The Notion of Face in a Subcultural Diversity Language Classroom

Author: Dr. Abdallah Dawod Omer Jumaa. Professor assistant,

Applied Linguistics at University of Nyala- Faculty of education.

Presently working in Department of English Language and Translation,

College of Science and Arts Unaiza at Al Qassim University-

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Abdallah.jumaa86@gmail.com

الخلاصة

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى فكرة ماء الوجة اراقة وحفظا فى داخل الفصل لكل من مدرسى اللغة الإنجليزية و لدارسى اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية من خلفيات ثقافية متعددة واللذين يعاملون كدارسين من خلفية ثقافية واحدة داخل الفصل الدراسى ذات الثقافات المتعددة مكتشفا يعض أنماط إستخدام اللغة فى بعض السياقات . وكذلك تحاول إكتشاف فكرة ماء الوجة لدى دارسى اللغة الأجنبية أثناء تلقيهم للحصص الراسية أو المحاضرات التى تقارن أنماط إستخدام اللغة الأجنبية فى بعض السياقات مقارنة بإستخدام لغاتهم وثقافاتهم الأم .ويرى ذلك فى الصعوبات التى تواجة الطلاب انفسهم حيث يجدون كل شىء مختلق عن يحملونه ثقافة ولغة وتصورا. يضاف الى ذلك فهناك مفاهيم إجتماعية وكذلك بعض التصورات عن الرجل الأبيض خاطئة لدى الدارسين تقف حجر عثرة فى طريق تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية. تعتبر هذه الدراسة دعوة وإقتراح لتدريس إستخدامات اللغة الأنجليزية كلغة اجنبية فى السياقات المختلفة مقارنة بإستخدامات لغات الدارسين ذوخلفيات لغوية وثقافية متعددة داخل قاعات دراسية متعددة الثقافات.

1

1-Abstract

This study aims at studying the notion of face from both teachers of English and EFL learners of subcultural diversity in the subcultural diversity language classroom exploring the aspects of pragmatics. Also it explores the face notion of the EFL learners when they receive English classes taught pragmatically where the pragmatic aspects of the foreign language (English) compared to the pragmatic aspects of their own mother tongues and cultures. This is seen apparently seen in the difficulties that face the learners themselves when the find things are linguistically, culturally and conceptually different. Additionally, some mis-concepts of some learners of that every white man knows English better because it is his native language make EFL learners dare not speak English in front of them. Furthermore, this paper is an invitation and a proposal for teaching pragmatics of English as a target language compared to the pragmatics of EFL learners' languages and cultures in the subrcultural classrooms.

2-The Statement of the Problem

-When communicating in English in various settings, EFL learners of subcultural diversity background encounter difficulties to understand each other successfully.

-The teachers treat all the learners as if they are coming from the same cultural diversity background.

3-Objectives of the study

  This research is intended to achieve the objectives below:

-To make the EFL learners of subcultural diversity background aware of their own languages

- the mirror of their cultures- versus the EFL culture when communicating in English.

-To recognize strategies and tactics (of face saving/threatening) that may be used by the EFL learners of the subcultural background.

-To discover the factors which contribute to successful EFL communication of the learners of subcultural diversity background?

-To find out the areas of break down communication of the EFL learners of subcultural diversity background.

4-Questions of the Study

The raised questions by the present study are as follows:

-To what extent do syllabuses of English of University level make the EFL learners of subcultural diversity background aware of their own languages when communicating in English?

-What are the factors which contribute to successful communication of the EFL learners of diversity cultural diversity backgrounds?

-Do the EFL learners of subcultural diversity backgrounds know that EFL learning helps in learning and understanding other languages?

5- Methodology

The research methodology that will be followed to carry out this study is descriptive, analytical and empirical one. The researcher is going to describe, analyze and teach the areas of language learning. Instruments like, observation and questionnaires will be used for data collection. Data will be analyzed manually and by computer – the SPSS program.

-The Setting

The setting for this study is any subrcultural diversity classroom in any multicultural and multilingual country.

-The Study Population

University students of faculty of arts particularly, the students of department of English, approximately, numbered as two hundred and half (250) subjects, are to be the study population for this investigation.

All the students should be living in place whether living with their families or they are borders. They should all speak Arabic as a lingua-franca, yet some of them have their first languages others than Arabic as their mother tongues. They should all be learners of English as a foreign language.

-Sampling Size

A classroom of (44) students, is to be the sample size for this research, and all the students in this class should have the same characteristics such as:

  i) Showing great interest in learning English;

ii) Showing great willingness to participate in this study;

Students who are specialist in English will be selected by distributing 44 papers (written the word WINER on each one) within hundred papers, which corresponds the total number to the first students who attended the first lecture. Every student who got the paper with the word WINNER was selected as one of the subjects to participate in this study. The participation was taking place during the classes' days.

6-Key Words: Face threatening/ saving, intercultural classroom, pragmatics, positive/ negative face.

7-World Conceptualization

7-1- Culture Diversity in Language Classrooms

Decades ago, educational policies around the world, particularly those of language teaching were built upon the assumptions that students would come from   the main stream cultures of the countries they reside in. There was a rare contact with other cultures. This led to misinterpretations, stereotypes, categorizations and even prejudice of other cultures (Pacheco de Freitas (2018:5)). UNESCO, in Freitas (2018:7), argues that language is at the core of intercultural education that linguistic competences are fundamental in empowering the individuals in democratic and plural societies promote access to other cultures and encourage openness to cultural exchange. So the concept of inclusive education brought to the view, that education and language teaching researchers predict it should be based on enhancing appropriate assistance for learners from diverse cultural backgrounds with various abilities and providing equal chances to guide them into meaningful education. (Cbedo-Mas etal.(2017:15)).

Culturally, in the multilingual classrooms relevant materials should be built on students' linguistic and cultural resources while teaching language through content and themes. Students should be supported and motivated to apply the target language strategically by dealing with student – centered activities. That because some educators preference to integrate language skills into instruction from the beginning.

Jane and Micheal Clarke (1990:41) address the issue of stereotyping in TESOL materials of English, they confirm that "it is the diversity of world views, values and roles within as well as between cultures that need to be addressed." For example, they point out that Anglo- American or Eurocentrism in many EFL textbooks can give an over positive stereotype of the dominant group and lead to feelings of inferiority or resentment in the learners. Furthermore, teaching EFL teaching idea as conceptualizes by Barrow, Robin (1990: 3), may lead to imposing the values and beliefs of English speaking western world upon individuals and countries whose traditions are totally different. Barrow adds that any program of teaching involves behaving in ways that they may shape values and beliefs.

As Agustina,Sheila and Yudi, C. B.(2016:93) rephrase students' various characteristics can be changed via classroom good interactions which are essential for both students and teachers for academic sense. The teacher inside the classroom does not only provide students with subject materials only but also shares moral values that will support students to manage outside the classroom. A good interaction enables teachers to construct positive relations with students that can bridge the gap by good communication skills. Therefore, carrying out effective communication in the classroom is essential and cannot be devaluated.

Subculture is defined by *Vocabulary.Com Dictionary,* as "a group pf people within a large culture such as a country, who have something in common". The people of subcultures and the people of dominant cultures may share religious or political beliefs or science fiction fans, for example. This is clearly seen in the case of Sudan that Arabic is the dominant (main stream) culture shared by all Sudanese besides other various identified subcultures. And as Zhao (2007:130- 135) states that when teachers and students from different cultural backgrounds come together in one classroom, differences arise from what they accustomed in their ways of speaking and their body language- gestures and facial expressions besides the using of address terms and ways of participation in activities all seem to be different. For, means of address between teachers and students; the in class behavior of students; the relationship between students teachers may vary from culture to other. Thus, cultural conflicts and misunderstandings might be seen in types of teacher – student behavior. And face work will be noticed when practicing kinship relationship because some cultures based on hierarchical kinship relationships and other cultures do not.

Exploring that cultural norms significantly determine the perception of situation, Kim and et al. (2012: 1100- 1118) add that individual face needs , situational factors and culture as well as interaction are important predicators of individuals' management strategies in potentially impolite situations. Findings of cross-cultural research on face needs and face work reveal that, in social interactions, face work can operate in culture- specific ways include: individual characteristics and situational characteristics.

A foreign language teacher in cultural subcultural diversity classroom is expected to process skills and competences that support him to be an intercultural mediator because these competences and skills are affected by a number of factors which are necessary to full understanding of language teaching process of interculturality. A contrast should be made between mono - cultural and intercultural education; source culture should be distinguished from target culture; so as to achieve the values of heterogeneity, diversity, equality, interaction, solidarity, respect and empathy m (Gomez Parra and R. Rodriguiez (2009:58- 95)).

7-2-The Notion of Face

Scollon and Scollon in Chen (2017: 153), claim that there is no faceless communication, but Huang, Qian (2014:175), sees face work as:

"the actions taken to deal with the face wants of one or another, besides the enactment of verbal and non-verbal moves; self- presentation acts; impression management interaction ,and face strategies which can be used diffuse , manage , enhance, or downgrade self , or others face. It concerns of communicative behaviours that people use to regulate their social dignity and to support or challenge the others social dignity."

Zhao,Wanli,(2010:34) reports that face want is a universal phenomenon in speech communication, which is what people of different cultural backgrounds all try to observe and maintain. Yet Brown and Levinson assert that every speech act is a fata. They address the context for face threatening act options.

Most of pragmaticians of face studies point out that one of the most influential models that tries to explain the impact of social factors on people's use of language is Brown and Levinson's (1978/1987) Face Model of Politeness.

Face, is defined by Brown and Levinson as; "the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself." Brown and Levinson distinguish negative face from positive one, that negative face reflects every person basic claim to territories, personal preserves rights to non – distraction – i.e., to freedom of action and freedom from imposition. On contrast, the positive face reflects every person's need that his or her self-image is appreciated and approved of. Generally, as noted in Discourse Action Politeness Theory (2016), Brown and Levinson are divided FTAs into five major types as seen below:

(i) A type of FTA, on record, baldly e.g. Hey, lend me 10 Dollars.

(ii) A type of FTA, on record with redressive action: positive/solidarity politeness e.g., Hey my friend could you lend me 10 Dollars?

(iii) A type of FTA, on record with redressive action: negative/ respect politeness e.g.

   Sorry, I have to ask, but could you borrow me 10 Dollars?

(iv)A type of FTA, off record e.g. Oh no, I'm out of money!

(v) No FTA,when the risk of asking is too great, so you don't ask.

FTAs can be directly performed (on-record) and FTAs which are performed indirectly (off-record). On record FTAs can be performed with redressive or without redressive acts. Redressive can be positive politeness (approve of) or negative politeness (the need to left free from imposition).

Reflecting on pragmatics of interpersonal communication, Cap in Pior,Cap and Magdalena Kozanecka (2002 :50 -53)elaborates pragmatic politeness as a series of strategies employed by S to promote and maintain harmonious relations with H to manage S's and H's face. Furthermore, Cap extends his discussions to include contexts for FTA options as he sees them as follows:

   1) On record baldly: Used whenever external factors impose extreme directness
      e.g. In emergencies/time constrains.

   2) On record with positive politeness: Used in any informal settings.

   3) On record with negative politeness: Adopted in most formal settings.

   4) Off record: This is adopted whenever there is a need for hinting or being elliptical e.g. when implying H's guilt).

Taking in account the different cultural backgrounds that may raise further difficulties of mutual understanding between two culturally different interlocutors, Brown and Levinson (1978/1987) in Schmitt, argue that "speakers take three main variables into account when deciding how to word a face threatening utterances such as a request or a challenge." (Schmitt (2002: 82)).

Basing on Brown and Levinson, Grundy (2008:197 –70)), discusses the terms positive, negative and off – record politeness- saying that when a speaker "has a face threatening act to perform, a person chooses from the three super ordinate strategies: 'do the act on - record'. 'Do the act off – record' and 'don't do the act at all'. They mean by on - record without attempting to hide what (people) are doing, and they mean by off – record in such a way as to pretend to hide as demonstrated by instances below:

      (i)Do the act on – record:

           - Baldy, without redress;

           - With positive politeness redress; and

           - With negative politeness redress.

      (ii)Do the act off-record.

      (iii) Don't do the act.

Furthermore, Grundy (2008: 199), reports that since Brown and Levinson have listed the positive and negative politeness strategies available to their Model person, the notion of face model of politeness has been bitterly charged of not providing a satisfactory answer to the crucial question of in what ways the proposed universal strategies of language use fit the culture specific"?, Brown and Levinson have tried to account for various cross – cultural differences.

Jaszcolt (2002: 326), explains that " culture of D and P, the level of W is culture specific, determined by the values of D,P and R" Further, "different acts are FTAs in different cultures and to a different degree. Some cultures have high levels of P.D and R and use only small FTAs – using only negative politeness". Furthermore, Jaszcolt(2002:326) emphasizes that" positive –politeness cultures have a low level of W. In these cultures impositions are thought of as small, so are social distance and relative power". Brown and Levinson ignore the sub cultural differences, women use of more positive politeness strategies, in addition to, other 'wants' interact with face wants.

A growing discontent with explaining politeness through a set of strategies makes Escandell - Vida (1996, 1998) to adopt a new trend to explain politeness called *a cognitive approach to politeness*. Escandell uses frames, structures of knowledge to demonstrate that polite behavior fits in naturally with peoples' assumptions about conversation. Jaszcolt (2002:327) says that Escandell proposes that the notion of '*social adequacy'* comes first to that of a strategy in the way that any strategies, which are used "to achieve politeness must assume some expectations of socially adequate behavior". Vidal (c.f. Jaszcolt (2002:327)) further assumes that "if politeness is based on expectation, then it can be explained in terms of knowledge; if so a psychological, cognitive frame work will be able to account for it". Viewing politeness as acting within the conditions of a conversational contract (cc), Fraser in Jaszcolt, has brought to the light his proposal of Conversational Contract, which is a set of rights and obligations.

Viewing politeness as acting within the conditions of a Conversational Contract (CC), Fraser has brought to light his proposed *Conversational Contact,* which is a set of rights and obligations, brought into conversation by the participants and are negotiated, if necessary, as conversation politeness -the politeness that is usually maintained in conversation and known as a dynamic politeness. Escandell – Vidal (c.f. Jaszcolt (2002: 228) - in the relevance theoretic spirit - has proposes that the politeness has to be intentional an overt. It should be clear to both the speaker and hearer so as to communicate.

This type of politeness is known as a communicated politeness. It is quite different from the other linguistic politeness namely, the strategic politeness. Keeping a part the dilemma of dynamic\ static discussing from the relevance theoretic perspective, separates cases of communicated politeness from the cases where politeness is not clear,   because the anticipated level of politeness has kept hidden.

In the EFL classroom, Chen, Ju (2017: 159) reports that, FATS can be categorized into four main types as: indirect threat (avoiding explicit mention of the students), indirect accusation (involving questions to students about of their unfavorable behavior), direct threats with modified blame (with softer expression), and direct threats with explicit blame. But in the viewpoint of Agustina, Sheila and Yudi C., Bambang (2016:94-95), teachers are less conscious of direct expressions in the classrooms when applying face threatening or face losing utterances such as *What is your name?*(asking for student name), *No, it's wrong.*,

or *That's wrong.* (For feedback), or *OK,wait,wait, I'm trying to understand your expression* etc. Sheila and Bambang praise teachers' awareness of using face – saving utterances like, expressions of the positive feedback: alright , of-course, good and so forth ; lengthening utterances using declaratives and interrogative structures or giving appreciation to the students through the expressions such as: *Good* and *Thank you* . In face language learning, Takeda, Reiko (Educational Studies 58:122), sees face as a double –edged sword for language learners that would not be expected not to become proficient, they are still learning a target language. When teaching speech acts of a language, teachers need to be conscious of face importance in accordance to social and contextual variables particularly the teachers who try to elicit questions in - order to promote students' participation, because this sometimes poses challenges. Building upon French and Raven – the psychologists, Augustina, Sheila and Cahyono, B.Y. (2016: 93), identify five bases for power on the basis of its work on relationships. These five bases reveal in the EFL classroom as: legitimate power; reverent power; expert power; coercive power; and reward power.

8. Data Presentation and Results

8.1. Data Presentation and Results of Questionnaires

8.1.1. The Teachers' Questionnaire

Table (8-1) shows multiple comparisons for the teachers' questionnaire.

(I) Applied Linguistics	(J) Applied Linguistics	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Upper Bound	Lower Bound
Pronunciation	By means of Peer correction	1.500	2.180	.992	7.77	-4.77
Structures	By means of Peer correction	1.750	2.180	.977	8.02	-4.52
Vocabulary	By means of Peer correction	2.000	2.180	.949	8.27	-4.27

Social practices	By means of Peer correction	.750	2.180	1.000	7.02	-5.52
Correcting learner's errors	By means of Peer correction	.250	2.180	1.000	6.52	-6.02
Corrected learners production	By means of Peer correction	14.000(*)	2.180	.000	20.27	7.73
Learners correction welcome	By means of Peer correction	-.250	2.180	1.000	6.02	-6.52
By means of explicit teaching	By means of Peer correction	.750	2.180	1.000	7.02	-5.52
By means of correction	By means of Peer correction	1.500	2.180	.992	7.77	-4.77
By means of task-based instruction	By means of Peer correction	1.250	2.180	.998	7.52	-5.02

To know the opinions of EFL teachers of University of Nyala about " *Why teachers do not use pragmatic awareness?* ", the researcher has used the sample Least Standard Deviation (L S D) to analyze questionnaire (1).A Dunnett t-tests treat one group as a control one, and compares all the other groups against it. Results show that mean differences at level sign 5% only between the average treatment (By means of peer correction, corrected learners production), where the value of P- value = 0.000 or significance is least from 0.05 with the existence of * mark on the average differences. Thus, it can be said that there are no mean differences that are different from zero (0) between the other means, therefore, the null hypothesis which says that there are differences between the other averages is rejected, because the mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

8.2. Data Presentation and Results of Students' Questionnaire:

Students' questionnaire includes parts: A; B; C, and D.

8.2.1. Students' Questionnaire: Part (One)

Table (8-2-1): Contrast Coefficients for Section (A)

Contrast	Mother tongue			
	Arabic	Fur	Hausa	Zaghawa
1	3	-1	-1	-1
2	-1	3	-1	-1
3	-1	-1	3	-1

The table above (8-2-1), deals with the mother tongue influence on learning English as a foreign language in University of Nyala as reflected by the languages Arabic; Fur; Zaghawa and Hausa. The results read that the four languages differ in their influences on EFL learning as reflected by the three levels of contrast and depicted by the factors of the three comparisons. The results reject the items of students' questionnaire part (one) section (A) which hypothesizes that: *Mother tongue's influence on EFL learning.*

Table (8-2-2): Demonstrates the F- test results for section (B)

	Sum of squares	df	Mean squares	F	Sig.
Between (combined)	119.76	3	89.920	.182	.908
Groups Linear term Un weighted	75.500	1	75.500	.344	.561
Weighted	23.437	1	23.437	.107	.746
Deviation	96.324	2	48.162	.220	.804
With Groups	7890.239	36	219.173		
Total	8010.000	39			

Results of F – test for questionnaire, part (one) section (B): Tables (1) and (2) *"social uses, and needs for English"*, show that the means are not difference at the level (5% = 0.05), because all values of P – value > 0.05.

Therefore, the results reject section B's items of students' questionnaire, part (one) section (B), tables (1) and (2). That the value contrast is got out as follows: *Value* contrast $=\sum \frac{c_1 y_1}{r}$ where r represents the views which equal 4.

Table (8-2- 3): Shows the results of the F- test for section (c)

	Sum of squares	Df	Mean squares	F	Sig.
Between (combined)	116.595	3	38.865	.518	.672
Groups Linear term Unweighted	35.878	1	35.878	.478	.494
Weighted	38.001	1	8.001	.507	.481
Deviation	78.594	2	39.297	.524	.597
With Groups	2700.505	36	75.140		
Total	2817.100	39			

Table (8-2-3): shows the results of F-Test, which indicate to null means of differences between averages of the results as answers of differences between averages of the results as answers to the items of students' questionnaire , part (one) section (C): *English Classes (Language Skills).*

Table (8-3) of students' questionnaire, part (one) section (C) depicts the factors of the three comparisons (1, 2 and 3), table (3) of the section exhibits the T-test of means of comparisons, from which it is clear that all comparisons are not means at the level sign (5% = 0.05) because all values of P-value > 0.05. Therefore, the results reject items of students' questionnaire part (one) section (C). Because the value contrast is extracted as follows: Value contrast $= \sum \frac{c_1 y_1}{r}$ where r represents the views equals 4.

Table (8-2-4): Demonstrates F- test Results for section (D)

	Sum of squares	Df	Mean squares	F	Sig.
Between (combined)	756.230	3	252.077	3.859	.017
Groups Linear term Un weighted	309.520	1	309.520	4.738	.036
Weighted	53.676	1	53.676	.822	.371
Deviation	702.554	2	351.277	5.377	.009
With Groups	2351.670	36	65.324		
Total	3107.900	36			

Table (8-2-4) Demonstrates results of students' questionnaire part (one) section (D). It confirms that F-test results are referent to nullification of means of differences between averages (results) as answers to the items of questionnaire, part (one) section (D) *"Some reasons for studying English"* at the level (1% = 0.01 and 5% = 0.05). **But** table (4-6) below demonstrates the three factors of comparisons (1, 2, and 3).

٨.3. Students' Questionnaire: Part Two

This questionnaire investigates the section of "Speech Acts" namely "Apologies" and "Requests".

Table (8-3-1): Shows Paired Samples Statisticsfor speech acts
*–requestsand apologie**s***

		Mean	N	Std.Deviaition	Std.Error
Pair 1	Requests	28.58	40	4.082	.645
	Apologies	7.63	40	1.314	.208

From the table (8-3-1), the results show that the connection factors between requests and apologies equals 0.0223 which is weak and means at level sign (5% = 0.05).

Table (8-3-2): Explains Paired Samples Test for requests and apologies

	Paired Differences					T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Differences				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 Requests Apologies	20.950	4.000	.632	19.671	22.229	33.128	39	.000

From table (8-3 - 2), the results read that the T-test refers to that the values of P-value 0.000 < 0.05, which show results' rejecting of the null items i.e., there are mean differences between apologies and requests that is different from zero.

8.4 Students' Questionnaire: Part Three

This part of students' questionnaire part (four), deals with *the relations between Mona Huda.*

Table (8-4-1): Paired Samples Correlations
for Mona and Huda's relationship

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1 section.A and section.B	40	.071	.664

From the table (8-4-1) above it is noticed that the connection result is 0.071, which is weak connection and mean sign at level (5% = 0.05).

Table (8-4-2) shows the results for the relation between Mona and Huda

	Paired Differences					t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Differences				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 section A – section B	13.3250	3.0012	.4745	12.3652	14.2848	28.081	39	.000

The table (8-4-2) above shows that the T-test results indicate to the values of P-value 0.000 < 0.05, which leads to reject the null hypothesis. That is there are mean differences between section (A) and section (B) that F is different from zero.

6. Discussion

This section of the study is completely devoted to discussing the results of the data presented above and interpreting the degrees of face saving/threatening from the percentages and round figures resulted out form both the questionnaire and observation results.

Studying answers of the question, "why do teachers not use cultural diversity awareness?", which are contributed by the teachers of the subcultural diversity language classrooms at University of Nyala, besides making classroom observations while teaching English language items affording chances to the EFL learners to see the differences and similarities between English cultural items contrasted to the same cultural items of the learners' own mother tongues', the questionnaires' results and researcher's observations revealed that all the answers contributed by the EFL teachers of University of Nyala were revolving around language learning areas: pronunciation; structures; vocabulary and meaning ; social practices and politeness; in addition to teaching style and effective ways of instruction.

1- Structures:

As (80% = 0.8) of teachers see that teaching structures is most important to learn English, (20% = 0.2) of teachers also think that structures of English are only important. Furthermore, (50% = 0.5) of teachers of English believe that learners need the most instruction in language structures. While (50% = 0.5) of them think that structures of language can be acquired naturally without instruction. No one of EFL teachers has given priority to correcting learners' errors in the area of structures, when the teachers of English were been asked to number the areas of language according to how often they believe their students' production is to be corrected? About (70% = 0.7) of the teachers have not given any justification for that. All teachers (100% = 0.10) of English noted that learners of English do not welcome correction in all areas of language learning (mentioned above) at all. Concerning the answer whether learners react more favorably to correction in one area of language learning than others, structures were found neglected completely when teachers were been asked to identify the area of language learning that teachers were most confident of correcting learners production.

2- Vocabulary and Meaning;

The researcher observed that as (25% = 0.25) of teachers of English believe that it is important to focus their lessons mostly on vocabulary and meaning other (25% = 0.25) of them see that focusing on vocabulary and meaning is not important but (50% = 0.5) think that focusing their lessons on vocabulary and meaning is of less importance. Considering the areas teachers believe that learners need the most instruction, only (25% = 0.25) of teachers think most instruction should be concentrated on vocabulary and meaning, whereas (75% = 0.75) see no reason for focusing language lessons on vocabulary and meaning.

As for frequent correction of learners' production of teachers, (50% = 0.5) of teachers call for correction while other (50% = 0.50) reject the idea of correction and give priority to vocabulary and meaning. But priority and correction were given to students' production in the area of vocabulary and meaning by other (50% = 0.5) of EFL teachers. Furthermore teachers mentioned that they are confident of correcting the production of their learners in the area of vocabulary and meaning.

3- Pronunciation:

Pronunciation has been considered by (25% =25) of teachers of English as one of the most significant areas of language learning, and believe that learners need the most instruction in this area, though it can be acquired naturally without instruction. And (50% = 0.5) of teachers agree to frequent correction of learners' production in the area of pronunciation. While (30% = 0.3) of teachers see that priority is to be enhanced to pronunciation in lessons focused, other (50% = 0.5) of teachers numbered pronunciation as to be given very often correction but none of the teachers justified his answer. All (100% = 0.10) teachers have the opinion that students do not welcome correction in the area of pronunciation. There is not any sign in the opinion of teachers refer to that students react favorably to correction of pronunciation. But (25% = 0.25) of teacher declare that they feel confident of correcting learners' production in the area of pronunciation.

4- Social practices and politeness:

Teachers of English contributed various ideas concerning the significance of "social practices and politeness," While (25% = 0.25) of them agreed that this area is very important, other (25% = 0.25) of them have believed that it is important. Half of them (50% = 0.5) have conceived that this area of social practices and meaning is the area of no importance in the lesson focus, though (75% = 0.75) thought that this area needs instruction. As (50% = 0.5) of teachers felt that social practice and meaning can be acquired naturally without instruction, other (50% = 0.5) do believe in frequent correction of learners' production in the area of social practices and politeness. While (50% = 0.5) of teachers see no reason in giving priority to correcting social practices and politeness. Whereas (25% = 0.25) of teachers never correct the learners' production in the area of social practices and meaning; another equal number of (25% = 0.25) correct the production of their students very often. As (25% = 0.25) of teachers have justified their answer another (25% = 0.25) refused to do that. In the opinion of the most (75% = 0.75) of teachers, learners do not welcome correction in the area of social practices and meaning. Only (25% = 0.25) of teachers have believed that students react favorably to correction in the area of social practices and meaning, but no one of teachers (0% = 0.0) say that he/she is confident of correcting learners' production in this area.

5- Teaching Style:

When the EFL teachers were asked to express their opinions about the factors that affect their present teaching performance, twenty percent (25% = 0.25) of them mentioned the factors of teacher training. Also another number of (25% = 0.25) attributed this to the ways by which they were been taught English when they were at schools (i.e. experience of their former teachers of English who taught them excellently).The third (50% = 0.5) of the teachers added the experience of their present long and rich experienced colleagues. But none (0% = 0.0) of the teachers nominated the ways that they were been taught another L2.

6- Effective Ways of Instruction:

For the most effective ways of instruction they provide when instruction is beneficial, the EFL teachers contributed the results demonstrated that a small number (25% = 0.25) of teachers see means of explicit teaching is the most beneficial. Whereas (25% = 0.25) of teachers consider means of correction is very effective. However (75% = 0.75) of teachers believe in effectiveness of the means of task-based instruction. At the same time (25% = 0.25) of teachers of English say that the means of peer correction is the least effective.

Classroom observations indicated that as all (100% = 1.0) of the subcultural diversity learners in the language classrooms of University of Nyala are bilingual- speak Arabic and English-, two third of them (75% = 0.75) are trilingual- speak Arabic, English and French. And (90% 0.9) others are polyglot- speak, Arabic, English, French and one of their native languages such as Fur, Zaghawa, and Hausa etc.

While discussing the importance of speaking English as an international or global language, that it should be practiced everywhere and every time with friends, relatives, people in the streets markets stadiums etc., about (60% = 0.6) of learners have frankly expressed their opinions that they do not intend to speak English to their relatives and other people in their societies because of social reasons, that they think others may consider their behavior of speaking English as a matter of arrogance, therefore, a little number (5% = 0.05) of them speak English at home to parents brothers and sisters and some relatives. A few number (20% = 0.2) of the EFL learners speak English to others for reasons such as dreaming to visit USA or England or any other English speaking countries for some purposes.

But the majority feels that speaking of English is a trap for they are afraid to commit mistakes in front of others. Furthermore, they think that they study English just to pass the exams of English language only. They never dream of using English as a profession tool in the future at all. Also EFL learners believe in that every white foreigner is English who knows his mother tongue better as they know their mother tongues, so they are not daring to defy such persons by speaking English to them.

Concerns English classes all students express their dissatisfaction, since the majority (80% = 0.8) of learners has suggested that they need the English classes that enable them to understand others (native speakers of English) and to be understood by others (native speakers of English) when communicating in English. They complain about teacher organizing activities and suggest that activities should be organized by societies and language clubs, and teachers should use useful aids for teaching and organizing English classes particularly in language activities.

Most of the learners (65% = 0.65) suggest that the only reasons make them study or learn English is to pass English Exams and to speak to their friends only.

A great number of students (80% = 0.8) believe that speaking English is not a safe job, but it is not difficult to speak English to their friends. They mention that sometimes they speak English at markets, roads and festivals when there is no way out e.g. when they are been asked by a foreigner for direction or asking about things or when they are been greeted by foreigners. In many cases they use Arabic besides English during communicating in English.

Halve of learners (50% = 0.5) of English as a foreign language in this study note that it is very difficult to use "introductions" of English, because it is difficult how to "start a conversation" and how to "close" it? It is a matter of so many rules that are difficult to be kept in mind. Furthermore, the researcher has noticed that students are able to practice formal conversational routines such as the formal greeting formulas (good morning/evening, afternoon etc.), but they fail to practice informal greeting formulas such as (hi ,Ciao, and bye) are answered in formulas other than ("Hi" ,"Ciao'', and "Bye"). Also it is observed that learners are not able to close conversations such as "see you" and "Nice to meet you" using the same formulas.

Excellent Results are been observed when the learners have been learning formulas of English requests, that the majority (90% = 0.9) of the students have got high marks for this section. Also good results (88% = 0.88) are seen when using requests as permissions. Though about (50% = 0.5) of learners know to use the formula "Sorry", it is noticed that they ignore the other formulas of apology besides the various apology strategies. Furthermore, the (87% = 0.87) of learners are not able to find the relationship between requests, apologies and politeness easily, they face   some difficulties with learning them.

For the people relations, the small number of the learners (25% = 0.25) noticed to deal so easily with people's relations that they have been able to identify the relation between Mona and Huda, and the degree of offence but have not been able to identify Mona's status and losing or gaining face.

It observed that most of (99% = 0.99) of learners agree that the reasons for complimenting are: Admiration, persuading and for cajoling. They show examples for compliments as polite speech acts of face flattering. Here are some examples:

Ya lil warda al yaniaa = What a pretty girl!

Arabic Ya zahiya = what a girl!

Fur   { Ye selbe / ye selbe / = you beautiful girl.
         Muru fago = the strong and brave man arrived.

Most of the learners' examples show the implicit compliments. The learners thought that cajoling strategies are used for flattering others or persuading them for gaining things from them. The learners believe that overt compliments are not answered or answered by remarks of anger on the face of complimentees because it brings shock to complimenters.

Learners mention that in some African cultures people do not compliment men or the belonging things (possessions) because people fear of what they call (Aein), which in English corresponds to evil eye.

After an explicit teaching of English speech acts-apologies; requests and compliments-; and English conversational routines – introductions; starting and closing conversations and greetings,

the structured and unstructured, group interviews reveal the following results:

-Compliments:

A great number (90% = 0.9) of learners of English complimenting in contrast to their mother tongues complimenting, have gained very high marks that, (80% = 0.8) learners were able to contrast English complimenting to the complimenting of their mother tongues'.

(i)Introductions   (ii) conversations (iii) greetings

Only (66% = 0.66) learners were able to introduce themselves to others; introduce others and re-introduce themselves. About (20% = 0.2) of learners show good performance when contrasting English conventions of starting conversations to starting conversational conventions of their mother tongues. But (80% = 0.8) of the learners performed excellently when contrasting English conventions of closing conversations to the conventions of their native languages.

Average number(50% = 0.5)of learners got good marks when learning English greeting formulas in contrast to the formulas of their first languages'. While (99% = 0.99) of learners were able to express their mother tongues' greeting formulas but only (30% = 0.3) were able to learn English greetings correctly, particularly the informal ones. Whereas, (90% = 0.9) of learners were quite happy with greeting gestures most of them select: Salam; handshaking; salute; hugging; and back slapping.

9-Conclusion

Investigating the notion of face in a subcultural diversity language classroom, seeing the areas of both face saving and face threatening, the study leads to the following conclusions:

A) For teachers

Linguistically, though most teachers believe that teaching and correcting learners' production in pronunciation and structures are essential in learning EFL, it appears that teaching pronunciation and grammar in a subcultural diversity language classroom is not a safe job that they are highly face threat areas because of various sound systems and different structural systems are seen. Therefore, the majority of teachers who participated in this study were not confident with correcting the production of the learners in pronunciation and structures. For vocabulary teaching, most of EFL teachers in a subcultural diversity language classroom see on reason to focus on their lessons, because it is the thorniest area too.

As for social practice (social routines) areas and politeness, approximately all teachers confirm that these areas needs accurate instruction and intensive practice, a few teachers guaranteed correcting the production of the learners. The teachers appreciated their own ex teachers' styles of teaching of EFL and praised the training factors but no body nominated the effective styles of teaching of his/her own in the subcultural diversity language classroom.

A small number of teachers sees the use of explicit teaching and correction of the learners production as an effective means of teaching EFL in a subcultural diversity language classroom, though the majority prefers the task – based instruction.

B) For students

To the EFL learners of the subcultural diversity background speaking English inside and outside the classroom is a trap for many reasons: some reasons stem from the nature of their cultures that speaking a language your society does not understand is considered as a matter of arrogance. Therefore, the learners of EFL rarely speak English in their societies but they can speak to their parents, brothers, sisters, friends and to a very limited extent to the foreigners when there is no way out when they faced by foreigners ask for directions or clarifying for things. Another reason is the wrong concept that any white knows English well because it is his own native language. The nature of the structures and sound systems of some languages of the EFL learners of subcultural diversity background are different from that of English so speaking English inside the classroom is a trap. They study English to pass the school exam only. They are not ambitious to use it as a profession tool one day.

Most of the learners show their dissatisfaction of English classes. They think that the classes do not answer their needs of speaking in the way to be understood by the native speakers of English language. They also want to understand the native speakers. The learners further complain about the organization of the activities in the classroom by the teachers. They believe in that activities should be organized by learners' societies and clubs.

For social routines, practicing English introductions, starting and closing conversations, answering informal greetings , besides using apology strategies stand as a great challenge in the in front of the EFL learners of subcultural diversity background this may be of the cultural specific rules used by every subculture.

Compliments as polite speech acts of face flattering used for admiration, persuasion or cajoling, are normally and successfully practiced. The same is true for formal greetings and greeting gestures such as Salaam, handshaking, salute, hugging, backslapping.

References

Augustina,Sheila and Yudi Cahyono B.(2016) " Politeness and Power Relation in Classroom Interactions: A Study on Indonesian Learners and Lecturers". **International Journal of Language and Linguistics. Vol. 3, No. 2; June 2016**

Abermann,G.,and Gehrke,I.(---).*The Multicultural Classroom- A Guaranteed Intercultural Learning Space?*25ᵗʰ FORSCHUNGUFGRUM

Barrow, Robin (1990). "Cultures, Values and the Language Classroom". **Culture and Language Classroom- Milestones in ELT.**ed. by Brain Harrison (1990). Hong Kong**.**

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. (1978 / 1987). *Politeness- Some universals in language usage***.**United Kingdom,Cambridge University Press.

Byram, M. and Guilherme, M.(2010)"Intercultural Education and Intercultural Communication: Tracing the Relationship". **Becoming Intercultural Inside and Outside the Classroom** (ed.)By Yau Tsai and Stephanie Houghton. Cambridge Scholars Publishing 2010

Clarke,M. and Jane(1990). "Stereotyping in TESOL Materials". **Culture and Language Classroom- Milestones in ELT.**ed. by Brain Harrison (1990). Hong Kong**.**

Chen, Ju(2017)." Face Threatening Acts: "Conflict between a Teacher and Students in EFL Classroom". **Open Journal of Modern Linguistics 2017, 7, 151 – 166**

Huan, Qian(2014). " Facework Strategies in EFL Classroom**". Journal of Language Teaching and Research Vol.5, No.I, PP.175- 182, January 2014**

Kim,W.,and Guan,X. and Parke,H. S.(2012)." Face and Facework: A Cross -Cultural Comparison of Managing Politeness Norms in the United

States and Korea". **International Journal of Communication 6 (2012),
1100- 1118**

Jaszcolt, K. M. (2002). *Semantics and Pragmatics – Meaning in Language and Discourse*.
Great Britain, Pearson Education.

--------- (2016).Discourse as Action, Politeness Theory. Lesson: 8.

Grundy, P. (2008) *Doing Pragmatics*. Hodder Education; Part of Hachette Liver.

Nowacka, M. and Cap, P. (2002) "Language in Action: Pragmatic and Social
Aspects of Language Use". (In) **Studies in Language and Linguistics –
Selected Reading for Students of English Philology; pp. 42-**53

Reiko, Takeda **(-). "**Face and Language Learning**". Educational Studies 58,
International Christian University**

Parra,E.G.and Rodriguez,A.R.(2009). "The Intercultural Training of Foreign
Language Teachers. The Spanish Case".(In) **el guiniguada . IssN:0213-
0610, PP.53-66 (2009)**

Wanli, Zhao (2010). "An Investigation of Students' Face Wants in Chinese English
Teachers' Classroom Feedback." **Journal of Language Teaching and
research, Vol. 1, pp.29-34, January 2010.**

Zhao,Yuqin (2007). **"**Cultural Conflicts in an Intercultural Classroom Discourse and
interpretations from
a Cultural Perspective"**. Intercultural Communication Studies XVI:1   2007.**