



## Linguistics and Translation

*Elixir Ling. & Trans.* 53 (2012) 11992-11998

**Elixir**  
ISSN: 2229-712X

# Gender differences in using gratitude expressions in Iranian academic context

Mohammad Javad Mohammadi<sup>1</sup>, Saeed Khazaie<sup>1</sup> and Bizhan Hekmatshoar Tabari<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz.

<sup>2</sup>Allameh Mohaddes Noori Institute of Higher Education, Iran.

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received: 17 October 2012;

Received in revised form:

7 December 2012;

Accepted: 7 December 2012;

### Keywords

Pragmatics,  
Speech acts,  
Gratitude speech act,  
Gratitude strategies,  
Persian.

## ABSTRACT

Recently, there has been a growing interest in the realm of gender-bound language. A myriad of studies in this area are devoted to different speech acts. To expand the scope of speech act studies, the present contribution highlights the gender differences in frequency of utilizing five most common gratitude expressions ranging from least affective to most affective in Persian language. To this aim, the data employed includes a corpus of 40 naturally-occurring gratitude exchanges, 20 for men and 20 for women of academic context, collected through giving participants a researcher-made 20 items questionnaire. The results revealed that there is a meaningful difference between men and women in using these gratitude expressions, in the way that, contrary to the men, women tend to use more affective ones.

© 2012 Elixir All rights reserved.

## Introduction

### Difference theory

Males and females can be differentiated in various ways concerning both physiological and psychological features. Eisenmen (1997) asserts that women, in comparison to men, are endowed with better memory. Men, contrary to the men, are quite accurate in maintaining a sense of direction. This fact is in line with the claim that men tend to do better than women on visual-spatial tests and in mathematics.

There are also social differences between men and women. One of the most significant theories on social differences between males and females is "difference theory". According to this theory, men and women, even those within the same group, live in different or separate cultural worlds and, as a result, they promote different ways of speaking (Uchida, 1992).

### Communicative competence

The concept of communicative competence, first introduced by Hymes (1966), is defined as "what a speaker needs to know to communicate appropriately within a particular speech community" (Saville-Troike, 1996:362). Hymes' communicative competence was originally a reaction to Chomsky's (1965) linguistic competence which discounts contextual appropriateness (Barron, 2003:8). Canale and Swain (1980) developed Hymes' (1972) theoretical concept of communicative competence into grammatical competence (lexis, morphology, sentence-grammar, semantics, and phonology), and sociolinguistic competence (sociocultural rules and rules of discourse). Canale (1983) made a further distinction between sociolinguistic competence (sociocultural rules) and discourse competence (cohesion and coherence).

In Bachman's (1990) model of communicative competence language competence was broken down into two discrete components, namely pragmatic competence and organization competence. Organization competence consists of grammatical competence and textual competence, while pragmatic competence comprises illocutionary competence and

sociolinguist competence. In other words, Bachman's (1990) pragmatic competence is concerned with the relationship between utterances and the functions that speakers intend to perform through those utterances (illocutionary force) and the characteristics of the context of language use that determine the appropriateness of utterances.

Leech (1983) and Thomas (1983) divide pragmatics into pragmatolinguistics and sociopragmatics. In fact, this model clarifies the distinction between ability and knowledge. According to Thomas (1983), pragmatolinguistic knowledge refers to the linguistic encoding of pragmatic force, and sociopragmatic knowledge refers to the perceptions of what constitutes appropriate linguistic behavior. Moreover, Cohen (1996) proposes two distinct levels of abilities required for acquisition of pragmatic competence, namely sociocultural ability and sociolinguistic ability. Speakers' sociocultural ability is used to determine which speech act is appropriate given the culture involved, the situation, the speakers' background variables and relationships. Sociolinguistic ability constitutes "the speakers' control over the actual language forms used to realize the speech acts (e.g. 'sorry' vs. 'excuse me', 'really sorry' vs. 'very sorry')" (Cohen, 1996: 388).

Applying Bachman's (1990) notion of pragmatic competence, the present study examines Iranian males and females' pragmatic competence in performing expressions of gratitude after receiving an offer, gift or favor.

### On the Meaning of Gratitude

The word gratitude is derived from the Latin root *gratia* meaning grace, graciousness, or gratefulness. All derivatives from this Latin root "have to do with kindness, generosity, gifts, the beauty of giving and receiving, or getting something for nothing" (Pruyser, 1976, p. 69). The object of gratitude is other-directed—persons, as well as to impersonal (nature) or nonhuman sources (e.g., God, animals, the cosmos; Solomon, 1977; Teigen, 1997).

Gratitude has been defined as “the willingness to recognize the unearned increments of value in one’s experience” (Bertocci & Millard, 1963, p. 389), and “an estimate of gain coupled with the judgment that someone else is responsible for that gain” (Solomon, 1977, p. 316). The benefit, gift, or personal gain might be material or nonmaterial (e.g., emotional or spiritual).

As an emotion, gratitude is an attribution-dependent state (Weiner, 1985) that results from a two-step cognitive process: (a) recognizing that one has obtained a positive outcome, and (b) recognizing that there is an external source for this positive outcome.

People often show appreciation to express thanks to other people because of some reasons such as receiving help, a gift or other favors. Therefore, it is a positive emotion or attitude acknowledgment of a benefit that one has received or will receive. Depending on different gender, the expression of gratitude can be delivered in different way because female speech is being different from male.

### Literature review

With the general growth of feminist work in many academic fields, it is hardly surprising that the relationship between language and gender has attracted considerable attention in recent years. In an attempt to go beyond “folklinguistic” assumptions about how men and women use language (the assumption that women are “talkative”, for example), studies have focused on anything from different syntactical, phonological or lexical uses of language to aspects of conversation analysis, such as topic nomination and control, interruptions and other interactional features. While some research has focused only on the description of differences, other work has sought to show how linguistic differences both reflect and reproduce social difference. Accordingly, Coates (1988) suggests that research on language and gender can be divided into studies that focus on dominance and those that focus on difference.

Much of the earlier work emphasized dominance. Lakoff’s (1975) pioneering work suggested that women’s speech typically displayed a range of features, such as tag questions, which marked it as inferior and weak. Thus, she argued that the type of subordinate speech learned by a young girl “will later be an excuse others use to keep her in a demeaning position, to refuse to treat her seriously as a human being” (1975, p.5). While there are clearly some problems with Lakoff’s work - her analysis was not based on empirical research, for example, and the automatic equation of subordinate with ‘weak’ is problematic - the emphasis on dominance has understandably remained at the Centre of much of this work. Research has shown how men nominated topics more, interrupted more often, held the floor for longer, and so on (see, for example, Zimmerman and West, 1975). The chief focus of this approach, then, has been to show how patterns of interaction between men and women reflect the dominant position of men in society.

Some studies, however, have taken a different approach by looking not so much at power in mixed-sex interactions as at how same-sex groups produce certain types of interaction. In a typical study of this type, Maltz and Borker (1982) developed lists of what they described as men’s and women’s features of language. They argued that these norms of interaction were acquired in same-sex groups rather than mixed-sex groups and that the issue is therefore one of (sub-) cultural miscommunication rather than social inequality. Much of this research has focused on comparisons between, for example, the

competitive conversational style of men and the cooperative conversational style of women. While some of the more popular work of this type, such as Tannen (1987), lacks a critical dimension, the emphasis on difference has nevertheless been valuable in fostering research into gender subgroup interactions and in emphasizing the need to see women’s language use not only as ‘subordinate’ but also as a significant subcultural domain.

One important aspect of pragmatic competence is the production and understanding of speech acts and their appropriateness in a given situation (Cheng, 2005: 9) which fall into the “*difference studies*”. Austin (1962) defines speech acts as the actions performed in saying something. According to Austin’s theory, these “functional units in communication” (Cohen, 1996: 384) have propositional or locutionary meaning (the literal meaning of the utterance), illocutionary meaning (the social function of the utterance), and perlocutionary force (the effect produced by the utterance in a given context) (Cohen, 1996: 384). Speech act theory therefore attempts to explain how speakers use language to meet intended actions and how hearers infer intended meaning from what is said. Eisenstein and Bodman (1986) have identified thanking as an illocutionary act under Searle’s classification of speech act (Searle, 1976). Their study indicates that an expression of gratitude is:

“An illocutionary act performed by a speaker which is based on a past act performed by the hearer. This past act benefits the speaker and the speaker believes it to have benefited him or her. The speaker feels grateful or appreciative, and makes a statement which counts as an expression of gratitude.” (p. 167)

However, not all expressions using the word ‘thank you’ refer to gratitude (Eisenstein and Bodman, 1993). They can also refer to other language functions such as compliments and closings (Rubin, 1983). Even the use of thanking might differ from culture to culture. For instance, ‘thank you’ used in American English is more common as an expression of gratitude while in British English it is more a formal marker (Hymes, 1972, cited in Eisenstein and Bodman, 1993:65). As Coulmas (1981) puts it:

“The social relation of the participants and the inherent properties of the object of gratitude work together to determine the degree of gratefulness that should be expressed in a given situation. Differences in this respect are obviously subject to cultural variation.” (p.75)

Saying thank you is a problem not only for native speakers, but also for second language learners who need to know when and how to thank in the target culture (Bodman and Eisenstein, 1988; Eisenstein and Bodman, 1986, 1993). The problem is typically considered in terms of when and how thanking is an appropriate response to the social situation (Cheng, 2005:3). Kumar (2001) highlights the significance of expressions of gratitude in the following words:

“Expressions of gratitude in the normal day-to-day interactions between the members of a society seem obviously to fall in the category of the “social” use of language. Expressions of gratitude and politeness are a major instrument the use of which keeps the bonds between the members of a society well-cemented and strong.

They are used profusely and extensively both side by side with and in addition to reciprocating actions. Many are the occasions when, were we to be deprived of the opportunity to use an expression of gratitude, we would feel cheated and betrayed.” (p. 6)

Other studies have shown that even advanced learners have difficulty adequately expressing gratitude (Eisenstein and Bodman, 1986, 1993; Hinkel, 1994). Moreover, while there is a large body of literature on requests and some on apologies, the speech act of thanking has not been studied much (Kasper and Blum-Kulka, 1993:59).

Previous studies have shown that expressions of gratitude present interesting cultural differences across languages and few, if any, have highlighted the gender differences in expressing gratitude within the same language. In the light of lack of this kind of studies, the present contribution targeted the Iranian gender differences in association with expressing gratitude.

### Research questions

Iranians are very thankful people. They use a lot of gratitude expressions in their daily life. Despite the importance of speech acts, especially the gratitude speech act, little Iranian investigators have conducted their studies in this respect. Therefore, the present study is an attempt to give answer to the following questions.

1. Whether men or women use more affective gratitude expressions?
2. What are the reasons affecting gender difference, if any, in using different gratitude expressions by academic members?

### Method

#### Participants

Two groups of academic participants were compared in the current study. The first group members were 20 males whose age ranged from 23 to 54 with different academic occupations such as university personnel, university students, and university instructors. The second population members were 20 females ranging from 21 to 52-year-old with academic occupations such as university personnel, university students, and university instructors. The participants of the study were randomly selected for the purpose of systematic comparison of using most frequent gratitude strategies by the male and female academic members.

#### Instruments

First of all, in order to extract the most common gratitude expressions, the researchers posed an open ended question of "How do you usually express your gratitude". The second instrument employed in this study was a discourse completion task (DCT). For DCT, a 20-item researcher-made questionnaire was designed by the researcher himself questioning the respondents about the likelihood of the situation, i.e. have they ever been in a particular situation, and if so, how they express their gratitude in receiving the favor, benefit, help or gift in that situation. In order to elicit data, five fix common Persian gratitude expressions ranging from least affective gratitude expressions to most affective ones were inserted. The questionnaire used in this study was designed first in Persian (Appendix A) because the native language of the respondents of

this questionnaire was Persian and then they were translated into English (Appendix B).

The second instrument was SPSS 16 software for descriptive and statistical analysis of the results. First, the researcher calculated the frequency of any answer both for men and women separately. Then, the researchers reckoned the percentage of all answers in order to signify the most frequent ones. As the last step, independent-samples T-test was performed to see if there is meaningful gender difference in these situations.

### Procedures

At first, the open-ended questionnaire was distributed between the participants to elicit the five most frequent gratitude expressions. Then, the research-made questionnaire which was originally in Persian was distributed between the participants and they were asked to choose one item out of five for each question. Secondly, after data elicitation, SPSS 16 software was utilized to statistically analyze the results. The participants of the study were coded as 1 representing male and 2 representing female. The response options were also coded as 1 for *thank you*, 2 for *thank you for your favor*, 3 for *thank you for your unsparing efforts*, 4 for *your generosity overwhelms me*, and 5 for words *cannot convey my gratitude*. In this study 1 is regarded as least affective, 2 is considered as less affective, 3 is referred to as affective, 4 is seen as highly affective, and 5 is viewed as most affective gratitude expression. Then, the researcher reckoned the frequency of any answer both for men and women separately. After that, the researchers reckoned the percentage of all answers in order to signify the most frequent ones, and finally, independent-samples T-test was performed to see if there is meaningful gender difference in the imagined situations.

### Data analysis

After data elicitation, the data obtained by the questionnaires were coded and entered into the SPSS 16 software. After statistical analysis of data using SPSS16 software, the frequency of answers (Appendix C) was reckoned. Then, the frequency of answers for each gender was calculated separately (Appendix D). It was revealed that contrary to the females who more utilize items C, D & E which are more affective thanking strategies, males in this study highly tend to use items A & B which are simple thanking strategies.

For the next step, the researcher performed independent-samples T-test to see if there is gender difference in using these five most frequent gratitude expressions (table.1). The alpha level was set at 0.05. The result of independent T-test was .033 which is less than 0.05 signaling that there are statistically significant differences in type of strategies used by males and females in the present study. Therefore, it can be assumed that there is correlation between gender and use of different gratitude expressions in this context.

Table.1. Independent Samples t-test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
total Equal variances assumed	.215	.645	-2.219	38	.033	-7.30000	3.29014	-13.96053	-.63947
Equal variances not assumed			-2.219	37.782	.033	-7.30000	3.29014	-13.96180	-.63820

\*p< 0.05

Table 2, shows the statistic descriptions of the male and female teachers who participated in the present study.

**Table.2. statistics of male and female participants of the study**

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Total	Male	20	51.5500	10.79218	2.41320
	Female	20	58.8500	10.00145	2.23639

## Conclusions

The present study examined the Iranian academic members' gender differences in association with expressing gratitude. To this end, two groups of participants were compared in the current study. The first group members were 20 males whose age ranged from 23 to 54 with different academic occupations such as university personnel, university students, and university instructors. The second population members were 20 females ranging from 21 to 52-year-old with academic occupations such as university personnel, university students, and university instructors. For data elicitation, a researcher-made 20-item questionnaire with five options ranging from very simple gratitude expressions to very affective ones was designed and distributed between participants.

Results revealed that women compared with men show evidence of a more grateful disposition and derive greater benefits from the experience and expression of gratitude. It was discovered that women tend to frequently use more affective gratitude strategies. We found several mechanisms that explain this relation, including women's tendencies to hold more positive appraisals about the benefits of gratitude; men's tendencies to use more simple gratitude expressions, and women's greater willingness to openly express emotions and view this as an effective regulatory act.

Based on the available evidence, gratitude is one of the strongest contributors to well-being, and our data suggest that women are in a more favorable position to benefit. As a moral motivator, gratitude encourages prosocial behavior in the beneficiary either directly toward the benefactor or others. Consequently, to the degree that gratitude encourages such behavior; women increase their chances for well-being because the presence of strong social relationships is perhaps the single greatest cause of happiness (Argyle, 2001; Diener & Seligman, 2002). As a moral reinforcer, gratitude increases the probability that the benefactor will act prosocially toward the beneficiary in the future. Women reported experiencing greater and more affective gratitude. Thus, women compared with men are more likely to receive additional benefits—be it in the form of material possessions or nurturing relationships—from the benefactor yet again.

These resources will accrue over time and be a valuable reserve to tap into when needed, thus promoting psychological resiliency. Also, gratitude is a “hard-to-fake signal” of cooperation, which includes the character strengths of honesty, trustworthiness, and integrity. In the simplest terms, gratitude signals to others in the group which people are genuine cooperators (as opposed to free riders). Therefore, people who more effectively experience and express gratitude—and our studies collectively suggest these people would probably be women—are more likely to enjoy cooperative exchanges (Emmons & McNamara, 2006). Taken together, our data indicate that women compared with men are at an advantage to reap more benefits—such as personal and relational well-being,

social capital, and physical resources—from the experience and expression of gratitude.

Conducting the present study was not without its own limitations. The first limitation was choosing five most frequent gratitude expressions used by Iranians out of so many existing expressions. To this end, a pilot study was conducted in which participants were asked to insert their own gratitude expressions. Then, the answers were analyzed statistically and five most frequent were selected to be used in the current study. The other problem we faced was assuring the participants' anonymity, because some of them were very sensitive not to be revealed.

The present study has explored the speech act of gratitude among Iranian academic members. There are other speech acts which demand more investigations. Therefore, we are convinced of the need to target more speech acts of Persian language so that we will have a comprehensive glossary of Persian speech acts studies.

## References

- Argyle, M. (2001). *The psychology of happiness*. New York: Taylor and Francis Inc.
- Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*: Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barron, A. (2003). *Acquisition in Interlanguage Pragmatics : Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context*: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Bertocci, P. A., & Millard, R. M. (1963). *Personality and the good: Psychological and ethical perspectives*. New York: McKay.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 2-27). London, etc.: Longman.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.
- Coates, J. (1988). Chapter 6: "Introduction." In J. Coates and D. Cameron (op. cit.) pp. 63-73.
- Cohen, A. (1996). Speech Acts. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 383 - 420): Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Diener, E., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). Very happy people. *Psychological Science*, 13, 80-83.
- Eisenman, R. (1997). Men, women and gender differences: the attitudes of three feminists – Gloria Steinem, Gloria Allred and Bella Azbug. Retrieved December 21, 2011, from <http://www.google.com/search?q=cache:ww.../eisenman.html+men+women+differences&hl=e>
- Emmons, R. A., & McNamara, P. (2006). Sacred emotions and affective neuroscience: Gratitude, costly signaling, and the brain. In P. McNamara (Ed.), *Where God and science meet: How brain and evolutionary studies alter our understanding of religion* (pp. 27-46). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Hymes, D. (1966). *On communicative competence*. Paper presented at the Research Planning Conference on Language Development among Disadvantaged Children.
- Hymes, D. H. (1972). On communicative competence. In B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Lakoff, R. (1975) *Language and Woman's Place*. New York: Harper and Row.

Lazarus, R. S., & Lazarus, B. N. (1994). *Passion and reason: Making sense of our emotions*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Maltz, D.N. and R.A. Borker (1982). "A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication." In J. Gumpers (Ed.). *Language and social identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pruyser, P. W. (1976). *The minister as diagnostician: Personal problems in pastoral perspective*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Saville-Troike, M. (1996). The ethnography of communication. In S. L. McKay & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 351-382). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Solomon, R. C. (1977). *The passions*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Tannen, D. (1987). *That's not what I meant*. London: Dent.

Teigen, K. H. (1997). Luck, envy, and gratitude: It could have been different. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 38, 313-323.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 91-112.

Uchida, A. (1992). When difference is dominance: A critique of the anti-power-based cultural approach to gender differences. *Language in Society*, 21, 547-568.

Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychological Review*, 92, 548-573.

Zimmerman, D. & West, C. (1975). "Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation." In B. Thorne & N. Henley (Eds.). *Language and sex: Difference and dominance*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

## Appendix A

### پرسشنامه

#### جنسیت: سن:

**لطفاً خود را در شرایط زیر فرض کنید و دور عبارتی را که به نظر شما برای ابراز تشکر در آن شرایط مناسب است، خط بکشید.**

فرض کنید قصد تشکر از کسی را دارید که کتابی را که به دنبالش بودید را (1) به شما قرض داده است.

الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم.

د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زبانم برای تشکر قاصر است.

فرض کنید قصد تشکر از کسی را دارید که اتومبیلش را برای رفتن به (2) سرکار به شما قرض داده است.

الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم.

د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زبانم برای تشکر قاصر است.

(3) فرض کنید قصد تشکر از آموزگار فرزندان را دارید.

الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم.

د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زبانم برای تشکر قاصر است.

(4) فرض کنید قصد تشکر از کسی را دارید که هدیه ای را به شما داده است.

الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم.

د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زبانم برای تشکر قاصر است.

فرض کنید قصد تشکر از کسی را دارید که در مراسم عروسی شما شرکت (5) کرده است.

الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم.

د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زبانم برای تشکر قاصر است.

فرض کنید قصد تشکر از رئیس خود را دارید که با مرخصی شما موافقت (6) کرده است.

الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم.

د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زبانم برای تشکر قاصر است.

(7) فرض کنید قصد تشکر از رفتر محل خود را دارید.

الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم.

د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زبانم برای تشکر قاصر است.

فرض کنید قصد تشکر از دوست خود را دارید که با شما همدردی کرده (8) است.

الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم.

د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زبانم برای تشکر قاصر است.

فرض کنید قصد تشکر از تعمیرکاری را دارید که اتومبیل شما را تعمیر (9) کرده است.

الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم.

د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زبانم برای تشکر قاصر است.

(10) فرض کنید قصد تشکر از زحمات والدین خود را دارید.

الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم.

د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زبانم برای تشکر قاصر است.

(11) فرض کنید قصد تشکر از فرزند خود را دارید که نان خریده است.

الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم.

د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زبانم برای تشکر قاصر است.

فرض کنید قصد تشکر از کسی را دارید که جایش را در اتوبوس به شما داده (12) است.

الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم.

د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زبانم برای تشکر قاصر است.

(13) فرض کنید قصد تشکر از والدینی را دارید که با عمل پیوند کلیه فرزند مجروحشان به فرزند شما موافق هستند.

الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم.

د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زبانم برای تشکر قاصر است.

فرض کنید قصد تشکر از کسی را دارید که برای گرفتن وام بانکی ضمانت (14) شما را کرده است.

الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم.

د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زبانم برای تشکر قاصر است.

فرض کنید قصد تشکر از کسی را دارید که اتومبیل شما را هل داده است تا (15) روشن شود.

الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم.

د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زبانم برای تشکر قاصر است.

فرض کنید قصد تشکر از پزشکی را دارید که فرزند شما را معالجه کرده (16) است.

- الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم. د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زیانم برای تشکر قاصر است.
- 17) فرض کنید قصد تشکر از پلیس محله خود را دارید. الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم. د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زیانم برای تشکر قاصر است.
- 18) نوبتش را به شما داده است. الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم. د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زیانم برای تشکر قاصر است.
- فرض کنید قصد تشکر از کسی را دارید که به شما پول قرض داده است. 19) الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم. د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زیانم برای تشکر قاصر است.
- فرض کنید قصد تشکر از کسی را دارید که کارت شناسایی گمشده شما را به شما باز گردانده است. 20) الف. ممنون ب. از لطف شما ممنونم. ج. از زحمات بی دریغ شما ممنونم. د. این مهربونی شما مرا شرمند کرده. و. زیانم برای تشکر قاصر است.
- از صبر و شکیبایی شما سپاسگزاریم.

## Appendix B

### English translation of the questionnaire

*What gratitude expression do you prefer to use in the following situations? Circle around your desired option.*

- Suppose you want to appreciate somebody who has borrowed you the book you were looking for.  
A. Thank you B. Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts. D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E. Words cannot convey my gratitude.
- Suppose you want to appreciate somebody who has lent you a car to go to work.  
A. Thank you B. Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts. D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E. Words cannot convey my gratitude.
- Suppose you want to appreciate your child's teacher.  
A. Thank you B. Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts. D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E. Words cannot convey my gratitude.
- Suppose you want to appreciate somebody who has given you a gift.  
A. Thank you B. Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts. D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E. Words cannot convey my gratitude.
- Suppose you want to appreciate somebody who has participated in your wedding ceremony.  
A. Thank you B. Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts. D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E. Words cannot convey my gratitude.
- Suppose you want to appreciate your boss who has agreed with your vacation.  
A. Thank you B. Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts. D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E. Words cannot convey my gratitude.
- Suppose you want to appreciate the sweeper of your parish.

A. Thank you B. Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts. D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E. Words cannot convey my gratitude.

8. Suppose you want to appreciate your comrade who has sympathized with you.

A. Thank you B. Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts. D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E. Words cannot convey my gratitude.

9. Suppose you want to appreciate a serviceman who has repaired your car.

A. Thank you B. Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts. D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E. Words cannot convey my gratitude.

10. Suppose you want to appreciate your parents for their efforts.

A. Thank you B. Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts. D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E. Words cannot convey my gratitude.

11. Suppose you want to appreciate your child who has bought some bread.

A. Thank you B. Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts. D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E. Words cannot convey my gratitude.

12. Suppose you want to appreciate someone who has given his/her seat to you in the bus.

A. Thank you B. Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts. D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E. Words cannot convey my gratitude.

13. Suppose you want to appreciate the parents who have agreed with their injured boy's liver transplantation to your child.

A. Thank you B. Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts. D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E. Words cannot convey my gratitude.

14. Suppose you want to appreciate somebody who has vouched for you to get loan from bank.

A. Thank you B. Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts. D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E. Words cannot convey my gratitude.

15. Suppose you want to appreciate somebody who has pushed your car to get started.

A. Thank you B. Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts. D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E. Words cannot convey my gratitude.

16. Suppose you want to appreciate a doctor who has treated your child.

A. Thank you B. Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts. D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E. Words cannot convey my gratitude.

17. Suppose you want to appreciate the police of your parish.

A. Thank you B. Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts. D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E. Words cannot convey my gratitude.

18. Suppose you want to appreciate a clerk who has finished your administrative work.

A. Thank you B. Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts. D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E. Words cannot convey my gratitude.

19. Suppose you want to appreciate somebody who has lent you some money.

A. Thank you B. Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts. D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E. Words cannot convey my gratitude.

20. Suppose you want to appreciate somebody who has returned your lost objects.

A. Thank you B.Thank you for your favor. C. Thanks for your unsparing efforts.

D. Your generosity overwhelms me. E.Words cannot convey my gratitude.

**Thanks a lot for your patience**