



Islamic Azad University,
Larestan Branch
College of Humanities

An M.A. Thesis on Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Title:
**The Effects of Focused Tasks on Iranian EFL Learners’
Development of Pragmatic Competence**

Supervisor:
Dr. Reza Ghafar Samar

By:
Abdol Hossein Ahmadi

Tehran, Iran
October, 2012



Islamic Azad University,
Larestan Branch
College of Humanities

An M.A. Thesis on Teaching English as a Foreign Language

Title:
**The Effects of Focused Tasks on Iranian EFL Learners’
Development of Pragmatic Competence**

Supervisor:
Dr. Reza Ghafar Samar

By:
Abdol Hossein Ahmadi

Tehran, Iran
October, 2012

Thesis Committee Members

Dr. Parviz Birjandi.....
Dr. Parviz Maftoon.....
Dr. Mona Khabiri.....

In the Name of God

Thesis Authenticity Commitment

The undersigned, **Abdol Hossein Ahmadi**, the M.A. holder in TEFL defended my thesis on Bahman 30th 1390 under the title of

The Effects of Focused Tasks on Iranian EFL Learners’ Development of Pragmatic Competence

With the grade point average of 18. Hereby, I am committed that this thesis is the outcome of my own research.

1. To ensure the authenticity of my thesis and avoid plagiarism, I have carefully cited others' works and research papers wherever used both in the text and reference page.
 2. This thesis has not been so far presented for the fulfillment of any educational degree (neither higher nor lower) in other universities and institutes for higher education.
 3. If, after graduation, I needed to report the findings of this research in any manner, e.g., book, or to apply for a patent on an invention, etc., I will ask the deputy for the research affairs to issue the required warranties.
 4. If the above mentioned certified statements were found to be otherwise, I would accept the consequences without any objection, and the authorities (in the university) are allowed to treat me according to the rules and regulations.
- Furthermore, I would have no right for objection if my degree was rendered null and void.

Title

The Effects of Focused Tasks on Iranian EFL Learners' Development of Pragmatic Competence

This dissertation is dedicated to:

To my Late Father,
My wife and Lovely Daughter

Acknowledgements

I need to thank so many people for the important role they played in the development of this study that I cannot do justice to their contributions. First and foremost, I would like to thank our late professor Mirhassani whose invaluable criticism filled us with courage to fulfill our academic responsibilities. I am heartily thankful to my supervisor Dr Reza Ghafar Samar, who ushered me through the maze of this study with his help, support, careful readings, and comments. My special thanks also go to Professor Birjandi whose classes were an asset. Over and above his teaching, whenever circumstances frustrated us, he was unfailingly there. I also owe deep gratitude to Dr. Maftoon whose attributes such as punctuality and precision made us prepared for life. I have always admired and valued his engaging classes.

Special thanks also go to both my students at Islamic Azad University, Larestan Branch and the native speakers of English who whole-heartedly took part in the painstaking process of data collection. I am also thankful to Dr. Mohsen Pornoor, Dr. Mehdi Haghshenas, and Dr. Fatimeh Ghasemi who helped me collect the data from American native speakers of English.

Importantly, I wish to thank my parents, since completing this study would not have been possible without their prayers. I anxiously hope they will regard the result as worthy of my absences and their sacrifices.

Table of Contents

	Page
Title	I
Thesis Authenticity Commitment	II
Dedication	III
Acknowledgments	IV
Table of Contents	V
List of Tables	IX
List of Figures	X
Abstract	XI
CHAPTER I: Background and Purpose	2
1.1 Statement of the Problem and Purpose of the study	6
1.2 Significance of the Study	9
1.3 Research Questions and Hypotheses	11
1.4 Definition of Key Terms	...
1.5 Limitations of the Study	...
1.5.1 Test Effect	...
1.5.2. Time Limitation	...
1.5.3. Sample Size	...
1.6 Delimitations of the Study	...
1.7 Summary of the Chapter	...

CHAPTER II: Review of the Related Literature	13
2.1 Historical View of Pragmatics	14
2.2 Definition of Pragmatics	15
2.3 The Philosophical view of Speech Act	16
2.3.1 Austin and Speech Act Classification	17
2.3.2 Searl's Approach to Speech Act Classification	19
2.4 Pragmatics, Indirectness and Politeness	20
2.4.1 Leech's Approach to Politeness: Tact Maxim	...
2.4.1.1 The Cost-Benefit Scale	...
2.4.1.2 Optionality and Indirectness Scale	...
2.4.1.3 Power and Social Distance	...
2.4.2 Politeness and the Management of the Face	...
2.5 Concluding Remark on General Pragmatics	...
2.6 Cross-Cultural Pragmatics	...
2.7 Interlanguage Pragmatics	...
2.8 The Theoretical Background of Pragmatic Competence	...
2.9 The Theoretical Background of Interlanguage Pragmatics	...
2.10 Focus on Form in Pragmatic Studies	...
2.11 Theoretical Basis of the Focused Tasks in the Study	...
2.11.1 Dictogloss	...
2.11.2 Consciousness Raising Task	...

CHAPTER III: Methodology	22
3.1 Participants	22
3.2 Instruments	26
3.2.1 English Language Proficiency Test	26
3.2.2 Construction of the Scenarios	28
3.2.2.1 Exemplar Generation	29
3.2.2.2 Likelihood Situation	29
3.2.2.3 Metapragmatic Assessment	...
3.2.3 Production Test	...
3.2.4 Recognition Test	...
3.2.5 Appropriacy Judgment Test	...
3.3 Treatment	...
3.3.1 Target Requestive Downgraders	...
3.3.2 Instructional Treatment	...
3.3.2.1 Group 1: Consciousness Raising Task	...
3.3.2.2 Group 2: Dictogloss Task	...
3.4 Procedure	...
3.5 Research Design	...
3.6 Summary of the Chapter	...
CHAPTER IV: Results and Discussion	31
4.1 The Homogeneity of Learners	33
4.2 The Multivariate Analysis Assumption	38

4.3 The Effects of Instructional Treatments: Null Hypothesis 1	42
4.3.1 Perception Measure	...
4.3.2 Recognition Measure	...
4.3.3 Appropriacy Judgment Test	...
4.3.4 Production Measure	...
4.3.5 Input-Based vs. Output-Based Tasks	...
4.3.6 Discussion	...
4.7 Summary of the Chapter	...
CHAPTER V: Conclusion and Pedagogical Implications	44
5.1 A Brief Restatement of the Problem and Methodology	44
5.2 Conclusion	46
5.4 Pedagogical Implications	47
5.4.1 Theoretical Implications	47
5.4.2 Pedagogical Implications	48
5.5 Suggestions for Further Research	49
References	51
Appendices	52

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1 The Relationship between Input/Output Based Tasks and their Explicitness/Implicitness	9
Table 2 Features of the Tasks Employed in the Study	23
Table 3 Characteristics of Iranian EFL Learners Preparing the Instruments	73
Table 4 Characteristics of American Native Speakers Providing Baseline Data	76
Table 5 Characteristics of Iranian EFL Participants in the Experimental Study	76
Table 6 Correlation between OPT & TOEFL Subskills and Total Scores	78
Table 7 ANOVA Results Showing no significant differences Among Groups	79
Table 8 A Framework for the Assessment of Requestive Downgraders	86
Table 9 Request Downgradrs Appropriate for the Contextual Variables in Requests	87
Table 10 Syntactic, Clausal and Lexical Downgraders Internally Modifying Requests	94

List of Figures

	Page
Figure 1 Mean Plot for the Effects of Treatment on the Perception Measure	128
Figure 2 Mean Plot for the Effects of Treatment on the Recognition Measure	133
Figure 3 Mean Plot for the Effects of Treatment on the Appropriacy Judgment Test	138
Figure 4 Mean Plot for the Effects of Treatment on the Production Measure	143
Figure 5 Mean Plot for the Effects of Time on the Perception Measure	162
Figure 6 Mean Plot for the Effects of Time on the Recognition Measure	167
Figure 7 Mean Plot for the Effects of Time on the Appropriacy Judgment Test	172
Figure 8 Mean Plot for the Effects of Time on the Production Measure	177
Figure 9 ‘MI _s by Instruction’ Mean Plot for the Recognition Measure in the Immediate Posttest	197
Figure 10 ‘MI _s by Instruction’ Mean Plot for the Recognition Measure in the Delayed Posttest	199
Figure 11 ‘MI _s by Instruction’ Mean Plot for the Production Measure in the Delayed Posttest	205

Abstract

The present study explored the effects of focused tasks on the development of Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic competence. Complementary to this focus, the researcher singled out interpersonal and linguistic intelligences to explore their interactions with the focused tasks in the development of Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic ability. 147 Iranian EFL learners with similar characteristics to those in the experimental phase were asked to participate in the pilot tests to help the researcher construct the instruments. In line with the factorial design of the study, the researcher also utilized Armstrong's (1993) multiple intelligences (MI) checklist to collect information concerning the intelligence profiles of the participants. 58 American native English speakers were also employed to provide the baseline data for both the instructional targets and the construction of the recognition test and appropriacy judgment test (AJT). To carry out the study, the researcher matched 120 undergraduates ranging in age from 21 to 26 in four groups based on their scores on the Oxford Placement Test (2004) and their intelligence profiles. The groups were then randomly assigned to the instructional conditions, namely consciousness raising task, dictogloss task, input enhancement task, and the provision of recast through a role play task. These tasks were utilized to implement the instructional treatments for 8 sessions. Findings revealed that the effects of instructional treatments were significant among groups on the recognition measure, AJT and the production measure. Apart from the performance of the participants in the input enhancement task on the perception measure, the participants in all tasks and conditions were significantly better in the immediate posttest than in the pretest on pragmatic measures. Unlike the AJT and the production measure, the effects of time were not significant among groups on the perception and recognition measures.

Chapter One:

Background and Purpose

CHAPTER I

Background and Purpose

The significant role of pragmatics in the first and second language classroom has been manifested through different models and schemes representing pragmatic-discourse approaches to classroom interactions (Kasper, 2001a).

Regarding the paramount importance of pragmatics in the foreign and second language teaching, Kasper and Rose (2001) also proposed that the recent curricula and materials include strong pragmatic components or adopt pragmatic approaches as their organizing principles. The newer link between interlanguage pragmatics (ILP) and classroom research, however, has not received the required attention. That is, pragmatics as the object of classroom research needs to be researched more deeply (Kasper, 2001a).

ILP introduced as the second generation hybrid belongs to both pragmatics and second language acquisition (Ellis, 1994; Kasper & Rose, 1999). From the ILP perspective, pragmatics is akin to morphosyntax, lexis and phonology with the same constraints on learners' knowledge, use and acquisition of L2 pragmatics (Kasper & Rose, 1999). Rose and Kasper (2001), however, stated that second language (L2) pragmatics has not yet gained the popularity of phonology, morphology, and syntax. Rose (2005) similarly proposed that despite the fact that research on the effects of instruction in second language

pragmatics is a part of the literature on instructed second language acquisition (SLA), pragmatics as a learning target has not figured prominently in the recent surveys.

Reviewing pragmatic learning in L2 classes from observational and interventional perspectives, Kasper (2001a) argued that a significant portion of pragmatic literature has only focused on the ILP use rather than development. He emphasized that studies on the effects of instruction on learners' acquisition of L2 pragmatics are conspicuously missing. Boxer (2002) also pointed out that research on the instructed ILP is in its infancy and only recently greater attention has been paid to make learners aware of it.

Regarding the paucity and the necessity for more instructed ILP studies in formal L2 classroom settings, Bardovi-Harling and Griffin (2005) made references to differences between native speakers and non-native speakers and believed that these gaps should be bridged by practitioners through more instructed ILP studies. Alcon-Soler and Martinez (2005) also claimed that pragmatic studies should be subjected to the same three conditions as any other types of knowledge in the target language, namely appropriate input, opportunities for output and feedback provision. Contrary to what Alcon-Soler and Martinez (2005) proposed, the bulk of the studies have either drawn their attention to the implicit and explicit teaching of pragmatic features (e.g., Alcon-Soler, 2005; House, 1996; Takahashi, 2001; Tateyama, 2001; Yoshimi, 2001) or

examined the effects of different input-based tasks on the learners' enhancement of pragmatic competence (i.e., Takimoto, 2006, 2009). More important, the instructed ILP studies have not compared the effects of input-based and output-based tasks with varying degrees of implicitness and explicitness on learners' enhancement of pragmatic features. Therefore, the researcher utilized such focused tasks to teach the requestive downgraders as the instructional treatments in the present research.

The speech act of request was chosen because requests differ cross-linguistically (Ellis, 1994, 1997). Ellis (1997) also pointed out that there is some evidence to suggest that the acquisition of requests follows a developmental path, and even advanced learners experience difficulties in performing requests. Furthermore, according to Dalton-Puffer and Nikula (2006), directives and requests are common in the classroom discourse.

As emphasized by Ellis (1994), requests are subject to modifications taking the form of downgraders, "a pragmatic resource for mitigating the strengths of a statement or request" (Takimoto, 2009, p. 8). Blum-Kulka, House, and Kasper (1989, cited in Fukuya, 2002) theoretically divided downgraders into three categories i.e., internally modified lexical-phrasal downgraders, internally modified syntactic downgraders and externally modified downgraders.

Blum-Kulka and Olhstein (1998), Hassel (2001) and House and Kasper (1987) demonstrated that even advanced EFL learners did not modify their

requests internally as often as native speakers did, or employed supportive moves that included redundant elements. They reported that most studies revealed the learners' overuse of external downgraders (cited in Alcon-Soler, Jorda & Martinez-Flor, 2005). Hill (1997, cited in Takimoto, 2009) also found that Japanese EFL learners tended to use mono-clausal requestive downgraders when biclausal requestive downgraders were more appropriate. Therefore, in compliance with EFL learners' need for more formal instructions on the internal requestive downgraders, this study investigated the effects of focused tasks on this pragmatic feature.

As one of the principles of instructed SLA, Ellis (2005) reminded the educators about the role of individual differences (ID_s) as the essential ingredients in the process of SLA. In pragmatic studies, however, the significance of learner variables has been passed into oblivion. While a number of studies have investigated the role of ID_s in the acquisition of morpho-syntactic features such as Robinson (1997, 2002), only few studies have recently considered the influence of learner variables on the learners' development of L2 pragmatic. Robinson (2005) argued that the studies concerning the role of individual differences in learning under different conditions of exposure such as focus on form techniques and different task types are conspicuously missing. Therefore, in this study, the researcher also examined the interaction between the effects of focused tasks and Iranian EFL

learners' individual differences on the development of their pragmatic competence.

1.1 Statement of the Problem and Purpose of the Study

Parallel to mainstream SLA research, ILP researchers have recently borrowed the principles of instructed SLA and explored the instructional effects on learners' developing of L2 pragmatic competence (Takahashi, 2005b). Since the extension of form focused tasks and activities to pragmatic studies is still in the initial stages (Boxer, 2002; Kasper, 2001a; Takahashi, 2005b), Jean and Kaya, (1996) argued that findings should not be taken as definitive unless ILP studies would be examined in greater detail from different perspectives (cited in Takimoto, 2009).

As suggested by Alcon-Soler and Martinez (2005), developmental pragmatic studies should include input, output, and feedback in their design. However, the past studies, motivated by Schmidt's (1990) noticing hypothesis, have either focused on the implicitness and explicitness of pragmatic features or compared the effects of input based tasks on the learners' enhancement of pragmatic ability. Researchers should also apply the insights gained from different SLA hypotheses such as Swain's (1985, cited in Ellis, 2003) output hypothesis and Long's (1996, cited in Kasper, 2001a) interaction hypothesis to their research. Accordingly, the present research examined whether or not the inclusion of

input or output in tasks with the varying degrees of explicitness and implicitness could be more conducive to improving learners' pragmatic competence.

As stated, the role of individual differences as one of the principles of instructed SLA (Ellis, 2005) has been consigned to oblivion in pragmatic studies. Attention to this problem was attracted by the arguments raised by various researchers (e.g., Robinson 2005; Schmidt, 1990). For example, Robinson (2005) stated that, "research into acquisition of L2 pragmatics, and its susceptibility to instruction is beginning to address the role of noticing and awareness, and individual variations in the extent of this" (p. 59). Similarly, Schmidt (1990) proposed that the relation between attention and awareness provides a link to the study of individual difference in language learning. Therefore, the researcher explored the interaction between the effects of different instructional tasks and Iranian EFL learners' multiple intelligences (MI) on the development of their pragmatic competence.

To address the above gaps and problems, this study, in the first place, investigated the impact of input-based and output-based tasks on Iranian EFL learners' improvement of pragmatic ability. In this study, input-based and output-based tasks included two other tasks. The input-based task incorporated one implicit task and one explicit task and the output-based task, similarly, focused on learners' production through an implicit and an explicit task. This relationship can be illustrated in Table 1:

Table 1

The Relationship between Input-Based and Output-Based Tasks and their Explicitness / Implicitness

	Input Based Tasks	Output Based Tasks
Explicit Task	Consciousness Raising Task	Dictogloss Task
Implicit Task	Input enhancement Task	Role Play Task

As demonstrated in Table 1, the researcher utilized the CR as an input-based task and the dictogloss as an output-based task to explicitly raise learners' awareness of the target features. On the implicit end, the researcher executed a role play task to provide an opportunity for learners' production. When the learners produced an inappropriate or inaccurate form, the researcher used the recast to raise learners' awareness of the target features. The researcher also utilized the input enhancement as an input-based task to raise learners' awareness of the requestive downgraders implicitly.

The impact of the above mentioned tasks was assessed on Iranian EFL learners' ability from the lowest to the highest level of the pragmatic competence. More specifically, the researcher explored the effects of different input-based and output-based tasks on Iranian EFL learners' immediate and delayed recognition, appropriacy judgment, and the written production of pragmatically appropriate and linguistically accurate requestive downgraders.

The researcher also compared the learners' perceptions concerning the nature of language before and after the implementation of instructional treatments.

In the second place, the current research also explored the interaction between the effects of the instructional treatments (i.e., input-based and output-based tasks) and Iranian EFL learners' MI (i.e., interpersonal vs. linguistic intelligence) on the development of their pragmatic ability.

1.2 Significance of the Study

To investigate the learning of L2 pragmatics, Kasper and Rose (2001) argued that one of the key issues is whether the pragmatic ability should be subjected to formal instructions or not. In this regard, Kasper and Rose (2001) held that although adult learners already possess a considerable amount of pragmatic knowledge (i.e., universal and L1 transferable features), many aspects of L2 pragmatics are not acquired without the benefit of instruction, or they are learned more slowly. Therefore, not only do instructional interventions appear plausible in the realm of pragmatics but also various approaches to pragmatic instructions should be compared.

This study, therefore, made an attempt to illuminate the right path for developing learners' pragmatic ability especially in EFL settings where exposure to the second language is limited. The effects of input-based and

output-based tasks on EFL learners' enhancement of requestive downgraders can provide an answer to both what and how of teaching. "What part" revolves around the teachability of the targeted pragmatic features; that is, whether pragmatics is amenable to instruction or not. "How part," however, examines the effectiveness of different teaching approaches in the improvement of learners' L2 pragmatic ability. Various approaches to teaching requestive downgraders may indicate which tasks or activities can provide a stronger link between the teachability and learnability of pragmatic features in the short and long run.

Theoretically speaking, tasks and activities in this study are supported by different hypotheses, i.e., Schmidt's (1990) noticing hypothesis, Swain's (1985, cited in Ellis, 2003) output hypothesis, and Long's (1996) interaction hypothesis. Therefore, the findings of the study might show the practical implications of these hypotheses in pragmatics.

From another perspective, Ellis (2003) proposed that focused tasks can be designed in three main ways: (1) structure-based production tasks (i.e., dictogloss task), (2) comprehension based tasks (i.e., input enhancement task), and 3) consciousness raising task. He also mentioned that some methodological techniques, such as recasts, can be employed to focus the learners' awareness on the target features. Therefore, this study can also reveal which tasks or activities can lead to a better learnability of pragmatic features.

The incorporation of individual differences in pragmatic studies is also a new area which needs to be uncovered more deeply in future studies. The current research examined the interaction between the effects of focused tasks and Iranian EFL learners' MI (interpersonal vs. linguistic intelligence) on the improvement of learners' pragmatic competence. Therefore, this study can demonstrate whether or not learner variables can influence the outcome of research to the benefit of learners with a particular intelligence profile.

1.3 Research Questions and Hypotheses

As stated, this study firstly examined the effects of input-based and output-based tasks on Iranian EFL learners' recognition, appropriacy judgment, and production of requestive downgraders in the immediate and delayed posttests. The researcher also measured the effects of these tasks on Iranian EFL learners' immediate and delayed perceptions concerning the nature of language.

Chapter Two:

Review of the Related Literature

CHAPTER II

Review of the Related Literature

Pragmatics which has grown into a secure discipline only in institutional terms (i.e., different journals, professions and organizations, interactional conferences) has not yet established itself operationally as a well-founded paradigm (Spencer-Oatey & Ziegarac, 2002). They proposed that while abundant pragmatic theories and frameworks exist, there is no agreement over the borderline of pragmatics. Similarly, Leech (1983) stated that pragmatics was once regarded as "a ragbag" (p.1) in which divergent and unrelated data was placed.

Although the above paragraph shows the status of pragmatics, its role in language teaching is so highly respected that the nature of language cannot be known unless pragmatics is understood. Kasper and Rose (2001), for instance, proposed that many second and foreign language teaching contexts, curricula and materials developed in recent years include a strong pragmatic component or even adopt a pragmatic approach as their organizing principle.

In this chapter, the researcher initially reviewed general pragmatics in brief. Since the focus of this study was on the developmental interlanguage pragmatics (ILP), the researcher thoroughly elaborated on it. The first part, dealing with the definitions of pragmatics, the historical backgrounds of pragmatics, the philosophical views of speech acts and the politeness theory,

laid the foundations for the second part in which the available literature on the instructed ILP was discussed. Having delved deeply into pragmatic competence and instructed interlanguage pragmatics from the theoretical perspective, the researcher reviewed the empirical interventional studies exhaustively.

2.1 The Historical View of Pragmatics

The current use of pragmatics is traced back to Morris (1938, cited in Levinson, 1983) whose concern was with the semiotics including syntax, semantics and pragmatics. Leech (1983) similarly examined the same branches of inquiry and elaborated on the emergence of pragmatics. Leech argued that in the decade of 50s, linguistics was nothing beyond phonetics and phonemics and at most morpho-phonemics. In this time, even syntax was regarded so abstract that it was impossible to subject it to investigation. According to Leech, only a decade later, the place of syntax was secured in linguistics by Chomsky and his followers but semantics was assumed a slippery concept. Chomsky (1957) tried to explain the slipperiness of semantics through different versions of standard theory which led to a very narrow definition of the generative grammar paradigm (cited in Leech, 1983).

As a reaction to generative grammarians, Leech (1983) stated that generative semantists based their linguistic theories mainly on semantics but they found it difficult to exclude the way meaning varies from one context to another;

therefore, semantics spilled over into pragmatics. Pragmatics, however, is inherently different from the traditional components of a linguistic theory; therefore, they are hardly comparable (Verschueren, 1999). He mentioned that linguistic pragmatics studies people's use of language, a form of behavior or social action. For Verschueren, pragmatics is regarded as a window to the relationship between language and human life.

2.2 Definitions of Pragmatics

Having introduced the term general pragmatics, Leech (1983) made a distinction between pragmalinguistic and sociopragmatics. Leech defined sociopragmatics as, "the specific local condition on language use" (p. 10) and pragmalinguistics, as "the study of more linguistic end of pragmatics" (p. 11). Based on Halliday's (1970, 1973) work, Leech further distinguished between interpersonal rhetoric including cooperative principle, politeness principles, and so forth and textual pragmatics such as processibility principles, clarity principle, and so forth.

Pragmatics was also defined as, "the study of those relations between language contexts that are grammaticalized or encoded in the structure of the language" (Levinson, 1983, p. 9). Levinson believed that this definition restricts the scope of pragmatics to certain aspects of linguistic structures such as the study of deixis, presupposition, speech act and the conversational implicature.

Thomas (1995) eschewed the unilateral emphasis on either the speaker or hearer and defined pragmatics as “a dynamic process involving the negotiation of meaning between speaker and hearer, the context of utterance (physical, social and linguistics) and the meaning potential of an utterance” (p. 22).

Following Levinson’s (1983) definition, this study has limited itself to the study of speech act since its impact on language and the language pedagogy has been influential. The significance of speech act in second language acquisition or pedagogy has been emphasized by different educators (e.g., Bardovi-Harling, 2001; Munby, 1978; Wilkins, 1976). Inspired by Leech’s (1983) definition of the general pragmatics and interpersonal rhetoric, the researcher further investigated the study of speech act within politeness principles and was mainly concerned with the tact maxim.

2.3 The Philosophical View of Speech Act

Thomas (1995) made a distinction between logical positivist philosophers and ordinary-based philosophers. For the former group, everyday language is deficient and meaningful statements are those that can be tested empirically (Paltridge, 2000). Therefore, according to Paltridge, a sentence like ‘the king of France is bald’ is meaningless since its truth conditions cannot be met. Ordinary language philosophers, on the other hand, indicated that many sentences cannot meet truth conditions (e.g., ‘I sleep all the time, the doctor: the speaker was

clearly awake when talking to her doctor’) but are valid enough to maintain communication effectively and go beyond the literal meaning (Thomas, 1995). The theory of speech act was launched by Austin when there was a high concern with the verifiability and the deficiency of the ordinary language (Levinson, 1983).

2.3.1 Austin and speech act classification.

Austin (1962) termed utterances and sentences realized by doing something as performatives. He contrasted performatives with statements and utterances called constatives (cited in Thomas, 1995). Opposite to constative utterances whose truth or falsity can be evaluated empirically in the real world (e.g., I drive a car), performatives undertaking an action (e.g., I apologize) not just a statement or a question is realized when the verb is uttered (Wardhaugh, 1986).

Austin (1962) divided performatives into five categories: (1) verdictives such as giving a verdict or estimate; (2) exercitives typified by exercising of powers, rights, or influences as in appointing; (3) commissives typified by promising or undertaking, and committing one to do something by announcing an intention; (4) behabitatives dealing with matters as apologizing, congratulating, or cursing; and (5) expositives referring to how one makes utterances fit into an argument or exposition (cited in Wardhaugh, 1986, p. 276).

For performative hypothesis to be successful, Austin (1962, cited in Thomas, 1995) formulated the felicity conditions as follows:

(1) There must be a conventional procedure having a conventional effect, the circumstances and persons must be appropriate; (2) the procedure must be executed correctly and appropriately; and (3) often the person must have the requisite thought, feelings and intentions; If consequent conduct specified, then the relevant parties must do it. (p. 37)

Based on Levinson (1983), there have been two shifts from the original performative hypothesis: the first shift stated that there is a more general class of performative utterances that include both explicit and implicit performatives. Austin (1962) defined the explicit performative as a sentence which contained a verb that named the speech act whereas the implicit performative was a sentence which did not contain such a verb (e.g., shut up vs. I order you to shut up) (cited in Paltridge, 2000).

The second shift rejected the rigid dichotomy of performatives/constatives to a general theory of illocutionary acts which included various performatives and constatives as sub-cases (Levinson, 1983). Thomas (1995) stated that the notion that only performative verbs can be used to perform actions was untenable due to a number of reasons: “Firstly, the presence of a performative verb does not

guarantee the action; secondly, ‘doing things with words’ does not always involve performatives and finally, there is no formal way of distinguishing a performative verb from other verbs” (p. 44).

For these reasons, Austin (1962) replaced the constative/performative terminology by a three-fold distinction: locutions (act of saying something), illocutions (what is done in saying something) and pre-locutions (what is done by saying something) (cited in Verschueren, 1999).

2.3.2 Searl’s approach to speech act.

Similar to Austin, Searl (1979) proposed a general classification system listing five types of general functions of speech acts: (1) declaratives such as naming, appointing; (2) asseratives such as suggesting, boasting, claiming; (3) expressive such as praising, congratulating, blaming; (4) directives typified by ordering, requesting, advising; and (5) commissives such as promising, vowing, offering (cited in Leech, 1983, pp.105-106).

Searl (1969) made a distinction between regulative and constative rules. While the former group controls the existing activities e.g., traffic regulations, the latter group creates or constitutes the activity itself e.g., the rule of a game (cited in Levinson, 1983). In an attempt to systematize Austin’s work, Searl (1969) attempted to describe the speech acts in terms of constitutive rules: (1) the propositional act, (2) the preparatory condition, (3) the sincerity condition,

and (4) the essential condition (cited in Thomas, 1995). Thomas leveled a number of criticisms to Searl's approach to speech act. For example, she claimed that some speech acts overlap (e.g., request, command, order) and sometimes impossible to distinguish fully between one speech act and another; partly, because the conditions specified by Searl are only applicable only to the central and most typical usage of a speech act verb.

2.4 Pragmatics: Indirectness and Politeness

According to Searl (1979), a different approach to distinguishing speech acts can be made on the basis of the structure (cited in Yule, 1996). Yule stated that whenever there is a direct relationship between a structure and a function, we have a direct speech act but whenever there is an indirect relationship between a structure and a function we have an indirect speech act. That is, a declarative statement used to make a statement is a direct speech act but a declarative statement used to make a request is an indirect speech act.

Chapter Three:

Methodology

CHAPTER III

Methodology

We now come to the methodology section which functions as the pedestal for the current study. This chapter, describing the steps taken by the researcher to carry out the study, discusses the specifics of the participants, instruments, instructional treatment and the procedure in detail.

3.1 Participants

To complete different phases of the study, 355 participants took part in it. These participants were employed to help the researcher prepare the instruments and carry out the experimental phase of the study.

Prior to the experimental phase of the study, 147 Iranian EFL learners studying at Islamic Azad University, Larestan-Branch were requested to take part over a semester to prepare the instruments. These senior students majoring in the English language and literature at the B.A. level were 26 males and 121 females ranging in age from 21 to 26 (only one learner was 33). The participants had never experienced life in a second language environment, and their exposure to the English language was only through formal education in high school and university. Table 3 specifically and in detail demonstrates the characteristics of the participants in different phases to prepare the instruments.

Table 3

Characteristics of Iranian EFL Learners Preparing the Instruments

	Sex				Educational Level			
	TN	Age M	M	F	Freshman	Sophomore	Jr.	Sr.
Construction of Scen.	70	22.8	15	55	-	-	-	70
Metapragmatic Eval.	20	21.15	2	18	-	-	20	-
Reliability of Production,	20	22.2	3	17	-	-	-	20
Recognition and AJT								
Reliability of Perception	37	21.37	6	31	-	-	11	26

Note: AJT=Appropriacy Judgment test; Scen=Scenario; Eval=Evaluation; Age M=Age Mean; TN= Total Number ; Jr.= Junior; Sr.=Senior

To provide the baseline data for different phases of the study, the researcher also asked 58 American native speakers of English to take part in the study. Initially, 25 American native speakers of English took part to provide the baseline data for the development of instructional materials in the study. Participants in this phase were 20 males and 5 females, and their age ranged from 20 to 63. Native speakers were from different fields of the study, e.g., physics, history, linguistics, etc., and their education backgrounds ranged from B.A. to Ph.D. To obtain the most representative and natural answers, the researcher did not restrict native speakers in terms of their age and education.

In the second phase, the data were collected from 18 other American native speakers of English (14 males and 4 females) to develop the recognition test. In the last stage, 15 American native speakers of English (12 males and 3 females)

also took part in the study to provide the data for the appropriacy judgment test. Similar to native speakers taking part in the first phase, the native speakers participating to provide the baseline data for the recognition and the appropriacy judgment test were from different fields of the study e.g., physics, history, linguistics, etc and their education backgrounds ranged from B.A. to Ph.D. As mentioned above, to obtain the most representative and natural answers, the researcher did not restrict them in terms of their age and education.

To provide the baseline data, three Iranian Ph.D. students living in the U.S. helped the researcher collect the data. They forwarded the tests the researcher e-mailed them to native speakers. In this way, 35 American native speakers of English participated in the study and responded to tests. Furthermore, the researchers contacted about 100 native members of the ‘Linguistlist’ site through their e-mails, but only 23 American native speakers of English were willing to participate and replied the e-mails. Table 4 shows the characteristics of American native speakers of English.

Table 4

Characteristics of American Native Speakers Providing the Baseline Data

	Sex				Educational Level				
	TN	Age M	M	F	B.A.	B.S.	M.A.	M.S.	Ph.D.
BaseL D for Ins. Treat	25	32.08	20	5	3	4	4	6	8
BaseL D for Recognition	18	37.13	14	4	2	2	3	4	7
BaseL D for AJT	15	40.47	12	3	1	2	4	3	5

Base LD= Baseline data; Ins. Treat=instructional treatment; AJT= Appropriacy Judgment Test; Age M=Age Mean; TN=Total Number

For the experimental phase of the study, 150 Iranian EFL learners initially sat for the Oxford Placement Test (2004). Based on their willingness, their scores on the OPT and their intelligence profiles, 120 students were matched in four experimental groups. The participants majoring in TEFL and English language and literature were mainly studying in Islamic Azad University. Twenty Five students were also brought to participate in the study from Evaz Payam Noor University and Applied and Scientific University. In this phase, 29 males and 91 females comprised the participants ranging in age from 18 to 26. The participants were mainly juniors and seniors but some freshmen and sophomores were also included in the study. Based on the participants' score on the OPT, there were 20 upper intermediate learners (i.e., five in each group), 40 intermediate (i.e., 10 in each group) and 60 elementary (i.e., 15 in each group)

in the study. Table 5 displays the characteristics of the participants in the experimental phase of the study.

3.2 Instruments

To carry out different phases of the study, the researcher employed different kinds of tests and questionnaires: (a) the Oxford Placement Test (2004) to examine the participants' homogeneity, (b) a production test, a recognition test, an appropriacy judgment test and a perception questionnaire to measure the effects of the instructional treatment on the participants' development of pragmatic competence, and (c) a multiple intelligences survey to identify learners' intelligence profiles.

3.2.1 English language proficiency test.

To ensure the participants' homogeneity, the researcher administered the Oxford placement test (OPT) to Iranian EFL learners at Islamic Azad University-Larestan Branch, Scientific and Applied University of Larestan and Evaz Payam Noor University. According to Allan (2004), the OPT has been calibrated against the proficiency levels based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEF), the Cambridge ESOL Examinations, and other major international examinations such as TOEFL. The

OPT calibrations have been based on direct and indirect data from multilingual populations of test takers and expert judgments (see Appendix A).

The test comprising listening and grammar sections includes 100 items in each part. Yamini and Tahriri (2010) proposed that the performance on the listening section is based on applying knowledge of sound and writing systems at a speed well within the native speakers' competence. For the grammar section, they argued that the test measures grammar, vocabulary and reading skills together in contextualized items. Similarly, Jurkovič (2010) mentioned that the first section of OPT mostly aims at testing reading, listening and vocabulary size while the second part is a test of grammar, vocabulary and reading skills. Winstler, Hideki and Mariko (2011) estimated the reliability of the OPT at .80 which is acceptable. Having conducted a factor analysis, Winstler, Hideki and Mariko argued that the OPT can also be used as a language proficiency test. Birjandi and Sayyari (2010) utilized the OPT to determine proficiency level of participants. Although they argued that the sections of the test are integrated with reading skills and vocabulary in context, they established the concurrent validity of the OPT by calculating the Pearson correlation coefficient between the OPT scores and a retired paper-based TOEFL scores of 32 participants. Table 6 shows the acceptable results of the correlation coefficients between the OPT and TOEFL subskills and total scores taken from Birjandi and Syarri (2010, p. 33):

Table 6

Correlation between OPT and TOEFL Subskills and Total Scores

	TOEFL Structure		TOEFL Listening		TOEFL Reading		TOEFL Total	
	<i>R</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>P</i>
OPT Grammar	.71**	.00	.83**	.00	.91**	.00	.89**	.00
OPT Listening	.72**	.00	.87**	.00	.92**	.00	.91**	.00
OPT Total	.72**	.00	.86**	.00	.92**	.00	.90**	.00

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

From 150 Iranian EFL learners taking part in the test, 120 were selected based on their score and willingness to participate in the study. Then they were matched in different experimental groups. The matched participants were from three levels: upper intermediate, lower intermediate and elementary. In each group, there were 5 upper intermediate, 10 lower intermediate and 15 elementary learners. Table 7 shows no significant differences among groups at the outset of the study.

3.2.2 Construction of the scenarios.

To prepare the instruments (i.e., a production test, a recognition test and an appropriacy Judgment test) for the study, the researcher employed Iranian EFL learners, with the same characteristics as those taking part in the experimental phase of the study. Following Liu (2007), the scenarios were constructed in

three phases: ‘the exemplar generation stage’, ‘the likelihood situation’ and ‘the metapragmatic assessment’.

3.2.2.1 Exemplar generation.

To ensure the authenticity of the scenarios (Liu, 2007), the researcher requested 70 Iranian EFL learners to generate request scenarios (i.e., scenarios in which one of the interlocutors needed to make a request) to prepare the instruments for the study. To make certain that students knew how to generate different scenarios and confine them within the scope of the study, the researcher asked them to generate the scenarios in the light of three contextual variables of power, social distance and the size of imposition.

3.2.2.2 Likelihood situation.

In the second phase, the 60 selected scenarios were subjected to ‘the likelihood situation’ (Liu, 2007). According to Liu, this phase investigated how likely it was that the elicited scenarios would occur in Iranian EFL learners’ daily lives. In this stage, the selected scenarios were given to a group of 20 Iranian EFL learners to rate the likelihood that the situation would occur in their daily lives on a 5-point Likert scale, with 5 being the most likely and 1 the least likely. Scenarios with the mean score of 3 (or close to 3) and above were retained and the rest were removed from the study (see Appendix B).

Chapter Four

Results and Discussion

CHAPTER IV

Results and Discussion

As it was stated in previous chapters, this study investigated the effects of focused tasks on the development of Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic competence. To this end, the researcher employed the CR as an input-based task and the dictogloss as an output-based task to explicitly raise learners' awareness of the requestive downgraders. The researcher also implemented the recast through a role play task to both raise implicitly learners' awareness of the requestive downgraders and provide an opportunity for the learners' production of the target features. The input enhancement as an input-based task was also utilized to implicitly raise the learners' awareness of the requestive downgraders. The effects of these tasks were measured through a recognition test, a production test, a perception questionnaire and an appropriacy judgment test. Following Table displays task features shown in chapter 1 once again:

Table 18

Features of the Focused Tasks and Techniques Used in the Study

	Dictogloss	CR	Recast	Input Enhancement
Explicit Task	+	+	-	-
Implicit Task	-	-	+	+
Input Tasks	+	+	+	+
Output Tasks	+	-	+	-

Table 18 shows that focused tasks can be approached from two perspectives: (1) the explicit or implicit teaching of the target features and (2) the effects of input-based and output-based tasks on focusing the learners' attention on the target features. Due to the limited available data on the effects of focused tasks on the development of learners' pragmatic competence, the present research approached teaching pragmatic features from the second perspective. In the discussion section, however, the results are also discussed in the light of the first perspective; since, the past studies mainly approached teaching pragmatic features from the implicit/explicit points of view.

Although the main focus of the study was on the effects of focused tasks on the enhancement of learners' pragmatic competence, the review of literature revealed that pragmatic studies have not yet seriously considered the role of learners' individual differences in the pragmatic acquisition. For instance, Robinson (2005) in this regard mentioned that the studies concerning the influence of individual differences in learning under different conditions of exposure such as focus on form techniques and different task types are conspicuously missing in the realm of pragmatics. Therefore, following research questions were formulated based on the above discussions:

1. Are the effects of instructional treatments (i.e., input-based vs. output-based tasks) significant on Iranian EFL learners' language perception, appropriacy judgment, recognition and production of the requestive downgraders?
2. Are the effects of time significant on Iranian EFL learners' language perception, appropriacy judgment, recognition and production of requestive downgraders?
3. Are the effects of MI_s significant on Iranian EFL learners' language perception, appropriacy judgment, recognition and production of the requestive downgraders?
4. Are the interactions between the effects of input-based and output-based tasks and Iranian EFL learners' MI_s significant on the immediate and delayed language perception, appropriacy judgment, recognition and production of the requestive downgraders?

4.1 The Homogeneity of Learners

To ensure the homogeneity of learners in different groups at the outset of the study, the researcher administered the OPT to the participants in the study. The results in Table 19 show no significant differences among the learners' language proficiency in different groups at the beginning of the study. In addition to the results of the OPT, pragmatic measures administered as the

pretests testified to the homogeneity of Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic ability at the outset of the study.

Table 19

ANOVA Results Showing Learners' Homogeneity on the OPT and Pragmatic Measures in the Pretest

Measure		SS	df	MS	F	P	Leven's T	P
OPT	B G	.692	3	.231	.001	1.0	.216	.885
	WG	28531.90	116	245.96				
	T	28532.59	119					
Perception Test	B G	424.158	3	141.38	1.56	.202	1.044	.376
	WG	10496.83	116	90.490				
	T	10920.99	119					
Recognition Test	BG	460.56	3	153.52	2.05	.110	1.991	.119
	WG	8669.40	116	74.736				
	T	9129.96	119					
AJT	B G	59.133	3	19.711	.075	.973	1.074	.363
	WG	30398.33	116	262.05				
	T	30457.46	119					
Production Test	B G	12.158	3	4.05	.146	.932	1.991	.116
	WG	3217.83	116	27.74				
	T	3229.99	119					

Note: P* < .05; SS= sum of squares; df= degree of freedom; P=probability level; MS= Mean Score; BG=Between Group; WG= Within Group; AJT=Appropriacy judgment test

In line with the factorial design of the study, the researcher matched subjects in experimental groups based on their scores on the OPT and intelligence profiles. Table 20 illustrates the performance of learners with different intelligence profiles on the OPT in each group. This table displays no significant differences between learners' with an inclination to interpersonal or linguistic intelligence on the OPT in the pretest.

Table 20

'Instruction by MI_s' Pairwise Comparison on the OPT in the Pretest

Instruction	MI	N	OPT Mean	SD	MD	P
CR	Linguistic	13	121.00	14.92	1.3	.82
	Interpersonal	17	119.70	15.94		
Dictogloss Task	Linguistic	18	116.88	14.93	-7.44	.233
	Interpersonal	12	124.32	16.34		
Recast	Linguistic	14	122.78	12.34	4.41	.444
	Interpersonal	16	118.37	17.63		
Input enhancement Task	Linguistic	13	124.15	16.79	8.15	.153
	Interpersonal	17	116.00	14.85		
Total	Linguistic	58	121.31	14.82	1.72	.54
	Interpersonal	62	119.53	16.152		

*P**<.05; MD: Mean difference; MI=multiple intelligence

In a more detailed look, Table 21 demonstrates that learners with a tendency to interpersonal or linguistic intelligence showed no significant differences on different pragmatic measures in different instructional conditions. Based on the findings in Table 20 and 21, the researcher assumed that learners' with an inclination to interpersonal or linguistic intelligence had similar language proficiency in each group at the outset of the study. Therefore, post instructional changes cannot be attributed to learners' pre-existing differences in language or pragmatic proficiency.

Table 21

'Instruction by MI_s' Pairwise Comparison on Pragmatic Measures in the Pretest

Group	Measure	MI	N	Mean	SD	MD	P	
Consciousness Raising Task	Recognition	Linguistic	13	35.69	11.38			
		Interpersonal	17	30.64	8.65	5.04	.178	
	Production	Linguistic	13	12.30	4.30			
		Interpersonal	17	11.88	5.13	.425	.182	
	AJT	Linguistic	13	211.38	15.14			
		Interpersonal	17	213.52	13.52	2.15	.574	
	Perception	Linguistic	13	66.84	11.10			
		Interpersonal	17	69.00	9.63	2.14	.686	
	Dictogloss Task	Recognition	Linguistic	18	25.66	6.10		
			Interpersonal	12	31.00	8.82	5.33	.080
Production		Linguistic	18	12.00	6.21			
		Interpersonal	12	15.75	3.84	3.75	.126	
AJT		Linguistic	18	213.05	16.63			
		Interpersonal	12	214.66	22.30	.917	.787	
Perception		Linguistic	18	67.33	7.48			
		Interpersonal	12	68.25	10.98	1.61	.822	
Recast		Recognition	Linguistic	14	28.28	7.12		
			Interpersonal	16	29.56	9.85	1.27	.691
	Production	Linguistic	14	13.00	4.35			
		Interpersonal	16	11.81	4.02	1.18	.444	
	AJT	Linguistic	14	216.78	13.33			
		Interpersonal	16	212.06	12.28	3.05	.300	
	Perception	Linguistic	14	66.42	8.06			
		Interpersonal	16	63.37	7.74	4.72	.321	
	Input Enhancement Task	Recognition	Linguistic	13	29.15	9.37		
			Interpersonal	17	27.94	7.24	1.12	.692
Production		Linguistic	13	13.84	7.17			
		Interpersonal	17	11.82	5.27	2.02	.380	
AJT		Linguistic	13	216.78	20.13			
		Interpersonal	17	212.06	17.38	4.63	.252	
Perception		Linguistic	13	72.69	11.04			
		Interpersonal	17	68.05	10.53	2.47	.721	

4.2 The Assumption of Multivariate Analysis

To examine the effects of the instructional treatments on different measures of pragmatic competence, the researcher utilized 'General Linear Model: Multivariate analysis and Multivariate Repeated Measure'. These two tests were utilized to analyze the research questions (i.e., the main effects of instructional treatments, time, MI_s and the interaction effects of instructional treatments and MI_s). To ensure that multivariate analyses and multivariate repeated measure can be used safely, the researcher initially checked the Leven's test as the main assumption behind these tests. Table 22 shows the results of the Leven's test on the dependant variables for the MANOVA. This table presenting the equal error variances of the dependant variables across groups testifies to the safe use of this test.

Table 22
Leven's Test Showing the Error variance of the Measures

Measures	df1	Df2	F	P
Pretest Recognition	7	112	.572	.778
Post Recognition	7	112	1.65	.127
Delayed recognition	7	112	1.17	.323
Pretest Production	7	112	1.09	.371
Post Production	7	112	1.59	.143
Delayed Production	7	112	1.46	.188
Pretest Perception	7	112	.661	.705
Post Perception	7	112	1.51	.169
Delayed Perception	7	112	1.38	.219
Pretest AJT	7	112	.824	.569
Post AJT	7	112	1.33	.242
Delayed AJT	7	112	1.28	.623

The Leven's test in Table 23 also testifies to the safe use of the test of multivariate analysis repeated measure. Since this table shows no significant differences among the error variance of the dependant variables; the researcher safely used the multivariate and other related analyses.

Table 23

Leven's Test Showing the Error Variance of the Measures

Measures	df1	df2	F	P
Pretest Perception	3	116	1.044	.376
Post Perception	3	116	.691	.559
Delayed Perception	3	116	.271	.885
Pretest Recognition	3	116	.742	.529
Post Recognition	3	116	1.308	.275
Delayed recognition	3	116	1.598	.194
Pretest AJT	3	116	1.074	.363
Post AJT	3	116	1.408	.244
Delayed AJT	3	116	.086	.967
Pretest Production	3	116	2.014	.116
Post Production	3	116	1.541	.208
Delayed Production	3	116	2.207	.091

Note: P* < .05; df = degree of freedom; P = probability level; AJT = Appropriacy judgment test

As part of the analyses, the researcher also used multivariate analysis to compare the effects of input-based tasks (i.e., CR + input enhancement tasks) and output-based tasks (dictogloss + recast condition) on pragmatic measures. Findings in Table 24 also reveal the safe use of this test for the analysis of the data.

Table 24

Leven's Test Showing the Error Variance of the Measures

Measures	df1	df2	F	P
Pretest Perception	1	118	2.282	.134
Post Perception	1	118	.227	.635
Delayed Perception	1	118	.158	.692
Pretest Recognition	1	118	1.643	.202
Post Recognition	1	118	1.241	.268
Delayed recognition	1	118	.094	.759
Pretest AJT	1	118	.002	.963
Post AJT	1	118	.242	.623
Delayed AJT	1	118	.053	.818
Pretest Production	1	118	.165	.685
Post Production	1	118	7.939	.006
Delayed Production	1	118	3.594	.060

Table 24 shows that, except for the production measure in the immediate posttest, the Leven's test has not been violated. In this regard, Garson (2008) stated that a failure to meet the assumption of homogeneity of variance is not fatal to ANOVA models when groups are of equal size.

4.3 The Effects of Instructional Treatments: Null Hypothesis 1

The first hypothesis investigates the effects of input-based (i.e., CR and input enhancement) tasks and output-based (i.e., recast and dictogloss) tasks on different pragmatic measures. To test this hypothesis, the researcher utilized the general linear model: multivariate analysis encompassing a number of tests such as the univariate test to examine the effects of instructional treatments among groups on pragmatic measures. The researcher also employed a post hoc analysis to spot the cause of the significance. In addition to this test, the researchers also employed multivariate analysis repeated measure including a number of tests to investigate the effects of treatment within each group on different measures. While 'MANOVA' analyzed the effects of treatment on the average dependant variables, the univariate test did the same on separate dependant variables. Finally, a pair-wise comparison was conducted to specifically investigate the effects of treatment within each experimental group on different pragmatic measures.

Since a number of variables were needed to be investigated in this hypothesis, analyses were carried out separately for each measure.

Chapter Five

Conclusion and Pedagogical Implications

CHAPTER V

Conclusion, Implications and Suggestion for Further Research

In this chapter, the researcher, firstly, summarizes the main points of Chapter 1 to 4. Through referring to the gaps in the ILP literature, he restates the problems and purposes of the study and then briefly reviews the methodology section. Since the researcher separately discussed the results of each hypothesis in chapter 4, a general discussion for all the hypotheses is also presented here. Secondly, in the light of the findings and discussions, the researcher draws the tentative conclusions and justifications for each measure. After presenting the conclusions and justifications for the results, the researcher will finally elaborate on the pedagogical and theoretical implications derived from the findings of the study and propose some suggestions for further research.

5.1 A Brief Restatement of the Problem and Methodology Section

Due to the limited available data on the developmental pragmatic studies, Jean and Kaya (1996) argued that the findings should not be taken as definitive unless ILP studies are examined in greater detail from different perspectives (cited in Takimoto, 2009). Furthermore, not only have the past studies mainly focused on the implicit and explicit teaching of L2 pragmatic features but only

few studies have investigated the effects of focused tasks on the learners' acquisition of L2 pragmatic features. Therefore, future studies need to compare the effects of focused tasks with varying degrees of explicitness and implicitness on the learners' enhancement of L2 pragmatic ability.

To this end, the researcher investigated the effects of focused tasks on the development of Iranian EFL learners' pragmatic competence. It was proposed that the effect of focused tasks can be approached from two perspectives: (1) the implicit and explicit teaching of target features and (2) the effects of input-based and output-based tasks on the enhancement of learners' pragmatic ability.

Although in the current research, the researcher had the second perspective in mind throughout the research, the results needed to be discussed with respect to both perspectives. Complementary to the main focus of the study discussed above, the researcher also examined the interactions between the effects of focused tasks and Iranian EFL learners' individual differences on the development of their pragmatic competence.

In this study, the researcher utilized CR as an input-based task and dictogloss as an output-based task to explicitly raise the learners' awareness of the target features. On the implicit end, the researcher employed input enhancement task as an input-based task to implicitly raise learners' awareness of the target features. He also implemented the recast through a role play task to both raise learners' awareness of target features and provide an opportunity for learners' production. The researcher also explored the interaction between the effects of

these tasks and Iranian EFL learners' MI_s on the development of their pragmatic competence.

To fulfill the above goals, the researcher matched the subjects in four experimental groups based on their scores on the OPT and their interpersonal and linguistic intelligence profiles. Then, he randomly assigned the groups to the experimental conditions, namely the consciousness raising task, the dictogloss task, the input enhancement task and the recast condition. These instructional tasks were utilized to implement the requestive downgraders for eight sessions. To measure the effects of different instructional tasks on the learner's development of pragmatic competence, the researcher developed a perception questionnaire, a recognition test, an appropriacy judgment test, and a production test. In the next section, the researcher presents a general discussion of the findings.

5.2 Conclusion

Findings of the study revealed that except for input enhancement as an input-based task implicitly raising learners' awareness of the target features, other tasks and activities were effective in the development of learners' perceptions. Based on the results, it can be concluded that more overt instruction might be more fruitful in the learners' enhancement of perceptions.

As mentioned earlier, participants in the input enhancement task only responded to a request letter in which the contextual variables of power, social

distance and size of imposition were typographically highlighted. Although both the input enhancement task and the recast as the corrective feedback are on the implicit end of the explicit/implicit continuum, participants in the recast condition could develop their perceptions concerning the nature of language from the pretest to the immediate and delayed posttests. Therefore, the input enhancement as an input-based task implicitly raising learners' awareness of the target features was the least effective condition for the perception measure.

5.4 Implications

As stated, since previous studies have not compared the effects of the focused tasks on the development of learners' pragmatic competence, the justification and discussion here are speculative; therefore, similar studies may more firmly assert the role of input-based and output-based tasks in pragmatics. In the light of the results of this study, some conclusions providing grounds for further research and pedagogical implications for teachers and practitioners are reached.

5.4.1 Theoretical implications.

Tasks and activities in this study are supported by different hypotheses, i.e., Schmidt's (1990) noticing hypothesis, Swain's (1985, cited in Ellis, 2003)

output hypothesis, and Long's (1996) interaction hypothesis. Based on the findings, learners had a better performance when they had an opportunity to process the target features through either explicit tasks, (i.e., CR and dictogloss tasks), or output-based tasks, (i.e., dictogloss and role-play tasks). This means that tasks gaining insights from Swain's (1985, cited in Ellis, 2003) output hypothesis, Long's (1996) interaction hypothesis, and tasks raising learners' awareness at the level of understanding can be more effective.

5.4.2 Pedagogical Implications.

5.4.2.1 Implication for teachers.

The results not only confirmed the teachability of the pragmatic features but also revealed the applicability of the focused tasks and activities in the realm of pragmatics; therefore, in EFL contexts where exposure to the second language culture is limited, formal instruction can help EFL learners enhance their pragmatic competence.

Findings also revealed a significant gap before and after the treatment on the learners' perception measure. This gap shows teachers the necessity for raising learners' awareness about cross cultural differences and non-linguistic factors in the process of L2 acquisition. That is, teachers should also pay some heed to EFL learners' sociopragmatic ability, in addition to pragmalinguistic ability.

5.4.2.2 Implications for material developers.

The findings of the study can also have some implications for material developers. Except for the perception measure, participants in the input enhancement task performed significantly better in the immediate and delayed posttests than their pretest on all pragmatic measures. Therefore, material developers can employ the typographical technique of input enhancement task to implicitly improve students' pragmatic ability through highlighting the sociolinguistic variables in textbooks.

Material developers can also design some sections in textbooks to raise learners' awareness about cross-cultural differences and the conflicting norms in L1 and L2. In this way, teachers in language classes can efficiently modify learners' perceptions regarding the nature of language. They can raise learners' awareness of the fact that the pragmatic competence is as equally significant as the linguistic competence.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

As stated, this study investigated the effects of focused tasks on Iranian EFL learners' development of pragmatic competence. To this end, the researcher employed CR as an input-based task and the dictogloss as an output-based task to explicitly raise learners' awareness of the requestive downgrades. The researcher also operationalized recast through a role play task to both provide an

opportunity for learners' production and raise learners' awareness of the requestive downgraders implicitly. Input enhancement task as an input-based task was also utilized to implicitly raise the learners' awareness of the requestive downgraders.

REFERENCES

- Acat, M. B. (2005). Applicability of the multiple intelligence theory to the process of organizing and planning of learning and teaching. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 14(1), 54-72. EJ 846579.
- Alcon-Soler, E. (2005). Does instruction work for learning pragmatics in the EFL context? *System*, 33, 417-435.
- Alcon-Soler, E., & Martinez-Flor, A. (2005). Editors' introduction to pragmatics in instructed language learning. *System*, 33, 381-384.
- Alcon-Soler, E., Safont Jorda, P., & Martinez-Flor, A. (2005). *Towards a typology of modifiers for the speech act of requesting: A sociopragmatic approach*. Retrieved January 29, 2011, <http://www.dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo.pdf>
- Allen, D. (2004). *Oxford placement test 1*. Oxford: OUP.
- Anderson, J. (2000). *Learning and memory: An integrated approach*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Armstrong, T. (1993). *7 kinds of smart: Identifying and developing your many intelligences*. New York: Plume, Penguin Group.
- Backman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: OUP.
- Backman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). *Language testing in practice*. Oxford: OUP.

Appendices

Appendix A

Oxford Placement Test: New 2004 Edition

Grammar Test Part 1

Look at these examples. The correct answer is ticked,

- a. In warm climates people /√likes/ are liking sitting outside in the sun.
- b. If it is very hot, they sit at/√in/under the shade

I. Now the test will begin. Tick the correct answers.

1. Water is to boil/is boiling/boils at a temperature of 100 degree Celsius.
2. In some countries, there is/is/it is very hot all the time
3. In cold countries, people wear thick clothes **for keeping/to keep/ for to keep** warm.
4. In England people are always talking about a weather/the weather/weather.
5. In some places, it rains/there rains/it raining almost everyday
6. In desert there isn't the/some/any grass.
7. Places near the Equator have a warm/the warm/warm weather even in the cold season.
8. In England coldest/the coldest/colder time of year is usually from December to February.
9. The most/Most/ of Most people don't know what it is really like in other countries.
- 10 Very less /little/few people can travel abroad.
11. Mohammad Ali has won/won/is winning his first world title in 1960.
12. After he had won/have won/was winning an Olympic gold medal he became a professional boxer.
13. His religious beliefs have made him/made him/to made him change his name when he became champion
14. If he has/would have/had lost his first fight with Sonny Liston, no one would have been surprised.
15. He has travelled a lot both/and/or as a boxer and as world famous personality.
16. He is very well known all in/all over/in all the world
17. Many people is believing/are believing/believe he was the greatest boxer of all time.
18. To be the best from/in/of the world is not easy
19. Like any top sportsman Ali had to/must/should train very hard.

Appendix B

The Questionnaire for the Evaluation of Constructed Scenarios

پرسشنامه زیر از شصت سناریو در موقعیتهای متفاوت تشکیل شده است. لطفا سناریوهای زیر را بدقت مطالعه کرده و آنها را بر اساس توضیحات و جدول زیر ارزشیابی کنید.

Scale						Scenario
قدرت درخواست کننده	5	4	E	2	1	خواهر کوچکتر شما برای پرداخت قبوض آب و برق می خواهد به بانک برود. مقداری پول به اومی دهید و از او می خواهید که به حساب شما واریز نماید.
میزان آشنایی / فاصله اجتماعی	5	4	3	2	1	
حجم درخواست	5	4	3	2	1	
امکان وقوع درخواست	5	4	3	2	1	

توجه:

1- قدرت درخواست کننده:

قدرت درخواست کننده نسبت به طرف مقابل به پنج درجه تقسیم شده است.
 1و2 = قدرت درخواست کننده نسبت به طرف مقابل کمترین میباشد.
 = قدرت درخواست کننده نسبت به طرف مقابل مساوی می باشد. E
 3و4 = قدرت درخواست کننده نسبت به طرف مقابل بیشتر میباشد.

2- فاصله اجتماعی / میزان آشنایی:

فاصله اجتماعی / میزان آشنایی به پنج درجه تقسیم شده است.
 1 = کمترین فاصله اجتماعی (یعنی مخاطبین همدیگر را به خوبی می شناسند)
 5 = بیشترین فاصله اجتماعی (یعنی مخاطبین همدیگر را به خوبی نمی شناسند)

3- حجم یا سنگینی درخواست:

نوع درخواست و حجم یا سنگینی آن نیز به پنج درجه تقسیم شده است.
 1 = درخواست با کمترین حجم
 5 = درخواست با سنگینترین حجم

4- امکان وقوع درخواست در زندگی روزمره

امکان وقوع درخواست در زندگی روزمره نیز به پنج درجه تقسیم شده است.
 1 = عدم امکان وقوع درخواست در زندگی روزمره
 5 = بیشترین امکان وقوع درخواست در زندگی روزمره

تعامل بین تاثیر فعاليت های تمرکزی و هوشهای چند گانه بر روی توسعه توانش عملی دانشجویان ایرانی رشته زبان انگلیسی (انگلیسی به عنوان زبان خارجه)

مطالعه حاضر به بررسی تاثیر فعاليت های تمرکزی (focused tasks) بر روی پیشرفت توانش کاربردی زبان آموزان انگلیسی به عنوان زبان خارجه پرداخته است. همچنین بررسی تعامل فعاليتهاي تمرکزی و هوشهای بین فردی و زبانی نیز از اهداف این مطالعه بوده است. در آغاز، 147 زبان آموز انگلیسی ایرانی با شرکت در مطالعه، محققین را در ساخت ابزار تحقیق یعنی پرسشنامه درک، تستهای تشخیص و تولید یاری نمودند. محقق همچنین با استفاده از پرسشنامه هوش چندگانه آرمسترانگ اطلاعات مورد نیاز در ارتباط با هوش زبان آموزان را جمع آوری نمود. در همین راستا، 43 بومی آمریکایی انگلیسی زبان برای ساختن تست تشخیص و مواد آموزشی برای انجام تحقیق دعوت به همکاری شدند. برای انجام تحقیق، 120 زبان آموز انگلیسی فارسی زبان بر اساس نمراتشان در آزمون سطح آکسورد (2004) به چهار گروه همگن تقسیم گردیدند. این گروهها به طور تصادفی در یکی از شرایط آموزشی آگاهی انگیزی (Consciousness Raising) و برجسته سازی (Input Enhancement) به عنوان فعاليتهاي ورود محور، املاء-انشاء (Dictogloss) و نقش آفرینی (Role play) به عنوان یک فعاليتهاي تولید محور، قرار گرفتند. این فعاليتها برای ارائه آموزش یعنی تدریس فرمهای تعدیل کننده درخواست در زبان دوم به مدت هشت جلسه مورد استفاده قرار گرفتند. مطالعه حاضر نشان داد که تفاوت معنا داری بین گروههای آموزشی بر روی تستهای تشخیص (Recognition)، تولید (Production) و مناسب سنجی کلام (Appropriacy Judgment Test) وجود دارد. به استثناء عملکرد شرکت کنندگان در گروه برجسته سازی بر روی تست درک (Perception)، شرکت کنندگان در تمامی گروهها عملکرد بهتری در پس آزمون اول نسبت به پیش آزمون داشتند. نتایج نشان داد در حالیکه تاثیر زمان باعث تفاوت معنا داری بین گروههای آموزشی بر روی تستهای درک و تشخیص نگردید، تاثیر این عامل باعث تفاوت معنا داری بین گروههای آموزشی بر روی تست مناسب سنجی کلام و تولید گردید. تنها شرکت کنندگان در گروههای آموزشی املاء-انشاء و برجسته سازی تنها قادر به حفظ تاثیر مثبت آموزش در پس آزمون دوم به ترتیب بر روی تستهای درک و تشخیص نبودند.

تعهد نامه اصالت رساله یا پایان نامه

اینجانب **عبدالحسین احمدی** دانش آموخته مقطع کارشناسی ارشد ناپیوسته در رشته آموزش زبان انگلیسی که در تاریخ **1390/11/30** از پایان نامه / رساله خود تحت عنوان :

تاثیر فعالیت های تمرکزی بر توسعه توانش عملی دانشجویان ایرانی رشته زبان انگلیسی (انگلیسی به عنوان زبان خارجه)

با کسب نمره **18** و درجه بسیار خوب دفاع نموده ام بدینوسیله متعهد می شود :

- (1) این پایان نامه / رساله حاصل تحقیق و پژوهش انجام شده توسط اینجانب بوده و در مواردی که از دستاوردهای علمی و پژوهشی دیگران (اعم از پایان نامه ، کتاب ، مقاله و ...) استفاده نموده ام ، مطابق ضوابط و رویه موجود ، نام منبع مورد استفاده و سایر مشخصات آن را در فهرست مربوطه ذکر و درج کرده ام.
- (2) این پایان نامه / رساله قبلاً برای دریافت هیچ مدرک تحصیلی (هم سطح ، پایین تر یا بالاتر) در سایر دانشگاه ها و مؤسسات آموزش عالی ارائه نشده است.
- (3) چنانچه بعد از فراغت از تحصیل ، قصد استفاده و هرگونه بهره برداری اعم از چاپ کتاب ، ثبت اختراع و ... از این پایان نامه داشته باشم ، از حوزه معاونت پژوهشی واحد مجوزهای مربوطه را اخذ نمایم.
- (4) چنانچه در هر مقطع زمانی خلاف موارد فوق ثابت شود ، عواقب ناشی از آن را می پذیرم و واحد دانشگاهی مجاز است با اینجانب مطابق ضوابط و مقررات رفتار نموده و در صورت ابطال مدرک تحصیلی ام هیچگونه ادعایی نخواهم داشت.

نام و نام خانوادگی: **عبدالحسین احمدی**

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ



دانشگاه آزاد اسلامی واحد لارستان
دانشکده علوم انسانی

پایان نامه کارشناسی ارشد رشته آموزش زبان انگلیسی (M.A.)

موضوع

تعامل بین تاثیر فعالیت های تمرکزی و هوش های چند گانه بر توسعه توانش عملی
دانشجویان ایرانی رشته زبان انگلیسی (انگلیسی به عنوان زبان خارجه)

استاد راهنما
دکتر رضا غفارثمر

نگارنده
عبدالحسین احمدی

سال تحصیلی
1390-1391