The effect of instruction on learning refusals in EFL learners

Mahmoud. Rostamy[1], Kaivan Parhoodeh[2*]
[1]Khatam Al Anbia University, Tehran, Iran
mahmoud.rostamy@gmail.com
[2]Islamic Azad University Gillan-e-Gharb center, Gillan-e-Gharb, Iran
k.parhoodeh@gmail.com

*Corresponding Author

Abstract- *The major aim of learning a second or foreign language is communication. In order to be a competent communicator, we must get familiar with the ingredients of speech and language. Speech acts are one of the principal elements and functional units of communication. In this realm, refusals play a key role. Due to their inherently face threatening nature, refusals are of an especially sensitive nature, and a pragmatic breakdown in this act may easily lead to unintended offence or breakdowns in communication. Refusals are also of interest due to their typically complex constructions. They are often negotiated over several terms and involve some degree of indirectness. While there are a great number of studies which examine certain speech acts, the amount of research on refusals is much more limited. The aim of this study is to investigate whether either of the instruction types, explicit vs. implicit, proves more efficient in improving pragmatic performance of Iranian EFL learners. For this reason, 45 male, military intermediate EFL learners all between19-25 years of age in a military language institute, in Tehran, Iran, were selected to participate in the study. A pretest/posttest design was adopted in this study. Having formed the three groups under investigation, (explicit, implicit and explicit-implicit) I measured all subjects' pragmatic performance of L2 refusals through Discourse Completion Tests, DCTs. All groups were exposed to conversations from 'spectrum' English books which embody refusals. The findings proved the efficiency of explicit instruction over implicit one in increasing Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic performance.*

Keywords- *Pragmatic development, Pragmatic instruction, Refusals, Explicit instruction, implicit instruction*

1. INTRODUCTION

Successful communication in the target language requires not only the knowledge of grammar and vocabulary but also pragmatic competence and knowledge about the culture of target language (Rezvani & Ozdemir, 2010). As Eslami-Rasekh (2004) puts it, the development of pragmatic and sociolinguistic rules of language use is important for language learners. It is necessary to understand and create language that is appropriate to the situations in which one is functioning, because failure to do so may cause users to miss key points that are being communicated or to have their messages misunderstood. Many studies in recent years have accentuated the crucial role pragmatics plays in second/foreign language learning. However, as Soler (2005) asserts, the significant question of whether pragmatics is teachable, is proposed. Thus, we are almost left with an incomplete picture of the nature of pragmatic instruction.

This study is set up to further investigate whether either of the instruction types, explicit vs. implicit, proves more efficient in ameliorating pragmatic performance of Iranian EFL learners. The speech act under investigation in this study is refusal*.* The form and content of refusals vary depending on the type of speech act that elicits them

(request, offer, etc), and they usually vary in degree of directness depending on the status of the participants (Beeb et al, 1990).Three research questions have been raised in this study to clarify the kind of instruction which suits our teaching and learning environments. Of course doing such a kind of research has got its own problems and limitations namely, cultural discrepancies, methods of eliciting appropriate and intended reaction from the learners, and willingness of learners to cooperate for the sake of obtaining fruitful results and conclusions. To be really honest doing such a research in a military center was not a matter of ease and I came across many official and bureaucratic problems during data- collection procedures.

1.1. Language pragmatics

Some constitute pragmatics as: 'A user-based prospective on the language sciences such as linguistics, the philosophy of language and the sociology of language which essentially focuses on the exploration of language use and the users of language in real-life situations and, more generally, on the principles which govern language in everyday interaction.
(Pütz and Neff-Aertselaer, 2008). Therefore, pragmatics studies language as realized in interactive contexts and consequently, as the creation of meaning in online discourse situations. Moreover, to Schauer (2009),

pragmatics is a relatively young discipline, compared to, for example, phonetics and syntax which began to establish itself as an independent area of linguistic research only about forty years ago. Linguistic pragmatics has its foundation in language philosophy and developed, he believes, as a result of ideas concerning the functions and use of language. Schauer points out that the first definition of pragmatics that is generally quoted was developed by Morris (1938), who, allegedly, defined pragmatics as 'the study of the relation of signs to interpreters.' In their book 'investigating Pragmatics in Foreign Language Learning and Testing', Soler and Martinez-Flor (2008) deal profoundly with language pragmatics. To them, the study of pragmatics encompasses areas such as deixis, conversational implicature, presupposition, and conversational structure. However, the study of second language pragmatics, also referred to as interlanguage pragmatics (ILP), focuses mainly on the investigation of speech acts,

Conversational structure and conversational implicature. Interlanguage pragmatics research, they state, has focused on describing and explaining learners' use, perception and acquisition of second language (L2) pragmatic ability both in L2 and foreign language contexts. Ishihara and Cohen (2010), two eminent figures in the domain of language pragmatics, have come up with a work entitled 'Teaching and Learning Pragmatics' which contains longitudinal studies and the concomitant findings. It is believed that the notion of pragmatics has numerous meanings depending on the context. When it is said someone is

Taking a 'pragmatic approach' to something, the implication is that the person is being practical. Yet, the word assumes a more specialized meaning in applied linguistics. The term pragmatic ability refers both to knowledge about pragmatics and the ability to use it.

In a comprehensive study, Chang (2009) advocates the significance of pragmatics asserting that to use language accurately, mastery of the formal properties of phonological, lexical and grammatical systems is required. The accuracy of language form, however, does not guarantee the appropriateness of the language use. Learners, he keeps, need to

acquire competence as to when to speak, and what to talk about with whom, where and in what manner in order to use language appropriately. McLean (2004) believes that taking pragmatics into account would give students a fighting chance, stating that, by attending to pragmatic factors in second language situations, students will be better able to make informed choices in negotiating effective communication. Meaning is not something that is inherent in the words alone. Making meaning, he says, is a dynamic process of negotiation involving both speaker and hearer.. In one study, Silva (2000) related the topics of pragmatics, bilingualism and the native speakers. She makes it overt that there is a bias in second language acquisition literature that a second/foreign language learner does not have 'native speaker competence' in the second/foreign language. Contrary to this view,

researchers in bilingualism and multilingualism question the whole notion of 'native-like competence'. Findings from her study demonstrate that monolinguals constantly adjust the way they deal with their L1 in both linguistic and pragmatic terms.

1.2. Pragmatic Instruction

In recent years, one of the main concerns of language teachers in the field of second language acquisition was the development of learners' communicative competence in second or foreign language; assert Martinez-Flor and Uso-Juan (2010). Recent models of communicative competence have revealed that communicating appropriately and effectively in a target language requires not only knowledge of the features of the language systems, but also of the pragmatic rules of language use. Given this need, Martinez-Flor and Uso-Juan (2010b) propose what has been decided on by previous researchers that the presentation of rich and contextually appropriate input has been regarded as necessary condition for developing learners' pragmatic ability when understanding and performing speech acts in the target language.

Then, Ishihara (2010) presents three terms in teaching pragmatics: noticing, awareness and attention. She indicates that attention and awareness can be viewed as inseparable. Attention is considered as a variety of mechanisms or subsystems that control access to awareness. Attention, she keeps, is limited and selective in nature, managing access to

Consciousness and leading to the control of action and learning. Ishihara further discussed that when pragmatic information is noticed, whether attended to deliberately or inadvertently, the input has the potential to become intake and may be stored in long-term memory.

Kondo (2001), on the other hand, proposes an awareness-raising approach towards pragmatic instruction. She revealed that, learners' discussion after they had analyzed their own speech act performance and the data presented in the textbook indicated that learners have come to be aware of several pragmatic aspects related to cross-cultural understanding through instruction.

Takimoto (2009) evaluated the effectiveness of three types: input-based instruction, comprehension-based instruction, structured input-instruction, and conscious-raising instruction on the development or learners' pragmatic proficiency.

The results of the data analysis indicate that the three treatment groups performed significantly better than the control group, but that the comprehension-based instruction group did not maintain the positive effects of the treatment between the posttest and follow-up test in the listening test.

1.3. Refusals

Many linguists and scholars in the realm of pragmatics, consider refusals a little different from other speech acts since, they occur as a result or response to other speech acts. For instance, Ellis (2008) believes that it is difficult to adapt refusals with Searle's (1975) classification of speech

acts. Ellis also points out that refusals occur in the form of responses to a variety of illocutionary acts such as invitations, offers, requests, and suggestions. Ellis proposes that refusals be treated as an informal 'interactional' tern rather than a 'speech act' proper.

Ishihara and Cohen (2010) put that, in making a refusal, the speaker/writer is typically communicating a potentially undesirable message as far as the listener/reader is concerned. There are some strategies employed in mitigating refusals. They assert that refusals are often made in response to speech act of requests, invitations, offers, and suggestions.

Refusals can be either direct or indirect. Ishihara and Cohen also reveal that refusals can be accompanied by some other elements such as statement of positive opinion, statement of empathy and so forth. Kawate-Mierzejewska (2006) examined request-refusal sequences among 20 Japanese speakers of Japanese (JJs), and 20 American English speakers of Japanese (AJs) in a naturalistic context. All request-refusal situations were through telephone conversations. As a result, the AJs utilized seven different types of refusal sequences, consisting of 13 different refusal sub-sequences, while The JJs used 6 different types consisting of seven different refusal sub-sequences.

Kondo (2001), similarly, seeks to find out the effects on pragmatic development through awareness-raising instruction. She considers pragmatic development as the usage of refusals by Japanese EFL learners. Kondo comes to the very conclusion that pragmatics can be taught and, in this case, consciousness-raising is of integral importance for the learners to become aware of the similarities and differences between their native language and the target language. Most importantly, the study revealed that learners' choices of refusal strategies changed and became more similar to American pattern after explicit instruction.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Interlanguage pragmatic research has focused on describing learners' production, perception and acquisition of second language users' pragmatic ability. Among the different issues that have been considered, speech acts have been examined from a cross-cultural and a developmental perspective in different contexts. In educational contexts, learners' development of pragmatics has been addressed from different theoretical perspectives (Alcón, 2008) and the factors that potentially influence pragmatic learning have been highlighted. Among those factors, the role of instruction on learners' awareness and production of speech acts has generated a lot of interest in the field of ILP. In this way, work on the effect of instruction in relation to different speech acts (Olshtain and Cohen, 1990, on apologies; Rose and Ng Kwai-Fun, 2001, on compliments and compliment responses; Alcón, 2005; Codina, 2008; Martínez Flor, 2007; Safont, 2005, 2007; Salazar, 2007; Takahashi, 2001; Usó-Juan, 2007, on refusals) supports Schmidt's (1993, 1995, 2001) noticing

hypothesis, and has provided evidence that high levels of attention-drawing activities are more helpful for pragmatic learning than exposure to positive evidence (see also Jeon and Kaya, 2006; and the collection of papers in Alcón and Martínez-Flor, 2005, 2008 and Rose and Kasper, 2001). In addition, results of studies dealing with the effect of instruction also seem to provide evidence on the superiority of explicit over implicit pragmatic intervention (see Takahashi, 2010, for a review of the effect of pragmatic instruction on speech act performance).

Following these research outcomes in the area of language pedagogy, suggestions are made for techniques and activities either to develop learners' pragmatic awareness about speech acts or to provide opportunities for speech act performance (for instance the volumes by Bardovi-Harlig and Mahan-Taylor, 2003, and Tatsuki, 2005). Similarly, some pedagogical models have been suggested that aim to provide learners with the theoretical conditions for language learning, mainly adequate input, opportunities for output and feedback (Judd, 1999; Kondo, 2008; Martínez-Flor and Usó-Juan, 2006. See also Martínez- Flor and Usó-Juan, 2010, for a review of different pedagogical proposals). Although we can claim that these pedagogical models offer learners opportunities for noticing, understanding and producing speech acts, two issues remain to be dealt with. The first one is related to the fact that speech acts are not presented in their sequential environment .Kasper & Rose (2002) consider the ability to recognize the appropriateness

of an utterance within a given context and to choose one possible form over another based on that understanding, one of the most important skills associated with pragmatic competence. It has been observed that L2 learners display a noticeably different L2 pragmatic system than the native speakers of the L2, both in production and comprehension (Bardovi-Harlig, 2001; Kasper, 1997). This is mostly caused by learners' notion of transferability. Kasper & Schmidt (1996) have explained it in two terms: One is the possibility of the learners' hesitation of transferring the L1 strategies that may be universal or at least common to L2, and the other is transferring strategies, assuming them to be universal, thus transferable, when actually it is not the case. In line with this perspective, I would argue that even advanced learners' utterances may contain pragmatic errors. For these reasons I assume that instruction on L2 pragmatics is necessary at every level of proficiency to develop learners' pragmatic competence and performance.

What makes linguistic meaning in context clear is pragmatics (Franklin, 2003).Taken by itself, the sentence is essentially uninterpretable. Context plays an integral role in comprehending the real sense of the sentence. Full understanding of how formal properties are learnt will not be achieved without examining the way in which these properties are used in actual communication. (Ellis, 2008). Use of language is also closely and uniquely tied to the culture and often rules of speaking vary across languages. According to these implicit cultural rules, we constantly alter our language use depending on the situation and the

interlocutor. (Ishihara,2003). The relevant literature for refusals is very rich ,particularly in intra-cultural communication cited Ahmad Qadoury Abed,2008 in his article (pragmatic transfer in Iraqi EFL learners' refusals) .The speech act of refusal has been assigned a face-threatening characteristic in politeness and speech act research(Brown & Levinson,1987; Felix-Brasdefer,2006).Similarly, research in conversation analysis has referred to refusal as a dispreferred conversational action(Levinson,1983;Heritage,1984). Dispreferred acts in conversation are usually delayed, qualified or accounted and refusals have been referred to as one of the accountable acts in conversation(Heritage,1984).

Refusing is a complex issue because the speaker directly or indirectly says no to his or her interlocutor's request, invitation or suggestion (Chen, 1996).According to Chen (1996), refusals are often realized through indirect strategies, which require a high level of pragmatic competence. Patricia solazar cited that the speech act of refusal has attracted researchers' attention due to the face-threatening nature it entails.

If refusals are challenging for native speakers as they may involve lengthy negotiation moves , the situation becomes even more complex in interactions between NSs and NNSs or between NNSs and NNSs Patricia Salazar & M. Pilar Safont (2005) .In fact , refusing is a complex task for NNSs since it may be conducive to communication failure(Salazar,2005).

In line with Safont's (2005) claim, there is a need for providing systematized pragmatic patterns in identifying and providing specific speech acts. Patterns provided in teaching pragmatics should be based on research into interlanguage pragmatics and foreign language acquisition. Moreover, according to Coulmas(1981),routine formulae constitute a substantial part of adult NS pragmatic competence and learners need to acquire a sizeable repertoire of routines in order to cope efficiently with recurrent and expanding social situations and discourse requirements.

According to Beeb,Takahashi ,and Uliss- weltz(1990), refusals are a major " sticking point" for non-native speakers and are complex in nature. Gass and Houck (1999) add that part of the complexity of refusals lies in the fact that they may involve a long negotiated sequence, and that, because they function as second pair part, they preclude extensive planning on the part of the refuser. Beeb et al. also comment that the risk of face threat is so inherent to the speech act of refusal that some degree of indirectness is usually required.

3. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the present study was to compare the effect of explicit & implicit instruction of English refusals to some EFL learners. Whether instruction of Refusals should be done explicitly or implicitly is a subject worthy of attention not only for learners but also for language

planners and authorities involved in the language education. Coming to a logical and reasonable conclusion on the so called subject would have pedagogical implications in the realm of English learning and teaching.

2.1. Research Questions

Q1.Does explicit instruction of refusals has any effects on learning refusals of intermediate EFL learners?
Q2.Does implicit instructions of refusals have a significant effect on learning refusals of intermediate EFL learners

4. METHODOLOGY

3.1.Participants

40 male intermediate EFL military learners all between 19-25 years of age at a military language institute in Tehran 'Iran' were randomly selected to participate in the study. Prior to the initiation of the study, some measures and steps were taken to assess various factors contributing to valid and reliable results. For the sake of homogeneity, their proficiency level in English was measured by a pragmatic format kind of questionnaire.

4.2. Instruments

A pretest/posttest design was adopted in this study. After having formed the two groups under investigation, I measured all subjects' pragmatic performance of L2 refusals through Discourse Completion Tests, DCTs (See Appendix). This kind of test is piloted through Cronbach's alpha (coefficient Alpha).A format according to the most frequently used refusal phrases in English which includes at least five factors or elements namely (No, No thank you, I'd better not, I'm sorry, and absolutely not) was devised .The frequency of occurrences of these phrases in pre and post test was a signal for the effectiveness of instruction. Due to the fact that this study did not take a contrastive approach and neither did it intend to investigate the strategies learners employ in the case of speech acts, DCTs are in target language, English.

4.3. Data-collection procedure

This study was implemented in a military institutional context a in Tehran, Iran. Subjects in all groups were in their inter mediate phase of the course, meeting six hours a day five days a week. Each class session took one hour and half.

All the subjects in the experimental groups received treatment throughout a term which lasted 60 hours. The course books taught in this institute are special military books. In addition to the main class material, subjects were also exposed to dialogs of 'Spectrum' English book in which refusals were embedded. By exposing the subjects to the dialogs in the two treatment groups, i.e. explicit and implicit, it was intended to raise learners' pragmatic awareness of L2 refusals.. In the explicit group, a focus on forms instruction was provided based on explicit awareness-raising tasks on refusals. That is, sentence structures were elaborated upon for the learners to deduce refusal forms. However, in the implicit group, the input enhancement approach was taken on pragmalinguistic and

sociolinguistic factors involved in refusals. This means that in implicit group the setting was organized in a way that learners' induced refusal forms from the dialogs. At the beginning of the term I distributed the first DCT as a pretest to be completed by the students. After about four weeks of continuous instruction the second DCT was distributed.

To account for the practice effect, situations of DCT in which subjects were to refuse something, were of the same theme but different occasions. The method of teaching refusals to the explicit group was as the following: firs of all I introduced to them an element of rejection in English .By creating some authentic and real question- rejection situations, I taught them the newly rejection element. Then I and the students practiced collaboratively one of the dialogs of Spectrum English book.Every day, one dialog for about one hour. The In the implicit group I just wrote on the board the element of refusal or brought some pictures and props of rejection or refusing to the class and

worked on dialogs without emphasizing on the element of rejection.

3.4. Data Analysis

I analyzed the first pre- DCT for the two groups that is explicit and implicit ones. I counted the frequency of occurrences of the five most occurring elements of rejection for each member of the two groups. I did the same procedure for the second post-DCT for the two implicit and explicit groups.

5. RESULTS

At the end of the treatment period, a posttest with the format of an open-ended Discourse Completion Test (the same as the pretest) was administered in all the two groups under investigation. Situations of DCT in which subjects were to refuse something, were of the same theme but different occasions so as to account for the practice effect.

Table 1.Control Group

Pretest Valid	frequency	percent	Valid Pretest	Cumulative percent	posttest Valid	frequency	percent	Valid Pretest	Cumulative percent
1	2	10.0	10.0	10.0	1	1	5.0	5.0	5.0
2	7	35.0	35.0	45.0	2	7	35.0	35.5	40.0
3	10	50.0	50.0	95.0	3	12	60.0	60.0	100
4	1	5.0	5.0	100.0	Total	20	100.0	100.0	
Total	20	100.0	100.0						

Each sheet of pretest and posttest was rated on a five-scale ranking order: 5 (excellent), 4 (very good), 3 (good), 2 (average), 1 (poor).Teachers & instructors of English , who held academic degrees, were asked to rate each pretest and posttest DCT without having been presented with the distinctions of the three groups under study.

Then with the assistance of a statistician, the results were analyzed employing positive rank test statistics and

Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test. Data gained from the pretest and posttest for each of the three groups, were processed through Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program. The results of the data processing from the pretest and posttest in control, explicit and implicit group are presented in tables 1, 2 and 3 respectively.

Table2. Explicit Group

Pretest Valid	frequency	percent	Valid Pretest	Cumulative percent	posttest Valid	frequency	percent	Valid Pretest	Cumulative percent
1	1	5.0	5.0	5.0	2	1	5.0	5.0	5.0
2	8	40.0	40.0	45.0	3	3	15.0	15.0	20.0
3	10	50.0	50.0	95.0	4	11	55.0	55.0	75.0
4	1	5.0	5.0	100.0	5	5	25.0	25.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	100.0		Total	20	100.0	100.0	

Table 1 report on the subjects in control group. It is obvious from the cumulative percent in pretest and posttest that in control group, where the presentation of dialogs was merely to ameliorate English proficiency of the subjects, no significant change occurs in pragmatic production of refusals.

In Tables 2 and 3, on the other hand, the effect of instruction on pragmatic production of refusals is quite tangible. Particularly, in explicit group there is a drastic change in subjects' performance of refusals after the treatment period.

Table 3. Implicit Group

Pretest Valid	frequency	percent	Valid Pretest	Cumulative percent	posttest Valid	frequency	percent	Valid Pretest	Cumulative percent
2	7	35.0	35.0	35.0	2	4	20.0	20.0	20.0
3	11	55.0	55.0	90.0	3	8	40.0	40.0	60.0
4	2	10.0	10.0	100.0	4	7	35.0	35.5	95.0
Total	20	100.0	100.0		5	1	5.0	5.0	100.0
					Total	20	100.0	100.0	

Table 4 is the calculation of all the data processing formulas for the three groups under study. To make the concomitant statistical results more vivid, it is to put that p-value in the probability of obtaining a test statistics. If p-value is smaller than α ($p < 0.05$), it means that the difference is significant. That is to say, if p-value is .000, the null hypothesis is rejected. As illustrated by table 4, the P-value (Exact Sig. 2-tailed) for control, explicit and implicit groups is 1.000, .000, and .013 respectively. This is indicative of the fact that, instruction does make a difference in developing pragmatic performance of EFL learners. Further, it is evident from table 4 that subjects in the explicit group surpassed those in implicit group in pragmatic performance.

Table 4. Summary of the results of all three groups

	Control Pretest-posttest	Explicit Pretest-posttest	Implicit Pretest-posttest
Z	-.3782	-.3.4642	-2.6734
Asymp.Sig.(2-tabled)	.705	0.001	0.008
Exact Sig. (2-tabled)	1.0000	0.000	0.013
Exact Sig. (1-tabled)	0.500	0.000	0.006
Point probability	0.273	0.000	0.006

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

All in all, the findings of this research on pragmatics are indicative of the fact that instruction seems to make a tangible difference in improving L2 learners' pragmatic production of refusals. However, explicit instruction proves more effective in boosting pragmatic ability of L2 learners. As a result, H0 of this study which had not foreseen any difference between explicit and implicit instruction on pragmatic development, is rejected. Previous studies on the effects of instruction on pragmatic performance go in the same line.

In Iranian EFL context, it is safe to claim that due to the lack of direct communication of Iranian EFL learners with native speakers of English, pragmatics proves even more crucial. Studies and observations in Iranian context have pointed out that EFL learners produce language which is almost structurally accurate but not contextually appropriate.

Given that appropriate use of language is the case of L2 pragmatics, it is recommended that language teachers be aware of this need in learners. More specifically, explicit approach of teaching speech acts turns out to be more efficient in learners' pragmatic development.

7. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study contributes to the previous studies on the positive effect of instruction on the development of pragmatic competence in Second and foreign language learning. So, language teachers should take this fact into consideration to include issues of language pragmatics in ESL/EFL classes. Similarly, it is on pedagogy scholars and syllabus planners not to ignore knowledge of pragmatic aspects in their syllabus design.

REFERENCES

[1] Alcon Soler, E. & Martinez-Flor, A. (2008). *Investigating Pragmatics in ForeignLanguage Learning, Teaching and Testing.* Great Britain: Cromwell Press, Chapter 1).

[2] Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2001). Evaluating the empirical evidence: Grounds for instruction in pragmatics? In: K. Rose & G. Kasper (Eds.) , *Pragmatics in language teaching* (pp. 13-32). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[3] Barron, A. 2003. *Acquisition in interlanguage pragmatics: learning how to do things.*

Philadelphia, PA, USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[4] Bouton, L. F. (1994b). *Conversational implicature in a second language*: Learned slowly when not deliberately taught. *Journal of Pragmatics, 22*, 157-167.

[5] Brown, P., & Levinson, S. 1978/1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[6] Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). *Communicative Competence*: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics,* 6, 5-35.Cheng, W. 2003. *Intercultural Conversation: A Study of Hong Kong Chinese*. Philadelphia, PA, USA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[7] Ellis, R., (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press.

[8] Fromkin, V., Rodman R. & Hymas, N. (2003). *An Introduction to Language.* United States: Thomson, (Chapter 5).

[9] Goffman, E. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-face Behavior*. Garden City, NY: Anchor. Holtgraves, T. (1998). Interpreting Indirect Replies. *Cognitive Psychology*, 37, 1-27.

[10] Holtgraves, T. (2005). Social Psychology, Cognitive Psychology, and Linguistic Politeness. *Journal of Politeness Research. Language, Behaviour, Culture,*1, 73-93.

[11] House, J. (1996). Developing pragmatic fluency in English as a foreign language: Routines and met pragmatic awareness. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition18,* 225- 52.

[12] Ishihara, N. & A. Cohen, (2010). *Teaching and Learning Pragmatics*. Longman: Pearson.

[13] Ishihara, N., (2003). Identity and Pragmatic Performance of Second Language Learners.Paper Presented at the Annual Conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics. Kawate-Mierzejewska, M. (2006). *Request-refusal Interactions in Telephone Conversations.* Tokyo: Kuroshio Publishers.

[14] Kasper, G. (1997). *Can pragmatic competence be taught?* (NetWork #6) [HTML document]. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i, Second Language Teaching &Curriculum enter. Retrieved October, 26, 2001, from www.nflrc.hawaii.edu/NetWorks/NW06.

[15] Kasper, G., & Schmidt, R. (1996). Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*, 149-69.

*[16]*Kasper, G. & Rose, K. R. (1999). Pragmatics and SLA. *Annual Review of Applied   Linguistics,* 19, 81-104.

*[17]*Kasper, G., Rose, K.R. 2002. *Pragmatic Development in a Second Language.* Mahwah, NJ: Blackwell.

[18] Kim, D., & Hall, J. K. (2002). The role of an interactive book reading program in the development of second language pragmatic competence. *The Modern Language Journal, 86*, 332-348.

[19] King, K. A., & Silver, R. E. (1993). "Sticking points": Effects of instruction on NNS refusal strategies. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, 9*, 47-82.

[20] Kubota, M. (1995). Teachability of conversational implicative to Japanese EFLlearners. *IRLT Bulletin 9*, 35–67

[21] Kempson, R. M. (1996). *Semantics, Pragmatics and Natural-Language interpretation*. Blackwell.

[22] Kondo, S. (2001). Instructional Effects on Pragmatic Development: Refusal by Japanese EFL Learners. *Publications of Akenohoshi Women's Junior College.* 19. 33-51.

[23] Martinez-Flor, A. & E. Uso-Juan, (2010a). *Pragmatics and Speech Act Performance*.Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

*[24]*Martinez-Flor, A. & E. Uso-Juan, (2010b). *Speech Act Performance: Theoretical, Empirical and Methodological Issues*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

[25] McLean, T. (2004). Giving Students a Fighting Chance: *Pragmatics in the Language Classroom. TESL Canada Journal.* 21(2). 72-92.

[26] Morris, C. H. (1938). *Foundation of the Theory of Signs.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[27] Pütz, M. & Aertselaer, J. (2008). *Developing Contrastive Pragmatics.* Berlin: Sigurd Wendland.

[28] Searle, J. (1975). *Indirect Speech Acts* in P. Cole and J. Morgan. New York: Academic Press.

[29] Schauer, G. (2009). *Interlanguage Pragmatic Development.* New York: Continuum, (Chapter 2).

[30] Tannen, D. (1985). Silence: anything but. In: D. Tannen, & Saville-Troike (Eds.), *Perspectives on Silence* (pp. 93-112). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

[31] Tateyama, Y. (2001). Explicit and implicit teaching of pragmatics routines: Japanese sumimasen. In: K. Rose, & G. Kasper. (Eds.) , *Pragmatics in Language Teaching* (pp. 200-222). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[32] Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in "interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*. New York:Longman Group.

[33] Turnbull, W. (2001). *An Appraisal of Pragmatic Elicitation Techniques for the Socialsychological Study of Talk*: The Case of Request Refusals. *Pragmatics.* 11(1). 31- 61.

[34] Umale, J. (2011). Pragmatic Failure in Refusal Strategies: British versus Omani Interlocutors. *Arab World English Journal.* 2(1). 18-46.

[35] Wishnoff, J. (2000). Hedging your bets: L2 learners' acquisition of pragmatic devices in academic writing and computer-mediated discourse [PDF document]. University of Hawai'i, Working Papers in Second Language Studies, 19 (1), Fall 2000, pp. 119- 157. From http://www.hawaii.edu/sls/?link=working_papers

Author's Biography

Mahmoud Rostamy was born in Malayer, Iran in 1974. He has received his MA in TEFL from Allameh Tabatabaii university, Tehran , Iran. He has been teaching English for 13 years in Shaheed Satari university and also Air & Defence Force language centers.
Currently he is teaching English in Khatam Al Anbia military university, Tehran , Iran. His research interests are contrastive analysis and language teaching methodology.

Kaivan Parhoodeh was born in Kermanshah, Iran in 1979. He received an MA in TEFL from Azad University Takestan Branch, Iran. He, with 10 years of teaching experience, in some Universities & Language Centers. At present he is teaching English in Azad University & Payame noor University Gillan-e- Gharb center, Iran. His favorite fields of research and study are testing and teacher education.

Appendix: Sample DCT

1. You are working in a college. You are unmarried and one of your married colleagues who has a big family comes to your house to borrow money.
   Colleague: I have a big family and I just don't know where the money goes. The children always need something or the other. Could you lend me $100 for a month?
   You: ………………………………………………………
   Colleague: It's O.K. I'll borrow from someone else.

2. You are working in a college. Your boss who is the head of your department requests you to come at the weekend to help him.
   Boss: If you do not mind, I would like you to come during the weekend to help me with the library work?
   You: ………………………………………………..
   Boss: Well, then maybe next weekend.

3. You are a clerk in the Insurance office. You have some important personal work. You request your boss to let you go in the afternoon when the boss is having a lot of pending work for you.
   Clerk: I have some important work. Could I leave my office early today?
   You: …………………………………………………
   Clerk: Then, could I leave tomorrow?

4. Your friend invites you on telephone, for dinner and a magic show at a hotel.
   Friend: We have arranged a get-together at Radissons. There would be dinner and magic show for children. You are invited to join us.
   You: …………………………………………………
   Friend: Well, I can understand your position.

5. You have joined a company recently and your boss invites you for lunch at his place.
   Boss: How about your coming over to lunch tomorrow at my residence?
   You: ………………………………………………..
   Boss: Oh, I understand. That is more important.

6. You are the boss of a company. Your employee wants to invite you for his daughter's birthday.
   Employee: I've arranged a small party for my daughter's birthday at home on Monday and I would be delighted if you could come along.
   You:…………………………………………………..
   Employee: It's O.K. I can understand.

7. You work as a lecturer in a college. The workload is very high and you are getting stressed over your job. Your friend suggests that you take a break and go to Malaysia.
   Friend: You are overstressed due to work. Why don't you take a break and go to Malaysia?
   You: ………………………………………………..
   Friend: You could still think about it, later on.

8. You are a student and an excellent football player. You want to become a scientist but your counsellor suggests you to take up football as your career.
   Counselor: John, you are so good at football, why don't you make it your career?
   You: ………………………………………………..
   Counselor: Well, it is your choice mine was just a suggestion.

9. You are in a new place waiting for your friend, James to pick you up. You have to meet an important person to discuss business prospects. You are hard pressed for time and your friend is going to help you with the transport. It's been an hour and he hasn't shown up. You telephone him and he is not at home and his housekeeper suggests that you take a cab and come home.
   Housekeeper: Normally James is very punctual. It seems he has got stuck somewhere. You could take a cab and come home.
   You: ………………………………………………..
   House Keeper: Well, if you do not want to, just let me have your name and address.

10. You are a businessman and have no time as you have just started your business. Your son has been a nuisance in the school. The principal wants to meet you in this connection. You generally do all your work yourself and do not take the help of others. Your friend offers to meet the Principal on your behalf and sort out matters.
    Friend: If you do not have time, I can go and sort out matters with the Principal.
    You: ………………………………………………..