conversation. Provocation was focused only on one person and occurred at the beginning and in the middle. Interestingly, we observed that when speakers stopped talking for a while, they focused their talk after the pause on the comparison between the present time and the future, all as part of their wish to have a better life in their coming days. And intimacy covered three main items: social life, friends, and cooking.

One might ask, ‘Why do provocation and intimacy occur at the same time?’ We noticed that provocation occurred mainly when speakers wanted to tease each other and mainly towards one person. Knowing each other well and having a good relationship among all speakers were important factors to the continuation of teasing without the participants ending their conversation as enemies. It was found, for instance, that speaker C, who was provoked and teased most of the time, tried to ignore what the others were saying to her.
Table 4.50: Types of Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T TCC</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>LOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recording</td>
<td>TOT</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Small talk</td>
<td>topic change, interruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telling stories</td>
<td>personal experiences, friend experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>social matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gossip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provocation</td>
<td>personal criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silence</td>
<td>thoughts of present situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>social, friends, cooking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. The semantic role in relation to the six main functions of FB

Table 4.51: FB Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FBSWMF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fifth conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above results can be seen the similarity of the number of FB actions given in various functions. This similarity demonstrates how the conversation was carried out. The conversation was run normally, which justified the similar number of FB actions given by all speakers throughout.
4.4.6 In Conversation 6

A i) A table for all FB actions and non-FB turns

Table 4.52: Non-FB Turns and FB Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Non-FB turns</th>
<th>FB actions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A ii) FB consisting of a single word utterance

Table 4.53: FB Single Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Medial</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A iii) 1. FB consisting of more than one word utterance, or complex FB, type 1

Table 4.54: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>RedFBU</th>
<th>DAL</th>
<th>RepFBU</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>SW or P</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A iii) 2. FB consisting of more than one word utterance, or complex FB, type 2

Table 4.55: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>SFB + Red</th>
<th>SFB + DAL</th>
<th>SFB + Rep</th>
<th>SFB+IP</th>
<th>SFB + MP</th>
<th>SFB + SW</th>
<th>SFB + SFB</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A iv) E FB

Table 4.56: Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E FB</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A v) G & E FB

Table 4.57: Giving and Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G &amp; E FB</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A vi) Self FB

Table 4.58: Self FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self FB</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This conversation contains the second highest number of FB actions. FB single word occurred the most, then FB an utterance. The type of subjects discussed in this conversation and the large volume of contributions by most of the participants played an important role in generating this number of FB actions of the various types.

B. The relationship between conversation and pragmatics in relation to the six main types of talk in conversation 6

Conversation 6 contained small talk, gossip, telling stories, aggressive discussion, provocation and intimacy. Telling stories and facts appeared throughout the conversation and concerned the following subjects: Qur’anic narratives, scientific facts, personal experiences, and self criticism at the personal and the group level. Aggressive talk also occurred in the conversation,
focusing mostly on human rights in the Middle East in general and the Arab world in particular, personal attitudes, personal views, religious views, and personal advice regarding the two cultures: the Arab world and the West. Small talk occurred at the beginning and in the middle of the conversation, with topics like security, authority, human rights, and short greetings. The topics in the gossip concerned politics, racism, and religion (about persons who are rigid in their adherence, thereby preventing others from becoming attracted to the religion), and gossip occurred at the beginning and in the middle of the conversation. We have observed that provocation was running through this conversation as a whole. Silence was missing simply because this was a potentially controversial conversation where all participants contributed and continuously talked and discussed, etc. The only place for intimacy was found at the end of this conversation when one of the speakers eschewed all heated topics and chose another simple one.

Table 4.59: Types of Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>T O T</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>L O C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telling stories/facts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>religion, science, personal experiences, and self criticism</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive discussion</td>
<td>politics, religion, personal advice, intercultural contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small talk</td>
<td>topic change, personal views, and greetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossip</td>
<td>local authority, human rights, politics, racism, religion, and family relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provocation</td>
<td>attitudes that people hold that are threatening to others and attitudes, religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence</td>
<td>individual experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>individual experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. The semantic role in relation to the six main functions of FB

Table 4.60: FB Functions

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FBSWMF</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-understanding</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitation</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**                **</td>
<td><strong>252 FB actions</strong></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the above table, the following formula may be suggested. Controversial topics mean more contributions to the discussion, which will lead to more FB actions.

It is a very labour-intensive task to investigate the length of time between every FB action for each participant. However, it is worthwhile to do so, because this will give an initial idea of the approximate time needed between each FB action and the next in spoken Palestinian Arabic. In addition, this will expand the empirical research of linguistics by adding new information about spoken Palestinian Arabic.

In 4.4.8, the conclusion of the present section, item viii, an attempt has been made to give an initial estimation regarding both the total time and turns per minute for each conversation. For example, the sixth conversation (above) has been measured, whose length is one hour, and the total number of both FB actions and non-FB turns is 978 instances. FB actions were given in 576 actions, while non-FB turns were given in 402 turns. It may be concluded from this that FB actions were given every second or approximately every third turn, and so on for the rest of the conversations.

In a future work, I hope to be able to devote more attention to analysing how the time was distributed between non-FB turns and FB actions for each participant in the conversations. This will add new information about the approximate time between each FB action given, thus enabling this linguistic phenomenon to be seen from a different perspective, i.e., a temporal one.
4.4.7 Relationship between Feedback Functions and Types of Conversations/Talk

Now that the figures for each main FB function have been established, it may be possible to answer the following question: What is the reason for the occurrence of a certain type of FB in conversation?

As has been seen in tables 6 and 14 (and all related tables for types of conversations), as well as table 66, the types of conversation interact to elicit specific FB functions. Matching the results for the various FB functions with their conversation types will lead to an answer which could be formulated as follows:

a) Hesitation forms was the most frequent when the type of conversation involved ‘controversial discussion’, ‘provocation’ and especially ‘silence’. However, it was observed that controversial discussion caused a lot of hesitation, manifested in the frequent use of the expression [laakin] ‘but’ (an expression of hesitation) by the participants throughout their conversations. Concerning provocation, it was observed that there is a natural interaction to be found from a person who had been provoked. Therefore, a hesitation was a result of provocation. Hesitation could be expressed through silence; it was observed that in some situations the informant would keep silent so as to express his/her hesitation towards a certain topic with which he/she did not agree.

b) Acceptance forms was the second most frequent as FB actions, after hesitation, when the type of talk involved ‘gossip’ and ‘telling stories or facts’. These two types of talk appear to produce mostly acceptance forms. When someone is gossiping about another person, a group of people or regimes, etc., the sort of FB action to be expected is mostly acceptance. Of course there may be some cases of rejection, but in general acceptance occurs the most, simply because it is related very often to the personal experiences of no-one but the speaker himself, therefore the other participants have no further choice but to accept what is said.

The same goes for the telling of facts. Facts usually do not need to be argued; therefore, most of the FB actions given during this sort of conversation are also made in order to accept the information told by a speaker.

c) Lack of understanding and rejection were the third most frequent as FB actions, after acceptance, when non-understanding is involved in most of these types of talk, i.e. ‘discussion’, ‘gossip’, ‘narrative’, ‘small talk’, ‘provocation’,
and especially ‘silence’. Regarding the lack of understanding, several reasons could depend upon on the part of the listener, including the lack of willingness or the inability to continue the contact, to receive the message, to understand the message, and also to react properly and adequately to what he/she hears. At least one of these factors is enough to cause a misunderstanding between speakers in any communication.

In the recorded conversations, it was apparent that the reason for non-understanding always included at least one of the aforementioned factors. Rejection is found when the type of talk involves ‘argument’ and ‘provocation’. This thesis does not claim that every conversation consisting of argument and provocation must bring about expressions of rejection as a result, but as far as has been found in the present data, when the topic becomes more controversial, it reaches points where disagreements will occur between speakers. The same goes for provocation; usually emotional people are easily provoked and this was one important factor where a lot of negative FB actions were expected to be found in the data.

In comparison with the above two main functions, non-understanding and rejection, it has become evident that a greater lack of understanding is found in several types of conversation for many other reasons, such as overlapping speech, low sounds, metaphorical answers, etc.

d) Agreement and confirmation forms were the least frequent FB actions when the type of topic was mainly ‘small talk’, especially ‘gossip’ and ‘silence’.19 ‘Agreement’ and ‘confirmation’ were found often in two different types of talk: small talk and gossip, and also silence (which is not a type of talk):

i) Small talk, which mainly uses very short phrases, sentences, etc. Speakers in this kind of situation, as has been observed, used mainly the agreement or the confirmation forms

ii) In the case of gossiping, there is a different form of acceptance. This can be represented as follows: when a speaker confirms the topic of gossip, that means he/she was witnessing the event; and when he/she agrees with the topic of gossip, that means he/she agrees with it without witnessing the event.

---

19 For more information about the differences among ‘acceptance’, ‘agreement’ and ‘confirmation’, see Chapter 2, subsection 2.3.6 (example 19 of secondary FB).
iii) As for silence when a speaker was talking about a certain subject, the occurrence of silence (on the role of listener) indicates confirmation and/or agreement with what has been said.

The above comparison between FB main functions and conversation types allows the following hypotheses to be made:

1) If ‘acceptance’, ‘agreement’, or ‘confirmation’ alone or together constitute more than 50% of responses, then there is a positive conversational atmosphere.
2) If ‘hesitation’, ‘rejection’, and to some (slight) extent ‘non-understanding’ alone or together constitute more than 50% of responses, then there is a negative conversational atmosphere.

The above hypothesis reflects, roughly, the main results of the correlation between FB main functions and conversation types.

It is fair to say that the above results do not mean that the same will be found in any Arabic conversation, because several factors are playing roles to produce such an outcome, such as the sort of topics discussed, the personal character of each informant, how strong the relationship between them is the level of education, age, experiences, etc. One essential point should always be borne in mind: without the help of the criteria discussed in subsection 3.2.3.2, such as ‘simple context’, ‘verbal context’, ‘spatio-temporal context’, etc., and subsection 2.3.2, as described by Allwood (1979) and Allwood et al (1994), Lyons (1977a), and Shiffrin (1994), the present analyses would not be achieved successfully.

4.4.8 Conclusion

In this subsection an attempt will be made to draw conclusions regarding the main results of the above tables. These will be formulated as follows:

i) Summary of comparison between turns and feedback
ii) Summary of FB single word recordings
iii) Summary of complex FB, type 1 recordings
iv) Summary of complex FB, type 2 recordings
v) Summary of eliciting FB recordings
vi) Summary of giving and eliciting FB recordings
vii) Summary of self FB recordings
viii) Ranking of conversations according to number of turns
ix) Summary of types of conversation (includes a table)
x) Summary and brief discussion of main feedback functions in recordings (tables)
i) Summary of comparison between turns and feedback

Taking into consideration four types of FB: FB position: simple (single word) and complex (consisting of a phrase), E FB: single word and more than one word, G & E FB, and self FB, and comparing them with the ‘non-FB turns’, we find that:

a) The total for all turns including ‘FB actions and non-FB’ turns is 4152
b) The total for all ‘non-FB turns’ given is 1721
c) The total for all ‘FB actions’ given is 2431 actions
d) Most of the ‘non-FB turns’ and ‘FB actions’ are found in the first conversation
e) ‘Non-FB turns’ and ‘FB actions’ are least frequent in the fifth conversation

ii) Summary of (feedback single word) recordings

FBSW = FB single word
CFBU (1) = complex FB in an utterance type 1
CFBU (2) = complex FB in an utterance type 2

Table 4.61: Conclusion for Both FB Single Word and Complex FB Type 1 and 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FBSW</th>
<th>CFBU (1)</th>
<th>CFBU (2)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1120</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1728 FB actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all conversations, FB was expressed by single words a total of 1120 times. The sixth conversation contained the most FB.

By way of summarising the results in the following section, the following observations can be made:

a) The number of FB actions in the third (397 FB actions) and fourth (336 FB actions) conversations was almost the same. That suggests an interesting idea of how males differ from females in giving FB as single word. Five males gave almost the same amount of FB as two females. Of course it may be imagined that if the same number of females had participated, much more of this type of FB could have been expected. Also, it may be pointed out that the third conversation was a formal meeting and since one person, who was the boss, talked much more than the others, then perhaps this was one important factor behind the small number of FB actions that occurred as a single word in this conversation.
b) Initial FB was most frequent, i.e., 480 FB actions. Even if one characteristic of the Arabs is that they sometimes delay their FB, as discussed earlier in chapter 1, section 1.5, nonetheless results for this type prove that initial FB in a sentence is still the type found most in many languages (see Allwood et.al. 1989, Allwood 1993, and Nivre et.al. 1999).

c) Regarding single FB word, there were 298 FB actions. Adding hesitation and non-understanding FB to the criteria, as two main functions of FB actions, was one important factor in producing this kind of result. In addition, it has been observed that during a conversation the same speaker gave several FB expressions throughout his/her turn.

d) Medial FB was found in 269 actions. There may be several reasons for FB occurring in the middle of a sentence. According to Yassine and Harris and Morn as discussed in section 1.5, Arabs often delay their FB and like to elaborate their introduction. Arabs may delay their immediate, short and direct FB in conversation for several reasons, e.g., to avoid being considered rude. In addition, one reason can also be of a lack of understanding between speakers.

e) Final FB was the least frequent: 72 FB actions. FB at the end of sentences might cause a lot of confusion, misunderstanding, etc., even between speakers who come from the same culture. Therefore, speakers in general focus their attention on quick and initial responses rather than delayed responses or responses that would come at the end of a sentence.

f) In the fifth conversation, FB actions were not given much, probably owing to psychological factors, e.g. greater shyness among the speakers. The total number was 79 FB actions.


g) The first and sixth conversations contained the most FB actions, the main reasons for this being potentially the occurrence of controversial subjects in the first conversation, and the same level of education among the participants in the sixth conversation. Regarding the educational level in the sixth conversation, several important topics were discussed (see table 59 of the present chapter), which show that a (strong) background based on academic and varied knowledge between the participants would assuredly increase the level of their interaction and FB in the conversation.
To conclude, it can be suggested that since most of the topics in both conversations (first and sixth) were heated or controversial, there were more contributions to the discussion, which means there were more FB actions.

iii) Summary of complex feedback, type 1 recordings

The total for all complex FB, type 1 was 413 instances. As noted above, the sixth conversation had the most FB actions. The three forms of FB actions that occurred most were: repetition = 232 FB actions, reduplication = 87 FB actions, and idiomatic phrase = 56 FB actions. Since repetition is one important behavioural trait among Arabs. There is an observable tendency for repetition among the Arabs, then it is logical to expect this amount of repetition as FB between speakers. Looking at reduplication, the relationship between repetition and reduplication are very strong, and sometimes it is hard to distinguish between them. For this reason, a high number of FB actions reduplicated in Arabic has to be expected.

All this helps to explain the high number of FB actions that occur as idiomatic phrases in the conversations.

iv) Summary of complex feedback, type 2 recordings

The total for all complex FB, type 2 was 195 instances. The most frequent types were:

1. Simple FB unit + simple FB unit = 96 FB actions
2. Simple FB unit + deictic or anaphoric linking = 33 FB actions
3. Simple FB unit + repetition of simple FB unit = 28 FB actions
4. Simple FB unit + reduplication of simple FB unit = 18 FB actions
5. Simple FB unit + simple word or phrase = 14 FB actions
6. Both simple FB unit + modal phrase, and simple FB unit + idiomatic phrase = 03 FB actions for each.

The total of all instances of complex FB was 195.
The sixth conversation contained the most of this type of FB.

Considering both types, ‘FB single’ and complex FB, found in these conversations, ‘FB single’ was represented by 1120 cases, while complex FB (types 1 and 2) had 608 FB actions. The sum of all FB actions of this type was 1728 actions.
This result shows that the single word FB expressions, which are used to express the general functions, i.e. acceptance, rejection, etc., are given more than those which are expressed in more than one word. This is simply because, in conversation, human beings prefer to hear short and more direct answers than complicated ones. Furthermore, FB single word, especially the primary one (see, subsection 2.3.6 of this study) according to Allwood et al (1999), is very often short, direct, and unambiguous, and is used when the context does not demand a more specific or complicated kind of action. Meanwhile FB in an utterance, type 1 and 2, is used in more specific contexts and/or to express more specific meanings.

v) Summary of eliciting FB recordings

E FBSW = eliciting FB single word  
E FBU = eliciting FB in an utterance

Table 4.62: Conclusion for E FB Single Word and More Than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E FBSW</th>
<th>E FBU</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have obtained the following results:

a) For all conversations, E FB was expressed through single words i.e., 89 actions.
b) The total for all E FB of more than one word was 163 times.
c) The number of E FB actions was most frequent in the first conversation, with 69 FB actions.
d) E FB actions for both the second and third conversations were almost the same: for the second there were 50 FB actions, and for the third there were 44 FB actions.
d) The fewest E FB actions, at almost the same frequency in both cases, were given in the fourth conversation, i.e., 29 FB actions and the fifth one, i.e., 24 FB actions.

As we have observed from the above results, E FB actions consisting of more than one word were given more than the single FB of this type. This has to do with the culturally determined speech habits of Arabs, who favour a longer phrase to elicit FB from the listener rather than a single expression. In addition, there is a central role of intonation in Arabic for distinguishing this kind of FB action. This rising intonation does not always occur with the regular, known FB expressions e.g., ‘yes’, ‘right’, ‘no’, etc. but may occur with any normal word,
and the only difference is the rising intonation added at the end of the normal word e.g., [go/] ?, [ea/t] ?, etc.

Of course, reasons such as the desire to show dominance, to control the talk, or sometimes misunderstanding, etc. are very important motivations for the eliciting of FB action. It also may be concluded that, inasmuch as no large amount of E FB occurred in a conversation, there was a low degree of misunderstanding among all speakers in general.

vi) Summary of giving and eliciting FB recordings

G & E FBSU = giving and eliciting FB actions single and in an utterance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G &amp; E FBSU</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) The total for all G & E FB actions was 74 instances.
b) The first conversation contained the most G & E FB, which was 20 FB actions.
c) G & E FB actions in the sixth conversation were less frequent than in the first conversation i.e., 16 FB actions.
d) The second, third and fourth conversations contained almost the same number of G & E FB actions: second = 11, third = 10, and fourth = 12 FB actions.
e) Meanwhile, the fifth conversation had the least of this type i.e., 5 FB actions. In connection with the fifth conversation, two important reasons could lie behind this low number of G & E FB. These are that most of the conversation was controlled by two interlocutors, and the duration of this conversation was less than the other ones.

To give a brief comment on the above results, it may be said that G & E FBSU (giving and eliciting FB actions: single and in an utterance) is not so frequent between speakers in any normal conversation. People usually use FB to express their verbal or non-verbal reaction. Yet to give FB and then to end one’s talk with eliciting FB, or encouraging the listener to give an FB action, is not so common. This may be due to the fact that what the speaker needs to hear is a listener’s FB only. These kinds of FB actions mainly occur when an FB-giver needs, wants, is curious, is interested, prefers, etc., to get the listener’s reaction to what has been said.
vii) Summary of self FB recordings

Self FBSU = Self FB actions for single word and with an utterance

Table 4.64: Conclusion for Self FB Single Word and More Than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self FBSU</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all conversations, self FB was expressed in 377 instances. An attempt will be made to summarise this with the following observations:
a) The number of self FB actions in the second (58 self FB actions) and fourth (64 self FB actions) conversations was almost the same.
b) The number of self FB actions in the third (88 self FB actions) and sixth (97 self FB actions) conversations was also almost the same.
c) The first conversation (44 self FB actions) had fewer self FB actions than the above ones.
d) The fifth conversation (26 self FB actions) had the fewest.

To give FB to yourself might cause a little confusion to the listener/s and create a lot of misunderstandings, confusion, etc. during interaction with speakers who come from another culture. But cultural differences are not the only factor behind this phenomenon. Sometimes, especially during heated discussions, when delving deeply into a certain topic, etc., a person may elicit FB from, and give FB to, himself. It is evident from the data that sometimes self FB occurred repeatedly during the same utterance. This is mainly what gave rise to the high number of this kind of FB actions in the conversations.

viii) Ranking of Conversations According to Number of Turns

The total for all turns, including FB actions and non-FB turns, in the conversations, was 4152. The conversations with the highest figures for all FB actions and non-FB turns were:

Table 4.65: Ranking According to Number of Turns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Conversation</th>
<th>Total Number of Turns</th>
<th>Turns Per Minute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. the first conversation</td>
<td>1002</td>
<td>12.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the above figures, it may be concluded that for (any) Arabic conversation lasting approximately one hour there are likely to be between 400 and 900 turns. Of these turns, it may be expected that:

- **200 to 500 FB actions, and**
- **200 to 400 non-FB turns**

Each recording lasted one hour, except the fifth conversation, which lasted half an hour. The following comments may be deduced from the above: There may sometimes be found a slight difference in conversations between the number of FB actions and non-FB turns, as in the second and third conversations; on other occasions, such as in the first and the sixth conversations, there is a large difference between the number of FB actions and non-FB turns. By looking at the types of conversations discussed above from 4.4.1 to 4.4.6, item iv, an attempt has been made to give some (logical) reasons for the variations in the frequency of FB. In addition, this analysis has given an illustration of the sort of talk that Arabs produce in their conversations (see tables 6 to 14).

From the point of view of gender, it may be assumed that when an Arab woman participates in any conversation she will contribute more turns and give more FB actions than males. For example, see speakers A and B in the first conversation, in comparison with speakers E, G and H (males) of the sixth conversation. In these two conversations, all males and females took an active part. However, the gender difference can be noticed in terms of a greater number of turns and number of FB actions in favour of the females.

However, cultural and religious reasons may (sometimes) curtail the active participation of females, even if they are close relatives of the other interlocutors. For example, speaker A participated in the first conversation and also very briefly in the second conversation (which otherwise involved males only). However in the second conversation, she did not take the same sort of major part she had in the first conversation. So, what about the sixth conversation, then, which included only males? The rate of taking turns and giving FB in the sixth conversation was almost uniformly distributed between
the informants, while in the first conversation it was mainly distributed between two (female) persons: A and B.

Reasons such as different ages (young or old); that they initiated most of the topics; and that some participants had more influence than the others, etc., were very important in determining the dominate role they played in this conversation, which is reflected surely in the amount of FB given from those people.

Concerning the fifth conversation, in which all the participants were female, it can be seen that two participants, B and C, were active all the time and more than the others. The rate was nearly 287 turns over a period of 30 minutes. Reasons such as the shyness of the rest of the participants about being recorded, and the fact that they were involved in playing card games during the recording time, etc., explain why their role was more passive in the conversation.

ix) A summary of types of conversation

From the table above, it can be seen that most topics occurred in every conversation, leading to the following results:

a) ‘Discussion’ and ‘intimacy’ occurred in every conversation of the data.
b) ‘Gossip’ was found in all conversations except the fifth one.
c) ‘Telling stories’ took place in all conversations except the second recording.
d) ‘Small talk’ took place in four conversations recorded, but not in the first and the fourth ones.
e) ‘Provocation’ was also found in all conversations except the fourth one.

The table below will demonstrate, according to the data, the relation between type of talk and type of FB.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{TOT} &= \text{types of talk} \\
\text{TCFB} &= \text{types of conversations and FB}
\end{align*}
\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOT</th>
<th>Type of FB</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gossip:</td>
<td>+ Perception, Acceptance</td>
<td>17 topics: relatives, family, friends, politics, relatives, level of education, personal matters, authority, social matters, authority, local authority, human rights, politics, racism, religion, and family relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling stories/Facts:</td>
<td>+ Perception, Acceptance</td>
<td>17 topics: relatives, society, scientific purposes, numbers, visitors, families, relatives, friends, social behaviour, personal experiences, friends’ experiences, religion, science, personal experiences, and self criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Aggressive) Discussion</td>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>11 topics: family matters, language purists, politics, work instructions, social matters, family issues, social matters, politics, religion, personal advice, intercultural contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small talk</td>
<td>Confirmation, Agreement</td>
<td>11 topics: social, political, personal views, respectful habits, occupation, work reputation, topic change, interruption, topic change, personal views, and greetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provocation</td>
<td>Rejection, and hesitation</td>
<td>6 topics: private, religion, personal views, recorder issue, personal criticism, threatening</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Having identified the figures for each FB type and function, the following important question may now be answered: What is the reason for giving a certain type of FB in conversation? As seen in the above table, an attempt has been made as much as possible to show the correlation between these six types of conversation and the types of FB. Therefore, matching the results of FB with their conversation types will lead us to an answer which is already formulated above in the ‘summary of types of conversation’.

**x) Summary and brief discussion of main feedback functions recordings (tables)**

Summarising the results of the main FB functions, we can make the following observations:

a) FB words that occurred in all main functions were used 1120 times.

b) The most frequent FB actions were: hesitation and acceptance forms.

c) FB actions in the non-understanding and rejection forms were almost equally frequent and were less frequent than hesitation and acceptance.

d) FB actions in the agreement form were less frequent than hesitation, acceptance, non-understanding, and rejection.

e) FB actions in the confirmation form were the least frequent.

It may be necessary to discuss the difference between the two main functions of FB ‘agreement’ and ‘confirmation’. The context will usually help for making the relevant interpretation of an FB expression. The expression [nafam] (‘yes’) in Arabic shows how this FB expression can be used reflexively in order to express
these two different FB functions which are recoverable from the preceding context (see also secondary FB, subsection 2.3.6, item II, example 19).

(25)

ii) A: [nimṭi halla?] ‘let’s move now?’
   B: [naḥam] ‘yes’
      (agreement)

iii) A: [ibtiṣha badri?] ‘do you wake up early?’
    B: [naḥam] ‘yes’
       (confirmation)

Table 4.67: Main FB Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FBWMF</th>
<th>CONV. 1</th>
<th>CONV. 2</th>
<th>CONV. 3</th>
<th>CONV. 4</th>
<th>CONV. 5</th>
<th>CONV. 6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accep</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conf</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejec</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-U</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To comment on the above table, which represents all FB expressions in correlation to their main functions, hesitation and acceptance were given the most. From the above results it may be assumed that both positive and negative FB expressions predominate in spoken Palestinian Arabic. Probably similar researches, in the future, would offer interesting comparisons between our present findings of FB main functions, and that for other languages.

Ambiguity or Multifunctionality of Feedback

In some of the examples furnished by the conversations, one fails to distinguish a specific meaning function. The FB is rather ambiguous and confusing. Two instances of this can be given:
B’s answer is: simple FB unit + modal phrase. B gives a positive answer to a negative question; this, however, could confuse the listener. B’s FB could either be positive or negative, accepting or not accepting, agreeing or disagreeing, etc.

B’s answer once again puts the listener in another dilemma. It cannot be determined whether B means that he accepts the offer or rejects it.

Such examples sometimes make it difficult for a listener or a researcher to determine what type of response is intended. However, discussing the main functions of FB, as was done earlier, will enable more precise judgements to be made.

Probably some would say that this is an issue of particle class e.g., [naFal] ‘yes’, and [bala] ‘yes’, and is due to the nature of the particle, which means that only context decides. However, as soon as ‘focus negative questions’ arise, then there is a level of ambiguity with this sort of answer in spoken Palestinian Arabic. For more information on focus negative questions see Kiefer’s discussion (1969), discussed in chapter 2, subsection 2.3.2.

In the appendix of this thesis (A.4 I) there is more description of FB in its multifunctional and ambiguous contexts.

**Total Amount of Feedback that Occurred as Single Word**

The table below shows the sum of all FB expressions in correlation to their main functions.
Table 4.68: Single Word FB: Functions and Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-understanding</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitation</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 1120 FB single word main functions

As observed in table 67 above, the most frequently occurring functions of FB actions in spoken Palestinian Arabic are: hesitation and acceptance. Regarding this result, it may be said that the high number of hesitations do not mean that negative atmosphere influenced most of the conversations or even any other (similar) conversation/s; however, because there are plenty of FB expressions used which carried the meaning of hesitation in the Palestinian Arabic, it can be seen that this was reflected clearly in the number of FB actions given in this particular function of FB. As for the amount of acceptance FB, this sort of result is never surprising, simply because it can be assumed that most (similar) conversations would have come to an almost similar conclusion. The lack of acceptance during conversation would almost lead to stop or interrupt the conversation and end up with stop continuing contact between speakers.

4.5 Summary of Results

The findings of this chapter can be summarized as follows: The total number of FB actions and non-FB turns was 4152. FB were given in 2431 actions, while non-FB turns occurred 1721 turns.

The four main ways of giving FB represented in the data were:

i) FB position (i.e. a way of categorising FB) = FBSW and CFBU (type 1 and 2). The results of the count were as follows: FBSW = 1120 actions, and CFBU type 1 = 413, while CFBU type 2 was found in 195 actions.

ii) E FB = E FBW and E FBU. The results of the count were as follows: E FBW = 89 actions, and E FBU = 163 actions
iii) G & E FB = 74 actions including single word and more than one word

iv) Self FB = 377 actions including single word and in an utterance.

In connection with the previous point, tables were drawn and explicited for individual differences in giving FB.

Six types of conversations have been discussed, and demonstrated in tables, to give the motivation for high or low frequency of FB actions. The results show the following:

b) The most frequent kinds of talk were ‘discussion’, ‘gossip’, and ‘intimacy’

c) In the correlation between the aforementioned three types of talk and FB function, both ‘hesitation’ and ‘acceptance’ forms were the most frequent (see table 68 above).

The total sum for the six main FB functions is given as 1120 actions.

In the coming chapter, I will summarise the results and the contribution made by this study. The analysis of FB and sociolinguistic variations will be described for each participant in conversation. Also a discussion of personal markers in connection with FB will be given.
Chapter 5

The Analysis of Feedback with Regard to Sociolinguistic and Personal Markers

5.1 On the Possibility of Generalising from the Results of the Feedback in Relation to Functions and Activity

The total number of FB actions and non-FB turns recorded in the data was 4152 instances. The amount of FB in the present data was high in comparison with the non-FB turns: FB actions were given at every second turn on average (see subsection 3.2.2) during the conversations (see section 4.4 above). The present study has excluded non-verbal FB (see chapter 3), which is very common among Arabs throughout their conversations and occurs in different forms:

a) in isolation
b) in short sounds, which denote a specific FB action, e.g., click sounds to refer to an action of negation or objection
c) in combination with verbal FB, to reinforce a verbal FB.

Moving on to the function of all FB actions that occurred in the conversations, the sum of all FB actions was calculated by classifying each FB expression under its own function. For instance, the expression ‘yes’ was ascribed to the function of acceptance. Therefore, we have considered this FB expression in its specific meaning. According to the six main functions of primary FB (discussed in Allwood et al 1991 and in 3.2.4, 4.1, and 4.4), we have found 1120 FB actions of this type. ‘Hesitation’ forms occurred most, followed in frequency of occurrence by ‘acceptance’, ‘non-understanding’, ‘rejection’, ‘agreement’ and ‘confirmation’.

These results do not necessarily distinguish Arabic from other languages, but since very little research has been done in this area, it is difficult to make such a comparison. With regard to the correlation between FB actions, main functions, and types of conversations (sec. 4.4.7), the following discussion will show how these main functions relate to each type of speech activity. Six types of talk have been illustrated: gossip, telling stories, (aggressive) discussion, small talk,
provocation, intimacy, and silence (as a form of communication). These six types of conversation were the most frequent varieties here. Table 6, section 4.4, displays these relations, and all tables concerning item VI in the same section describe the place where each topic was taken up.

Although in principle these types of conversations are often interlinked with each other, separating them from one another will not contradict their analyses; rather, it enables the link between these types of talk and FB to be demonstrated, as well as an exploration as far as possible into the factors leading to a certain number of FB actions in a conversation.

i) Discussion

If controversial, heated, or aggressive discussion is involved in any kind of talk, then it can generally be observed that the conversation will contain much hesitation, rejection and/or objection, and many non-understanding expressions between the interlocutors.

There are several reasons for this type of talk among the informants, such as different opinions, scientific topics, and sometimes teasing, provoking, correcting of information, difficulties in hearing, as well as uncertainty of information.

The total number of FB actions (see subsection 3.2.2 for more explanation regarding the use of terms ‘action’, ‘turns’, etc. as FB) in drawing hesitation, rejection, and non-understanding forms, was 615.

Let us consider the following example from the data, in which a certain religious subject is discussed and three participants are involved in the discussion. Speaker D, for instance, gave several FB actions and misheard certain words from speaker B:

[data sample] (1)

B : [bass haði lubb duðuðulak fil islaam] ‘but this is the main reason for (your) entering Islam’
D : [<kayf> <if> // hattaa law / ḏakarahaa irrasuwî // <layj jîw lubb χuruujak min il islaam>] ‘how what // even though / the holy prophet said it // why what is the main reason for your leaving Islam’?
@ <mood: negative perception/understanding, mood: questions>
B : [il irtidaad] ‘apostasy’
D : [il irtidaad / [tayyib hal tatrük işşiriya <w: // +>] ‘apostasy / ok why then do you leave the context and … /’
C : ([iðaa ya’ñii ya’ñii tutruk tutruk issunna] wa timsik il quraan bass uw <nimsik il quraan uw nutruk issunnaa> <huwwa /// +>] ‘that means, that means you leave, you leave the sunna ///’
@ <mood: question>.20

ii) Gossip

Gossip is the second type of talk identified. This type of talk obliges the participants to keep silent while the speaker is talking. Responses in these kinds of topics are mainly acceptance, non-understanding, and sometimes confirmation. It seems likely that in any human language, when gossip is involved, most of the participants’ reactions will be either to accept or to confirm, while non-understanding comes for reasons like mishearing, loss of concentration, etc.

There might be several interpretations for the common occurrence of this type of talk in the present conversations, e.g., the eagerness of some participants to get some new information, the eagerness of some participants to criticise some absent persons, or the eagerness to talk about certain regimes. Sometimes it is used for teasing and provoking other participants in the conversation.

Gossip occurred in all data conversations except the fifth one, possibly for two reasons: most of the participants did not feel comfortable to talk freely because they knew their conversation was being recorded, and most of the participants directed their talk (e.g., provoking, teasing, etc.) toward one person only, namely speaker C (see chapter 4, section 4.4.5).

iii) Narratives / Telling stories

This type of conversation is often connected with positive responses. Usually, when someone is talking in a narrative style, the other listeners will not deny or even object to his/her talk, because in such cases there is no place to reject a story told, and the listener has no option but to accept what the interlocutor is saying. However, in some cases (although not often), listeners might disagree about certain facts or perceptions. There is also a cultural reason for this. Most of the persons telling stories in these conversations were older, and deference

20 ‘Sunna’ means the inheritance of the sayings and actions of the Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him.
was given to them by those listening. Listeners did not object to their stories but
gave positive FB actions and perceptions all the time, even if the stories were not
always plausible, or even true, as happened occasionally in the first
conversations (see, for example, Speakers A and B).

Narratives occurred throughout the fourth, fifth and sixth conversations. Most
speakers like to take part in this type of talk. Most of these topics created
disagreements among the majority of participants. The first conversation was
not shown as a disagreement between the speakers, but they agreed mostly with
each other and tried to support each other’s opinions. Narratives hardly featured
in the second conversation, the reason being that there was much interruption
and overlapping of conversation among the speakers. FB actions in connection
with narratives were found most frequently in ‘acceptance’ form during this type
of talk.

Let us consider the following example from the data, where speaker A started to
tell a tragic story and speaker B used confirmation FB before speaker A finished
her talk:

[Data sample] (2)
A : … [?illii aʃtuwhun hurriyyt-hun uw maθalan χałaʃ aʃaβit issin il qaanuwnii raahat la kull
wahdi [χamastaʃʃar sani] uw θalattaʃʃar sani> yaʃnii isyaar rahuw uw χaradʒuw uw ḟuwfii
[ʃuʃar fiihuʃun] ‘who gave them their freedom or if she reached the legal age and
each one reached her thirteenth or fifteenth year of age, that means they are still
very young and when they left home (alone) see what happened to them’
   @ <loud, high pitch, loud>
B : <$>[mm]>’mm’
B : <$>[..]> @ <mood: unclear talk>
Speaker B, in the above example, used a confirmation FB which carries a
meaning of acceptance. As mentioned before, the context usually helps in
making the relevant interpretation of an FB expression. Therefore, some FB
expressions can be used automatically to express other, different FB functions
(as in the above example) which are recoverable from the preceding context (see
also subsection 2.3.6, secondary FB example 19).

IV) Small Talk

This is the fourth type of conversation discussed in the present thesis. This kind
of talk can be named under chatting as well, besides with this form of talk
participants never have long mutual talk. In this type of talk several kinds of speech acts occurred, such as greetings, congratulations, introducing each other, allusions, etc. ‘Agreement’, ‘confirmation’ and ‘non-understanding’ were all involved, simply because both interlocutors have no choice but to agree and/or confirm the transmitted information. Some difficulties in hearing, caused by noise, overlapping of talk, or even physical hearing problems may cause non-understanding between speakers. These activity types were lacking when, for instance, the speakers did not hear or know each other well enough or possibly did not like each other, or a participant was not in the right mood, therefore speakers preferred to be brief in their answers. This happened, for instance, throughout the fifth conversation, leading to a reduction in the number of FB actions.

This type of talk has more dominance and influence in some other cultures, e.g. Swedish. In Arab society, small talk is normally expected to serve as an introduction on the part of the speaker to open a new subject. See Allwood et. al., (1989/90), Alwood et. al., (1991), and Allwood (1993).

With regard to the Arab culture in connection with this type of talk, we think that even though the Arabs like the spoken word, the amount of small talk they use during their conversations, according to my personal observations, remains less than the Swedes.

In the data, small-talk occurred in different forms and was distributed as follows. The fifth conversation contained the most. The main reason was that conversations were short in this type. The second and sixth had a moderate amount, probably because heated and controversial discussion made most of the participants eager to take part in these two conversations. The third conversation had the least, probably due to the formal nature of the meeting. In this conversation the boss took the greatest part in the discussion and the meeting was organised in such a way that there was not much opportunity for anyone to chat with others, etc. Both the first and fourth, as far as was observed, had almost no small talk, maybe because the talk was dominated by specific persons. As shown in table 66 of chapter 4, small talk is combined very often with confirmation and agreement FB. Let us consider the following example from the data as a reflection of this type of talk, where speaker B was talking about a religious issue, then he moved to another topic, namely investment and securities trading, etc:
[data sample] (3)
B : [faa ilmuslim faa bimudţarrad maa innu iyqwl tubtu ?ila allaah χalaas // ]‘so a Muslim as soon as he says (with pure intentions) God I have repented, it’s enough’
@ <unclear speech from other participants>
A : [istαfiruw allaaha fa?innahu χaffaaraa] ‘seek forgiveness from God because he is a forgiver’
B : [<kayf haalkum ?>] ‘how are you?’
@ <mood: question>
A : [allaahb iybaarik fiik] ‘God bless you’
B : [<kayf il il?urdun> uw kull ꧀am wintu? bχayr] ‘how is Jordan and happy new year’
@ <mood: question>
A : [wallaa ilḥamdulillaa] ‘praise God’
B : [il haraka <kayf hinaak wil istiθmaaraat>] ‘how is the movement there and the investments?’
@ <mood: question, loud>
A : [il istiθmaaraat aa ikwayysi ilwaďi‘ ikwayyis bass / illi issuww haad?i ilaan raakid lyuwmayn haay] ‘the investments yes it’s fine the situation is fine but / the market is lazy these days’
B : [<irrukuwd ʕaalamii ʕaalamii>] ‘laziness is universal universal’
@ <loud slow>
A : [raakid dʒiddan] ‘very quiet’

V) Provocation

This type of talk is represented by different forms of FB. For instance, expressions like [ballaahi:] (‘by God’) and [wallaahi:] (‘I swear by God’) are used for both provoking and replying to a provocation. In some societies, provoking others might turn the whole conversation into a serious matter, especially if, for instance, i) all participants or even just some of them do not know each other well, or ii) maybe the participants are not in the mood to accept such an action. It is necessary to explain that the present data did not include a high level of provocative topics due to the intimate relationship between most of the participants. Provocation was found in five of the present data conversations, but was not observed in the fourth one, mainly because both speakers discussed several (important) issues, e.g., society, women’s education and family matters, among others, where there was no need for provocation in their conversation.
Provocation is very often connected with negative FB expressions. Therefore, it has been observed that it is often connected with rejection and hesitation (see table 66 of chapter 4).

The example below represents one provocative action from speaker B towards speaker C, when she told some facts about his childhood, and he felt provoked by part of this information:

[data sample] (4)
B: [uw qad ma raasuww yinţaraq] ‘several times his head was beaten against the wall’
@ <Event: imitating>
@ <unclear speech A)
C: [laa yaad mif sahih] ‘no no not right’
B: [qad ma inţarab raasak bilhayt aqwul ilhaa <ay] bidduw iberi iyšíir lu iṣṣubuḥ rasuw>]
‘your head was beaten several times against the wall and I was telling her, what he wants is, maybe that his head will suffer tomorrow morning’
C: [laa mif sahih] no not right’
B: [balaaf] ‘up to you’ (roughly)
C: [maa batḍakkar inmüw raasii inţaraq bilhayt] ‘I don't remember that my head was ever beaten against the wall’
F: [yaʃnii haaḍii ?illii mafruwḍ innak titḍakkarhaa <ibdʒad>] ‘this particular information you should remember very well’
@ <laughter D, F, and B>

As we have seen from the example above, speaker C felt provoked and objected to the information of speaker B, which is shown clearly by his giving a long rejection expression i.e. [la:] ‘no’.

vi) Intimacy

In principle this type of talk seems to be of primary importance in order to achieve any kind of contact between individuals. Omitting this type of talk may leave any interaction severely lacking, and preclude almost every (successful) degree of communication.

As we have noticed in the present data conversations, intimacy was found throughout all conversations. Such reasons as: a close relationship between participants, a calm and quiet atmosphere, avoiding unpleasant subjects and/or
expressions, etc. played important roles in creating intimacy as one type of talk. One might ask in this connection whether intimacy and provocation can occur at the same time. This is not easy to answer since conversation is a very complicated interplay between speaker and hearer. We cannot predict how this or that conversation will unfold. When a similar issue was discussed in section 1.5 (emotional FB) under some of the Arab characteristics, it was observed that an Arab can be a moody person, meaning that he/she might love what he/she hates, refuse what he/she accepts, and even curse what he/she seeks to praise (see Yassine 1997). This behaviour is related to the psychological state of Arabs. Since Arabs are emotional people (from the positive perspective i.e., to show their real feelings, etc.) such an expression like ‘moody’ can be slightly accepted. Therefore, we may expect this sort of human behaviour where both intimacy and provocation would appear according to the psychological state of an Arab person.

It is a complex task to analyse all the aforementioned types of activities and their correlation to FB actions. The analysis in table 6, item B of section 4.4 relied mostly on my own interpretations and observations, and it cannot be claimed that table 6 gives definitive rules. Sometimes the listener might, in a situation of ‘(aggressive) discussion’, use the expression ‘yes’ as an acceptance form instead of the ‘no’ rejection form. The same would apply to FB and its main functions, discussed in subsection 2.3.5, when, for instance, one expression can be used to signal more than one function. Many people would use the expression ‘yes’ to signal both acceptance and confirmation, and the expression ‘what!’ to signal both rejection and non-understanding, etc. For this reason expressions like ‘yes’ can also be used instead of ‘ok’, ‘mm’ as a more indirect way of expressing agreement and confirmation. Therefore we believe that, in order to avoid a lot of confusion, a study such as ours needs to describe both: the expression itself, and the situation in which the meaning arises in order to reach the maximum degree of reliability in our analyses.

vii) Silence

How can silence be considered as a form of communication if a speaker does not make any utterance? To keep silent at the beginning of speech, during speech, or even at the end of speech can be a significant form of communication. Silence is discussed by poets of classical Arabic literature. For example, there is an old proverb among the Arabs that says:
1. [iðaa kaana-lkalaamu min fiqqah fal sukutu min ḏahab] ‘if talk is made of silver, silence is made of gold’, in English: ‘silence is golden’.

2. Another ancient classical poet says,
[wala?in nadimta ṭala sukutika marratan falatandamanna ṭala-lkalaami miraaru] ‘if you regretted being silent once, you will regret your talk more than once’

From these examples we get a brief glimpse of how important this form of communication was considered among the Arabs even in the old times.

Silence can signal disapproval in Arab culture, just it can in English culture, and no doubt in many other cultures as well. We may add also that even though silence can be considered as a negative FB action, it can also be considered as a positive one. This could be shown in different ways, e.g. facial expression, bodily movements, inhaling and/or exhaling, as well as when a speaker does not say anything and does not show any of the above movements. This can often be considered as a signal of agreement and also disagreement with what he/she hears. One interesting observation based on the data conversations is that silence was observed a fair amount in four data conversations but not so much in the first and sixth conversations. Reasons such as controversial discussions among all the participants appear to have been behind the absence of this form of communication in both conversations.

How can a reader be shown the way in which silence sometimes occurred in place of an uttered FB? The answer to this question is based on two points:

   a) For the conversations in which the researcher took part, i.e., the first, second, and sixth, I relied on my personal witnessing of silence in making an analysis.

   b) For the conversations in which I did not take part, i.e., the third, fourth, and fifth, relied on the context in my analysis, i.e., what comes before and after the text, and on asking some of the participants who took part in these conversations for clarifications.

Since our present data deals with verbal language, it is rather hard to observe an example of silence through the audio tapes. However, one observed example can still be given. In the first conversation, speaker C, as can be seen below, delayed
his FB a little because of his objection to the information he heard from speaker B. Speaker C’s delay was accompanied by a negative facial expression for a few seconds, before he went on to express his objection verbally:

[data sample] (7)
A : [haay şuwrtil mawdʒuwday anaa imbayyni qaddayʃ]
‘you may see my pictures, it is there and it shows how I look’
F : [laa bass muna imbayynay ikbiiray] ‘no but Muna looks older’
@ <negative face expression from speaker C for few seconds>
C : [hatta laww /// <ayʃ ayʃ il ayʃ ilbilwiʔaa ilbint> fii ?ilʔumur haðaa]
‘even though what what the what did the girls understand at such an age?’
@ <mood: question (hesitation)>

In the coming section, it will be shown how FB could be related to sociolinguistic variation, which this study deals with, e.g., age, education, class, etc. See all these varieties below. The discussion will be supported by several selected examples from the data and my own observations. In doing this, however, a different approach to FB is given as well as to the relation between some main social variations and one essential linguistic phenomena in language communication, namely, FB.

5.2 Feedback and Sociolinguistic Variation

In her thesis, which is a sociolinguistic study (based on empirical research carried out in three provincial towns in Jordan: Sult, Ajloun, and Karak), Al-Wer (1991) followed the modern sociolinguistic methods of data collection and analysis. Her study aimed to investigate the use of four phonological variables in the speech of a sample of women informants. These four phonological variables are: [q], [θ], [d] and [j]. Her classification was based on two selected social variables only, which are ‘age’ and ‘education’, in the speech of a sample of 116 women.

Al-Wer’s study was based on three interrelated sociolinguistic concepts, these are: variable salience, linguistic accommodation, and social network pressure (Al-Wer, 1991: 1-2). The writer’s three concepts represent important factors for most studies that fall within sociolinguistics. As far as we can see from Al-Wer’s study, it does not have much that we may apply in the present study, since her study focused on the phonological part that is related to the social network of
women’s speech, while our study deals with particular expressions that are related to one linguistic phenomenon that falls under spoken communication. However, an attempt will be made to find some interesting result/s that can be compared with similar items discussed in the present section i.e., age, and education.

The following section will discuss FB on the one hand, and its relation with some (selected) social variables on the other. The selected variables are as follows: age, social class, gender, (levels of) education, occupation and occasion. Each variable will be demonstrated according to the following steps:

1. A table will be drawn for each conversation and for each individual to show their social variations
2. The total number of FB actions will be given for each participant in conversation
3. After drawing tables for each variable, e.g. age differences, several examples will be selected to show their FB actions in relation to social variation.

The reader is warned in advance that it will be necessary to repeat the same numbers for the total FB actions for each individual.

Keys for each social variable will be supplied. With regard to point 3 above, examples used from the data conversations will be as relevant as possible, and an attempt will be made to show how this FB example matches each item of the sociolinguistic variables in question. It is hoped that in doing this the relation between certain FB actions and their social variations will be successfully demonstrated. Although it will not be possible to capture all variations, an attempt will be made to capture the ones that are the most important and interesting, and to support these examples with several comments in order to explain, for instance, which of them are the most common, and which are the least.

Since the following varieties will be drawn in tables to capture all the Arabic examples and their translations, it is important to point out that the English translations of some expressions might be the same. These Arabic expressions may reflect degrees of formality, but their meaning is definitely the same, which should be reflected in the English translation as well. For example, Arabic can sometimes be translated in a number of ways; for instance, the expression [madbuwt] can be translated as both ‘exactly!’ and ‘right!’.

For this reason it is
hoped that the following examples will not cause the reader confusion when he/she sees the same translation in English referring to two Arabic forms.

Before starting the discussion regarding each sociolinguistic variable, it is worth noting some relevant points from a social study related to the present section. The study in question is by Dilworth Parkinson, entitled *Constructing the Social Context of Communication* (1985). Parkinson attempts ‘to describe the Egyptian Arabic (EA) of address system from a linguistic structure’ (p. 3). This means he is looking not only for traditional linguistic subsystems, but also that his work is based upon a specific question in his data: ‘Who is using which terms to whom and in what situation?’

Parkinson’s study supports this thesis when discussing the social variables shown in different speech communities, and makes different uses of terms of address as a whole. Of course he does not attempt to discuss FB as a notion; however, he discusses several different expressions which are used by different social groups in different situations. For example, some use expressions only occasionally as relatively minor conveyors of social information and others use expressions constantly and make them carry a relatively large social communicative load (Parkinson 1985: 3).

I) **Age Differences and Feedback (tables)**

In spoken Palestinian Arabic, there are certain FB forms used by young people that old people seldom use; the examples below show some of these differences.

Table 5.1: Age grouping and FB expressions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old people</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Young people</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[maẓbuːɬ]</td>
<td>‘exactly’ / ‘right’</td>
<td>[ṣah]</td>
<td>‘exactly’ / ‘right’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tabaflan]</td>
<td>‘surely’</td>
<td>[ṭabīfii]</td>
<td>‘naturally/ah’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[bikull ta/kiid]</td>
<td>‘in all certainty’</td>
<td>[a?ki:d]</td>
<td>‘sure’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[mamnuwn]</td>
<td>‘grateful’</td>
<td>[ṣukran]</td>
<td>‘thanks’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[laa yumal]</td>
<td>‘no bother’</td>
<td>[mahḍuwm]</td>
<td>‘nice’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[braw]</td>
<td>‘good’ (encourage form)</td>
<td>[mabluwʕ]</td>
<td>‘swallowed’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above examples of FB expressions show how age differences can play a part in the choice of FB. These Arabic expressions may reflect degrees of formality, but not the actual meaning of the words, since their meaning is the same, which, as can be seen from some examples in the above table, should be reflected in the English translation as well.

Keys will be used as follows:
Con = conversation, S = speakers, M/F = male/female, Youth = 15-25 years of age, Young = 25-35 years of age, Middle = 35-50 years of age, Old = 50-70 years of age.

Table 5.2: in Conversation 1
Age Variation and Number of FB actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Young</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3: in Conversation 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Young</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.4: in Conversation 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Young</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5: in Conversation 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Young</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6: in Conversation 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Young</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7: in Conversation 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>Young</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Old</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data conversations show that old people gave quite large numbers of FB expressions. Consider, for instance, A and B in the first conversation, as well as speaker F in the second conversation. It is not very common for old people to give many FB actions. However, when this happened, as in conversations 1 and 2
above, it should have been for particular reasons. For instance, the first conversation includes both speakers A and B, who had not met for a long time. Therefore, they were very eager to chat with each other and to open new subjects.

It is necessary to add that there are certain FB expressions among the younger generations that are hardly used by older people e.g., [mahduwm] ‘nice’, which is mainly used by people from al-Sham, and, [rahiib] ‘scary’, which is used as a positive FB meaning ‘good’, ‘nice’, etc., mainly by people from the Gulf area. Meanwhile, some FB expressions are used by older people and are very seldom heard among younger people, e.g., [afarim] ‘well done’, [d3ada] ‘fine’, [imniih] ‘good’, etc. This is not to claim that the above examples in table 1 will always be used exclusively by a certain age group, but these were the results provided by the data for this study.

My presumption (which based on my own observation and the analyses of the present data conversation) is that mainly older people who take their time before giving certain FB actions; therefore, their FB often includes rather long intonation, a quiet or calm voice, or FB as a longer phrase e.g., [bikull takiid] ‘by all certainty’. They delay giving their FB more than the younger people do.

To conclude the above description, the following hypothesis may be drawn. The present data conversations included six old people and twenty-seven of a younger age. To compare them, the old people gave 543 FB actions divided by 6= 90 FB actions per person, while the young people gave 1906 FB actions divided by 27= 70 FB actions per person. From these results the following conclusion may be drawn: if the old people had the same number of participants as the young people, their FB actions would probably reach the same number as that given by the young ones.

The other comment concerns the older males. For example, speaker G in the first conversation gave a small number of FB actions. But when he participated once again in the second conversation as speaker D, the same speaker gave double the number of FB actions of the first conversation. There are some reasons for his increased participation, of course, namely, his meeting speaker F, who was almost the same age and with whom he had an intimate relationship, which prompted him to talk more, and for a longer period of time.
II) Social-Class Differences and Feedback (tables)

It must be noted that all participants in the present conversations were from the middle class. Since both the low-class and the high-class are missing in the data this thesis focuses on another (one) aspect of social classes: the difference in income. Incomes (especially in places like Saudi Arabia, the Gulf area and even in al-Sham) very often play an important role in determining social differences between persons.

The keys used are as follows:
Con = conversation, S = speakers, M/F = male/female, H I = high income, M I = middle income
Note, ‘low income’ will be excluded from any classification, because none of the participants were relevant to this group.

Table 5.8: in Conversation 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>H I</th>
<th>M I</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9: in Conversation 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>H I</th>
<th>M I</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The present data shows that the most influential persons – by this is meant here those with the highest income, and also those who use their strong personalities...
to control most of the talk in the conversation – gave ‘short’ and ‘quick’ FB actions, e.g. [a a a] ‘yes yes yes’, [m] ‘mm’, etc. They did not hesitate to interrupt the other participants and take the floor from any of the interlocutors, as is seen with speakers B and F in the second conversation, speaker B in the third conversation, and C in the sixth conversation.

Altogether, our data conversations included six people who have high incomes, seventeen who have middle incomes, and ten who have no income. In comparison with this number of participants, those who have high incomes gave 613 FB actions divided by 6 = 102 FB actions per person, while those who have middle incomes gave 1085 FB actions divided by 17 = 63 FB actions per person, and those who have no incomes gave 751 FB actions divided by 10 = 75 FB actions per person. From these results the following conclusion may be drawn: if the people with a high income had the same number of participants as those with the middle incomes, it might be expected that a higher number of FB actions would be given by them, and the same goes for those who have no income at all.

Another interesting observation that was made is that the other participants looked for a response from the most influential participant in the conversation, no matter what the reason was. In my view this has to do with cultural and political factors relating to the Middle East in general.

Let us consider the following example from the data when speaker A was talking to B and then speaker B transferred his talk to speaker C to attract his attention. As a result speaker C gave FB to speaker B, as can be seen below:

[data sample] (8)
$ Start:
(…)
A : [ruht turkiyaa uw min turkiyaa baruwh bulyaaryaa maθalan laakin maa fii // χuruwδζ] ‘I went to Turkey and from Turkey to Bulgaria for example but there is no way out’
B : [laa fii χuruwj (...) ‘no there is’
@ <several persons are talking at the same time for few seconds>
B : [ya’nii isaa?it ilfahim bän ilbafar // aa yaa Basim] ‘I mean misunderstanding between people // yes Basim?’
C : [naʔam] ‘yes’
B : [baqwwl la akram qan baʔid min tạχًاʂʂuʂʂatnaa fiihaa jiiʔ min isaaʔit ilfahim il baʃar lamman iysiiʔuw fahim baʔid] ‘I told Akram about some of our specialities (studies education) which include some of the misunderstanding between people
when they misunderstand each other’
C: [naʃam naʃam] ‘yes yes’

Speaker C was one of the influential people in this conversation. Speaker B was already directing his talk to another participant, but suddenly he transferred the same question to speaker C instead, and became more interested in getting his FB, and to open a new topic with him instead of continuing with speaker A. It is important to point out here that when speaker B transferred his question to C, this had less to do with involving a new participant than with the fact that he intended deliberately to attract speaker C’s attention.

To expand the discussion a little more, it could be said that nowadays the individual in the Arab world sits between three great systems: religion, culture and politics. Usually those who occupy high positions and/or earn high incomes are the most important people in society, due to the fact that the rich have influence in both political and economic matters. These are the most important factors in which people are usually interested.

Some of the comments regarding the various social classes include, for example, that boasting was common among those who have high incomes when the context required it, for instance, when talking about money or status.

Another example of the differences in social class can be seen with speaker D in the sixth conversation. Sometimes he tried to change the register of his conversation, including his FB actions, into more classical Arabic. One motivation for his style of conversation could be that he would like to show that he has some knowledge and background of CA (Classical Arabic), so he changed the register of his conversation to [al fuʃhaa], the ‘classical’ level. This point deserves a little explanation. Among Arabs, switching registers from classical to modern standard Arabic, or from modern standard Arabic into dialect is, to some extent acceptable, and would be considered (especially during ‘controversial discussion’) as another way of showing superiority over the others. However, this point must not be exaggerated. The Arabs appreciate their [alfuʃhaa] language, but when they speak in a certain register, they prefer to remain with it. Therefore, we need to stress here that the FB data did not include the sort of behaviour in which there is a change from one register of language to another.

The final example regarding social-class differences concerns speaker F in the sixth conversation. When he was asked several questions related to his work, he
demonstrated his experience and knowledge – that he knows more than the others – by using FB actions in certain forms to show this advantage, even though he wasn’t among those who earned the highest income. The FB he used is [ah ilbidʒuw ya siidii il țiазiiز...] (‘Yes Pijuwt (Peugeot) my dear fellow…’). Actually, such examples would appear to non-Arabic speakers as normal responses. However, since this person was known to the researcher, it could be concluded that the former responds in a particular style, as exemplified above. In addition, context is a very important factor that can assist such an analysis. Regarding the above example, it appears that speaker F tried to show his superiority through using some expressions used mainly by high-class people, even though he used such a humble expression as [ya siidii] (‘my boss’). Also it is necessary to point out that there is still little difference, in many respects, between those of MI (middle income) and those of HI (high income) in the form of word choice and sometimes in FB expressions as well. In general, these sorts of differences are found mainly on an individual basis. Regarding the above example [ya siidii], one example is obviously not enough to prove this point; however, this is what has been found in the data so far, and it is fairly certain that such examples are common in spoken (Palestinian) Arabic.

III) Gender Differences and Feedback (tables)

Some examples from the data may be listed, and my own observations, in order to show some gender differences in applying FB.

Table 5.14: Gender and FB, Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male FB</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Female FB</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[muw ʂahiib]</td>
<td>‘not right’</td>
<td>[ya  configparserii]</td>
<td>‘oh disaster!’ / ‘oh misfortune’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[bikull takiid]</td>
<td>‘in all certainty’</td>
<td>[ya waradii]</td>
<td>‘oh goodness!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[maʃluwm]</td>
<td>‘known’</td>
<td>[ʃan ʂahiːh ?] (long eliciting forms)</td>
<td>‘truly?’ / ‘right’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃan dʒadd aah?]</td>
<td>‘truly yes?’</td>
<td>[sʃaam]</td>
<td>‘damn’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[niilay]</td>
<td>‘damn’, ‘shame’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the female FB expressions listed above represent negative or positive attitudes, such as surprise or shock. There are such FB expressions as appear in the above table, which contain special forms, or special phonemes e.g., ‘ayayay’ (‘oh oh oh’) or ‘la⁵⁰ la⁵⁰ la⁵⁰ la⁵⁰’ (‘no no no no’), and which are all used to express FB attitudes of surprise or negativity.

It has been observed that there are two important differences in FB between males and females. In the FB of females, long melody and intonation appear clearly, which is very seldom found in males’ FB. Also, there are certain FB expressions used more often by females than males, e.g., [ya waradii] ‘oh goodness!’; [ya χaybtii] ‘oh disaster!’ / oh misfortune’; [sxaam] ‘damn’, [niilay] damn’ / ‘shame’, which are shown in the above table. In the first conversation, speaker B gave several FB expressions of those demonstrated in the table.

It is worth explaining that in cases where a male may use some of these particular FB expressions, e.g., [ya χaybtii] ‘oh disaster!’ / oh misfortune’ which are usually used by females, he might expose himself to reproach from the other males because he used an expression that is used very often by females.  

From the above discussion it can be clearly seen how social variables are related to gender with regard to the different social groups of people as has been discussed earlier in the present section. The above examples of FB used by females show the connection between gender and some special expressions which are related to this particular gender, which means that Parkinson was right when he observed and demonstrated that several forms (see table 5.14 and its discussion above) are used by females and special forms are used by males.

Let us now present our tables and then give some comments concerning the conversations in question.

---

21 For more information regarding sex, social-classes, and age differences in addresses, see Parkinson (1985)
### Table 5.15: in Conversation 1 Gender Variation and Number of FB Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.16: in Conversation 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.17: in Conversation 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.18: in Conversation 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The present conversations included nine females and twenty-four males. With this number of participants, females (over two and a half hours) gave 818 FB actions divided by 9 = 90 FB actions per person, while (over four hours) males gave 1631 FB actions divided by 24 = 67 FB actions per person. From these results the following conclusion may be drawn: if there had been the same number of female participants as males, there might have been a somewhat higher number of FB actions from females.

In mixed conversation and when the atmosphere was quite normal/calm, a high number of FB actions was given by females, and sometimes they gave even more than males, as can be seen with speakers A and B in the first conversation. Meanwhile, when the atmosphere of the conversation was not calm, e.g. when both males and females did not know each other well, or there were still some cultural formalities between them, etc., then not many FB actions were given, particularly not by females.

Since gender differences are an important issue in these analyses, it is necessary to explain a part of Arab culture concerning this matter. Arab society is considered a conservative society. Individuals’ interactions during any conversation can vary, depending on several factors:
- When it consists purely of males
- When it consists purely of females
- When it is mixed

When the conversation includes both males and females, there are generally no barriers to effective interaction. If the conversation includes only males or only females, however, then men’s FB is shorter in both formal and informal conversation, but women’s FB includes longer phrases, such as, [ya waradii] ‘oh goodness!’, and [fan ṣahīḥ?] ‘truly?’ / ‘right’ (long eliciting forms). Therefore, the main discussion will be focused on the mixed conversation.

Another point in this regard is that even if the relation is close between the participants of both genders, some other characteristics like shyness, religion, habits, etc., come in to play and can increase or decrease the number of FB actions between the two genders in Arab society. Shyness, for instance, from the female side, plays a role in female participation, as can be seen in the first conversation with speakers F (female), who gave fewer FB actions than speaker C (male).

Another interesting observation regarding male-female conversation is that males delay their FB actions, while females do just the opposite. In addition, if the conversation includes both sexes, for some cultural reasons, as explained above, females give shorter more immediate FB actions than males do.

Some of these short responses are:

[data sample] (9)
Women:  [ah] ‘yes’, [la] ‘no’, [mm] ‘mm’

Women appear to dominate conversations and/or take a major role in cases where they are the eldest, e.g. speakers A and B in the first conversation. Likewise, if there is an intimate and close relationship between both sexes.
IV) Education Differences and Feedback (tables)

This part of the analysis turns to a different kind of sociolinguistic variation related to FB expressions. In the following analysis, the participants are classified into four main levels of education. These are:

- High level of education = university level and above
- Secondary level of education = high school diploma
- Primary level = elementary/supplementary school
- Unlearned level = illiterate

The question to be asked here is: Are there any real differences to be found in giving or eliciting FB that are related to the education level of participants? As can be observed in the data, the less educated people give more FB actions and use (sometimes) certain types of FB expressions differently from the more educated ones. This echoes Al-Wer’s conclusion, which states that education plays a role in showing some variants in this matter. Al-Wer’s conclusion says that it was found that the younger and more educated a speaker is the more she varies between the local and the non-local features (Al-Wer, 1991: 197).

Let us see the list of examples in the table below, which is based on the present data conversations.

Note: high education = university and above + high school diploma holders’ low education = elementary school/supplementary school + unlearned people. The examples below will show the comparison of FB expressions between these two levels of people.
Table 5.21: Level of Education and examples of FB Usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Education</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Low Education</th>
<th>Main Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ʕafwan] [maʃira^b]</td>
<td>‘sorry’</td>
<td>[ayʃ], [ay:h], [əh], [ha]</td>
<td>Enquire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[naʃam]</td>
<td>‘yes’</td>
<td>[maʃii]</td>
<td>positive FB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[aywa^b]</td>
<td>‘yes’</td>
<td>[ʔa:]</td>
<td>positive FB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[abadan]</td>
<td>‘never’</td>
<td>[bilmarra^b]</td>
<td>negative form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[la]</td>
<td>‘no’</td>
<td>[laʔa]</td>
<td>negative FB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dʒamiil]</td>
<td>‘nice’</td>
<td>[ikwayys] [hilw]</td>
<td>positive form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[mudhiba]</td>
<td>‘impressive’ or ‘wonderful’</td>
<td>[ʕayyb]</td>
<td>positive form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that FB occurs in various forms and is dependent on the educational level of the people who are using it.

The tables below show the educational differences between participants in conversations.

Con = conversation, S = speakers, High = high level, Secondary = secondary level, Primary = primary level, and Unlearned.

Table 5.22: in Conversation 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Unlearned</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.23: in Conversation 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Unlearned</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.24: in Conversation 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Unlearned</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.25: in Conversation 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Unlearned</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.26: in Conversation 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Unlearned</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.27: in Conversation 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Unlearned</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, a comparison may be made between people of different educational levels, as reflected in the conversations. The present data included seventeen highly educated persons, ten with secondary or high school level, six with primary level, but none who entirely lacked any education. Those with a high level of education gave 1187 FB actions divided by 17 = 69 FB actions per person, secondary attendants gave 719 FB actions divided by 10 = 71 FB actions per person, while people with only elementary school or primary level gave 543 FB actions divided by 6 = 90 FB actions per person. From these results the following conclusion may be drawn: if both secondary and primary levels had the same number of participants as high level, the same number of FB actions as for those with a high level of education might be expected.

It is necessary to point out that often ‘low educational FB’ examples, i.e. [ayʃ], [ayːh], [ʔah], [ʔa] (forms of enquiry), which are given in the list of examples at the very beginning of this analysis, are still considered as impolite FB expressions by the majority of highly educated people.

Of course this judgment is not based on any study that has classified those sorts of impolite or polite FB expressions. However, as a native speaker of Arabic I can discern whether these sorts of FB forms might offend, please, etc.

Another comment that needs to be made with regard to the discussion of the educational level of the speakers is that there appear to be certain responses of which a speaker should be aware when he/she talks to his/her teacher e.g., [naʃam] ‘yes’ [bittakeːid] ‘surely’, professor or father e.g., [ʔaadir] ‘yes/ok’, ‘it will be done’ [ʔamrak] ‘under your order’, for instance. This, however, is not to say that there must be specific FB expressions which have to be given for each person, i.e., the father or the teacher. Perhaps the same FB expression is given
for both the father and the teacher, but it depends upon the situation and with whom they are talking.

To extend the discussion of this point, education can be said to play a role in determining certain responses. In this discussion, the examples have not been based upon any individual or exceptional level; therefore, for example, FB expressions such as those which have been observed from speakers A and B in the first conversation, like [sχaam laṭ-haːa] (‘damn her’), [sχaam laṭṭuːb] (‘damn him’), [ay/j], [ayːːh] (‘enquire’), combined with high and long intonations, can be typical examples that reflect this group of people who have this level of education. Other examples like [abadan] (‘never’/‘ever’) produced with calm, low intonations, can be typical examples that reflect people with a high level of education.

As we have seen, the level of education is not only related to the type of FB given, but to its intonation, e.g. whether it is rising or low, as well as the context, which plays an important role in giving certain FB actions in a specific situation. In general, people with a low level of education gave a specific type of FB which very often consisted of: rising intonation, loud voice and several interrupting FB expressions, even before the other speaker had finished talking. This, however, might cause confusion, misunderstanding, or misinterpretation of the whole communication between the interlocutors. One almost can identify a set of users of a specific social group from the level of their intonation.

This does not mean that highly educated persons never use the same FB expressions as the poorly educated people do; sometimes they do, especially when speaking aggressively or when talking to a poorly educated person for better understanding, or even sometimes when teasing others. For example, in Arabic there is an old proverb that says: [χaʔiːib innaasa ðala qadri ðuquwliːhim] (‘talk to people according to their level of understanding’). When we talk, we have to modify our speech so as to give explicit and clear FB to the others. One wrong FB expression given to a poorly educated person could cause misunderstanding and vice-versa; therefore, the way in which we talk must be appropriate in order to achieve successful contact with each other.

Let us consider the following example where speaker A, who is less educated than B, did not understand what the FB expression means exactly, therefore, he needs more clarification in order to understand B’s FB.
V) Occupation Differences and Feedback (tables)

FB usage can be determined by social group’s occupation. People usually spend many hours in their jobs negotiating, interacting, etc. on different matters, with different people, and using literary or technical terms, machines, etc. All these daily activities have an effect on their contact with others, even from outside their field of work. For example, salesmen who are meeting people all the time use many more different kinds of FB expressions, in form and number, than those who are working, for instance, in a factory with machines. The salesmen use a lot of polite (selected) FB expressions when they talk to people, e.g., [bikulli suruwr] (‘with pleasure’), [inta tu’murni] (‘you just ask for’), [haa’dir] (‘yes/ok ‘it will be done’), while the type of FB used by a factory worker will be different, e.g., [maafii] (‘ok’), [maafii muʃkila] (‘there is no problem’), [xalaas] (‘enough’), and the frequency of FB will be less.

Since it is impossible to capture all FB expressions related to occupations, let us demonstrate selected examples from the present data to show, where possible, the influence of occupations on people’s interaction and in relation to FB.

Table 5.28: Occupation and FB, Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employed People</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Unemployed People</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Main Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[dʒayyid]</td>
<td>‘good’</td>
<td>[aːh]</td>
<td>‘yes’</td>
<td>Pos FB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ṭabiʃii]</td>
<td>‘naturally’</td>
<td>[maʃliʃ]</td>
<td>‘no bother’</td>
<td>Pos form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[bikull tʔakiid]</td>
<td>‘by all means’</td>
<td>[muw (miiʃ) šaḥiḥ]</td>
<td>‘not right’</td>
<td>Pos phrase Neg phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[maʃluum]</td>
<td>‘known’</td>
<td>[aːh]</td>
<td>‘what?’</td>
<td>Pos form Neg perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[muradʒdʒah],</td>
<td>‘preferable’</td>
<td>[mazbuwtʃ]</td>
<td>‘exactly’ / ‘ri</td>
<td>Pos FB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[muʃadʒal]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[aːh]</td>
<td>‘ah? ’</td>
<td>[ṭayyib]</td>
<td>‘ok’</td>
<td>Pos FB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows that several FB occur in different forms that are related and dependent on the occupational differences when people use them. The following tables illustrate the occupational differences among participants in conversations.

Table 5.29: in Conversation 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Variation and Number of FB Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Housewife</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.30: in Conversation 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Housewife</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.31: in Conversation 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Housewife</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.32: in Conversation 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Housewife</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.33: in Conversation 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Housewife</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.34: in Conversation 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Housewife</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have seen from speakers B, C and D in the sixth conversation, for example, that each of them gave many FB expressions related to both background and occupations, such as when speaker C used the FB expression [marhaba] ‘hi’. This expression has a lot of meanings, all related to given situations, e.g. ‘yes’ when someone has called you, ‘good bye’ when someone is leaving, ‘yes’ when you agree with someone, ‘yes’ permission to a speaker to continue his talk, etc. The expression [marhaba] is a typical Arabic FB form used, very often, by those who work in selling goods.

Another comment concerns the sixth conversation, and more precisely speaker H. This speaker gave the fewest FB actions; however, he used certain FB expressions, e.g. [laʔiimay] ‘bad’ and [laʔiimay dżiddan] ‘very bad’, which are used by someone who faces difficulty in carrying on in a certain situation or in continuing on working on particular things. This speaker works as a mechanical engineer, and this is what motivates his use of this FB expression a few times during the conversation, which is related to cars, large engines, machines, etc.

The present data included twenty three employed persons, five unemployed, and five housewives. The present data included twenty-three employed persons, five unemployed, and five housewives. Those employed people gave 1698 FB actions divided by 23= 73 FB actions per person; unemployed gave 112 FB actions divided by 5= 22 FB actions per person, while housewives gave 639 FB actions divided by 5= 127 FB actions per person.

VI) Differences of Occasion/Context and Feedback (tables)

In the sociolinguistic analyses, it is important to take into account that these conversations were recorded on different occasions. It should be emphasised
that in Saudi Arabia (where the conversations were recorded) there are only two main public holidays:

Examples (11)

[\text{iidi-i\text{"}fit\text{"}}] ‘the Ramadan feast’, which comes immediately after Ramadan and lasts for three days only.

[\text{iidi-lla?\text{"}h\text{"}a}] ‘the feast of sacrifice’, which comes at the end of [\text{al} \text{haji}] when pilgrims visit the holy places in Mecca and Medina at a specific time once a year.

In addition to the above two main holidays, there are some other less significant occasions when the Arabs as a people, relatives, friends, etc., can gather and exchange greetings. These less significant occasions are not observed by the majority of Arabs in Saudi Arabia. Some of these occasions are: birthdays, wedding parties, wishing someone well for the future, expressing gratitude, etc. All these occasions have their own (FB) expressions, such as specific greetings and responses.

Let us now describe the occasion for each of the data conversations.

a. First conversation = normal meeting at which several people gathered, both guests and hosts, who had not met for some time.
b. Second conversation = related mainly to the ‘Ramadan feast’ occasion. In addition, some of those visitors i.e., B, F and E came to greet and meet several persons at the same time.
c. Third conversation = an official meeting; however, it took place during Ramadan as well.
d. Fourth conversation = social meeting between close friends.
e. Fifth conversation = social meeting between close friends.
f. Sixth conversation = two purposes for this meeting: ‘the breakfast feast of Ramadan’, and to meet one of the participants, speaker B, before his departure.

As has been mentioned previously, there are usually several (special) FB expressions that would be given on these occasions, and I have observed this in the data conversations as well. Some of these examples are as follows:

Note, the Ramadan feast and the feast of sacrifice have almost the same greetings and responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occasions and Examples</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Felicitations: e.g. feasts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Ramadan feast:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A: [mini-l'aaydiin] ‘happy feast’</td>
<td>B: [‘alayna uw’alaykum] ‘for all of us’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A: [ramađaan kariim] ‘happy Ramadan’</td>
<td>B: [yin’aad ‘alayna uw’alaykum] ‘for all of us’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Feast of sacrifice:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: [kull ‘aam wintubb χayr] ‘may you be well every year’</td>
<td>B: [wintubb χayr] ‘you too’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: [alf mabruwk] ‘thousand congratulations’</td>
<td>B: [allaa ibaari fiik (Yuqbaalak)] ‘God bless you (you too)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Marriage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: [wintuwb bissirha wiSalama] ‘you too with safety and peace’</td>
<td>B: [allaa ibaari fiik] ‘God bless you’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Graduation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: [allaa ibaari fiik] ‘God bless you’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benevolence:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Birthdays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: [Yuqbal miyt sana] ‘happy birthday’ (means: may you live for a hundred years)</td>
<td>B: [Yuqran] ‘thanks’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Returning after a long trip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: [ilhamdilla ‘assalaama] ‘thank God for safety’</td>
<td>B: [allaa ysalma] ‘God bless you’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: [nawwarti-lbalad] ‘you have lit up the city’</td>
<td>B: [biwd3wudak] ‘by your presence’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Leaving for a long trip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: [tariiq iSalama] ‘safe road’</td>
<td>B: [allaa ysalma] ‘God bless you’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociality: e.g. normal greetings</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: [assalamu ‘alaykum] ‘peace upon you’</td>
<td>B: [wa’alaykum issalam] ‘peace upon you too’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: [marhaba] ‘hello’</td>
<td>B: [marhabtd3n (ahlan wasahlan)] ‘hello to you’ (lit. two welcomes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Arabic is full of such expressions for different occasions. Some of them are influenced by religious expressions and some are influenced by social conventions. The following tables, in our data, demonstrate the type of occasion and then number of FB actions.

Codes are as follows: Con = conversation, S = speakers, NM = normal meeting, SO = special occasion, and OM = official meeting

Table 5.36: in Conversation 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>NM</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>OM</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.37: in Conversation 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>NM</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>OM</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.38: in Conversation 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>NM</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>OM</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.39: in Conversation 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>NM</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>OM</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.40: in Conversation 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>NM</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>OM</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.41: in Conversation 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>NM</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>OM</th>
<th>FB Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding normal meetings, it was observed that no special FB expressions were given on such occasions. But as soon as a conversation meets an occasion, several FB expressions would occur.

To conclude the above tables, the present data included thirteen persons in the normal meeting, fifteen persons on different (social) occasions, and five in an office meeting. Those who belong to the normal meeting gave 1035 FB actions divided by 13 = 79 FB actions per person; those who participated in social or special occasions gave 1017 FB actions divided by 15 = 67 FB actions per person, while those who took part in an office meeting gave 397 FB actions divided by 5 = 79 FB actions per person.
A good example of this is the third conversation, which comprises a formal meeting that took place in Ramadan. Speaker B (the boss of this establishment) opened the meeting by greeting his staff and invoking this coming occasion. Two responses came from speakers A and C, with overlap, and this is shown clearly as follows:

[data sample] (12)
B : [aa // bismilla irrahmaan irrahiim waʃʃalaatu wassalaam ṣalaa <nabiynnnaa adʒmaʃʃiin> // kull ṣaam wa ʃantum biʃʃayr [/ <yaʃʃni hay ittawaqquʃʃaat>] /// ṣanay bahibb ilqaʃʃda itkuwn mirtaaha akθar min kido /// yaa ʃiinii ʃalimsadʒdʒil // yaa ʃiinii // <ʃalimsadʒdʒil> ʃayiib] ‘aa// in the name of God the most Gracious most Merciful and peace and prayers upon our prophet // I wish you all a happy feast and healthy year / that meets all expectations // I would like our meeting to be more comfortable than this /// oh my dear the recorder // my dear // the recorder ok’
@ <high pitch>
@ <mood: cough>
C : [<ah winta-bʃʃayr>] ‘yes and you too’

It is necessary to point out that the question from speaker A, at the beginning of speaker B’s talk, is based on either a negative perception or on the fact that he did not notice what B said at the very beginning of his speech. What needs to be shown in this example, are the special form/s used for responding on special occasion/s.

5.2.1 Conclusion

First of all, it should be clear to the reader that in correlation to FB phenomena, I do not claim that the above six variables (age, social class, gender, levels of education, occupation, and occasion) cover all sociolinguistic variables in Arabic. However, as can be seen, these six variables are important and worth stressing. Sociolinguistic variables play an interesting and essential role in determining individual responses. Of course, there are always exceptions, such as when an old person may use FB expressions normally used by young people; for instance, when an old man says [ardʒw-lmajdiira b laakin..] ‘excuse me but…’ instead of saying [la laakin..] ‘no but…’, etc. to denote to his rejection. But in spite of this, in the FB and sociolinguistic variations in the data, there were slight, moderate, and substantial effects corresponding to these variations:
I) **Slight effects**

There were not many effects on FB expressions due to *age* and *social class*. This was probably due to the following reasons:

- Regarding *age*, they (especially the old participants) inherit a lot of their ancestors’ styles of FB expressions, and it is very rare that one sees any changes in these styles.
- Regarding *social class*: since all participants come from the middle class, there have not been many effects of this variable on their FB expressions. It is necessary to point out that if the data included some participants from, for instance, the royal family, there might be special forms of FB expression as well.

II) **Moderate effects**

There appear to have been moderate effects on FB expressions due to *gender*. Gender difference has more of an impact on FB than age and social class. This variation was mainly observed in female participants who used special FB expressions. In Arab culture, when a male uses the type of FB expressions normally used by females, he will be reproached and teased by the other individuals, as mentioned before. This can be observed clearly in a conservative society, e.g., Saudi Arabia.

Similar examples can be found in Parkinson’s book (1985: 187-191) where he has described his four pragmatic functions as [muṣaksāḥ], which is usually glossed as ‘teasing’, or ‘harassing’, but, according to Parkinson, these are somewhat inadequate. He continues to argue that the term refers to a highly developed, and much enjoyed, speech act in which speakers are more or less proficient. It is normally engaged in by young men, although young women also participate occasionally (ibid: 189). Parkinson listed some examples of how, for instance, women use male terms when teasing other women e.g., [ya baaja], [bee], [afandi] ‘sir’ (all of which are apparently of Turkish origin), or a term of address that implies beauty, as in [ya jmiil] ‘hey beautiful’. Also it seems that men address women by using male terms in cases of ‘flattery’ e.g., using a term like [baṣmuḥandis] ‘engineer’ to someone who ‘really’ does not deserve it (ibid: 188).
III) Substantial effects

Substantial effects on FB actions have been seen in connection with the following three sociolinguistic variables: level of education, occupation, and type of occasion. Each one of these three social variables was observed among the participants and during conversations. The following variables appear to have been the most flexible ones:

- The revolution in education, e.g., computer science, new education programs, etc., has influenced daily language use and communication.
- *The type of occupation* affected the informants in direct and indirect ways to make them form certain responses that show the relation between response and their occupation.
- Plain special occasions of Arab society, and mainly those which are not based on religious matters, e.g. mother’s day, birthday, etc., exerted the greatest impact on FB.

It is worth pointing out that even though a lot of specific FB expressions occur in connection with these variations, there is always a sort of social balance which controls and directs those effects. In other words, even if a number of FB effects are related to these sociolinguistic variations, these changes must be controlled by certain (central) measures, such as mutual respect and humility toward others.

Parkinson’s study and analysis focuses upon ‘three’ essential social variables: gender, social class and age. For instance, when he discusses the ‘terms of respect’ in Egyptian Arabic, he bases his discussion and analyses on gender, social class and age simultaneously. The same applies to the rest of his selected items, i.e., names and labels, family terms, friendly and joking terms, and terms of abuse.

Al-Wer’s study (1991) focused on both age and education for 116 women, her analysis of the data, showed that generally the younger and educated women, who have more contacts with outside communities, accommodate to the non-local variants considerably more often than the older and less educated women who are more liable to local social network pressure.

Another point related to the social variations, and with regard to all their examples, because it is not more than a question of social grouping is that while this was the situation in all of the present data, it might not hold for other data
samples. In the next section, and with regard to the communicative acts, personal markers will be discussed in connection with FB actions.

5.3 Personal (Discourse) Markers

There is a relation between FB and discourse markers. This relation can be shown in different forms, e.g., to request additional information for clarification. These sort of forms fall under eliciting FB. The use of many discourse markers might carry important FB actions, some positive, some negative, and some might be in between.

Regarding personal discourse markers in human communication, Schiffrin’s book (1987) should be acknowledged as one of the main references in this matter. The concept of ‘discourse markers’, as Schiffrin named them, concerns two main things: how people use language, and what they use language for. As Schiffrin says, intonation plays a very central role in discourse markers (Schiffrin 1987: ix). Rising and falling with long or short, average intonations indicate different meanings. For example, when someone says [the/n] with a rising intonation during his/her talk, we, as listener/s, expect that he/she is going to say surprising things, or mention some unexpected news/event, etc. The intonation modifies important, and sometimes, the central meaning of specific personal markers.

In Arabic, for instance, a person can give several personal markers that would be distributed or placed at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of his talk. Here are some examples:

[u?h] oh, [waa] and, [li?annu] because, [tayyib] well, [?aw] or, [ba?dayn] so, [jayf illi baqṣudub] you see what I mean, [jaayif] you know, [baqṣud] I mean, [jaayif] you see, [ya ?azizii] oh dear, [il?aan] [halla?] now, [laakin] [bass] but, [ba?dayn] then, etc. Important motivations can lie behind increasing and/or decreasing the quantity of these markers. For example, some of politicians use these markers quite often during their interviews, speeches, etc., simply to avoid telling people the truth. For example, words like [fi-lhaqiqa?b], [fi-lwaaqi?i], ‘in fact’, ‘indeed’ etc. are used frequently by a number of politicians while in fact what they intend to say is far from that which they are talking about. On the other hand, directors of companies, etc. avoid using these markers as much as possible during their formal meetings with their staff, in order to avoid wasting time. Of course, it
cannot be denied that the use of these markers varies among individuals as well; some may use them very often, and others may use them very seldom.

One recent work that is related to discourse markers is written by Al-Khalil (2005), the aim of his thesis being to investigate whether the placement of these markers in the turns is consequential for the types of activities being executed in the turn, or at least part of the turns where they occur and how the activities they mark correspond to develop the activities carried out in the turns preceding and following the turn they appear in. Al-Khalil’s study broadens the world’s view of Arabic sociolinguistics research which is related to most of the existing studies that have concentrated on gender, syntax, phonology, phonetics, dialectology, and standard/non-standard forms of Arabic. Furthermore, his study of Syrian discourse markers contributes to the research on Syrian Arabic. The writer mentioned only two studies where discourse markers in Arabic are discussed, i.e., Kinberg and Abu Khadra (1987), and Ghobrial (1993). This, however, is explained by fact that such expressions occur in colloquial Syrian Arabic only – a form of Arabic which not many researchers work on (Al-Khalil, 2005:15).

Al-Khalil aimed in his study to investigate instantiations of: [halla?] ‘now’, [yašni] ‘it means’, [ţayyīb] ‘well’, and [lakaan] ‘so’ respectively. He maintained that these words belong to a group of expressions that occur frequently in speech and do not apparently affect the propositional content of the utterances in which they appear (Al-Khalil, 2005: 9). The writer gave an explicit description regarding these four markers, i.e., their positions in the utterance (e.g., single, initial, medial, and final in position), what different meanings they carry, etc., all to show how flexible and important it is for those particular markers in Syrian Arabic to be seen.

In the present data, the participants gave a number of personal markers. Some examples will be selected and discussed as well. Three points will be discussed under the present section: several definitions of discourse analysis according to several writers, a definition of discourse/personal markers according to Schiffrin, and my main comments regarding these markers supported with examples.
I) Definitions of Discourse Analysis

‘Discourse analysis’ is a vast and complex field, and since the wide range of this thesis deals with this field of linguistics, we may start our discussion by illustrating several definitions of discourse analysis. Two of these definitions have been suggested by Schiffrin (1987):


According to Brown and Yule, ‘the analysis of discourse is necessarily the analysis of language in use. As such, it cannot be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purposes or functions which these forms are designed to serve in human affairs’ (Brown and Yule 1983: 1).

**Definition (2): Stubbs (1983a: 1)**

Stubbs suggested the following definition: ‘discourse analysis consists of attempts to study the organisation of language above the sentence or above the clause, and therefore to study larger linguistic units, such as conversation exchanges or written texts. It follows that discourse analysis is also concerned with language in use in social context, and in particular with interaction or dialogue between speakers’ (Stubbs 1983: 1).

To make a small comparison between the above two definitions, Stubbs focused on a particular unit of analysis as outlined above, which led him towards a similar pragmatic emphasis on ‘language in use’. In contrast, Brown and Yule focused on a particular perspective of language, i.e., its functional and structural sides, which, according to Schiffrin are tied to a focus on parole (versus language). Looking at these two definitions it can be seen that the authors observed a definitional problem.

We should add also that Brown and Yule (1983: viii) observed that the term ‘discourse analysis’, ‘has come to be used with a wide range of meanings which cover a wide range of activities. It is used to describe activities at the intersection of disciplines as diverse as sociolinguistics, psycho-linguistics, philosophical linguistics, and computational linguistics’. (Stubbs 1983: 12) added that, ‘no one is in a position to write a comprehensive account of discourse analysis. The subject is at once too vast, and too lacking in focus and consensus … Anything at all that is written on discourse analysis is partial and controversial’.
Other (Short) Definitions by Other Writers

The term ‘discourse analysis’ was also discussed by several other writers in connection with major subfields of linguistics, for example:

- One major subfield of linguistics is *pragmatics*, for which Leech (1983: 10) has suggested the following definition: ‘the study of the general conditions of the communicative use of language’.
- Levinson (1983), in his sixth chapter, included an independent section under the name of *conversation analysis and linguistics*, which is related to, or the same as, discourse analysis.
- Several writers have edited collections in *sociolinguistics* which include articles that could fit comfortably into the category of discourse analysis, such as Sherzer (1983), Giglioli (1972) (see also Schiffrin (1987: 1-3).

Schiffrin argued that speaker and hearer jointly integrate discourse structure, meaning, and action in their efforts to find coherence. What Schiffrin meant is that both interlocutors distribute their efforts during their communication with each other which include: the systematic analysis of their talk, the meaning, and their action part; all are essential factors in leading to a coherent, clear, and successful result in their discourse.

To end this discussion the following definition of discourse analysis may be suggested:

*the study that concerns the analysis of any mutual interaction (e.g., between humans, a human and an animal/machine, an animal and a machine, etc.) and discourse form, meaning, and situation together, as well as covering all human communicative use of language to either groups of people or individuals.*

This definition does not cover all the areas of discourse analysis. What is meant by ‘any mutual interaction’ is all kinds of interactions between mankind and animate creatures, or even machines like computers, etc. That means I suggest a broad function for the field of discourse analysis to cover more than human communication.

Regarding the relation between discourse analysis and FB, as has been explained above, FB is not only an action to be given but is an essential action in human language communication which is signalled in different ways, e.g., verbally, non-verbally, or a combination of the two. Discourse analysis describes all the
signals, e.g., verbal FB, non-verbal FB, or their combinations, as well as their relation to semantic (meaning) and pragmatic (situational) parts.

II) A Definition of Discourse/Personal Markers

Schiffrin (1987: 31) defines markers as ‘sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk’.

Two important features of the items listed above as markers need to be noted:

a) They often precede units of talk, e.g., a sentence, which have the features of tone units
b) They can also occur within such items, which means that they are integrated through the units of talk e.g., in the middle of sentence, etc.

Let us consider the following example, from Schiffrin’s book, where both ‘you know’ and ‘but’ occur as a preface to a tone unit:

(13)
\textit{you know} I’m probably wrong, \textbf{but} I’m – \textit{you know} that’s what I’m that’s my opinion.

With regard to markers, Schiffrin discussed all the elements she included in her definition: brackets, units of talk, and sequential dependence (Schiffrin 1983: 31-48). To make the picture clearer, we should give a summary, supported by examples from our data, for each element that Schiffrin discussed.

A) Brackets

Brackets work at different social organisational levels (see also Goffman 1974: 251-69, Goffman 1963, 1971, Schegloff 1972, and Schiffrin 1977) and at different levels of the organisation of talk. For example, \textit{meta-linguistics} can mark a discourse unit as long as a \textit{conversation} or as short as a \textit{word}; they can mark units embedded within larger units e.g., reasons within explanations, answers within pairs of questions and answers, etc. (Schiffrin 1987: 36).

The following example from the first conversation from the data shows speaker B, who was telling a story, asking questions, giving answers to herself and explaining some reasons and motivations through her talk, as well as the
importance of FB expressions when they are given near the end of a story to give support and more motivation to the story:

[data sample] (14)

A : [uw binnisbi lil balaaay maa kuntif mibiyi ?illaa laylit ?ilfurus wii ?imluw <dawf/ //>

wii [ayf bidnaa ni?mal wi ayf bidnaa insawwii] wii yuqisuf ?umurhah a uw maa yuqisuf

?umurhah qaamat sittii im ?abuwya naadat-haa qaalatil-haa yay?ti ?uw fii hal binit qaalatil-haa

<maalhaa maalhaa // maalhaa ifii> ah ah ?illa… .]

‘and I wasn’t grown up enough to be married yet until the wedding night, then they made a lot of noise and disturbances, and what we are going to do and what we are going to make, etc. and God curse her… then my grandfather stood up and called the person who made this noise and told her what’s up with our daughter, what’s up what’s up is there anything yes yes then… .’

As can be seen throughout the explanation by participant A, she started telling her story, and through her talk several ‘brackets’ occurred, like giving reasons within her explanation, giving questions and answers, all at the same time. We have observed also several markers involved in this explanation, which appear in bold. These are: [uw] [wii] [wi] = ‘and’, [ah] [ah] = ‘yes’

These kinds of markers, which occur as brackets, often occur within a long sentence as part of storytelling, for example. Very often a speaker has to end his/her talk by giving certain self FB expressions in order to support and stress his/her opinion.

B) Units of talk

These come as a sentence, proposition, speech act, etc. There have been many efforts to define units of language more precisely, as well as units of speech. According to Schiffrin, units are defined by their structural relations with other units, their cohesive relations, or their interactional relations. She observes that a precise definition of markers in relation to the units of talk is not possible. Since there are many units of talk which influence the use of markers, basing a definition on a more precise unit would place a tremendous limit on an analysis by restricting attention to just that unit. Therefore, rather than defining markers in relation to units of talk, Schiffrin suggested ‘that we should try to independently characterise some part of talk as a unit, and then see how (if) the boundaries of these units are marked’ (p. 31-36):

The following data examples support these claims:
In the first conversation, Speaker C gave this marker to start explaining a certain point. This is a case of a syntactic unit.

In the sixth conversation Speaker B made a request followed by a reason. We will try to apply this example with Schiffrin’s proposition.

C) Sequential dependence

According to Schiffrin, sequential dependence represents the main element of markers which, ‘is to indicate that markers are devices that work on a discourse level, they are not dependent on the smaller units of talk of which discourse is composed” (Schiffrin 1983: 37).

Schiffrin provided several examples to show that many ways are available to express this element, e.g., particles, adverbs and connectors like ‘well’, ‘now’, ‘right’, etc.

The following example from the data will show one form of this element:

Now, let us show some links between these personal markers and FB by compiling a list of these markers in Arabic, and their most common meanings which can be gleaned from the contextual coordinates of talk. The discussion of the following list will be based on observations made from the data conversations.

There is a link between linguistic FB and these discourse markers; however, this link is varied in strength, i.e.,
- sometimes it comes as a high level of response, e.g., [ikwayys] ‘well’ (I’m fine),
- sometimes it comes as a low level of response, e.g., [willa] ‘or’ (signal to the speaker to continue his talk)
  sometimes it has to be combined with one of the main FB expressions, e.g.,
  [ṭab laʔ] ‘oh no’ (= rejection FB).

Intonation, or tones, play a central role in the use of these markers to show their real functions, e.g., [aː/run] ‘oh’ (= clarification request), [wolla/h] ‘swear to God’ (= confirmation request), etc. All these elements should be kept in mind while discussing these markers in (any) human language communication.

Other Definition by Other Writer

A discourse marker was also defined by Al-Khalil (2005) as follows, “the term discourse marker has come to be applied to a group of lexical items or phrases, e.g., I mean, y’know, oh, and well, which are conspicuous by their presence in specifically spoken language” (Al-Khalil, 2005: 9).

According to Al-Khalil there have been several terminologies that a number of writers have used for the term ‘discourse markers’. For instance, some used the term ‘particles’, ‘discourse markers’, ‘lexical markers’, ‘connectives or softening connectives’, ‘discourse connectives’, ‘pragmatic markers’, ‘mannerisms of speech’, ‘filler words’, and ‘automatisms’. Al-Khalil observed that no consensus seems to have emerged regarding fundamental issues of terminology and classification, despite the quantity of research in this field (Al-Khalil, 2005: 10).

As can be seen, discourse markers have been investigated within a number of frameworks reflecting different research interests, methods, and goals. Al-Khalil’s current study, which focused on the four Syrian markers, is rooted in the assumption that utterances in conversation follow one another in a way that displays that participants have attended to a previous utterance or sequence of utterances. Speakers in this respect structure and place their utterances in such a way as to show co-participants that they have understood prior utterances and have paid attention to the construction and placement of their current utterances (Al-Khalil, 2005: 11).
III) Main Comments and Examples of These Markers

Below will be illustrated the list of examples, which will be divided into eight different categories. One marker may be seen in more than one category, which means it is used to express different functions at the same time. The following examples do not necessarily reflect and cover all personal markers found in Arabic:

(18) 
[ṭab] ‘oh’, [uw:] ‘oh’, and [baṣdāyn] [hayk] ‘then’ (request for, e.g., additional information, more clarification, etc.)

(19) 
[wa] [wi] [ʔuw] ‘and’, [laakin] [ṭab] [bass] ‘but’, and [yaʔni] [liʔaalik] ‘so’ (all can be used to take the floor from the other speaker)

(20) 
1. [hallaʔ] [ilʔa:n] [halqay:t] [hassa] [issa] [halwaqit] and [dalhiin] ‘now’ (to denote a sort of comparison)

(21) 

(22) 
2. [yaʔni] [liʔaalik] ‘so’, [liʔanuw] [ilaʔaan] ‘because’, and [baṣdāyn] [hayk] ‘then’ [some kind of relationship between motivations and interferences]

(23) 
[ikwayyis] [ṭayyib] [dẓayyid] [imniih] ‘well’, [laakin] [ṭab] [bass] ‘but’, and [ibtiʔraf] [inta ðaairif] [ʔaarif] ‘you know’ (all can be used as question/answer structures for this analysis)

(24) 
[fil haqiiqa:] ‘in fact’, [fil waaqi:] ‘in reality’, [minil mulaahaḍ] ‘it can be observed’, [minil muʔakkad] ‘with certainty’, [minil mutawaqqa:] ‘it’s expected’ (prepositional appendices used very often upon initiation of talk)
Let us consider the different meanings of each of the following four markers on which Al-Khalil (2005) built his analyses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Expression</th>
<th>Al-Khalil’s Interpretations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[hallaʔ] ‘now’=</td>
<td>marking topic change, marking topic shift, marking accounts, marking support, and in reported speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[yaʕni] ‘it means’=</td>
<td>explanation of intentions, expansion of ideas, mitigation, summing up, check on understanding, and assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tayyib] ‘well’=</td>
<td>occupying a whole turn, requesting an account/explanation, marking focus, marking requests, request for action, request for explanation/account, and as in reported speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[lakaan] ‘so’ roughly=</td>
<td>challenge/repair initiation, marking conclusion, accounts for actions, fishing for an alternative, marking disagreement, marking support, local and global scope of ‘lakaan’, marking challenge, marking conclusions, and ‘lakaan’ in the meaning of ‘of course’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above analyses and descriptions of these four markers, the writer provided very rich information and data to the reader/s, and showed him/her the amount of flexibility of using each one of these markers in spoken language. In addition, the above meanings interfere in FB actions because we have seen many interpretations fall under FB and its different operations, e.g., [yaʕni] ‘it means’= explanation of intention; this, however, is similar to the FB expression [aʔ] ‘yes’ (with falling intonation), which means something like ‘not exactly’, ‘not sure’, or even ‘not interested’, showing an important part of explaining the intention for the listener.

It has been noted from the above list of examples that several Arabic markers can be used to denote one (sometimes more) English marker. The integrational
effect of several Arabic dialects helps to produce many discourse markers which sometimes denote the same meaning; however, these come in different forms, and sometimes the same markers can also be used in different situations and have different meanings.

Since the present study is a continuation of my previous research, in the next section a comparison will be made between the previous and present studies. The intention of this comparison is to show the additional points that were added and discussed in the present study, as well as the results reached in both studies.
Chapter 6

Conclusions and Suggestions for Further Study

My hope, first of all, is that this thesis contributes to the understanding of how FB phenomena and their operations are used in spoken Palestinian Arabic. In this chapter, a summary and conclusion will be made of the main findings. In addition, a review will be made of the questions previously raised and of what emerges as a main result of this work, and which, hopefully, could help open a fruitful area of research.

6.1 Theoretical Contributions of the Study and its Theoretical Implications

The core of this contribution is centred mainly on chapter 1 sections 1.2 and 1.3, chapter 4, section 4.1 and chapter 5, sections 5.2 and 5.3.

In chapter 1, section 1.2 some of the main motivations for choosing this linguistic phenomenon in spoken Palestinian Arabic have been illustrated. It appears that to give FB to another speaker is not as easy as it sounds, even if this other comes from the same culture and background. This is what I have tried to describe and explain through the present study.

Moving to chapter 2, section 2.3, and chapter 4, section 4.1, the theories that were discussed mainly by Allwood (1976, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, and 93); and others like Nivre (1991) and Nivre et.al. (1999), Levinson (1983), Schiffrin (1994), etc., have been tested in order to see how far these theories have succeeded in accounting for my own data. Below is a clarification the contributions of this thesis, and a justification of the reasons and the theories resorted to as far as possible.

Theoretical Implications

i) With reference to chapter 1 section 1.2, I would like to repeat the following objectives, which are:

a) To add new linguistic data/information
b) To try to confirm the results obtained in the previous thesis

c) To contribute new knowledge about spoken Palestinian Arabic and to give special attention to the aspect of communicative function.

d) To remove, as far as possible, misunderstanding, etc., between people from the Arab world and other cultures.

e) To improve understanding between interlocutors.

Points a, b, c, d and e, then, are the main items on which discussions might be focused, and the headings below will correspond to them, in that order.

a) Linguistic information

One of the main aims behind any researcher’s work is of course to add new data to his/her specific field of study. The effort is all the more rewarding if no one has preceded him/her in writing about his/her topic. This was one of the aims of the study.

b) Confirming and supporting our results

In chapter 1, section 1.3 and subsection 1.3.1, this study was compared with, and confirmed the previous one. Since the main topic remains FB, there has been an opportunity to make this comparison, which has shown that this linguistic phenomenon is essential for effective human face-to-face interaction. The criteria selected to describe the data were as follows:

- Some deal with numerals, e.g., sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4
- Some deal with communicative functions, e.g., subsections 2.3.4 and 2.3.5.

Through this comparison and confirmation, the empirical base of this phenomenon was expanded and shown concretely through, for instance, the increase in the number of FB actions when new types of FB actions were added to the analyses, i.e. the two main functions of FB (non-understanding and hesitation), Eliciting FB, Giving and Eliciting FB, and self FB.

c) Spoken (Palestinian) Arabic

Since no one has discussed FB in spoken Palestinian Arabic before, it is my aim to pioneer studies of this topic in language communication. Moreover, it needs to be to stressed once again that this thesis, in addition to being a description of FB as linguistic expressions (discussed in 1.1.1, 1.1.3, and 1.1.3.1) focuses also
on the analysis and description of FB as communicative functions. Hopefully in trying to achieve this goal I have provided some new knowledge and useful information about spoken Palestinian Arabic.

**d) Removing misunderstanding**

Since, according to Allwood (1979, 1988) and Allwood et al (1991) the basic communicative functions require the speaker to be willing and able to understand the message, then it may be imagined how necessary it is to discuss this item in order to remove, as much as possible, the ambiguity that may arise between speakers. Currently, understanding represents the most important area in this study and in the field of communication as a whole, because if this item is missing, incomplete, or has failed to be achieved, etc., then a number of misunderstandings between speakers must be expected to occur, and which will result in unsuccessful contact. Removing misunderstanding is a difficult task even between those who come from the same place and speak the same language. The rest of the basic communicative functions mentioned previously (see for instance subsection 2.3.5, and item i of 2.3.3) represent part of a solid basis to complete the circle of understanding between interlocutors when they communicate. To remind the reader, these other basic functions are: contact, perception, and the attitudinal reaction. In section 1.5 the importance of understanding in intercultural communication has been discussed. It is important to be aware of the three items suggested, i.e., input, background, and the meaning of connection (if a listener receives the message orally, he/she must give the answer orally, and so on. See section 1.5, example 8) in order to avoid serious misunderstanding between those who come from different cultures.

**e) Improve misunderstanding between interlocutors**

One extra factor may be added to the ones above:

**Success of communication/contact**

Wherever they may come from, people need to communicate. Item c has to do with culture. My description of FB could be a helpful tool for other cultures, nations, etc. to establish as fruitful a contact as possible with the Arab culture in question here. This is what this empirical study argues for.

ii) The questions raised in chapter 2, section 2.1, represent the core of this thesis. These are as follows:
• How did linguists develop and use notions of FB in early times?
  This question is discussed in section 2.2, subsection 2.2.1, with regard to the ideas of two linguists of Antiquity who made early observations that might be remotely related to FB phenomena.
• How do linguists define FB as a communication process?
  This question is discussed in section 2.3, subsection 2.3.2, where theories of several writers are discussed.
• How do linguists define linguistic FB?
  The answer to this question is discussed in subsection 2.3.3, where four definitions are presented: ‘a definition of linguistic FB’, ‘definitions of FB unit’ and ‘definitions of single word FB’.

2. The fourth, fifth and sixth questions answered in chapter 4 are:

• What specific functions does FB fulfill in communication?
  This was discussed in subsections 2.3.6 and 2.3.5, where the six basic functions of FB, as well as the main types of those functions, are discussed and exemplified.
• How do we recognise an FB expression in its main functions?
  This question was dealt with in section 2.4, items I and II, which were discussed in accordance with the coding manual written by Nivre et al (1999) which focused on the ways of expressing FB functions verbally
• In what specific ways is FB manifested in communication?
  Since the previous question is meant to discuss the main two ways of expressing FB actions, this question, which is discussed from subsections 2.4.1 to 2.4.4, is meant to demonstrate several ways of describing, analysing, and discussing FB actions, which are: FB positions as a single word and in an utterance, eliciting FB, giving and eliciting FB, as well as self FB.

3. In addition, the remaining part of the sixth question, listed above (In what specific ways is FB manifested in communication?), was answered in chapter 5. This concerns FB and sociolinguistic variations.

It is hoped that the answers are convenient and clear for the reader. They also support the theories were described by several linguists, and mainly Allwood, which connection with the FB phenomenon as an independent linguistic concept. Those answers prove that FB is a universal phenomenon, applicable to, for instance, the Arabic in the data, and without which communication would be impossible.
It is important to point out that all FB actions (verbal or non-verbal) which occurred in the conversations vary not only from one culture to another but also from one person to another, even if they come from the same culture. A deeper analysis of this will not be made here. Neither is it being claimed that the sum of all FB actions actually given entails that ‘the number of FB actions given in a similar situation should be xx actions exactly’. The results obtained only represent the approximate number of FB actions that can be expected to occur in an ordinary Arabic conversation.

6.2 Conclusions and Discussion of Background

*Linguistic feedback* is the term used by Allwood (1993) to refer to ‘linguistic mechanisms which ensure that a set of basic requirements on communication, such as possibilities for continued contact, for mutual perception and for mutual understanding can be met’ (Allwood adopted the term *feedback* from Wiener 1948). The process of communication, according to several writers, with regard to FB was discussed, and several figures were drawn for better and clearer explanation, in addition to Wiener (1948), who suggested the term FB for technical purposes, and Fries (1952), who used the term FB for describing language in communication.

FB has been discussed, classified, and described in great detail, especially by Allwood and others such as Levinson and Lyons. The psychological aspect is the main factor in the FB process, because there is a very strong social or conversational demand on persons involved in communication to signal their responses in order to keep the communication going.

**Concerning the topics raised in the introduction:**

- Several definitions of FB were given by writers, e.g.:
  1. Linguistic FB, given by Allwood (1993)
  2. FB units, given also by Allwood (1988a and b), by Nivre *et al* (1999), and Cherry (1966)
  3. FB as a single word, given by Allwood (1993), and another one suggested by us in (1995)
FB in communication fulfills at least four main functions: contact, perception, understanding and attitudinal reactions (Allwood 1979, 1988 a, b & c, and Allwood et al 1991). Moreover, the theory can account for most aspects of linguistic FB: acceptance, agreement, confirmation and rejection. Two more aspects have been added which play the same role as the previous ones, viz.: non-understanding and hesitation. Allwood (1976) has said that it is possible to distinguish between three main levels of communicative status. These are:

- Indicated information
- Displayed information
- Signalled information.

Additional observations and problems related to FB basic functions will be discussed later in this conclusion.

FB can be recognised when it is expressed either verbally (the kind treated in the present study) or non-verbally. Nivre et al (1999) drew our attention to:

a) The FB unit, with a structure made up of lexical category, syntactic category, phonological operations, morphological operations, and contextual operations
b) The position of FB
c) The function of FB.

As a result of the theoretical survey reported in the preceding sections, a workable definition of FB can be expressed in the following way:

A linguistic act is analysed here as feedback if the act is used to signal a reaction of one or more of these four functions:

1. continued contact
2. mutual perception
3. mutual understanding
4. reaction to main evocative intention of preceding utterance

To match the connection among the above four items and FB, the following table has been drawn, which includes, for each item, an example of its positive and negative FB answer:
Table 6.1: Main Communicative Functions and their Positive and Negative FB Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction of Function</th>
<th>Positive Answer</th>
<th>Negative Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued contact</td>
<td>I will continue</td>
<td>I will go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual perception</td>
<td>I can hear you</td>
<td>What?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual understanding</td>
<td>I understand</td>
<td>Yes but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction to main evocative intention of preceding utterance</td>
<td>Yes it is</td>
<td>No it is not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corresponding to the four FB functions of the above definition suggested by Allwood (1979), specific expressions of FB can be used or signalled, e.g. yes, no, agree, confirm.

The use of FB terminology according to a number of writers, and relevant observations connected with FB, were given and displayed in table 1 of chapter 2.

As to the question of what expressions are used to give – or elicit – FB, Allwood (1988) proposes the following definition of FB unit:

‘a feedback unit is a maximal continuous stretch of utterance (occurring on its own or as part of a larger utterance), the primary function of which is to give and/ or elicit feedback’

Regarding Allwood’s definition of the FB unit, I want to argue that, as a special case of FB, we may talk about ‘emotional FB’ (see sec. 1.5, item IV, and subsection 2.3.5 item ii), where the speaker gives a personal reaction related to his/her feelings, in addition to signalling one of the four basic functions mentioned above.

As FB can be expressed verbally or nonverbally, the question arises: Could we use only gesture in order to give or elicit FB on both levels, primary and secondary? (For the meaning of these terms in verbal FB, see 1.1.1 in my previous study, and 2.3.5). I think we can, because facial features e.g., eye contact play a very strong role in signalling the FB of the other speakers explicitly, apart from the gestures of hand, head, etc.
A: did you listen to the news yesterday?
B: (attitudinal reaction plus nodding head)

Speaker B showed a reaction corresponding to the bad news he expected, then expressed it by a sad facial expression and supported this by nodding his head.

A: what do you think of this?
B: (uncertain face plus hand movement)

Speaker A needs to get B’s FB concerning a certain subject. Speaker B gives only an uncertain facial expression and supports his expression with a hand gesture, which means roughly ‘I do not know’.

Some observations and discussion regarding background

I will now discuss some further observations and questions, related to FB:

1. Another way of discussing the communicative status of FB is by classifying the communicative acts which precede the FB action. The idea is that an act of giving FB acquires its meaning from the overall communicative context.

2. A question may be posed: how do we know which FB function is signalled in a given situation? For example, the expression ‘mm’ might signal various functions like listening, understanding, request for continuation, or confirmation. Unfortunately, none of the previous writers discussed in chapter 2 has suggested any kind of analytic technique for solving problems of this kind. It seems, however, that the analyst has various means at his disposal, such as his global understanding of the conversation, including different kinds of background information shared by the interlocutors. The expression ‘mm’, for instance, can be pronounced with different prosodic contours (level, rising, falling intonation, etc).

3. We should observe, moreover, that an expression like ‘no’, which is used in signaling the rejection function, can also be used to signal an emotive attitude at the outcome of an event, without there being any communication. An example is when you say ‘no no’ when witnessing an accident.

4. As mentioned in chapter 2, there might be a problem of misunderstanding between a speaker and a hearer so that the hearer gives his FB response in
accordance with his understanding, which is erroneous. The analysis of FB cannot be reduced to a study of ideal matching between expressions at a superficial level, but requires an understanding of the FB action in relation to what has been understood. The study of FB is closely related to a more general study of understanding.

5. Above we have made a basic distinction between verbal FB and non-verbal FB, but the student of verbal FB should always consider it important that non-verbal signals be taken into account, i.e. eye gaze, gestures, and other bodily movements.

6. Even if FB seems to be a universal phenomenon in human communication, there are language-specific differences which are not easily captured in an overall theory. For example:

(3)  
(i) In English  
A: didn’t you do it?  
B: no (= I didn’t do it)

Arabic  
A: [maa ʔamalt-haaʃ?] ‘didn’t you do it?’  
B: [illaa] ‘yes’ (= yes I did it, or no I didn’t not do it)

As we can see, the Arabic answer is ambiguous, and because of this it is very common in that language to give a complete answer after giving a FB expression, i.e. ‘yes I did it’ or ‘no I did not do it’.

(4)  
(ii) In English  
A: don’t you go there sometimes?  
B: no (= no I don't)

Arabic  
A: [bitruwiʃ ihnaak baʃd ilʔhyaan?] ‘don’t you go there sometimes?’  
B: [aa] ‘yes’ (= yes I go, or no I don’t go there sometimes)

Once again, the Arabic answer is ambiguous. If this answer were given to an English interlocutor, misunderstanding would most probably arise.

(5):  
A: didn’t you do that?  
B: no (= I didn’t do that)

The last subsection of this study of the Arabic FB system contains:
1) Some characteristics of Arabs, according to a number of writers
2) FB in Arabic, comprising:
   a) Arabic FB in syntactic categories
   b) Some observations on characteristics of Arabic FB
   c) Its functional description (based on Allwood’s 1987/88 descriptions)

This study has submitted an analysis regarding the Arabs from two main points of view: some of their personal characteristics, and some features of their spoken language based on recorded data and some observations.

7. Since FB is subject to conversational maxims in the Gricean sense, there is no simple correlation between FB item and FB function. For example, we can say ‘yes’ ironically instead of ‘no’.

On the most general level, FB seems to be an essential ingredient of all human communication. It would appear that no language lacks FB.

Finally, even if we accept most of the theoretical points reviewed above, there are still some problems (as pointed out under 2, 4 and 7 above) which need to be solved.

6.3 Summary of Method

The chapter on method (chapter 3) contained two main sections: one on the collection and description of data, the second on the analysis of data.

- In the section regarding the collection and description of data (3.1), a brief description was given of Jeddah (Saudi Arabia), the place where the conversations were recorded. With regard to setting and informants, the time that the data conversations were collected, the types of conversation, the number of these conversations, and the technical measures used by the researcher to register them were recorded. Some of the problems noted were connected with video recordings, for example. A table giving the main characteristics of each recording in terms of setting and participants was presented in this section as well.
- In connection with the analysis of data (3.2), a coding scheme was given to present the analysis of linguistic FB in the recorded data. This coding scheme was based partly on Nivre, Allwood and Ahlsén (1999), who discussed three categories: structure, function and position. Allwood et al, applied these three categories to FB actions consisting of one single word utterance and FB actions consisting of a more than one word utterance. In addition, non-FB turns have been discussed. Moreover, the discussion has been extended to include both semantic and pragmatic analyses of FB actions.

Finally (in subsection 3.2.4 and 3.2.5) the main functions of FB and the correlation between FB functions and type of activity/conversation have been discussed. All these data have been collected in tables and quantified for each instance in chapter 4. Part of the classification of the different types of FB expressions for use in analysing the data conversations has been borrowed from Allwood (1988). It focuses on three main items:

   i) the general recognition of FB: FB actions and non-FB turns. FB consisting of a one word utterance, more than one word utterance, E FB, G & E FB, self FB, and non-FB turns
   ii) the semantic analysis of FB actions, and the criteria for deciding the function of FB
   iii) the pragmatic analysis concerning main types of conversations or activities, which proved most decisive in the data conversations.

### 6.4 Summary of Structural Variation

This research deals with pragmatics, but not with syntax. However, the syntactic part is still related to this field of linguistics. Therefore, a brief description has been made below and a discussion of the syntactical part, based on observations from the present data. A rough estimation of the two main types of FB can be classified as: **grammatical category** and **structural operations** (see Nivre et al 1999). These are as follows:

**A) Grammatical categories**

The total number of different FB cases falling under the ‘lexical’ category is 12. There are 15 cases of FB forms falling under the ‘syntactical’ category; 12 are common, and 3 are uncommon expressions in Arabic.
B) Structural operations

The most frequent ‘phonological’ operations in FB are reduplication and lengthening, while prosody and vowel addition were less frequent.

‘Morphological’ operations (see Nivre et al 1999) consist of reduplication, inflection, derivation, and compounding. Reduplication was the most frequently met of the morphological forms.

The third type of operation is the ‘contextual’ one. In the data and in relation to FB, three different groups have been distinguished:

i) Repetition of single form/sentence
ii) Repetition of single form/sentence occurring as initial or final in context + single FB expression, with a main function such as acceptance, confirmation, etc.
iii) Complex structure of repetition of single form/sentence; occurs as initial, medial, or final in context + two FB expressions, with main functions being distributed in the sentence

The second group, ‘repetition’, is the most frequent in the data. Repetition was most frequently used as FB in combination with acceptance, agreement, confirmation, rejection, hesitation, and non-understanding.

It is important to point out that Arabic speakers exaggerate sometimes by resorting to the repetition phenomenon during contact. This occurred repeatedly in all conversations in order to express understanding, perception, contact, and attitudinal reactions while talking. Repetition does indeed seem to play an important role in Arab culture.

From the above summary of structural variation, the conclusion is not that this investigation, on the basis of the empirical data, has yielded all the varieties produced by Arabs in conversation. A number of examples that are relevant to the discussion have been selected and listed under their own categories. We have also kept as close to the meaning of participants’ talk as possible for use in our analyses. Hopefully this will open the door in the future to a similar topic dealing with this field of studies.
6.5 Summary of Results/Main Findings

The main findings can be summarised in this chapter. This will be divided into the following points:

1. In the present data, the total number of all FB actions is 2431, while non-FB turns are given 1721 times. The sum for both is 4152 FB actions and non-FB turns.

The total duration of all recorded conversations is five and a half hours; an FB action was given approximately every second turn.

2. Four main ways of giving FB actions were treated in the present conversations:

   a) Position, which includes both feedback consisting of a one word utterance, or simple feedback, and feedback consisting of more than one word as an utterance, or complex feedback
   b) Eliciting feedback, which includes both feedback consisting of a one word utterance, and feedback consisting of more than one word in an utterance
   c) Giving and eliciting feedback = feedback consisting of a single word or more than one word in an utterance
   d) Self feedback = feedback consisting of a single word or more than one word in an utterance

Concerning items c and d above, FB as single word and as a longer phrase were not calculated separately. In other words, both ways have been accounted together in our total count.

3. Separate tables are given to demonstrate the individual differences of the following items:

   i) The sum of all FB consisting of one word utterances is 1120 actions, and the total FB consisting of more than one word (types 1 and 2), is 608 actions.
   ii) The sum of all E FB consisting of one word utterances is 89 actions, and the sum of all E FB consisting of more than one word in an utterance is 163 actions.
iii) The total of all G & E FB consisting of both one word and more than one word in an utterance is 74 actions.
iv) The sum of all self FB consisting of both one word and more than one word in an utterance is 377 actions.
iii) The sum of all non-FB turns is 1721 turns.

According to the above (main) figures from the present conversations, the following conclusion may be offered:

- We expect between 400 to 900 turns, comprising:
  - 200 to 500 feedback turns, and
  - 200 to 400 non-feedback turns

These numbers reflect the expectation for a similar conversation (e.g., length, occasion, participants, etc)

4. Regarding the correlation between different types of activity and types of FB, six types of activity occurred most frequently in the data conversations. These types of activities are: discussion, gossip, narratives, small talk, provocation and intimacy. Silence has been added as a form of communication. Two main points were discussed and the following results were found:

i) The most frequent kinds of talk were discussion and intimacy. ‘Gossip’ occurred in all conversations except the fifth one.

ii) As for the correlation between FB function and types of conversation, acceptance forms prevailed in ‘gossip’ and ‘telling stories/facts’, as well as ‘intimacy’. Rejection forms prevailed in ‘discussion’ and ‘provocation’. Agreement occurred in ‘small talk’ and ‘intimacy’, as well as in ‘silence’ as one form of communication. Hesitation occurred in ‘provocation’, and ‘silence’ (as a form of communication). Both acceptance and hesitation forms were most frequent in the present data.

5. FB function. The total for all main FB functions is given as 1120 actions. The most frequent FB functions are hesitation and acceptance, with the hesitation forms being more frequent than the acceptance forms.

6. The last subsection of this study of the Arabic FB system concerns FB in Arabic, comprising:
a) Some observations on characteristics of Arabic FB

From the data it can be seen that speakers and hearers shared a common view of the conversation because they both know from what components a conversation may be constructed and how those components may be combined. Moreover, shared knowledge of the possible units and rules on which the structure of any particular conversation may be composed is what enables speakers and hearers to arrive at a common view of their interaction.

This study has submitted an analysis regarding the Arabs from two main points of view:

- Some of their personal characteristics (see sec. 1.5 of this study)
- Some features of their spoken language based on recorded data and many observations.

### 6.6 Shortcomings of the Present Study

To conclude with suggestions relevant to this kind of research, several points will be illustrated below. It is hoped that the reader will find these proposals useful in future studies with a similar purpose.

1. Video recordings. To support empirical studies, especially in this area, it is necessary to record the conversation by video. Some of the main reasons for my failure to video-record any conversations have been given in section 1.3. Recording by video increases the range of description by gathering both verbal and non-verbal communication, e.g. the expression ‘yes’ = sound + facial expression + nodding head + body movement like hand waves. Such information provides robust data, which should facilitate profitable analyses, with a view to achieving improved results in this field.
2. To give more attention to the analyses of FB expressions, origin, meaning, and situation, one should cover each FB action, verbal or non-verbal, separately and extend this discussion by including the following steps:

Figure (6.1)

```
FB expression ➔ its origin ➔ its meaning ➔ the situation (in language usage)
```
It seems that the above proposed steps, if followed, would permit the covering of a wide range of description, analysis and discussion of the phenomenon of FB in any human language.

3. Future research should strive to open the way for a comparison between spoken Arabic and other languages. A comparison of this kind by means of empirical studies should, in my view, consist of at least five items: structure of language/syntax, meaning/semantics, situation/pragmatics, morphology, phonology, and perhaps the figures/statistical number of FB actions given in conversation. For instance, the semantics would provide a clear approach for interpreting the real meaning of the FB expression, while pragmatics would be focused on the exact situation where it occurred, and so on. Such comparisons should take in both of these aspects in order to yield a comprehensive analysis.

Furthermore, it would be interesting to support this discussion and findings by giving the sum of all FB actions produced. Each FB expression should be classified under its relevant category. This would show an interesting variation between the two languages intended to be described. In section 1.3 of this thesis, an attempt has been made to provide brief comparison between Arabic and Swedish, by using my own data and Swedish data (see Nordenstam, 1994). However, our comparison does not cover all the aspects mentioned above, and we therefore would encourage similar studies to devote more attention to those areas.

4. Comparing linguistic FB among Arabic dialects. It might be useful to extend this field within the regional area. For instance, it could be done to show the difference between SA (spoken Arabic) on one hand and MSA/CA on the other. Such comparisons could help remove ambiguities among Arabs themselves, viz. those who speak Arabic when they interact. There are, for instance, big differences between Saudi Arabian dialects and those of North Africa, e.g. Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco and Libya.

5. As has been demonstrated, the present study was undertaken to describe, analyse, and discuss FB actions in ‘verbal’ spoken Palestinian Arabic and excludes ‘non-verbal’ actions, but it might also prove useful to treat the same subject by focusing on non-verbal FB in communication. This would reinforce both aspects and could, through this combination, produce interesting results. Another question might be: How does one get more accurate results when describing FB actions in empirical studies? Is it by
treating verbal contact separately from non-verbal contact? Or by combining both through, for instance, video recordings?

6. The tactics of data collection. It has been mentioned in subsection 3.1.1 that the researcher, in some of his recordings, did not inform the informants beforehand that their conversations were to be recorded. However, such a practice is not preferable. While such a procedure is motivated by the wish to obtain more natural, rich, valuable, and reliable data, if the researcher favours this style, he/she should be aware of at least two things:

i) it is important to have enough background knowledge of the culture, e.g. habits, customs, language, beliefs, etc.
ii) He/she must be honest and inform the participants upon completion of the data collection phase, offering to destroy the recordings, even if only one of them is objects to being recorded.

7. With regard to the pragmatic analyses of FB of the present study in item VI, section 4.4, it would be useful to add more types of activities, which will benefit the description and discussion of FB in spoken language communication.

8. It may also be added that studying FB in a wider social group of participants would be important for assessing how social class affects conversation and could give fascinating results with regard to meaning, situation, and structure. This wider social group of people would include the lower/middle class of society, and particularly participants from a wider range of gender mixes and professional occupations, ranking from tradesmen to high-ranking religious leaders, for instance.
Appendix A

A.1  I) The Traditional View of the Varieties of the Arabic Spoken Language

Since the present study deals with the Arabic dialect, and precisely with PA, then it is necessary to give an overview of the Arabic spoken language. This overview will not focus on one specific dialect; however, it will discuss, according to some Arab writers, the concept of the Arabic dialect, and how this dialect expanded in the Arab world. Traditionally, Arabs used to give several definitions of [lahd3a] 'dialect', e.g. [luγatu-ilisaan] 'language of the tongue', [jurs ilkalaam] 'rhythm of speech', [lisaanu fariiqin mina nnaas] 'the tongue of a group of people', etc. Several types of talk even exist in the same location.

Two questions might arise here: did Arabic, originally, consist of different dialects, which then became one language? Or was it one language which became several dialects?

It seems that the majority of Arab linguists supported the first view. Moreover, the answer can include two parts:

i) Two Arabic grammarians, Ibn Faaris and Ibn Jinni, living in the eighth century AD, said that the dialect of the Quraysh (the inhabitants of Mecca before and after the Islamic period), was the most prominent among the other Arabic dialects, and the purest that dominated the pre-Islamic peninsula. Qurayshi Arabic was also the most prestigious because of its political position at the time. The writers explained this dominance as a result of God's having chosen the Holy Prophet [muhammad] (Mohammad) from this area.

ii) Arabic speakers do not consist of one group only, although the different groups are all related. These tribes were distributed throughout [Al jaziira] 'the Peninsula'. There were various common reasons for their being in contact with each other, e.g. trade, climate, war, marketing, etc. This, however, created an environment of competing dialects. As a consequence, the weaker dialects disappeared, and the stronger remained and dominated. The best example is the dialect of the Quraysh. Of course there are other reasons: the dialect of the Quraysh was supported politically, religiously, economically and linguistically. It is important to point out that even in Mecca, where the Qurayshi dialect was predominant, many other dialects were spoken.
II) Overview of the Varieties of Arabic Language

There are several writers who have discussed Arabic within the realm of daily language use. Moreover, their analyses and contributions have tried to go even further, that is, to classify Arabic into several groups. For instance, in their discussion about the expression [alnumat al'arabiyyatu yaniiyyah] 'the Arabic language is rich', the 'richness' meant is to refer to the extensive vocabulary and grammar of [al'arabiyyah alfusha] 'classical Arabic' (Badawi 1973).

T.F. Mitchell, in his paper entitled *What is educated spoken Arabic* (1986), has discussed and analysed SA ('spoken Arabic'). However, his paper is based on an introductory chapter of a grammar (in preparation) of educated spoken Arabic in Egypt and the Levant. The writer has discussed several terms, e.g.,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CA</th>
<th>classical Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>modern standard Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>educated spoken Arabic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mitchell has discussed, according to Meiseles (1980), a new term, which is,

| OLA      | oral literary Arabic (Mitchell 1986: 9) |

Moreover, under a section entitled 'Varieties or styles?', Mitchell has demonstrated that a number of varieties has been recognised by several writers:

iii) Meiseles (1980) distinguishes four styles:

- *Literary Arabic or Standard Arabic*. No difference is recognised for practical purposes between CA and MSA. Blanc's 'Standard Arabic'.

- *Oral Literary Arabic* (OLA). The spoken variety of a somewhat unfelicitously termed 'substandard Arabic'. OLA has a written counterpart in informal written Arabic (IWA). OLA is an 'Arab's attempt to speak classical Arabic' and is not to be identified with any orthoepic rendering of CA, which belongs to (1).

- *Educated Spoken Arabic* (ESA). A vernacular type characterised by the aspirations of its speakers to get rid of local features through a process of koineisation and/or borrowings from literary Arabic (cf. Blanc).
- *Plain Vernacular*. Exclusively spoken but widely ramified and common only in informal conversation of a lower register. Often abandoned in favour of any 'higher' variety of Arabic, primarily ESA (Mitchell 1986: 12).

From varieties mentioned above, it can be considered that the relevant one for spoken language is the style given by Badawi (1973), 'the colloquial of the enlightened' or *educated colloquial*, influenced by contemporary life but not by CA/MSA grammar.

There is at least one fundamental difference between Mitchell's view of ESA and those briefly outlined above. ESA cannot be seen as one of a series of separate varieties on a par with MSA and the vernaculars; rather it is created and maintained by the constant interplay of written and vernacular Arabic.

In his article entitled 'Formal and Informal Arabic' (1994: 47-66), Alan Kaye has illustrated several terms regarding SA: MSA, CA and ASK (both classical Arabic and modern standard Arabic). In addition to these, I suggest two more that Kaye has not used, even if he has used their concepts in this article. These are: WMSA (written modern standard Arabic), and SMSA (spoken modern standard Arabic). Kaye has said that sometimes MSA is used to mean Modern Written Arabic or the *Schriftsprache* which can be found in contemporary biographies, novels, newspapers and magazines. He has also maintained that MSA is quite different from religious sermons which tend to be more 'Classical', phonologically, semantically and idiomatically. I agree with Kaye's claim that MSA can be considered, furthermore, as a modern form of CA, i.e., the language of the Qur’an, or 'the best language', according to [Al əʕalib] (d. 1038).

The writer has pointed out that MSA is not the mother-tongue of any Arab, and his opinion is that MSA must be regarded as an ill-defined system, since it does not have any native speakers. Many Arabs will not disagree with this.

Cuvalay-Haak (1997) has devoted her book, *The Verb in Literary and Colloquial Arabic*, to phenomena associated with the Arabic verb, e.g. the expression of tense, mood, etc. Moreover, Haak has divided the Arabic language into three main groups:

i) the term [əfəsha] refers to 'Classical Arabic' (CA),

ii) Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), and
iii) the term [al'ammiyya], 'colloquial', covers a wide variety of Modern Arabic (MA) dialects, which each have their own vocabulary and grammar (Cuvalay-Haak 1997: 3)

A.2  I) Turns in Conversations: Quantitative Results (tables)

The following section demonstrates many (detailed) tables which were repeated earlier, in order to keep all our results in one place; however, to show an individual variation for each participant in the conversation is the most important factor that justifies the repetition of information in this way.

This subsection will be a count of how many turns, or how many times each participant has taken the floor from other participants in conversation. This statistical amount, however, will include, e.g., verbal contact, all interruptions, overlapping, hesitation, etc. throughout the conversation. On the other hand, other kinds of speech acts, such as non-verbal contact and sounds such as inhaling, exhaling, laughing, clicking, coughing, sneezing, mumbling, etc., have not been taken into account. I have excluded these types of speech acts for two reasons: they have not occurred many times in the conversation, and it is a custom among Arab speakers that if someone has taken the turn in a conversation, he/she must produce a fully understandable word, phrase, or even sentence, and refrain from using a single short sound.

The subsection below will show the number of turns given in the course of each conversation. The figure will include both FB actions and non-FB turns, taken together. There is a slight difference between the tables below and those in 4.4 from table 4.7 to table 4.13. Here, both FB actions and non-FB turns have been collated together, while in 4.4, tables six to eleven they have been separated; one of the motivations for doing this is to show the variation for each participant when he/she takes the floor in the conversation.

Table A.2.1: Turns in conversations

In the following conversation, about twenty turns given by a few children have been excluded. (see subsection 3.1.2 table ‘2’
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Number of Turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1002</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total = 1002 turns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.2.2: Turns in conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Number of Turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>752</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total = 752 turns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.2.3: Turns in conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Number of Turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>646</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total = 646 turns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A.2.4: Turns in conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Number of Turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 487 turns

Table A.2.5: Turns in conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Number of Turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total are = 200 turns

Table A.2.6: Turns in conversations

In the following conversation, about six turns occasioned by two children have been excluded. (See subsection 3.1.2 table ‘7’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Number of Turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 978 turns
II) Feedback and Non-Feedback Turns (tables)

The reader will be able to see when each participant is taking the floor from the others, and whether the turn was given as a non-FB turn or an FB action, e.g. showing his/her dominance, power, influence, etc.

To begin with, the table below gives a comparison between non-FB turns and FB actions: non-FB turns is the sum of all turns that do not include (any) FB actions, while FB actions is the sum of all FB actions for each participant in the conversation.

Table A.2.7: Non-FB Turns and FB Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Non-FB Turns</th>
<th>FB Actions</th>
<th>Speaker Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>470</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>1002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.2.8: Non-FB Turns and FB Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Non-FB Turns</th>
<th>FB Actions</th>
<th>Speaker Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>329</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A.2.9: Non-FB Turns and FB Actions

#### Non-FB Turns and FB Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Non-FB Turns</th>
<th>FB Actions</th>
<th>Speaker Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>249</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A.2.10: Non-FB Turns and FB Actions

#### Non-FB Turns and FB Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Non-FB Turns</th>
<th>FB Actions</th>
<th>Speaker Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table A.2.11: Non-FB Turns and FB Actions

#### Non-FB Turns and FB Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Non-FB Turns</th>
<th>FB Actions</th>
<th>Speaker Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A.2.12: Non-FB Turns and FB Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recording</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Non-FB Turns</th>
<th>FB Actions</th>
<th>Speaker Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>402</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III) The Main Four Feedback Processes (tables)

All FB processes, for each participant will be analysed and quantified. The abbreviations and codes used will be explained. Each conversation will include six main tables. All will be represented as follows:

1) **FB position, which includes three main tables:**
   - a) Simple FB consisting of a single word utterance
   - b) Complex FB consisting of more than one word, type 1
   - c) Complex FB consisting of more than one word, type 2

2) **E FB, which includes both single word and more than one word in one table**
3) **G & E FB, which includes one table**
4) **Own FB, which also includes one table**

Now, regarding the above four main types of FB, the tables below are going to demonstrate each individual in all six conversations

We will also give an abbreviation of the Palestinian Arabic according to number of writers.
**First Conversation:**

i) Table A.2.13: Position in Utterance of Single Word FB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Medial</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 240 FB actions

ii) Table A.2.14: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RedFBU</th>
<th>DAL</th>
<th>RepFBU</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>SW or P</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 115 FB actions
iii) Table A.2.15: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 2

**CFBU**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SFB + Red</th>
<th>SFB + DAL</th>
<th>SFB + Rep</th>
<th>SFB+IP</th>
<th>SFB + MP</th>
<th>SFB + SW</th>
<th>SFB + SFB</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 44 FB actions

Table A.2.16: Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

**E FB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single word</th>
<th>More than one word</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 69 E FB actions
Table A.2.17: Giving and Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

**G & E FB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Single &amp; more than one word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 20 G & E FB actions

Table A.2.18: Self FB Single Word and More than One Word

**Self FB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Single &amp; more than one word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 44 Self FB actions
Second Conversation:

i) Table A.2.19: Position in Utterance of Single Word FB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Medial</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 188 FB actions

ii) Table A.2.20: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>RedFBU</th>
<th>DAL</th>
<th>RepFBU</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>SW or P</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 90 FB actions
iii) Table A.2.21: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 2

**CFBU**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>SFB + Red</th>
<th>SFB + DAL</th>
<th>SFB + Rep</th>
<th>SFB+IP</th>
<th>SFB + MP</th>
<th>SFB + SW</th>
<th>SFB + SFB</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 25 FB actions

Table A.2.22: Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

**E FB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Single word</th>
<th>More than one word</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 50 E FB actions
Table A.2.23: Giving and Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Single &amp; more than one word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 11 G & E FB actions

Table A.2.24: Self FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Single &amp; more than one word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 58 Self FB actions
Third Conversation:

i) Table A.2.25: Position in Utterance of Single Word FB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Medial</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 178 FB actions

ii) Table A.2.26: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RedFBU</th>
<th>DAL</th>
<th>RepFBU</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>SW or P</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 42 FB actions
### Table A.2.27: FB Consisting of More Than One Word, type 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>SFB + Red</th>
<th>SFB + DAL</th>
<th>SFB + Rep</th>
<th>SFB+IP</th>
<th>SFB + MP</th>
<th>SFB + SW</th>
<th>SFB + SFB</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 35 FB actions

### Table A.2.28: Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Single word</th>
<th>More than one word</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 44 E FB actions

### Table A.2.29: Giving and Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Single &amp; more than one word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 10 G & E FB actions
Table A.2.30: Self FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single &amp; more than one word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 88 Self FB actions

**Fourth Conversation:**

i) Table A.2.31: Position in Utterance of Single Word FB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Medial</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 182 FB actions

ii) Table A.2.32: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RedFBU</th>
<th>DAL</th>
<th>RepFBU</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>SW or P</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 20 FB actions
iii) Table A.2.33: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 2

**CFBU**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SFB + Red</th>
<th>SFB + DAL</th>
<th>SFB + Rep</th>
<th>SFB + IP</th>
<th>SFB + MP</th>
<th>SFB + SW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 29 FB actions

Table A.2.34: Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

**E FB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single word</th>
<th>More than one word</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 29 E FB actions

Table A.2.35: Giving and Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

**G & E FB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single &amp; more than one word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 12 G & E FB actions
Table A.2.36: Self FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self FB</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Single &amp; more than one word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Total = 64 Self FB actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifth Conversation:

i) Table A.2.37: Position in Utterance of Single Word FB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FBSW</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Medial</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 79 FB actions

ii) Table A.2.38: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CFBU</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>RedFBU</td>
<td>DAL</td>
<td>RepFBU</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>MP</td>
<td>SW or P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 18 FB actions
Table A.2.39: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>SFB + Red</th>
<th>SFB + DAL</th>
<th>SFB + Rep</th>
<th>SFB+IP</th>
<th>SFB + MP</th>
<th>SFB + SW</th>
<th>SFB + SFB</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 15 FB actions

Table A.2.40: Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Single word</th>
<th>More than one word</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 24 E FB actions

Table A.2.41: Giving and Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Single &amp; more than one word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 05 G & E FB actions
Table A.2.42: Self FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self FB</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Single &amp; more than one word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 26 Self FB actions

Sixth Conversation:

i) Table A.2.43: Position in Utterance of Single Word FB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FBSW</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 252 FB actions
ii) Table A.2.44: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CFBU</th>
<th>RedFBU</th>
<th>DAL</th>
<th>RepFBU</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>MP</th>
<th>SW or P</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 128 FB actions

iii) Table A.2.45: FB Consisting of More than One Word, type 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CFBU</th>
<th>SFB + Red</th>
<th>SFB + DAL</th>
<th>SFB + Rep</th>
<th>SFB+IP</th>
<th>SFB + MP</th>
<th>SFB + SW</th>
<th>SFB + SFB</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 47 FB actions
Table A.2.46: Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

**E FB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Single word</th>
<th>More than one word</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 36 E FB actions

Table A.2.47: Giving and Eliciting FB Single Word and More than One Word

**G & E FB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>Single &amp; more than one word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 16 G & E FB actions
Table A.2.48: Self FB Single Word and More than One Word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self FB</th>
<th>Single &amp; more than one word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total = 97 Self FB actions

A.3 I) Feedback and Structure of Expressions

This section will discuss the variation of structure in spoken Arabic FB. Two main categories will be illustrated and described in this section: grammatical categories and structural operations. A list of FB examples found in the data will be given. The examples will illustrate, in the light of the coding manual written by Nivre et al. (1999), several aspects of FB actions in Arabic. Furthermore, an attempt will be made to establish which FB types in the data occur most frequently under these classifications.

Following the guidelines given in 2.4, each FB structural unit will be discussed and classified under:

I) Grammatical categories, which include both lexical and syntactical categories

II) Structural operations, which include phonological, morphological and contextual operations

Variation in the structure of feedback

II) Grammatical Categories

As explained in section 2.4 (‘I’ Structure) this classification covers two types of FB actions: lexical and syntactic. Below, all FB actions in the data will be discussed according to their different aspects.
A. Lexical Classification

This category refers to secondary FB words (Allwood 1988a). Below, I have selected from the data conversations, as far as possible, all types of FB in this category.

The codes used were:
FBW= feedback words, FBC= feedback copula, INTER= interjection, N= noun, ADJ= adjective, V= verb, P= preposition, ADV= adverb, PN= proper name, PRON= pronoun, CONJ= conjunction, COMP= complementizer, DET= determiner, AUX= auxiliary.

(1) A: [anaa itdżawwazit uw haadżarit] 'I married and emigrated'
   B: [aa] 'yes' (= confirmation+ acceptance) FBW

(2) A: [fii a2y i3ii ʔaani?] 'is there anything else?'
   B: [fiih] 'in' (there is) (= + emphatic) FBC

(3) A: [inta aḏitnii] 'you hurt me'
   B: [ʔuʧɜnii] 'excuse me' (= regret) INTR

(4) A: [faahim] 'understood?'
   B: [waad'[f]h] 'clear' (= + perception) ADJ

(5) A: [kiif ʕaayfu?] 'how do you see him?'
   B: [hɪluw] 'sweet' (= evaluative) ADJ

(6) A: [yalla, ii'j ra2yak?] 'come in, what do you think?'
   B: [yadʒuwz] 'possible' (= epistemic) V

(7) A: [inta maa kunit ihnaak] 'you were not there'
   B: [bitta2kiid] 'certainly' (= + agreement) ADV

(8) A: [miin kaan imdʒanninhum daayman?] 'who was driving them crazy all the time?'
   B: Saamii (= proper name) PN

(9) A: [huwwa kaan?] 'was it he?'
B: [huwwa] ‘him’ (yes him) (= + confirmation) PRON

(10) A: [iftiriḏ innu ḫaṣal marraḥ ṭaannyaḥ?] ‘and suppose it happened again?!’
B: [uw baḏdayn] ‘and then’ (= scepticism) CONJ

(11) A: [yaʃnii maa-fii aʔy ḫal] ‘it means there is no any solution’
B: [ḥadaa huwwa] ‘that is so’ (= sorrow) COMP

(12) A: [mumkin itquwl-lii ?ay waaḥid minhum ?] ‘will you tell me which one of them?’
B: [ḥadaa] ‘this’ (+ pointing with finger) DET

(13) A: [haḏaa kaan fii ʔahid ūθmaan] ‘this was during Othman's time’
B: [kaan] 'was' (yes it was) (= + agreement and sorrow) AUX

Under the lexical category, at least twelve different forms have been given and identified. Most FB actions given under this category are so-called ‘FB words’, then ‘FB adverbs’.

B) Syntactical Category

FB in this category consists of more than one word unit, i.e. a sentence, verb phrase, etc.

Below, I will indicate the different syntactical categories found in the present data conversations.

The codes used are:

Adv= adverb, P= phrase, S= sentence, VP= verb phrase, Conj= conjunction, NP= noun phrase, Rep= repetition, Det= determiner, Comp= complementiser, V= verb, Pron= pronoun, N= noun, and PP= preposition phrase and INTERR= interrogative

1) The most commonly used types of feedback are exemplified below:

(14) A: [anaa kaan ʔinḍii: ḥifliin] ‘I had two children’
B: [naʃam ᵘahiḥ] ‘yes right’ (= + agreement) (ADV P)

(15) A: [inta kunt itḥib haḏuwl innaas] ‘you loved these people’
B: [naʃam wallahii] ‘yes I swear’ (= + emphatic acceptance) (ADV S)
A: [fil-baakistaanii ðindhum nafss il kilmi] ‘Pakistanis have the same word’
B: [anaa batmannaa aa] ‘I hope…yes’ (= boulemaic) (S ADV)

(17) A: [hal hummaa min nafs il-aśil ?] ‘are they from the same origin?’
B: [naʃam naʃam naʃam] ‘yes, yes, yes’ (ADV Rep/Red)

(18) A: [hal hummaa nidʒhaw: fii zawaadʒhum ?] ‘did they succeed in their marriage?’
B: [aa illii kaanuw..] ‘yes who were they…’ (= + acceptance) (ADV COMP P)

(19) A: [miḥtaaḍža b lamuʃ faaʃi] ‘it needs a free mind’
B: [naʃam yimkin] ‘yes probable’ (= average acceptance) (ADV V)

(20) A: [inta mitaʔkkid minnu ?] ‘are you sure of him?’
B: [aa anaa mitaʔakkid] ‘yes I am’ (= + acceptance) (ADV PRON P)

(21) A: [haðaa miʃ asaas qawii laddawlaḥ] ‘this is not a strong reconstruction’
B: [naʃam laakin] ‘yes but…’ (= - acceptance and understanding) (ADV CONJ P)
The last example belongs to a very common expression type in Arabic, usable in
different situations, either after FB, e.g., no but, or before FB, e.g., but mmm

(22) A: [iḥnaa laazim nitaʔkkad] ‘we should be certain’
B: [wallahi ʃahiʃ] ‘I swear it is right’ (= surprise) (S ADV)

(23) A: [mumkin innii astaʔmilhaa] ‘could I use it?’
B: [hay ?akiːd] ‘this surely….’ (= + perception and epistemic) (DET ADV)

(24) A: [inta laazim tintibih] ‘you should be careful’
B: [anaa ʃaarif] ‘I know’ (= epistemic) (S)
C: [anaa aʃtaqiday ʃayk] ‘I think so’ (= epistemic) (S)

(25) A: [ʃuð baalak minhaa ikwayyis] ‘take good care of her?’
B: [fii ʃinaynaa] ‘in our eyes’ (= politeness) (PP)

2) Types of feedback which were given less are:

(26) A: [huwwa duktuwr] ‘he is a doctor’
B: [ayʃ ʃuʃit ?] ‘what did you say?’ (= - perception) (INTERR P)
(27) A: [hal hummaa naas mutażallifii:n?] ‘are they a primitive people!’
    B: [bigazziz] ‘disgusting’ (= disgust) (ADJ)

(28) A: [ildżaw ġar hinaa] ‘it is hot in here’
    B: [aa şahiṭh aa] ‘yes it is yes’ (= indication of information status) (ADV P)

In the syntactic category, fifteen different cases were observed in the present conversations; twelve are used the most, and three are used less. We see, from the examples above, the prevalence of the adverbial form in Arabic FB expressions.

III) Structural Operations

This type of FB has been subdivided into three main operations:

A) Phonological Operations

Arabs make frequent use of FB phonemes in their daily language. However, not as many short words – consisting of one phoneme – were used as FB as they would be by speakers of other languages, such as Swedish.

First, the most common types of feedback that belongs to phonological operations were:

Reduplication. When an FB item is repeated, it thereby adds more meaning of the same kind.

(29) i) [aa aaa] ‘yes yes’ (emphatic acceptance) Reduplication (pure)

Reduplication can take different forms in Arabic, as the following examples show:

ii) [laa la’a] ‘no no’ (emphatic rejection) Reduplication of CV + glottal stop

iii) [ah ahha] ‘right right’ Reduplication of CV + glottal fricative (emphatic acceptance)

Lengthening is used to express ‘emphasis’. Moreover, in Arabic the contrast between neutral length and expanded length is used to signal different FB functions.
(30)  
  
  i)  [la la:] ‘no’  
      Lengthening long  
      (emphatic rejection)  

  ii)  [lāa/] ‘no’  
       Neutral  
       (simple rejection)  

Two types of phonological operations which were less frequently used were:

- Prosody, i.e. intonation, using the same FB expression to give different meanings with regard to the intonation.

(31)  [/m] ‘m’  
      Rising intonation  
      (confirmation plus warning)

- Vowel addition: the insertion of a vowel into a consonant combination.

(32)  [fuw] 'what'  
      Single short (adding ‘uw’ after the phoneme [f])

As can be observed from the above examples, the FB actions were given mostly as phonological reduplication and lengthening. On the other hand, the least frequent forms were expressed by prosody and vowel addition.

B)  Morphological Operations

Several FB morphemes were used during the conversations. The examples below will demonstrate the main classes of this operation, and an example will be given for each morphological case.

Reduplication:

(33)  A: [zayy ma-ttfaqnaa] ‘as we agreed?’  
     B: [a?kiid a?kiid a?kiid] ‘sure sure sure’

Inflection:

(34)  A: [iįʃ kamaan] ‘what's more?’  
     B: [haʔii uw haʔaa] ‘this (feminine demonstrative pronoun) and this’  
     (masculine demonstration pronoun). Confirmation state.
Derivation:

(35)  A: [raʔy/akʔ] ‘do you think so?’
       B: [akiid bittaʔ/kiid] ‘sure surely’

Compounding:

(36)  A: [inta mušammimʔ] ‘do you insist?’
       B: [bikull-taʔkiid] ‘certainly’ (roughly)

The most common single type of morphological operation was reduplication. However, the remaining categories together outnumbered reduplication.

C) Contextual Operations

Arabic conversations are full of FB as contextual forms, especially repetition, either by itself (= repeating the same expression recursively) or in combination with other forms i.e. repetition + confirmation, repetition + rejection, etc. Sometimes even more complicated structures can be observed, i.e. acceptance + repetition + continuation; however, this structure is not common. Repetition in positions will be outlined in the figure below.

Table. A.3.49: Main Groups of Repetition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Aspects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>Single repetition (as acceptance, agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rejection, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep+ FB</td>
<td>Initial repetition + feedback form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB + Rep</td>
<td>Feedback form + final repetition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complex structures (not common):

| Rep + -- + --     | Initial in context                          |
| -- + Rep + --     | Middle in context                           |
| -- + -- + Rep     | Final in context                            |

Corresponding to the above table, another table has been set up below that illustrates the three groups with examples. The codes used are:
affir= affirmative, conf= confirmation, repet= repetition, accep= acceptance, rejec= rejection, agree= agreement, corr= corretion, under= understanding, perc= perception, inter= interrogative, laugh= laughter, domin= dominance, repro= reproaching, eval= evaluative, boul= boulemaic, - = negative, + = positive.

Table. A.3.50: Contextual Forms in Arabic

**Examples of contextual forms**

**Feedback function**

**Group (1):**
Single or sentence repetition:

A: [huwwa/] ‘him’
B: [huwwa]\ ‘him’ (affir repet)

A: [maaʃii/] ‘ok’
B: [maaʃii\] ‘ok’ (agree repet)

A: [tihl/if] ‘swear’
B: [bæh/nif] ‘I swear’ (conf repet)

A: [iʃʃarka liʃrabiya liʃistiθmaaraat] ‘the Arabic investment company’
B: [iʃʃarka liʃrabiyya liʃistiθmaar aat] ‘the Arabic investment company?’ (+ under)

**Group (2):**
Repetition + other FB form:

A: [hiyya kaanat tịrrii waraa\] ‘she was running after him’
B: [mm kaanat tịrrii waraa\] ‘mm she was running after him’ (conf+ repet)

A: [uw akaltuw yaa maamaa ?] ‘didn’t we eat, mother?’
B: [uw akalnaa! aa] ‘we ate! yes’ (repet + - accep)

A: [muʃaddal waʃtii] ‘low point average’
B: [miʃ muʃaddal waʃtii] ‘not low point average’ (rejec + repet)

**Group (3):**
Complex structure:

A: [inta kunt ihnaak ?] ‘were you not there?’
B: [anaa kunt ihnaak laa // aa] ‘I certainly was there no // yes’ (repet + rejec + accep)

A: [aywa liʃmara iʃʃarkassiyya\] ‘yes the
The above table contains a few examples for each group. More examples will follow in the appendix to this thesis.

Within the contextual operation framework, several cases of ‘repetition’ occurred in all conversations. In the second group, repetition, in combination with FB expression main functions (= acceptance, agreement, confirmation, or rejection), was a common occurrence. This is a reminder of how often the phenomenon of repetition is used as FB in normal Arabic talk. Some other types of speech acts were involved as well (verbal and non-verbal): correction, interrogation, laughter, swearing, reproaching, interruption, etc.

The phenomenon of repetition is discussed in section 1.5. It plays a very important role in Arabic conversation. This, however, does not entail that repetition is used mainly as FB; it is used for a variety of purposes. The value of repetition among Arabs and in Arab culture is that it covers a wide range of languages: both written and spoken, as well as body language. This, however, does not mean that a speaker has to keep repeating his expressions all the time to be understood or to make clear his requests or orders; this is not the case. Some other factors, like facial expression, are important for hearers to decide whether the speaker is serious or not, but repetition as a linguistic phenomenon is central to Arabic culture.

### More Examples of Contextual Operations: List of feedback examples as repetition forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of contextual forms</th>
<th>Feedback function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group (1): Single or sentence repetition</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A: [la la la] ‘no no no’</td>
<td>(repet rejec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: [la la la] ‘no no no’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sharkasian women
B: [aywa¹ i]arkasya² a²] ‘yes the Sharkasian women ah’
A: [bitkuwn iddiniyaa badrii] ‘the time will be early’
B: [laa iz u²³z u²³uhur bitkuwn iddiniya] ‘no, the time will be noon!’ (rejec+ corr + repet)
A: [akam ʃaχs humma kaanu] ‘how many persons are they?’
B: [akam ʃaχs humma kaanu] ‘how many persons are they?’ (repet inter)

A: [maʃquwl] ‘reasonable?’
B: [maʃquwl] ‘reasonable’ (repet agree)

A: [bidd/ak] ‘Do you want?’
B: [biddii] ‘I want’ (repet boul)

**Group (2): Repetition + other FB forms**

A: [inti itdʒawwazti uw hadʒarti ibnafs ilwaqt] ‘did you marry and emigrate at the same time?’
B: [ah ana itdʒawwazit wo hadʒarit ibnafs ilwaqt] ‘yeah I married and emigrated at the same time’ (accep + repet)

A: [humma mu lazim ikunu ananiyyn] ‘they shouldn't be selfish’
B: [ah bass lazim ikunu ananiyyn] ‘yes but they should be selfish’ (- accep + repet)

A: [anaa baḥib ali uw jamal] ‘I like Ali and Jamal’
B: [ali uw jamal ah] ‘Ali and Jamal yeah’ (repet + agree)

A: [imḥammad aχuwk] ‘Muhammed your brother’
B: [ah aχuwk] ‘ah your brother’ (agree + repet)

A: [inta kaan lak nahfaat] ‘you had some fantasies’
B: [nahfaat mm] ‘some fantasies mm’ (repet + conf)

A: [wala ityaddayituw] ‘did you not eat your lunch?’
B: [ityaddaynaa/ la] ‘we ate our lunch? no’ (repet + rejec)

A: [ayh la maa qultillhaa] ‘eh no I did not tell her’
B: [ayh la maa qalatilhaa] ‘eh no she did not tell her’ (- perc + repet)

A: [humma aʃʃaruw ʃalayh] ‘they pointed to him’
B: [aʃʃaruw ʃalihaa/] ‘they pointed to her’ (repet + corr)

A: [bisammuw il ʃanbari] ‘they call it Al Anbari’
B: [hada huwwa il ʃanbari/] ‘is this Al Anbari?’ (inter+ repet)

A: [uw ana maʃ ʃarafaat] ‘and I am with Arafat’
B: [Falafat] ‘Arafat <.>’
@ <laughter>

A: [u’sut inta] ‘you silent!’
B: [u’suttttttt] ‘silent’

Speaker A used a common expression among children, and the original word is [u’skut] but they replaced ‘k’ with ‘t’ for easier articulation.

A: [c’amasmiyya] ‘five hundred and five’
B: [c’amasmiyya uamsa ظ] ‘five hundred and five great’

Group (3): Complex structures

A: [inta maa ḥatqarrir] ‘will you not decide?’
B: [ah ḥaqarrir ah] ‘yes I will decide yes’

A: [bitkuwn faadya] ‘it becomes empty’
B: [ah bitkuwn faadya ظ] ‘ah it becomes empty good’

A: [f’an ila?’kil] ‘about food about drink’
B: [bizzabt bass f’an ila?’kil bizzabt] ‘exactly it’s only about food exactly’

A.4 I) Feedback and Ambiguity

One problem when studying FB in human communication is that it is highly multi-dimensional. What does a speaker mean when he says ‘yes’ and shakes his head, or when he says ‘no’ with a rising intonation?

Another question concerns the relation between ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ FB. Suppose A says: ‘I think we should have a cup of coffee’, and B answers: ‘ok’, or ‘I agree’. Do these two different responses mean the same thing, or not? I will not pursue these kinds of questions in this section, but merely indicate some of the empirical problems.

Below a table is set up to indicate these different dimensions, intonation, and non-verbal actions, showing how intonation and gesture together can modify the verbal content.

Note, the sign: + means ‘exists in non-verbal’:
Table. A.4.51: Intonation and Gesture in Verbal Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FB Unit</th>
<th>Rising</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Falling</th>
<th>Nodding</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Shaking</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘sorry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>[/]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘sorry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm</td>
<td>[]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘sorry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ah</td>
<td>[/]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘surprise’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>what</td>
<td>[/]</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘repeat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘be aware’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These non-verbal actions modify verbal action.

Ambiguity or Multi-functionality

In a given situation, there is not usually ambiguity, or ambiguity will not arise, while FB is given in communication, but the practice of such situations reveals at least three main FB functions. In the figure below a diagram has been drawn to indicate these functions:

**Figure (A.4.1)**

**FB-Functions:**

(1) I agree
(2) mm
(3) thanks

**FB-Expressions**

I agree (two degrees of positive FB)
mm (ambiguity)
thanks (unambiguity)

The symbols below: I, II, III and IV refer to different responses for each listener. On the pattern of the above diagram, this example may be given:
A: Would you like some tea?

I) B: I agree and/ or mm = which shows two different levels of giving a positive FB expression: agreement and confirmation

II) B: Thanks = ambiguous answer which does not indicate the real intention of the listener's FB i.e. ‘yes thanks’, or ‘no thanks’

III) B: Yes = simple and clear FB expression

Another special case of ambiguity is when ‘rejection’ is used. It seems that there exists an unstable area between ‘rejection’ and ‘confirmation’ when giving FB. This is the place for what may be called ‘hesitation’.

Example (2)

A: What do you think?
B: [we:ll] (+ waving head both sides)

On the other hand the other two main functions of FB: ‘acceptance’ and ‘agreement’ are easy to distinguish from ‘rejection’ expressions. In other words, there is no such difficulty in recognising ‘acceptance’ and ‘agreement’ as there (sometimes) has between ‘rejection’ and ‘confirmation’ (the example above). Besides, the degree of confirmation of a positive FB is in general weaker than for acceptance or agreement.
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