

GAZİ ÜNİVERSİTESİ
EĞİTİM BİLİMLERİ ENSTİTÜSÜ
YABANCI DİLLER EĞİTİMİ ANABİLİM DALI
İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLİĞİ BİLİM DALI

USING THEATRE EXTRACTS IN TEACHING SPEECH
ACTS TO TURKISH EFL STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL
REFERENCE TO APOLOGIES AND REFUSALS

PhD DISSERTATION

Kadriye Dilek AKPINAR

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Abdlvahit akır

**Ankara
Haziran, 2009**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are several people who deserve a lot of credit for their various contributions to the realization of this dissertation. First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Abdlvahit akır for his invaluable guidance, enormous time commitment, great encouragement and incredible patience throughout this process.

I would also like to thank the other members of my committee, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Arif Sarıoban, Ass. Prof. Dr. Aslı  zlem Tarakcıoėlu, Ass. Prof. Dr Nurdan Grbz and Ass. Prof Dr. Paa Tefvik Cephe whose advice, expertise, insightful comments, and support were instrumental to the success of this dissertation.

It would not have been possible to conduct this investigation without the support of Tuėe Aktan, wife of my cousin, who collected data from American native speakers of English.

The statistical analyses in this dissertation would not have been possible without the remarkable efforts of my colleague Egemen Aydoėdu.

I am also grateful to my friend Mehmet Bardakı who supported with the format of my dissertation with his great patience.

Finally, my heart-felt thanks go out to my husband, Erdal, for all the sacrifices he has made, his unfailing love, his enormous emotional support and his encouragement throughout this process.

And my lovely son Mert, I will never forget your generosity for granting your valuable time which you could spend with your mum.

ABSTRACT

The development of pragmatic and sociolinguistic rules in language use is important for language learners. It is necessary to understand and use language that is appropriate to the various situations, because failure to do so may cause users to miss key points that are being communicated or to have their messages misunderstood. Worse, yet, is the possibility of a total communication breakdown and the stereotypical labeling of second language users as people who are insensitive, rude, or inept (Thomas,1983). Apologies and refusals are considered to be highly complex speech acts as they differ cross-culturally, thus, these language specific semantic formulas are prone to misunderstandings.

This present study concerns with the teaching and learning of the more subtle and complex features of the speech act of apologizing and refusing in English to Turkish Prep-school learners by using theatre extracts as authentic material. Data was collected from 10 American native speakers of English and 40 Turkish Prep-school foreign language learners, 20 of which were experimental and 20 of which were the control group from the same proficiency level. Participants were given a discourse role-play test (DRPT) instrument for elicitation including both apology and refusal strategies via pre- and post-test questionnaire and the classroom treatments were video recorded for ethnographic data. Theatre extracts from English and American playwrights' plays were used as an authentic material with pragmatic instruction throughout one semester. Findings indicated that effective instruction of speech acts through theatre extracts can assist learners in producing native-like utterances in certain situations and affect their sociolinguistic behavior.

ÖZET

İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğrenen Türk Öğrencilerine Özür ve Red Söz Eylemlerinin Öğretiminde Tiyatro Eserlerinden Alıntılarının Kullanımı

Dil kullanımında edimbilim ve sosyodilbilim kurallarının geliştirilmesi dil öğrenenler açısından önemlidir. Dili çeşitli durumlara uygun bir şekilde anlamak ve kullanmak gereklidir, aksi takdirde, iletilmek istenen önemli noktalar gözden kaçabilir veya mesajların yanlış anlaşılmasına sebep olabilir. Daha da kötüsü, iletişim bütünüyle kopabilir hatta ikinci dil kullanıcıları duyarsız, kaba ve beceriksiz kalıp yargılarıyla etiketlenebilir (Thomas,1983). Özürler ve redler, kültürden kültüre değişiklik gösterdikleri için oldukça karmaşık söz eylemleridir; bu yüzden bu dile özgü anlamsal formüller yanlış anlaşılmalara açıktırlar.

Bu çalışma, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen Türk Hazırlık sınıfı öğrencilerine tiyatro eserlerinden yapılan alıntılarının özgün materyal olarak kullanılması yoluyla İngilizce özür dileme ve reddetme söz eylemlerinin karmaşık ve detaylı özelliklerini öğretmeyi hedeflemektedir. Veriler anadili olarak İngilizce konuşan 10 Amerikalı ve yirmisi uygulama yirmisi control grubu olmak üzere 40 hazırlık okulu öğrencisi Türk denekden toplanmıştır. Özür ve reddetme söz eylemlerini içeren sözlü söylem tamamlama testi bilgi toplama tekniği olarak katılımcılara ön test ve son test aracılığıyla verilmiş ve etnografik veri toplama aracı olarak da sınıf içi uygulamaları videoya kaydedilmiştir. Bir ders dönemi boyunca Amerikan ve İngiliz oyun yazarlarının oyunlarından alınan parçalar edimbilimsel öğretimle beraber kullanılmıştır. Bulgular, tiyatro alıntıları kullanarak etkili bir söz eylem öğretiminin, belirli durumlarda öğrencilerin ana dil kullanıcıları benzeri ifadeler kullanmalarına yardımcı olduğunu ve sosyodilbilimsel davranışlarını etkilediğini göstermiştir.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
JÜRİ ÜYELERİNİN İMZA SAYFASI	
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ÖZET	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	ix
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the study	1
1.2. Purpose of the study	5
1.3. Research questions	7
1.4. Limitations of the study	8
1.5. Definitions of some key concepts	9
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE	
2.1. Communicative Competence	12
2.2. Linguistic Pragmatics	16
2.3. Pragmatics across Cultures	20
2.3.1. Contrastive Pragmatics	21
2.3.2. Cross-cultural Pragmatics	22
2.3.3. Interlanguage Pragmatics	24
2.4. Speech Acts	26
2.4.1. Speech Acts- from Philosophy to Linguistics	26
2.4.2. Classification of Illocutionary Acts	27
2.4.3. The Issue of Directness and Indirectness	29
2.4.4. The Speech Act in Empirical Research	30
2.5. Politeness Theories	31
2.5.1. Conversational- maxim View	32

2.5.2. Face- saving View	35
2.5.3. Conversational-contract View	39
2.6. The speech act of apology	39
2.6.1. Apology strategies	41
2.6.2. Speech Act of Apologies in Cross- Cultural Studies	44
2.7. The Speech Act of Refusals	47
2.7.1. Refusal Strategies	48
2.7.2. Speech Act of Refusals in Cross-cultural Studies	50
2.8. Studies on Teaching Speech Acts	52
2.8.1. Approaches and Techniques for Teaching Speech Acts	55
2.8.2. Different Teaching Materials	59
2.8.3. The Potential Problems of Using Text Books	61
2.8.4. Using Theatre Extracts as Representational Material	63
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	
3. 1. Subjects	66
3.1.2. Learners of English	66
3.1.3. Native Speakers of English	69
3.2. Data Collection Instruments	70
3.2.1. Instruments for Ethnography	70
3.2.2. Instruments for Elicitation	71
3.3. Data Collection Procedure	74
3.3.1. Pre-test and Post-test	75
3.3.2. Instructional Treatments and Tasks	78
3.3.3. Theatre Extracts as a Representational Material	80
3.3.4. Class Observations / Recordings and Treatment Evaluations	82
3.4. Data Analysis and the Coding Scheme	83
3.5. Reliability of the Coding Scheme	85
CHARTER IV: RESULTS and DISCUSSION	
4.1. Analysis of Pre-test Results	88
4.1.1. Frequency Analysis of Apologies (pre-test)	88
4.1.2 Frequency Analysis of Refusals (pre-test)	95
4.2. Analysis of Post-test Results	101
4.2.1 Frequency Analysis of Apologies (post-test)	102
4.2.2 Frequency Analysis of Refusals (post-test)	109

4.3. Frequency Analysis of Pre-post tests in Terms of Contextual Factors	115
4.3.1. Frequencies of Contextual Factors in Apology Situations (pre-test)	115
4.3.2 Frequencies of Contextual Factors in Apology Situations (post-test)	118
4.3.3. Frequencies of Contextual Factors in Refusal Situations (pre-test)	122
4.3.4. Frequencies of Contextual Factors in Refusal Situations (post-test)	125
4.4. Learners' evaluations of the treatments and language learning.....	129
4.5. Summary of the chapter	137
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS	
5.1 Discussions of Findings and Research Questions	141
5.2. Pedagogical Implications	144
5.3. Effects of Theatre Extracts and Text-book Material	146
5.4. Future Researches	148
REFERENCES	151
APPENDICES	168

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 3.1. Evaluation Scale of the Proficiency Test.....	67
Table 3.2. Contextual Factors in Apology Situations	76
Table 3.3. Contextual Factors in Refusal Situations	76
Table 3.4. Sample Coding Table for Refusals	84
Table 3.5. Sample Coding Table for Apologies	85
Table 4.1. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Pre-test in Situation 1	88
Table 4.2. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Pre-test in Situation 2	90
Table 4.3. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Pre-test in Situation 3	92
Table 4.4. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Pre-test in Situation 4	94
Table 4.5. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Pre-test in Situation 1	95
Table 4.6. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Pre-test in Situation 2	97
Table 4.7. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Pre-test in Situation 3	99
Table 4.8. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Pre-test in Situation 4	100
Table 4.9. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Post-test in Situation 1	102
Table 4.10. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Post-test in Situation 2	104
Table 4.11. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Post-test in Situation 3	106
Table 4.12. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Post-test in Situation 4	108
Table 4.13. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Post-test in Situation 1	109
Table 4.14. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Post-test in Situation 2	111
Table 4.15. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Post-test in Situation 3	113
Table 4.16. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Post-test in Situation 4	114
Table 4.17. Frequency of Semantic Formulas in Apologies (pre-test)	116
Table 4.18. Frequency of Semantic Formulas in Apologies (post-test)	119
Table 4.19. Frequency of Semantic Formulas in Refusals (pre-test)	123
Table 4.20. Frequency of Semantic Formulas in Refusals (post-test)	126
Table 4.21. Learners' Evaluations of the SA Lessons	130
Table 4.22. Aspects of Lessons Difficult to Understand Evaluated by Learners	133
Table 4.23. Other aspects of English that Learners Would Like to Learn	134

Table 4.24 Activity that was Most Beneficial as Evaluated by Learners	134
Table 4.25 Activity that was Least Beneficial as Evaluated by Learners	135
Table 4.26 Suggestions for Improving the Lessons	136
Table 4.27 Other Comments of the Learners	137

ABBREVIATIONS

CCSARP	(Cross-cultural Speech Act Research Project)
DRPT	(Discourse Role-play Test)
EFL	(English as a Foreign Language)
EFLC	(English as a Foreign Language Learners of the Control Group)
EFLT	(English as a Foreign Language Learners of the Treatment
Group)	
H	(Hearer)
IFID	(Illocutionary Force Indicating Device)
ILP	(Interlanguage Pragmatics)
NES	(Native English Speakers)
S	(Speaker)
SA	(Speech Act)
WDCT	(Written Discourse Completion Task)

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the Study

The concept of communicative competence, first introduced by the anthropologist and sociolinguist, Hymes, in 1964, and defined in Hymes (1972), was born out of a reaction against Chomsky's (1965) notion of competence, which encompassed knowledge of the rules of grammar alone and disregarded contextual appropriateness. In contrast to this narrow concept, communicative competence consists of grammatical competence and knowledge of the sociocultural rules of appropriate language use. Unlike Chomsky's, Hymes' concept of competence not only includes knowledge, but also the ability to use this underlying knowledge (Hymes, 1972). Hymes' research typified the shift in the study of language at that time from an interest in the language system in isolation to the study of language in use. An influential and comprehensive review of communicative competence and related notions was offered by Canale and Swain (1980), who also proposed a widely cited framework of communicative competence for language instruction. While pragmatics does not figure as a term among their three components of communicative competence (grammatical, sociolinguistic, and strategic competence), pragmatic ability is included under "sociolinguistic competence," called "rules of use." Canale (1983) expanded the earlier version of the framework by adding discourse competence as a fourth component. A decade after the original framework had been published, Bachman (1990) suggested a model of communicative ability that not only includes pragmatic competence as one of the two main components of "language competence," parallel to "organizational competence," but subsumes "sociolinguistic competence" and "illocutionary competence" under pragmatic competence. The prominence of pragmatic ability has been maintained in a revision of this model by Bachman and Palmer (1996).

In many second and foreign language teaching contexts, curricula and materials developed in recent years include strong pragmatic components or even adopt a pragmatic approach as their organizing principle (Rose and Kasper, 2001). Leech (1983) and Thomas (1983) divided pragmatics into two components: *pragmalinguistics* and *sociopragmatics*. *Pragmalinguistics* refers to the resources for conveying communicative acts and relational or interpersonal meanings. According to Rose and Kasper, (2001) such resources include pragmatic strategies such as directness and indirectness, routines, and a large range of linguistic forms which can intensify or soften communicative acts. For one example, compare these two versions of an apology: the terse “Sorry” versus the Wildean “I’m absolutely devastated – could you possibly find it in your heart to forgive me?” In both versions, the speaker chooses from among the available *pragmalinguistic* resources of English which serve the function of apologizing (which would also include other items, such as “ It was my fault” or “ I won’t let it happen again”), but she indexes a very different attitude and social relationship in each of the apologies (e.g., Fraser, 1981; House and Kasper, 1981a; Brown and Levinson, 1987; Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper, 1989), which is where *sociopragmatics* comes into the picture.

Sociopragmatics has been described by Leech (1983: 10) as the “sociological interface of pragmatics,” referring to the social perceptions underlying participants’ interpretation and performance of communicative action. Speech communities differ in their assessment of speakers’ and hearers’ social distance and social power, their rights and obligations, and the degree of imposition involved in particular communicative acts (Blum- Kulka and House, 1989; Olshtain, 1989; Takahashi and Beebe, 1993; Kasper and Rose, 1999). The values of context factors are negotiable; they are subject to change through the dynamics of conversational interaction, as captured in Fraser’s (1990) notion of the “conversational contract” and in Myers-Scotton’s *Markedness Model* (2001: 3). As Thomas (1983) points out, although *pragmalinguistics* is, in a sense, akin to grammar in that it consists of linguistic forms and their respective functions, *sociopragmatics* is very much about proper social behavior, making it a far more thorny issue to deal with in the classroom- it is one thing to teach people what functions bits of language serve, but it is entirely different to teach people how to behave “properly”. Here learners must be made aware of the consequences of making

pragmatic choices, but the choice to act a certain way should be theirs alone (Siegal, 1994, 1996).

As it is understood, most of the sociopragmatic studies attempted to describe interlanguage development of learners and thus focused their attention on speech act strategies and realization of these by language learners. Based on the theories of speech acts proposed by Austin and Searle (1970) there is now a large and fast-growing literature on interlanguage pragmatics, that is, a branch of pragmatics which specifically discusses how non-native speakers comprehend and produce a speech act in a target language and how their pragmatic competence develops over time, or in other words; learners' use and acquisition of L2 pragmatic ability (Kasper and Blum-Kulka, 1993; Kasper and Rose, 1999; Bardovi-Harlig, 2001). Participants in these studies are often foreign language learners, who may have little access to target-language input and even less opportunity for productive L2 use outside the classroom. The importance of speech acts in foreign language teaching is also emphasized by Rivers (1973: 25) who states that students need to understand how language is used in relation to the structure of society and its patterns of inner and outer relationships, if they are to avoid clashes, misunderstandings, and hurt. Supporting River's views, Takahashi (1996: 189) argues that one of the general assumptions in interlanguage pragmatics is that intercultural miscommunication is often caused by learners' falling back on their native language sociocultural norms and conventions in realizing speech acts in a target language. Speakers and listeners have the ability to convey pragmatic intent indirectly and infer indirectly conveyed meaning by utilizing cues in the utterance, context information, and various knowledge sources (Gumperz, 1996). The main categories of communicative acts- in Searle's (1976) influential classification, representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations- are available in any community as are (according to current evidence) such individual communicative acts as greetings, leave takings, requests, offers, suggestions, invitations, refusals, apologies, complaints, or expressions of gratitude.

Universal pragmatic knowledge includes the expectation that recurrent speech situations are managed by means of conversational routines (Coulmas, 1981a; Nattinger and DeCarrico, 1992) rather than by newly created utterances. Unfortunately, for Kasper and Rose (2001) learners do not always capitalize on the knowledge they

already have. It is well-known from educational psychology that students do not always transfer available knowledge and strategies to new tasks. This is also true for some aspects of learners' universal or L1-based pragmatic knowledge. L2 learners often tend toward literal interpretation, taking utterances at face value rather than inferring what is meant from what is said and understanding context information (Carrell, 1979, 1981). Kasper (1981) supports this view by stating that "learners frequently underuse politeness marking in L2 even though they regularly mark their utterances for politeness in L1".

Furthermore, certain communicative acts are known in some communities but not in others. For example, in the category of declarations, acts tied to a particular institutional context derive their function from the institution and will not be available outside it (Kasper and Rose, 2001). Performing communicative acts appropriately often involves norms specific to a particular cultural and institutional context, such as supporting a refusal of an adviser's suggestion with appropriate reasons and status-congruent mitigation in the course of an academic advising session (Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford, 1990). Pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatic conventions are tied to the grammatical and lexical structures of particular languages. In addition to these crosscultural differences, the indexical meaning of speech acts and strategies varies inter- and intraculturally. As Blum-Kulka and Tannen (1987, 1993) indicate, "whether indirectness is perceived as more or less polite than directness, or whether volubility indexes more or less power, depends on cultural preferences and the context of use".

In order to investigate how the learning of L2 pragmatics, which is the case of this study – both the learning processes and the outcomes – is shaped by instructional context and activities, three major questions require examination: what opportunities for developing L2 pragmatic ability are offered in language classrooms; whether pragmatic ability develops in a classroom setting without instruction in pragmatics; and what effects various approaches to instruction have on pragmatic development (Kasper and Rose, 2001: 4). The first and third questions clearly call for classroom research – the resources, processes, and limitations of classroom learning can be explored only through data-based studies in classroom settings. Kasper and Rose (2001) identify answers to second question - whether pragmatic ability develops without pedagogical intervention – that can be gleaned from the pragmatics and interlanguage pragmatics literature. As Bardovi-Harlig (2001) demonstrates, many aspects of L2 pragmatics are not acquired

without the benefit of instruction, or they are learned more slowly. There is thus a strong indication that instructional intervention may be facilitative to, or even necessary for, the acquisition of L2 pragmatic ability.

1.2. Purpose of the study

It is now quite clear why speech acts have an important role in our daily use of language based on what was mentioned in the previous sections. It is important to master in speech acts while learning a second or foreign language because they not only facilitate the process of communication, but also make it more effective. The important question to be considered is ‘are speech acts haphazardly picked up in the process of language learning, or should they be systematically taught?’ Olshtain and Cohen (1990), Ellis (1992), and King and Silver (1993) have argued that teaching speech acts to foreign students has a marked effect on their performance. For example, Olshtain and Cohen (1990) in their studies pre-tested a group of learners on their apologizing behavior and then they provided them with some instruction on how to make apologies in a native-like manner. The result of post-test revealed that the utterances produced by the learners were more in line with native behavior.

The findings of the above studies together with many similar researches indicate that teaching speech acts should be an important component of any language teaching program to train students to become communicatively competent.

The challenge for foreign or second language teaching is whether we can arrange learning opportunities in such a way that they benefit the development of pragmatic competence in L2. Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993: 7) in their review of sociopragmatic studies state that there is only a handful of studies investigating different languages such as Hebrew (Blum-Kulka, 1982; Olshtain, 1983; Olshtain and Cohen 1989), German (Faerch and Kasper, 1984), Norwegian (Svanes, 1989), Spanish (Koike, 1989), and Japanese (Sawyer, 1992). In addition, there have been only a limited number of studies where English is learned as a foreign language until recently. For instance, in Turkey, one PhD and a few research and M.A. thesis have been conducted in the last decade (Erçetin, 1995; Mızıkacı, 1991; Kamışlı and Aktuna, 1996; İrman, 1996; İstifçi, 1998; Tunçel, 1999; Karsan, 2005). All these studies focused on the

differences between Turkish and English speech act preferences and aimed at putting forward the possible sources of sociopragmatic failures of learners. There has been only one study that approaches to the subject from the pedagogical aspect (Atay, 1996) in Turkey. Thus, a need has arisen to study sociopragmatic development of Turkish language learners in terms of using an instructional approach that has not been used before. This is one of the reasons that we choose to investigate apology and refusal strategies in this study that have been carried out in Western cultures cross-culturally.

We, therefore, need to know what pragmatic aspects can be taught and which instructional approaches and materials may be most effective. If we map the communicative actions in classical language classroom discourse against the pragmatic competence that non-native speakers need to communicate in the world outside, it becomes immediately obvious that the language classroom in its classical format does not offer students what they need - neither in terms of teacher's input, nor in terms of students' productive language use.

Comparisons of textbook dialogues and authentic discourse show that there is often a mismatch between the two. For instance, Bardovi-Harlig et.al. (1991) examined conversational closings in 20 textbooks for American English and found that a few of them represented closing phases accurately. Myers-Scotton and Bernstein (1988) discovered similar discrepancies between the representation of many other conversational features in authentic discourse and textbook dialogues. The reason for such inaccurate textbook representations is that native speakers are only partially aware of their pragmatic competence (the same is true of their language competence generally). Collie and Slater (1987) focused on the positive contributions language learning through literature could make in that literary texts constituted valuable authentic material as they expose the learner to different registers, types of language use. Writers such as Maley, and Duff, (1978) and Wessels, (1987) have pointed to the values and uses of drama especially from sociocultural aspect: "Drama provides cultural and language enrichment by revealing insights into the target culture and presenting language contexts that make items memorable by placing them in a realistic social and physical context".

This is the main reason to use extracts of theatre from distinguished playwrights of English and American literature in this study. This study also aims at comparing text

book instruction with authentic discourse material in teaching speech acts in a foreign language environment.

In the light of above views, we can sum up the purpose of this study as in the following:

- 1) assessing EFL learners' level of awareness of the speech acts to be taught,
- 2) presenting examples of the speech act parallel to real life situations from authentic material (extracts of theatre), so that students become aware of some contextual factors such as situational and social factors,
- 3) reinforcing learners' awareness of all the factors affecting the choice of different strategies in different situations,
- 4) finding out whether students who received instruction through authentic material use more varied and more pragmatically appropriate realization strategies when apologizing and refusing compared to the learners who received instruction through text book material,
- 5) exploring expectations and evaluations of the learners about the treatment.

1.3. Research questions

This study aims at answering the following questions

- 1) What are the preferences of native speakers of English in expressing themselves in various apologizing and refusing situations?
- 2) What do Prep-school learners of Gazi University Foreign Languages Department (EFL) students use in expressing themselves in apology and refusal situations in the pre-test?
- 3) Will the instruction and the tasks given by the authentic material (theatre extracts) affect EFL learners' pragmatically appropriate use of apologies and refusals?
- 4) Will the instruction given by the text-book material affect EFL learners' pragmatically appropriate use of apologies and refusals?
- 5) Is there any significant difference between the two EFL groups (control and treatment) in their awareness of appropriate apologies and refusals in the post-test?
- 6) How do the students in the treatment group react to the teaching material (theatre extracts) and the instruction given during the lessons?

The first question will establish the baseline data to enable the comparison of the results obtained from the questions 2-3-4-5.

1.4. Limitations of the study

This study investigated two types of responding (post-event) speech acts of refusing and apologizing. Although there are many speech acts that would be studied, refusals and apologies seemed to be most relevant for the aims of this study. Reasons for choosing refusals and apologies are: (1) both of them are responding speech acts, (2) there are few studies on apologizing in Turkey (Mızıkacı, 1991; Erçetin, 1995; Kamışlı and Aktuna, 1996; Tunçel, 1999 and Karsan, 2005) and no studies have appeared on refusing in the literature in Turkey. Additionally, studies carried out throughout the world and in Turkey revealed that it is impossible to study more than two different speech acts in a study. In other words, there are many speech acts to study on and the results cannot be generalized for all speech acts and all situations.

Second limitation that might be considered when interpreting findings from our study is related to the selection of particular two SAs of apologies and refusals. Since there have been a limited number of studies on teaching speech acts to Turkish EFL learners, it should be interesting to analyse whether the selection of other SAs would lead us to obtain similar results. The teachability of other speech acts and pragmatic features could be examined by employing the same materials and approaches or by using different ones.

The present study is also limited in the small number of theatre extracts and textbooks analysed, and the findings cannot be extrapolated to other pragmatic aspects, since we have only focused on apologies and refusals. This information could then be used to craft methodologies to use in teaching pragmatics in the language classroom.

The fourth limitation that makes us view our results with caution about making generalizations refers to the particular population of learners involved in this study. In our research, participants of native speakers of English consisted of university students in a large American university. Based on their classes and their willingness to participate, they were included in the study. For this reason, the number of native

English speakers was limited. As for the Turkish EFL learner groups, we used two intact classes consisting of male and female students from the Prep school of Gazi University with an intermediate level of proficiency in English between the age range of 18-22. Thus, the student individual variables may have influenced our findings. Gender, for instance, has been claimed to affect learners' specific use of speech acts (Rose and NG Kwai-fun, 2001). However, we could not take into consideration this variable related to the more female-oriented nature of the department our participants involved in. Similarly, age and proficiency should have also been taken into account, which means that we do not know how younger, older, beginner or advanced learners would have performed in a similar way after receiving the instruction.

A fifth limitation concerns the fact that, due to institutional constraints, the teacher of the treatment and the control group was not the same person. Thus, although the teacher of the control group was specifically explained not to deal with any extra practice or material related to pragmatic issues except using the text-book material within the standard curriculum, her personality as well as her teaching style may have had an effect on learners' participation and motivation towards the activities implemented in the classroom. Otherwise, it would be interesting to see whether any differences between the two teachers' styles could have affected our findings.

Finally, another limitation our study was the analysis of the short-term effects of the instructional treatments. The post-tests that ascertained the effects of instruction with theatre extracts in this study were distributed the week after the last session had been implemented. We would have liked to make use of a delayed post-test in order to determine whether learners' gains in their pragmatic behavior had been retained some time after the instructional period took place, but this was not possible due to institutional constraints.

1.5. Definitions of some key concepts

Communicative Competence: Communicative competence refers to the ability to use target language knowledge in communicative situations. Namely, it is the ability to react in a culturally acceptable way in that context and to choose the stylistically appropriate form of language for that context.

Pragmatics: Pragmatics is the knowledge which enables speakers to produce and understand utterances in relation to specific communicative purposes and specific speech contexts. It studies how people comprehend and produce a communicative or speech act in a certain speech situation and tries to determine the relationship between language and the situation in which it is used.

Sociopragmatic competence: The term sociolinguistic competence has been often used in place of sociopragmatic competence. Canale and Swain (as cited in Wolfson, 1989:47) explain that sociopragmatic competence comprises of two sets of rules of sociocultural rules of use and rules of discourse. Therefore, it would be possible to say that sociopragmatics is the outcome of the combination of sociocultural rules of use and the rules of discourse. Thus, the term sociopragmatic competence treated as the way nonnative speakers produce utterances/sentences which are considered appropriate in various contexts in their attempt to communicate in L2.

Interlanguage pragmatics: Interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) specifically discusses how nonnative speakers comprehend and produce a speech act in a target language and how their pragmatic competence develops over time. It refers to nonnative speakers' comprehension and production of speech acts, and how L2 related speech act knowledge is acquired.

Speech acts: Speech acts are the acts which are performed via language such as making promises, giving commands, asking questions, making statements, and issuing apologies. As in the following statements *I apologize* or *I object* the speaker not only says something, but also actively does something.

Semantic formulae (Semantic Strategies): Semantic formulae are the set of sentences used to perform a speech act. Each semantic formulae consists of a word, phrase or sentence which meets a particular semantic criterion or strategy. A speaker can use many different ways to apologize after some behavior or action has resulted in the violation of social norms. S/he can use the relevant performative verb e.g. *apologize*; or s/he may use another explicit verb such as *be sorry*; or s/he may use an indirect

utterance, the meaning of which constitutes the appropriate speech act in the specific context although it seems a simple statement about some state of affairs.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW of LITERATURE

2.1. Communicative Competence

Linguistic background

Within linguistics, there was a shift of emphasis from an almost exclusive concern with formal aspects of language (structural linguistics and generative transformational grammar) in the 1960s to a growing interest in language use in the 1970s and the 1980s. Instead of viewing the language system in isolation, various linguistic disciplines, such as sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, ethnomethodology, and the ethnography of speaking, have attempted to relate language to extralinguistic factors and to explore the nature of communication. This change of emphasis provided the rationale for the communicative approach to language teaching with communicative competence as a key concept.

The notion of communicative competence is a reaction against the narrow Chomskyan concept of competence. This notion was originally introduced by Hymes in the mid-1960s and later defined in his 1971 paper; it includes a consideration of theories about language functions (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969).

Exemplifying the tendency in linguistics to focus on the language system in isolation and deal with the formal properties of language exclusively, transformational generative grammar aims at formulating the finite set of rules which enable an individual to generate and understand an infinite number of grammatical sentences (Chomsky, 1965:8). In this context Chomsky (1965:4) introduced the distinction between competence and performance, identifying competence with an ideal speaker-listener's knowledge of the rules of the language and equating performance with language use, or the manifestation of competence in concrete situations under limiting psychological conditions. Thus, competence, which is regarded as the proper object of

transformational grammar, is exclusively associated with rules of form and the criterion of grammaticality (Chomsky, 1965:11).

With the emergence in the philosophy of language of theories of speech act functions, there was a movement away from the structural definition of language towards a functional definition of language. In contrast to Chomsky, who considers language to be “a set (finite or infinite) of sentences, each finite in length and constructed out of a set of elements” (Chomsky, 1957:13), Searle (1969:22-23) conceives of language as a series of acts in the world rather than as a collection of sentences.

While accepting the relevance of observing a distinction between what underlies communicative behaviour and actual observable language use, Hymes (1972:271) rejects the Chomskyan notion of competence on the grounds that Chomsky’s dichotomy between competence and performance provides no place for contextual appropriateness and thereby ignores the sociocultural factors which determine the appropriateness of an utterance in the context in which it occurs. Failing to take into consideration the sociocultural dimension of language use, the Chomskyan concept of competence (1957, 1965) was found too restricted, providing only a partial account of the knowledge required for language use. According to Hymes, other types of knowledge than how to compose grammatically correct sentences were required for communication. In addition to rules of form, communicative behaviour relies on “the rules of use without which the rules of grammar would be useless” (Hymes, 1979:15), and the crucial questions are the extent to which something is “formally possible, feasible, appropriate and actually performed” (Hymes, 1979:19).

Using the contrast between the “underlying” and the “actual” in distinguishing between competence and performance, Hymes (1972:283) bases his redefinition of competence (in terms of communicative competence) on the acceptability rather than the grammatical correctness of utterances. By including the notion of appropriateness to context in the definition of competence, Hymes expands it to comprise all rule-systems underlying language use, and thus accords a central role to sociocultural factors. According to Trosborg (1995:9) this implies a much more comprehensive concept of competence, which in a sense subsumes Chomsky’s narrow notion of linguistic

competence, as communicative competence embraces rules of form as well as rules of use.

Hymes's work, which exemplifies the shift away from the study of language as a system in isolation towards the study of language as communication, emphasizes the intimate relationship between language and extralinguistic factors and the necessity of relating language to sociocultural factors in order to account for language use.

The Components of Communicative Competence

According to a fairly recent framework (Canale and Swain, 1980; Canale, 1983), communicative competence is seen as a modular or compartmentalized view of competence, rather than as a single global factor.

On the linguistic level, it includes four interrelated areas of competence: linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence and strategic competence. According to Trosborg (1995:10) comprising the knowledge of how to communicate meaning, using acceptable forms in appropriate contexts, it conflates the concepts of linguistics and socio-cultural knowledge.

On the psycholinguistic level, there are two dimensions to communicative competence: a knowledge component and a skills component (Trosborg, 1995:10). Canale and Swain (1980:34) emphasize that the notion involves knowledge as well as skill in using this knowledge in actual communication. Whereas knowledge denotes what one knows (consciously and unconsciously) about language and about other aspects of communicative language use, skill refers to how well one can use this knowledge in actual communication (Canale, 1983:5). It covers what is traditionally referred to as the four skills: speaking, listening, reading and writing.

Linguistic competence refers to the mastery of the language code. It focuses directly on the knowledge and skill required to understand and express accurately the literal meaning of utterances, and includes the syntactic, morphosyntactic, phonological and lexical levels. As such it corresponds roughly to the Chomskyan concept of competence.

Sociolinguistic competence is concerned with the sociocultural rules of use, i.e. the system of rules which determines the appropriateness of a given utterance in a given social context. The contextual factors are those components of speech events referred to in the ethnography of speaking research, i.e. setting, speaker-hearer role relationship, channel, genre, key, etc. This area of competence can be divided into two aspects: appropriateness of meaning and appropriateness of form.

The term sociopragmatic competence refers to appropriateness of meaning, i.e. whether a particular speech act, attitude or proposition is judged to be proper in a given situation, whereas pragmalinguistic competence concerns the linguistic realization of meaning, i.e. the extent to which a given meaning (including communicative functions, attitudes and propositions) is represented in a form that is proper in a given sociolinguistic context (Canale, 1983:7).

Discourse competence refers to the appropriateness of utterances to their linguistic contexts. This type of competence refers to knowledge of how to combine sentences into unified spoken or written texts of various types. Unity of text is achieved through cohesion in form (e.g. pronominalization, synonyms, ellipses, conjunctions, parallel structures, etc.) and coherence in meaning (e.g. literal meanings, communicative functions and attitudes). Trosborg (1995) also takes discourse competence to include discourse management, e.g. turntaking, use of gambits and discourse phases, such as openings and closings of conversation. The theoretical framework rests on recent work in the area of discourse analysis (e.g. Sinclair and Coulthart, 1975; Burton 1980; Coulthart and Montgomery, 1981). Apart from the inclusion of fillers (Canale, 1983:25), this aspect of discourse competence is not mentioned in Canale's framework.

Strategic competence is a compensatory element which enables a speaker to make up for gaps in his knowledge system or lack of fluency by means of communication strategies. These strategies are used for two major reasons: 1) to compensate for breakdowns in communication, 2) to enhance the effectiveness of communication. They are employed by native speakers in cases where there is a gap in the speaker's knowledge (e.g. lack of a particular technical term) or if a speaker has problems in retrieving a particular item from memory. However, as communication

strategies are compensatory devices, they are particularly useful to second/foreign language learners. Since learners are likely to encounter numerous communicative problems due to their partial or imperfect knowledge of the target language, they must compensate for gaps in their interlanguage system by means of compensatory strategies.

In addition to four specified components of communicative competence, it is important to stress that this theory of communicative competence interacts with other systems of knowledge and skill (Canale, 1983:6). Factors relating to personality and volition are important, and, as language does not exist in a vacuum, world knowledge is crucial. Hence personality factors and world knowledge are part of the framework proposed for communicative competence.

2.2. Linguistic Pragmatics

Linguistic pragmatics is to be distinguished from non-linguistic pragmatics, i.e. pragmatics in the domains of the sociologist, the psychologist, the ethnomethodologist, the literary scholar, and so on. Up to a point, pragmatics is an integral part of linguistics, and the boundary between linguistic pragmatics and other domains of pragmatics is determined by “the stretching capacities of a coherent unified linguistic framework” (Wierzbicka, 1991:19)

Pragmatic theory, which originated as a philosophical theory (Morris, 1938; Wittgenstein as cited in Trosborg, 1995; Austin, 1962; Strawson, 1964), is a relatively new discipline (compared to syntax and semantics). The word *pragma* is Greek and refers to activity, deed, affair (*Prassein, prattaine*, to pass through, experience, practice) (*Webster's third new international dictionary* 1976). Pragmatics is defined as 1) a branch of semiotics (study of signs and symbols) dealing with the relation between signs or linguistic expressions and those who use them, 2) a branch of linguistics dealing with the contexts in which people use language and the behaviour of speakers and listeners (*Longman dictionary of the English language* 1991). The view of language as action has become the key concept in what is currently understood as linguistic pragmatics.

The modern usage of *pragmatics* was first introduced by Morris (1938: 6), who used the term in a very broad sense to refer to the study of “the relations of signs to interpreters”.¹ The notion of pragmatics was expanded within the behaviouristic theory of semiotics (Black as cited in Trosborg, 1995), and the scope was extended to include areas such as sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, and matters as diverse as the psychopathology of communication and the evolution of symbol systems (Levinson, 1983:2).

In particular, Austin’s (1962) famous work *How to do things with words* gave rise to a new outlook on language. His important realization that “in saying something a speaker also does something” has been widely accepted, and his division of acts into locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts (Austin, 1962:108) has formed the basis for the development of communicative functions defined by illocutionary force.

Searle (1969, 1975, 1976) has revised and extended Austin’s theory of pragmatic functions and has been particularly concerned with establishing a set of conditions, the so called “felicity conditions” on which the successful performance of a speech act depends. The notion of “direct” / “indirect” speech acts has also been a critical issue, and discussions pertaining to this notion have been carried out mostly with requests as the focus of attention (e.g. Searle, 1975; Morgan, 1978; Clark as cited in Trosborg 1995; Weizman, 1989).

Pragmatics is also firmly rooted in other traditions, such as linguistics and ethnography. This gives rise to a number of ways of describing pragmatics, both as a theory in its own right, and as an attempt to differentiate it from other disciplines. Very general definitions are offered by two influential pragmaticians, Stephen C. Levinson and Geoffrey Leech.

According to Levinson (1983:5) pragmatics, in a traditional sense, comprises “the study of language uses”, to be distinguished from syntax, which is “the study of combinatorial properties of words and their parts”, and from semantics, which is “the study of meaning” (Levinson, 1983:5). Deixis, conversational implicature, presupposition, speech acts, and conversational structure are treated as key areas of linguistic pragmatics.

Some linguists assume pragmatics and grammar to be complementary domains of linguistics (Leech, 1983), while others such as Akmajian, Demers, and Harnish (1979:267) suppose that pragmatics is just a part of grammar by asserting “if use does determine meaning, then the theory of language use will provide the foundations for semantics, so at least that part of pragmatics that concerns itself with meaning and reference will be a part of grammar”. Finally, some linguists such as Jaworski and Coupland (1999:14), claim that pragmatics and semantics (a subgroup of grammar) are closely related.

Green (1990:21) draws attention to the necessity of studying pragmatics under two headings. The first is *universal pragmatics* which all “normal linguistic human beings develop in common by virtue of being social animals capable of independent thought” and the other is *culture specific pragmatics* (parochial) which people in different cultures learn, apparently through observation and sometimes through explicit instruction. He also claims that *universal pragmatics* was what Grice had in mind while describing cooperative principle.

Recently textbooks tend to handle pragmatics from a more specific point of view. This specific handling has resulted in the categorization of pragmatics into two different ways, one of which equated pragmatics with the speaker meaning, and the other with utterance interpretations. In the latter, linguists who use a cognitive approach focus too much on the receiver of the message ignoring the social constraints during the production of an utterance while the former focuses on the producer of the message. However, this tendency, according to Thomas (1995:4), “obscures the fact that the process of interpreting what we hear involves moving between several levels of meaning.”

The first of these levels is that of *abstract meaning*, which deals with misunderstandings caused by possible meanings of a word or phrase. These misunderstandings may be caused by failing to assign the sense of reference in context. For example, after a long discussion on the relative merits of computers with speaker A using terms such as 286, RS/600, speaker B asks speaker C who has taken no part in the conversation: *Do you know what fifteen fifteens are?* Then speaker C replies: *No, I*

don't know much about computer hardware. The problem in that case is that speaker C interprets B's simple question about elementary arithmetics as a challenging question on complicated new computers. This is because speaker C is in a different domain of discourse and thus misinterprets the meaning of *fifteen-fifteens* in this context. Assigning the correct or intended sense in context, as Thomas (1995) asserts, is trying to find out the contextual sense of a word that is the sense in which the speaker is using a word. The problems of assigning sense in context may be caused by homographs, words with the same spelling but with different pronunciation and meaning. Similarly the polysemous words, which have different but clearly related meanings, or homonymous words, which have different but clearly related meanings, or homonymous words, which have the same spelling and pronunciation but different (completely unrelated) meanings, and lexical items can also cause real problems, especially, for non-native speakers of a language.

The second level of meaning is *contextual meaning* in which we move from abstract meaning to utterance meaning by assigning sense and/or reference to a word, phrase or sentence. In some cases, understanding sense perfectly in context may not be enough to understand what a speaker means. One reason may be failing to understand the reference in context. As expressed by Downing, reference is usually defined as a major linguistic function. This function enables us to establish connections between words or linguistic signs and things in the world, and between different words within a text. However, reference, here, is dealt with as a pragmatic function, that is, as a context-dependent function because the pragmatic factor is crucial. This can be seen in the following extract from Tom Stoppard's play *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*.

Act: The old man thinks he's in love with his daughter

Ros: (Appalled) Good God! We're out of our depth here.

Act: No, no, no-he hasn't got a daughter-the old man thinks he's in love with his daughter.

Ros: The old man is?

Act: Hamlet in love with the old man's daughter, the old man thinks.

Ros: Ha! It's beginning to make sense! Unrequited passion! (Stoppard 1967, 61)

Another problem may be caused by structural ambiguity (syntactic) as in the sentence:

“Afterwards, the Bishop walked among the pilgrims eating their picnic lunches” (Thomas, 1995:12). In this sentence it is difficult to distinguish who was eating the sandwiches, the Bishop or the pilgrims.

The problems in question involve failure to understand the intended meaning are caused by ambiguities of sense, reference, and structure up to now. Another problem is utterance meaning. Thomas defines utterance meaning as “what the speaker actually does mean by these words on a particular occasion” and it is called sentence-context pairing by Gazdar (1979).

The third and the last level of meaning *force* which is also the second level of speaker meaning is used to refer to the communicative intention of the speaker. This term was introduced into pragmatics by J.L. Austin (1962), and Thomas points out the significance of this force by saying:

Most of our misunderstandings of other people are not due to any inability to hear them or parse their sentences or understand their words... A far more important source of difficulty in communication is that we often fail to understand a speaker's intention. (1995:18)

To understand an utterance is possible only on condition that the hearer understands both utterance meaning and force correctly. Understanding only one of these components is not enough to get the correct message. Thomas (1995: 20) reports that at a conference where she attended a group of British and American linguists were discussing another linguist who was not there. “Her works became very popular” says one of them. Thomas states that she herself correctly interpreted the intended force of utterance as a *criticism* because she had already known what the speaker thought about the book in question. On the other hand, American linguists interpreted *popular* as *well received having a lot of success*.

2.3. Pragmatics across Cultures

The comparison of pragmatics in and between different cultures has been approached from a number of perspectives. From an initial contrastive approach,

researchers then moved to a cross-cultural approach. Both perspectives are briefly discussed in the following.

2.3.1. Contrastive pragmatics

Even though communicative functions appear to exist across languages, the ways in which a given function is realized may differ from one language to another. Riley (1981) has pointed to the task of making a particular language function the object of study and then contrast its linguistic realizations in a number of languages.

Reiss (1985:6) asserts that in identifying speech acts, the aim is basically to work within a contrastive model of language functions to show what kinds of speech acts there are, what functions they serve, and how they are related to each other. Based on the assumption that speech acts are universal as claimed by Austin and Searle and supported by Brown-Levinson, cross linguistic comparisons of speech acts could be made. However, it was soon discovered that cross-linguistic generalizations should be supplemented by analyses of cultural details as in the ethnography of speaking.

In different countries, people may speak in different ways-not only because they use different linguistic codes, involving different lexicons and different grammars, but also because their ways of using the codes are different (Wierzbicka, 1991:67). The cultural norms reflected in speech acts may differ from one language to another. Different cultures find expression in different systems of speech acts; in the words of Wierzbicka (1991:26) “different speech acts become entrenched, and, to some extent, codified in different languages”. According to Trosborg (1995), different pragmatic norms reflect different hierarchies of values characteristic of different cultures, and a comparison, for example of speech acts across countries, will more often than not involve a comparison of different cultures.

j

With a growing concern with the influence of culture on the realization of speech acts, contrastive pragmatics has developed into the particular field of cross-cultural pragmatics concerned with contrasting pragmatics across cultural communities.

2.3.2 Cross- cultural Pragmatics

This research area not only takes the pragmalinguistic, but also the sociopragmatic side of language into account. In House-Edmondson's words:

Cross-cultural pragmatics is a field of inquiry which compares the ways in which two or more languages are used in communication. Cross-cultural pragmatics is an important new branch of contrastive linguistic studies because in any two languages different features of the social context may be found to be relevant in deciding what can be expressed and how it is conventionally expressed. (1986: 282)

The main ideas of this new direction of the study of (socio) pragmatics are the following:

In different societies and different communities, people speak differently; these differences in ways of speaking are profound and systematic, they reflect different cultural values, or at least different hierarchies of values; different ways of speaking, different communicative styles, can be explained and made sense of in terms of independently established different cultural values and cultural priorities. (Wierzbicka, 1991:69)

In accounting for social realizations of speech acts, cross-cultural variables which affect their use become extremely important. Breakdowns in inter-cultural and inter-ethnic communication may easily occur as a consequence of culturally distinct styles of interaction. Culturally determined differences in expectations and interpretations may create misunderstandings and ill-feelings (Gumperz, 1978).

Typically, research focuses on the range and contextual distribution of strategies and linguistic forms used to convey illocutionary meaning and politeness. The Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) is the most well known research project in the area of cross-cultural pragmatics/ interlanguage pragmatics. Within the framework of this large-scale project, both native and nonnative varieties of request and apology realisations were established for different social contexts across various languages and cultures using a single coding system (e. g., Blum-Kulka et al., 1989; House, 1989). The method employed was the discourse completion task (DCT) and the varieties analysed included American English, Australian English, British English, Canadian French, Danish, German, Hebrew and Argentinean Spanish.

The use of specific speech acts have been found to vary with culture. With regard to for example compliments, Wolfson (1983) found that the Americans pay compliments in situations in which complimenting would be inappropriate in other cultures; also Basso (as cited in Trosborg, 1995) found that some American compliments were made the object of ridicule by Athabaskan Indians. Daikuhara (as cited in Trosborg, 1995) compares the use of compliments in Japanese and American English.

Studies of cross-cultural differences resulting in miscommunication have been reported, e.g. deriving from interactions between speakers of British English and Indian English in England (Gumperz, 1982; 1982b), and from interactions between speakers with English and Russian cultural backgrounds (Thomas, 1983).

An aspect which has received a considerable amount of attention in cross-cultural pragmatic research is the notion of indirectness (Blum-Kulka, House and Kasper, 1989:5-7). The Greeks are reported to be more indirect than the Americans in Tannen's study (1981), while speakers of Hebrew, on the other hand, are more direct than speakers of American English (Katriel, 1986) and than speakers of English Levenston's (as cited in Trosborg, 1995) study of realizations of assents and disagreement, and Blum-Kulka's (1982) study of requests). A contrastive study of German and English requestive behaviour (House and Kasper, 1981) reveals Germans speakers as being more direct than the English. These comparisons, again, make sense only when sociopragmatic factors are taken into account.

Another issue of which is the concern of cross-cultural pragmatics is universality vs. culture specificity in relation to the notion of speech acts. A claim for universality has been made by, e.g. Austin (1962); Searle (1969, 1975); Fraser (1985) for the realization of speech acts, and by Leech (1983); Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) for politeness strategies. The theory is that strategies for realizing speech acts, for conveying politeness and mitigating the force of utterances are essentially the same across cultures, although they are subject to cultural specification and elaboration in any particular society (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 13-15).

In terms of discursual aspects, a few studies have focused on the opening and closing conversations, e.g. House (1982) (opening and closing phases of everyday dialogues in English and German), and on the use of gambits, e.g. Faerch- Kasper (1983) (German and Danish).

2.3.3 Interlanguage pragmatics

Interlanguage pragmatics has been defined by different researchers as: "... the investigation of non-native speakers' comprehension and production of speech acts, and the acquisition of L2 related speech act knowledge." (Kasper and Dahl, 1991: 215) or "... the study of nonnative speakers' use and acquisition of L2 pragmatic knowledge" (Kasper and Rose, 1999: 81) and "... the study of nonnative speakers' comprehension, production, and acquisition of linguistic action in L2, or, put briefly, ILP [interlanguage pragmatics] investigates 'how to do things with words' (Austin) in a second language." (Kasper, 1998b: 184)

Underlying these three definitions are two basic points. Firstly, interlanguage pragmatics is concerned with language in use, i. e., with language as action – the subject of pragmatics. Secondly, as the term "interlanguage pragmatics" itself indeed suggests, research should concentrate both on learners' use and acquisition of pragmatic knowledge.

It is, however, cross-cultural pragmatics from which interlanguage pragmatics is a direct off-shoot - investigations of pragmatics across culture inevitably having led to the question as to what language learners do in a second or foreign language. Since its conception in the early 1980s, therefore, most of the research questions, the methodology and indeed the theoretical background of interlanguage pragmatics have stemmed from cross-cultural pragmatics rather than from second language acquisition, the other parent discipline of interlanguage pragmatics. Indeed, this bias is even reflected in the definitions of interlanguage pragmatics proposed above, since in all three definitions reference is made to non-native speakers (NNS) rather than to learners.

The body of research on interlanguage realisations of various speech acts is large. Such studies concentrate predominantly on learner/ native speaker differences in the range and contextual distribution of strategies and linguistic forms used to convey illocutionary meaning and politeness. In a recent overview, Bardovi Harlig (2001) identifies the main areas of learner/ native speaker differences in production to lie in the actual speech acts realised, the choice of semantic formulas employed to realise a particular speech act, the content of these semantic formulas and, finally, in the form which these realisations take.

As far as the influence of second language acquisition is concerned, development issues have remained largely neglected in interlanguage pragmatics. Consequently, despite a number of key articles having been devoted to acquisitional issues in recent years, such as (Bardovi-Harlig, 1999; Kasper, 2000; Kasper and Rose, 1999; Kasper and Schmidt; 1996) and despite a slow increase in the number of developmental studies conducted (above all, via an increase in interlanguage pragmatic cross-sectional studies), many questions still remain open and a lack of understanding of development patterns and indeed of the factors which influence interlanguage pragmatic development is to be identified. Indeed, Bardovi-Harlig (1999a: 678), recently commenting on the current lack of research in this regard, states: “The study of how L2 related speech act knowledge is acquired is more of a desideratum than a reality”. Unlike the case in other interlanguage specialisations, such as interlanguage phonology, morphology, syntax or semantics, or indeed in first language acquisition research, it can be suggested, therefore, that the understanding of development in ILP is so lacking that interlanguage pragmatics has ignored one of its main goals, “...the acquisition of L2 related speech act knowledge” (Kasper and Dahl, 1991: 215) and, with the exception of studies relating to transfer from L1 to L2, thus largely distanced itself from second language acquisition research, at the core of which lie development issues. Apart from being a symptom of interlanguage pragmatics’ roots in cross-cultural pragmatics, this state of affairs is also, as Kasper (1992: 204) comments, partly due to the extensive concentration on universal grammar theory in second language acquisition, a theory in which pragmatics has no place.

2.4. Speech Acts

It was the dawn of speech act theory which triggered the development of the field of pragmatics, where it has remained one of the most influential theories. Speech acts, which would associate different meanings to different people, can be viewed from two different point of views: a- Philosophical. b- Sociolinguistic.

2.4.1. Speech acts from philosophy to linguistics

It is the British ordinary language philosopher, John Austin, whom we have to thank for speech act theory, a theory which, through the work of John Searle, triggered interest in contextualised utterance meaning in linguistics and, thereby, spawned the field of pragmatics, a fundamental departure from the truth-conditional semantics prevalent at the time.

In a series of lectures given in 1955, and published posthumously in 1962 (Austin, 1976), Austin identified that, irrespective of what we say, we are always ‘doing things with words’. In acting with words, Austin maintains that a speaker produces three acts:

- the *locutionary* act, i. e., the act of uttering (phonemes, morphemes, sentences) and also referring to and saying something about the world.
- the *illocutionary* act, i. e., the speaker’s (S) intention realised in producing an utterance, e. g., request, compliment.
- the *perlocutionary* act, i. e., the intended effect of an utterance on the hearer (H), e. g., to make H do something, to make H happy.

That is to say that, in producing an utterance, we not only say something about the world (locution), but we also perform an act (illocution) which we intend to have an effect on our interlocutor (perlocution). The illocutionary act is the principal focus of speech act theory and it is, indeed, itself, standardly referred to as the ‘speech act’. In other words, as Searle et al. (1980: vii) phrase it, the central assumption of speech act theory is that: “ ... the minimal unit of communication is not a sentence or other

expression, but rather the performance of certain kinds of acts, such as making statements, asking questions, giving orders, describing, ..., etc.”

The illocutionary act signals how a particular proposition is to be interpreted, as one proposition may occur in various illocutionary acts, as in the case of such utterances as “Jane, go to bed”, “Jane, will you go to bed?”, “Jane will go to bed” -while each of these utterances have the same proposition (i. e., Jane will go to bed), the illocutions differ, representing respectively an order, a question and a predication (Searle et al., 1980: vii). Illocutionary force indicating devices, such as performative verbs, mood, word order, intonation, etc., aid the hearer in assigning illocutionary force to an utterance. In addition, Searle (1969: 66) also proposed that there exist certain conditions, constitutive rules of a speech act, termed felicity conditions, which must be met if an act is to be performed. These, like other types of illocutionary force indicating device, facilitate in identifying the particular speech act in question. Despite these means, however, an illocution is not always felicitous and, likewise, a perlocution not always successful.

2.4.2. Classification of illocutionary acts

Trosborg (1995:22-23) reports that “Illocutionary acts are seen as communicative devices which express an intended environmental effect beyond comprehension of the speech act.” Searle gives the following verbs as examples of the verbs denoting illocutionary acts: *state, describe, assert, warn, remark, comment, command, order, request, criticize, apologize, censure, approve, welcome, promise, object, demand, argue*, and reports Austin’s claim that there are over a thousand such expressions in English (as cited in Searle, 1979:136). Both Austin and Searle base their theories on the hypothesis that “speaking a language is engaging in a rule-governed form of behavior” (Searle, 1969:11), but whereas Chomsky conceived of language as a set of sentences, they assume that language can be regarded as a form of verbal acting.

In “A classification of illocutionary acts”, Searle (1976:1-16) makes a consistent classification of functions of language usage by dividing illocutionary acts into a limited number of major categories. He takes as the chief criterion of classification the speaker’s the speaker’s communicative intention manifested in the *illocutionary*

purpose (or point) of the act (corresponding to the essential condition) and the correspondence between *direction of fit*, i.e. the relation between words and the world, and the psychological state of the mind expressed by the speaker (corresponding to the sincerity condition). He finds that communicative functions are reducible to five major classes, namely *representatives*, *directives*, *expressives*, *commissives*, and *declarations*.

Representatives: In performing *representatives* the speaker tries to commit himself to the belief that the expressed proposition is true. With the purpose of describing the world, the speaker says how something is, in Searle's words he tries to make "the words match the world" (1976). This class includes acts such as affirming, alleging, asserting, stating, forecasting, predicting, announcing, concluding, insisting, notifying, confessing, denying and so on (Parker and Riley, 2000:15).

Directives: The purpose of the speaker in performing *directives* is to get the hearer to do something. As opposed to representatives, by using directives a speaker tries to make "the world match the words." For example, the purpose of a request is to involve the hearer in some future action which has positive consequences (benefits) for the speaker and may mean costs to the hearer (Trosborg, 1995: 14-15). This class includes acts of requesting, ordering, questioning, forbidding, advising, suggesting, insisting, recommending, warning and so on (Parker and Riley, 2000:15).

Commissives: In commissives, the speaker commits himself to some future action. Similar to directives, the speaker's attempt is to make "the world matches the words" again. In the case of an offer, as an example, the speaker means that he volunteers to carry out a future action assuming that the result of which will have some positive consequences for the hearer (but he is not sure if the hearer wants the action carried out or not) (Trosborg, 1995:16). This class includes acts of promising, volunteering, offering, threatening, swearing, vowing etc. (Parker and Riley, 2000:15).

Expressives: The speaker's purpose in performing this class of illocutionary act is to express the emotional state of the speaker regarding some prior action or state of affairs. For example, in an apology, the speaker expresses regret (on the part of the speaker) having performed (or failed to perform) a prior action which had negative consequences on the hearer (Trosborg, 1995:15). Thanking, welcoming, apologizing,

congratulating, deploring, objecting and commiserating are some examples of this class (Parker and Riley, 2000:15).

Declarations: A declaration is an utterance which causes an immediate change in the institutional state of affairs. Performance of such utterances depends on the existence of elaborate extra-linguistic institutions (Dimitracopoulou, 1990:12). The speakers attempt is to make both “words to world” and “world to words” (Trosborg, 1995:16). This last group includes acts of naming, resigning, baptizing, appointing, surrendering, christening, declaring war, firing from employment and so on (Parker and Riley, 2000:15).

2.4.3. The issue of Directness and Indirectness

As it is known, people sometimes mean more than what they say. Verschueren (1985:10) supports this idea with this statement: “This is not true only with respect to the propositional content of utterances but also with respect to their illocutionary force. Such indirectness needs to be accounted for and in connection with the illocutionary force in terms of indirect speech acts.” Parker and Riley (2000: 23) express that an illocutionary act is issued directly when the syntactic form (structure) of the utterance matches the illocutionary force of the utterance (function). For example, if a yes-no interrogative form “Do you know Mary?” is used to ask a yes-no question (one to which you can respond with Yes or No) or an exclamatory form “How nice you are!” is used to issue an expressive or an imperative form “Keep quiet!” to issue a directive, then these utterances are direct illocutionary acts.

However, in an indirect illocutionary act there is an indirect relationship between the structure and its function (Yule, 1996:55). In Parker and Riley’s words, the syntactic form of the utterance does not match the illocutionary force of an utterance in an indirect illocutionary act. An act is indirect if it is not performed by means of performing any other act (Akmajian et al., 1979:272). For example, an indirect illocutionary act is issued when the *Wh*- interrogative form “Why don’t you be quiet?” is used as the directive “Be quiet!” (Parker and Riley, 2000:23). “Can you pass me the salt?” is an indirect speech act because it is an imperative subtype distinguished as an interrogative (Verschueren, 1985:10).

Indirect speech acts are regarded to be more polite than direct speech acts in English (Yule, 1996:56). Taylor (1990) supports Gibbs' (1986) findings that over 90 per cent of English speakers' requests are made indirectly. Maybe that is the reason why English speakers consider German speakers who are learning English impolite. This consideration is not because of the grammatical errors, but because of pragmatic errors they make. Since in their native language, Germans prefer direct speech acts more than English speakers do. Similarly, Polish speakers use indirect requests less frequently than English speaker do, too. In other words, "the more indirect a request is, the more polite it is" (Wierzbicka, 1985). The use of the request cannot be said to be a universal device of politeness.

2.4.4. The speech act in empirical research

The large number of studies conducted in both cross-cultural and interlanguage pragmatics with the speech act as a unit of analysis is evidence of its usefulness in empirical analysis. Nonetheless, it is important to keep some of the criticisms levelled at speech act theory in mind. Some of the main points of critique are addressed in the following.

Primarily speaker-oriented:

In speech act theory, the hearer is seen as playing a passive role. The illocutionary force of a particular utterance is determined with regard to the linguistic form of the utterance and also introspection as to whether the necessary felicity conditions -not least in relation to the speaker's beliefs and feelings - are fulfilled. Interactional aspects are, thus, neglected. However, conversation is not just a mere chain of independent illocutionary forces - rather, speech acts are related to other speech acts within a wider discourse context. Speech act theory, in that it does not consider the function played by utterances in driving conversation is, therefore, insufficient in accounting for what actually happens in conversation.

Allocation of illocutionary force to utterances:

This is a crucial step in empirical research. However, this may be rather more difficult than suggested by Searle at times. Indeed, in some situations, both the hearer

and speaker may react to a particular speech act on a number of levels- in other words; an utterance may have multiple illocutionary points (Labov and Fanshel, as cited in Barron, 2003). Kasper (1989b:41) and Wierzbicka (1991:199) maintain in this regard, however, that for the greater majority of utterances, the illocutionary force is unambiguous and, indeed, it must be admitted that we do usually know what a speaker intends to achieve by using a particular utterance. As Wierzbicka says:

I believe that when we listen to other people we more often than not do know what they are doing, and we know it, to a large extent, due to unmistakable linguistic clues. ... 'Pragmatic' guesses play a part, too, but if we had to rely on guesses, human communication would be much less successful, much less effective than it in fact is. (1991:199)

Furthermore, these latter researchers argue that just as semantic ambiguity does not cause the notion of the lexical item to be overthrown; neither should uncertainty in the assignment of illocutionary force invalidate the notion of the speech act.

A focus on verbal dialogues:

This leads to a lack of concern for paralinguistic and non-verbal aspects of language (Geis, 1995: 13). This issue is not, however, of relevance in the present study as the data, though taking the spoken form, are written.

Universal presumption:

The claim that the strategies used to perform an indirect speech act are universal given that they are based on universal felicity conditions has been debated in the light of cross-cultural differences found. It may be concluded that the speech act, although not without fault as a conceptual unit, is, by and large, suited to the study of language in use. However, its limitations regarding lack of reference to the wider discourse context must be kept in mind.

2.5. Politeness theories

Different speech communities demonstrate both similarities and differences in using language to establish, maintain and foster interpersonal relations, leading to potential difficulties in interaction between cultures. Since the late 1970s, various politeness theories have been proposed within pragmatics to explain interactional

conventions of language use - both universal and culture-specific. It is these which are addressed in the following, but first it is better turn to the term 'politeness' itself.

Regrettably, the term "politeness" often triggers some confusion since it not only signifies a pragmatic concept, but also a lay concept and a sociolinguistic concept. The lay concept of politeness (termed the 'social-norm view' of politeness by Fraser, (1990: 220) relates to "...proper social conduct and tactful consideration of others" (Kasper, 1994: 3206). Etiquette books designed for different cultures are a good example. On the other hand, politeness as a sociolinguistic concept, is concerned with obligatory signals of respect or familiarity, which derive from such characteristics as age, sex, family position and social position. Examples are address forms in English, the T/ V forms in German and French and honorifics in Japanese and Korean. As Thomas writes:

The reason why I say that deference has little to do with pragmatics is that generally, unless the speaker deliberately wishes to flout the behavioural norms of a given society ..., the speaker has no choice as to whether to use the deferent form or not - usage is dictated by sociolinguistic norms (original emphasis). (1995: 152)

In contrast, politeness in pragmatics is concerned with "...ways in which the relational function in linguistic action is expressed" (Kasper, 1994: 3206). In other words, it concerns how language is employed in a strategic manner to attain such goals as promoting or maintaining interpersonal relationships. In the following, the three principal approaches to the study of politeness from a pragmatic perspective are presented in a framework adopted from Fraser (1990). In other words, focus is first on the conversational-maxim view of politeness, then on the face-saving view and finally on the conversational-contract view. The relative emphasis accorded to these differing approaches reflects their importance for the study at hand.

2.5.1 Conversational-maxim view

Both the conversational-maxim and the face-saving view of politeness have their starting point in Grice's account of verbal interaction (Grice, as cited in Cole and J. L. Morgan, 1978) Grice argues that because speakers are rational individuals and share common goals, conversations are governed by a co-operative principle, which reads:

“Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged”. (Grice 1975: 45)

Associated with this principle are four maxims - the maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner - which are observed in effective conversation. Politeness theorists, such as Brown and Levinson (1987), Lakoff (as cited in Barron, 2003) and Leech (1983), argue, however, that Grice’s account of verbal interaction is insufficient as it concentrates on the referential function of language and, thus, does not adequately account for politeness in language - indeed, politeness is characterised as a mere flouting of the maxims. While a co-operative request might, for instance, read “Bring out the rubbish”, a more polite one, depending on the particular situation, might be “Could you bring out the rubbish?” (flouting the maxim of manner, which states that one should avoid obscurity and ambiguity and be brief and orderly). Unlike Grice, politeness researchers highlight the relational function of language, and the related conflict and resultant trade-off between the goals of politeness and maximum efficiency.

Leech (1983) is the best known proponent of the conversational-maxim view of politeness. Like other researchers, such as Edmondson (1981) and Lakoff (as cited in Barron, 2003), Leech is of the opinion that speakers not only heed the co-operative principle in conversation, but also a further principle relating to the interactional nature of conversation. This, he terms the politeness principle. It reads:

‘Minimize (other things being equal) the expression of impolite beliefs,’ ...
 (‘Maximize (other things being equal) the expression of polite beliefs’) ...
 (original emphasis) (Leech 1983: 81)

The politeness principle interacts with, and is sometimes in conflict with, Grice’s co-operative principle. Similar to the co-operative principle, the politeness principle is divided into a number of maxims, namely the Maxims of Tact, Generosity, Approbation, Modesty, Agreement and Sympathy, each of which functions along a range of different pragmatic scales which allow a speaker to determine the relevant degree of modesty, agreement, generosity, etc. necessary in each particular case. Leech’s maxims are associated with particular illocutionary forces. Since directives (impositives in Leech’s terms) and commissives will be of interest in the present analysis, we will look here

more closely at the maxims relating to these illocutionary forces, namely at the Tact and Generosity Maxims, both of which operate along the cost-benefit scale (Leech, 1983: 106).

The Tact Maxim is divided into two elements both of which concentrate on the hearer (Leech 1983). These are: (a) 'Minimize the cost to h' and (b) 'Maximise the benefit to h' (original emphasis). This maxim explains, for example, why in such requests as "Can you come here for a minute?", the understater, 'a minute', is employed - namely in order to minimise the cost to the hearer. The Generosity Maxim, on the other hand, is speaker-oriented (Leech, 1983: 133). It is formulated as follows: (a) Minimize benefit to self, (b) Maximize cost to self.

In some instances, both the Tact and Generosity Maxims are relevant, such as in the offer, "I'll make you a cup of tea." Here the benefit to the hearer is maximised (Tact Maxim, (b)) and the cost to self also maximised (Generosity Maxim, (b)) (more so than it would be in the offer "Do you want a cup of tea?" where the speaker is not explicitly mentioned). In other cases, however, one or other of the maxims may apply on their own and on occasion, unlike Grice's maxims, both politeness maxims may be in conflict in which case the strongest wins out, as in the request "Could I have your notes from yesterday?" Here the benefit to self is maximised rather than minimised, competing against the Generosity Maxim (a), while the cost to the hearer is minimised (Tact Maxim (a)) (since the hearer is not explicitly mentioned as s/ he would be in an utterance such as 'Could you give me your notes?') (Leech, 1983: 134).

Cross-cultural variation in politeness norms is accounted for in the theory by the suggestion that different maxims are given different relative weightings in different cultures (Leech, 1983: 80). Indeed, in a study comparing compliment responses in Irish English with previous findings on such responses elicited by Chen (1993) for Chinese and American English, Schneider (1999) finds the Irish culture to give equal weight to the Agreement and Modesty Maxims in contrast to Chinese society and American society, the former in which more importance is attached to the Modesty Maxim; the latter in which the Agreement Maxim is most important (Schneider and Schneider as cited in Baron, 2003:15).

Apart from its contribution to explaining cultural differences, Leech's theory is of heuristic value and has also spawned much research. It is, however, not without criticism - the major faults relating firstly to the lack of empirical basis for the maxims suggested (Kasper, 1994:3208) and also to the apparently infinite number of maxims which may be suggested to account for regularities in language use - a feature which makes the theory cumbersome and effectively unfalsifiable. Furthermore, Leech has also been accused of disregarding uncooperative communication, such as debates and discussions (Trosborg, 1995:25). Finally, the model remains on a rather abstract level - as Watts et al. (1992:6) point out, it does not explain how speakers decide on a particular strategy in order to realise a particular type and level of politeness.

2.5.2 Face-saving view

Brown and Levinson's (1978, 1987) theory remains the most well-known and influential politeness theory proposed to date. Similar to the conversational-maxim view, it is assumed here that conversationalists are rational individuals. Flouting of Grice's (1975) maxims is regarded a consequence of politeness.

A second central assumption of the theory relates to Goffman's (as cited in Barron, 2003:16) concept of 'face' which Brown and Levinson adopt and expand to include both positive and negative aspects. Face refers to "...the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself..." (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 61). In interaction, face "...can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to" (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 61). Since maintaining one's own face depends on maintenance of one's interactant's face, it is in the mutual interest of both conversational participants to preserve each other's face. Positive face refers to the human desire to belong, to be valued, accepted, recognised and liked by others, whereas negative face concerns the basic human need for independence and autonomy.

Brown and Levinson's approach is speech-act based. They suggest that certain speech acts are intrinsically face-threatening acts (FTA), i. e., they potentially threaten either the positive and/ or negative face of the speaker and/ or hearer. Consequently, given that speakers are rational individuals who select the most efficient means of achieving a particular end, they engage in face-management. In doing so, speakers

choose from a range of five super-strategies and a large selection of sub-strategies that strategy which best serves to reduce the particular face-threat at hand. In this way, it is made clear to the hearer that any face-threat is unintentional. The five super-strategies which speakers have at their disposal are in order of increasing politeness and decreasing directness (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 68):

Do the act bald on the record

Clarity, directness and conciseness are the hallmarks of this strategy. Realisations follow Grice's maxims, as in the request, 'Give me your notes.'

Do the act with positive redress (positive politeness)

Here the hearer's need for acceptance is addressed by the speaker emphasising that s/ he likes the hearer. Sub-strategies include the use of such in-group identity markers as slang, dialect, nicknames or jokes, or the expression of sympathy.

Do the act with negative redress (negative politeness)

Use of this strategy thematises the hearer's right to autonomy by, for example, providing the hearer - at least superficially - with a way out via the use of conventionally indirect request strategies, such as 'Can you give me your notes?'

Do the act off the record

In this case, ambiguity serves to disguise the exact nature of the relevant illocutionary force and so shields the speaker from any negative consequences which may be associated with the realisation of the speech act in question. In this way, should the hearer feel his/ her face threatened by the particular illocution, the speaker can plead that a different illocution was intended. Hints, metaphors and ellipsis are among the sub-strategies available.

Don't do the act

This particular strategy is chosen where the realisation of a particular speech act is regarded as too face-threatening.

In realising a speech act, the speaker has to choose from these five super-strategies -but what criteria does s/he base his/her decision on? According to Brown and Levinson (1987: 74), the choice is a function of the relevant degree of face-threat (the “weightiness” of a face-threatening act). This is calculated by adding the relevant values for three independent, central social variables together. These values are the:

- *social distance* (D) between the speaker and the hearer, i. e., the degree of familiarity between interlocutors,
- *relative power* (P) of the speaker with respect to the hearer, i. e., the degree to which H can impose his own plans and his own self-evaluation (face) at the expense of S’s plans and self-evaluation (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 77),
- absolute *rank of imposition* in the particular culture (R)

The factors affecting the relative degree of imposition vary for different speech acts. For requests, for example, the relative degree of obligation for the H to comply with the particular request is a relevant factor in certain cultures (Blum-Kulka and House, 1989: 141).

Each of these three social factors may be weighted differently in different cultures, leading to culture-specific views of the relative degree of face-threat and, thus, culture-specific strategy choices in a single situation (Brown and Levinson, 1987:243).

Brown and Levinson’s (1987) theory has been applauded for its insightful explanations into the workings of society, for the questions it has raised and, finally, for its tangibility and, thus, ease of application to further empirical research endeavours.

The negative aspects of the theory cannot, however, be overlooked and, indeed, the theory has been extensively criticised on a number of important points briefly mentioned in the following. Let us look firstly at the critical issue of universality.

Brown and Levinson’s claim for universality for their theory has been criticised from a theoretical and empirical perspective on two accounts. Firstly, the universality of the concept of face itself has come into question since it presupposes that the notion of self is identical across cultures (Kasper, 1994: 3208). In the light of accounts of

researchers, such as Gu (1990: 241), Mao (1994: 472) and Matsumoto (1988: 423), however, it appears that Brown and Levinson's focus on individualism reflects an ethnocentric Western-bias. In Eastern cultures, more specifically in China and Japan, face is, these scholars argue, not just a personal concept, but rather is, or at least involves, an interpersonal concept, having to do with group membership. Secondly, the proposed universally-valid positive correlation between face and politeness has been questioned. Gu (1990: 242), Ide (as cited in Baron, 2003:16) and Matsumoto (1988) suggest, for example, that marking social standing rather than saving face is the primary motivation in interactions in Japan, i. e., social indexing rather than strategic politeness (Kasper, 1994: 3208).

A further criticism relates to the direct relationship proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987) between increasing indirectness and increasing politeness. This assumption has been proved to be incorrect by empirical evidence presented by Blum-Kulka (1987:136) and House-Edmondson (1986:290). Related to this issue, is also the criticism that it may be illogical to assume that negative politeness is employed when the degree of face-threat is relatively high, and positive politeness when it is somewhat lower, regardless of whether it is the positive or negative face which is actually affected (Turner, 1996:6).

A third major concern relates to the direct relationship suggested by Brown and Levinson between increasing weight of contextual factors and increasing politeness. This has been shown by empirical research to be inaccurate. Wolfson (1988: 32), on the basis of her own research on middle class American English and those of other researchers' findings, proposes a bulge theory to explain why intimates and status unequals and strangers all use approximately the same politeness patterns and why this relative level of politeness is lower than that invested by non-intimates, status equal friends, co-workers and acquaintances. According to her theory, less effort has to be invested at the two extremes of social distance due to the low negotiability of the relationship.

The equal weighting suggested for the factors P, D and R has also been criticised, and it has been proposed that the constituent variables may not be as independent as has

been claimed - the values of P and D may, for example, possibly influence the value of R, and a high P differential may automatically create a degree of distance.

2.5.3 Conversational-contract view

The final central approach to politeness phenomena to be addressed very briefly in this context is that proposed by Fraser (1990) and Fraser and Nolen (1981). This view of politeness differs from both of the above in that politeness is not regarded here as additional to interaction, but rather as an integral part of it. In addition, the approach taken is discourse-based rather than speech-act based. According to this theory, interactants enter a conversation with a particular conception as to the rights and obligations of both parties based on their social relationship. These perceptions form the conversational contract and to abide by the terms of this contract is to act in a polite manner. Indeed, as Kasper (1994: 3207) puts it: “Acting politely ... is virtually the same as using language appropriately” according to this theory. However, either in the course of, or following, a particular conversation, such perceptions may be readjusted due to the dynamics of interaction (Fraser, 1990: 232). Although this theory can be commended for highlighting the interactive nature of conversation, overall the theory is difficult to apply to empirical research given its abstract and imprecise nature (Thomas, 1995: 177). As a result, it is of minor importance in the present investigation.

2.6. The speech act of apology

Research on speech acts has shown that apologies are among the more frequently used speech acts in people’s daily affairs (see Blum-Kulka *et al.*, 1989). At the same time both research and folk literature are replete with reports of communication problems that arise from the mis-management of apologies, which result in sometimes serious interpersonal and even international consequences. These might, on the one hand, be caused when an expectation that an apology of some form (as a minimum) should have been offered goes unfulfilled. Or, on the other hand, it may be the result of one party failing to recognize that an apology is needed to soften an offence. Olshtain (1989) cites an instance of a virtual collapse of the Israeli cabinet, which was eventually resolved after a painstaking negotiation forced the then Industry

Minister to offer a suitable apology to the country's Premier. A more recent incident involved a US surveillance aircraft making an emergency landing in China following a collision with a Chinese fighter jet. After extensive procrastination, the Chinese government put an end to the detention of the American air crew once it had received an official letter of apology from the US President (McGeary, as cited in Intachakra, 2004).

Apologies belong to the class of expressives. They are aimed at fulfilling communicative functions such as displaying regret and maintaining the negative face wants of interactants. There is a potential loss of negative face when an offence has occurred (or is about to occur). Hence, the responsible party is required to redress the offended party's damaged personal autonomy by uttering an apology. In the terminology of Leech (1983:104-105), the act of apologizing is a convivial speech act, the goal of which coincides with the social goal of maintaining harmony between speaker and hearer. Apologies offer respect and deference to the hearer and are, according to Holmes (as cited in Intachakra, 2004), 'facesupportive' acts. Goffman (as cited in Intachakra, 2004) proposed that apologizing is an important component of the 'remedial interchange': "when a speaker perceives him/herself as being culpable for an infringement that affects another speaker, he/she will, as a matter of politeness, attempt to restore the social balance by 'transforming what could be seen as offensive into what can be seen as acceptable'".

Depending on the situation, the speaker may use either one of the following devices in a remedial interchange: a request, an apology and an account. The first is called for when an infringement is forthcoming (such as prior to asking a stranger for directions), while the remainder are postevent elements (such as showing regret and then explaining the cause of the transgression). Olshtain and Cohen (1983) introduced the notion of 'speech act set' on the basis of the common characteristics of apologizing behaviour. Although determining how to express repentance is situationspecific and language-specific, it seems that a remedial move may contain repetitive semantic formulae and incorporate either a speech act verb or an indirect strategy, or a combination of both in the same speech event (Olshtain and Cohen, 1983: 20).

2.6.1. Apology strategies

An important aspect in resolving a conflict is the fact that it takes two parties to start an interpersonal conflict and two parties to resolve it (Takaku et al., 2001). If the wrongdoer decides to apologize and the offended person does not allow him/her to defend his/her position, the apology will be useless. If the offended waits for an apology and the wrongdoer does not think there is a need for one, the offended may end up waiting to no avail.

An apology must have the so-called three R's: regret, responsibility, and remedy, all of which a wrongdoer must show for the offended to take his/her apology as sincere. Engel (as cited in Bataineh and Bataineh, 2006: 1901-1927) claims that in the absence of any of these, the apology will not be sincere, and, thus, will not have the desired effect.

Fraser (1981:263) states that in order for an apology to be viewed as convincing, the offender has to use a combination of two or more of the following strategies:

1. announcing that an apology is forthcoming through clauses such as *I (hereby) apologize . . .*;
2. stating the offender's obligation to apologize with words such as *I must apologize*;
3. offering to apologize to show the sincerity of the act with sentences such as *Do you want me to apologize?*;
4. requesting the acceptance of the given apology with clauses such as *Please accept my apology for . . .*;
5. expressing regret for the offense through the use of intensifiers such as *truly, terribly, very, and so*;
6. requesting forgiveness for the offense;
7. acknowledging responsibility for the act;
8. promising forbearance from a similar offending act with sentences such as *I promise you that will never happen again*; and
9. offering redress to show that the offender really regrets the offense with offers such as *Please let me pay for the damage I have done*.

Trosborg (1987: 150-152) suggests that an offender has the following set of strategies from which s/he may choose:

1. *minimizing the degree of offense* either by discussing the preconditions of the offense or blaming another person for it;
2. *acknowledgment of responsibility* for which s/he lists the substrategies of implicit acknowledgment; explicit acknowledgment; expression of lack of intent; expression of self-deficiency; expression of embarrassment; and explicit acceptance of the blame depending on the degree the offender accepts the blame;
3. *implicit or explicit explanation or account* by the offender to mitigate his/her responsibility;
4. *offer of repair* which is carried out either by a literal offer in which the offender states that s/he will pay for the damage or a compensation which might balance the offense;
5. *promise of forbearance* where the offender promises never to repeat the offense; and
6. *expressing concern* for the offended person in order to calm him/her.

Olshtain and Cohen (1983), who introduced the notion of ‘the speech act set of apology’, identified the following five apology strategies:

1. an Illocutionary Force Indicating Device (henceforth, IFID; Levinson, 1983:238) such as *sorry* and *excuse me*,
2. an expression of the speaker’s responsibility for the offense,
3. a statement or account of the cause which brought about the violation,
4. an offer of repair, and
5. a promise of forbearance.

In addition to these strategies that make up the speech act set, wrongdoers can intensify or downgrade their apologies. According to Olshtain (1989), among the most common intensifiers are *very* and *really*, while an expression such as *I’m sorry, but you really shouldn’t get insulted by such remarks* is a common manifestation of a speaker’s intention to downgrade an apology.

While Olshtain (1983) claims that the act of apologizing requires an action or an utterance which is intended to ‘set things right’, Holmes (as cited in Intachakra, 2004) considers an apology an example of a ‘face-supportive act’.

Brown and Attardo (2000) report that an apology consists of the following five components, listed in order of importance:

- a. an expression of apology, in which the wrongdoer vocalizes his/her feelings of regret;
- b. an explanation of the situation, in which the wrongdoer tries to reconstruct the incident for the offended to see that s/he deserves forgiveness;
- c. an acknowledgment of responsibility, whereby the wrongdoer claims his/her responsibility for what has happened as a part of his/her apology;
- d. an offer of repair, in which the wrongdoer tries to present a way to undo the harm; and
- e. a promise of non-recurrence, whereby the wrongdoer promises not to repeat the offense and, thus, insures gaining the offended person's sympathy for his/her awkward position.

The above do not seem to all and always be the case. For example, the word sorry is an adequate apology to a close friend, a case in which the wrongdoer only uses the first component and does without the other four.

Several studies have shown that the expression of apology may lead to more lenient disciplining and punishment (Goffman as cited in Intachakra, 2004; Darby and Schlenker, 1982, 1989; Ohbuchi et al., 1989). Ohbuchi et al. (1989) examined the effects of apologies on aggression. They found that when the offender apologized, the offended rated the offender as more sincere, more responsible, more careful, and less unpleasant than an offender who did not apologize. Further, they found that expressions of apology led to significantly less aggression by the offended toward the offender. Likewise, Harrell (as cited in Bataineh and Bataineh, 2006) found that offenders who were remorseful were considered more sorrowful and keen on reparation than those who were nonremorseful against whom more aggression was shown. Rosen and Adams (as cited in Bataineh and Bataineh, 2006) found that when the offender expressed remorse, s/he was perceived as less likely to repeat the violation.

2.6.2. Speech act of apologies in cross- cultural studies

Research on cross-cultural comparative discourse (e.g. Gumperz and Tanen, 1979; Cohen and Olshtain, 1981; Olshtain, 1983; Blum-Kulka and Olshtain, 1984) has revealed that different cultures possess different rules of appropriateness. Borkin and Reinhart (as cited in Bataineh and Bataineh, 2006) suggest that acquiring appropriate formulas for ritualistic apologies is problematic for non-native speakers; this is further supported by Olshtain (1983) who claims that events that require an apology have been shown to vary cross-culturally.

In order to produce learners who can effectively communicate in an L2, training in the structures of that language would not be adequate unless the learner is also trained in the rules of appropriateness in that language. Thus, theories of second language teaching and learning have experienced a major shift from the 'structural' approach to the 'communicative' approach at the heart of which is the notion of 'socio-cultural competence' as an important component of communicative competence. Within this paradigm, cross-cultural studies of speech acts have gained more importance because of their potential to lend better understanding of the interdependence of linguistic forms and socio-cultural context (Al-Zumor, 2003).

Numerous studies have recognized that a learner's ability to use speech acts appropriately is a major component of pragmatic competence. Rintell (1979:98–106), who defines pragmatics as the study of speech acts, argues that the learner's pragmatic ability in the target language is reflected in how one produces utterances to communicate 'specific intentions' and how one interprets other speakers' intentions as conveyed by these utterances.

A good body of pragmatic research has examined apologies in different languages, considering various variables such as the politeness strategies employed (e.g. Brown and Levinson, 1978; Garcia, 1989; Ruzickova, 1998; Marquez-Reiter, 2000), the cultural values reflected in the realization of an apology (e.g. Cordella, 1990; Suszczynska, 1999), gender (e.g. Cordella, 1990), the factors affecting the choice/use of a particular strategy (e.g. Cohen and Olshtain, 1981; Fraser, 1981; Olshtain and Cohen, 1983) and the strategies used by native and non-native speakers (Garcia, 1989;

Trosborg, 1987). Among the most cited of this type of research is the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP) in which requests and apologies are analyzed across a number of languages (viz., Argentinean Spanish, Australian English, Canadian French, German, and Israeli Hebrew) for the purpose of determining the potential existence and characteristics of universal pragmatic principles in speech act realization (Blum-Kulka et al., 1989).

Olshtain (1983) investigated how English and Russian learners of Hebrew apologized in L2 and their respective L1. Following the procedure of Cohen and Olshtain (1981), she examined realization patterns of apologies by native speakers of Hebrew to compare native and nonnative usage. She found that unlike the Russian group, who apologized more in Hebrew, the English group apologized considerably less in Hebrew although they apologized more often in their L1.

Olshtain (1989) compared strategy preference of apologies by speakers of English, French, German, and Hebrew and found considerable similarities in selection of IFIDs and expression of responsibility. She concluded that “different languages will realize apologies in very similar ways” (1989:171). In a similar study, Vollmer and Olshtain (as cited in Blum-Kulka et al.) investigated apology realization preferences of 200 speakers of German to determine the potential relationship between realization patterns of apology and social/situational parameters such as social status, social distance, the offended person’s expectation of an apology, and severity of offense. The findings revealed that the subjects used IFIDs and stressed responsibility in all situations in rather high percentages, and that the use of intensification of apologies was strongly related to situational parameters.

To summarize, previous research on speech act realization has revealed the following:

1. There are many similarities of realization patterns of apologies across cultures and gender although several differences are also detected.
2. The choice of apology strategies is often closely related to social/situational parameters that affect one’s choice of these strategies.
3. L2 learners tend to transfer their native sociopragmatic strategies to apologies in L2.
4. L2 learners tend to apologize differently in L2 from L1.

Sugimoto (1997) compared the apology styles of 200 American (79 males and 121 females) and 181 Japanese (82 males and 99 females) college students who responded to an open-ended questionnaire on situations warranting an apology. Sugimoto (1997) reported the following strategies:

I. Primary strategies are those frequently used by offenders when attempting to apologize. They include:

1. statement of remorse in which the wrongdoer acknowledges that s/he has done something wrong,
2. accounts in which the wrongdoer tells of what has happened (keeping in mind that this is highly subjective, depending on the way one tells the story and the role s/he played in it),
3. description of damage in which the wrongdoer describes what changes have been inflicted on the object in discussion or the repercussions of a certain deed on others, and
4. reparation in which the wrongdoer tries to repair the damage s/he has inflicted on others by offering words that may cause the harm done to be forgotten.

II. Secondary strategies include:

1. compensation, which differs from reparation in that the wrongdoer offers to replace the damaged object or pay for it, and
2. promise not to repeat offense in which the wrongdoer does his/her utmost to assure the injured party that what has taken place will not occur in the future.

III. Seldom used strategies include:

1. explicit assessment of responsibility in which the wrongdoer attempts to describe his/her role in and responsibility for what has happened,
2. contextualization in which the wrongdoer describes the context of the injury and what has happened in order to make the injured party see the whole picture,
3. self-castigation in which the wrongdoer claims responsibility for what has happened and is being hard on him-/herself, and
4. gratitude in which the wrongdoer is thankful that the offended is willing to give him/her a chance to explain and be forgiven.

Sugimoto (1997) reported that the four most used strategies are statement of remorse, accounts, description of damage, and reparation, and that, with the exception of accounts, the Japanese respondents used these strategies more than their American

counterparts did. She further reported that compensation and promise not to repeat offense were secondary strategies used mainly by the Japanese respondents.

2.7. The speech act of refusals

Refusals, as all the other speech acts, occur in all languages. However, not all languages/cultures refuse in the same way nor do they feel comfortable refusing the same invitation or suggestion. The speech act of refusal occur when a speaker directly or indirectly says ‘no’ to request or invitation. Refusal is a face-threatening act to the listener/ requester/ inviter, because it contradicts his or her expectations, and is often realized through indirect strategies. Thus, it requires a high level of pragmatic competence. Chen (1996) used semantic Formula to analyze speech act sets of refusal (refusing requests, invitations, offers and suggestions), and concluded that direct refusal as “NO” was not a common strategy for any of the subjects, regardless of their language background. For example, an expression of regret, common in Americans’ refusals, was generally produced by the Chinese speakers, which might lead to unpleasant feelings between speakers in an American context.

Speakers who may be considered fluent in a second language due to their mastery of the grammar and vocabulary of that language may still lack pragmatic competence; in other words, they may still be unable to produce language that is socially and culturally appropriate. In cross-cultural communication, refusals are known as ‘striking points’ for many non native speakers (Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliz-Weltz, 1990). Refusals can be tricky speech acts to perform linguistically and psychologically since the possibility of offending the interlocutor is inherent in the act itself (Know, 2004). As a face-threatening act, a sensitive pragmatic task and high pragmatic competence concern constructing refusals. As a failure to refuse appropriately can risk the interpersonal relations of the speakers, refusals usually include various strategies to avoid offending one’s interlocutors. However, the choice of these strategies may vary across languages and cultures. For example, in refusing invitations, offers and suggestions, gratitude was regularly expressed by American English speakers, but rarely by Egyptian Arabic speakers (Nelson, Al-batal, and Echols, 1996). When Mandarin Chinese speakers wanted to refuse requests, they expressed positive opinion (e.g., ‘I

would like to....') much less frequently than American English since Chinese informants were concerned that if they ever expressed positive opinions, they would be forced to comply (Liao and Bressnahan, 1996).

2.7.1. Refusal strategies

A semantic formula refers to 'a word, phrase, or sentence that meets a particular semantic criterion or strategy; any one or more of these can be used to perform the act in question' (Cohen, 1996: 265). In coding refusals in terms of semantic formulas, the taxonomy of refusals formulated by Beebe *et al.* (1990) is frequently used in cross-cultural studies. They are the following:

Direct

Performative (e. g., 'I refuse')

Nonperformative statement

1. 'No'
2. Negative willingness/ability ('I can't', 'I don't think so')

Indirect

Statement of regret (e. g., 'I'm sorry ...', 'I feel terrible ...')

Wish (e. g., 'I wish I could help you ...')

Excuse, reason, explanation (e. g., 'My children will be home that night'; 'I have a headache')

Statement of alternative

1. I can do X instead of Y (e. g., 'I'd rather ...', 'I'd prefer ...')
2. Why don't you do X instead of Y (e. g., 'Why don't you ask someone else?')

Set conditions for future or past acceptance (e. g., 'If you had asked me earlier, I would have...')

Promise of future acceptance (e. g., 'I'll do it next time', 'I promise I'll ...', or 'Next time I'll ...' __using 'will' or promise or 'promise')

Statement of principle (e. g., 'I never do business with friends')

Statement of philosophy (e. g., 'One can't be too careful')

Attempt to dissuade interlocutor

1. Threat or statement of negative consequences to the requester
(e. g., 'I won't be any fun tonight' to refuse an invitation)

2. Guilt trip (e. g., waitress to customers who want to sit a while: 'I can't make a living off people who just order coffee')
3. Criticize the request/requester, etc.
(statement of negative feeling or opinion); insult/attack
(e. g., 'Who do you think you are?' 'That's a terrible idea!')
4. Request for help, empathy, and assistance by dropping or holding the request.
5. Let interlocutor off the hook (e. g., 'Don't worry about it', 'That's okay', 'You don't have to')
6. Self-defense (e. g., 'I'm trying my best', 'I'm doing all I can do')

Acceptance that functions as a refusal

1. Unspecific or indefinite reply
2. Lack of enthusiasm

Avoidance

1. Nonverbal
 - a. Silence
 - b. Hesitation
 - c. Do nothing
 - d. Physical departure
2. Verbal
 - a. Topic switch
 - b. Joke
 - c. Repetition of part of request, etc. (e. g., 'Monday?')
 - d. Postponement (e. g., 'I'll think about it')
 - e. Hedging (e. g., 'Gee, I don't know', 'I'm not sure')

Adjuncts to refusals

1. Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement (e. g., 'That's a good idea ...'; 'I'd love to ...')
2. Statement of empathy (e. g., 'I realize you are in a difficult situation')
3. Pause fillers (e. g., 'uhh', 'well', 'oh', 'uhm')
4. Gratitude/appreciation

In addition, the researchers in other studies also discovered and labeled other semantic formulas of refusals. They are the following:

Passive negative willingness (e. g., 'It will be difficult')

Saying I tried/considered (e. g., ‘I already tried’)

Statement of solidarity (e. g., ‘As you and I have always known ...’)

Elaboration on the reason (e. g., ‘If I don’t show up on time, my wife will kill me’)

Statement of relinquishment (e. g., ‘I can’t do anything about it’)

Asking a question (e. g., ‘Is it really effective?’)

For example, in the situation in which one’s classmate asks to borrow lecture notes, the participant may refuse by saying ‘I’m afraid I can’t. I already promised to lend them to my friend, so why don’t you ask someone else?’, this response would be coded as [negative willingness] plus [reason] plus [statement of alternative].

2.7.2. Speech act of refusals in cross-cultural studies

Several major investigations into the speech act of refusing have been conducted by Beebe, Beebe. et al., and Beebe and Takahashi as cited in Wolfson (1989). The finding of their study (Beebe et al., as cited in Wolfson, 1989) demonstrates that Japanese learners of English manifest sociolinguistic transfer in refusals by the sequencing of formulas for refusing the actual frequency in use of formulas, and their specific content. One significant finding was that the status of the addressee is a much stronger conditioning factor in the speech of Japanese speaking both in English and in their native language. An example of the related differences status in the behavior of the Japanese is that, unlike English speaking Americans, they did not apologize or express regret in responses to those of lower position. Additional evidence of status-related differences is manifested in the Japanese responses to invitations from higher-as opposed to lower-status interlocutors. In contrast, Americans in these situations make a distinction along the lines of social distance by responding in a brief and unelaborated fashion to both higher- and lower-status unequal while offering much longer and more detailed responses to peers. In their analysis of strategies for refusing, they classify refusals into direct and indirect refusals. Direct refusals such as “I refuse” or “no” were found to be used by Americans mainly in response to intimates and status unequal or strangers. Indirect refusals, used by Americans primarily to acquaintances of equal status, included three major strategies which were usually found to be used in sequence at the beginning of a refusal. These were (1) an expression of positive opinion such as “I’d like to,” (2) an expression of regret such as “I’m sorry,” and excuse, reason, or

explanation such as “My children will be home that night” or “I have a headache”. Other strategies included a statement expressing a wish to be able to comply with the request, the statement of an alternative, a condition for future or past acceptance (e.g., “If you had asked me earlier....”), a promise of future acceptance (e.g., “I’ll do it next time”), a statement of principle (e.g., “I never do business with friends”), a statement of philosophy (e.g., “One can’t be too careful”), an attempt to dissuade the interlocutor, a criticism of the request, a request for empathy, a statement letting the interlocutor off the hook (e.g., “Don’t worry about it”), self-defense (e.g., “I’m doing my best”), an unspecific or indefinite reply, a display of lack enthusiasm, and verbal or nonverbal avoidance such as silence or a topic switch, a hedge, or a joke. In another study of refusals as made by Japanese ESL learners at tow levels of proficiency, Takahashi and Beebe (1987) found that low and high proficiency learners differed in the order and frequency of semantic formulas they use. The lower proficiency learners were also more direct in their refusals than higher-level ESL learners. To investigate the evidence of pragmatic transfer in Japanese ESL learners’ refusals, Beebe, Takahashi, and Uliss-Weltz (1990) compared refusal strategies used by Japanese ESL learners to those used by Americans. They also tested the differences in the order, frequency, and content of semantic formulas used by Japanese and Americans. They found evidence of transfer in all three areas (Beebe et al., 1990). Chen (1996) used semantic formula to analyze speech act sets of refusal (refusing requests, invitations, offers and suggestions) produced by American and Chinese speakers of English. She found that direct refusal was not a common strategy for any of the subjects, regardless of their language background.

There are few empirical studies on speech act behavior involving the Arabic language or even native speakers of Arabic. Umar (2004) studied the request strategies as used by Advanced Arab learners of English as a foreign language as compared to those strategies used by British native speakers of English. He found that the two groups adopted similar strategies when addressing their request to equals or people in higher positions. In this case, the subjects rely heavily on conventionally indirect strategies. However, when requests are addressed to people in lower positions the Arabic sample shows a marked tendency towards using more direct request strategies in performing their request than the British sample. El-Shazly (1993) studies the request strategies in American English, Egyptian Arabic, and English as spoken by Egyptian second

language learners. The results of this study have indicated that there are differences in the requesting strategies used by these groups. The Arab speakers of English demonstrate a high tendency towards using conventional indirectness which depends on the use of interrogatives. Modifiers are also examined among the groups. No differences are found with respect to use of “Upgraders”. “Downgraders”, however, are found to be more frequently used by native Arabic speakers. They display a noticeable tendency to use more than one downgrader in a single utterance. This group is also found to be unique in using religious expressions as downgraders.

2.8. Studies on teaching the speech acts

“In contrast to second language learning environments, research conducted in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context reports that the range of speech acts and realisation strategies is quite narrow, and the typical interaction patterns restrict pragmatic input and opportunities for practising discourse organisation strategies (Lörscher and Schulze as cited in Soler, 2005: 418). Moreover, Rose (1999) as cited in Hinkel points out that large classes, limited contact hours and little opportunity for intercultural communication are some of the features of the EFL context that hinder pragmatic learning. One possible explanation for that is that learners, on the one hand, may either hesitate to transfer the L1 strategies that may be universal or at least common to L2, or, on the other hand, transfer strategies, assuming them to be universal, thus transferable, when actually it is not the case (Kasper and Schmidt, 1996:155). In conclusion, instruction on L2 pragmatics is necessary at every level of learners’ proficiency. Studies that have attempted to teach pragmatic features of the L2, Kasper (1997), Kasper and Rose (1999), and Kasper (2001a, 2001b), have concluded that L2 pragmatics is teachable.

Several studies have focused on specific speech acts and their realization strategies. Such studies include Olshtain and Cohen (1990) on apologies. Their study was designed not to search more basic apology forms, and instead include a wider range of semantic formulas used in apologies, such as explanation, offer of repair and promise of forbearance. Billymer (1990) and Rose and Ng (2001) have taken up compliments and compliment responses as the object of instruction. Manes and Wolfson’s (as cited in Rose, 2005) research on compliments has served as the main source of instructional

content for these studies by providing the nine so-called ‘syntactic formulas’ for compliments, the top three of which (e.g., *That dress is really nice, I really love that dress, That’s really a nice dress*) accounted for some 85% of compliments in their corpus. For compliment responses, learners in both studies were taught the range of compliment response types (i.e., *accept, deflect, and reject*), and also made aware of the interactional utility of deflection as a preferred strategy. Requests have also served as the learning target in several studies. In the case of Fukuya and Clark (2001), the focus was on six mitigators (i.e., *perhaps, possibly, I’d be grateful if, I’d appreciate if, I was wondering if, and I know . . . but*) used to soften the impositional force of requests. For Takahashi (2001), the target was two biclausal English request forms (i.e., *Would/could you VP* and *Would it be possible to VP*). Safont (2003) and Salazar (2003) both examined the effects of instruction in English requests with Spanish-speaking university students in Spain. In Safont’s (as cited in Rose, 2005) study, request modification (e.g., softeners, grounders, disarmers) was the focus, and an important increase in learners’ use of internal and external modification was found on a written discourse-completion task (DCT) posttest, but in the case of Salazar (as cited in Rose, 2005) learners showed no difference in the range of request strategies on the DCT pre and posttest, however, use of a wider range of strategies during one of the instructional sessions have been evidenced. Suggestions have also been addressed in interventional studies such as the studies conducted by Marti’nez-Flor and Fukuya (2005) and Koike and Pearson (2005).

King and Silver (1993) present the findings of a study of refusals in English. In a pre-test/post-test treatment and control group design, they taught polite refusal strategies to six intermediate level learners of ESL (four native speakers of Japanese, one of Spanish, and one of Greek). Their treatment consisted of a discussion of personal experience, reading and analysis of dialogs, explicit teaching, and role-plays during a seventy-minute class. Although the researchers had planned output practice through role-playing activities, because of time constraints, the learners only had limited opportunity for output practice. The control group did not receive any instruction on refusals. The study used a discourse completion questionnaire as pre-test and post-test. Besides the DCT, they also used telephone talks as delayed post-test. The results showed little effect of instruction on the written post-test and no effect on the delayed post-test. The authors speculate that if they had included presentation of natural data and/or a listening component as input as well as output practice opportunities in their

instructional treatment, which would match up to telephone talk data collection technique, their study would have produced better results on the two outcome measures. Morrow (as cited in Soler, 2005) investigated the effect of instruction on learners' production of refusal and complaint speech acts. He adopted an explicit approach (metapragmatic judgment tasks, model dialogs, explanation of the semantic formulas, games, controlled output practice, and role-plays). The treatment lasted three hours and thirty minutes. His study followed a pre-test/post-test design, including a delayed post-test six months later. He did not use a control group. In order to assess learners' previous knowledge, two questionnaires were administered: a pragmatic appropriateness judgment test and a pragmatic ability self-report. As outcome measures he used role-plays with holistic ratings. The data were analyzed using holistic ratings of clarity and politeness as well as comparison of pre-test and post-test distributions of discourse features with those of native English speakers. Statistical tests showed that participants in his study improved both in clarity and politeness, which were observed in comparisons between pre- and post-tests holistic mean scores on immediate post-tests. The comparison between pre-test and delayed post-test did not display a significant difference. He explains that he could not assess whether the gains were maintained up to post-test carried out six months after the treatment because of the small number of participants who came for the posttest and also due to the possible effect of naturalistic learning that happened between post-tests. The results on the immediate post-test then suggest that the instructional treatment in Morrow's study helped participants to perform complaints and refusals more clearly and more politely, and, to a limited extent, more native-like.

Kondo (2001) reports the findings of a study involving thirty-five Japanese learners of English who were taught refusals in English. The study adopted a pre-post/post-test design without a control group. The instructional component consisted of implicit/explicit teaching, including models, explicit explanation, analysis of semantic formulas, controlled/free practice, and cross-cultural comparison, followed by discussion. A pre-test/post-test oral DCT was administered. Results showed a change toward the pattern of American English refusals, but, even after instruction, the Japanese learners of English (JE) retained some characteristics of their pragmatic behavior which they strongly prefer in the L1: Statement of regret, though approximating American English speakers, was still more frequent among JE.

These three studies showed some evidence of the effectiveness of instruction. King and Silver (1993) and Kondo (2001), though, acknowledged methodological limitations in the instructional components and data-collection strategies. In King and Silver (1993), the teaching approach was not clearly described, so it is hard to evaluate whether the limited effects of the instruction may have been due to inappropriate teaching. As Doughty (2003) points out, the difficulties in demonstrating the strengths of instruction in SLA acquisition lies in the failure to operationalize, or even describe the instructional component. In King and Silver's study, there was also a mismatch between the demands of one of the data-collection sessions, the telephone conversation, and presumable expected outcomes in the training sessions in study. Though Kondo's (2001) teaching approach was clearly presented, she acknowledges as a pitfall in her study the fact that the outcome measure did not elicit interactional data, which would better reflect the contexts in which language is really spoken; nor did it include a control group, which might have corroborated the effects of instruction as measured by the DCT.

Similarly, Morrow (as cited in Soler, 2005) did not include a control condition, as mentioned above, which would have made it possible to determine whether the effects found were really due to the treatment. Interestingly, the author points out that there were occasions in which the participants exhibited high linguistics skills yet were quite direct and impolite. Morrow adds that, since he did not use any kind of self-report data, it was not possible to identify whether the participants acted that way because they did not know how to perform appropriately (pragmalinguistic ability) or whether they did not know that they should perform more politely in a given situation (sociopragmatic ability).

2.8.1. Approaches and techniques for teaching speech acts

Besides, in relation to the effect of different teaching approaches to pragmatic learning, the advantage of the planned and explicit teaching condition over the implicit one is reported in House and Kasper (1981), House (1996), Rose and Ng Kwai-Fun (2001) and Takahashi (2001). House and Kasper's (1981) study involved German university students of EFL and focused on a variety of discourse markers and gambits. The authors designed two versions of the same communicative course, one explicit and

one implicit, which provided learners with adequate input and opportunities to practise. Learners in the explicit version of the course received metapragmatic information and participated in discussions related to their performance in the role plays, whereas learners in the implicit treatment did not receive any metapragmatic explanation. Results of the study indicate that both groups improved but the explicit group had an advantage over the implicit one. Similar findings are reported in House (1996), since both the explicit and implicit group benefited from instruction focused on developing pragmatic fluency, but the explicit group used a higher variety of discourse markers and strategies. Focusing on requests, Takahashi (2001) reported explicit instruction as being more effective. The author, who examined the effect of four input enhancement conditions (explicit teaching, NS-learners request comparison, NS-NNS request comparison, and reading comprehension) on Japanese EFL learners' development of request strategies, reports that the explicit group outperformed the other three groups in the use of the four request strategies addressed in the study.

As pointed out by the above mentioned studies on pragmatic instructional intervention, explicit metapragmatic instruction seems to be more effective than implicit teaching. However, more recently, a few studies that have examined how implicit instruction works for pragmatic learning present inconclusive results. The studies conducted by Fukuya et al. (1998), Fukuya and Clark (2001) and Martinez-Flor (2004) illustrate how the focus on form approach can be conceptualised in the interventional research on pragmatic learning by adopting a pro-active focus on form. On the one hand, Fukuya et al. (1998) implemented recasts as implicit feedback on learners' production of requests. The authors employed an interaction enhancement technique consisting in showing a sad face to indicate a sociopragmatic error followed by repetition of students' inappropriate utterance with rising intonation. Results of the study did not support the hypothesis that this implicit feedback would be efficient in comparison to the explicit group that received explicit instruction on the sociopragmatic factors that affected appropriateness of requests in different situations.

The effect of different teaching approaches is also reported in Rose and Ng Kwai-Fun (2001). The authors compared the use of inductive and deductive approaches in teaching compliments and compliment responses to university learners of English in Hong Kong. The main difference between the groups involved whether learners were

provided with metapragmatic explanations or not. Results of the study show that, although a deductive and inductive approach proved effective as far as pragmalinguistics is concerned, only the deductive approach involving metapragmatic discussion showed a positive effect on developing learners' sociopragmatic proficiency. Here we find it necessary to give Decoo's (1996) Deductive /inductive approach in detail to explain why this particular approach was chosen in the treatment part of this study. Decoo discusses at length the range of possibilities in the induction-deduction opposition, noting that like any dichotomy, this opposition actually represents a continuum. Decoo elaborates five modalities on this continuum, from actual deduction to 'subconscious' induction on unstructured material. For our purposes, the modalities relevant for the instructional treatments employed in this study are Decoo's (1996: 97) Modality A and B, which he describes as follows:

Modality A- Actual deduction: The grammatical rule or pattern is explicitly stated at the beginning of the learning process and the students move into the applications of this (examples and exercises).

Modality B- Conscious induction as guided discovery: The students first encounter various examples, often sentences, sometimes embedded in a text. The 'conscious discovery' of the grammar is then directed by the teacher: on the basis of examples he normally asks a few key-questions and the students are led to discover and formulate the rule.

While Decoo's descriptions of these modalities of induction and deduction clearly involve the teaching and learning of grammar, we can think of no reason why these principles cannot be applied to other areas of language teaching and learning such as pragmatics. That's why some of the tasks were designed based on this approach in this study: our deductive treatment is essentially an application of Decoo's Modality A, while the inductive treatment represents his Modality B.

The findings of the above studies together with many similar researches indicate that the approaches used in teaching speech acts aim to train students who are communicatively competent. By reviewing the literature of language teaching it was seen that some techniques were also suggested besides the approaches to develop effective speech act behavior among foreign language learners. In their later studies on

apologies, Olshtain and Cohen (1991, 1994) developed their 1990 teaching techniques to formulate the steps used in teaching speech acts. As this procedure will be used in the present study, we will give details as follows (adapted from Olshtain and Cohen, 1991).

1. *Discourse completion task (DCT)*: This is one of the most useful tools in interlanguage and cross-cultural pragmatics research. It is the first step in which the teacher determines the students' level of awareness of speech acts in general and of the particular speech act to be taught. This assessment can be carried out in writing or in an oral interaction with the teacher. If it is done in writing as it is chosen in this study students are required to do a completion exercise and provide appropriate responses to various scenarios. For example;

Please write in the provided space whatever you would say in the following conversational situations.

You forget a meeting with a friend; this is the second time that the same thing has happened with the same person. At the end of the day your friend phones you and says:

“I waited for you more than twenty minutes! What happened?”

You:

According to the results received on such an assessment questionnaire, it would be easier for the teacher to plan teaching goals and procedures.

2. *The model dialogue*: Through this useful technique, we can present students with examples of speech acts in use. At first, students listen to a dialogue and then they identify the kind of speech acts used. Next they are presented with more dialogues without any information concerning the particular situation, and they have to do their best to guess the age, social status, and the relationship between the speakers. These considerations, which can be discussed in groups, help students become sensitive to the social and pragmatic factors that affect speech acts. Such model dialogues could focus on the distinction between “I’m sorry” and “Excuse me” or on the appropriate choice of a strategy or any other element of the apology act.
3. *Role –play*: This technique is particularly suitable if it follows the model dialogue. After students have analyzed a number of dialogues in terms of their

language functions, it is time to divide them in pairs and have them act out these dialogues. Here it is important to supply the learners with ample information about the interlocutors in the conversation and about the situation.

4. *The evaluation of a situation:* It is a useful technique to further reinforce the learners' awareness of the factors affecting the choice of semantic formulas. In this activity the students are given a set of apology/refusal situations, and for each they have to decide, in pairs or small groups, whether the violation requiring the apology is severe or mild, whether the speaker/apologizer needs to intensify his/her apology, whether a specific strategy is called for.
5. *Feedback and discussion:* They are useful activities for speech act teaching since students need to talk about their perceptions, expectations, and awareness of similarities and differences between speech act behavior in the target language and in their native culture. Such feedback relating to the role plays and further discussion with the learner group help the participants become more aware of speech act behavior and help them recognize areas of interference where communication failure may occur.

In the lesson plan of this study the above mentioned steps suggested by Olshtain and Cohen (1991) will be followed, to assess Turkish EFL learners' knowledge of appropriate apology and refusal formulas and remedy the gaps in their knowledge.

2.8.2. Different teaching materials

Bearing in mind the findings of these studies and in line with Bardovi-Harlig (2001) and Kasper (1997), we believe that it would be beneficial to develop training programmes for teachers to make them aware of the importance of their talk and the use of appropriate materials for their learners' pragmatic acquisition. In fact, as claimed by Bardovi-Harlig (1996:34), "it is important that learners observe native speakers in action". For this reason, apart from teachers' output, we think that bringing authentic materials into the classroom would positively contribute to widen learners' exposure to pragmatic input. The importance of these instructional materials is, thus, the second source of input learners face in the classroom. Boxer (2003) claims that it would be only when spontaneous speech is captured in authentic data for language materials that we might begin to teach the underlying strategies of speech behaviour. For this reason, we

believe that there is a need to base materials and teaching practices on natural language data if our aim is to provide the necessary conditions in the classroom to make learners aware of communicatively appropriate patterns. For example, the use of spoken corpora (Alcon and Safont as cited in Soler, 2005; Campoy and Safont as cited in Martinez, 2004; Koester, 2002; Safont and Campoy as cited in Martinez, 2004) has been regarded as a useful instrument to present authentic speaker input in the classroom. The study conducted by Campoy and Safont (as cited in Martinez, 2004) focused on the use of conventionally indirect request strategies in two different oral corpora involving EFL learners and NSs. The authors found that there were differences between the learners' and NSs' oral production as regards the variety of this particular request type of strategy. Similar findings were obtained in a recent study (Safont and Campoy as cited in Martinez, 2004) in which the researchers also compared EFL learners' production on requests online transcripts from NSs' both formal and informal dialogues. These results led the authors to acknowledge the benefits of exploiting this pedagogical source of authentic data in the EFL classroom.

On the other hand, another suitable material that presents authentic audiovisual input refers to the use of video, films and TV. In fact, video input has long been used as a language teaching resource and a fairly large number of researchers (Rose, 1997; 2001; Ryan, 1998; Arthur, 1999; Canning-Wilson, 2000; Washburn as cited in Eslami-Rasekh, 2005) have already praised the use of video sequences in the classroom. Ryan (1998), for instance, suggests the use of films in the classroom in order to develop learner motivation and activate their cognitive domains. Hart (1992), Wyburd (as cited in Martinez, 2004) and Canning- Wilson (2000) also point out that the use of audiovisual materials provides contextualised view of language and helps learners visualise words and meanings. Moreover, visual materials change classroom routines. Therefore, all these features are of crucial importance when developing pragmatics in the FL classroom, since students should be aware of the relationship between participants when performing specific speech acts and also the contextual factors affecting their conversational interaction (Thomas, 1995).

One example is the series conducted by Rose (1993, 1994, 1997, 2001), who argues that "in foreign language contexts, exposure to film is generally the closest that language learners will ever get to witnessing or participating in native speaker

interaction” (Rose, 1997:283). The author compared the occurrence of compliments (collected by Manes and Wolfson, 1981), and found that, for global categories, such as the distribution of syntactic formulae, the film data closely corresponded to naturally-occurring speech. In the same way, Grant and Starks (as cited in Soler, 2005) conducted a study comparing closings in twenty-three EFL coursebooks with closings from fifty episodes of the soap opera *Shortland Street*. The authors claim that television conversations imitate natural conversations, provide a wide variety of functional conversational English, imitate natural speech and follow the cultural and linguistic behaviour of both the language and the participants (Grants and Starks, as cited in Soler, 2005). The potential of TV has also been examined by Washburn (as cited in Eslami-Rasekh, 2005) who paid attention to the benefits of presenting scenes from sitcoms as opportunities to observe pragmatic language use. As Washburn (as cited in Eslami-Rasekh, 2005) notes, “sitcoms present many models of appropriate pragmatic language use among various characters of differing status, familiarity, gender, and in varied settings, such as at work, at home, in public places, and at formal gatherings”. Apart from offering rich, varied and contextualised situations, the author also mentions that this source of input may help teachers not to be the sole suppliers of pragmatic information in the classroom context.

2.8.3. The potential problems of using text books

The use of teaching *materials* to develop pragmatic competence is vital, especially in foreign learning environments. However, it has been claimed that most textbooks and other written manuals have been based on NSs’ intuitions rather than on empirical studies of pragmatic norms (Boxer, 2003; LoCastro, 2003). Bardovi-Harlig et al. (1991), for instance, analysed closings in twenty ESL coursebooks and observed that the aim of most of them was to introduce new grammatical structures instead of providing realistic conversational input. Infact, the majority of the coursebooks presented abrupt examples of closings which were considered to be pragmatically inappropriate. The lack of natural examples representing the real use of language was also examined in Alcon and Tricker’s (as cited in Martinez-Flor, 2004) study of the discourse marker “well” in two EFL coursebooks and in transcripts from a film. According to these authors, the coursebooks analysed did not pay any attention to the

different uses of “well” as an interactive discourse marker signaling insufficiency or mitigating face threats.

Moving on to the presentation of specific speech acts, Boxer and Pickering (1995) focused on the realization of complaints were based on the authors’ intuitions, only presenting instances of direct complaints in conversations between friends. The authors argued that no examples of dialogues between interlocutors with relationships involving other social distances were presented in which indirect complaints would have been far more appropriate. In this sense, they also reported a lack of underlying social strategies in the presentation of the speech act. Similarly, Meier (1997) criticised the presentation of speech acts in EFL materials on a directness / politeness scale and concluded that coursebooks exhibit an arbitrary selection which does not pay attention to contextual factors, and may cause learners’ failure and problems of misunderstanding in the TL. This inappropriate treatment of speech acts was also the focus of attention in the study carried out by Salazar and Uso (as cited in Martinez-Flor, 2004), who examined requests in several coursebooks for students of tourism and found that the speech act under analysis was embedded in exercises focusing on syntactic structures leaving aside the communicative intent of requesting. Moreover, the most common category employed to express the speech act of requesting was the conventionally-indirect strategy of request realization (Trosborg, 1995), with only a few instances of indirect requests. A similar finding was obtained in Salazar and Uso’s (as cited in Martinez-Flor, 2004) study of suggestions and advice acts, in which no instances of indirect structures were found. Again, the authors reported insufficient attention to communicative competence, since the speech acts were presented and practiced isolation without paying attention to contextual or interactional pragmatic factors.

Also focusing on advice acts, Mandala (1999) compared the presentation of this speech act in forty-one natural interactions and forty textbook dialogues and found a mismatch between both types of data. The author pointed out that textbook dialogues were biased towards the speaker’s perspective without showing instances of conflict talk that were commonly found in the natural samples. Safont and Alcon (as cited in Martinez-Flor, 2004) also focused on the occurrence of requests, suggestions and advice in EFL materials and in an oral corpus containing spontaneous conversations. These authors came to similar conclusions regarding the artificial and inappropriate

description of speech acts in the materials analysed, since only the linguistic forms had been taken into account. Providing learners with just a list of forms to express a particular speech act has been considered as inefficient and inappropriate to foster learners' pragmatic competence (Koester, 2002; Crandall and Basturkmen, 2004).

2.8.4. Using drama/theatre extracts as representational material

The purpose of this study is to propose an approach for enabling students to effectively navigate through culturally-embedded situations in which they may find themselves in America, for example refusing and apologizing properly in various situations. The approach is not intended to be a language teaching panacea: the primary aim is the development of sociocultural awareness through the study of pragmatically-laden texts. Improvements in such areas as vocabulary, spelling, fluency and listening are probable, yet unintentional, outcomes of this approach. Based on the studies described in the previous chapter that textbooks typically are inappropriate for delivering the necessary input, and then an alternative form of material is needed. Whatever material is used, the primary goal is that learners can at least notice how these factors can exist across cultures and countries (Bardovi-Harlig and Dornyei as cited in Tatsuki, 2006), and how these factors may affect communication. The aims of such a pedagogical approach will be described below. The central claim of this study is that representational texts are suited to developing this knowledge for two reasons: representational texts encode sociocultural forms, and the mental processes and cognitive ability necessary for understanding and responding to such texts are the same as those that are required for noticing and consciously applying sociocultural forms. Indeed, it could even be argued that the first reason, to some extent at least, causes the second.

The latter reason can involve the following skills or processes: observing, interpreting, analysing, inferencing and reacting. Widdowson (1983: 34) asserts that it is through the process of communicating that we infer meaning, and literature can help students how to learn and use language because 'in drama and in normal conversation the meaning is created by the interaction. It's not there in the language'. Studying literature can thus enable learners to become better communicators by encouraging

them to interpret meaning. When reading a representational text the aim is for students to create meaning through the process of ‘integrating one’s own needs, understanding and expectations with a written text’ (Brumfit, 1985: 119). McCarthy (as cited in Hanford, 2002) argues for a similar process, deconstruction, whereby the learner first experiences, then analyses and understands a text. It is through experiencing the pragmatic mechanisms in a text that students can understand such notions as tension, conflict and irony.

The former reason can be elucidated by pondering W.H. Auden’s definition of a good poet: ‘like a valley cheese: local, but prized elsewhere.’ Unlike textbook material which is often lacking in any kind of cultural or controversial colour and is invented (Cook, 1998), representational texts are examples of attested language, and attested language ‘is a site in which beliefs, values and points of view are produced, encoded and contested’ (Carter and McCarthy as cited in Hanford, 2002). This holds true for both literature and spontaneous speech. And studying selected examples of the former can lead to a fuller understanding of and more adept participation with the latter (Tomlinson, 1994 and Cook as cited in Hanford, 2002). It should be noted, however, that not all representational texts are equally rich or accessible in pedagogical terms: the *Wife of Bath* is arguably of less immediate and obvious value to the language learner than, say, *Shirley Valentine*. Thus we choose drama texts as a representational material for teaching speech acts regarding the values and uses of drama pointed out by the writers such as Maley, and Duff, (1978) and Wessels, (1987) : “Drama can help the teacher to achieve 'reality' in several ways. It can overcome the students' resistance to learning the new language”.

Drama provides cultural and language enrichment by revealing insights into the target culture and presenting language contexts that make items memorable by placing them in a realistic social and physical context.

By allowing reading and the adding of some characterisation to a drama /theatre text, learners became personally and fully involved in the learning process, in a context in which it is possible for learners to feel less self-conscious and more empowered to express themselves through the multiple voices (Vygotsky, 87; Bakhtin, 1981, 1986) of the differing characters. One of the drawbacks in the use of literary texts such as novels

and poems is that many of them contain language forms that learners of a language find difficult to understand. This could be overcome by simplifying them, often leading to a loss of 'literariness' - leading to criticism that the texts became pale imitations of the original writing. The lack of suitable texts in the traditional body of literature, in my view opens the door for the inclusion of drama in language learning curricula as it tends to use much more naturalistic language than in poems and novels. Theatre texts help to address the need for sufficient texts for worthwhile reading in which suitable materials can be accessed.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

3.1. Subjects

Three groups of participants were used in the study as the subject population. First group was American native speakers of English, whose preferences of speech acts were used as baseline data. Second and third groups were Turkish learners of English as a foreign language in Gazi University divided as the treatment and control groups.

3.1.1. Learners of English

Pre-academic School Turkish EFL learners who would continue their education in Education Faculty, ELT department at Gazi University in the following year were selected as subject population for this study since these learners were considered to be generally at the intermediate level. Two groups participated in the study, one treatment and one control group, each containing 20 university prep students of Gazi University, comprising a total 40. They all spoke Turkish as their L1 and they were all learning English as a foreign language. The subjects were all of intermediate level according to the proficiency exam, prepared and administered by the test office of the Research and Application Center for the Teaching of Foreign Languages of Gazi University. The exam was designed especially for the students of ELT department and was roughly upper-intermediate. In addition to the multiple choice questions which aim to assess their grammar, vocabulary and reading skills, the exam was composed of sections for other skills, namely, listening, writing and speaking. Finally, those who get a minimum of 60 out of 100 pass the exam and those who got a mark below 60 study one year at the Preparatory School. The evaluation scale suggested by the Research and Application Center for the Teaching of Foreign Languages is shown in the table 3.1.

Table 3.1. Evaluation Scale of the Proficiency Test

76-100 Advanced
61-75 Upper-Intermediate
45-60 Intermediate
31-45 Lower-Intermediate
16-30 Elementary
0-15 Beginner

According to above scale the subject population of this study was at an intermediate level since all of them got a grade between 46 and 59. As such, they are expected to have more or less a given consistency in the English grammar that they learned during seven or eight years of English background and also vocabulary knowledge sufficient at least to understand and perform basic communicative activities. Even though research in the area of ILP has indicated that being grammatically proficient does not make one pragmatically competent, the literature has not ruled out the facilitative role of linguistic competence in the acquisition of pragmatic competence. “It has been shown repeatedly in the literature that second language learners fail to achieve native communicative competence even at a rather advanced stage of learning (or acquisition in the natural setting)” (Olshtain and Blum-Kulka, 1985). Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford (1992) make a similar observation in their study involving graduate students. Furthermore, Bardovi-Harlig and Dornyei (as cited in Tatsuki, 2006) and Hadley (1993) suggest that pragmatics is best taught and acquired when more advanced L2 learners are involved.

After determining their proficiency level, those who participated in the study were given a background questionnaire [see Appendix 1] to complete. In the BQ for EFL learners subjects were asked to provide basic information (age, gender, course of study) as well as more specific information. Specific information elicited included, parents’ nationality, English learning environments, high school type (state or

Anadolu/Private high school), length of formal English study, frequency and context of English use, self-determination of English fluency and whether they have been abroad. These questions aimed at selecting subjects who had similar characteristics and enabled the researcher to exclude subjects who have been abroad, grown up as bilingual and have English speaker parents.

Results of the survey indicated that the main age over the two groups was quite similar, since all students' ages ranged between 18 and 22 years old. Concerning gender, it is worth mentioning that there were more females than males in the two groups, which may be related to the more female-oriented nature of the department our participants involved in. Although it has been claimed that gender may be one of the individual variables that influences participants' use of speech acts (Kasper and Rose, 2002), we decided not to exclude the data from the male participants, since we were conducting research in intact classes. 55% have had between 18 months and 4 years of lycee English education while 45% had between 4 and 7 years. Some of them had attended a language course before starting the university. 57% rated their English as "fluent" 95% of them said that their English study has focused on grammar and grammar exercises. Furthermore, the questionnaire indicated that these subjects had limited exposure to English outside the class: they were mostly engaged in activities such as reading English books and listening to music in English, rather than reading magazines and newspapers or watching video films in English. Only a few learners said that they employed the English language to communicate with other people, mainly through the Internet. In fact, and contrarily to our expectations, almost none of the participants said that they used the Internet as an instrument with which they could practice their English, except for the few who had established contact with people from other countries through the Internet. 95% of the subjects had no friends or relatives whose native language is English and none of them had lived in an English speaking country long enough to acquire their norms of speaking.

Taking into consideration all the information mentioned above, which was collected in order to describe our group of EFL participants, it seems that they shared general and homogenous features. Most important of all was to acknowledge the fact that our students' main contact with the English language had taken place in the EFL classroom. This context, thus as mentioned in the previous chapters, is the only setting

where learners may be faced with communicative situations that help them to develop their pragmatic competence.

They study 25 hours of English a week. Each class studies with 2 non-native instructors for 22 hours a week. The remaining 3 hours are given by a native-speaker of English who mainly studies speaking and free writing with the students. One of the instructors of the experimental group was both a member of the teaching staff of the university and the researcher herself. Non-native teachers of both control and experimental groups were female, native speakers of Turkish with seven year teaching experience each. The students used the textbook Success, upper- intermediate, (by Jane Comyns Carr and Jennifer Parsons) which followed a mixed syllabus; mainly a skills-based syllabus combined with a structural syllabus which deals with the basic structures of English, and a topical syllabus, which deals with vocabulary. Only the direct apology and refusal modals such as “I’m sorry; excuse me” “No, thank you.; I’m sorry, I can’t” are given in some dialogues of listening activities but there’s no focus on any other apology or refusal strategies. They also lack underlying contextual factors such as social distance, power and etc. in the speech act presentation since they focus on linguistic proficiency.

3.1.2. Native Speakers of English

10 native speakers of American English participated to collect baseline data for the speech act preferences of native English speakers. They were between 21 and 24 years of age; 5 were females and 5 were males. All of them were university students of Incarnate University St Antonio, Texas, USA. The subjects represent a sample of convenience and cannot be generalized to all age groups of native English speakers. However, they would seem to be representative of young, educated American English speakers.

Their preferences were compared with the performance of 40 intermediate level Turkish learners of English as foreign language (EFL) learners.

3.2. Data collection instruments

Speech act behavior is generally studied via two kinds of data collection methods: ethnography and elicitation. Instruments used in this study include both the ethnographic and elicitation techniques bearing in mind Cohen's (1996) and Kasper and Rose's (2002) suggestions of taking a multi-method approach when collecting speech act data.

3.2.1. Instruments for ethnography

Ethnography involves the gathering of data through everyday observations of natural spoken interaction and techniques generally used are observations and interviews. Data of that nature reflect the actual use of language. Several researchers, however, have expressed their concerns about the amount of time needed, the inability to control the variables involved, the low frequency and situational dependency of certain SAs, the difficulty of comparing and generalizing the findings, and the potential bias of recording the data (Fraser, Rintell, and Walters, 1980; Olshtain and Cohen, 1983; Beebe and Takahashi, 1989; Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991; Hartford and Bardovi-Harlig, 1992). Most researchers rely on elicitation techniques as a result of these criticisms of the ethnographic approach. Following are the advantages associated with the elicitation approach: (a) it can be used to obtain a large amount of data in a short period of time; (b) it can help create initial classifications of semantic formula and strategies occurring in natural speech; (c) it allows the study of the norms of socially acceptable behavior; (d) the researcher can control for specific variables of the situation; and (e) it can be used to search for features of universality and culture-specificity in speech act behavior (e.g., Beebe and Cummings, 1985; Olshtain and Blum-Kulka, 1985; Wolfson, 1989). In spite of the many advantages of this approach, researchers such as Wolfson, Marmor, and Jones (1989) and Beebe and Cummings (1985) have questioned its ability to reflect real SA behavior, seen for example in the actual wording of utterances, the number of turns, the length of response and the range of formula. Thus, both approaches have positive and negative aspects.

Since the aim of the present study is to assess EFL learners' pragmatic development, authentic data is needed besides elicitation. In this study, class observations of the researcher and evaluation of the learners after the treatments were designed for gathering ethnographic data.

3.2.2. Instruments for elicitation

Despite the fact that the assessment of pragmatic proficiency is a relatively new area, at least six types of instruments for elicitation have been tested to date (Brown, 2001). They include (a) written discourse completion tasks; (b) multiple-choice discourse completion; (c) oral discourse completion; (d) discourse role-play; (e) discourse self assessment; and (f) role-play assessments. Among these six, the written discourse completion task (WDCT) is the most frequently used (see Kasper & Dahl, 1991) to gather empirical data in the field of ILP. The WDCT was first used by Blum-Kulka (1982) to study native and nonnative speaker requests in Hebrew. This instrument became widely known after its first systematic and extensive use in 1989 as the primary method of data collection in the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Project (CCSARP). A WDCT is an instrument that asks learners to read a written description of a situation, which usually includes factors like setting, participant roles, and degree of imposition and requires them to write what they would say in that situation (Brown, 2001). An example of a CCSARP WDCT item constructed to elicit a refuse is seen below:

You are working on a group project with three other students. Your group is having a discussion with your professor late Friday afternoon. It is 5:30pm. You are planning to pick up a friend at the airport immediately after the meeting and must leave the university within 15 minutes.

Professor: Hey, it's getting late. Why don't we all go down to the cafeteria? We can finish up there while we eat dinner.

You:.....

According to Beebe and Cummings (1985) Discourse Completion questionnaires are a highly effective means of:

- 1) gathering a large amount of data quickly;
- 2) creating an initial classification of semantic formulas and strategies that will occur in natural speech;
- 3) studying the stereotypical, perceived requirements for a socially appropriate (though not always polite) response;
- 4) gaining insight into social and psychological factors that are likely to affect speech and performance; and
- 5) ascertaining the canonical shape of refusals, apologies, partings, etc., in the minds of the speakers of that language. (1985:13)

Discourse Completion responses do not, however, adequately represent:

- 1) the actual wording used in real interaction;
- 2) the range of formulas and strategies used (some, like avoidance, tend to be left out);
- 3) the length of response or the number of turns it takes to fulfill the function;
- 4) the depth of emotion that in turn qualitatively affects the tone, content, and form of linguistic performance;
- 5) the number of repetitions and elaborations that occur; or
- 6) the actual rate of occurrence of a speech act –e.g., whether or not someone would naturalistically refuse at all in a given situation (Beebe and Cummings, 1985:14)

WDCTs are easy to administer because of their written format and control of variables, which allows for large-scale group testing. The main disadvantage associated with this instrument is that participants are required only to understand and produce written language, thus discouraging oral production. Moreover, because of too much time at their disposal and lack of another person with whom to interact, learners often produce stereotypical answers. Whereas with role-plays, having to actually speak instead of write makes it easier for the participants to imagine themselves in the respective situations. From these points of view, role-plays seem to be more effective as a data collection method.

It is also true, however, that role-plays can sometimes result in unnatural behavior on the part of the participants (Jung, 2004). In addition, not all role-plays are the same. Although open role-plays provide a wider context in which the speech act is produced as opposed to closed ones, they are more difficult to transcribe and code and offer less control of the variables involved in the study (Kasper and Dahl, 1991). Therefore, the researcher needs to carefully prepare the role-plays and the situations.

Thus, as the above explanation suggests, although role-plays may not be the first choice for studying the perception of speech acts, they seem to be one of the best choices in researching the production of speech acts. Cohen and Olshtain (1993) discussed the benefits and drawbacks of different instruments used in collecting data and concluded that the main instruments used for speech act production are role-play interviews and the discourse completion test. Moreover, in some instances, role-plays seem to be the better choice, as they solve some of the concerns that the WDCT raises.

The discourse role-play test (DRPT) instrument was used here since the goal of the study is to measure the development of pragmatic competence of learners; the most efficient way to get naturalistic data is through oral role-play. Oral production allows the participant little time to think about stereotypical answers, in contrast to written discourse completion tasks. Like the other instruments, however, this one also has its drawbacks. Data must first be audio or video recorded and then transcribed. Rating the data could be cumbersome and expensive if the researcher must hire and train such raters.

Consequently in this study we chose to use DRPT taking into account all these difficulties since the study of speech act production in general, and that of apologies and refusals in particular, is a complex endeavor, and much care needs to be taken in designing and administering data collection instruments, and also in analyzing the results. Demeter (2007) supports the idea that in the absence of a unanimously accepted and reliable instrument, the best solution is to use the instrument that is most appropriate to the specific purpose of the study. Thus, insofar as the study of apologies and refusals are concerned, role-plays would be appropriate for studying the production of these speech acts.

The present study combines both the ethnographic and elicitation approaches, under the assumptions that the combination will yield richer data and only a few studies on speech act realizations used both of these instruments, for example, Mwinyelle (2005) who studied giving advice in Spanish and Félix-Brasdefer (2006) who searched for linguistic politeness in Mexico. In addition, this was the first study using the combination of ethnographic and elicitation instruments especially preferring role plays for elicitation technique that is conducted in Turkey to assess the performance of Turkish EFL learners' speech act realizations. From this aspect, this study will also shed light to evaluate data collection methods for SA researchers. Therefore, the use of ethnographic methods to collect data in this study provided the researcher the opportunity of both evaluating the course, interactions of the students and their non-verbal language which is necessary in performing speech acts. In addition, the elicitation technique of the discourse role-play instrument (DRPT) allowed for the collection of more realistic data through oral role-plays. Oral data are the most appropriate since the objective of this study is to measure the development of EFL learners' pragmatic competence over a period of one academic semester.

3.3. Data collection procedure

The general research design of this study involved three groups of participants (native English speakers (NES) and FL learners of English, one for treatment (EFLT), one for control group (EFLC). All participants in the present study role-played the four test situations (pre and post-test) and recorded with a tape recorder. Responses of native English speakers were reviewed for evidence of common components of speech act sets to establish a set baseline responses. Both the control and the treatment group took the same tests before and after the treatments to guarantee a fair analysis and comparison among these groups.

As for the class observations, the instruction given to the treatment group with tasks and activities derived from theatre extracts was video-taped.

Finally, at the end of the instruction which lasted thirteen hour, the treatment group was given the evaluation form in order to find out an answer for the last research question.

3.3.1. Pre-test and Post-test

Regarding the construction of role-plays in the present study, we followed what has been termed as *role enactment* by Trosborg (1987, 1995). According to her (1987:153), role enactment involves performing a role that is part of one's normal life or personality. This means that the role- plays have to be specifically created for the participants by containing situations and characters that are familiar to them. In line with Trosborg (1987, 1995), Martí'nez-Flor (2004) claims that the integration of role - enactments in the FL classroom will facilitate learners' process of acquiring the TL. For this reason, all the tasks and the role play situations in pre and post tests were designed in order to make students feel identified in the situations.

In addition, in devising these apology and refusal role-play situations, various contextual factors were taken into account, which are observed to determine the speaker's selection of particular apology and refusal strategies (Maeshiba et al., 1996). In the study of speech acts, the effect of contextual factors such as social-cultural variations and interpersonal relationship has long been taken into consideration for the interpretation of semantic formula. The current role play situations varied according to hearer's social status (e.g., apologizing to a professor where the hearer's (H) status is higher than the speaker (S) or refusing a friend where the H and S are equal). Social distance is another contextual factor found to affect apology and refusal performances. A combination of close, familiar and unfamiliar social distances between the (S) and the hearer (H) were chosen attentively. In addition to social status and distance another contextual factor was the situation type of refusals. Refusal situations consisted of four types: a request, an invitation, an offer and a suggestion. Requests are defined as polite demands for something; the requester asks a favor of the other person (e.g. asking to borrow class notes). Invitations are types of requests (e.g. asking someone to come to dinner); however, instead of asking a favour, the inviter is usually attempting to be thoughtful and kind. Offers refer to asking individuals if they want something (e.g. a piece of cake). Suggestions are ideas put forward for people to consider (e.g. to choose a course). In summary, different combinations of these contextual factors were devised in the study, as illustrated in Table 3.1. and Table 3. 2.

Table 3.2. Contextual factors in apology situations

Sit	Participants	Status	Social distance	Topic
1	student-professor	higher	familiar	Not to attending a class
2	student-student	equal	unfamiliar	Stepping on a fellow student's foot
3	student-younger sister	lower	close	Breaking a promise
4	student-lecturer	higher	unfamiliar	Bumping into a professor

Table 3.3. Contextual factors in refusal situations

Sit	Participants	Status	Social distance	Topic
1	student-student	equal	familiar	Refusing an invitation of dinner
2	student-professor	higher	familiar	Refusing a suggestion of taking course
3	student-student	equal	unfamiliar	Refusing a request of filling a questionnaire
4	student-younger sister	lower	close	Refusing an offer of tea

To determine the appropriateness of eight situations three native American English speakers who work as an English lecturer in Başkent and Gazi University and three Turkish lecturers of English at the ELT department of Gazi University were asked if the situations were feasible in their countries. Specifically each situation was read aloud by the researcher and they were asked three questions: would this situation happen in Turkey/ United States? Is this a situation in which an apology/refusal could be given? Would you classify this situation (refusal) as an offer, invitation, request, or suggestion? The interviewees also often provided additional commentary on the situations. Based on these interviews, one refusal situation was changed because Turkish lecturers reported that in Turkey this situation would never occur because of status factors. In all refusal situations three of them used the same labels (e.g. offer, invitation, request, and suggestion) as those used in Beebe *et al.* (1990).

Both of the Americans interviewed stated that the situations were feasible and that a refusal and an apology was a possible response for each situation. As with the Turkish lecturers, both of them agreed with the labels Beebe *et al.* (1990) assigned to each situation.

After designing role play situations based on the above explanations, the comparison of the participants' L2 conversational pragmatic behavior was made during pre- and post-test. The aim is to identify and explore changes in the refusal and apology strategies adopted by the participants in the treatment group during the post-test as compared to the pre-test. The pragmatic behavior of the EFL learners during pre-and post test were also compared with that of native speakers' to determine differences between native and nonnative groups. Data of native English speakers collected by a Turkish MA student in St. Antonio at Incarnate University with an audio tape. Recordings were sent to the researcher via internet.

Each of the participants from the treatment and control group was first given a card describing the role-play situation (see Appendix 2). The recordings of the pretest role-plays were done at the beginning of the 2008-2009 Fall Semester during the class periods of the participating students. Learners were given a maximum of three minutes for each situation. It was assumed that these recorded oral role-plays would contain short sentences and few pragmatic strategies inappropriate to the native-speaker norms due to learners' lack of pragmatic knowledge of the apology and refusal SA in English.

A post-test was conducted at the end of the semester after the last treatment. Learners were again given the same four situations. The same maximum amount of three minutes was given to learners to role-play the test situations. After thirteen treatments within thirteen weeks of regular classes, learners who received instruction were expected to use more varied and more pragmatically appropriate realization strategies when apologizing and refusing. Moreover, it was expected to provide evidence for the effectiveness of the instructional materials and procedures.

3.3.2. Instructional Treatments and Tasks

An increasingly large number of studies have adopted a type of interventional research that examines the effectiveness of adopting various teaching approaches and materials. (see chapter 2) In this study an inductive approach, where the students had to figure out in groups how refusals and apologies are used in English and a teacher-directed deductive approach, including explanations of refusal and apology strategies are used in line with the studies of Kubota (1995) and Bouton (1994).

The activities and tasks (see Appendix 3) in this study were designed to enhance the students' ability to recognize and understand the target speech acts using theatre extracts gathered from native American playwrights' original plays(see Appendix 4). Data which was collected from native speakers of American English and its comparison with EFL learners' performance (especially points where learners diverged from native speaker norms) provided baseline information to design the treatment instruction. The study was conducted in the spring term of 2008-2009 which lasted throughout the whole semester. Total time of treatment was approximately thirteen hours. The detailed description of the tasks applied to the treatment group was as follows:

In the first task, a deductive approach was applied and firstly each learner was given a handout (1) with definitions of some key words, namely *pragmatics*, *sociolinguistic competence*, *semantic formulas of apologies and refusal* (see Appendix 5-8). The instructor then explained to the learners the meanings of these terms and how they were relevant to the study in which they were about to participate. The handouts ensured that the explanation was uniform to all learners. Then the instructor asked the learners to read three representational theatres extracts (see all the extracts in Appendix 4) in which target speech acts were made by the participants who have close relationship.

In addition, the learners and the instructor participated in a metapragmatic discussion on each scene and the instructor followed up with instruction on certain sociolinguistic and pragmatic elements. Learners were then asked the following questions:

- a. What happened in this scene?
- b. Who were the participants of the conversation?

c. What was the apology/refusal about?

After having familiarized students with the patterns they were asked to read the extracts from the plays for the second time. The decision to allow the learners to read each scene twice was made due to previous research that shows that L2 learners usually find it difficult to focus simultaneously on both content and form (VanPatten, 1989).

Then, they were put into groups to have a metapragmatic discussion about the scenes. The metapragmatic discussion was in English; however, learners could respond in Turkish if they desired. The reason for this option was to motivate all learners to participate freely and actively in the discussion without being hindered by language limitations. Since the aim of the discussion was to raise pragmatic awareness in learners, the use of Turkish helped learners who otherwise would not have participated.

The instructor provides students with the following questions to guide them in their discussions:

- Which strategies of apology/refusal are used in the extracts?
- Did you notice anything in the choice of words, structure of the sentence(s) and verbal forms by the people talking? Point out the word(s) or phrase(s) and comment.
- Given a similar situation in English, would you use the same words or verbal forms or is it normal to hear this kind of performance? How different will native English speakers have done it?
- Do you use the same strategies when apologizing or refusing in Turkish?

After or during the discussion, the instructor teaches the pragmatic aspects that were encountered in the scenes. By doing that, the instructor raises their level of consciousness and understanding of the contextual factors such as gender, social distance, and social status in the use of target speech acts.

Next, learners were given handout 2, which consisted of an inductive presentation of semantic formulae and modifiers (see Appendix 6A-6B) chosen from the representational theatre extracts. This handout was followed by an information sheet consisting of further examples with description (form/function mapping) of semantic formulae, which the researcher went over with learners. Then different examples of

refusal and apology situations taken from different theatre extracts were given to the students and they were asked to find them in the printed version, and complete them according to the given semantic formula.

Next task consisted of consciousness-raising activities which focus on contextual factors given in the first task. Different situations (ranging from indirect to direct) were given to the students as handout 3 (see App. 7A-7B). They were asked to write a dialogue between the interlocutors appropriate for each situation using an apology or a refusal form. During the metapragmatic discussion, the instructor asked them to compare the options they provided for each situation in pairs or small groups.

Finally, students were paired up to role-play a situation similar to the scenes they read. They are reminded to apply the rules discussed in class and also to use conversational routines and other pragmatic features they might have observed from the drama extracts to help them role-play. In groups, learners planned the role-play, performed in front of the class, and received explicit corrective feedback in the form of comments on felicitous/infelicitous realizations of the speech acts from the instructor and their peers.

The learners in the control group were also given the pragmatic instruction supported by handout (1) with definitions of some key words, namely *pragmatics*, *sociolinguistic competence*, *semantic formulas of apologies and refusal* (see Appendix 5-8). However, they used the text-book material and continued their curriculum.

3.3.3. Theatre extracts as a representational material

As it has been acknowledged in the previous chapters that learners, especially in an FL setting, are limited to the sole exposure of the teacher and the materials employed in the classroom. These materials are usually textbooks or language manuals. These two main sources of input have been regarded as artificial for not providing learners with enough pertinent input (Kasper, 1997; LoCastro, 2003). For this reason, different alternatives to present pragmatic input have been suggested, such as the use of spoken corpora, (Alcon and Safont as cited in Soler, 2005; Koester, 2002; among many others) or the use of video, TV and films (Rose, 1993, 1994, 1997, 2001; Grant and Starks as

cited in Soler, 2005; Washburn as cited in Eslami-Rasekh, 2005; among others). As has been discussed above, textbook dialogues do not tend to be a good source of pragmatic input, but representational texts can be. Film scripts, like plays, are designed as spoken texts, and therefore have the added advantage of, if not providing a model, then providing a text which can be engaged with 'as a text of speech' (McCarthy as cited in Hanford, 2002). For students it often is the realm of spoken interaction that proves the most perplexing and fleeting.

The question of why such a material is necessary is answered by Kramsch (1993: 49):

Teaching how to shape contexts of interaction cannot be done directly by a well-dosed administration of facts... Pragmatic knowledge... can only be acquired through observation and analysis and a feel for the whole social context. It is not an 'if - then' affair. It requires, therefore, a totally different pedagogical approach.

In this study, we used the representational theatre extracts as an authentic material from American and English playwrights which have never been used before in pragmatic studies. (Appendix 4) Approximately 96 plays from different playwrights such as Tom Stoppard, Christopher Durang, David Mamet, Arthur Miller, Lillian Hellman, John Guare, Paula Vogel, David Albee, and Simon Neil were analyzed. 29 representative scenes from apologies and 34 scenes from refusals were selected and categorized according to the semantic formulas used by Beebe for refusals and by Olshtain for apologies. Readability of the texts which is an attempt to match the reading level of written material to the "reading with understanding" level of the reader was calculated with SMOG calculator. SMOG (simplified measure of gobbledygook) is a formula that gives a readability level for written material. SMOG calculator was developed by Harry McLaughlin PH.D. www.harrymclaughlin.com/SMOG.htm The SMOG grades and educational level of the readers were given below:

SMOG Grade	Educational Level
0 – 6	low-literate
7	junior high school

8	junior high school
9	some high school
10	some high school
11	some high school
12	high school graduate
13 – 15	some college
16	university degree
17 – 18	post-graduate studies
19+	post-graduate degree

The SMOG grades of the chosen extracts for this study were between 9.32 and 11, which means, the readability level is appropriate to the educational level of our subjects. The representational theatre extracts served as a useful L2 pragmatic tool in aiding the learners to acquire pragmatic knowledge. The native English speakers in the conversations assumed to be models of correct English pragmatic use, and their interaction provided the learners with rich pragmatic input.

3.3.4. Class observations / recordings and treatment evaluations

In addition to the recordings of the oral role-play data, other data were gathered on the acquisition of refusals and apologies. The researcher who was the instructor of the treatment group video-taped the lessons. The purpose of the recordings was to observe the reactions of the learners including non-verbal language and the metapragmatic discussion that took place during every lesson.

At the end of the semester, learners were given evaluation forms to assess the lessons (see Appendix 9). The learners' evaluation form contained questions about the level of difficulty of the lessons and test situations, how helpful the metapragmatic discussions were, and the role of the drama extracts in helping with the understanding of

the speech act in question, with raising or lowering the interest level, or with other class work. They were also asked to comment or give feedback about the lessons. By administering this evaluation form our aim was to examine students' awareness or recognition of what they were learning during the treatment sessions, as well as their pragmatic development throughout the process of instruction.

3.4. Data Analysis and the Coding Scheme

Data analysis of the refusal strategies elicited from the participant were guided mainly by that of Beebe *et al.* (1990) in their study of pragmatic transfer in Japanese ESL refusals. On the other hand, the analysis of the apologies were based on a list of semantic formulae related to the speech act of apologizing which was originally developed by Fraser but modified by Olshtain and Cohen (1983) (see Appendix 8A-8B for a complete list plus examples for each).

After both Turkish learners of English and native speakers of English DRPT collected, the recordings were transcribed and analyzed in terms of the frequencies of a sequence or combinations of semantic formulas. A semantic formula refers to 'a word, phrase, or sentence that meets a particular semantic criterion or strategy; any one or more of these can be used to perform the act in question' (Cohen, 1996: 265).

The participants' responses for the refusal situations were coded using the following scheme. For example, this response from a NES subject for refusing an invitation for dinner (Situation 1), "I'd love to. I'm sorry I can't make it today as I'm going to study," was coded as follows:

I'd love to = statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement (Adj).

I'm sorry = statement of regret (IndA).

I can't make it today = negative willingness/ability (DirB2).

As I am going to study = excuse, reason, explanation (IndC).

Preliminary remarks that could not appear alone and function as refusals were termed 'adjuncts.' For example, subjects often expressed gratitude or appreciation (e.g., 'thank you') before giving their excuse ('but I've already made other plans'). Without the excuse, the expression of positive feeling would sound like an acceptance.

Another respond given by an EFLT participant for the first situation was coded as follows:

Table 3.4. Sample Coding Table for Refusals

I'm sorry.	I wish I could have dinner with you	but I have a class that night.
IndA Statement of regret	IndB Wish	IndC Excuse, reason, explanation

The combinations of the semantic formulae were represented in the tables for the above situation as IndA+IndB+IndC

The other SA strategy of this study, the apology, was also coded in this study as follows. For example, the utterance by an EFLT subject for the second situation (stepping on a fellow student's foot) "I'm sorry. I didn't see you. Are you O.K.?" was coded as:

I'm sorry = An expression of regret (1a)

I didn't see you =Explanation or account (2)

Are you O.K.? = Concern for the hearer (4)

Another response for the same situation was coded as in the example:

Table 3.5. Sample Coding Table for Apologies

Oh, excuse me!	It is my fault	Are you all right?
1c A request for forgiveness	3a Explicit self-blame	4 Concern for the hearer

The combinations of semantic formulae were represented in the tables as: 1c+3a+4

In the analysis of the data, the frequencies of semantic formulae used by NES, EFLC and EFLT groups were calculated to see the similarities and differences of control and treatment groups when compared to the NES group in pre and post- tests. In addition to the frequency of semantic formulae, the percentages of those used by the participants in order to discover any potential differences which might be attributed to the contextual factors of social distance and social status were analysed.

3.5. Reliability of the coding scheme

The criterion of reliability provides information concerning as to whether the data collection procedure is consistent and accurate, and reliability constitutes the upper limit of validity (Seliger and Shohamy, 1986). Therefore, tests of reliability are required for the data collection instrument for the future interlanguage pragmatic research (Kasper and Dahl, 1991). As stated by Seliger and Shohamy, the type of reliability applied depends on where the researcher suspects that inaccuracies in the data collection procedure could occur (1989). In the present study, the subjects' responses to the oral role-plays were coded through a coding scheme originally developed by Olshtain and Cohen (1991) for apologies, and by Beebe (1990) for refusals.

Prior to the actual coding of our subjects' responses, an initial pilot-coding session was performed and a training session was held for the one native and two non-native English language instructors to carefully develop and ensure our participants' coder reliability. Once each group's DRPTs were transcribed, they were coded and then recoded by the three English instructors to ensure coding reliability. For any situation

in which a coding disagreement arose, the coding in question was discussed and decided on by all three coders.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the data collected are presented and discussed with regard to the effects of the theatre extracts as an instructional material for teaching SA of refusals and apologies to the EFL learners. Responses of native English speakers were reviewed for evidence of common components of SA sets to establish a set baseline responses. The responses made by EFL learners were then evaluated for the presence and quality of the speech act components as compared to the native speakers. The following sections (4.1 to 4.2) contain the frequency analysis of the semantic formulae used by control, treatment and native speaker groups in pre-post test situations before and after the treatments. Frequencies of semantic formulae preferred by the subjects in pre-post tests situations regarding to the contextual factors of social distance and social status were analyzed separately in sections (4.3 to 4.4). Answers are sought to the research questions stated in Chapter One of this investigation:

- 1) *What are the preferences of native speakers of English in expressing themselves in various apologizing and refusing situations?*
- 2) *What do Prep-school learners of Gazi University Foreign Languages Department (EFL) students use in expressing themselves in various apology and refusal situations in the pre-test?*
- 3) *Will the instruction and the tasks given by the authentic material (theatre extracts) affect EFL learners' pragmatically appropriate use of apologies and refusals?*
- 4) *Will the instruction given by the text-book material affect EFL learners' pragmatically appropriate use of apologies and refusals?*
- 5) *Is there any significant difference between the two EFL groups (control and treatment) in their awareness of appropriate apologies and refusals in the post-test?*
- 6) *How do the students in the treatment group react to the teaching material (theatre extracts) and the instruction given during the lessons?*

The last question was answered by analysing and discussing the results of learners' evaluation forms about the lessons in section 4.5.

4.1. Analysis of Pre-test Results

The analyses of four Apology and four Refusal situations in pre- test were presented below including frequency of use of semantic formulas. This section tries to find out the answers to the first two research questions: 1) What are the preferences of native speakers of English in expressing themselves in various apologizing and refusing situations? 2) What do Prep-school learners of Gazi University Foreign Languages Department (EFL) students use in expressing themselves in various apology and refusal situations in the pre-test?

4.1.1. Frequency Analysis of Apologies (pre-test)

Tables 4.1 below displays the data derived from situation 1, where a student did not attend a course which he promised his professor to give a lecture.

Table 4.1. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Pre-test in Situation 1

Not to attending a class	NES (n:10)		EFLC (n:20)		EFLT (n:20)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
1a	0	0	13	65	12	60
3g	0	0	1	5	0	0
5	0	0	1	5	0	0
1a+3c+2+1b+3a	2	20	0	0	0	0
6+5	1	10	0	0	0	0
1a+2+5	4	40	1	5	3	15
3e+1a+2+6	3	30	1	5	1	5
1a+3c	0	0	0	0	1	5
1b+2+6	0	0	0	0	1	5
1a+5	0	0	2	10	1	5
1a+6	0	0	0	0	1	5
1a+1c	0	0	1	5	0	0

NES= native speakers of English

EFLC= Turkish EFL learners of control group

EFLT= Turkish EFL learners of treatment group

In this situation the combination of apologies with the highest frequency of use (a total level of 40%) for the NES was *expression of regret+ explanation+ offer of repair*. Following this highest frequency, 30% of NES used the combination of *self-dispraise+ expression of regret+ explanation+ promise of forbearance*, 20% used *regret+ self-deficiency+ explanation+ request for forgiveness+ explicit self-blame*. The percentages of EFL learners both for the control and for the treatment groups show similarities for the first situation of the pre-test. The main apology strategy of *an expression of regret* was most frequently used by the EFLCs (65%) and EFLTs (60%). 10% of EFLC group used the combination of *expression of regret+ offer of repair* while 5% of EFLTs used the same combination. Another combination used by EFLC (5%) and EFLT (15%) was *expression of regret+ explanation+ offer of repair*. Other strategies with the lowest frequencies used by EFLCs and EFLTs were *refusal to acknowledge guilt; expression of regret+ promise of forbearance* and *expression of regret+ request for forgiveness*. When the frequencies of semantic formulas used by the three groups in the first situation were compared, it could be said that native English speakers used more varied and complex semantic formulas than the EFL learners. Moreover, the NES group displayed an overall higher frequency for the use of *an offer of repair* and *promise of forbearance* than the other two groups. For example:

“Well, I didn’t attend the previous course. I just want to know if I can compensate it for the next time.”

“I apologize. I’ll try to do my best if you can give me another chance”

On the other hand, Turkish EFL learners used the main strategies more than the sub strategies when apologizing and instead of complex combinations, they preferred simple semantic formulas without any combinations such as Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs). For example one student from the EFLC group said, *“I’m really sorry. Excuse me”* which in fact means the repetition of the same apology strategy (IFID). They rarely used the strategies of compensation unlike the native speakers.

Table 4.2 below displays the data derived from situation 2, where a student steps on a fellow student’s foot in the school bus.

Table 4.2. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Pre-test in Situation 2

Stepping on a fellow student's foot	NES(n:10)		EFLC(n:20)		EFLT(n:20)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
1a	5	50	4	20	4	20
1c	0	0	1	5	1	5
3g	0	0	0	0	3	15
1a+2	1	10	0	0	1	5
1a+3c	0	0	2	10	1	5
1a+2+6	0	0	0	0	1	5
1a+6	0	0	1	5	0	0
1a+2+1a	0	0	0	0	1	5
1c+3a	1	10	0	0	0	0
1c+3c	1	10	0	0	0	0
1c+1a+3c	1	10	0	0	0	0
1a+4	1	10	0	0	2	10
1a+3b	0	0	6	30	1	5
1a+3g	0	0	6	30	5	25

In this situation, the baseline data gathered from the pre-test results revealed that main strategy of IFID (*an expression of regret*) was mostly preferred by NES (50%). The lower percentages of other semantic formulas (10%) used by the NES such as *expression of regret+ explanation*; *request for forgiveness+ explicit self-blame*; *request for forgiveness+ expression of self-deficiency*; *request for forgiveness+ expression of regret+ expression of self-deficiency* and *expression of regret+ concern for the hearer* also included the strategy of IFID. Thus, the appropriate way of apologizing in this situation in which a student steps on a fellow student's foot in the school bus seemed to be using an IFID either in a combination or in a single semantic formula. It is worth mentioning here that in the preferences of EFL learner groups almost all the combinations and single semantic formulas included IFID just like the NES group. However, the preferences of Turkish EFL learners' especially the EFLTs' using *denial of responsibility* (15%) and the combination of *expression of regret+ denial of responsibility* (25%) most frequently (totally 40%) made the striking difference with the NES group. These higher preferences of the use of this strategy seemed to reveal a cultural factor that Turkish EFL learners tended to deny the

responsibility more than the native speakers of English. For example, while a participant from the EFLC group utters such a sentence “I’m sorry but it wasn’t my fault” another one from the NES group produces a combination as “I simply apologize. It was quite my mistake.” Thus, this difference signaled the EFL groups’ lack of L2 sociopragmatic knowledge. The highest percentage of EFLCs’ using the combination of *expression of regret+ lack of intent* (30%) and *expression of regret+ refusal to acknowledge guilt* also revealed the important difference between the native and non-native English speaker groups. For example:

“Sorry. I didn’t do it deliberately.”

“I’m sorry but it was the bus-driver’s fault.”

It is also interesting that 15% of the EFLTs did not use an explicit “apology” which is the main semantic formula of expressing politeness. They used the semantic formula of *refusal to acknowledge guilt* without expressing any apology word. For example, “*It wasn’t my fault*”; “*Oh, the bus-driver suddenly breaks*”. On the other hand all the participants in the NES group used a semantic formula of IFID, which means expressing an explicit apology at the beginning of their utterances.

Table 4.3. below demonstrates the frequencies derived from situation 3, where someone forgets his promise of taking his/her younger sister/brother to cinema.

Table 4.3. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Pre-test in Situation 3

Breaking promise	a	NES (n:10)		EFLC (n:20)		EFLT (n:20)	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
1a		0	0	2	10	1	5
1b		0	0	1	5	1	5
1c		0	0	0	0	2	10
6		0	0	1	5	0	0
1a+3c+6+5		1	10	0	0	0	0
3c+5		1	10	1	5	0	0
1a+2+5		1	10	1	5	0	0
1a+2		1	10	3	15	6	30
1a+3c+6		0	0	1	5	1	5
2+3c+5		0	0	0	0	1	5
1b+5		3	30	0	0	0	0
1b+6		1	10	0	0	0	0
1c+6		0	0	1	5	0	0
1a+2+3c		0	0	2	10	2	10
1a+3c		0	0	1	5	1	5
3a+1a		0	0	1	5	0	0
1a+5		1	10	3	15	3	15
1a+3c+5		1	10	1	5	2	10
1a+2+1c+6		0	0	1	5	0	0

As it is indicated in table 4.3 the baseline data revealed that NES primarily reserved their preferences to the use of apologizing, (e.g. “I’m terribly sorry; Thousands of apologies”) IFID and its combinations. The most frequently used combination for the NES group was *an offer of apology (IFID)+ offer of repair* (30%) (e.g. “I apologize. Are you free now?”). This combination was followed by other semantic formulas with the equal percentage of 10%. They were: *IFID+ expression of self-deficiency+ promise of forbearance+ offer of repair* (e.g. “I’m really sorry. I completely forgot it. It won’t happen again. Why don’t we go now?”) which is the richest combination that native speakers produced; *IFID+ explanation+ offer of repair* (e.g. “Sorry darling. I failed to make a note in my folder and completely forgot it. We can go tomorrow if you like”) and *IFID+ expression of self-deficiency+ offer of repair*.

When NESs’ use of complex combinations compared with EFLCs and EFLTs, the low preference of complex combinations of the EFLs’ were identical. Only 5% of EFLC used a complex combination of *IFID+ explanation+ request for forgiveness+*

promise of forbearance while none of the participants in the EFLT group preferred this combination. Yet a simple combination of *expression of regret+ explanation* (e.g. “I’m sorry. I was very busy”) was preferred by 6 EFLT (30%) and 3 EFLC (15%) participants though it was not a preference of NES. The low frequency of Turkish EFL learners’ using complex combinations unlike native speakers may indicate that the learners could not develop such elaborate uses yet because they lack some of the sociopragmatic norms of English language. In terms of single IFID usage, EFLC (totally 15%) preferences were closer to EFLT (totally 20%) but none of the participants of NES used them.

The combination of *IFID+ Explanation* was used by EFLC (15%) and EFLT (30%) more frequently than the NES (10%) which reveals that Turkish EFL learners prefer giving explanation rather than using the strategies of compensation unlike the NES in a situation where a person breaks a promise given to his/her younger sibling. For example a participant from NES apologized in such a way: “I’m extremely sorry. I’ll try to make it up soon” whereas a participant from EFLT preferred saying: “I’m sorry but one of my professors asked me to help him and I couldn’t call you.”

Table 4.4 below displays the frequencies derived from situation 4 where a university student who is carrying a chair in the lobby of the university bumps into a professor whom he/she does not know well and hurt his/her hand accidentally.

Table 4.4. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Pre-test in Situation 4

Bumping into a professor	NES (n=10)		EFLC (n=20)		EFLT (n=20)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
1a	1	10	7	35	3	15
1c	0	0	0	0	1	5
3a	0	0	1	5	0	0
3b	0	0	1	5	0	0
1a+4+5	2	20	0	0	1	5
1a+4	1	10	0	0	4	20
1b+3a+3b	1	10	0	0	0	0
4+1a+2+3c	1	10	0	0	0	0
1a+2	1	10	0	0	0	0
1b+3c+4	1	10	0	0	0	0
1c+5	1	10	0	0	0	0
1a+3c	0	0	1	5	1	5
1a+3b+4	0	0	0	0	1	5
1a+3b+3c	0	0	1	5	0	0
1a+3b	0	0	4	20	7	35
1a+1c	0	0	2	10	0	0
1a+5	1	10	0	0	0	0
1a+3a	0	0	1	5	1	5
1a+2+3c	0	0	2	10	0	0
1c+3c	0	0	0	0	1	5

In this situation, different from the previous three situations, the frequencies of the semantic formulas preferred by NES as a baseline data were rather lower because of the diversity of the combinations they created. Although NES preferred various combinations, most of them consisted of semantic formulas of IFID and concern for the hearer. They were: *IFID+ concern for the hearer+ offer of repair* (20%) (“Oh, I am sorry. Are you all right? How can I help you?”); *concern for the hearer+ IFID+ explanation+ expression of self-deficiency* (10%) (“Oh; are you O.K.? Please forgive me! I was in a hurry and I didn’t see you”), and *IFID+ expression of self-deficiency+ concern for the hearer* (10%). Thus, the appropriate semantic formula seemed to be the combinations of *IFID* and *concern for the hearer*. It is worth mentioning here that, in using the semantic formula of *concern for the hearer* EFLT group did not differ strictly from the NES since 5% of EFLT used *IFID+ concern for the hearer+ offer of repair*, 20% preferred *IFID+ concern for the hearer* in the situation of bumping into a professor in the lobby of the university. It can be observed from the table 4.4 that the

preferences of EFLC group deviated from the other two groups in using no semantic formula of *concern for the hearer*.

Another deviation between the EFL and NES groups was observed in the usage of the semantic formula of *lack of intent*. 35% of EFLT and 20% of EFLC preferred the combination of *IFID+ lack of intent* (“I’m sorry. I did not do it deliberately”) while none of the participant in the NES preferred this semantic formula.

On the other hand the simple usage of IFID was frequently used by the two EFL groups similar with the previous three situations (35% for EFLC and a total level of 20% for EFLT). Interestingly 2 participants from EFLC (20%) repeated IFID semantic formulas (*an expression of regret+ a request for forgiveness*) in a single sentence (“I’m really sorry. Forgive me!”). This can be an indication of EFL learners’ inadequate knowledge of expressing more varied and complex utterances elaborated with the combinations of apology semantic formulas.

4.1.2 Frequency Analysis of Refusals (pre-test)

Table 4.5 below displays the data derived from the pre-test results of situation 1, where the speaker refuses one of his friend’s invitation of dinner.

Table 4.5. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Pre-test in Situation 1

Refusing an invitation of dinner	NES (n:10)		EFLC (n:20)		EFLT (n:20)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
IndE	0	0	0	0	1	5
Adj+IndC+DirB2+IndA	2	20	0	0	0	0
DirB1+IndA+IndC+IndA	1	10	2	10	1	5
DirB1+IndC	1	10	6	30	3	15
IndA+DirB2+IndC+IndF	2	20	0	0	0	0
DirB2+IndC	1	10	0	0	5	25
Adj+IndC+DirB2	3	30	0	0	0	0
DirB2+IndA	0	0	2	10	0	0
IndA+IndC	0	0	4	20	3	15
DirB1+DirB2+IndC	0	0	2	10	0	0
IndA+IndC+DirB2	0	0	3	15	5	25
DirB1+Adj+IndC	0	0	1	5	0	0
Adj+IndC	0	0	0	0	2	10

In this situation data elicited from the three groups have some significant differences especially in the use of semantic formula of *adjuncts to refusal*. The combinations used by the NES group including adjuncts to refusals were: *adjuncts to refusal+ excuse+ nonperformative statement(negative ability)+ regret* (20%) (“I’d love to but I have to study for the big test. I cannot come. I’m sorry”); *adjuncts to refusal+ excuse+ nonperformative statement (no)* (30%) (“That’s a good idea but I promised some of my classmates to study for tomorrow’s test. I think I cannot eat with you”). The total frequency of using combinations including adjuncts to refusals were 50% for NES whereas 5% for EFLC and 10% for EFLT. They were: *nonperformative statement(no)+ adjuncts to refusal+ excuse* (5% EFLC) (“No. It is a good idea but I’m going to study for tomorrow’s exam.”) and *adjuncts to refusal+ excuse* (20% EFLT) (“It’s a good idea but there will be an exam for tomorrow and I must study.”)

Another point in this situation that deserves attention was that the NES group maintained a high frequency (20%) of the use of the combination of *regret+ nonperformative statement(negative ability)+ excuse+ promise of future acceptance* (“I’m sorry. It is really impossible since I have a class this evening. Maybe next time.”) while none of the EFL learner groups used this combination.

The other deviation of EFL learner groups from the NES was the usage of the semantic formula of *direct nonperformative statement*. EFL learner groups highly preferred the combinations including *direct nonperformative statement of no* (a total level of 55% for EFLC and EFLT) while 20% of NES group used the combinations including *direct statement of no*. Some combinations and frequency values used by EFLC and EFLT were: *nonperformative statement (no)+ regret+ excuse+ regret* (10% EFLC-5%EFLT); *nonperformative statement (no)+ excuse* (30%EFLC-15%EFLT) (No. I am going to study) and *regret+ excuse+ nonperformative statement (no)* (15% EFLC-25%EFLT). Instead of *direct nonperformative statement of no* the NES group tended to refuse by using *direct nonperformative statement of negative ability/willingness* which is the more polite way of refusing. For example; *adjuncts to refusal+ excuse+ nonperformative statement(negative ability)* (30%), *regret+ nonperformative statement(negative ability)+ excuse+ promise of future acceptance* (20%). It is also

worth mentioning here that the semantic formula of *promise of future acceptance preferred* only by the NES group, which can be the indication of EFL learner groups' lack of sociopragmatic knowledge.

Table 4.6 below demonstrates the frequencies derived from situation 2, where a university student refuses his advisor's suggestion of taking an additional course.

Table 4.6. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Pre-test in Situation 2

Refusing a suggestion of taking course	NES (n:10)		EFLC (n:20)		EFLT (n:20)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
IndF	0	0	1	5	0	0
K2	0	0	2	10	0	0
DirB2	0	0	10	50	4	20
DirB2+IndD	0	0	2	10	1	5
IndD+DirB2	1	10	0	0	0	0
IndC+IndF	1	10	1	5	3	15
IndF+IndC+DirB2	1	10	0	0	0	0
K2+IndD	3	30	0	0	0	0
K2+IndJ	2	20	0	0	0	0
K2+IndC	1	10	1	5	0	0
DirB2+IndF	0	0	1	5	1	5
DirB2+IndI	0	0	1	5	0	0
IndA+DirB2+IndF	0	0	1	5	0	0
Adj+IndC+DirB2	1	10	0	0	1	5
Adj+DirB2	0	0	0	0	8	40
IndA+IndH	0	0	0	0	1	5
IndA+IndC+IndF	0	0	0	0	1	5

In this situation, NES clearly displayed that combinations including semantic formula of *verbal avoidance (indefinite postponement)* were highly appropriate. For example; *indefinite postponement+ statement of alternative* (30%) (“Oh, I think not now but maybe in the future. Is there any possibility of taking another course for this semester replacing with English Literature?”), *indefinite postponement+ acceptance functioning as a refusal (unspecific or indefinite reply)* (20%) (“Well, actually, I had all the courses planned in my schedule but I don’t know if it is really beneficial for me.”) and *indefinite postponement+ excuse* (10%) were the combinations preferred by the NES group. An indirect refusal formula of *acceptance functioning as a refusal* was used by the NES group (20%) which was produced by none of EFL learner groups. It is

worth mentioning here that during the metapragmatic discussions with the EFLT group, they mentioned that they have never used some of the indirect refusal strategies in English, especially the indirect semantic formula of *acceptance functioning as a refusal*. Another example of their lack of sociopragmatic knowledge in English was the usage of the semantic formula of *verbal avoidance*. Unlike the NES group neither EFLC nor EFLT used semantic formula of *verbal avoidance* in a combination but 10% of EFLC used it separately (not within a combination).

It is also important that preferences of EFLC and EFLT groups strikingly differ from each other in this situation. The semantic formula of *nonperformative statement (negative ability/willingness)* was highly (50%) used by the EFLC while the combination of *adjuncts to refusal (pause filler)+ negative ability/willingness* (“Aaaa. I don’t really want to take this course for this semester.”) was preferred (40%) by the EFLT. The semantic formula of *nonperformative statement (negative ability/willingness)* was also used by the EFLT but this was less than the EFLC with the frequency of 20 %. (“I think I’m not able to take an additional course”). The results of the frequencies indicated that Turkish EFL students tended to use direct refusal strategies while the NES group produced indirect strategies.

The combination of *excuse+ promise of future acceptance* was the only common semantic formula preferred by all the three groups with low frequency values. 10% for the NES, 5% for the EFLC and 15% for the EFLT which can be an indication of the deviation between the participants before the pragmatic instruction.

Table 4.7 below demonstrates the frequencies derived from situation 3, where a university student refuses a solicitor’s request of filling a questionnaire.

Table 4.7. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Pre-test in Situation 3

Refusing a request of filling a questionnaire	NES (n:10)		EFLC (n:20)		EFLT (n:20)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
IndC	0	0	2	10	0	0
IndA+IndC	5	50	10	50	10	50
IndA+DirB2+IndC	3	30	2	10	4	20
DirB2+K2	1	10	0	0	0	0
IndA+DirB2	0	0	1	5	0	0
DirB1+IndC	0	0	1	5	0	0
IndA+IndC+K2	1	10	0	0	0	0
DirB1+DirB2	0	0	1	5	0	0
DirB1+DirB2+IndC	0	0	1	5	5	25
IndC+IndE	0	0	1	5	0	0
IndB+IndC	0	0	1	5	0	0
IndC+DirB2	0	0	0	0	1	5

Unlike the previous three situations, in this situation all the three groups demonstrated an equal high level of frequency in the usage of the combination of *regret+ excuse* (50% for each group). This is very important since Turkish EFL learners for the first time produced native-like utterances in the situation of refusing a request of filling a questionnaire (“I’m sorry. I have to attend my lesson”). Second combination in which all the groups were approximately close in the frequency ranges of their preferences to each other was *regret+ nonperformative statement(negative ability/willingness)+ excuse* (30% NES, 10% EFLC and 20%EFLT).

However, there were still some deviations among the three groups in their preferences of semantic formulas. For example, the combination of *nonperformative statement (negative ability/willingness+ indefinite postponement* (“I couldn’t do it now. Maybe later on.”) and *regret+ excuse+ indefinite postponement* (“I’m sorry. I have to go now but I can do it later.”) were used (10%) by the NES group but not preferred by the Turkish EFL groups.

Another striking point in the above table was the scattered preferences of the EFLC group with the lowest frequency range of 5%. These combinations were *regret+ nonperformative statement (negative ability/willingness)*, *nonperformative statement(no)+ excuse* (“No. I must go now”), *performative verb+ nonperformative*

statement(no) (“I refuse. No.”) which was not an appropriate way of refusing a request and this preference revealed their lack of sociopragmatic knowledge.

On the other hand the preferences of the EFLT were not as scattered as the EFLC yet they did not use appropriate refusal semantic formulas either when compared with the norms of the NES group. For example the combination of *performative verb+ nonperformative statement(no)+ excuse* (25%) (“I refuse. No. I have to go to now”) was the signal of their inadequate sociopragmatic knowledge just like the EFLC group.

Finally it could be deduced from the above table that at least half of the Turkish EFL learners used the refusal semantic formulas which were similar to native-like utterances while the other half demonstrated inappropriate combinations in the situation of refusing a request of a solicitor.

Table 4.8 below demonstrates the frequencies derived from situation 4, where a person refuses his/her brother’s/sister’s offer of tea.

Table 4.8. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Pre-test in Situation 4

Refusing an offer of tea	NES (n:10)		EFLC (n:20)		EFLT (n:20)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
DirB1	1	10	10	50	8	40
Adj+DirB1	0	0	1	5	2	10
DirB1+Adj	1	10	0	0	0	0
DirB1+Adj+K2	2	20	0	0	0	0
DirB1+Adj+IndC	4	40	0	0	2	10
DirB1+IndC+K2	2	20	0	0	1	5
IndA+IndC	0	0	7	35	5	25
DirB1+DirB2+IndC	0	0	2	10	2	10

In this situation, NES preferences mostly accumulated on *nonperformative statement(no)+ adjuncts to refusal+ excuse* (40%) (“No, honey. I’d like to, but it’s too late and I have to go to bed.”), *nonperformative statement(no)+ adjuncts to refusal+ verbal avoidance(joke)* (20%) (“Oh, no, dear. You’re so kind. Will you make me stay awake all night?”) and *nonperformative statement(no)+ excuse+ verbal avoidance(joke)* (20%) (“No, honey. I think we should sleep. Too late for you, too late for me, too late for tea!”). Yet, some other formulas such as *nonperformative statement(no)* (10%) and *nonperformative statement(no)+ adjuncts to refusal* (10%) were lower in use.

On the other hand, Turkish subjects of EFLC and EFLTS’ preferences accumulated over formulas of *nonperformative statement(no)* (50% for EFLC and 40% for EFLT), *regret+ excuse* (35% for EFLC and 25% for EFLT) and *nonperformative statement(no)+ nonperformative statement(negative ability/willingness)+ excuse* (10% for EFLC and EFLT) which were strikingly different from the preferences of NES. Thus, the deviation of the frequencies for the learner groups and NES in terms of the pre-test results revealed that EFL learners were unable to produce native-like utterances in the situation of refusing his/her brother’s/sister’s offer of tea. Some of the utterances of Turkish EFL learners were as follows:

“I’m sorry. I’ll get up early in the morning so I have to go to the bed.” (EFLC)

“Dear, forgive me but I have already had two cups of tea. That’s enough I think” (EFLT)

“No. I don’t want any more.” (EFLT)

“No, darling. I cannot drink any more since it’s too late and I’d better go to sleep.” (EFLC)

“You’re so kind but no. Thank you” (EFLC)

4.2. Analysis of Post-test Results

This section discusses the Turkish EFL learners’ acquisition of pragmatic competence and analyzes the effects of the instruction through the theatre extracts as a representational material during a period of one academic semester including metapragmatic discussion, and the pragmatic instruction. In other words, the effects of the instruction on the development of the learners’ pragmatic competence were analysed. The following section also compares the use of text-book material with the theatre extracts on the development of English apology and refusal SAs by the two groups of

EFL learners in apologizing and refusing in terms of native speaker norms. Through these analyses it was aimed to find out the answers of the research questions: 3) Will the instruction and the tasks given by the authentic material (theatre extracts) affect EFL learners' pragmatically appropriate use of apologies and refusals? 4) Will the instruction given by the text-book material affect EFL learners' pragmatically appropriate use of apologies and refusals? 5) Is there any significant difference between the two EFL groups (control and treatment) in their awareness of appropriate apologies and refusals in the post-test?

4.2.1 Frequency Analysis of Apologies (post-test)

The analyses of four Apology situations in post- test were presented below including frequency of use of semantic formulas.

Table 4.9 below displays the data derived from situation 1, where a student did not attend a course in which he promised his professor to give a lecture.

Table 4.9. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Post-test in Situation 1

Not to attending a class	NES (n:10)		EFLC (n:20)		EFLT (n:20)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
1a	0	0	2	10	0	0
5	0	0	1	5	0	0
1a+3c+2+1b+3a	2	20	1	5	4	20
6+5	1	10	0	0	2	10
1a+2+5	4	40	1	5	6	30
1a+2	0	0	10	50	1	5
3e+1a+2+6	3	30	0	0	1	5
1b+2+1a	0	0	0	0	1	5
1a+5	0	0	2	10	0	0
1a+3g+2+6	0	0	0	0	1	5
1a+1c	0	0	1	5	0	0
1c+3a+2	0	0	2	10	1	5
1b+3f+2	0	0	0	0	1	5
1a+3d+2+3f+5	0	0	0	0	2	10

In the situation of not to attending a class, the accumulation of EFLT responses was observed in the use of new combinations of apology semantic formulas which did

not exist in the pre-test. Single IFID, the most frequently used strategy in the pre-test, for both EFLT and EFLC (60%-65%) did not exist in EFLT and decreased to 5% in EFLC, which indicated an extreme change in the preferences of the two groups. A complex combination of *expression of regret+ expression of self-deficiency+ explanation+ request for forgiveness+ explicit self-blame* which was not preferred by the EFLC and EFLT in the pre-test was increased to 20% for EFLT (equal to the frequency of NES) and 5% for EFLC in the post-test which can be considered as an indication of the effects of instruction with theatre extracts for the treatment group. Another significant difference between the pre and post test preferences of EFLT was the use of a combination of *expression of regret+ explanation+ offer of repair* widely used by NES (40%) and was preferred less by the EFLC (5%) and EFLT (15%) in the pre-test increased to 30% for the EFLT but did not change in the preferences of EFLC (5%). This can be the signal of the difference between the effect of using text book material and authentic material (theatre extracts) in teaching SA of apologies in English.

However, the combination of *self-dispraise +expression of regret+ explanation+ promise of forbearance* used by NES (30%) but rarely preferred by EFLT (5%) and EFLC (5%) remained in the same frequency value for these two groups. This can be explained as Turkish EFL learners who transferred their sociocultural norms to their target language, being under the influence of their native language. These results demonstrate that negative transfer can occur and some of the habits in SA realizations are resistant to change even after instruction.

It is interesting that the EFLT group preferred some combinations that they did not use in the pre-test. Although they were not preferred by the NES and the EFLC either, this deviation of EFLT group can be commented as their raising awareness of different semantic formulas and combinations of apologizing in English. For example, 10% of EFLTs used the combination of *expression of regret+ expression of embarrassment+ explanation+ justify hearer+ offer of repair* (“I’m really sorry. I am ashamed of it but I was ill and I couldn’t attend the course. You’re right to be angry. Please give me one more chance.”) which is the signal of the effect of the instruction and the material used in teaching SAs leading them to use more complex and longer sentences with wider use of different semantic formulas.

Table 4.10 below displays the data derived from the situation 2, where a student steps on a fellow student's foot.

Table 4.10. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Post-test in Situation 2

Stepping on a fellow student's foot	NES (10)		EFLC (n:20)		EFLT (n:20)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
1a	5	50	2	10	0	0
3g+1c	0	0	1	5	0	0
1c	0	0	1	5	0	0
1a+3b+2	0	0	1	5	1	5
1a+3g+2	0	0	2	10	0	0
3e+1a+4	0	0	0	0	1	5
1c+3g+2	0	0	1	5	0	0
1a+2	1	10	0	0	0	0
1a+3c	0	0	11	55	0	0
1a+3c+4	0	0	1	5	6	30
1a+3d+3a	0	0	0	0	2	10
1a+1b+3b	0	0	0	0	1	5
1c+3a	1	10	0	0	3	15
1c+3c	1	10	0	0	1	5
1c+1a+3c	1	10	0	0	0	0
1a+4	1	10	0	0	5	25

The most significant result obtained from the analysis of responses was the remarkably changing preferences of EFLT group when compared with the pre-test results. Although the base-line data derived from NES showed that the most appropriate semantic formula for this situation was single IFID (50%) the usage of single IFID for the EFLT decreased from 20% to no usage of IFID in the post-test. In fact, this seems to be a negative deviation, but instead of using single IFID, they preferred using this semantic formula insistently in almost all the combinations they produced. For example, *IFID+ expression of self-deficiency+ concern for the hearer* (30%), *IFID+ explicit self blame* (15%), *IFID+ concern for the hearer* (10%), *IFID+ justify hearer+ expression of self-deficiency* (15%). For the EFLC the deviation, observed from the results of post-test, was not as much as EFLT when compared with the results of the pre-test in the usage of single IFID. The frequency of using this semantic formula decreased to total level of 15% from 20%. The combinations of IFID were also observed in EFLC but the tendency for this group was the usage of *expression*

of *self deficiency* and its combinations. For example, *IFID+ expression of self deficiency* (55%) and *IFID+ expression of self deficiency+ concern for the hearer* (5%) (a total level of 60%) were frequently preferred by EFLC. If we consider the high frequency usage of *refusal to acknowledge guilt* (30%) and *lack of intent* (30%) in the pre-test, the changing realizations of EFLC may be interpreted as an improvement in terms of the realization of new patterns but still not the proper ones when compared with that of NES and EFLT. For example while the participants from EFLC utter combinations such as:

“Oh, I am sorry. I didn’t control myself”

“Forgive me please. I couldn’t stop since the bus is very crowded.”

“I’m sorry but it wasn’t my fault because the bus driver suddenly breaks”

Participants from EFLT preferred the following ones:

“I’m really sorry. I couldn’t stop. Are you all right?”

“Pardon me. It’s completely my fault.”

“Oh! Sorry! I hope I didn’t hurt you.”

As it was understood from the above examples the preferences of EFLC and EFLT group differ from each other in terms of using the semantic formula of *refusal to acknowledge guilt*. While it was used at a total level of 40% by EFLT after the treatment, this semantic formula was used by none of the participants of the treatment group which is in line with the preferences of NES. The tendency of EFLT was the usage of *explicit self-blame* and *concern for the hearer* in the post-test. These changing preferences of EFLT group may be the result of the theatre extracts as an authentic material they were exposed to in their learning process. The other semantic formulas which came closer to the frequencies of NES for EFLT group were *IFID+ explicit self-blame* (15%); *IFID+ self-dispraise* (5%) in the situation of stepping on a fellow student’s foot in the university bus.

Table 4.11 below displays the data derived from situation 3, where someone forgets his/her promise of taking his/her younger sister/brother to cinema.

Table 4.11. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Post-test in Situation 3

Breaking a promise	NES (n:10)		EFLC (n:20)		EFLT (n:20)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
1a	0	0	2	10	0	0
1b	0	0	1	5	0	0
6	0	0	1	5	0	0
1a+3c+6+5	1	10	1	5	2	10
3c+5	1	10	0	0	2	10
1a+2+5	1	10	2	10	0	0
1a+2	1	10	2	10	0	0
1a+3c+6	0	0	1	5	0	0
3e+5+1c	0	0	1	5	0	0
1b+5	3	30	0	0	4	20
1b+6	1	10	0	0	2	10
1c+6	0	0	1	5	0	0
1a+2+3c	0	0	2	10	0	0
1a+3c	0	0	1	5	0	0
3a+1a	0	0	1	5	0	0
1a+5	1	10	2	10	2	10
1a+3c+5	1	10	0	0	2	10
1a+2+1c+6	0	0	1	5	0	0
3a+3c+5	0	0	1	5	2	10
3f+3c+1a	0	0	0	0	2	10
3e+3c+6	0	0	0	0	2	10

The analysis of the frequencies of post-test indicated that preferences of EFLT especially in using the combinations including the semantic formulas of *offer of repair* and *promise of forbearance* increased strikingly. *IFID(expression of regret)+ expression of self-deficiency+ promise of forbearance+ offer of repair* (10% equal to NES), *expression of self-deficiency + offer of repair* (10%) were equal to NES, *IFID(an offer of apology)+ offer of repair* (20%) were closer the frequencies of NES (30%) and *IFID(an offer of apology)+ promise of forbearance* (10%) were equal to NES values. Although the semantic formula of explanation or account was highly preferred in the pre-test (a total level of 40%) by EFLT, it was not used in the post-test. Moreover, more complex combinations and longer utterances began to be produced by EFLT after the treatment. For example: “Sorry, honey. I forgot it. Believe me it won’t happen again? Why don’t we go now?”

It is also worth mentioning here that EFLT group produced two different combinations *justify hearer+ expression of self-deficiency+ expression of regret* (10%) (“I know you’re completely right to be angry but unfortunately I forgot it. I am very sorry.”) and *self-dispraise+ expression of self-deficiency+ promise of forbearance* (10%) (“I’m such a dimwit. I couldn’t remember my promise. I’ll never do it again.”) which were not used by NES. This can be an indication of their development in producing diverse semantic formulas as a result of their sociopragmatic development.

In the results of the EFLC the frequencies of using single IFID (a total level of 15%) remained in the same frequency value in the post-test, which can be an indication of the inadequacy of using text-book material in teaching SAs. Another indication supporting this claim may be the usage of combinations including *explanation or account* (a total level of 35%) which was not preferred by neither NES nor EFLT.

“I’m sorry, dear. I was very busy.”

“I’m sorry. I met one of my old friends. Please forgive me. I won’t forget it again”

Table 4.12 below displays the frequencies derived from situation 4, where a university student who is carrying a chair in the lobby of the university bumps into a professor, whom he/she does not know well and hurt his/her hand accidentally.

Table 4.12. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Post-test in Situation 4

Bumping into a professor	NES (n:10)		EFLC (n:20)		EFLT (n:20)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
1a	1	10	6	30	0	0
4+3a+6	0	0	0	0	2	10
3a	0	0	1	5	0	0
3b	0	0	1	5	0	0
1a+4+5	2	20	0	0	2	10
1a+4	1	10	0	0	0	0
1b+3a+3b	1	10	0	0	2	10
4+1a+2+3c	1	10	0	0	1	5
1a+2	1	10	0	0	0	0
1b+3c+4	1	10	0	0	3	15
1c+5	1	10	0	0	2	10
1a+3c	0	0	2	10	0	0
1a+3b+4	0	0	0	0	2	10
1a+3b+3c	0	0	1	5	0	0
1a+3b	0	0	4	20	0	0
1a+1c	0	0	2	10	0	0
1a+5	1	10	0	0	2	10
1a+2+3c	0	0	2	10	0	0
1a+1c+3d+4	0	0	0	0	3	15
1a+3c+3d	0	0	1	5	1	5

The results derived from the pos-test of the fourth situation indicated that the frequency values of EFLT changed significantly when compared with the results of the pre-test. The semantic formula of single IFID which was used at a total level of 20% in the pre-test was not preferred by the same group in the pos-test. On the other hand, EFLC deviated both from EFLT and NES with the frequency of 30% in using single IFID. Other changes in the preferences of EFLT were the usage of a combination of *IFID+ concern for the hearer+ offer of repair* (10%) (“Oh! I’m really sorry. I hope I didn’t hurt you. How can I help you?”); *IFID+ explicit self-blame+ lack of intent* (10%); *IFID+ expression of self-deficiency+ concern for the hearer* (15%) (I apologize. I didn’t see you. I hope you are all right). The frequencies of EFLT in the post-test were almost similar to the frequencies of NES, which may be an indication of the effect of instruction in teaching apology SAs with authentic material. Interestingly 15% of the learners from EFLT produced a combination of *IFID (expression of regret+ request for forgiveness+ expression of embarrassment+ concern for the hearer* (“Oh! I’m sorry.

Forgive me please. I am ashamed of it. Are you fine?”) which was not uttered by the other two groups. It was a complex semantic formula of taking on responsibility of the situation, which may be an indication of changing attitudes of EFLT after pragmatic treatment.

On the other hand, the frequencies of semantic formulas used by EFLC in the post-test remained almost the same when compared with the results of the pre-test. Exceptionally, the combination of *IFID+ expression of self-deficiency+ expression of embarrassment* (“I am sorry. I didn’t see you. I feel awful about it.”) was used (5%) by one learner in the post-test. The results obtained from the post-test revealed the difference between using text-book material and theatre extracts as an authentic material in teaching SAs in English.

4.2.2 Frequency Analysis of Refusals (post-test)

Table 4.13 below displays the data derived from situation 1, where someone refuses his/her friend’s invitation of a dinner.

Table 4.13. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Post-test in Situation 1

Refusing an invitation of dinner	NES (n:10)		EFLC (n:20)		EFLT (n:20)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
IndirectG	0	0	0	0	3	15
Adj+IndC+DirB2+IndA	1	10	1	5	0	0
DirB1+IndA+IndC+IndA	1	10	2	10	0	0
DirB1+IndC	1	10	5	25	0	0
IndA+DirB2+IndC+IndF	2	20	0	0	3	15
DirB2+IndC	1	10	0	0	3	15
Adj+IndC+DirB2	3	30	1	5	3	15
IndA+IndC	0	0	3	15	0	0
DirB1+DirB2+IndC	1	10	2	10	0	0
IndA+IndC+DirB1	0	0	3	15	0	0
DirB1+Adj+IndC	0	0	1	5	0	0
Adj+IndC+IndF	0	0	2	10	5	25
Adj+IndC	0	0	0	0	2	10
IndA+IndC+IndF	0	0	0	0	1	5

The frequencies of refusal strategies preferred especially by the EFLT group in the post-test results indicated important differences when compared with the results of the pre-test. The main difference was in the usage of *adjuncts* which were highly preferred by NES (50%) whereas the same formula was preferred 5% for EFLC and 10% for EFLT in the pre-test. The results of the pos-test maintained that the usage of *adjuncts* increased from totally 10% to 50% for the EFLT group. Yet, it is worth mentioning here that the usage of the same semantic formula also increased in the EFLC group from totally 5% to 25%, which could be considered an important difference but still the frequency values were not as closer as the native-speaker norms when compared with the EFLT. Frequencies of the combinations produced by EFLT and EFLC including the semantic formula of adjuncts were: *adjuncts to refusal+ excuse+ nonperformative statement(negative ability/willingness)* (15% for EFLT-5% for EFLC), *adjuncts to refusal+ excuse+ promise of future acceptance* (25% for EFLT-10% for EFLC) and *adjuncts to refusal+ excuse* (10 for EFLT-0% for EFLC).

It is also striking that the high frequency of the usage of direct semantic formula of *nonperformative statement of (no)* (a total level of 55%) for EFLT and EFLC in the pre-test was used by none of the participants of EFLT in the post-test while it continued to be highly preferred by EFLC (totally 60%) unlike the native speaker norms. Thus, these results maintained a clear comparison of using text book material with authentic material (theatre extracts in this study) in teaching speech acts.

This claim was also supported when some of the combinations which were not preferred in the pre-test by EFLT happened to be used in a way exactly similar to the native-like utterances in the post-test such as *regret+ nonperformative statement(negative ability/willingness)+ excuse+ promise of future acceptance* (0% in pre-test and 15% in post-test) and *adjuncts to refusals+ excuse+ nonperformative statement(negative ability/willingness)* (0% in pre-test and 15 % in post-test). For example:

“I’m really sorry but I cannot because I have to prepare for tomorrow’s test. I hope we can go this weekend.”

“What a good idea but unfortunately I have a big test tomorrow and I have planned to study this evening. Actually it is impossible for me.”

Another striking point was the preferences of EFLT in using an indirect semantic formula of *statement of principle* (15%) which was preferred neither by NES nor by EFLC (“I never go out the night before a big test”). It may be deduced from this difference that participants of EFLT became aware of various strategies of refusing which they had not realized before the courses.

Table 4.14 below displays the data derived from situation 2, where a university student refuses his/her advisor’s suggestion of taking an additional course.

Table 4.14. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Post-test in Situation 2

Refusing a suggestion of taking a course	NES (n:10)		EFLC (n:20)		EFLT (n:10)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
IndirectF	0	0	1	5	0	0
IndirectK2	0	0	2	10	0	0
DirB2	0	0	7	35	0	0
DirB2+IndD	0	0	2	10	0	0
IndD+DirB2	1	10	0	0	0	0
IndC+IndF	1	10	1	5	0	0
IndF+IndC+DirB2	1	10	1	5	0	0
K2+IndD	3	30	1	5	4	20
K2+IndJ	2	20	0	0	3	15
K2+IndC	1	10	1	5	3	15
DirB2+IndF	0	0	1	5	0	0
DirB2+IndI	0	0	1	5	0	0
IndA+DirB2+IndF	0	0	1	5	1	5
Adj+IndC+DirB2	1	10	0	0	2	10
IndF+IndD	0	0	1	5	1	5
Adj+K2	0	0	0	0	2	10
IndB+IndC+IndF	0	0	0	0	1	5
K2(request information)	0	0	0	0	3	15

In this situation the frequencies of post-test results indicated that while the EFLC group did not significantly change their preferences of refusal semantic formulas, the EFLT group came closer to the native speaker norms in their realizations of semantic formulas when compared with the results of the pre-test. Only the frequency of the semantic formula of *nonperformative statement (negative ability/willingness)* which was 50% in the pre-test of EFLC decreased to the frequency of 35% in the post-test. Other

frequencies of semantic formulas remained the same, which can be interpreted as the inefficacy of using text-book material in teaching speech acts.

On the other hand, the preferences of EFLT in using the semantic formula of *verbal avoidance (request information)+ statement of alternative* increased from 0% to 20% which is closer to the NES (30%) results (“Will this course be beneficial for me? Is there another course I can take and replace it with English Literature?”). Other combinations which gained acceleration were the *verbal avoidance (repetition of part of request)+acceptance functioning as a refusal* (English Literature? Oh, well, yes) 15% (it is worth mentioning here that the EFLT participants supported the lack of enthusiasm with their body language and the tone of their voice) and the combination of *verbal avoidance (indefinite postponement)+ excuse* (Maybe I can take it later since I’ve already planned my schedule) 15%.

The semantic formula of *verbal avoidance (request information)* which was mentioned in the above combination was also used separately by 15% of EFLT participants. Thus, these native-like preferences of EFLT in the situation of refusing the suggestion of an advisor to take an additional course can be considered as the signal of the effect of using authentic material in the realization of refusal semantic formulas.

Table 4.15 below displays the data derived from situation 3, where a university student refuses a solicitor’s request of filling a questionnaire.

Table 4.15. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Post-test in Situation 3

Refusing a request of filling a questionnaire	NES (n:10)		EFLC (n:20)		EFLT (n:20)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
IndC	0	0	2	10	0	0
IndA+IndC	5	50	8	40	3	15
IndA+DirB2+IndC	3	30	1	5	4	20
DirB2+K2	1	10	1	5	2	10
IndA+DirB2	0	0	1	5	0	0
DirB1+IndC	0	0	1	5	0	0
IndA+IndC+K2	1	10	0	0	0	0
DirB1+DirB2	0	0	1	5	0	0
DirB1+DirB2+IndC	0	0	1	5	0	0
IndC+IndE	0	0	1	5	0	0
IndB+IndC	0	0	1	5	1	5
IndC+K2	0	0	1	5	1	5
IndG	0	0	0	0	1	5
IndD+IndC	0	0	1	5	3	15
IndC+IndG+IndC	0	0	0	0	2	10
DirB1	0	0	0	0	3	15

According to the table 4.15 the frequency results for the situation of refusing a request of a solicitor did not maintain the same results when compared with the other situations in terms of verifying the third hypothesis of this study. Because the combination of *regret+ excuse* preferred interestingly by all the groups with a high frequency (50%) in the pre-test decreased to 15% for EFLT and 40% for EFLC in the post-test. This deviation of the EFLT was also observed in their preferences of other semantic formulas and combinations. They were: *wish+ excuse* (5%) (“I wish I could but I’m in a hurry”), *excuse+ verbal avoidance (indefinite postponement)* (5%) (“I must go now maybe later”), *statement of principle* (5%) (“I never fill in questionnaires in this way”) which is in fact not an appropriate way of refusing someone, *statement of alternative+ excuse* (15%) (“Why don’t you ask another one. I’m in a hurry”), *excuse+ statement of principle+ excuse* (10%) and direct *nonperformative statement of no* (15%). The results of the EFLT can indicate that although they did not produced native-like utterances they used various semantic formulas and combinations which were not used in the pre-test. Yet, it was assumed from the frequencies of this situation that the use of

authentic material and the sociopragmatic information were not as effective as in the other refusal situations.

When the results derived from the EFLC were analyzed, it was observed that the frequencies of *excuse* (10%), *regret+ verbal avoidance* (5%), *nonperformative statement(no)+ excuse* (5%), *nonperformative statement(no)+ nonperformative statement(negative ability)* (5%), *nonperformative statement(no)+ nonperformative statement(negative ability)+ excuse* (5%), *excuse+ set condition for acceptance* (5%) and *wish+ excuse* (5%) remained in the same range. The inconsistency of the low frequency values can indicate that they did not learn the appropriate way of refusing in such a situation during one term courses of English with text-book material.

Table 4.16 below displays the data derived from situation 4, where a person refuses his/her brother's/sister's offer of tea.

Table 4.16. Frequency of Use of Semantic Formulas of Post-test in Situation 4

Refusing an offer of tea	NES (n:10)		EFLC (n:20)		EFLT (n:20)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
DirB1	1	10	7	35	1	5
Adj+DirB2	0	0	1	5	1	5
DirB1+Adj	1	10	0	0	3	15
DirB1+Adj+K2	2	20	0	0	3	15
DirB1+Adj+IndC	4	40	1	5	6	30
DirB1+IndC+K2	2	20	1	5	2	10
IndA+IndC	0	0	7	35	1	5
DirB1+DirB2+IndC	0	0	2	10	0	0
IndD	0	0	0	0	1	5
DirB1+IndC	0	0	1	5	1	5
DirB1+IndD	0	0	0	0	1	5

The most significant result obtained from the analysis of responses of the post-test was the remarkably changing preferences of EFLT group when compared with the pre-test results. According to the base-line data derived from NES, the most appropriate way of refusing seemed to be the combination of semantic formulas of *nonperformative statement (no)+ adjuncts to refusal+ excuse* with the highest frequency of 40%. Interestingly, the preferences of EFLT rose from 10% to 30% in using this combination.

Other remarkable changes in the preferences of EFLT were *nonperformative statement (no)+ adjuncts to refusal* (from 0% to 15%) (“No. Thank you. You’re so kind”), *nonperformative statement (no)+ adjuncts to refusal+ verbal avoidance* (from 0% to 10%) (No. Thanks. Let’s go to sleep”), *regret+ excuse* (from 25% to 5%). All these changing preferences were in line with native-speaker norms.

Another interesting point here was the single usage of the semantic formula of *nonperformative statement (no)*. While the EFLT (40%) and EFLC (50%) widely preferred this direct semantic formula in the pre-test the frequencies decreased to 5% for EFLT and 35% for EFLC in the post-test. The deviation between the two Turkish learner groups’ preferences can maintain the effect of the instruction through authentic material given to the treatment group.

4.3. Frequency analysis of pre-post tests in terms of Contextual Factors

In this section Frequencies of Cross-cultural variation in apology and refusal patterns of NES, EFLCs and EFLTs were analysed in terms of contextual factors of social status and social distance. Firstly, the results of pre-test were discussed and secondly, the comparison between the pre and post-test results were analysed in terms of using modification patterns in a detailed way.

4.3.1 Frequencies of contextual factors in Apology Situations (pre-test)

Situation 1: Apologizing to a familiar and higher status person

“A university student does not attend a course of a professor which he/she promised to deliver a lecture.

Situation 2: Apologizing to an unfamiliar and equal status person

“A university student steps on a fellow student’s foot”

Situation 3: Apologizing to a close and lower status person

“A person forgets to take his/her younger sister/brother to cinema”

Table 4.17 presents the frequency of semantic formulas used in apologizing to a higher/familiar, an equal/unfamiliar and a lower/close status/distance person in pre-test

Table 4.17 Frequency of semantic formulas in apologies (pre-test) Sit:1-2-3 Social Status/Social Distance

Semantic Formulas	NSE (n:10)						EFLC (n:20)						EFLT (n:20)					
	Higher/ Familiar (Sit1)		Equal Unfamiliar (Sit2)		Lower Close (Sit3)		Higher Familiar (Sit1)		Equal Unfamiliar (Sit2)		Lower Close (Sit3)		Higher Familiar (Sit1)		Equal Unfamiliar (Sit2)		Lower Close (Sit3)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
IFID	9	90	10	100	9	90	18	90	20	100	18	90	20	100	18	90	18	90
Explanation or Account	9	90	1	10	2	20	14	70	0	0	6	30	14	70	4	20	7	35
Explicit self-blame	2	20	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Expression of self-deficiency	3	30	2	20	3	30	0	0	2	10	7	35	1	5	1	5	9	45
Offer of repair	5	50	0	0	8	80	4	20	0	0	7	35	4	20	0	0	9	45
Promise of forbearance	4	40	0	0	2	20	0	0	1	5	4	20	2	10	1	5	2	10
Refusal to acknowledge guilt	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	30	0	0	0	0	7	35	0	0
Concern for the hearer	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	0	0
Lack of intent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	30	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0
Self-dispraise	3	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	20	1	5	1	5	7	35

From examining the data presented in Table 4.17 it was found that IFIDs appeared in all situations in rather high percentages for all the three groups. Yet, the difference occurred in using intensifiers in the first situation. The use of intensifier relates to social power between a speaker and a hearer: The lower the speaker's status, the more he/she intensifies his/her apology by using words like "really", "very", "so" and "terribly".

From the data in Table 4.17 it is clear that the subjects of NES used intensifiers most frequently in S1 (a student, a professor). On the other hand EFLC and EFLT used intensifiers less than the NESs in the pre-test of S1. Additionally, most of the native speakers apologized by using form of address such as "professor" and "sir" while none of the participants in EFL groups used a form of address.

The high frequency of the use of IFIDs were also observed in S2 (a student, a student) and S3 (an elder brother, a younger brother) for all the groups, however, instead of intensifiers for this time downgraders such as "just", "simply", "a little bit", "I think" were widely used especially in S3 by NES which is directly related to hearer's inferior status. It is also worth mentioning here that NES especially in S2 had utterances often starting with emotional exclamations (*Oh/Oh, my God/Lord.t~ Oh, no!*) whereas EFLs rarely used them.

When the contextual factor of social distance was taken into consideration, the form of addresses such as "honey" and "dear" were preferred by NES more than EFLT and EFLC for S3 where the hearer and speaker were siblings, which means a close relationship between the interlocutors. The results indicate that although the frequencies of Turkish EFL learners were in line with the NES in using the semantic formula of IFIDs in all the three situations, they lacked the sociopragmatic knowledge of using appropriate modifications.

The second highly preferred semantic formula *explanation or account* preferred by NES (90%) in S1 was used less frequently by EFLT and EFLC (70%), which means that social status plays a decisive role in speech act realization. Thus, they did not tend to give explanation when the hearer is lower or equal status person. The frequencies in using *explanation or account* for each group were as follows: 10% in S2, 20% in S3 by NES; 0% in S2, 30% in S3 by EFLC and 20% in S2, 35% in S3 by EFLT. Additionally,

NES used intensifiers while giving an explanation or excuse to a professor more than the EFL groups. (e.g. “I was *very* ill”, “I had a *terrible* cold”)

The semantic formula of *offer of repair* was used more frequently in S1 by NES (50%) when compared with that of EFLC (20%) and EFLT (20%) where the student apologizes to the professor. Interestingly, native speakers maintained an extremely high frequency of *offer of repair* in S3 (80%) whereas EFLC (35%) and EFLT (45%) deviated from native speaker norms. Unexpectedly, NES used this semantic formula in lower status person which may indicate that social distance and the severity of offense determine the choice of semantic formula instead of social status in apologizing to a younger brother/sister.

Other deviation between NES and EFL learner groups was found in the use of *expression of self-efficiency* especially in S1 where apologizing to a higher/familiar person with the frequency rates of 30% for NES, 0% for EFLC and 5% for EFLT. In S2 and S3 NES used downgraders more than the EFLC and EFLT such as “*I think* I forgot it.” “I’m *a little bit* late. Forgive me.” in S3 when apologizing to a lower status person.

Finally, according to the results of pre-test EFL learner groups preferred the semantic formula of *refusal to acknowledge guilt* (30% by EFLC and 35% by EFLT) in especially S2 while none of the NES participants used this impolite strategy in any situations.

The results derived from the pre-test concerning the contextual factors of social status and social distance can indicate that although the Turkish EFL learners had some similarities in using some of the semantic formulas such as *IFIDs* and *explanation or account*, they differ from the native speaker norms in using the appropriate intensifiers and downgraders and some other semantic formulas as a result of insufficient sociopragmatic knowledge of the target language.

4.3.2 Frequencies of contextual factors in Apology Situations (post-test)

Table 4.18 presents the frequency of semantic formulas used in apologizing to a higher/familiar, an equal/unfamiliar and a lower/close status/distance person in post-test.

Table 4.18 Frequency of semantic formulas in apologies post-test Sit:1-2-3 Social Status/Social Distance

Semantic Formulas	NSE (n:10)						EFLC (n:20)						EFLT (n:20)					
	Higher/ Familiar		Equal Unfamiliar		Lower Close		Higher Familiar		Equal Unfamiliar		Lower Close		Higher Familiar		Equal Unfamiliar		Lower Close	
IFID	9	90	10	100	9	90	18	90	20	100	19	95	18	90	20	100	12	60
Explanation or Account	9	90	1	10	2	20	15	75	1	5	7	35	18	90	6	30	4	20
Explicit self-blame	2	20	1	10	0	0	1	5	1	5	2	10	5	25	3	15	2	10
Expression of self-deficiency	3	30	2	20	3	30	1	5	2	10	7	35	4	20	6	30	17	85
Offer of repair	5	50	0	0	8	80	4	20	0	0	8	40	8	40	0	0	7	35
Promise of forbearance	4	40	0	0	2	20	0	0	1	5	5	25	4	20	0	0	11	55
Refusal to acknowledge guilt	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	30	0	0	1	5	10	50	0	0
Concern for the hearer	0	0	1	10	0	0	0	0	2	10	0	0	0	0	6	30	0	0
Lack of intent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	30	0	0	2	10	2	10	0	0
Expression of embarrassment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	2	10	0	0
Self-dispraise	3	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	20	1	5	1	5	7	35
Justify hearer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	15	3	15

The results derived from the post-test indicated that the highly use of IFIDs especially in S1 and S2 remained in the same percentages for the EFLC and EFLT when compared with the results of the pre-test. The only difference which can be mentioned here was the decrease in the frequency of IFID (from 90% to 60%) in S3 (apologizing to a lower status and close person) used by EFLT. Although this seems to be a deviation from the NES, the preference of intensifiers which was not parallel to the native speaker norms in the pre-test were frequently used by EFLT in the post-test. Especially in S1 (a student, a professor) where a speaker of lower social status has to apologize EFLT used the intensifiers such as “terribly”, “really” and “very” more than EFLC, which can be considered as an effect of using theater extracts instead of text-book material in teaching SAs.

Regarding the semantic formula of *explanations or accounts*, the data indicates that the native speakers in the situation of apologizing to a lower social status (like S1) tended to use this strategy more often than in the case when the speaker’s status is equal or high. Actually, the student who was unable to attend the course of a professor (S1) explained why he/she was absent in order to make a good excuse. From the data of the pre-test, it was found that almost all of the subjects used this strategy but the percentages of EFLC and EFLT were less than NES. It is important that EFLC percentages in using semantic formula of *explanations or accounts* in S1 raised from 70% to 90%, which is exactly similar with that of NES according to the results of the post-test. They also used intensifiers to support their excuses (e.g. “I am really sorry. I had a *terrible* cold so I couldn’t come *even* to the school”).

The third semantic formula of *explicit self-blame* which was not used by EFLT and EFLC in the pre-test increased to 25% in S1 and 15% in S2 for EFLT. Additionally, intensifiers were used with this semantic formula in S1 (a student, a professor) e.g. “I’m terribly sorry professor. It was *completely* my fault”. On the other hand, EFLC preferences of using this semantic formula were not changed significantly and none of the participants used intensifiers in S1.

The semantic formula of *offer of repair* which was not preferred by EFLC and EFLT as frequently as NES in the pre-test especially in S1 increased to 40% for EFLT and to 20% for EFLC in the post-test. These significant changing attitudes of EFLTs’

can be an indication of their raising awareness of contextual factors such as social status and social distance in the preference of semantic formulas because *offer of repair* is a compensation strategy and it is expected to be used while apologizing to a higher status person like S1. Moreover, EFLT used upgraders within this semantic formula similar to the native speakers such as. “*I’m sure that you won’t mind giving me another chance. I mean please let me compensate my mistake*” As understood from this example, they were able to elaborate their apologies in the post-test which is an indication of their sociopragmatic development.

Another compensation strategy of *promise of forbearance* used by 40 % of the NES in S1 was not preferred by EFL learner groups in any situations of the pre-test. Surprisingly, while the percentages did not change remarkably in S1 for the EFL learner groups only the EFLT’s preference of using this semantic formula raised from 10% to 55% in S3 of the post-test. Additionally, they preferred using intensifiers such as “believe me” which in fact seems more appropriate in S1 with a higher status person based on the NES norms. This can be the result of the Turkish culture, which is resistant to change. Thus, Native American speakers did not tend to use promise of forbearance in a situation where the interlocutors have a close social distance and the H is a lower social status unlike the Turkish EFL learners.

The same cultural factor can also be observed in the use of the semantic formula of *self dispraise*. While it was preferred by NES (30%) in S1 (a student, a professor), EFL learners tended to use this semantic formula in S3 where an elder brother apologizes to his younger brother because of breaking his promise instead of using it in S1. The percentages remained the same both for EFLC and EFLT when the results of pre and post-tests were compared. Thus, it could be claimed that some cultural behaviors did not change easily. Contrary to NES, EFL learners used intensifiers of “such”, “really” and “big” in S3 instead of S1 where the hearer is a higher status person and the severity of the offense was relatively higher within the semantic formula of *self dispraise*. (e.g. “I am a *big* dimwit!” “I’m *such* a dull”)

4.3.3. Frequencies of contextual factors in Refusal Situations (pre-test)

Situation 2: Refusing a suggestion of a familiar and a higher status person'

"A university student refuses his advisor's suggestion of taking an additional course"

Situation 3: Refusing a request of an unfamiliar and equal status person

"A university student refuses a solicitor's request of filling a questionnaire"

Situation 4: Refusing an offer of a close and lower status person

"A person refuses of his/her younger sister/brother's offer of a cup of tea"

Table 4.19 presents the frequency of semantic formulas used in refusals of suggestion, request, and offer from a higher/familiar, an equal/unfamiliar and a lower/close status/distance person in the pre-test.

The pre-test results maintained that NES used direct refusal formulas (i.e., ‘no’, negative willingness, and passive negative willingness) least frequently with a higher status person (30%), while EFLCs (30%) and EFLTs (50%) used them least frequently with an unfamiliar, equal status person. In terms of direct formulas, whereas EFL learner groups favored either *negative willingness* (e.g., “I can’t) or “no” as their choice of direct formulas in all the three situations, NES tended to use passive negative willingness (e.g., “It won’t be possible”) and never used “no” especially in S2(refusing a suggestion of a higher status person). Therefore, NES in general sounded less direct in their tone of refusals even when they were using direct refusal formulas than EFLs.

NES also used semantic formula of *regret* (50%) more frequently to a higher status person than did EFLC (5%) and EFLT (10%). Contrary to NES, EFLs used this semantic formula more frequently (65% for EFLC and 70% for EFLT) in S3 (refusing a request of an unfamiliar, equal status person). In addition, only NES used intensifiers such as “very”, “really” and “greatly” when they were expressing regret when refusing a suggestion of a higher status person (e.g., “I’m really sorry but...”). Moreover, NES used formulas that were rarely or never used by EFLs. For example, in refusing a higher status person’s suggestion, NES often used the address forms such as “Professor” and “Sir”, while EFLs rarely used them.

While both NES and EFLs used the semantic formula of *excuse, reason, explanation* with the highest frequencies in S3 (90% for NES and EFLC, 100% for EFLT) the difference was in the content. For example, in refusing a professor’s suggestion EFL learners typically referred to their lack of information about the suggested course (e.g., “ ...because I don’t know anything about English Literature” or “.....I think this course won’t be beneficial for me”) whereas NES usually referred to their already planned schedule (e.g. “.....since I’ve already planned the courses I’ll take this semester”). This means that NES elaborated their reasons more than did EFL learners although they used the same semantic formula with almost equal percentages.

In using the semantic formula of *statement of alternative preferences* of NES were higher than EFL learners. This formula was used only in S2 by all the participants with the frequencies of 40% for NES, 10% for EFLC and 5% for EFLT. Although they used the same semantic formula, they differed in the content of the given formula. For

example, EFL learners usually asserted their alternatives to the professor as in “I’ll take it in another semester” or “I can take another course”. However, NES usually sought the professor’s permission in an interrogative form in order to check if their alternatives were viable as in “Would it be possible if I could replace English Literature with another course?” and never used “no”.

NES also maintained an indefinite postponement (60%) much more frequently to S2 than S3 (20%) and S4 (40%) whereas EFLs rarely preferred it (EFLC 15% to S2 and EFLT 5% to S4). NES especially postponed the suggestion of the professor (S2) with the polite questions expressing their regret to the hearer (e.g., “Is it possible to take this course later?”) where as EFLs were more direct and more impolite (e.g., “I think it’s better to take it later”)

Contrary to all other indirect refusals, NES stated *positive opinion* and expressed gratitude more frequently in S4 (refusing a lower status, close person) (70%) than S2 (refusing a higher status person) (50%). The same semantic formula was used less frequently by EFLs. EFLC stated positive opinion in only S4 with the lowest frequency (5%) whereas EFLT used this semantic formula in S2 (10%) and in S4 (20%). These findings were in line with the study of Nelson *et al.* (1998) who reported that native English speakers expressed gratitude much more frequently than did Arabic speakers in refusing invitations, offers and suggestions. Similarly Liao and Bresnahan (1996) also reported that native speakers of English in their study of cross-cultural refusals stated positive feelings such as “I’d love to.....” much more frequently than did native speakers of Mandarin Chinese.

4.3.4. Frequencies of contextual factors in Refusal Situations (post-test)

Table 4.20 presents the frequency of semantic formulas used in refusing to a higher/familiar, an equal/unfamiliar and a lower/close status/distance person in the post-test.

The post-test results when compared with the results of the pre-test maintained that the EFLTs' use of direct refusal formulas (i.e., 'no', negative willingness, and passive negative willingness) decreased to 15% in S2 and increased to 90% in S4 that are closer to the native speaker norms. On the other hand, the frequencies of EFLC did not change significantly in all the three situations. In terms of direct formulas, whereas EFLC learner groups kept on using either *negative willingness* (e.g., "I can't") or "no" as their choice of direct formulas in all the three situations, EFLTs tended to use passive negative willingness (e.g., "It won't be possible") and gave up using "no" especially in S2 (refusing a suggestion of a higher status person). Therefore, EFLs came closer to NES in terms of being less direct in their tone of refusals even when they were using direct refusal formulas.

In using semantic formula of *regret* (apology) EFLT preferences were strikingly raised to 60% in S2 and decreased to 35% in S3 and 5% in S4 while the frequencies of EFLC did not change in S2 and S4. The only deviation in EFLCs was observed in S3 (unfamiliar, equal status person) parallel to NES. It is important that EFLTs favored using intensifiers such as "very", "really" and "terribly" when they were expressing their regret especially when refusing a suggestion of a higher status person (e.g., "I'm *terribly* sorry but..."). Moreover, they tended to use formulas that were rarely or never used in the pre-test. For example, in refusing a higher status person's suggestion, just like the NES, EFLT began to use the address forms such as "Professor" and "Sir" frequently, while EFLCs rarely used them.

Regarding the differences both in the frequencies and in the content of the use of the semantic formula of *excuse*, *reason*, *explanation* between NES and EFLs in the pre-test it could be said that the frequencies did not change remarkably in the post-test. However, EFLTs changed the content of their excuses sensitive to the status and distance of the hearer. For example, in refusing a professor's suggestion previously they referred to their lack of information about the suggested course (e.g., "...because I don't know anything about English Literature" or ".....I think this course won't be beneficial for me") but after the instruction given through drama extracts they tended to use more diverse and longer reasons. They cited their busy schedule instead of a

reaction about the course of “English Literature” as in the case of pre-test to explain their unavailability of accepting the suggestion by their advisor.

Other semantic formula was the *statement of alternative* used more widely by NES only in S2 in the pre-test. The results of the post-test maintained that both EFLCs (20%-5%) and EFLTs (25%-15%) stated alternatives in S3 and S4. Remarkably, not only the frequencies but also the content of stating alternatives of EFLTs’ was changed when we compared them with the pre-test results. For example, while they had asserted their alternatives to the professor with the statements reflecting their personal choices such as “I’ll take it in another semester” or “I can take another course”, they changed their attitudes towards expressing the hearer’s (in this case professor’s) power in selecting an alternative. (e.g. “Would you mind if I replace English Literature with another course?” or “Is it possible to take it next semester?”). Additionally only two EFLT learners said “no” whereas EFLCs’ preferences both in content and using “no” when stating an alternative in S2 did not change significantly. It is also interesting that EFLTs also used this semantic formula in S3(15%) and in S4 (10%) in the post-test unlike the pre-test which indicates that they became able to use more varied and mitigating formulas even in a situation where they refuse an equal or lower status person.

Another semantic formula which was preferred only by NES (20% in S2) in the pre-test was *acceptance functioning as a refusal* used by both of the EFLs (15% in S2) in the post-test. EFLCs’ using this semantic formula was interesting here as they improved their soci pragmatic knowledge throughout one academic semester even though they were not specifically instructed on this subject.

Another striking change in the preferences of EFLTs was observed in using the semantic formula of indefinite postponement which was widely used in all situations but not preferred by EFLs in the pre-test. The frequencies of the post-test maintained that the accumulation of EFLTs in the post-test was in line with the native speakers (60% in S2, 15% in S3 and 20 % in S4). They especially postponed the suggestion of the professor (S2) with polite questions expressing their regret to the hearer (e.g., “Is it possible to take this course later?”) whereas EFLCs were still more direct and more impolite (e.g., “I think it’s better to take it later”) as they were in the pre-test.

EFLT's expressing statement of positive opinion and gratitude remarkably rose especially in S4 when refusing an offer of a younger sibling (from 20% to 50%). They also emphasized their gratitude with forms of address such as "honey" or "dear" and then completed their utterances like "...it would be nice but..."

However the frequencies of EFLC in giving positive opinion did not change remarkably (5% in the pre-test, 20%) and this semantic formula was used only in S4. Thus, it could be deduced that EFLCs and EFLT's have significant differences in stating positive opinion in the post-test.

4.4. Learners' Evaluations of the Treatments and Language Learning

This section addresses the fifth research question (How do the students react to the teaching material and the instruction given during the lessons?). Results of learners' evaluations are reported here. The questions that learners answered covered their opinions about the SA lessons and testing as well as aspects of language learning. The evaluation form (see Appendix 9) was adapted from Lyster (1993). Each learner was given the questionnaire to rate the SA lessons and testing procedure. Space was also provided for learners to comment on the treatments and other issues related to language learning. Learners evaluated the following ten aspects of the (1) level of difficulty of theatre extracts; (2) level of difficulty of pre-, post-, tests; (3) interest level of SA lessons; (4) information learned about refusing and apologizing in English; (5) improved ability to refuse and apologize due to lessons; (6) usefulness of theatre extracts and treatment on apology and refuse; (7) usefulness of metapragmatic discussions; (8) helpfulness of pragmatic instruction; (9) helpfulness of theatre extracts; and (10) cultural aspects learned from theatre extracts. The means for all the answers were also calculated using a five-point scale. For instance, on the scale, the option of "Very Easy" was assigned the value of 1 while "Very Difficult" was assigned a 5. A total of twenty learners of the treatment group completed the questionnaires. Rating responses are discussed in this section in addition to comments that learners made on the open-ended questions. To show the number of learners who gave a particular response to an open-ended question, the responses were tabulated in a number of tables.

Learners' evaluations

In responding to the first question on the evaluation form regarding the level of difficulty of the lessons with drama extracts, 15 learners out of 20 in the treatment group indicated that the lessons with drama extracts were neither easy nor difficult and 3 learners said they were easy, as indicated in Table 4.21. Only 2 learners found it difficult.

Table 4.21 learners' evaluations of the SA lessons (1 = lowest rating, 5 = highest rating) in numbers

*N:20		Level of difficulty of theatre extracts	Level of difficulty of pre-post tests	Interest level of SA lessons	Information learned about refusing and apologizing in English	Treatments improved ability to refuse and apologize	Theatre extracts on apology and refusal useful	Meta-pragmatic discussion useful	Pragmatic Discussion helpful	Theatre extracts helpful	Cultural aspects learned from theatre extracts
		Q1 Learners	Q2 Learners	Q3 Learner	Q4 Learners	Q5 Learners	Q6 Learners	Q7 Learners	Q8 Learners	Q9 Learners	Q10 Learners
R A T I O N A L S	1	0	0	2	7	9	1	2	0	1	1
	2	3	3	12	13	10	2	2	0	2	3
	3	15	11	4	0	1	2	4	2	4	9
	4	2	6	1	0	0	12	10	8	11	4
	5	0	0	1	0	0	3	2	10	2	3

The second question asked about the level of difficulty of the pre- and post-tests (How would you rate the situations in the tests [pre-, post]?).

11 out of 20 indicated that the tests were neither easy nor difficult, and 6 learners thought they were difficult to perform. It may be just because of the elicitation technique used in the study. The tests used the format of role-plays; therefore, learners

had to produce their answers orally. This task was difficult for some of the learners, as reflected in their evaluation.

Question #3 queried learners about how interesting they found the lessons (How did you find the lessons?). Twelve out of 20 learners said they found the lessons interesting, 4 learners found them somewhat interesting, 1 found them a little interesting and 1 learner thought them not at all interesting (see Table 4.21). In the open-ended Question #13, most of the learners pointed out that the activity that most benefited them was the roleplays, while others indicated they liked the metapragmatic discussions. Of the two learners who indicated that the lessons were a little and not interesting at all, one of them wrote the following comment for Question #15 (Other comments): (4.27) “I found the lessons usually boring and uninvolved, plus it took class time away. Such as today, we should be studying for the final but are doing unrelated role-playing that has nothing to do, contextually speaking, with the final.”

Some other learners felt the lessons were interesting but thought that they took away class time. Example 4.27 shows what one of them wrote in response to Question #15:

“I felt that these lessons took away from our class time. They would be helpful lessons if taught under different circumstances. I would like to do this again.”

The fact that learners were not going to be tested on these lessons and that they did not count toward the final grade in the course reduced the level of interest and seriousness of some learners.

In response to Question #4 (Through these lessons, how much information did you learn about refusing and apologizing in English in an appropriate manner?), more than half of the learners 13 reported that these lessons helped them learn enough and 7 learners indicated that they helped them learn a lot about refusing and apologizing in English in an appropriate manner (see Table 4.21).

Question #5 asked learners if the lessons improved their pragmatic knowledge on refusing and apologizing in English (In your view, did the lessons in general help you improve your English in the area of knowing what is appropriate and what is not in

apologizing and refusing in English?). An overwhelming 19 out of 20 of the learners agreed that the lessons improved their ability to refuse and apologize in English. Only one learner indicated that the lessons did not help her at all. The same learner stated in the open-ended Question #15 her lack of interest in the lessons because they were not part of the course and, more precisely, because grades were not awarded for the tests that were taken in class.

As displayed in Table 4.21, responses to Question #6 show that 15 of the learners found the theater extracts useful in facilitating the acquisition of refusal and apology in English. Only one out of twenty learners did not find them useful at all and one found them a little useful. The reason could be that they understood nothing or little of some of the conversations in the extracts because few students indicated in the survey that some unknown vocabulary hindered their understanding of the extracts completely.

In response to Question #7, which queried learners about the usefulness of the metapragmatic discussions on the extracts, 2 out of 20 said they were completely useful, 10 learners reported that they were adequately useful and 4 learners felt that they were more or less useful while the 4 learners found them a little and not useful at all, which indicates that many learners found the discussion useful for learning the English speech acts of apologizing and refusing.

An overwhelming 18 out of 20 learners replied to Question #8 (Was the instructor's explanation of certain structures and [sociolinguistic] rules helpful?) as it was helpful. Only 2 learners said it was more or less helpful this indicates that pragmatic instruction by the teacher was effective in allowing the learners to acquire the pragmatic knowledge of refusing and apologizing in English.

Also, as to whether the theatre extracts were helpful (Question #9) or not, again, 17 learners answered affirmatively. This score confirms theatre extracts' usefulness in teaching speech acts.

The final evaluation question asked learners if the theatre extracts helped them to learn some aspects of the American culture and 3 learners said completely, 4 learners

mentioned adequately and 9 out of 20 felt that they were more or less helpful. Only one learner (see Table 4.21) did not find the extracts helpful.

The following discussion and tables examine the comments of the learners in response to the rest of the evaluation questionnaire (Questions 11-15). Some of these comments have been referred to in the rating questions (Questions 1-10) to support some of the answers.

In response to Question #11, Table 4.22 below presents various aspects of lessons that learners found difficult.

Table 4.22 Aspects of lessons difficult to understand as evaluated by learners (Question #11)

	ASPECTS OF LESSONS DIFFICULT TO UNDERSTAND	LEARNERS (n = 20)
i	Difficulty in understanding the context of the conversations in the extracts	6
ii	Difficult vocabulary in the extracts	5
iii	Using body language in role play activities	3
iv	Some of the apology strategies	3
v	No difficulty	2
vi	Some of the activities	1

As indicated in Table (4.22) 6 learners had difficulty in understanding the conversations in the extracts because they include some expressions which are culture specific. Five learners complained about the difficult vocabulary and expressions used in the extracts. Three learners said they had difficulty in using body language in role play activities since they require an ability of acting. Three learners mentioned that some indirect apology strategies e.g. *Refusal to acknowledge guilt*, *Denial of responsibility*, did not fit their understanding of apologizing.

Table 4.23 provides a tabulation of the responses of learners to Question #12 (What are some other aspects of English that you would like to learn?). Nine of the twenty learners

who answered this question wanted to learn everyday conversation with commonly used phrases, three preferred to learn slang and idioms and three wanted to learn more American culture.

Table 4.23 indicates other aspects in descending order.

Table 4.23 Other aspects of English that learners would like to learn

	OTHER ASPECTS OF ENGLISH	LEARNERS (n = 20)
i	Everyday conversation with commonly used phrases	9
ii	Slang, idioms	3
iii	More vocabulary	3
iv	More culture	3
v	Other SAs such as thanking, requesting etc.	1
vi	Oral proficiency	1

Question #13 asked learners to indicate the activity that most benefited them and the one that was least beneficial to them. Tables 4.24 and 4.25 display the responses of learners.

Table 4.24 Activity that was most beneficial as evaluated by learners (Question #13)

	MOST BENEFICIAL ACTIVITY	LEARNERS (n = 20)
i	Metapragmatic discussion after reading theatre extracts	9
ii	Role-plays	7
iii	Writing their own conversation in a given situation	2
iv	Reading theatre extracts	2

A majority of the learners who answered Question #13 felt that the activity that most benefited them was the metapragmatic discussions, followed by the role-plays. As shown in Table 4.24, the activity that least benefited learners by their own evaluation was reading theatre extracts. As some of the learners noted in their evaluations, they had difficulty understanding the context of the conversations because of the difficult vocabulary and some cultural aspects. It is not surprising, therefore, that these two learners who answered Question #13 indicated that reading theatre extracts benefited them the least.

Table 4.25 Activity that was least beneficial as evaluated by learners (Question #13)

	LEAST BENEFICIAL ACTIVITY	LEARNERS (n = 20)
i	Writing dialogue for a given situation	8
ii	Reading theatre extracts	7
iii	Identification of the strategies used in the extracts	3
iv	Role-plays	2

Question #14 asked for suggestions to improve the lessons. Only fifteen learners answered this question, of which five learners suggested that more time should be spent on metapragmatic discussions. The second suggestion most cited was to have some videos representing real conversations which they can observe the non-verbal language as well as verbal language in performing speech acts.

Table 4.26 shows the rest of the suggestions.

Table 4.26 Suggestions for improving the lessons (Question #14)

	SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING LESSONS	LEARNERS (n = 15)
i	More time on metapragmatic discussions	5
ii	Have some videos representing real conversations	4
iii	More speaking and interaction	2
iv	Spend more time on vocabulary	1
v	Have native speakers come and interact with learners	1
vi	Make situations more interesting and authentic	1
vii	Do more written activities	1

The last evaluation question (Question #15) asked learners to list other comments they had on the lessons, which was answered by only 14 learners. According to Table 4.27 seven out of fourteen of these learners commented that the lessons were very useful. One comment lauded pragmatic instruction as very effective. One learner said that he liked the idea of using theatre extracts as an instructional tool. Another comment said that the role-plays were very useful.

There were three learners who had a negative attitude toward the lessons. They made comments like “lessons are usually boring,” “complete waste of time,” and “did not learn anything;” “class time was taken away by doing these lessons.” These responses were not surprising because these learners believed that since they were not receiving credit for the work that they did for these lessons, it was a waste of time to focus their energy on them.

Table 4.27 displays a summary of the comments.

Table 4.27 Other comments

	OTHER COMMENTS	LEARNERS (n = 15)
i	More time on metapragmatic discussions	5
ii	Have some videos representing real conversations	4
iii	More speaking and interaction	2
iv	Spend more time on vocabulary	1
v	Have native speakers come and interact with learners	1
vi	Make situations more interesting and authentic	1
vii	Do more written activities	1

Even though some of the learners found the theatre extracts and the tests to be difficult, these problems did not affect their interest in the SA lessons. In fact, more than half of these learners indicated that the lessons helped them to learn the appropriate way to refuse and apologize in English and that they also learned some cultural aspects of America from the theatre extracts. Also, more than half indicated that metapragmatic discussion was helpful to them. Most of the learners indicated that the lessons actually improved their ability to refuse and apologize appropriately.

4.5 Summary of the chapter

The data for this investigation were analyzed and the results were presented in this chapter. Each of the three groups' performance on the SA tests was evaluated. The evaluation focused on semantic formulas and combinations in different contextual situations used by American native speakers of English and Turkish learners of English as a foreign language in apologizing and refusing in English. It was aimed to compare EFLs and NESs in terms of the frequency and the content of semantic formulas to see if any growth in pragmatic competence occurred in the areas mentioned above. Since each of the Turkish EFL group was exposed to different treatments with different materials during the period of one semester, comparisons were made between these two groups to see if there were any significant differences in the way each group acquired pragmatic

competence in the SA of apologizing and refusing according to the baseline data gathered from native speakers of English. In comparing the post-test with the pre-test statistical results on EFLC's and EFLT's improvement in pragmatic competence, it was observed that EFLT improved significantly in refusing and apologizing in terms of the use of appropriate SAs in line with native speaker norms.

The reason for this difference between these two EFL groups is attributed to the different treatments through different materials to which these groups were exposed. EFLT was exposed to the theatre extracts as an authentic material, metapragmatic discussion, and pragmatic instruction, whereas EFLC was exposed only to text-book material with explicit pragmatic instruction. The results of the pre-test indicated that NES and EFLs displayed variation which can be caused by cross-cultural differences or lack of sociopragmatic knowledge.

In the post-test data for EFLT, the statistical results showed significant improvements not only using more varied and complex utterances but also using semantic formulas and combinations of refusing and apologizing in various situations. In terms of contextual factors such as social status and social distance, the frequency results of the pre-test were in line with Bebe *et al.* (1990). They reported that both Japanese learners of English and native speakers of Japanese tended to respond differently to higher versus lower status interlocutors, while native speakers of English were sensitive to status equals versus status unequals (higher and lower). Parallel to the Beebe's findings Turkish EFL learners in the present study did not seem to be particularly sensitive to one certain status and distance versus another across different situations (i.e., requests, invitations, offers and suggestions in refusals). In general, according to the pre-test results NES tended to have more diverse and longer reasons than did EFL learners. Considering the post –test results of refusal strategies it may be claimed that EFLTs tended to take a more mitigating and sensitive approach in dealing with a higher status person than with other status types after the treatment with theatre extracts. Evidence for EFLTs' sensitivity as well as EFLCs' non-sensitivity to a particular status and distance may be found in the relative frequency of mitigating formulas used to a higher status person. Upon examining the total number of uses of each semantic formula of the post-test, EFLTs stated positive feelings, apologized, and elaborated their reasons significantly more frequently to a higher status person than they

used them in the pre-test while EFLCs did not shift the frequency of these formulas noticeably according to status and distance of the interlocutors neither in the pre nor in the post-test. In addition, while EFLTs learned using intensifiers such as “very”, “really” and “greatly” in expressing their regret when refusing a suggestion of a familiar, higher status person after the instruction with authentic material, EFLCs rarely used them without any sensitivity to the status and distance of the hearer as they did in the pre-test.

However, there were some cross-cultural differences between Turkish EFL learners and native speakers of English found in the use of some semantic formulas which were resistant to change in spite of the instruction and the material used to teach them the appropriate SA manners of English.

When the frequencies of the semantic formulas used in apologizing in the pre-test were analysed, the responses of the three groups of speakers to the situations under analysis (S1-S2-S3-S4) display similarities in the strategy choice: they all regularly used IFIDs, offer help, express concern and, as it is labeled in the model, take on responsibility. Still, on a more detailed level of description, very definite preferences, language-specific 'styles', can be observed in how speakers cope with the offended party in the examined situation.

In all three groups, the 'remedial action' starts with an IFID. The NES group, as expected, consequently uses an expression of regret, but always preceded by intensified adverbials (*I'm so/ terribly/ really sorry*). The utterances often start with emotional exclamations (*Oh/Oh, my God/Lord.t~ Oh, no!*), and in a number of cases especially in S1 where the H is a higher status person the IFID is repeated twice. In English, as has been demonstrated by many researchers (e.g. Holmes, 1990; Owen, 1983), the overwhelming expression is one of regret (*I'm sorry*), with few cases left to *excuse me*, and sporadic cases of *forgive me* or *I apologize*, the latter being used more in written apologies. The IFIDs are the strategies which are the most conventionalized and routinized, being as it were in the center of the speech act category of apologizing and representing verbal routines or syntactic-semantic formulae (Owen, 1983: 172) which are regularly used to fulfill a specific communicative function. In this study generally the findings of using the IFIDS in the pre-test show that, as for the modification

(upgrading) of the IFID, the English group resorts to it most often, the Turkish EFLs less frequently.

If this data of the pre-test on the assumption that the strategies like self-dispraise, non-intentionality, or self-deficiency (here labeled as 'self'-strategies) express responsibility is interpreted, then it may be claimed that the Turkish EFL group is not keen on taking responsibility as much as American native speakers of English. This seems somewhat counter-intuitive, as we feel that, for example, the intensified expression of regret or an expression of concern partly performs this job. Rather, the (dis)preference for the self-strategies should be seen as motivated by deeper cultural attitudes related to public self-exposure of an individual. Admitting one's deficiency can be quite embarrassing, discrediting, and ultimately unnecessary in a society that values personal preserves and egalitarianism. For the same reasons, there is a high expectation of consideration for others and their 'personal preserves', although within the limits of non-imposition on H's privacy.

The analysis of post-test results in apology situations revealed that using theatre extracts is more effective in teaching SAs than using text-book material since EFLTs reached the standards of NES in most of the situations especially in using appropriate modification patterns sensitive to contextual factors.

Also analyzed in this chapter are data from the evaluation form. This form contained responses from learners to questions about the quality of the SA lessons and tests given in this study. The opinions were mixed. For some learners, unknown vocabulary posed the most difficulty; however, most of the learners added that the theatre extracts were useful in helping learners to acquire pragmatic and cultural knowledge. Most of the learners also felt that the tests were difficult since they had to perform oral role-plays. Some of the learners offered some suggestions as to how to improve the lessons and tests in the future.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter reviews the effects of the use of an authentic material of theatre extracts supported with metapragmatic discussion, and pragmatic instruction on teaching of the SA of English apologies and refusals found in the study in a number of ways. Section 5.1 discusses the findings of this investigation with relation to the research questions. Section 5.2 addresses the pedagogical implications of this study for EFL and Section 5.3 examines effect of theatre extracts and textbook material, and pragmatic instruction on communicative competence. In Section 5.4 other aspects that also deserve to be explored in future investigations are outlined together with the final remarks of the researcher.

5.1 Discussions of Findings and Research Questions

This study investigated the hypothesis that theatre extracts together with metapragmatic discussion and pragmatic instruction, facilitates the acquisition of pragmatic competence in the English speech act of apologizing and refusing. Data were collected from the native speakers of English (as a baseline data) and two Turkish EFL learner groups. The frequency analysis of semantic formulas preferred by each group in the pre-and post-test were compared with each other.

The first two research questions for this investigation concerned with the preferences of native speakers of English and Prep-school learners of Gazi University Foreign Languages Department (EFL) in expressing themselves in various apology and refusal situations in the pre-test.

The pre-test results indicated that non-native speakers produced *fewer components* and less varied *semantic formulas* of the speech act sets of refusal and

apology than their native speaker counterparts. Additionally, the *quality of the components* of the speech act sets produced by non-native speakers was in most of the situations less appropriate than those produced by native speakers, which means that they were not sensitive to some contextual factors such as social distance and power. Few or no modifiers were used especially in the cases of higher status person where native speakers used a number of them to mitigate the face threat.

The main research topic of this study was whether non-native speakers were well practiced in apologies and refusals, or had acquired the semantic formulae for the speech acts, or were able to rely upon their first languages to combine common parts of the speech act set, they generally produced the same components as the native speakers. Kasper and Schmidt (1996) who studied the function of instruction on SA realizations also found that both intermediate and advanced learners use the same realization strategies as native speakers after instruction.

In the light of these findings, we hypothesized that it is possible that the non-native speaker subjects (EFLT) could acquire a higher level of pragmatic fluency due to having an instruction through authentic material, namely, theatre extracts in this case, whereas EFLC learners who have an instruction through text book material could not improve their pragmatic fluency. This is in line with the study of Bardovi-Harlig and Dornyei (1998) who argued that the impression of linguistic and phonological fluency may not be achieved simultaneously with pragmatic fluency, which is more likely acquired in the target language culture rather than one's first language culture.

Thus, learners in EFLT who was given a pragmatic instruction through theatre extracts showed significant improvement in the post-test results in using appropriate English apology and refusal SAs with more varied and complex semantic formulas. They also gained sensitivity to contextual factors of social status and social distance. They became able to use modification patterns regarding the hearer's position and the offense of the situation. This significant development of pragmatic competence in the post-test results was most likely due to the input from the theatre extracts, the metapragmatic discussion, and the pragmatic instruction that they received from the instructor, which responds the third and fourth research questions.

The fifth research question touched on the possibility of differences between the two EFL groups (control and treatment) in their awareness of appropriate apologies and refusals in the post-test. Parallel to the other studies the post-test results showed that learners in the traditional teacher-fronted language classroom with text-book material (EFLC) did not show any significant improvement in using appropriate speech acts at the end of the term when compared with the preferences of the EFLTs. Their lack of acquisition of pragmatic knowledge was probably due to using text-book material which is insufficient in representing various apology and refusal semantic formulas.

The last research question examined EFLTs' evaluations of the teaching material (theatre extracts) and the instruction given during the lessons. The students were asked to fill in an evaluation form at the end of the lessons. The analysis of the forms indicated that even though some of the learners found the theatre extracts and the tests to be difficult, these problems did not affect their interest in the SA lessons. In fact, more than half of these learners stated that the lessons helped them to learn the appropriate way to refuse and apologize in English and that they also learned some cultural aspects of America from the theatre extracts. Also, more than half indicated that metapragmatic discussion was helpful to them. Most of the learners mentioned that the lessons actually improved their ability to refuse and apologize appropriately. The most beneficial activity according to the learners was role-play activities.

Finally, video recordings analysed by the instructor at the end of the term to observe the reactions of the learners and the metapragmatic discussion that took place during each lesson. The aim of video-tape recordings was to observe the courses and students' reactions carefully since the instructor was the researcher at the same time in this study and there was a possibility of some unnoticed points during the lessons.

The observations of recordings indicated that they attended the metapragmatic discussions and activities with great interest. It is worth mentioning here that they tried to use non-verbal language in role-play activities.

5.2. Pedagogical Implications

It is maintained that the findings reported above have useful implications for the design of future generations of language pedagogical materials. In addition to lexical and grammatical specifications, language teaching syllabuses should incorporate information on the commonest conversational routines used for realizing speech acts. Data from corpus research are needed to identify functional and discoursal idiosyncrasies of recurrent speech acts in the target language (see also Koester, 2002).

Curriculum developers are responsible for making the students aware that many elements of the language they are learning are of repetitive and predictable nature. Approaching the development of communicative skills in this way would be beneficial shortcuts for those in the process of language acquisition. Another recommendation is that language teaching materials should include an appropriate weight of activities aimed at both consciousness raising and production. Consciousness raising tasks can include exercises based on samples of authentic or specially written conversations that illustrate the different conversational routines and strategies used in the realization of typical speech acts, whereas tasks that seek to improve production skills can employ natural conversations as a baseline and integrate a variety of role-play experiments to monitor the students' performance in comparison to that of the native speakers.

Contrastive information highlighting the differences between speech acts in English and the students' mother tongue plays a crucial role in distinguishing which situations call for particular verbal strategies in respective communities, and represents another step for modeling a comprehensive syllabus that would allow students to put their communicative skills into real-life practice.

This study illuminates several areas where ESL/EFL students might appear inappropriate (i.e., confrontational, presumptuous, vague) when apologizing or refusing. To help our students achieve optimal pragmatic success, teachers need to make students aware of specific *speech act sets* and the accompanying *linguistic features* that are necessary to produce appropriate and well-received refusals, apologies, and other important speech acts. Non-native speakers, especially those with little opportunity for interaction, may not have knowledge of the routine of semantic formulae, or may not

have internalized such rules to adequately produce them in spontaneous speech (Kasper, 1997), and textbooks are generally not a good source of input for students when studying pragmatic functions (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001).

The teaching of pragmatics in the language classroom enhances the objectives of communicative methodology by providing learners with additional contexts to understand and acquire TL forms. The acquisition of pragmatic competence seems to be a very difficult task; however, following Pearson (2001), if instruction in pragmatics is started at the earliest levels of L2 learning along with instruction in grammar and vocabulary, learners should be able to develop pragmatic competence in conjunction with other areas of linguistic competence. Many studies have dealt with the importance of pragmatic ability in L2 learners, pointing out the likelihood that these learners lapse unconsciously into the norms of their L1 culture and language and cause unintended offenses if they do not pay conscious attention to the relevant sociocultural factors in a given context (e.g., House and Kasper, 1981; Thomas, 1983; Holmes and Brown, 1987). It is therefore important for L2 teachers to help learners to develop “metapragmatic ability –the ability to analyze language in a conscious manner” (Thomas, 1983: 98). This knowledge should make the acquisition process of pragmatics easier for learners because they will understand the reasons for their choice of pragmatic strategies and the implications and consequences.

On the other hand, learners in a foreign language setting have very few opportunities to be exposed to authentic input or to interact with speakers of the TL outside the classroom (Tateyama et al., 1997). Taking these constraints into consideration through instruction learners may be provided with the three necessary conditions for pragmatics learning, namely input, output and feedback (Kasper 2001), an issue that has been considered in the present study. Therefore, relevant input might be brought into the classroom by means of some authentic materials. Apart from the theatre extracts used in the present study, videotaping authentic conversations, using scenes from various films or recording television sitcoms (Grant and Starks, 2001; Rose, 2001; Washburn, 2001; Koester, 2002). In this way different activities could be prepared on the basis of this material with the aim of raising learners’ pragmatic awareness about pragmlinguistic and sociopragmatic aspects of the TL. Indeed, the issue of developing learners’ pragmatic awareness has been claimed as one of the main

goals of the instruction in pragmatics (Bardovi-Harlig and Mahan-Taylor, 2003), since it is related to the concept of noticing (Schmidt, 1995). Apart from awareness, it is also important to develop activities that elicit learners' production, as this is concerned with the second condition for language learning, namely output. Consequently, opportunities for communicative practice are also required to develop pragmatic ability in the FL classroom. In this study, role-plays were used which have been widely employed in previous studies (Trosborg, 1995, 2003; Safont 2001), although other productive activities like those of simulation or drama may also be employed (Kasper, 1997).

In addition to relevant input and opportunities for output, the third condition for language learning, i.e. feedback, might also be considered in promoting FL learners' pragmatic competence. By giving them feedback, learners may also be made aware of their pragmatic failures and, thus, be provided with opportunities to notice the appropriate pragmatic aspects of the TL.

5.3. Effects of Theatre Extracts and Text-book Material

This study has also tried to demonstrate the wide range of possibilities of using theatre extracts to raise learners' pragmatic awareness and to elicit pragmatic production. In spite of the fact that communicative methods have become very popular in language pedagogy, many language textbooks still follow a sequence of grammatical structures. The textbook used by the learners in this study contains grammatical structures, cultural information, and communicative activities; however, there are no specific activities geared toward helping learners to acquire pragmatic knowledge. Most of the apologies and refusals in the textbook used in the Prep-schools of Gazi University were found in different exercises, reading texts and in the conversations of the listening parts. In the exercises and the reading texts, only a few instances were encountered in isolated sentences and in rewriting or transformation exercises, since no examples of natural conversations were found in the book examined. The analysis of the text-book used by the learners in this study also seems to indicate that refusals and apologies in this textbook are mostly performed by means of direct strategies (especially using IFIDS for apologies and performative refusals). This overreliance on direct semantic formulas as a main apology and refusal strategy, as well as its de-contextualised presentation, clearly reduce learners' exposure to SAs of refusals and apologies in real-life conversations and

limit learners' pragmatic development. In contrast, refusals and apologies in the theatre extracts analysed appear highly contextualised and show a wider variety of linguistic formulae. On the whole, the use of input from theatre extracts as authentic and motivating classroom material provides a natural use of language and can be regarded as an ideal source to raise learners' awareness of important pragmatic variables, such as setting, speaker's intentions, participants' relationship and social background, politeness, etc.

To sum up, results provide some evidence of the inappropriate pragmatic presentation in these exam-oriented textbooks FL learners are exposed to, particularly in the realization of the speech act of refusals and apologies and the difference between direct, indirect and conventionally indirect refusal and apology strategies. The use of theatre extracts in the classroom, on the other hand, offers learners a great potential value to develop their pragmatic competence, since it provides instances of real language use in a variety of contexts.

Theatre extracts as representational texts are considered a very useful tool that can provide very valuable information on TL pragmatics for L2 learners for teaching speech acts regarding the values and uses of drama pointed out by the writers such as Maley, and Duff, (1978) and Wessels, (1987) who emphasized that authentic foreign language with theatre extracts can show learners different L2 registers and cultural contexts.

The lessons used in this study tried to help learners to acquire pragmatic competence. Another way to foster pragmatic awareness suggested by researchers such as Carel (1999) and Overfield (1996) is training learners in ethnographic observation. In addition to explaining the pragmatic aspects of the video scenes, the teacher also directed learners' attention to aspects of TL pragmatics in class discussions and role-play practice.

Thus, taking into account that textbooks (i) do not provide real-life exemplification, and (ii) present isolated examples; and also that we as the foreign language teachers should aim at prompting genuine speech, and (ii') teaching

pragmatics -with an explicit focus on the realisation of speech acts -, we propose a few tasks that provide the following features:

- (i) real-world use of language (authentic input),
- (ii) innovative teaching (stimulating pedagogical tools), and
- (iii) excellent input to work with (offering different possibilities to create and adapt tasks according to the course's aims, time available or students' level).

Apart from the suggestions for the foreign language teachers, this study has also implications for the textbook developers. Textbooks need to acknowledge that cultural differences exist at the sociopragmatic as well as the pragmalinguistic level and they need to make these differences noticeable

5.4. Future Researches

Since there has been a limited number of studies on teaching speech acts to Turkish EFL learners, it should be interesting to analyse whether the selection of other SAs would lead us to obtain similar results. The teachability of other speech acts and pragmatic features could be examined by employing the same materials and approaches or by using different materials and approaches.

In the present study small number of theatre extracts and textbooks were analysed, and the findings cannot be extrapolated to other pragmatic aspects, since we have only focused on apologies and refusals. This information could then be used to craft methodologies to use in teaching pragmatics in the language classroom. Consequently, future studies may need to investigate these issues involving a larger number of materials and other pragmatic-discourse aspects that might affect learners' pragmatic competence.

An interesting contextual variable that future research may include is gender. An examination of how it interacts with other variables such as topic and the status of the addressee in an advice situation will produce much valuable data. Studies have shown that gender plays an important role in interacting with other variables in compliment and compliment response behavior (Holmes, 1988; Wolfson, 1989b). In analyzing the data for this study, it was noted that, in most of the pragmatic areas, women performed

better than men in refusing and apologizing. Reasons that account for this observation are not offered here because gender was outside the scope of the study.

Similarly, age and proficiency should have also been taken into account, which means that we do not know how younger, older, beginner or advanced learners would have performed in a similar way after receiving the instruction. Consequently, there is a need for further research that examines the influence of these and other individual variables such as motivation or social and psychological distance (Kasper and Rose, 2002) on the teachability of pragmatic competence.

In this study, as it was mentioned in the limitations (see Chapter 1), the teacher of the treatment and the control group was not the same person. Thus, although the teacher of the control group was specifically explained not to deal with any extra practice or material related to pragmatic issues except using the text-book material within the standard curriculum, her personality as well as her teaching style may have had an effect on learners' participation and motivation towards the activities implemented in the classroom. It would be interesting whether any differences between the two teachers' styles could have affected our findings. Additionally, this issue related to the influence that a particular teacher's style may have on learners' pragmatic performance should also be investigated in future pragmatic interventional studies.

Moreover, it is possible to make use of a delayed post-test in order to determine whether learners' gains in their pragmatic behavior had been retained some time after the instructional period took place which was not used in the present study. In this sense, we agree with Kasper and Rose (2002) in that further research should be carried out into the analysis of the long-term effects of instruction maybe with theatre extracts or any other authentic material by adopting the use of a delayed post-test as part of the research design features.

In conclusion, despite the above limitations, the present study has contributed to the growing body of research investigating the effects of instruction through authentic material-theatre extracts- on pragmatics and has widened the range of learning target features by focusing on the speech act of apologies and refusals. Moreover, it has also shed some more light on the effectiveness of different teaching approaches and

materials in developing learners' pragmatic competence in the EFL classroom. Finally, we have also offered a number of fresh insights into research methodology by elaborating and employing different data collection instruments. However, research on the effect of teaching is still limited and controversial (Kasper and Rose, 2002). Although most studies suggest that the teaching of pragmatics is beneficial for foreign language learners, the literature is still in its infancy. Thus the results obtained in this study, although tentative, may expand the scope of enquiry in the field of interlanguage pragmatics as well as opening several lines of investigation to be examined in future research. Only after more knowledge on interlanguage pragmatics is available will it be able to affect foreign language curricula.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Akmajian, A., Demers, R. A., & Harnish, R.M. (1979). *Linguistics: An Introduction to Language and Communication*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Al-Zumor, Abdul Wahid, 2003. *Apologies in Arabic and English: an inter-language and cross-cultural study*. Retrieved May 13th, 2003. <http://www.lboro.ac.uk/departments/ea/politeness/apologiesinarabicandenglish.htm>.
- Arthur, P. (1999). Why use video? A teacher's perspective. *VSELT*, 2:4.
- Atay, Derin. (1996). *The Teaching of Complex Speech Act Behavior: The Case of Requests*. M.A. Thesis. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University.
- Bachman, Lyle F. (1990). *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. [Oxford English]. Oxford, etc.: Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, Lyle F. and Palmer, Adrian S. (1996). *Language Testing in Practice* [Oxford Applied Linguistics]. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M (1986). The problem of speech genres. In: Emerson, C. and Holquist, M., Editors, *Speech genres and other late essays*, University of Texas Press, Austin, TX, pp. 60–102 Trans. V.W. McGee .
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1996). Pragmatics and language teaching: Bringing pragmatics and pedagogy together. In: Bouton, L.F. (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning*, vol. 7. University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL, pp. 21–39.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1999). Exploring the interlanguage of interlanguage pragmatics: A research agenda for acquisitional pragmatics. *Language Learning* 49: 677- 713.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.). *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. (pp.13-33). Cambridge University Press.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. & Dörnyei, Z. (1997). *Pragmatic awareness and instructed L2 learning:an empirical investigation*. Paper presented at the AAAL 1997 Conference, Orlando.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. (1990). Congruence in native and nonnative conversations: Status balance in the academic advising session. *Language Learning*, 40, 467-501.

- Bardovi-Harlig, K., Hartford, B.A.S., Mahan-Taylor, R., Morgan, M. J., & Reynolds, D.W. (1991). Developing pragmatic awareness: Closing the conversation. *ELT Journal*, 45, 4-15.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor. (2003). *Teaching Pragmatics*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of State Office of English Language Programs. Retrieved May 16th, 2005 <http://exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/pragmatics.htm>
- Barron A. (2003). *Acquisition in Interlanguage Pragmatics. Learning how to do things with words in a study abroad context..* Philadelphia, PA, USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company. p.16. Retrieved July, 2007
<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/gazi/Doc?id=10032036&ppg=315>
- Bataineh, R. F. and Batanieh, R. F. (2006). Apology Strategies of Jordanian EFL University Students. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 38: 1901-1927.
- Beebe, L. M., & Cummings, M. C. (1985). *Speech act performance: A function of the data collection procedure?* Paper presented at the TESOL Convention, New York.
- Beebe, L. and T. Takahashi. (1989) Sociolinguistic variation in face-threatening speech Acts: Chastisement and disagreement. In M. Eisenstein (ed.) *The Dynamic Interlanguage: Empirical Studies in Second Language Variation*. (pp. 199-218). New York: Plenum Press.
- Beebe, L.M., Takahashi, T., and Uliss-Weltz, R. (1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R.C. Scarcella, E.S. Anderson, and S.D. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55-94). New York: Newbury House Publishers.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning to say what you mean in a second language: A study of the speech act performance of learners of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics*, 3, 29-59.
- Blum-Kulka, S. (1987). Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different? *Journal of Pragmatics*. 11, 131-146.
- Blum-Kulka, S., & House, J. (1989). Cross-cultural and situational variation in requesting behavior. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 123-154). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

- Blum-Kulka, S. & Olshtain, E. (1984). Requests and apologies: a crosscultural study of speech act realization patterns (CCSARP). *Applied Linguistics* 5, 196–213.
- Boxer, D. (2003). Critical issues in developmental pragmatics. In A. Martinez-Flor, E. Uso and A. Fernandez (eds.), *Pragmatic competence in foreign language teaching*. Castello: Servei de Publicacions de la Universitat Jaume I. pp.45-67.
- Boxer, D. & Pickering, L. (1995). Problems in the presentation of speech acts in ELT material: the case of complaints. *ELT Journal*. 49/1. Oxford University Press.
- Bouton, L. F. (1994). Conversational implicature in the second language: Learned slowly when not deliberately taught. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 22, 157-67.
- Brown, J. D. (2001). *Using surveys in language programs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, S. & Attardo, S. (2000). *Understanding Language Structure, Interaction, and Variation: An Introduction to Applied Linguistics and Sociolinguistics for Nonspecialists*. Michigan University Press, Michigan.
- Brumfit, C. (1985) *Language and Literature Teaching: From Practice to Principle*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Burton, D. (1980). *Dialogue and Discourse: A Sociolinguistic Approach to Modern Drama Dialogue and Naturally Occurring Conversation*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. Richards and R. Schmidt (eds.). *Language and Communication [Applied Linguistics and Language Study]*, J. C., London, etc.: Longman. (pp:2-27).
- Canale, Michael and Swain, Merrill. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and Testing. *Applied Linguistics* 1 (1): 1- 47.
- Canning-Wilson, C. (2000). Practical aspects of using video in the foreign language classroom. *The Internet TESL Journal*, vol. VI:11.
- Carel, S. (1999). Developing awareness of French pragmatics: A case study of students' interactive use of a foreign language multimedia program. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 20, 11-23.

- Carrell, P. (1979). Indirect speech acts in ESL: Indirect answers. In C. Yorio, K. Perkins, & J. Schacter (Eds.), *The learner in focus*. Pp. 297-307. *Washington, DC: TESOL*. 79, 297-307
- Carrell, P. (1981). Relative difficulty of request forms in L1/L2 comprehension. In M. Hines & W. Rutherford (Eds.). *Washington, DC: TESOL*. 81, 141-152.
- Chen, R. (1993). Responding to compliments: A contrastive study of politeness strategies between American English and Chinese speakers. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 20: 49-75.
- Chomsky, Noam. (1957). *Syntactic Structures*. Mouton.
- Chomsky, Noam. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* [Special Technical Report of the Research Laboratory of Electronics of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology 11]. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cohen, A. D. (1996). Speech acts. In N. H. Hornberger, & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language teaching* (pp. 383-420). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, A. D. & Olshtain, E. (1981). Developing a measure of socio-cultural competence: the case of apology. *Language Learning* 31, 113-134.
- Cohen, A. D., & Olshtain, E. (1993). The production of speech acts by EFL learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 33-56.
- Collie, J and Slater, S. (1987). *Literature in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cordella, M. (1990). Apologizing in Chilean Spanish and Australian English: a cross-cultural perspective. *ARAL Series* (5) 66-92.
- Coulmas, F. (Ed.). (1981). *Conversational routine: Explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Coulthard, M. & Montgomery, M. (1981). *Studies in Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge
- Crandall K. P., E. & Basturkmen, H. (2004). Evaluating pragmatics-focused materials. *ELT Journal*. 58(1): 38-49.
- Darby, B.W. & Schlenker, B.R. (1982). Children's reactions to apologies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 43, 742-753.

- Darby, B. W. & Schlenker, B. R. (1989). Children's reactions to transgressions: effects of the actor's apology, reputation and remorse. *British Journal of Social Psychology*. 28, 353–364.
- Decoo, W. (1996). The induction-deduction opposition: Ambiguities and complexities of the didactic reality. *Iral*. 34, 95-118.
- Demeter, G. (2007). Symposium article: Role-plays as a data collection method for research on apology speech acts. *Simulation and Gaming*. 38:1, 83-90
- Dimitracopoulou, I. (1990). *Conversational Competence and Social Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Doughty, C., (2003). Instructed SLA: Constraints, compensation, and enhancement. In: Doughty, M.H., Long, M.H. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*. Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 256–310.
- Durang, C. (1990). *Christopher Durang Explains It All for You*. Grove Weidenfeld-New York.
- El-Shazly, A. (1993). *Requesting strategies in American English, Egyptian Arabic and English as spoken by Egyptian second language learners*. M.A. Thesis, Cairo: American University.
- Ellis, R. (1992). Learning to communicate: A study of two language learners' requests. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 14(1), 1-23.
- Erçetin, N.G. (1995). *Pragmatic Transfer in the Realization of Apologies: The case of Turkish EFL Learners*. M.A. Thesis. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi.
- Eslami-Rasekh, Z. (2005). Raising the pragmatic awareness of language learners. *ELT Journal*, 59 (2), 199-208.
- Faerch, C. and Kasper, G. (1983). On identifying communication strategies in interlanguage production. In C.Faerch- G. Kasper (eds.). *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. London: Longmans. pp. 71-103.
- Faerch, C. and Kasper, G. (1984). Pragmatic Knowledge: Rules and Procedures. *Applied Linguistics*. 5,3, 214-225.
- Félix-Brasdefer, J.C. (2005). Indirectness and politeness in Mexican Requests. In D. Eddington (Ed.), *Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistic Symposium* (pp.66-78). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press. Retrieved June 15th, 2007 (<http://www.lingref.com/cpp/hls/7/>)
- Félix-Brasdefer, J.C. (2006). Linguistic politeness in Mexico: Refusal strategies among

- male speakers of Mexican Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics* 38: 2158–2187.
Retrieved July, 2007. www.elsevier.com/locate/pragma
- Fraser, B. (1981). On Apologizing. In F. Coulmas (Ed.). *Conversational routine: Explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech*. The Hague: Mouton. pp.259-271
- Fraser, B. (1990). Perspectives on politeness. *Journal of Pragmatics*.14, 219-236.
- Fraser, B., Rintell, E., & Walters, J. (1980). An approach to conducting research on the acquisition of pragmatic competence in a second language. In D. Larsen Freeman (Ed.), *Discourse analysis in second language research*. (pp. 75-91). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Fraser, B., & Nolen, W. (1981). The association of deference with linguistic form. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 27: 93-109.
- Fukuya, Y.J. & Reeve, M., Gisi, J., & Christianson, M. (1998). Does Focus on Form work for teaching sociopragmatics? In: Paper presented at the 12th International Conference on Pragmatics and Language Learning, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 452736).
- Fukuya, Y. & Clark, M., (2001). A comparison of input enhancement and explicit instruction of mitigators. In: Bouton, L. (Ed.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning*. Monograph Series, vol. 10. Division of English as an International Language, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, IL, pp. 111–130.
- García, C. (1989). Apologizing in English: politeness strategies used by native and non-native speakers. *Multilingua* .(8) 3–20.
- Green, G.M. (1990). The Role of Pragmatics in Language Understanding. In L.F. Bouton and Y. Kachru (Ed.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning*. Pp.21-65. Urbana, Illinois: Division of English as an International Language Intensive English Institute, University of Illinois.
- Grice, H. Paul. (1975). Logic and conversation. In Cole and J. L. Morgan (eds). *Speech Acts [Syntax and Semantics 3]*,. NY, etc.: Academic Press. Pp. 41- 58
- Gu, Y. (1990). Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14 (2): 237-257.
- Guare, J. (1993). *Four Baboons Adoring The Sun And Other Plays*. Vintage Books. A Division of Random House, Inc. New York.
- Guerra, A. F. and Martínez Flor. (2003) Requests in films and in EFL Textbooks: A

- Comparison Universitat Jaume *ELIA* 4:17-34.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982a). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982b). *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1996). The linguistic and cultural relativity of conversational inference. In J. Gumperz & S. Levinson (Eds.). *Rethinking linguistic relativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Pp.374-406.
- Gumperz, J.J., Tannen, D., (1979). Individual and social differences in language use. In: F., Charles J., Kempler, D., W., William S.-Y. (Eds.). *Individual Differences in Language Ability and Language Behavior*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 305–327.
- Hadley, A. O. (1993). *Teaching language in context*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Handford, M. (2002) Developing Sociocultural Competence in the ESL Classroom. *Nottingham Linguistic Circular* 17
- Hart, I. (1992). Video, foreign languages teaching and the documentary tradition. *System*, 20: 1-13.
- Hartford, B. S., & Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1992). Experimental and observational data in the study of interlanguage pragmatics. In L. F. Bouton, & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (Vol. 3, pp. 33-52). Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois.
- Hellman, L., (1972). *The Collected Plays*. Little, Brown and Company-Boston-Toronto.
- Holmes, J., (1990). Apologies in New Zealand English. *Language in Society* 19: 155-199.
- Holmes, J., & Brown, D. F. (1987). Teachers and students learning about compliments. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 523-546.
- House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a Foreign Language: Routines and metapragmatic awareness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 18:225-252
- House, J., & Kasper, G. (1981). Politeness markers in English and German. In F. Coulmas (Ed.). *Conversational routine: Explorations in standardized communication situations and prepatterned speech*. The Hauge: Mouton. pp.157-185.

- Hymes, Dell H. (1971). *On communicative competence*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. pp.278-279.
- Hymes, Dell H. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride and J. Holmes (Eds). *Sociolinguistics [Penguin Modern Linguistics Readings]*. Harmondsworth: Penguin. pp. 269- 293
- Hymes, Dell H. (1979). On communicative competence. In Christopher J. Brumfit-Keith Johnson (Eds). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Pp.5-27.
- Intachakra, S. (2004). Contrastive Pragmatics and Language Teaching: Apologies and Thanks in English and Thai. *Regional Language Centre Journal* 35. (1): 37-62.
- İrman, İ. (1996). *An Evaluation of the Communicative Success of Turkish EFL Learners in Utilizing Politeness Strategies in Requests*. M.A. Thesis. Eskişehir: Anadolu University.
- İstifçi, İ. (1998). *An Interlanguage Study of Compliment Responses: A Case of Turkish Learners of English*. M.A. Thesis. Eskişehir: Anadolu University.
- Izumi, S., (2002). Output, Input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis: An experimental study on ESL relativization. In E. A. Soler. Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context? *System* 33: 417. Retrieved July, 2007 from www.elsevier.com/locate/system
- Jung, E. H. S. (2004). Interlanguage pragmatics: Apology speech acts. In C. L. Moder & A. Martinovic (Eds.), *Discourse across languages and cultures* (pp. 99-116). Philadelphia. John Benjamins.
- Kamışlı, S. & Aktuna, S. (1996). Effects of Social Power on Language Use across Speech Acts. *Applied Linguistics*. 6 (2), 199–222.
- Kasper, G. (1997). Can pragmatic competence be taught? *NFLRC Network* (6) Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center. Retrieved July 2008 from www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/networks/NW06/default.html
- Kasper, G. (1981). Pragmatische Aspekte in der Interimsprache [Pragmatic aspects of interlanguage]. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.) 2001. *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press. P.3.
- Kasper, G. (1998). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. In *Learning Foreign and Second*

- Languages: Perspectives in Research and Scholarship [Teaching Languages, Literatures, and Cultures 1]*, H. Byrnes (ed), NY: Modern Language Association. Pp.183- 208
- Kasper, G. (2000). Four perspectives on L2 pragmatic development (NFLRC Net Work #19) [HTML document]. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i at Manoa, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center. Retrieved [5.08. 2005] from the World Wide Web: [http://www.lll.hawaii.edu/nflrc/ NetWorks/ NW19/](http://www.lll.hawaii.edu/nflrc/NetWorks/NW19/)
- Kasper, G. (1992). Pragmatic transfer. *Second Language Research*. 8 (3): 203- 231.
- Kasper, G. (1994). Politeness. In *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, R. E. Asher (eds.) and J. M. Y. Simpson (coordinating ed), Vol. 6, 3206- 3211. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Kasper, G. (2001a). Classroom research in interlanguage pragmatics. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 33-60). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kasper, G. (2001b). Four perspectives on L2 pragmatic development. *Applied Linguistics*, 22, 502-530.
- Kasper, G & Blum-Kulka, S. (1993). *Interlanguage Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kasper, G. & Dahl, M.(1991). Research methods in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 13 (2): 215- 247.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (1999). Pragmatics and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistic*.19, 81-104.
- Kasper, G., & Rose, K. (2002). *Pragmatic development in a second language*. (Language Learning Monograph Series). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kasper, G. & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 18 (2): 149- 169.
- Katriel, T. (1986). Dugri speech: Talking straight in Israeli Sabra culture. In A. Trosborg. *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies*. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin. New York. P.46
- King, K. A., and Silver, R.E. (1993). 'Sticking points': Effects of instruction on NNS refusal strategies. *Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 9 (1), 47-82.
- Know, J. (2004). Expressing refusals in Korean and in American English. *Multilingua*,

23, 339-364.

- Koester, A. J. (2002). The performance of speech acts in workplace conversations and the teaching of communicative functions. *System*. 30: 167-184.
- Koike, D.A. (1989). Pragmatic Competence and Adult L2 Acquisition: Speech Acts and Interlanguage. *Modern Language Journal*. 73(3): 279-289.
- Koike, D.A., Pearson, L. (2005). The effect of instruction and feedback in the development of pragmatic competence. *System* 33 (3).
- Kondo, S. (2001). *Instructional effects on pragmatic development: Interlanguage refusal*. Paper presented at PacSLRF at University of Hawai'i at Manoa.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). Context and Culture in Language Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kubota, M. (1995). Teachability of conversational implicature to Japanese EFL learners. *IRLT Bulletin* , 9 , 35–67
- Lakoff, Robin (1973). The logic of politeness: Or minding your p's and q's. In Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society, C. Corum, T. C. Smith-Stark and A. Weiser (eds), 292- 305. Chicago: Chicago Linguistics Society.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M. H. (1991). *An introduction to second language acquisition research*. New York: Longman.
- Leech, G. (1983). The Principles of Pragmatics. In Kenneth R. Rose and Gabriele , Kasper (Eds.) *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press. pp: 4,10.
- Levinson, S.C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics: Cambridge University Press.
- Liao C. and Bresnahan, M.I. (1996). A contrastive pragmatic study on American English as Mandarin refusal strategies. *Language Sciences*, 17(3), 703-727.
- LoCastro, V. (2003). An introduction to pragmatics: Social action for language teachers. Michigan: Michigan Press.
- Lyster, R. (1993). *The effect of functional-analytic teaching on aspects of sociolinguistic competence: A study in French immersion classrooms at the grade eight level*. Doctoral dissertation, Toronto University

- Maeshiba, N., Yoshinaga, N., Kasper, G., & Ross, S. (1996). Transfer and proficiency in interlanguage apologizing. In S. M. Gass, & J. Neu (Eds.), *Speech acts across cultures: Challenges to communication in a second language* (pp. 155-187). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Maley, A and Duff, A, (1982) (2nd Edition). *Drama Techniques in Language Learning*. CUP
- Mamet, D., (1990). *Five Television Plays*. Grove Weidenfeld, New York.
- Mandala, S. (1999). Existing advice. In L.F. Bouton (ed.) *Pragmatics and language learning*, vol. 9. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. pp. 89-111.
- Mao, L. R. (1994). Beyond politeness theory: Face revisited and renewed. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 21 (5): 451–486
- Ma´rquez-Reiter, R. (2000). *Linguistic Politeness in Britain and Uruguay: A Contrastive Study of Requests and Apologies*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam.
- Martínez-Flor, A. (2004). *The effect of instruction on the development of pragmatic competence in the English as a foreign language context: A study based on suggestions. Doctoral Dissertation*. Universitat Jaume I, Castellón, Spain.
- Martínez-Flor, A., Fukuya, Y.J. (2005). The effects of instruction on learners' production of appropriate and accurate suggestions. *System* 33 (3).
- Matsumoto, Y. (1988). Reexamination of the universality of face: Politeness phenomena in Japanese. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 12 (4): 403- 426.
- Meier, A.J. (1997). Teaching the universals of politeness. *ELT Journal*, 51(1):21-28.
- Mızıkaçı, F. (1991). *A Sociocultural Investigation of Speech Acts. (Requests and Apologies) in Turkish and English*. M.A. Thesis. Ankara: Bilkent University.
- Morgan, J. (1978). Two Types of Convention in Indirect Speech Acts. In P. Cole(ed.). *Syntax and Semantics 9:Pragmatics*. New York Academic Press. pp: 261-281.
- Morris, C.W. (1938). Foundations of the Theory of Signs. In O. Neurath & R. Carnap & C. Morris (eds). *International Encyclopedia of United Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. pp: 719- 751. [Reprinted in: Charles W. Morris, 1971]

- Mwinyelle J. B. (2005) *The Acquisition of Pragmatic Competence in an L2 Classroom: Giving Advice in Spanish*. Phd Dissertation Faculty of the Graduate School of The University of Texas, Austin
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). Social motivations for code-switching: evidence from Africa. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.) 2001. *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press. p. 3.
- Myers-Scotton, C., & Bernstein, J. (1988). Natural conversation as a model for textbook dialogue. In G. Kasper. *How can language instruction help develop pragmatic competence? NFLRC Network* (6) Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center. Retrieved July 2003 from www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/networks/NW06/default.html
- Nattinger, J., & DeCarrico, J. (1992). *Lexical phrases and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nelson, Al-Batal, and Echols. (1996). Arabic and English compliment responses: potential for pragmatic failure. *Applied linguistics*, 17, 411-432.
- Ohbuchi, K., Kameda, M. and Agarie, N. (1989). Apology as aggression control: its role in mediating appraisal of and response to harm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 56, 219–227.
- Olshtain, E. (1983). Sociocultural Competence and Language Transfer: The Case of Apology. In M.S., Gass,. and L., Selinker, (Eds.). *Language Transfer in Language Learning*. Rowley:Newbury House Publishers.
- Olshtain, E. (1989). Apologies across languages. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex. (pp. 155-173).
- Olshtain, E. & Cohen, A. (1983). Apology: a speech act set. In: W., Nessa & J., Elliot (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and Language Acquisition*. Newbury House, Rowley, MA, pp. 18–35.
- Olshtain, E., & Blum-Kulka, S. (1985). Degree of approximation: Non-native reactions to native speech act behaviour. In S. Gass, & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 303-325). Rowley: Newbury House.
- Olshtain, E., and Cohen, A.D. (1989). Speech Act Behavior Across Languages. In Dechert, H.W. and Ranpach, M. (Eds.). *Interlanguage Pragmatics*. New York: OUP.
- Olshtain, E., and Cohen, A.D. (1990). The learning of complex speech act behavior.

- TESL Canada Journal*, 7(2), 45-65.
- Overfield, D. M. (1996). *Teaching pragmatic competence: Input, interaction and consciousness-raising*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh.
- Owen, M.,(1983). *Apologies and remedial interchanges*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Parker, F. & Riley, K. (2000). *Linguistics for Non-Linguists*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Pearson, L. E. (2001). *Pragmatics in foreign language teaching: The effects of instruction on L2 learners' acquisition of Spanish expressions of gratitude, apologies, and directives*. Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.
- Reiss, N. (1985). *Speech act taxonomy as a tool for ethnographic description: An analysis based on videotapes of continuous behaviour in two New York Households*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Riley, P. (1981). Towards a contrastive pragmatics. In . In A. Trosborg. *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies*. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin. New York. P.39
- Rintell, E. M. (1979). Getting your speech act together: the pragmatic ability of second language learners. *Working Papers on Bilingualism* .17, 98–106.
- Rivers, J. C. (1973). From Linguistic to Communicative Competence. *TESOL Quarterly*. 7(1) 25-34.
- Rose, K. R. (1993). Sociolinguistic consciousness-raising through video. *Language Teacher*, 17, 7-9.
- Rose, K. R. (1994). Pragmatic consciousness-raising in an EFL context. In L. F. Bouton, & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (Vol. 5, pp. 52-63). Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Rose, K. R. (1997). Pragmatics in the classroom: Theoretical concerns and practical possibilities. In L. F. Bouton (Ed.), *Pragmatics and language learning* (Vol. 8, pp. 267-295). Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Rose, K.R. (1999). Teachers and students learning about requests in Hong Kong. In: Hinkel, E. (Ed.), *Culture in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp.167–180.
- Rose, K. R. (2000). An exploratory cross-sectional study of interlanguage pragmatic development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*., 22, 27-67.

- Rose, K.R. (2005). On the effects of instruction in second language pragmatics. *System*.33, 385-399. www.elsevier.com/locate/system
- Rose, K.R. and Kasper, G. (2001). *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.p.3
- Rose, K. R., and Kwai-fun, C. N. (2001). Pragmatic and grammatical awareness: A function of the learning environment. In K. R. Rose, & G. Kasper (Eds.)
- Rose, K. and Ng, C.(2001). Inductive and deductive teaching of compliments and compliment responses. In: Rose, K., Kasper, G. (Eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 145–170.
- Ruzickova, E. (1998). Apologies in Cuban Spanish. *Paper presented at the First Hispanic Linguistics Colloquium*. Columbus, Ohio.
- Ryan, S. (1998). Using films to develop learner motivation. *The Internet TESL Journal*, vol. IV: 11.
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5, 1-23.
- Searle, J. (1979). What is a Speech Act? In P.P. Giglioli (Ed.) *Language and Social Context*. Great Britain: Cox & Wyman LTD. Pp. 136-154.
- Searle, J. R., Kiefer, F.and Bierwisch, Manfred (1980) Introduction. In J. R. Searle, F. Kiefer and M. Bierwisch (eds). *Speech Act Theory and Pragmatics* [Synthese Language Library 10], Dordrecht: Reidel. vii-xii
- Seliger, H. W. and Shohamy, E.(1986) *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford University Press.
- Schmidt, R. W. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. In R. W. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning (Technical Report #9)* (pp. 1-63). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center.
- Schmidt, R. W. (2001). Attention. In P. Robinson (ed.) *Cognition and second language instruction*. New York: Cambridge University Press. pp. 3-33

- Siegal, M. (1994). Looking east: Learning Japanese as a second language in Japan and the interaction of race, gender and social context. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.). *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press. P.3.
- Siegal, M. (1996). The role of learner subjectivity in second language sociolinguistic competency: Western women learning Japanese. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.). *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press. P.3.
- Sinclair, John McH. & Malcolm Coulthard. (1975). *Towards an Analysis of Discourse*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Soler, E. A. (2005). *Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context?* Department of English Studies, Universitat Jaume I, Campus Riu Sec, 12071 Castello' n, Spain Received 9 January 2005; received in revised form 4 April 2005; accepted 11 May 2005 www.elsevier.com/locate/system
- Stoppard, T. (1967). *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*. London: Faber & Faber Ltd.
- Stoppard, T. (1990). *The Plays for Radio*. London: Faber & Faber Ltd
- Stoppard, T. (1996). *Plays 1*. London: Faber & Faber Ltd.
- Stoppard, T. (1998). *Plays 3*. London: Faber & Faber Ltd.
- Stoppard, T. (1999). *Plays 4*. London: Faber & Faber Ltd.
- Stoppard, T. (1999). *Plays 5*. London: Faber & Faber Ltd
- Strawson, P.F. (1964). Intention and Convention in Speech Acts. In A. Trosborg. *Interlanguage Pragmatics: Requests, Complaints and Apologies*. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin. New York. P.5.
- Sugimoto, N. (1997). A Japan–U.S. comparison of apology styles. *Communication Research* (24) 349–370.
- Suszczyńska, M., (1999). Apologizing in English, Polish and Hungarian: different languages, different strategies. *Journal of Pragmatics*. (31), 1053–1065.
- Takahashi, S. (1996). Pragmatic Transferability. *Studies in ELT*. 18(2), 189–222.
- Takahashi, T., and Beebe, L. (1993). Cross-linguistic influence in the speech act of correction. In G. Kasper & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.). *Interlanguage pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp.138–157
- Takahashi, S. (2001). The role of input enhancement in developing pragmatic competence. In: Rose, K. and R., Kasper, G. (Eds.), *Pragmatics in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp.171–199.

- Takaku, S., Weiner, B., Ohbuchi, K., (2001). A cross-cultural examination of the effects of apology and perspective taking on forgiveness. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 20, 144–167.
- Tannen, D. (1981). Indirectness and discourse: ethnicity as conversational style. *Discourse Processes* 4, 221-238.
- Tannen, D. (1993). The relativity of linguistic strategies. Rethinking power and solidarity in gender and dominance. In K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.) *Pragmatics in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press. p.3.
- Tateyama, Y., Kasper G., Mui, L., Tay, H. & Thananart, O. (1997). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatics routines. In L.F. Bouton (ed.) *Pragmatics and Language Learning*, vol.8. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois. pp:163-177.
- Tatsuki, D. (2006). What is Authenticity. Authentic Communication: *Proceedings of the 5th Annual JALT Pan-SIG Conference*. Shizuoka, Japan: Tokai University College of Marine Science. pp. 1 – 15.
- Taylor, I. (1990). *Learning and Using Language*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. *Applied Linguistics* 4(2), 91-112
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: An introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Tomlinson, B. (1994) 'Pragmatic awareness activities', *Language Awareness* 3 (3 and 4): 109-27.
- Trosborg, A. (1987). Apology strategies in native/non-native English. *Journal of Pragmatics* .11, 147–167.
- Trosborg, A. (1995). *Interlanguage pragmatics. Requests, complaints and apologies*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Tunçel, R. (1999). Speech Act Realizations of EFL Learners: A Study on Apologizing and Thanking. PhD Thesis. Eskişehir: Anadolu University.
- Umar, A. (2004). Request strategies as used by advanced Arab learners of English as a foreign language. *Umm Al-Qura University Journal of Education & Social Sciences & Humanities*. 16(1).
- VanPatten, B. (1989). Can learners attend to form and content while processing input? *Hispania*, 72, 409-417.
- Verschueren, J. (1985). *What People Say They Do With Words*. USA: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

- Vollmer, H. J. and Olshtain, E. (1989). The language of apologies in German. In: S. Blum-Kulka, J. House & G. Kasper. (Eds.), *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Newbury House, Rowley, MA, pp. 197–218.
- Vygotsky, L.S.(1987). Thinking and speech. In Rieber and A Carton (eds). *The Collected works of L Vygotsky*. New York: Plenum
- Vogel, P., (1996). *The Baltimore Waltz and other plays*. Theatre Communications Group, Inc. New York
- Watts, R. J.& Konrad, S. E. (1992). Introduction. In R. J. Watts, S. Ide and K. Ehlich (eds). *Politeness in Language: Studies in its History, Theory and Practice [Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 59]*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.pp.1-17
- Weizman, E. (1989). Requestive Hints. In S. Blum-Kulka & J. House & G. Kasper (eds.). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Norwood. N.J:Ablex. Pp. 71-96.
- Wessels, C. (1987). *Drama* (Resource Books for Teachers) Oxford University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural Pragmatics. The Semantics of Human Interaction*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Widdowson, H. (1983). Talking shop: H.G.W. On literature and ELT. *ELTJ* 37 (1): 30-35.
- Wolfson, N. (1989). *Perspectives: Sociolinguistics and TESOL*. New York: Newbury
- Wolfson, N., Marmor, T., & Jones, S. (1989). Problems in the comparison of speech acts across cultures. In S. Blum-Kulka, J. House, & G. Kasper (Eds.), *Cross cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies* (pp. 174-196). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Demographic Information

1. Age and Gender:
2. Are your mother and father Turkish citizens? If no, mention his/her nationality
3. Please write down the name of your high school.
4. What is your first language?
5. How many years have you studied English in classes?
6. Have you studied English outside of school or university? If yes, please describe:
7. What has your English study focused on (i.e., Grammar and grammar exercises, translation, conversation, reading skills, listening skills)?
8. How often do you speak English?
9. With whom do you speak English, and for what purpose?
10. Do you consider yourself fluent in English?
11. Have you ever been to any English speaking country? If yes, How long and where have you been to?

APPENDIX 2

The Discourse Role-play Test

Directions: Listen to me carefully and respond the situations. Do not spend a lot of time thinking about what answer you think you should provide; instead, please respond as naturally as possible and try to give your response as you feel you would say it in the situation. Potential follow-up responses by the other person in some of the scenarios have been left out intentionally.

Apology Strategies

Situations

1. You have promised to deliver a lecture in class but due to a very bad cold, you have not been able to even attend the class. What would you say to your professor the next session you attend the class? **(Higher status—familiar)**

You:.....

2. The university bus is very crowded so you are standing in the bus. The bus-driver suddenly brakes and you lose your control and step on a fellow student's foot. What would you say?

. **(Equal status—unfamiliar)**

3. You have promised your younger sister/brother to take her/him to the cinema and you have forgotten to do so. She/he has been waiting for you at home for hours. What would you say to her/him as you get home? **(lower status—close)**

You:.....

4. As you are carrying a chair in the lobby of the university, you bumped into a professor whom you don't know well and hurt his/her hand accidentally. What would you say?

higher status-unfamiliar)

Refusal Situations

1. (Invitation: Equal- familiar)

A friend invites you to go out to dinner. However, you don't want to go because you are preparing a big test and have plans to be at a study group most of the night.

Friend: A bunch of us are going to eat tonight. Would you like to go?

You:.....

Friend: I wish you could come. See you tomorrow.

2. (Suggestion: Higher status-familiar)

You are a university student at English Language Teaching Department and since registration is next week, you are planning your schedule for your final semester. You have already put together a tentative schedule, but you need to get your advisor's approval. Although you took one course with this professor during your freshman year, you haven't had any contact with him other than in advising sessions once a semester. You have a meeting with him in his office to review the schedule that you have planned for next semester. When you arrive at his office, your advisor is reviewing your transcript and during the course of the conversation, he suggests that you take an additional course in English Literature, but you don't want to.

You:

Professor: O.K. No problem. You may take it next semester.

3. (Request: Equal status- unfamiliar)

On your way to class you are stopped by a student who you do not know soliciting people to fill out a questionnaire that would take about a half an hour. However you don't want to miss your class, so you don't want to stop and fill it out.

Student: Could you please take thirty minutes and fill out this questionnaire for me?

You:.....

4. (Offer: Lower status-close)

You are watching TV with your sister. You are drinking tea. Your sister asks you whether you want another cup of tea while she is going to kitchen. You don't want any more since it is time to go to bed.

Sister: How about another cup of tea?

You:

Note: Status and distance information was not read to the respondents, but is given here for the convenience of readers

APPENDIX 3

TASK 1 (APOLOGIES)		
Type	Deductive approach to the teaching of pragmatics.	
Goals	Students will have - differentiated between apology strategies, - focused on the participants' relationship, social status, the context, and the linguistic formulae employed.	
Materials	<i>Drama texts</i>: three scenes from the plays in which apologies are made by participants that have a close relationship and equal or lower status (eg. a daughter made her mother angry) - Handout with the definitions of semantic formulae, pragmatics, sociolinguistic competence, <i>semantic formulae of apologies</i>.	
Teaching Modes	Group work, pair workgroup discussion	
Time	45 minutes (approximately)	
Procedure	Pre	1. The teacher explains the different ways of performing apologies in English; and points out the importance of the context, the participants in the interaction, and social status of the interlocutors.
	While	2. Learners read the three different situations from the text of the plays.
		3. Learners are asked about the relationship between participants (gender, social distance, social status) and the apology employed in each situation, taking into account the contextual factors, the topic, and previous explanations.
		4. Learners read the texts again.
		5. Learners work in pairs or small groups and decide which strategy is used in each situation, and why.
	Post	6. Group discussion about the apologies used in these situations: whether the same formulae could be used in other situations (e.g. a secretary-boss apologizing situation).

TASK 2 (APOLOGIES)		
Type	Inductive approach to the teaching of pragmatics.	
Goals	Students will have recognized different levels of politeness in the realization of apologies.	
Materials	• Drama texts: scenes from plays showing different contexts and relationship between participants -<i>hospital (nurse-patient), home (wife-husband), theatre (two actors)</i>, etc.- but in which the same apology (an expression of regret) is made. • Handout in which students practice different forms and modifiers of apology situations.	
Teaching Modes	Group work, pair work, lecture, classroom discussion	
Time	40 minutes (approximately)	
Procedure	Pre	1. Students identify which semantic formulae are used in each utterance according to their politeness level.
	While	2. They compare and discuss their results (in pairs or small groups), trying to explain and rationalize: (1) the difference in the use of all those forms, (2) their level of politeness, and (3) the situation in which they are (not) appropriate.
		3. They generalize how native speakers of English generally apologize politely based on the scenes and the teacher emphasizes the other ways to say “I’m sorry” politely in English.
	Post	4. They decide whether there is any evidence in the plays that can illustrate their justification of politeness values in apologizing behavior.

TASK 3 (APOLOGIES)		
Type	Consciousness-raising.	
Goals	To raise learners' awareness of the different possibilities available to express the same apology, bearing in mind that the selection will depend on the participants' relationship, context, etc.	
Materials	• Drama texts: five short scenes from the plays in which apologies are made. The scenes show different situations which vary from a degree of close familiarity (son-father; friend-friend; sister-brother,...) to polite situations (secretary-boss; student-teacher; etc...). • Handout with the three other linguistic realizations of each situation.	
Teaching Mode	Lecture, Group work, Pair work, Brainstorming	
Time	45 + 45 (90 minutes approximately)	
Procedure	Pre	1. Students are given a handout with six different options (ranging from indirect to direct) for each of the scenes they are going to read, and have to mark the most appropriate apology for each situation.
	While	2. Teacher reads the six scenes from the plays
		3. Teacher asks learners to provide a justification of their selection taking into account participants' relationship, context, etc.
		4. Learners read the scenes again
	Post	5. Learners get in groups and discuss the options they provided for each situation, comparing them to the ones used in the plays.

TASK 4 (APOLOGIES)		
Type	Role-play.	
Goals	To be able to use different apologizing strategies in different contexts, in order to be appropriate in a particular situation.	
Materials	• <i>Drama texts</i>: Five short scenes from the plays , showing different situations in which several apologies are made (e.g. <i>The traffic was terrible; It is my fault; I didn't mean it; You're right to be angry</i>, etc.) • Handout in which 5 different situations (extracted from the scenes) are presented (as apologies learners need to make): Case 1-<i>You came late to your appointment with your doctor.</i> Case 2-<i>You forgot to ring your husband/wife that you will be late because of an unexpected meeting at work</i>, etc.	
Teaching Mode	Pair work, role-play	
Time	25 minutes (approximately)	
Procedure	Pre	1. Pair work: students role-play the five different situations presented in their handout.
	While	2. Volunteers perform <i>Case 1</i> in front of the class.
		3. Right after Case 1 is role-played, teacher plays that scene from the play.
	Post	4. Learners give their opinion on the appropriacy of the apologies made by peers and the original apology made in the play.
		5. The same procedure for Cases 2 to 5.

TASK 1 (REFUSALS)		
Type	Deductive approach to the teaching of pragmatics.	
Goals	To differentiate between refusal strategies, focusing on the participants' relationship, the context, and the linguistic formulae employed.	
Materials	• <i>Drama texts</i>: Three scenes from Tom Stoppard's plays in which refusals are made by participants that have a close relationship and the degree of imposition is low (eg. a student refuses one of his/her peers). • <i>Handout</i> with description of refusal strategies in English	
Teaching Mode	Group work, pair workgroup discussion	
Time	45 minutes (approximately)	
Procedure	Pre	1. The teacher explains the different ways of performing refusals in English; and points out the importance of the context, the participants in the interaction, and the results derived from the speech act performed.
	While	2. Learners read the three different situations from the text of the plays.
		3. Learners are asked about the relationship between participants (gender, social distance) and the refusal employed in each situation, taking into account the context, the topic, and previous explanations.
		4. Learners read the texts again.
		5. Learners work in pairs or small groups and decide which strategy is used in each situation, and why.
	Post	6. Group discussion about the refusals used in these situations: whether the same formulae could be used in other situations (eg. a visitor and a hostess refusing situation).

TASK 2 (REFUSALS)		
Type	Inductive approach to the teaching of pragmatics.	
Goals	To recognize different levels of politeness in the realization of refusals.	
Materials	• <i>Drama texts</i>: scenes from plays showing different contexts and relationship between participants -<i>hotel (customer-receptionist), home (servant-visitor), garden (two friends)</i>, etc.- but in which the same refusal (negative willingness) is made. • <i>Handout in which this refusal (negative willingness) is expressed in different forms: I can't; I don't think so; etc.</i>	
Teaching Mode	Group work, pair workgroup discussion	
Time	30 minutes (approximately)	
Procedure	Pre	1. Students organize all the utterances in the handout according to their politeness values (on their own).
	While	2. They compare and discuss their results (in pairs or small groups), trying to explain and rationalize: (1) the difference in the use of all those forms, (2) their level of politeness, and (3) the situation in which they are (not) appropriate.
		3. They read the scenes from the plays
	Post	4. They decide whether there is any evidence in the plays that can illustrate their justification of politeness values in refusing behavior.

TASK 3 (REFUSALS)		
Type	Consciousness-raising.	
Goals	To raise learners' awareness of the different possibilities available to express the same refusal, bearing in mind that the selection will depend on the participants' relationship, context, etc.	
Materials	• <i>Drama texts</i>: five short scenes from the plays in which refusals are made. The scenes show different situations which vary from a degree of close familiarity (two lovers; friend-friend; husband-wife,...) to polite situations (customer-receptionist; visitor-hostess; etc...). • Handout with the three other linguistic realizations of each situation.	
Teaching Mode	Group work, group discussion	
Time	30 minutes (approximately)	
Procedure	Pre	1. Students are given a handout with six different options (ranging from indirect to direct) for each of the scenes they are going to read, and have to mark the most appropriate refusal for each situation.
	While	2. Teacher reads the six scenes from the plays
		3. Teacher asks learners to provide a justification of their selection taking into account participants' relationship, context, etc.
	Post	4. Learners read the scenes again
		5. Learners get in groups and discuss the options they provided for each situation, comparing them to the ones used in the plays.

TASK 4 (REFUSALS)		
Type	Role-play.	
Goals	To be able to use different refusing strategies in different contexts, in order to be appropriate in a particular situation.	
Materials	• <i>Drama texts</i>: Five short scenes from the plays , showing different situations in which several refusals are made (e.g. <i>Well, I...I promised to see my professor; Your wife? No. Perhaps later on; I don't like tea, thank you; No, no, it's not a good idea, etc.</i>) • Handout in which 5 different situations (extracted from the scenes) are presented (as refusals learners need to make): Case 1-A girl refuses her boy friend's marriage proposal. Case 2- a son refuses his father's advice; etc.	
Teaching Mode	pair work, role-play	
Time	45 minutes (approximately)	
Procedure	Pre	1. Pair work: students role-play the five different situations presented in their handout.
	While	2. Volunteers perform <i>Case 1</i> in front of the class.
		3. Right after Case 1 is role-played, teacher plays that scene from the play.
		4. Learners give their opinion on the appropriacy of the apologies made by peers and the original refusal made in the play.
	Post	5. The same procedure for <i>Cases 2 to 5</i> .

APPENDIX 4A

REPRESENTATIVE THEATRE EXTRACTS OF APOLOGY SITUATIONS

Extract I

Christine: If you always spoke to me like that I could almost believe...

Fritz: What, dear?

Christine: That you love me as much as I dreamed you did the first time you kissed me. Do you remember?

Fritz: I do love you. (*He kisses her and then breaks away.*) But now let me go-

Christine: Are you already sorry you said it? After all, you're free. You can drop me if you want. You made no promises and I made no conditions. What happens to me doesn't matter-I've been happy once and it's all I ask of life. I only want you to know that I never loved anyone before you and when you don't want me anymore I'll never love anyone else.

Fritz: Don't say that – don't- it's too – (*distastefully*) it's like that picture-

Christine: (*hurt*) I realize your taste is above such sentiment – these clichés –

Fritz: Oh, Christine – everything tastes bitter to me now! I'm so sorry I hurt you – please don't, don't cry, Christine, Christine.

(Tom Stoppard “*Plays 3*”)

Extract 2

Arkadina: My son Decadent!

Konstantin: Go off to your cosy little theatre and act in your pathetic stupid little plays.

Arkadina: I have never in my life appeared in a play of that description! Get away from me! You can't even write a wretched little comic sketch! Go back to Kiev and open a shop! Parasite!

Konstantin: Skinflint!

Arkadina: Rat's nest!

Konstantin sits down and cries quietly.

Little nobody! Crybaby. Stop crying. Don't cry. There's nothing to cry about. Please don't cry... Please, there's no need to ... Oh, darling, I'm sorry – forgive me – forgive your awful mother – your poor miserable mother ...

Konstantin embraces her.

(Tom Stoppard “*Plays 3*”)

Extract3

Philo: Excuse me.

Carol: Hello, Mr. Kramer. Thank you for arranging the room.

Philo: I'm afraid it is not very nice, but of course they are not used to ...

Carol: Of course.

Philo: (*Pause*) I've been thinking about... about you being here

Carol: Oh yes?

Philo: I see you do not wish to talk to me. I am sorry I was rude to you.

Carol: Not at all. But thank you anyway for the thought.

(Tom Stoppard "*Plays 3*")

Extract 4

Brown: Very nice.

Nurse: Good evening...

Brown: Evening. A lovely night. Morning.

Nurse: Yes ... Mr...?

Brown: I'm sorry to be so late.

Nurse: (*Shuffling papers*) Were you expected earlier?

Brown: No. I telephoned.

(Tom Stoppard "*The Plays for Radio*")

Extract 5

Otto: Good morning, ma'am – you're not playing?

Genia: As you see, Lieutenant. I'm no match for that company.

Otto: They're not all athletes either ... I don't speak for your husband, of course. I mean ... (*Pause.*) ... Forgive me, ma'am, I'm disturbing your reading.

Genia: You aren't disturbing me at all. We haven't seen your mother. Does she have a performance today?

Otto: Oh, no.

(Tom Stoppard "*Plays 4*")

Extract 6

Christine: I'm not going there to pray.

Theodore: Perhaps later when you're...

Christine: When I'm calmer?

Theodore: Yes.

Christine: Tomorrow? Or in a month when I'm over it? Or six months when I'm in love again? *Damn* you, Theo

Theodore: I'm very sorry. I thought you understood. Everyone else did. How was I know that...

Christine: What? That I loved him?...

(Tom Stoppard “*Plays 4*”)

Extract 7

Natter: Good evening, Adele! How are you, Hofreiter, old man?

Friedrich: (*extending his hand*) Natter! Why are you so late?

Adele: (*very affectionately*) So, what have you been up to?

Natter: Forgive me, my love. I’ve been sitting in the park reading – it’s the only chance I get. Tell me, Hofreiter, is there anything nicer than sitting under a tree with a book?

Friedrich: That depends...on the book ...

(Tom Stoppard “*Plays 4*”)

Extract 8

Genia: I’m afraid we have a guest for supper- Dr Mauer.

Paul: Well, do bring him along too, ma’am!

Friedrich: All right then- perhaps we’ll come on later...but no promises.

Genia: Thank you all the same.

Paul: Oh, not at all. We would all be delighted. I take my leave, ma’am. Adieu, Mr Hofreiter. A thousand pardons for disturbing you.

He exists. Pause.

Friedrich: ... and half a dozen of the other, but I’ll put it another way. I mean, suppose you could bring him back to life by telling him you were prepared ... to be his mistress.

Genia: I don’t know.

Friedrich: You can’t have been that far from it ...Come on, you *did* love him...

Genia: But not enough, as you see.

Friedrich: You say that as if it was *my* fault .

Genia: No. It was mine.

Friedrich: But you do reproach yourself that you... drove him to kill himself.

Genia: I’m sorry he’s dead. But what should I reproach myself for? – my faithfulness?

(Tom Stoppard “*Plays 4*”)

Extract 9

Ivor: I can’t learn all this in a morning.

Turai: Why not? You knew it well enough last night.

Natasha: I never said, ‘No one can take your place.’

Turai: Yes, you did.

Natasha: Well, I didn’t mean it.

Ivor: You didn’t?

(Tom Stoppard “*Plays 3*”)

Extract 10

Max: I'm not upsetting you, I hope?

Charlotte: You underestimate me.

Max: (*interested*) Do I? A string quartet, you mean? That sort of thing? (*He ponders for a moment*)

Charlotte returns to the hall and reappears wearing her topcoat.

Charlotte: If you don't mind, I think I will go out after all. (*She moves to close the door behind her.*)

Max. You have forgotten your suitcase.

Pause. She comes back and picks up the suitcase. She takes the case to the door.

Charlotte: I'm sorry if you've had a bad time. But you've done everything wrong. There's a right thing to say if you can think what it is.

(Tom Stoppard "*Plays 5*")

Extract 11

Christine: Theodore, take me to him –I want to see him for the last time.

Theodore: I can't-

Christine: Please –I want a proper last time, you can't deny me that.

Theodore: It's too late. They buried him this morning.

Christine: Buried him? Without even telling me? They shot him and put him in a coffin and took him away and buried him and you didn't even tell me?

Theodore: Listen, I haven't had a minute! These last two days, you've no idea ... Don't forget I was the one who had to tell his parents, I had a lot on my mind, and consider my own feelings too, I was his best friend....

(Tom Stoppard "*Plays 4*")

Extract 12

Wife: It was my birthday-

George: I know it was your birthday –I told you I couldn't get away.

Wife: You can get away when it suits you –you are going off me.

George: How could I? –Think of last Saturday after tea –it doesn't add up-

Wife: Lust –

George: Oh, I'm hurt –

Wife: I knew it was a mistake

George: Don't let's have regrets –

Wife: Don't make me laugh –

(Tom Stoppard “*Plays 5*”)

Extract 13

Weinberl: We must be going –we have a long way to get home.

Christopher: Yes, and somebody really ought to give us our fare for our trouble.

Miss Blumenblatt (*barring their way*) Stop! You are not leaving here.

Weinberl: What?

Christopher: It wasn’t our fault. Don’t blame us.

Miss Blumenblatt takes him into an embrace.

Miss Blumenblatt: My dear pretty child –of course I don’t blame you!

(Tom Stoppard “*Plays Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*”)

Extract 14

F: Where were you?

M: Got stuck in traffic.

F: I waited. Come up with me?

M: I hurt my knee

F: You didn’t hurt your knee.

M: I can’t go up. What? Do you think I’m joking? I hurt my knee.

(John Guare “*The Talking Dog*”)

Extract 15

Anna: Believe me, I know how easy it is to get confused about that sometimes, but at a time like this, you have to get it separate-

Peter: I have to!...That’s what I’m trying to talk to you about! It’s not my problem!

Anna: Then why are you getting upset?

(Paula Vogel. *The Baltimore Waltz* and other plays.)

Extract 16

Anna: I’m sorry Peter. You were saying?

Peter: Never mind.

Anna: Oh, come on, Petey, don’t be that way.

(Paula Vogel. *The Baltimore Waltz* and other plays.)

Extract 17

Afternoon. Ruth is loosely bound in a chair with kitchen nylon cord rope. She has a gag in her mouth. Anna enters from front door, carrying shopping bag. As she turns, Anna sees Ruth.

Anna: Ruth!!

(The shopping bag drops. Ruth casually removes the gag from her mouth with a free hand.)

Ruth: Hi, honey. What'd the doctor have to say?

Anna: What is all this!! Are you all right?-

Ruth: I'm sorry, I just wanted to surprise you-

Anna: Surprise me!! Are you crazy?

(Anna stops, pants.)

Ruth: I'm sorry. Close the door. Are you all right?

Anna: Christ. You almost made me break my water.

(Anna sits)

Ruth: I'm sorry. It was stupid.

Anna: What in the hell are you doing? Why are you bound and gagged?

Ruth: I'm not. Orphan is.

(Paula Vogel. The Baltimore Waltz and other plays.)

Extract 18

Ursula: The Pope says you don't have to eat fish on Friday anymore. For the past ten years, you don't have to eat fish on Friday. And for the past ten years we've been hearing about your fish on Friday.

Vera: Well, Ursula, excuse me. I didn't mean to bore you.

Ursula: Well, then, try not to tell us in detail what you ate for dinner the night before. With or without your teeth in.

Lillian: Oh, really, Ursula, it doesn't matter. Just don't listen.

Vera (Brightly): All right, then –let's discuss something else.

(Paula Vogel. "The Baltimore Waltz and other plays")

Extract 19

Mrs. Mortar: Mary, I am still awaiting your explanation. Where have you been?

Mary: I took a walk.

Mrs. Mortar: So you took a walk. And may I ask, young lady, are we in the habit of taking walks when we should be at our classes?

Mary: I am sorry, Mrs. Mortar, I went to get you these flowers. I thought you would like them and I didn't know it would take so long to pick them.

Mrs. Mortar: That was very sweet of you, Mary; I always like thoughtfulness. But you must not allow anything to interfere with your classes.

(Lillian Hellman: "The Collected Plays")

Extract 20

Karen: I thought it was true until you came here a year ago. I don't think you're very happy here, and I'd like to find out why. (*Looks at Mary, waits for an answer, gets none, shakes her head*) Why, for example, do you find it necessary to lie to us so often?

Mary: (*without looking up*) I'm not lying. I went out walking and I saw the flowers and they looked pretty and I didn't know it was so late.

Karen: (*impatiently*). Stop it, Mary! I'm not interested in hearing that foolish story again. I *know* you got the flowers out of the garbage can. What I do want to know is why you feel you have to lie out of it.

Mary: I *did* pick the flowers near Conway's. You never believe me. You believe everybody but me. It's always like that. Everything I say you fuss at me about. Everything I do is wrong.

(Lillian Hellman: "The Collected Plays")

Extract 21

Martha: What were you doing outside the door?

Evelyn: (*hurriedly*) We were going uptairth, Mith Dobie.

Peggy: We came down to see how Mary was.

Martha: And you stopped long enough to see how we were. Did you deliberately listen?

Peggy: We didn't mean to. We heard voices and we couldn't help-

(Lillian Hellman: "The Collected Plays")

Extract 22

Karen: Sit down girls, I want to talk to you.

Peggy: We're awfully sorry, really. We just didn't think and-

Karen: I'm sorry too, Peggy. (*Thoughtfully*) You and Evelyn never used to do things like this. We'll have to separate you three.

(Lillian Hellman: "The Collected Plays")

Extract 23

Mary: You don't love me. You don't care whether they kill me or not.

Mrs Tilford: Mary.

Mary: You don't! You don't! You don't care what happens to me.

Mrs. Tilford: (*sternly*) But I *do* care that you're talking this way.

Mary: I'm sorry I said that, Grandma. I didn't mean to hurt your feelings. (*Puts her arms around Mrs. Tilford's neck*) Forgive me?

Mrs. Tilford: What made you talk like that?

Mary: (*in a whisper*) I'm scared, Grandma, I'm scared. They'll do dreadful things to me.

(Lillian Hellman: "The Collected Plays")

Extract 24

Rosalie: I didn't steal anything. I borrowed the bracelet and I was going to put it back as soon as I'd worn it to the movies. I never meant to keep it.

Mary: Nobody'll believe that, least of all the police. You're just a common, ordinary thief. Stop that bawling. You'll have the whole house down here in a minute.

Rosalie: You won't tell? Say you won't tell.

Mary: Am I a fibber?

Rosalie: No.

Mary: Then say: "I apologize on my hands and knees."

Rosalie: I apologize on my hands and knees. Let's play with the puzzle.

(Lillian Hellman: "The Collected Plays")

Extract 25

Congressman: Well, that's not the point, is it? The point is that you never *told* me...

Winnie: Well, if that's true, I'm sorry sir.

Congressman: No: *say* you never told me...

Winnie: Excuse me...

Congressman: You owe me an apology.

Winnie: I think that I apologized, excuse me...

(David Mamet. "Five Television Plays")

Extract 26

Elaine (*furious*): Don't you ever answer your door bell, Mrs. Mann? Do you always ignore your neighbours?

Eleanor: Oh, Mrs. Ackerman, I'm sorry. I didn't hear the bell. Can I get you coffee or... What's the matter with your daughter?

(David Mamet. "Five Television Plays")

Extract 27

Eleanor: Miss Mansfield, I can only apologize from the depth of my heart to you, and to you, Coach Griffin, for the pain and anguish my son Andrew has given you. And I only hope that never again will I be made to feel as embarrassed and humiliated by a member of my family, and I beg you all to forgive me.

(Christopher Durang “Christopher Durang Explains It All for You”)

Extract 28

Firth: They killed kid.

Whalen: I got all the news.

Firth: I feel bad. I can’t fight anymore.

Whalen: I heard you.

Firth (*angrily*): It wasn’t your kid.

Whalen (*angrily*): Didn’t I tell you not to fight?

Firth (*quietly*): You were right.

(Lillian Hellman: “The Collected Plays”)

Extract 29

Marthe: Then let us make sure we go in different directions, and do not meet again.
Good-bye, Teck.

Teck: Good-bye, Marthe. You will not believe me, but I tried my best, and I am now
most sorry to lose you.

Marthe: Yes. I believe you. (*She moves out. There is a silence for a minute.*)

(Lillian Hellman: “The Collected Plays”)

APPENDIX 4B

REPRESENTATIVE THEATRE EXTRACTS OF REFUSAL SITUATIONS

Extract 1

Chloé: Sorry –just cutting through –there’s tea in the pantry if you don’t mind mugs –

Bernard: How kind.

Chloé: Hannah will show you.

Bernard: Let me help you.

Chloé: No, it’s all right –

(Tom Stoppard. *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead.*)

Extract 2

Acherson: (*To Philo*) Come on- I’ll buy you a drink. What’s that music?

Philo: The wedding feast. The whole village is there.

Acherson: Can we go?

Philo: You will be welcomed. There is a tradition of hospitality here.

Acherson: Good. (*To Carol*) Coming?

Carol: No, thanks.

(*Acherson hesitates and then leaves with Philo*)

(Tom Stoppard: *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead.*)

Extract 3

Otto: How will I be able to let you know what’s happening to me?

Genia: You can write. My letters aren’t opened. And if you wanted to be especially careful, then simply write to me just as you are talking to me now –as to an old friend.

Otto: I couldn’t do that. Don’t ask it of me.

Genia: Then –don’t write at all.

Otto: Genia ...

(Tom Stoppard: *The Plays for Radio.*)

Extract 4

Nina: If you only knew how much I'd like to stay.

Arkadina: Somebody should see you home, my precious.

Nina: Oh –no! –no –

Sorin: Please stay a while –

Nina: I really can't.

Sorin: Just for an hour, no more –surely –

Nina hesitates a moment.

Nina: *(through her tears)* No –I simply can't. *(She shakes hands and goes off quickly.)*

(Tom Stoppard: The Plays for Radio.)

Extract 5

Brown: I require nursing. I need to be nursed for a bit. Yes. Where do I sign?

Nurse: I'm sorry, but admissions have to be arranged in advance except in the case of genuine emergency –I have no authority –

Brown: What do you want with authority? A nice person like you.

(Moves.) Where have you put me?

Nurse: *(Moves with him)* And *you* have no authority –

(Tom Stoppard: Plays I)

Extract 6

Brown: What colours do you like?

Matron: I like all colours. Just paint what you fancy. Paint Extracts from your own life.

Brown: Clever! Should I paint my last place of employment?

Matron: I'm trying to help you.

Brown: I'm sorry. I know you are. But I don't need help. Everything's fine for me.

(Pause)

Would you like me to paint the countryside?

Matron: Yes, that would be nice.

(Tom Stoppard: Plays I)

Extract 7

Mckendrick: One is naturally interested in what is happening in these places. And I have an academic interest –my field is the philosophical assumptions of social science.

Anderson: How fascinating. What is that exactly?

Mckendrick: *(Slightly hurt)* Perhaps my paper tomorrow afternoon will give you a fair idea.

Anderson: (*Mortified*) Tomorrow afternoon? I say, what rotten luck. That's exactly when I have to play truant. I *am* sorry.

Mckendrick: (*Coldly*) That's all right.

(Tom Stoppard: *Plays 3*)

Extract 8

Arkadina: ... Time for supper. Our celebrity hasn't eaten all day. We can carry on later. (*to konstantin*) Kostya, leave off your writing, we're going to supper.

Konstantin: I don't want any, I'm not hungry.

Arkadina: As you wish...

(Tom Stoppard: *Plays 3*)

Extract 9

Friedrich: You will come back here for supper afterwards?

Mauer: I don't know.

Friedrich: Of course you will.

Mauer: (*hesitatingly*) Thank you. But I must catch the 10.20 back to town. I have to be early at the hospital.

(Tom Stoppard: *Plays 3*)

Extract 10

Natasha: Justin, I've been looking everywhere for you.

Ivor: Have you?

Natasha: Oh, Justin! I need your help. Actually it's mother.

Ivor: Have you thought of asking Reggie Robinsod?

Natasha: Reggie Robinsod? Why do you say that?

Ivor: (*lapsing*) It's the way it's typed. (*Pause.*) Oh, right. (*resuming*) Have you thought of asking Reggie Robinsod?

(Tom Stoppard: *Plays 5*)

Extract 11

Mrs Wahl: ... We haven't yet sat down to a proper meal... We have to eat in this awful park. Well, see you before long, Genia...(*to Otto*) Will you come with us part of the way?

Otto: If I may accompany you as far as the tennis courts... Goodbye, ma'am, please give my respects to your husband.

(Tom Stoppard: *Plays 5*)

Extract 12

Christine: How are you? –Is everything well downstairs?

Frau Binder: Yes, you're quite a stranger. In fact, my husband was wondering if you'd join us for dinner in the Lehnergarten as it's the night the band plays.

Christine: Thank you very much, Frau Binder, but I can't this evening. Another time, perhaps. You don't mind, do you?

(Tom Stoppard: *Plays 3*)

Extract 13

Dvornichek arrives with a tray on which there are a cognac and a revolting looking cocktail.

Dvornichek: Here we are, gentlemen! One cognac and a Mad Dog.

Turai: At last.

Gal takes the cognac. Turai arrives at the tray too late.

What is this muck?

Dvornichek: That's the surprise.

Turai: I don't like surprises, especially when one is expecting cognac. How would *you* like it?

(Tom Stoppard: *Plays 5*)

Extract 14

Weinberl:...Nevertheless the bill will come.

Christopher: People of my class don't pay the bill.

Weinberl: I mean –

Christopher: (*very deliberately*) I know what you mean. I am not entirely stupid. Society will pay. *Our* society. Do you follow me?

Weinberl: Not exactly...

(Tom Stoppard: *Plays 4*)

Extract 15

Bernard: All right, but let me have a look.

Hannah: You'll queer my pitch.

Bernard: Dear girl, I know how to handle myself –

Hannah: And don't call me dear girl...

(Tom Stoppard: *Plays 1*)

Extract 16

Dr von Aigner: I'm dumbstruck. What's your complaint, Mr Serknitz?

Serknitz: I can't get my laundry back, you see. I've been asking for it for three days. It puts me in an awful spot.

Dr von Aigner: Yes, I see. But why don't you ask the chambermaid...

(Tom Stoppard: *Rosencrantz and Guildenstern are Dead*)

Extract 17

Friedrich: Careful –that really isn't necessary. Listen, Erna –I want to ask you something.

Erna: Then ask me.

Friedrich: All right –what would you think if ...listen –pay attention! –I'm quite sensible again. I want to get a divorce from Genia...and marry you, Erna.

Erna laughs.

Why...are you laughing?

Erna: Because you were only just saying that you were in a state to do something madly foolish.

(Tom Stoppard: *Plays 4*)

Extract 18

Herr Weiring: Turn you out? How can you say that? You only have me to protect you, and I failed you. We'll start again. You'll take singing lessons. There's a lot more to life. Being together. You and I. And summer's coming –we can go out to the country –

Christine: What are you talking about?

(Tom Stoppard: *Plays 4*)

Extract 19

Septimus: Will you join us this morning, Lord Augustus? We have our drawing lesson.

Augustus: I am a master of it at Eton, Mr Hodge, but we only draw naked women.

Septimus: You may work from memory.

Augustus: Disgusting!

(Tom Stoppard: *Plays 4*)

Extract 20

Christine: I'll see you later, father.

Herr Weiring: Should I come with you?

Christine: Well, I...I promised to see Mizi.

Herr Weiring: Ah yes, a much better idea. Youth must be served. Goodbye, then.

(Tom Stoppard: *Plays I*)

Extract 21

Mauer: Shall I come to Lake Vols, Fraulein Erna, yes or no?

Erna: I can see no reason at all why you should alter your plans.

Mauer: Is it really impossible for you to give me a straight answer, Erna?

Erna: It's not easy, Doctor. You know I'm very fond of you. You ought to come anyway. It would be the best way for us to get to know one another better. But naturally, you mustn't feel any more committed than I do.

Mauer: Neatly spoken.

Erna: And there's more. Listen. Naturally you have a favorite lady friend or some such –all unmarried gentlemen have. Well, don't be hasty. I mean, don't go away after our conversation thinking that you owe me your faithfulness.

(Tom Stoppard: *Plays I*)

Extract 22

Mauer: Here we are again...I hope I haven't kept you from supper?

Genia: I'll go and see how it's getting on...

Friedrich: Look, I've got an idea...Let's go to the park right away. I'm damned if I'm not in the mood for music and company. It's all the same to you, Mauer, isn't it?

Mauer: Me? What about your wife?

Genia: (*reluctantly*) I'd have to change...

Friedrich: Hurry up and change then, we'll be waiting for you in the garden.

(Tom Stoppard: *The Plays for Radio*)

Extract 23

Ruth: There's something I want you to do for me.

Peter: Sure. What?

Ruth: Would you take Cecil and Henri to the zoo?

Peter: Me?

Ruth: It would cheer Ann –it would cheer them up. They're really upset. Would you?

Peter: Oh, Ruthie –do you really think we should be doing this outside the home?

(Tom Stoppard: *The Plays for Radio*)

Extract 24

Dr von Aigner: I'm dumbstruck. What's your complaint, Mr Serknitz?

Serknitz: I can't get my laundry back, you see. I've been asking for it for three days. It puts me in an awful spot.

Dr von Aigner: Yes, I see. But why don't you ask the chambermaid...

(Tom Stoppard: *Plays 3*)

Extract 25

Hildegarde: Do we have time? I have just got to sit down and rest and catch my breath. *(She starts crying. AGNES comes and puts her hand around HILDEGARDE's shoulder.)*

George: For God's sake –it wasn't that bad.

Hildegarde: *(Furious.)* Oh, it's all right for you to talk –

George: *(Brightly, to his in-laws.)* Folks, we parked the car two blocks away. We were lucky. A DeSoto pulled out just as we came down the block, so anytime you're ready to leave, we'll go get it again.

Hildegarde: Just let me get my breath before we start out again.

(John Guare "Something I'll tell you Tuesday")

Extract 26

Andrew: I think we should hurry. Hospitals run on a tight schedule.

Hildegarde: Oh, Papa, you're always in such a hurry. It's so nice here with you. *(Patting her mother's hand.)* My God, we won't always have this chance. *(Horrifying pause all around. AGNES goes to the window.)*

George: That's a rotten thing to say.

Hildegarde: *(Realizing what she's said.)* Mama, I didn't mean that. I meant –and this is the truth – *(Rises, goes to AGNES.)* –the way George drives, I don't know how many more chances we're going to get apology

(John Guare "Something I'll tell you Tuesday")

Extract 27

Andrew: Are you packed? *(She nods yes. He pauses.)* Then get your coat on. *(He stands up)* I'll leave a note. *(He pantomimes writing a note. She runs off and returns with his coat and hat her coat and hat.)* I'll call a cab.

Agnes: No! I want to walk.

(John Guare "Something I'll tell you Tuesday")

Extract 28

Andrew: (*Stopping again.*) Look, we just can't walk up to the hospital. Let me call a cab.

Agnes: Are you tired?

Andrew: No.

Agnes: Is the suitcase heavy?

Andrew: No.

Agnes: Then we'll walk.

(John Guare "Something I'll tell you Tuesday")

Extract 29

Agnes: Andrew, could we have a cup of coffee?

Andrew: We can't be late.

Agnes: You want to get rid of me?

Andrew: NO! But –but hospitals run...let's get a cup of coffee. (*He sets down the suitcase. They sit on the chairs.*)

(John Guare "Something I'll tell you Tuesday")

Extract 30

Ruth/Henri: Will you tell us the same story...tonight? And sit on my bed?

Peter: Ruth, I'm really not in the mood right now to play-

Ruth/Henri: Can I sit in your lap?

Peter: Well, I'd really rather that you wouldn't-

(John Guare "Something I'll tell you Tuesday")

Extract 31

Anna/Cecil: Golly.

Ruth: Cecil, why don't you go join your other brothers in the other room? I think "Sesame Street" is on.

Cecil: Do you think I'm a child?

(*Noises of a wounded Cecil leaving the room. Pause.*)

Anna: Petey? Do you want to talk?

Peter: No! No!...I've got to go. I'm late. I'll...I'll see you later.

(John Guare "Something I'll tell you Tuesday")

Extract 32

Henri: Uncle Peter! Look! The monkey's pulling his pudding! In front of everybody!

(Henri laughs again.)

Peter: Oh, Henri, you always think the worst – *(He looks. Then, hurriedly)* – Ah, maybe we ought to go see the chimpanzees. Come on, Henri.

Henri: But I want to watch the monkey pull-!

Peter: I said come on.

(John Guare “Something I’ll tell you Tuesday”)

Extract 33

Anna: What can I do to make it up to you? Is there anything I can do to make you feel better? To cheer you up?

Henri: Well...there is a tiny, little something...

Anna: What can I do? Tell me...

Henri: Do you remember last year, when you got some money? And at the time, you asked me what I wanted, and I told you –

Anna: But Henri, baby –

Henri: And with all that money, what did we get? A movie. Sneakers. Chicken McNuggets...

Anna: But you like Chicken Mc –

Henri: I told you what I wanted, and you laughed at me. You laughed at me!

Anna: Henri! Where are we going to keep a pony in New York! Do you have any idea how much a pony costs? It's out of the question –

Henri: I really, really want a pony.

Anna: I'll think about it. I have to...talk to Ruth about this.

Henri: And I'll never, ever ask for anything again in my whole life. You could buy it for me with the money for college –

Anna: You're pushing your luck. I said I'll think about it. Now I want, your hands washed, your teeth brushed and the lights out.

Henri: *(Suddenly cheerful and obedient):* All right. I love you, Anna. Good night.

(Henri goes to the bedroom door and stops, suddenly overcome with doubt and fear.)

Henri: Anna?

Anna: What is it now?

Henri: Do you think maybe I could sleep with you and Ruth just for tonight?

(Anna stares ahead in worry.)

(John Guare “Something I’ll tell you Tuesday”)

APPENDIX 5

Definitions of Semantic Formulae, Pragmatics, Sociolinguistic Competence, Semantic Formulae of Apologies.

HANDOUT 1

DEFINITIONS

Pragmatics:

It is the study of language from the point of view of users, especially of the choices they make, the constraints they encounter in using language in social interaction and the effects their use of language has on other participants in the act of communication.

Sociolinguistic Competence:

This involves the appropriate use of language within various social contexts or situations. It can be seen as "verbal etiquette." Research has shown that parents rarely teach any grammar to their children, but that they are very active in teaching them how to make appropriate requests, apologies, expressions of gratitude, etc. From this we may infer that humans are more concerned with appropriateness than correctness in speech. If you remember back to your childhood, you were probably never told to say "May I please have a piece of candy" instead of "Give me some candy," because that is the way that people in your country should make requests. On the contrary, you were probably taught to say it that way, because it was "good" and "polite." In other words, verbal "manners" are taught as though they are exactly the same among all humans. The problem is that this is not always the case. But, since people are taught this way, they expect all people to have the same concepts of what would be polite and what would be rude to say in a given situation. So, while people are tolerant of grammar errors in young children and foreigners, they are not as tolerant of sociolinguistic *faux pas*. Therefore, when you travel to a foreign country or deal with foreigners in the future, sociolinguistic competence is perhaps the most important indicator of how you will be perceived by the people to whom you speak.

While parents focus on sociolinguistic competence and allow children to learn grammar mostly on their own, in the foreign language classroom, instructors take the opposite approach. Grammar is taught extensively while matters of social etiquette are

usually relegated to the end of the chapter where they are usually overlooked due to time concerns. In defense of instructors, these sections are also overlooked, because sociolinguistic competence would be extremely difficult to teach in a classroom setting. While young children are in natural social situations where their parents can be constantly reminding them of the appropriate thing to say in each situation, in a classroom, only the teacher is a native or near-native speaker and the setting is not "natural" at all. The only way the teacher could reasonably teach appropriate requests would be to say, in English, something like "When you're in a fancy restaurant, say . . . x . . . , When you're in a dive, say . . . y . . . , When you're with a friend, say . . . z . . ." The instructor could try to simulate these different situations in the classroom, but again, this would be very artificial and might still not be helpful to the students. This is where these drama extracts can be very helpful. In these scenes native English speakers interact in natural and semi-natural environments where they apologize and refuse to other native speakers of different ages, socioeconomic status, and gender. If you focus your attention on what is said in various situations, you will learn a great deal about sociolinguistics of refusing and apologizing in English.

Strategic competence:

Learning a foreign language is very different from other types of learning. This is because if your instructor speaks the language you are learning, you cannot understand every word they are saying. (But, if they speak Turkish, you won't learn at all!) Therefore, you must get used to feeling "lost" and using every context clue available in order to get the gist of what is being said. For many students this is very frustrating. As adults, we are used to understanding almost everything we hear and don't like feeling uncertain. However, the truth is that your instructor is probably speaking much more slowly than other English speakers you will encounter. Therefore, in order to be a successful language learner, it is extremely important that you develop strategies that enable you to relax, listen for words or look for body language that you recognize, and then "piece these together" and make educated guesses in order to fill in the gaps and try to figure out what is being said. This is what is called "strategic competence." Until you become proficient in the language, this ability will be extremely important for your listening comprehension. The characters in these drama extracts speak to each other as you will find in a normal conversation. This gives the viewer a chance to develop strategic competence in the comfort of his or her home before getting into a stressful situation in a foreign country.

APPENDIX 6A

Handout 2
ACTIVITIES

Saying ‘sorry’ in English

A. Read this example

Mary: You don’t! You don’t! You don’t care what happens to me.

Mrs. Tilford: (*sternly*) But I *do* care that you’re talking this way.

Mary: I’m sorry I said that, Grandma. I didn’t mean to hurt your feelings. (*Puts her arms around Mrs. Tilford’s neck*) Forgive me.

Mrs. Tilford and Mary are Americans. This example shows what they generally do to say

‘sorry’ politely.

B. Read the different parts of Mary’s response and say what she did to say ‘sorry’ politely to her grandmother. Circle the correct answer.

1. When Mary says ‘*I’m sorry I said that*’, she:

a. regrets	c. says he feels bad
b. offers an apology	d. blames herself

a. When Mary says ‘*I didn’t mean to...*’ she:

a. gets embarrassed	c. says she didn’t intended
b. justifies her grandmother	d. pretends to be offended

b. When Mary says ‘*...hurt your feelings*’, she:

a. offers of repair	c. says she feels bad
b. concerns for the hearer	d. regrets

c. When Mary says '*Forgive me*', she:

a. self-dispraises	c. gives an explanation
b. apologizes	d. requests for forgiveness

C. Look at the Mary's response again.

Mary: I'm sorry I said that, Grandma. I didn't mean to hurt your feelings. (*Puts her arms around Mrs. Tilford's neck*) Forgive me.

Note the sequence of phrases she uses in his response and complete the following statement about how Americans generally say 'sorry' politely.

First, Americans _____; second, they _____; third, they _____; and then, they _____.

D. Read Christopher's response to Miss Blumenblatt's utterance.

Weinberl: We must be going –we have a long way to get home.

Christopher: Yes, and somebody really ought to give us our fare for our trouble.

Miss Blumenblatt (*barring their way*) Stop! You are not leaving here.

Christopher: It wasn't our fault. Don't blame us.

Put a check (✓) mark next to the things he did in her response. Write down the exact part of his response that goes with it on the line provided.

_____ offers an apology: _____

_____ denies responsibility: _____

_____ says he's sorry: _____

_____ gives a positive opinion: _____

He did not exactly do what Mary did. Explain.

Other ways to say 'sorry' politely in American English:

Taking on responsibility: Americans show their regret in a situation that they feel themselves guilty by saying

It's my fault.
I feel awful about it.
I'm such a dimwit!
I feel awful about it

Show that you feel bad about the situation:

In the beginning:	At the end:
<i>I'm sorry</i>	<i>You're right to be angry</i>
<i>Forgive me</i>	<i>I'm the one to be offended</i>
<i>Excuse me</i>	<i>The traffic was terrible</i>
<i>Pardon me</i>	<i>It won't happen again</i>

E) We use a variety of ways to apologize. Here you have different examples of apologies taken from the drama extracts you have read. Find them in the printed version, and complete them according to the given semantic formula.

1.(an expression of regret).....(a request for forgiveness).....(self-dispraise)
2.(a request for forgiveness).....(pretend to be offended)
3. Well, I.....(lack of intent)
4. I know.....(justify hearer)
5.(denial of responsibility).....(blame the hearer)

APPENDIX 6B

HANDOUT 2

ACTIVITIES

Saying 'no' in English

A. Read this example:

Phil: Do you wanna see a movie tomorrow?

Chris: Uhm, I'd like to. Sorry, but I have to study for an exam tomorrow.

Chris and Phil are Americans. This example shows what they generally do to say 'no' politely.

B. Read the different parts of Chris's response and say what he did to say 'no' politely to Phil. Circle the correct answer.

1. When Chris says '*Uhm*', he:

a. gives an excuse	c. says he feels bad
b. hesitate	d. gives a positive opinion

a. When Chris says '*I'd like to*', he:

a. gives an excuse	c. says he feels bad
b. hesitate	d. gives a positive opinion

b. When Chris says '*Sorry*', he:

a. gives an excuse	c. says he feels bad
b. hesitate	d. gives a positive opinion

c. When Chris says '*but I have to study for an exam tomorrow*', he:

a. gives an excuse	c. says he feels bad
b. hesitate	d. gives a positive opinion

C. Look at the Chris's response again.

Chris: Uhm, I'd like to. Sorry, but I have to study for an exam tomorrow.

Note the sequence of phrases he uses in his response and complete the following statement about how Americans generally say 'no' politely.

First, Americans _____; second, they _____; third, they _____; and then, they _____.

D. Read Monica's response to Rachel's invitation.

Rachel: Hey Mon, what are you doing now? Wanna come see a movie with us?

Monica: Uhh, y'know actually I was gonna do some laundry.

Put a check (✓) mark next to the things she did in her response. Write down the exact part of her response that goes with it on the line provided.

_____ hesitates: _____

_____ gives an excuse: _____

_____ says she's sorry: _____

_____ gives a positive opinion: _____

She did not exactly do what Chris did. Explain.

Other ways to say 'no' politely in Am. English:

Hesitate: Americans show they are not ready to agree by saying things that show that they're thinking about what to say.

'Mmm', well, uhm, etc

Gee, I don't know.

I'm not sure.

I don't think I can.

Monica's *Uhh, y'know actually* shows this.

Show that you feel bad about the situation:

In the beginning: <i>Sorry...</i> <i>I'm sorry to say that...</i> <i>I wish I could, but...</i> <i>I really wanted to, but...</i>	At the end: <i>Sorry about that.</i>
--	--

Give an excuse: Americans unusually expect some kind of explanation, specific reasons for saying no.

I have a headache.

My friend is coming over tonight.

E) We use a variety of ways to refuse an offer, a suggestion, a request or an invitation.

Here you have different examples of refusals taken from the drama extracts you have read. Find them in the printed version, and complete them according to the given semantic formula.

1. No.(*Adjunct to refusal*)
2. Yes,(*statement of empathy*)(*statement of alternative*)
3. No!(*verbal avoidance hedging*).....(*topic switch*)
4. Why don't you ask.....
- 5.....(*verbal* *avoidance*
postponement).....(*hesitation*).....(*excuse, reason*)
6.(*verbal avoidance-repetition of part of request*)

APPENDIX 7A*Handout 3**ACTIVITIES with REFUSALS*

Write a dialogue for each of the following situations. In each situation you are refusing a specific person.

1. Your friend is having a party to celebrate the success of his/her thesis defense. S/he invited all his/her good friends, including you. But for a certain reason you couldn't go to his/her party.
2. Your boss asks you to spend an extra hour or two at work. But you promised your best friends to go out that night.
3. A classmate, who often misses class, asks to borrow your notes. But for this time you do not want to give your notes.
4. A classmate that you have known for a couple of years stops by your desk at the library and invites you to lunch. You want to leave school early today, so you would rather work through lunch to get ahead on your project.
5. You are working on a group project with three other students. Your group is having a discussion with your professor late Friday afternoon. It is 5:30pm. You are planning to pick up a friend at the airport immediately after the meeting and must leave the university within 15 minutes.
6. You arrive home and notice that your cleaning lady is extremely upset. She comes rushing up to you and tells you that she had an awful accident. While she was cleaning she bumped into the table and your china vase fell and broke. She insisted on paying for it.
7. You're a language teacher at a university. It is just about the middle of the term now and one of your students asks to speak to you. He/she told you that the students feel that the class would be better if you could give them more practice in conversation and less on grammar.

APPENDIX 7B

Handout 3

ACTIVITIES with APOLOGIES

Write a dialogue for each of the following situations. In each situation you are apologizing to a specific person.

1. You have borrowed your friend's notes and because of the rain yesterday, some of the notes have been wet and damaged.
2. You have promised one of the university staff to fill in and return a form two days ago but you have a two day delay.
3. You have been supposed to meet your close friend at the university library to exchange some books and you get there an hour later and find your friend still waiting for you at the library.
4. While you are talking with your friends, a student you don't know asks to look at the article which you are discussing. Without noticing, you pass it to him/her with your left hand. S/he looks at you with annoyance.
5. Your older sibling asks you to get his/her ruler which has fallen under the table you are writing at. Because you're feeling lazy, you take it with your toes and kick it towards him/her. S/he gets angry at this.
6. Your boss asks you to buy some office supplies. You buy the wrong things.
7. One evening while you are watering plants you are startled by someone saying hello. Because you are startled, you accidentally spray him with the hose you are using, so that this older man (who by his uniform is an employee of the television company come to collect payment) becomes soaking wet.

APPENDIX 8A

In coding apologies in terms of semantic formulas, the taxonomy of apologies formulated by Olshtain and Cohen (1983) was used. They are the following:

CLASSIFICATION OF APOLOGIES

(1) Illocutionary Force Indicating Devices (IFIDs)

- a. An expression of regret, e.g. *I'm sorry*
- b. An offer of apology, e.g. *I apologize*
- c. A request for forgiveness, e.g. *Excuse me~Forgive me~Pardon me*

(2) Explanation or Account

Any external mitigating circumstances, 'objective' reasons for the violation, e.g.

The traffic was terrible

(3) Taking on Responsibility

- a. Explicit self-blame, e.g. *It is my fault~my mistake*
- b. Lack of intent, e.g. *I didn't mean it*
- c. Expression of self-deficiency, e.g. *I was confused/I didn't see you~I forgot*
- d. Expression of embarrassment, e.g. *I feel awful about it*
- e. Self-dispraise, e.g. *I'm such a dimwit!*
- f. Justify hearer, e.g. *You're right to be angry*
- g. Refusal to acknowledge guilt

Denial of responsibility, e.g. *It wasn't my fault*

Blame the hearer, e.g. *It's your own fault*

Pretend to be offended, e.g. *I'm the one to be offended*

(4) Concern for the hearer, e.g. *I hope I didn't upset you/Are you all right?*

(5) Offer of Repair, e.g. *I'll pay for the damage*

(6) Promise of Forbearance, e.g. *It won't happen again*

APPENDIX 8B

In coding refusals in terms of semantic formulas, the taxonomy of refusals formulated by Beebe *et al.* (1990) was used. They are the following:

CLASSIFICATION OF REFUSALS

I. Direct

A. Performative (e.g., “I refuse”)

B. Nonperformative statement

1. “No”

2. Negative willingness (“I can’t”. “I won’t”. “I don’t think so”.)

II. Indirect

A. Statement of regret (e.g., “I’m sorry...”; “I feel terrible...”)

B. Wish (e.g., “I wish I could help you...”)

C. Excuse, reason, explanation (e.g., “My children will be home that night.”; “I have a headache.”)

D. Statement of alternative

1. I can’t do X instead of Y (e.g., “I’d rather...” “I’d prefer...”)

2. Why don’t you do X instead of Y (e.g., “Why don’t you ask someone else?”)

E. Set condition for future or past acceptance (e.g., “If you had asked me earlier, I would have...”)

F. Promise of future acceptance (e.g., “I’ll do it next time”; “I promise I’ll...” or “Next time I’ll...”-using “will” of promise or “promise”)

G. Statement of principle (e.g., “I never do business with friends.”)

H. Statement of philosophy (e.g., “One can’t be too careful.”)

I. Attempt to dissuade interlocutor

1. Threat or statement of negative consequences to the request (I won’t be any fun tonight” to refuse an invitation)

2. Guilt trip (e.g., Waitress to costumers who want to sit a while: I can’t make a living off people who just offer coffee.”)

3. Criticize request/requester, etc. (statement of negative felling or opinion);

4. Request for help, empathy, and assistance by dropping or holding the request.

5. Let interlocutor off the hook (e.g., “Don’t worry about it.” “That’s okay.” “You don’t have to.”)

6. Self defense (e.g., “I’m trying my best.” “I’m doing all I can do.” “I no do nutting wrong.”)

J. Acceptance that functions as a refusal

1. Unspecific or indefinite reply
2. Lack of enthusiasm

K. Avoidance

1. Nonverbal
 - a. Silence
 - b. Hesitation
 - c. Do nothing
 - d. Physical departure
2. Verbal
 - a. Topic switch
 - b. Joke
 - c. Repetition of part of request, etc. (e.g., “Monday?”)
 - d. Postponement (e.g., “I’ll think about it.”)
 - e. Hedging (e.g., “Gee, I don’t know.” “I’m not sure.”)

Adjuncts to Refusals

1. Statement of positive opinion/feeling or agreement (“That’s a good idea...”; “I’d love to...”)
2. Statement of empathy (e.g., “I realize you are in a difficult situation.”)
3. Pause fillers (e.g., “uhh”; “well”; “oh”; “uhm”)
4. Gratitude/ appreciation

From: Beebe, L. M., Takahashi, T., & Uliss-Weltz, R.(1990). Pragmatic transfer in ESL refusals. In R. C. Scarcella, E. Andersen, & S. D. Krashen (Eds.), *Developing communicative competence in a second language* (pp. 55-73). New York: Newbury House.

APPENDIX 9

STUDENT EVALUATION FORM

Circle the most appropriate response

1. How would you rate the lessons with drama extracts

Very easy easy neither easy nor difficult difficult very difficult

2. How would you rate the situations in the tests [pre-, post.]?

Very easy easy neither easy nor difficult difficult very difficult

3. How did you find the lessons?

Very interesting interesting somewhat a little not at all interesting

4. Through these lessons, how much information did you learn about refusing and apologizing in English in an appropriate manner?

Very much enough more or less a bit nothing

5. In your view, did the lessons help you to improve your English in the area regarding what is appropriate and what is not in refusing and apologizing in English?

Definitely probably perhaps probably not not at all

6. How useful were the theatre extracts in helping you to learn this aspect (pragmatic) of English?

Not at all a little more or less adequately completely

7. How useful were the [metapragmatic] discussions on the drama extracts?

Not at all a little more or less adequately completely

8. Was the instructor's explanation of pragmatic features and [sociolinguistic] rules helpful?

Not at all a little more or less adequately completely

9. Did the drama extracts help in any way?

Not at all a little more or less adequately completely

10. The drama extracts helped me to learn about some aspect of the American culture.

Not at all a little more or less adequately completely

11. What aspects of the lessons did you have trouble understanding?

12. What are some other aspects of English that you would like to learn?

13. Of all the activities in the lessons, which one benefited you the most? And the least?

Most:

Least:

14. What suggestions do you have for improving the lessons?

15. Please list any other comments you have on these lessons below: